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Abstract

This dissertation explores the relationship between the *compendios de castigos* brought into Castilian during the last years of the reign of Fernando III and the first four years of Alfonso X’s rule and the socio-political milieu in which they were circulated. The first two works are canonical texts of Arabic *adab*, instructional works for the education and criticism of rulers, and the third work was written in Castilian and modeled on the style of *adab* literature. For each text, I analyze the formal aspects of the frametales within each collection, and I propose a new method for looking at the didactic content. I first examine the work of *Calila e Dimna*, which the *infante* don Alfonso ordered to be translated into Castilian in 1251. Apart from being the first work of prose literary fiction to be made in Castilian, the act of translating this work, I argue, was important for three main reasons: first, for crafting his royal image as a patron of wisdom; second, for laying the foundation for a new model of Castilian monarchy; and third, for changing the goals of conquest from strictly material gains to the acquisition of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy, and science.

The second text I look at is the *Sendebar*, the translation project of Alfonso’s oldest sibling, the *infante* don Fadrique, who ordered the making of a Castilian version of the work in 1253. Following the same techniques of analysis as implemented in the study of *Calila e Dimna*, I propose a reception of *Sendebar* in the context of mid-thirteenth-
century Castile that challenges the goals of Alfonso’s cultural program and undermines Alfonso’s attempts to further centralize authority under the king. Where Alfonso’s book seeks to legitimize the centralization of power under the wise monarch, Fadrique’s book offers an alternative perspective to that model by offering an example of the dangers of potential abuse from an unchecked authority.

The final work studied was also made under the patronage of Alfonso X, most likely between 1255-58, and is titled the *Libro de los doze sabios*. I contend that the work as a whole also supports Alfonso’s cultural project of redefining the role of the king, crafting a new image for the monarchy in Castile, and re-writing the history of the conquest to make the acquisition of wisdom its primary goal. The application of my conclusions, regarding the process of meaning-making that is involved in these texts, to the socio-historical moment of the translation of *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar* and the creation of the *Libro de los doze sabios*, will allow a more nuanced understanding of the way the Alfonsine cultural campaign exercised its power and influence.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Historical Context

Alfonso X, as his uncle Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, was known during his own lifetime as a great patron of the Arts and Sciences. Scholars since his time have even suggested that he was more deserving of the title *stupor mundi* than his uncle because of Alfonso’s awe inspiring personal intelligence (Burns “Stupor Mundi” 13). Alfonso led one of the greatest projects of *translatio studii* in the history of the world, translating texts ranging from holy scriptures to astronomical calculations, political training to games of diversion, bringing works from Arabic and Hebrew into the vernacular Castilian language for the enrichment of his culture and subjects. In addition to mere translation, Alfonso had many works expanded and improved upon, such as the *Tablas alfonsís* which became the most comprehensive astronomical charts for centuries, and also he created original works on an equally impressive variety of topics, such as poetry, statecraft, historiography, and law.¹ Scholars still debate the extent of Alfonso’s role in the direct

¹ Robert I. Burns provides a helpful overview of the Alfonsine cultural project in his essay “Stupor Mundi: Alfonso X of Castile, the Learned”. See Charles Burnett for a history of translation projects carried out in medieval Spain. O’Callaghan discusses the
translation or composition of these projects, but consensus tends to favor the belief that he approved the codices being made in his royal *scriptoria*, and that with many, if not all, he personally revised and contributed to their final versions. Historians believe the monarch directly supervised a select collection of projects, and for some, such as his poetic works, critics consider Alfonso as the ‘author’ (while still recognizing that he was one of many authors and laborers involved in creating the final codex). The patronage of these cultural projects which made Castile and the Castilian language an important locus of knowledge in the thirteenth century also led posterity to name Alfonso X the father of the Castilian language and *el rey sabio*.

Posterity, however, often looks at the culmination of the deeds, the collective force of all the projects accomplished over the course of a lifetime, and frequently ignores the smaller details of particular choices made within specific historical contexts. My objective is not to challenge the labeling of Alfonso X as *el rey sabio*, or *stupor mundi*, but rather to look at Alfonso’s involvement in the fashioning of his royal image. Epithets, such as “el Sabio”, come to describe an essence about the bearer in a way that regular adjectives do not. While grammatically descriptive, they end up defining their subjects, which can lead us to forget that such titles were once describing an accumulation of actions. We also forget that individuals commonly craft their own construction of Alfonso X’s royal image in “Image and Reality: The King Creates His Kingdom” and *The Learned King: The Reign of Alfonso X of Castile*.
epithets. In the pages that follow, I study a selection of works that were brought into Castilian, two by translation and one by invention, during the first years of Alfonso’s reign and those immediately preceding his ascendancy to the throne in order to elucidate the negotiations, contestations, and political objectives and consequences that went along with the forging of his royal image as a wise ruler.

_Castile Before Alfonso X, el Sabio_

Castile did not acquire its power along perfectly progressive or linear routes over the period often referred to as the Reconquest. Its history ebbed and flowed, and Castile acquired and lost lands, cultures, resources, and peoples.² It began as a Leonese countship in north-central Iberia, given to Count Rodrigo I by the King of Asturias, Ordoño I (850-2).

² Joseph F. O’Callaghan’s classic book, _A History of Medieval Spain_ provides an excellent overview of the history of the Iberian Peninsula from the Visigoths to Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic Monarchs. For specific examples of Christian losses and setbacks during their conquest of the peninsula, see his chapter on the Almohads (234-53) and the particular case of the capture of Jaén in his chapter “The Great Reconquest” (351). See O’Callaghan’s treatment of the Crusade of Silves in 1189 in _Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain_ (59) Peter Linehan mentions Castilian losses, and short lived gains, during the thirteenth century in _Spain 1157-1300: A Partible Inheritance_ (69). For rebellions during the reign of Alfonso X, see H. Salvador Martínez 179-90).
Although it gained its independence from León in the midtenth century, it was not until the mid-eleventh century that Fernando I elevated the countship to a kingdom when he gave it to his first-born, Sancho II (O’Callaghan *A History* 198; *Reconquest* 23-24). At this moment, the territorial expanse of Castile was slightly less than that of bordering León and reached as far south as Segovia, but due to the collapse of the Umayyad Caliphate of Córdoba in 1031, and the creation of the Taifa kingdoms throughout the peninsula, its power of influence also extended over the kingdom of Zaragoza, which paid tribute to Sancho II.4

Over the next two centuries, Castile would eclipse and then absorb the kingdoms of León and Galicia, and would become the largest kingdom of the Iberian Peninsula,
rivaled only by Aragón as the dominant hegemonic force south of the Pyrenees. In no way as swift or far-reaching as the successful Umayyad campaigns of the eighth century, Castilian expansion during the first half of the thirteenth century occurred with surprising speed and efficacy. Unlike with the arrival of the Umayyads, however, the subjects of the conquered territories received their new Castilian rulers far less joyfully. Where Umayyad rule provided Jewish populations more liberties and autonomy, and even Christians quickly came to embrace the technological, cultural, and sanitary advances that came with the new ruling class, the populations of al-Andalus subjugated by Christian rulers five centuries later were primarily displaced, routinely expelled, and often relegated to positions of inferior status with few avenues for social ascendency or integration. If a parallel can be drawn between these two cases of conquest, it is that

5 The following scholars all reference the rapid expansion of Castile and its preeminent position in Iberia at this moment: Fletcher (144-45); O’Callaghan A History (333-57), Reconquest (209); and Salvador Martínez (118-19).

6 Maribel Fierro describes the differences of the two conquests, with particular attention given to language, in Al-Ándalus: saberes e intercambios culturales (13-24). See Fletcher for the treatment of Muslims during and after the Christian conquest of the southern kingdoms (131-56). In María Rosa Menocal’s well-known book, The Ornament of the World, she contrasts her idea of convivencia in al-Andalus to the culture of intolerance of post-reconquest Spain (266-73). While not directly expressed, one can glean further
coreligionists residing outside of the peninsula often endangered the rulers of Iberia, Muslim and Christian alike. These external powers frequently demanded greater intolerance towards groups considered to be “other”, meaning that in addition to the conflicts between peninsular rulers, the kingdoms of Iberia were recurrently threatened from multiple sides of the political sphere. Just as al-Andalus was continually condemned and periodically threatened for its laxity in religious orthodoxy by those across the strait of Gibraltar, Christian kingdoms and authorities were also vulnerable to examples of difference in treatment on the following pages of O’Callaghan A History (358-60); Reconquest (204-11).

Fierro’s work focuses on the history and culture of al-Andalus, and many of her most important essays are collected in the book The Almohad Revolution. Of particular interest here are the essays “Between the Magreb and al-Andalus”, “The mahdī Ibn Tūmart and al-Andalus”, and “Alfonso X ‘The Wise’”. See David Nirenberg for examples of coreligionists placing pressures on Muslim communities that were subjugated to Christian rulers. Regarding pressure from the Papacy, see Linehan The Spanish Church (178-79); also see Fletcher’s chapter “Convivencia” (131-56), in which he states: “The impulse to convert the Mudejars to Christianity tended to come from outside the peninsula” (140). Regarding Christian aggressions from beyond the Pensinsula against peninsular Christian kingdoms, there are many examples, the most notable being the Albigensian Crusade.
influence from powers and politics on the other side of the Pyrenees, which increasingly pressured Iberian rulers to expel, convert, or execute non-Christian subjects (Flecher 131-56; Márquez Villanueva El concepto 106-07).

The Castilian infante don Alfonso, son of Fernando III, ascended to the throne in 1252, having participated only four years earlier in the conquest of Sevilla in 1248, and before that in the campaign that took control of Murcia (1243-45). His father, Fernando III, credited with the conquests of Murcia and Sevilla, was the ruler during the capture of Trujillo (1233), Córdoba (1236), and Jaén (1246), among other territories, and in addition to the number of military victories under his command, Fernando III championed the greatest acquisition of territory that any one kingdom had seen since the Umayyads (O’Callaghan A History 333-57; Reconquest 92-123; Salvador Martínez 93-97; 118-19). Alfonso would inherit one of the largest, most powerful and ostensibly wealthiest kingdoms of Europe and the Mediterranean. The newly expanded Castile, however, was politically unstable for a myriad of reasons: legal, economic, cultural, religious, linguistic, and demographic (Fierro “Alfonso X” 186-93; González Jiménez 37-58; Salvador Martinez 118-34). 8 Despite the external appearance of fortitude and splendor,

---

8 It is not my goal to defend what aspect was more problematic, of greater importance, or of most concern for Alfonso X, but rather to acknowledge that the image that Castile upheld externally did not realistically reflect the internal problems of the kingdom
Castile was economically in ruins and most likely had been for a number of years (Salvador Martínez 126-27). For example, Salvador Martínez states that “durante aquel primer año de gobierno, Alfonso se tuvo que ocupar de una crisis interna que sin duda había empezado ya durante los últimos años del reinado de su padre y en ese momento había llegado a un estado alarmante: la economía del reino, que estaba prácticamente en ruinas” (126-27). Castile needed reform, and a willing king who was capable of such an undertaking.

The need for reform may be seen by the fact that Fernando III ordered that the Liber Iudiciorum, or Lex gothica, be translated into romance in 1241 and given as the legal code for newly conquered territories (O’Callaghan A History 509). Additionally, Fernando III during the latter part of his reign began to use romance for internal bureaucratic communications; a shift that some critics have claimed was inspired more by the lack of human resources than an ideological desire to make Castilian the language of court documents (Márquez Villanueva 50-53). Whether or not Fernando III ever had the intention of legislatively and bureaucratically reforming the state he had built through military conquest and diplomatic subjugation may never be known. What we do know, however, is that during the thirteenth century Castile repeatedly had to re-conquer territories, the actions of the crown were constantly contested by ecclesiastics, and immediately following its great expansion, a period that is traditionally characterizes as being an uncontested success.
despite the vulnerability of the realm to revolts, Fernando III was still looking beyond his borders up to the time of his death in 1252 as he was making preparations to invade the north of Africa (Ballesteros-Baretta 67; O’Callaghan *A History* 354). If Fernando had any interest in reforming the legislation and court practices of the domain, it does not appear that it was one of his priorities.

*The Infante don Alfonso*

Scholars note the scarcity of information about the early years of the *infante* don Alfonso (Ballesteros-Beretta 53, González Jiménez 19; Linehan *Spain...* 104-05; Salvador Martínez 28). After his birth in Toledo on November 23, 1221, he was given over to a wet-nurse and her husband, Urraca Pérez and don García Álvarez de Toledo, who accompanied the prince later to Burgos where at just four months of age he was recognized as heir to the throne at the Courts of 1222 (Ballesteros-Beretta 48-51; González Jiménez 17-19; Salvador Martínez 26). Come summer, he was given over to a tutor and his wife, don García Fernández de Villamayor and doña Mayor Arias, who raised the child through infancy and adolescence in Villaldemiro and Celada del Camino, both situated about 20 kilometers from Burgos (Ballesteros-Beretta 49-53; González Jiménez 17-19; Salvador Martínez 27). Apart from reconstructing probable associates and places of residence during his early years, based primarily in the land holdings of his tutors, little information regarding Alfonso’s childhood is known. One source is his own poetry, where in *Cantigas* 122 and 256 he describes that he witnessed two miracles performed by the Virgin Mary (González Jiménez 19; Salvador Martínez 29-30). The
first portrays how the Virgin Mary answered his mother’s prayers and resurrected his younger sister, Berenguela. The second speaks of his mother’s miraculous recovery from an illness in Cuenca that the doctors believed would be fatal. The coincidence that both childhood memories described in the Cantigas pertain primarily to his mother, and that the collection of Galician poetry is in praise of the Virgin, has led some critics to posit that Alfonso’s devotion to the Virgin is in some way connected to the loss of his own mother on November 5, 1235, just weeks before Alfonso’s fourteenth birthday (Salvador Martínez 30).

Scholars have reassembled other fragments of his youth from histories and chronicles, such as the accounts that he accompanied his father on campaigns in the south (González Jiménez 20-23; Salvador Martínez 95). At age ten the infante don Alfonso observed the clashes between Castilian and enemy forces, was instructed in tactics, and witnessed the enslavement and beheadings of his father’s enemies (Salvador Martínez 96). Historians believe that Alfonso wrote much of the description in the Estoria de España concerning the cabalgada de Jerez in 1231, possibly his first experience with warfare. He was most likely present at the conquests of Trujillo (1233) and Córdoba (1236), and by the age of nineteen we know that he fought in the campaigns in the south with his father. By 1243, at age twenty-one, he was leading the military operation in Murcia, and after its conclusion in 1245 he fought alongside his father in the taking of Sevilla in 1248. Fernando also turned over the distribution of land and resources won at
Sevilla to Alfonso. A great deal of his education, as his presence at so many battles attests, was in the art of warfare, both strategy and combat (Salvador Martínez 95-96).

We possess more documentation about the infante’s activities and whereabouts the decade before his ascension to the throne. We have substantial documentation from chronicles and treaties about Alfonso’s participation in the conquest of Murcia and its associated towns from 1243 to 1245. It was during this time that Alfonso began leading his own military campaigns, and signing pacts and treaties for Fernando III. This is also the time when Alfonso solidified his position as heir to the kingdom, and the likely decade of his knighting. The intervention of Alfonso in the Portuguese conflict supports the argument that by the late-1240s Alfonso was already beginning to distinguish himself from his father in anticipation of becoming king. In Portugal, King Sancho II’s younger brother, the infante don Afonso of Portugal, requested Pope Innocent IV to force Sancho

9 Linehan convincingly contests Ballesteros claim, among others, that Alfonso X knighted himself in Sevilla with the mechanical statue of Saint James, now residing in the Las Huelgas Convent in Burgos, before claiming the throne during the days immediately following the death of Fernando III, in his article “The Accession of Alfonso X (1252) and the Origins of the War of the Spanish Succession”. He concludes that Alfonso X was most likely knighted around the age of eighteen (23 November 1239), that it would have been unlikely that he had not received knighthood before marrying Violante de Aragón in 1246, and that he was certainly knighted before becoming king (59-63).
II to separate himself from his wife, doña Mencía López de Haro, for reasons of consanguinity. Sancho II refused, and in 1245 Innocent IV sent a letter that deposed the Portuguese monarch and started the civil war. Fernando III had sworn to the papacy that he would not engage in war against other Christians, and so he requested Alfonso not to intervene in the Portuguese struggle. Alfonso disobeyed and assembled a troop of 300 knights and rode to the assistance of Sancho II in 1246. Sancho was still deposed, but through Alfonso’s intervention he was rescued and taken to safety in Toledo where he died shortly thereafter (González Jiménez 27-30; Salvador Martínez 106-08). The incident also demonstrates the strength of Alfonso and Fernando’s relationship, and the slow process of transferring power from one monarch to the next by allowing for differences while still focusing on the major project of conquering the southern part of the peninsula (Salvador Martínez 109).

The last years of the reign of Fernando III and the first four years of Alfonso X’s rule form the historical frame of this dissertation, which explores the relationship between the compendios de castigos brought into Castilian during this period and the socio-political milieu in which they were circulated. The first and second chapters look at the translation of Calila e Dimna, which the infante don Alfonso ordered to be translated into Castilian in 1251. The act of translating this work, I argue, was important for three main reasons: first, for crafting his royal image as a patron of wisdom; second, for laying the foundation for a new model of Castilian monarchy; and third, for changing the goals
of conquest from strictly material gains to the acquisition of knowledge, wisdom, philosophy, and science.

The third chapter considers the translation project of Alfonso’s oldest sibling, the *infante* don Fadrique, who ordered the making of a Castilian version of *Sendebar* in 1253. While also a work of *adab* literature to assist in the training and correction of rulers, I propose a reception of *Sendebar* in the context of mid-thirteenth-century Castile that challenges the goals of Alfonso’s cultural program and undermines Alfonso’s attempts to further centralize authority under the king. Where Alfonso’s book seeks to legitimize the centralization of power under the wise monarch, Fadrique’s book offers an alternative perspective to that model by offering an example of the dangers of potential abuse from an unchecked authority.

The fourth chapter is another work made under the patronage of Alfonso X, most likely between 1255-58, the *Libro de los doze sabios*. Unlike *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar*, the *Libro de los doze sabios* is an original composition in Castilian, though it certainly finds its model and inspiration in other works of oriental origin that were circulating in the peninsula. The text itself purports to be a work made first under Fernando III and then expanded under Alfonso X, though no evidence other than the text itself has surfaced to support the claim that Fernando began the book. Recent work by Fernando Gómez Redondo has proposed that the book should be fully attributed to Alfonso X, a claim I support in this dissertation. While the internal workings of the text demonstrate a sophisticated structure and coherence, the work as a whole also supports
Alfonso’s cultural project of redefining the role of the king, crafting a new image for the monarchy in Castile, and re-writing the history of the conquest to make the acquisition of wisdom its primary goal.

Andalusī Culture and Arabic ‘Adab’ Literature

The three central works of this dissertation have much more in common with each other than critics have historically recognized. While Calila e Dimna and Sendebar, on one hand, have traditionally (since the eighteenth-century) been categorized as works of literature, the Libro de los doze sabios, on the other hand, has been read as a compendio de castigos, even though more often than not it has been cited for its historical, rather than its didactic content.¹⁰ Scholarship in recent decades, however, has reconsidered the

¹⁰ The Castilian compendio de castigos pertains to the group of didactic texts created to educate rulers and nobles, particularly to model conduct and participate in the education of the “hombre sabio”. Haro Cortés defines and describes the genre, and lists the Calila e Dimna, Sendebar, and Libro de los doze sabios all as members of this grouping (Los compendios 15-16). I am using the word “literature” here to speak of writing associated with what is often called “creative fiction”, and I am referencing the tradition of looking for the roots of Castilian prose fiction in these works. While later writers did seek inspiration in these works for writing imaginative works, it is now widely accepted among Hispano-medievalists that these works are didactic and used for education before entertainment, though a desire to entertain may also influence their composition.
way these works were read during the time of their appearance in Castilian, and while no study to date has brought them together to consider their joint contribution to the evolving ideas regarding the role of the king in mid-thirteenth-century Castile, studies of the individual books have concluded that they overlap as works of, or modeled on, Arabic adab literature.\(^{11}\)

Contemporary scholars of medieval Iberia have become more attuned to Arabic literary practices within adab, such as collections of maxims and sayings attributed to classical sources which overlap with the the Castilian *compendios de castigos*, and to the

\(^{11}\) Jerrilynn D. Dodds, María Rosa Menocal, and Abigail Krasner Balbale provide a general overview of the culture of adab in the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages in *The Arts of Intimacy: Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the Making of Castilian Culture* (235-238). The following authors either speak directly about adab, or mention the influence of Arabic literary traditions, when discussing the works in quest: Fernando Gómez-Redondo concerning *Calila e Dimna* (180-91); María Jesús Lacarra in her study of *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar, La cuentística medieval en España: los orígenes* (33-46); Margaret Parker in her book, *Didactic Structure and Content of* El libro de Calila e Digna (11); and David A. Wacks discusses the importance of adab in Castilian literary history in his work, *Framing Iberia: Māqāmat and Frametale Narratives in Medieval Spain* (30-40).
tradition of frametale narratives. Recent studies of the framed narrative firmly place *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar* within the genre of wisdom literature, deepening and broadening our understanding of the Castilian *compendio de castigos* (Haro Cortés *Los compendios* 16). Likewise, recent editions of these works are also stressing the importance of approaching the texts with their framed structure in mind. Scholars

12 The influence of *adab* on Castilian and European literatures and cultures has been discussed by Jerrilynn D. Dodds, María Rosa Menocal, and Abigail Krasner Balbale (235-238); Katharine Slater Gittes (245); and David Wacks (30-40). While *adab* is not strictly literature, the transmission of its teachings and practices are certainly passed down through the physical manifestation of literature, as discussed by Shawkat M. Toorawa in her article “Defining *adab* by (re)defining *Adib*: Ibn Abi Tahir Tayfur and storytelling”. José Fradejas Lebrero (9-14); Gómez-Redondo (214); Lacarra (*Cuentística* 11-31; *Los cuentos...* 23; *Sendebar* 14-18); Orazi (20-21); and Toorawa (298-301) all take notice of the similar history of transmission of *Sendebar* and *Calila e Dimna/Kalila wa Dimna* and the *Bilawhar wa Budasaf*, all of which passed through the *udaba* of ninth-century Baghdad. For further descriptions of *adab*, see Avner Giladi (5-8) and Fedwa Malti-Douglas (245).

13 For the framed structure of these works, see Federico Bravo (358-71), Fradejas Lebrero (15-23); Gómez-Redondo (218-34), Haro Cortés, *Los compendios* (150-58), Lacarra (*Cuentística* 47-131, *Sendebar* 21-49), and Orazi (25-31). Fedwa Malti-Douglas
tracing generic trends in literature during the later Middle Ages have recognized the influence of Arabic adab works on European texts, often pointing to Sendebar and Calila e Dimna as sites of encounter between East and West, while hispanists have long noted the mix of oriental and occidental influences on the making of the Libro de los doze sabios. As part of the adab tradition, scholarship on these works should also seek to connect them to political and socio-ethical criticism contemporary to the time of their production.

Bearing in mind that Calila e Dimna, Sendebar, and Libro de los doze sabios became accessible to a lay, Castilian audience within the same half-century as Barlaam y Josafat, Bocados de oro, Poridat de poridades, Flores de filosofia, Castigos de Sancho IV, and many others, the possibility that these works were also interpreted through a

characterizes the nature of the adab genre and explains its fusion of didacticism and literary enjoyment (245). Gittes demonstrates the importance of “literary frames” as a crucial part of the hermeneutics of adab literature in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales (245).

\[14\] See note 12 above for information concerning this topic and Calila e Dimna and Sendebar. For information on the Libro de los doze sabios, see for Bizzarri “La idea…” (6-8); Foronda (19); Gómez-Redondo (249); Haro Cortés La imagen... (38); and Walsh (15).
blend of Eastern and Western strategies should be considered. David Wacks states that “the literary practice of the frametale in medieval Iberia dates to at least the tenth century”, and he speculates that in al-Andalus Kalila wa-Dinma could possibly have circulated as early as the eighth or ninth century (12). The full extent to which the eldest infantes, Alfonso and Fadrique, were trained in adab can only be speculated, but during their twenties they both experienced extended periods of emersion in the cultural practices of Western Islamic societies. Whether Fadrique became acquainted with Sendebar in Sicily, while serving in the court of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II as a youth, or in al-Andalus, after the conquest of Sevilla, is unknown; either way, the similar history of both regions, especially their Arabized Christian courts, suggest that Fadrique was both versed in Arabic and familiar with adab literary works prior to traveling to Tunis and serving at the emir’s court (Salvador Martínez 148; Lacarra Sendebar 19-21).

15 Palafóx in Las éticas del exemplum discusses the blending of Eastern and Western practices in the Castigos de Sancho IV (29-59). For a traditional history on medieval politics and literature in Castile, see Juan Beneyto Pérez, who points to the Castilian author Juan Gil de Zamora (1241-1318) as providing the clearest treatise on the emerging style of instructional literature known as the speculum principis (352-53). Beneyto Pérez declared the Alphonsine court a new “época filosófico-moral” where the Western tradition of political discourse and exemplum instruction manuals blended with an Eastern tradition of wisdom literature (353).
Furthermore, both possibilities raise significant, though distinct, arguments for reading these works through a hybridized approach of university and *adab* practices. If Fadrique encountered *Sendebar* while at Frederick’s court, where one of the preferred languages of the emperor was Arabic, then the work becomes an exciting case of transmission that displays the interest of Christian nobles in *adab* works in the Western Mediterranean.\(^{16}\) If he found the work in post-conquest Sevilla, then the work must have been circulating in al-Andalus, and may have had a history in the peninsula that similarly dates to an earlier century, as did *Kalila wa Dimna*.

The *infante* Alfonso was no less familiar with the practices of high culture in Western Islam than his slightly younger, internationally trained brother Fadrique. Alfonso, as first-born, had to be educated in Castile, but this did not stop him from fostering a multilingual space of learning within the kingdom. Critics such as Maribel Fierro and Menocal have explored the various elements of Alfonso X’s court that imitated, appropriated, and celebrated the courtly practices of Almohad rulers, stressing that aesthetically and intellectually there are significant continuities that pass unbroken

\(^{16}\) María Rosa Menocal mentions the fertile ground for research regarding the influence of Arabic in Frederick II’s court in her book *The Arabic Role in Medieval Literary History*. For her description of the Holy Roman Emperor’s Sicilian court, see the chapter “Rethinking the Background”, specifically pp. 61-64, as well as n9 on page 69 for her sources and explanation of bibliography.
from the ultimate Caliphate to newly expanded Castile (Dodds, et al. 217-39; and Fierro, “Alfonso X” 186-93). More pertinent to the topic at hand, Jessica Katherine Zeitler, in her doctoral dissertation, traces the cultural practices in Western Islam surrounding the acquisition of ‘ilm (wisdom/learning), the formation of ulama (sages/those possessing ‘ilm), and the madrasa (school or educational space) in order to better understand the historical and social context in which the infante don Alfonso founded the madrasa of Murcia immediately following his conquest of the region from 1243-45. Zeitler concludes her study of education and learning spaces in the Islamic West with a case study of Kalila wa-Dinna, in which she both nuances the act of its tranlatio historically and postulates that Alfonso would not have ordered a translation of this specific work to be made without an acute understanding of the cultural context from which it was being extracted (151-96). It seems likely that the infante don Alfonso founded the madrasa in Murcia, and later the studium generale of Sevilla, for personal usage in order to acquire the type of education that was currently popular in the Arabized court of Frederick II; an education that would eventually lead him to become the royal patron of the expansive translation projects that would bring him world renown.

Despite the fact that the early circulations of frametale texts may have originally been exclusively in Arabic, an increased interest in Arabic wisdom had been growing in the Christian kingdoms of the peninsula since the twelfth century. By the thirteenth century, with the arrival of Alfonso X, translation projects designed to better mine the
wisdom of Arabic culture were under royal patronage.\textsuperscript{17} María Rosa Menocal boldly states in “To Create an Empire: Adab and the Invention of Castilian Culture” that “[t]he whole Alphonsine era, including its texts and ideologies, is best understood in terms of an Arabic tradition converted into a Castilian one” (195).\textsuperscript{18} Considering the centuries of cultural contact, as well as the more recent acquisition of Andalusī territory, citizens and libraries, a Castilian elite eager to consume this popular genre of literature was likely familiar with the concepts and practices of adab and its literary manifestation (Wacks 12). In addition to the likelihood that Sendebar and Kalila wa Dimna circulated widely in al-Andalus (Wacks 39 n40), the patronage of these texts by members of the royal family, the fictional setting of the plot in a court, and the production of the work in Castilian all

\textsuperscript{17} Wacks discusses the development, and subsequent appropriation, of Andalusī culture in his “Introduction” through post-colonial theory, describing the shifts in hegemony between Christians, Muslims, and Jews in terms of “cross-fertilization” and “hybridity” (1-15).

\textsuperscript{18} For more discussions on the continuities of the Almohad caliphate in the Arabized court of Alfonso X, see Dodds, Menocal, and Krasner Balbale (217-39) and Fierro (“Alfonso X” 186-93); Jessica Katherine Zeitler examines this topic in her doctoral dissertation, which focuses on Islamic intellectual spaces in Iberia and the foundation of the studium generale of Sevilla under Alfonso X, and concludes with a case study of the Kalila wa-Dimna (151-96).
suggest that it was directed toward a lay audience that was culturally aware of both Eastern and Western literary traditions.

Scholars have concluded that the *Libro de los doze sabios* was also highly influenced by Andalusí literary practices, and is another example of the degree to which the culture of al-Andalus had been exerted on Castile. Unlike most of the other thirteenth-century *compendios de castigos*, the *Libro de los doze sabios* was not translated from Latin, Arabic, or Hebrew, and is considered an original work from the reign of Alfonso X that was possibly begun under the command of Fernando III. Regardless of whether the father or the son began the work, the oriental elements of the text are undeniable, and when studied it is always compared to works that were translated from Arabic, such as *Libro de los buenos proverbios*, *Bocados de oro*, *Poridat de las poridades/Secreto de los secretos*, or works that are believed to be compilations of multiple Arabic sources, like *Flores de filosofía* and *Libro de los çien capítulos* (Haro Cortés *Los compendios*... 65-66; Lacarra and Blecua *Historia de la literatura* 393-402). The emergence of this Castilian production precedes Don Juan Manuel’s most well-known work, the *Libro del conde Lucanor*, by roughly 60 years, but perhaps equally embodies the idea of “cultural colonization” that Wacks finds in the fourteenth-century frametale collection (131). Many of Wacks’ conclusions about the colonization of Andalusí culture found in the *Conde Lucanor* are applicable to earlier works, like *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV* and the *Libro de los doze sabios*. Wacks observes, for example, “Juan Manuel’s use of Andalusí narrative material (anecdotes and tales) […] is meant to inject a bit of authority
derived from the prestigious cultural legacy of al-Andalus” (149). Unlike Juan Manuel, however, the king who ordered the making of the *Libro de los doze sabios* is not only “laying claim to the historical legacy of the al-Andalus colonized by his grandparents’ generation”, but he is also reminding contemporary readers of his own participation in the conquest of peninsular territory (149). Palafox notices a similar situation in *Castigos del Sancho IV*, produced almost four decades after *Libro de los doze sabios* by Alfonso’s son, where the narrator, Sancho IV, invokes the recent conquest of the city of Tarifa within his *compendio de castigos* as a reminder of his participation in that reconquest (59). All three of the works under consideration are recognized as being influenced by oriental collections of wisdom literature, so the appearance of *Libro de los doze sabios*, which occurred before the large-scale translation from Arabic to Castilian of other similar *compendios de castigos*, further confirms that Castilian audiences were consuming, collaborating with, and contributing to the production of Andalusī culture before Alfonso X took the throne (though possibly not on the same scale). Furthermore, much like the cultural scene in Sicily under Federick II, over a hundred years after Christians conquered the island, the circulation of works in Arabic in Iberia during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries most likely did not impede Christians from having access to their content.

The current study, therefore, is an attempt to situate these three works within the historical moments of their production in the Castilian language and interpret them through the lens of a heterogeneous culture with strong ties to Eastern and Western traditions. In order to accomplish this, some clarifications must be provided to distinguish
the way I use specific terms throughout this dissertation from the way they have been applied in other contexts.

**Adab**- In its most general and inclusive definition, _adab_ is “a curriculum of courtliness, leading to the formation of the _Adib_, the gentleman scholar” (Khalidi 8). Although literature is only one part of the “curriculum”, it is one of the means through which _adab_ is disseminated, specifically for those outside of the _madrasa_. I am most interested in the literature and hermeneutics of _adab_ in this study, which I contend to be a specific reading practice aimed at penetrating the hidden, secondary, or deeper meaning of exemplary narrative, _sententiae_, and advice compedia created as part of a curriculum of courtliness, and more specifically, one of political practice and critique. This narrower, more specific aspect of _adab_ is what should be understood by the term in this study.

**Didactic**- I use this term in a secular way, opposed to the frequent practice of using it for specifically religious/moral teaching. “Didactic” literature within _adab_ coming from Arabic did not instruct along clearly defined binaries of virtuous versus immoral action in a strictly spiritual context, but rather more often sought to instruct along lines of beneficial versus harmful actions, though what was spiritually beneficial or harmful could certainly be included. For this dissertation, “didactic” is understood as non-denominational teaching that is beneficial for living with worldly profit that often, though not always, supersedes spiritual profit.
Exemplary- Similar to the medieval understanding of “serving as an example”, but, as with didactic, I use it for non-denominational teaching and secular learning. See didactic and exemplum.

Exemplum- I start my understanding of exemplum as the technical term from classical rhetoric (paradeigma) and Aristotle, “an interpolated anecdote serving as an example”, but I expand the definition beyond the “interpolated anecdote” to include any substance of a “text”, in its most expansive understanding, that may “serve as an example” within the given context of the work (Curtius 59). Thus, in the context of this study, an exemplum can be singular, as in an interpolated story about ideal friendship or an allusion to Alexander the Great, as well as compound, as in the Chinese box or Russian doll organization of narratives within one exemplum. As with adab and didactic, exemplum is not understood here to be a moral or ethical example based in any religious worldview, but is best understood as pertaining to worldly things that may or may not be used for deeper spiritual contemplation.

Frame/Tales, Texts, and Paratexts

Gerard Genette’s term paratext is the sum of the space of the peritext and that of the epitext of a given work. Genette divides the space of the paratext along the lines of either being within the same volume as the text, the peritext, or being outside the volume, the epitext (Paratexts 4-5). Because Genette’s study focuses on the paratext of the modern
The textual and paratextual elements of the *Calila e Dimna*, *Sendebar*, and *Libro de los doze sabios* are the focus of my textual analysis, as all three are about courts, all three on the level of the peritext have colophons describing royal patronage, and on the level of the epitext, given their origin, cannot be detached from the cultural hegemony connected to the contemporaneous ideas of the (re)conquest of the Iberian Peninsula (Wacks 94-103).

I start my analysis at the level of the *frame/tale*. I understand these texts, and others of similar structure and intention, to be more than collections of interpolated narratives as the current terminology of frametale, framed tale, interpolated/intercalated narrative, etc., imply. I use the designation *frame/tale* in order to maintain a focus on the relationship that connects the two basic elements to this literary form, the frame and the tale, while also visually reminding the reader that each element is also distinct.  

By definition, frame/tales are textually inter-diegetic, and on the level of the text the frame is the element that separates and unites the two worlds, a situation that I find to be similar to Genette’s description of the paratext as a “threshold” (*Paratexts* 2). My use of this terminology requires adaptations for an application of some of his conclusions to works of the medieval period.

20 I will frequently refer to a frame/tale as a *unit* and its formal components, the frame and the tale, as *elements*. 
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of the term frame/tale will thus be applied to similar relationships of context and text where the \textit{text} takes on an exemplary function within its \textit{paratextual frame} (\textit{Paratexts} 8). Particular to the didactic frame/tale, however, is an additional threshold of genre that duplicates the frame/tale form onto the relationship of reader and text.\textsuperscript{21} For example, in the “Introducción de Ibn al-Muqaffa’” of the \textit{Calila e Dimna}, he instructs his reader in how to read the collections, stating:

\begin{quote}
Pues el que este libro leyere sepa la manera en que fue compuesto, et quál fue la intención de los filósofos et de los entendidos en sus enxemplos de las cosas que son aí dichas; que aquel que este non sophiere non sabrá qué será su fin en este libro. Et sepas que la primera cosa que conveiene al que este libro leyere es que se quiera guiar por sus anteçores, que son los filósofos et los sabios, et que lo lea, et que lo entienda bien, et que non sea su intento de leerlo fasta el cabo sin saber lo que ende leyere; ca aquel que que la su intención será de leerlo fasta en cabo et non lo entendiere non obrare por él non fará pro el leer nin avrá dél cosa de que se puede ayudar. (J.M. Cacho Blecua and María Jesús Lacarra, ed. 91)
\end{quote}

This introduction, like all of the introductions of the texts considered, mimics the framing mechanism held within that depicts a \textit{filósofo} providing \textit{exempla} to a king, in that the “Introducción de Ibn al-Muqaffa’” presents the content of the book as an example

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{21} Genette discusses the printed “genre indication” as peritext (94-103), and mentions the implied basic paratext of “genre” in his introduction (\textit{Paratexts} 7).
\end{footnote}
to the reader who, like the king, is to learn a lesson through properly scrutinizing what he is offered. The didactic aspect of these frame/tale collections, as expressed in their introductions, projects a larger frame/tale unit onto the reader and his world, in which his life experiences, including and extending beyond his engagement with the work, become the frame which presents the book to the reader. The frame/tale is then a literary form that forges associations across diegetic divides in order to better scrutinize both elements independently and in relation to each other.

While the frame/tale, as I define it, is a single unit, in its simplest form it still requires two elements: a frame (explicit or implied) and its exemplary content. Narratological usage defines a frame as “[a] set of related mental data representing various aspects of reality and enabling human perception and comprehension of these aspects”, but my understanding of the frame goes beyond the “positivist or literal sense” (to borrow from Stanley Fish) because it requires a reader to give it meaning (Prince 33; Fish “Interpreting” 468). Despite the clarity of purpose that many frames often purport to have, as Fish has shown, “the notion ‘same text’ is the product of the possession by two or more readers of similar interpretive strategies” (483). This is not to say that the frame does not exist, but that its recognition as a frame already requires a community of interpreters who have similar enough interpretive strategies to be able to differentiate the
frame from the object it frames. Moreover, when Genette asserts “the paratext is what enables a text to become a book and be offered as such to its readers”, the same relationship can be seen regarding the frame and its *exemplum* in that it is precisely what surrounds the *exemplum* that makes it exemplary.

I find formalist, narratological, and reader-response techniques to be helpful for describing the process of meaning-making that occurs when a reader encounters the didactic use of narrative *exempla*. The study of *exempla*, and specifically frame/tales, requires a sensitive examination of patterning within the texts that scrutinizes the *exemplum* itself, its location within its frame, and the frame/tale’s location within framing materials (peri- and epitexts). I borrow terminology and ideas from these schools of theory, but the location of inquiry for this project is not exactly the same as the theorists I use, as their research does not perfectly align and is not concerned with identical subjects.

22 Frames do, however, often go unnoticed. Genette’s study of the paratext is itself an effort to assist people in taking notice of framing material.

23 Of particular interest here is Hayden White’s article “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” and his assertion that we “experience the ‘fictionalization’ of history as an ‘explanation’ for the same reason that we experience great fiction as an illumination of a world we share with the author. In both we recognize the forms by which consciousness both constitutes and colonizes the world it seeks to inhabit comfortably” (301).
Particularly useful is Wolfgang Iser’s theory that the location of meaning-making is between the reader and the text. Iser defends that the text guides and limits the reader’s ability to fully fantasize through the use of norms and patterns, but this does not detach the activity of meaning production from the reader himself, stating: “[t]he process of assembling the meaning of the text […] does not lead to daydreaming but to the fulfillment of conditions that have already been structured in the text” (Act 49–50). I believe that the reader brings a host of interpretive strategies to the activity of reading, from which she builds a repertoire of schemata during an initial phase of “assembling meaning”. Furthermore, I contend that this first phase of reading is similar to the theory of “neutral principles”, not in the sense that there is a correct interpretation that is guaranteed, but rather, as stated by Steven Mailloux, that “certain interpretive conventions become in certain contexts the privileged way of making sense of texts” (47-48). In order for this dissertation to focus on frame/tales and paratextual material, certain limitations must be imposed. One such limitation is on the process of assembling the meaning for a text, a process that I believe has multiple phases. Specifically for what I have declared the first step in the reading process, I am imagining a medieval reader who assembles meaning along similar conventions as we do today. I am not arguing that the repertoire of schemata that she builds will be identical to those made by present day readers, though there will certainly be some overlap, but rather that the privileged interpretive conventions for mentally organizing words scrutinized on the physical page are similar enough to current privileged conventions that I can focus my research on what I see as the second phase of reading. In other words, before deciding on which schema, or
expectation, will ultimately fulfill the “conditions that have already been structured in the text”, I contend that modern scholars can unpack a sufficient number of textual expectations from a medieval work to successfully imagine a significant portion of a medieval reader’s repertoire of schemata.

The second step in the activity of reading, and where I am situating the location of meaning-making for this study, occurs when the reader selects from her repertoire a specific schema to be activated, or expectation to be fulfilled. This inventory of expectations has already been limited by the interpretive conventions of her community’s standpoint during the first phase, and by an initial set of structured textual conditions (primarily grammar and vocabulary). These same influences will inform her process of selection when choosing which expectation(s) to fulfill, but now this occurs on the level of selection, as options have been limited.²⁴ Frame/tales are polyvalent, textually inter-

²⁴ I agree with Mailoux’s rejection of neutral principles, and agree that interpretive theories cannot truly “constrain readings or avoid political entanglements” (48). Nonetheless, I conceive of the difference between reading phases one and two as similar to the following actions: Step one would be the building of a repertoire of meanings by initially approaching a text with a theory of neutral principles and then revisiting that same text with a theory of figurative principles. Subsequently, step two would occur when that same reader selected a single meaning from that repertoire of all the literal and figurative meanings imagined for that text.
diegetic, and exemplary; aspects that make impossible any claim to a (universally) correct reading. One could attempt to pinpoint the political and ideological standpoints surrounding the interpretation of a single frame/tale, but such a venture would be immense for any one of the texts selected for this project, and such a scope would be impractical for the study of all three together. Additionally, the frame/tales collected in the selected works are often embedded within larger frame/tales, complicating the task of locating political and ideological standpoints that inform any interpretation, as interpolated texts have textually inscribed readers, many of whom are also exemplary. This project seeks to use the exemplary status of the inscribed readers in Castilian *compendios de castigos* as indicators of textual patterning that assist the audience in assembling a meaning for the text. There are many levels of interpretation taking place, all of which function “repeatedly as a politically interested act of persuasion”, but I am ultimately concerned with the audience’s interpretation, that of an imagined Castilian of mid-thirteenth-century Spain, a privileged member of an educated background who is interested in gaining social power and in contemporary political discourses (Mailloux 50). However, before we can discuss the audience’s interpretation, certain practices

25 I am borrowing Mailloux’s words here that are specifically used in his examination of American cultural politics, but I believe that they can also be responsibly applied to other contexts. I contend that Mailloux would agree, as he applies this very concept to various contexts and periods within his book, and one of his main arguments about interpretive
about how frame/tales are unpacked must be considered, which returns us to the topic of meaning-making in the activity of reading.

Some critics, such as Susan Suleiman, have claimed that the content of the exemplum narrative itself is didactically irrelevant, and that the guiding meaning of the framed unit is established and confirmed by the framing mechanism (43). Alexander Gelley has countered this claim in part, stating that: “The gap between the level of precepts, of articulated truths, and that of injunction cannot be accounted for in terms of a closed narratological model like Suleiman’s [. . .]. To explore this kind of form we would need to look at works in which the exemplarity of narrative units is itself an issue” (160).

In the context of framed exempla, and particularly in the collections found in Iberia during the Middle Ages that have an origin in Andalusī culture or continue Andalusī literary traditions, we find abundant cases of works that allow us to examine this “gap” that Gelley observes between “the level of precepts” and the level of “injunction”, texts in which “the exemplarity of narrative units is itself an issue”. Critics, such as Suleiman and Gelley, have debated the locus of meaning for framed exempla. Gelley, for example, asserts that the act of framing itself involves, “a way of turning narrative into an interpretive modality” (160). I argue that, in addition to “turning narrative into an interpretive modality”, the act of framing also creates an ambiguous relationship between

acts is that they occur “within the context of power relations in a historical community” (50).
the frame and what is framed, and that it is through the subjugation of that ambiguity in the process of interpretation of narrative *exempla* that a monovalent meaning gains authority. I use ambiguous to mean having more than one potentially correct interpretation, but also as a limiting term on the open-endedness of interpretations; while there are limitless interpretations available, any given *exemplum* cannot mean anything.26

The *exemplum*, rather than an uncomplicated narrative with a univocal, self-evident interpretation, is limited in meaning by a number of factors: first, the items of its own narrativity; second, by the frame; and third, by the moral. At the same time, the moral and the frame are also mediated by the *exemplum*, making the discussion of any given frame/tale incomplete if it does not consider the process of inter-diegetic colonization whereby one element (either the frame or tale) imposes its meaning on the other.

Essential to my understanding is the development of what I am calling inter-diegetic colonization in order to describe the way framed content (initially *exempla* and *sententiae*) and its framing material (initially diegetic frames, introductions, etc) participate in a process of meaning-making. I use the term “colonization” for two reasons: first, because the meaning that emerges from the frame/tale is the authoritative plan that one element (frame or tale) successfully imposes onto the other, subjugating the potential meaning(s) of the colonized element to the authority of the colonizing element; second, because formalism and narratology are both positivist activities and do not use

26 See Jonathan Burgoyne on the *exemplum* as an ambivalent sign in *Reading...* (11-12).
the term colonization, its use inserts an experience and temporal based aspect to the concept in order to acknowledge that any one reader’s process of meaning-making is unavoidably social, as all readers always already belong to an “interpretive community” (Fish 468-83). Inter-diegetic colonization, as described above, is a reader-driven activity and the process by which a frame/tale garners its authority. The authoritative meaning that emerges as a result of inter-diegetic colonization is the monovalent significance attributed to the frame/tale.

The reader, as just stated, by determining what constitutes “frame” and what constitutes “exemplum” is the active agent who assigns meaning to both elements, which by their nature must occupy distinct diegeses. The reader then directs the colonization process through making a meaning for the whole frame/tale. In other words, in order for a reader to give a monovalent meaning to a frame/tale, she must direct a process of meaning-making that requires the subjugation of one element to the authoritative

27 Fish’s theory of the “interpretive community” is abstract, but I am borrowing his terminology and idea and applying it to a more concrete, though still immaterial, imagined group of readers. I often refer to this group as the audience, and an individual member as a reader, all of whom exist in an implied or imagined space. Not wholly material or abstract, the “interpretive community” that I imagine for these texts posses a socio-historic standpoint and make meaning through certain interpretive conventions informed by that standpoint.
significance of the other, eliminating the potential ambivalence of both, the gaps that separate them, and their diegetic difference. This entire meaning-making process of supplying a monovalent lesson to a frame/tale is the reader-driven activity of inter-diegetic colonization.

In order to demonstrate that the selected works also instruct the process of inter-diegetic colonization, I borrow technical language from Narratology, specifically from Gerard Prince’s *A Dictionary of Narratology* (2003). Adapting the idea of a “schema” to this study, I use the term to describe the evaluation process that a reader applies to a presented frame/tale situation with the purpose of determining if the relationship between frame and tale is “potent” or “impotent” concerning the feasibility of directing an inter-diegetic colonization.²⁸ For example, if the reader rejects the exemplarity of a frame/tale because after arriving at a meaning for the frame and one for the tale he determines the

²⁸ According to Prince, a schema is, “a global semantic framework representing various aspects of reality and guiding perception and comprehension of these (or related) aspects” (86). Narratological terms are useful for the analysis of frametale narratives and are the motivation for my choice to use Prince’s definition of schema. Also useful for my understanding is Foucault’s use of *episteme* as clarified in *Knowledge/Power*, which defines the episteme as “the ‘apparatus’ which makes possible the separation, not of the true from the false, but of what may from what may not be characterised [sic] as scientific” (197).
relationship incompatible, for that reader the relationship of the frame/tale elements is impotent, in that the effort needed for the reader to direct an inter-diegetic colonization is greater than the logical strength of the relationship. In contrast, when a reader concludes that a frame/tale is exemplary, in that a harmonized, monovalent meaning is able to be produced through the successful directing of an inter-diegetic colonization, the relationship between frame and tale for that reader can be said to be potent. Both circumstances assist in the uncovering of a reader’s schema, in that frame/tale situations with impotent relationships let us know that the reader found the frame and tale to be disharmonious, whereas those with potent relationships inform us that the reader found the frame and tale to be harmonious. Within texts, observing whether characters accept or reject exempla can therefore help us to uncover the process through which the character determines if a frame/tale relationship is potent or impotent, in other words, to uncover his schema.

In addition to schema, I also borrow the term “plan” from Prince, and am particularly interested in the distinction that a plan is “goal-directed”. I apply the term

\[\text{A plan is “a globally semantic framework representing various aspects of reality pertinent to a planner or being advancing toward a goal” (73). Prince makes a point to clarify that while “schemata are often taken to be equivalent to frames, plans, and scripts, […] a schema is a serially ordered, temporally bound frame”, while “a plan is a goal-directed schema” (86).}\]
plan to express the idea of a schema that has been “animated” by the authority produced through a successful inter-diegetic colonization. Schemata, through the process of determining potency for a frame/tale either confirm exemplarity or reject it. When a schema rejects potency it remains “inanimate”, in that colonization does not occur and no dominant significance to the frame/tale emerges. When a schema confirms potency, inter-diegetic colonization produces a monovalent meaning for the frame/tale, and the authority that is produced through the meaning-making process animates the schema. An animated schema, or plan, no longer determines potency, but rather seeks to assert and further enhance its authority through the subjugation of other frame/tales to its meaning.

A plan is thus related to inter-diegetic colonization in that they both function within hierarchical structures of authority, where inter-diegetic colonization is the site of the production of authority and the plan is the means through which that authority is transmitted. A plan, on one hand, subjugates other frame/tales to its monovalent, authoritative meaning in order to replicate and augment its authority, and on the other proposes a comparison between the internal aspects of the exemplum and, through analogy, similar aspects of the life of the receiver in order to generate some form of change in her life. From this position, I contend that it is the application of the moral or lesson of the exempla to one’s life that instills a goal within the exemplum and that, without this final stage, the example would remain a site for exercising the application of schemata. The hegemonic authority that a plan can produce is best seen in the case of the Chinese Box or Russian Doll form of the frame/tale, where the successful resolution of
each *exemplum* compounds and increases the authoritative moral that is attributed to the entire cycle.

Finally, by way of the analysis of frame/tales, I develop the assertion that narrators are capable of proposing new schemata to narratees through the use of embedded *exempla*. This is done one of two ways: 1) a narrator can instruct a narratee by presenting situations that she agrees are similar, and then explain to her which schema harmonizes the frame/tale; or, 2) the narrator can present multiple situations that harmonize along a different plan and which together challenge the narratee’s schema. The choice of a reader to apply a schema to a frame/tale is not the equivalent of a plan, in that the schema only becomes “goal-directed” (a plan) when it has determined the frame/tale to be potent and the reader directs the inter-diegetic colonization. A reader, therefore, can have multiple schemata, but only one schema may become a plan at any given moment. The rhetorical power of *exempla*, therefore, does not come from either frame or tale independently, but rather from the narrator’s ability to insert a new schema into the receiver’s repertoire of schemata and then bring about the animation of that particular schema, or simply to animate a schema already known to be within the narratee’s repertoire.

The conclusion of each chapter, and the final goal of this dissertation, is to apply this process of inter-diegetic colonization outwards from the inner cases of the framed *exemplum* to the increasingly more remote paratextual apparati that surround each text, that is, to introductions, prefaces, and epilogues, and eventually to the space of their epitextual, socio-historical contexts. Opposed to other types of paratexts, such as title,
name of author, etc., that less conspicuously perform their influence on the text in question, the framing material in these collections often explicitly calls attention to their status as paratext and to the status of the framed material, which is why I begin at the level of the *exemplum*. The introductory material (prologues, introductions, etc.) for these collections, nonetheless, also function as framing devices for the collection as a whole, and also explicitly turn the various frame/tales into individual and collective interpretive modalities through telling their readers to seek the “hidden meaning” beneath the surface of the stories held within. Unlike a collection of *exempla* that would be used by a preacher as a resource for sermons, where the examples are collected as a miscellany and are not conscientiously organized and packaged for deeper contemplation, these Castilian *compendios de castigos* unequivocally direct their readers to make connections across multiple diegeses, both internal and external to the text or *exemplum* proper. In other words, a frame/tale unit also becomes the *exemplum* element of larger frames, which together constitute a new frame/tale unit. The application of my conclusions, regarding the process of meaning-making that is involved in cases of inter-diegetic colonization between framing material and *exemplum*, to the socio-historical moment (paratextual “frame”) and the translation of *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar* and the creation of the *Libro de los doze sabios* (“exempla” of the success of Castilian expansion), will allow a more nuanced understanding of the way the Alfonsine cultural campaign exercised its power and influence.
Chapter 2: The Act of Framing in *Calila e Dimna*:

The Rhetorical Authority of Narrative *Exempla*

In 1251 the *principe heredero* of Castilla, *infante* don Alfonso, ordered a Castilian translation of the Arabic *Kalila wa-Dimna* to be made in Toledo.\(^1\) At this moment, few Christian kingdoms knew of the text, an *especulum principis* that likely originated in India during the second century and which came to symbolize the flourishing of a culture when translated, but throughout the southern and eastern Mediterranean, sages and rulers alike had celebrated *Kalila wa-Dimna* for roughly 500 years (Lacarra *La cuentística* 11-22; Montiel 7-18; Wacks 91-94; Zeitler 194). The very act of translation of this particular work (the arabic *Kalila wa-Dimna*) is a display of hegemony and conquest: universally, as the recorded history of *translatio* that is documented in the accumulation of peritexutal

\(^1\) The history of *Kalila wa-Dimna* and its extant manuscripts can be found in Isidoro Montiel’s *Historia y bibliografía del ‘Libro de Calila e Dimna’*, which traces the text back to its Indian origin in the *Panchatantra* but primarily focuses on the work after the additions and adaptations contributed by Abdallah ibn al-Mukaffa c. 750 CE. Montiel confirms what scholars before him have suggested that the Castilian *Calila e Dimna* is likely the best example of al-Mukaffa’s original of all extant arabic versions or translations (9-10).
elements (prologues and epilogue) weaves the movement of the text from one language to another with the burgeoning of civilizations; and locally, as the material movement of the translated codex itself signified to medievals of the thirteenth century a transfer of Arabic knowledge, with its cultural and symbolic value, to Castilian hands (Wacks 86-107; Zeitler 194). While these aspects of the Castilian *Calila e Dimna* (=CeD) are indispensable for understanding the cultural campaign of Alfonso X, and will be addressed in the following chapter, the present dissertation seeks to address why this text would be of interest to rulers and courtiers in the first place.

Too quickly has the question of didacticism been answered for *Calila e Dimna*. On one hand, source studies have dominated the field historically, either in identifying the work’s predecessors or tracing the influences that *CeD* has had on Spanish prose literature. On the other, more recent scholarship has been primarily interested in the symbolic meaning of the “act of translation” of the work on a cultural level (Wacks 94-104; Zeitler 194-96). Scholars that have looked at the lessons expounded in the work most commonly conclude that the *exempla* and *sententiae* adequately demonstrate the expressed goals of the frame in which they are contained (Lacarra *La cuentística...* 193; Gómez Redondo 196-213; Parker 94). Nonetheless, in *CeD*, as in the other Castilian *exempla* collections (such as *Sendebar, El caballero Zifar, Conde Lucanor*), the introductory material reminds its reader that “ha otro seso encubierto” within the stories of the text, and that like nuts “non se puede dellas aprovechar fasta que las partida el saque
Putting aside for the moment the cultural significance and political ideology that the work promotes when one combines its various chapters and paratextual components, the remainder of the current chapter addresses the “encobier” lessons within the cycle of stories about the jackals Calila and Dimna in the court of the Lion.

The current chapter is divided into two sections and focuses on the hidden lesson of Chapter Three of the work, which I argue instructs on how to manipulate frame/tales in order to influence a listener. The first section examines the rhetorical authority of the exemplum within its frame and demonstrates its ability to create and subsequently reinforce a schema, often through a process of displacing a previously dominant schema. By way of sequencing similar and dissimilar exempla (as well as, sententia, maxims, and refrains), the speaker demonstrates the ability to both limit and guide interpretation to the end that the listener will absorb the new, desired schema. The new schema, once admitted to an individual’s repertoire of schemata, can then be selected as a strategy of interpretation. As stated in the Introduction, the application of a schema is not the equivalent of a plan, but a schema can become a plan when it becomes goal-directed, that is, when it is animated through a reader successfully directing inter-diegetic colonization. Inter-diegetic colonization unites the frame/tale under a single meaning, a process that  

2 All quotes are taken from the critical edition of Calila e Dimna by Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua and María Jesús Lacarra.
requires the suppression of alternative interpretations and forces conformity under a single, authoritative meaning. The plan, containing the authority garnered through inter-diegetic colonization, then imposes its monovalent meaning on future cases and recasts itself upon previously understood situations (when applicable) until reaching its ultimate goal: the application to a reader’s experience.

The second section looks at the creation of framing devices, and specifically analyzes Dimna’s strategy of using exempla to implant a new schema into the Lion and the Ox’s already competing repertoire of schemata in order to manipulate the two friends into fighting each other. Whereas the first section focuses on the exempla, detailing the way that exempla can be used to propose a schema that competes with other schemata to become a plan, the second section explores the use of framing material by speakers to show how properly framing exempla is as important as selecting examples. Within CeD, this second section examines both the way Dimna implants the new schema as well as how he builds the frame through which that schema is to be read.

Reading, however, is not an activity of uninterrupted transmission, and accurate communication cannot be assured as it can between a tower and a transistor radio. Reading requires a hermeneutics. To recognize the frame of a frame/tale necessitates that one already belong to a community of interpreters who have similar enough interpretive strategies to be able to differentiate the frame from the object it frames. At the start of the chapter, Dimna and the Lion do not share interpretive strategies. Dimna, therefore, must also educate the Lion in his personal hermeneutics, that is, train the Lion to read
frame/tales with specific interpretive strategies in order to bring him into the desired interpretive community. The Lion’s education in a particular hermeneutics within an exemplum is thus an example of how one educates another in a particular hermeneutics for the reader of that exemplum.

While criticism thus far has concluded that Dimna seeds enmity between the Lion and the Ox through the use of “arte” (“deception”), I conclude Chapter 1 by arguing that one part of the “seso encubierto” of this chapter of the CeD is to demonstrate how he pulls the two friends apart. If the lesson for the king from his filósofo is simply transparent— that wicked men can divide friends— then the complexity of the chapter is reduced to its aesthetic value as extended story-telling, and al-Muqaffa’s exhortation that the reader seek the “seso encubierto” becomes a red-herring. If, as I contend, the deeper lesson is an explanation of how one separates friends, then the chapter is not solely a warning against deception, but also one in rhetoric, as Dimna’s “arte” is his use of language. I conclude that one practical lesson in this chapter of the CeD for the character of the king (and the reader) is about rhetoric, and specifically how frames and exempla must be constructed together to improve one’s effectiveness at influencing the actions of others.

Exploiting Exempla

One aspect of the collection that is well known by scholars is the diversity and complexity of the framing techniques implemented throughout the work. While there are certainly other areas for entrance into the labyrinthine collection, for the current reading
of the frames at work in the *CeD* I find starting within Chapter III, the cycle of stories revolving around Calila, Dimna, Sençeba, and the Lion to illustrate my arguments best. A brief summary of the chapter is needed, and for the sake of space and time, I will return to the most important aspects later on, but many items cannot be discussed at length in the scope of this dissertation.

Chapter III opens with a request by a king that his advisor (*filósofo*) tell him an *exemplum* about two friends that love each other and are separated by “el mesturero, falso, mentiroso” who leads them to “perder sus cuerpos et sus almas” (122). The advisor tells him that this is similar to what happened to the Lion and the Ox. The advisor opens his cycle of stories with a framing *exemplum* that also serves as a history of how Sençeba, the Ox, comes to the prairie within the domain of the Lion. Calila and Dimna are two jackels whose families at one time had fallen from the Lion’s grace. Dimna seeks to improve his lot in life through counseling the Lion, while Calila maintains that his position is comfortable and that close vicinity with the king can be both advantageous and dangerous. Dimna demonstrates his wisdom to the Lion, enters his counsel, and then advises him to accept Sençeba as his vassel, with whom he has been serving in the role of an ambassador. Dimna unites the Lion and the Ox in friendship, but once this service ends Dimna is left in the same position he held before. The jackel decides to trick the two friends, which results in the Lion killing Sençeba. Dimna ends the chapter as one of the Lion’s favored counselors. The chapter concludes by returning to the king and his advisor, and an admonition against false traitors.
Fairly early into the chapter, Calila tells an interesting inter-diegetic narrative cycle of *exempla* to Dimna, who has sought his friend’s advice on what to do about his discontent at being left outside of the Lion’s entourage after having united him with the Ox in friendship.\(^3\) All of the *exempla* from this cycle are also found in the *Panchatantra* (Blecua and Lacarra n137). The cycle revolves around a single protagonist/witness, a religious man, who, according to Blecua and Lacarra, comes to learn the error of his decisions (“comprende así cuál fue su error” 137). The *exempla* are as follows: The cleric had in his possession some rich cloth/garments of the king. A thief spied the luxurious

\(^3\) I name it an inter-diegetic narrative cycle because it is distinct from traditional frame/tale units that contain a frame with one or more interpolated tales (such as *The Seven Sages of Rome*) in that the cycle itself is packaged as a single interpolated *exemplum* to the larger frame of the story about the court of the Lion. At the same time, within this single interpolated *exemplum* that Calila tells are multiple interpolated *exempla* that serve as lessons for Calila’s protagonist, a religious man. Thus if we start at the level of the court of the Lion (which is already framed by the King and his counselor) and call it A, then the level of the religious man is A1, and the three interpolated tales are a1, a2, and a3, or: A<a1=a2=a3>A1>A. I will call it simply a *cycle* for ease of reading during its analysis, but later on I will refer to it as “the cycle of the religious man” or the “inter-diegetic narrative cycle of the religious man” once it is no longer the primary topic of discussion.
fabric and decided he would steal them, so he feigned discipleship until the father trusted him and left him alone with the cloth. The thief stole the garments, and the religious man went out in search of him. This exemplum frames the rest of the mini-cycle. The cleric then witnesses three events: (1) a fox is crushed by two fighting mountain goats as it tried to lick the blood between them; (2) an alcahueta dies by ingesting a poison she is attempting to administer to a client who has failed to pay for the services of one of her prostitutes; (3) a complicated tale of cuckoldry and trickery that climaxes with the family of a woman bringing her husband to the local mayor to punish him for cutting off his wife’s nose. With each exemplum we are told “et esto a ojo del religioso”. At the end of the third event, the holy man happens upon the trial, and requests to have a chance to explain how it all happened, saying, “sabed qu’ el ladrón non furtó a mí los paños, nin la gulpeja non la mataron los cabrones, nin el alcahueta non la mató la vedeganbre, nin la muger del alhajeme non le tajó su marido las narzes, mas nós mismos le fezimos” (141).

The cycle closes with Dimna replying to Calila, “entendido he lo que dixiste, et semeja a mi fazienda, et por buena fe non me mata a mí sinon yo mismo. Enpero, ¿qué faré agora?” (141).

Dimna’s response is both curious and telling, as it lays bare the complexities of narrative exempla and framing. The moral, or sentencia, of the cycle is declared by the cleric, and then reiterated by Dimna: what happens to us is the result of our own actions. That Dimna accepts the same conclusion is important, because both he and the religious man come to understand the same lesson, however, due to the fact that they occupy
distinct diegeses they must arrive at this result through different means. The cleric experiences and witnesses world events, and from their example he gains wisdom.

Dimna, however, does not experience or witness world events, but rather is told *exempla* which instruct him in understanding. The book of the world, like any *compendio de castigos*, provides *exempla* which can be applied to lived experience, as demonstrated by the application of the *sententia* from within the *exemplum* to Dimna’s own diegesis. The holy figure himself exemplifies this very action by “reading” the events of the world around him as he is witness to the cases of the fox, the *alcahueta*, and the trial. He then applies his understanding of the events to his own life and the theft of the royal garments. Dimna, similarly, “witnesses” the *exempla* as the receiver of Calila’s tales, and then applies what he learns to his life, stating, “semeja a mi fazienda”.

If Dimna had simply accepted the moral, the whole cycle would possibly not cause much pause for further consideration, but he rejects it. Had he accepted it, the *filósofo*’s *exemplum* for the King would not have reached its conclusion, as Dimna would have conformed his life to the model of the ascetic’s and desisted in achieving his goal of gaining the Lion’s favor. Like the cleric after viewing the first two interpolated events concerning the fox and the *alcahueta*, Dimna’s actions communicate to us that he rejects the moral, as he, too, continues seeking a resolution for his problem. Unlike the cleric, however, Dimna rejects the provided *exemplum* and moral. Why? Does it not fit his “fazienda”? If the only goal was to arrive at the *sententia* of the final *exemplum* of the cycle, why complicate the lesson with an inter-diegetic narrative cycle? Adding the
additional frame of the king and his filósofo, how does this mini-cycle contribute to the lesson about how a third party can manipulate two friends into enmity? Since the tools of Dimna’s deception are his words, specifically his rhetorical use of *exempla* and *sententia*, I contend that this mini-cycle has an “otro seso escondido”, and it is a lesson about *exempla* and frames. Dimna’s ultimate rejection of the moral is not to emphasize his ambitious personality, or a necessary device to prolong the narrative, but rather an active marker for the receiver of the collection to also pause and reflect on what has just occurred.

When examined, the inter-diegetic narrative cycle displays beautifully the fact that *exempla* have multiple interpretations that are manipulated by the framer to both limit their exemplary function and attempt to fix a specific meaning for the receiver. The three *exempla* witnessed by the religious man are not identical in meaning. They are actually quite different, and only adopt a similar meaning when united through the *sentencia* provided by the cleric at the very end. The father, initially blaming the thief for stealing the clothes, is presented by a fairly straightforward, uncomplicated example that proposes a distinct way of interpreting events in the first scenario, the case of the fox. While the *exemplum* itself could yield various interpretations (“Avoid temptation”, “Be careful for what you wish”, “Not all that glimmers is gold”, “You reap what you sow”), within the limiting frame of the religious man’s life experience and quest for the bandit who made him a victim, the *exemplum* provided by the fox is read through a binary of determining the victim and the abuser, the latter of which is originally assumed to have
the blame. The fox, unlike the cleric, put himself in danger and while he is the victim and the rams are the assumed abusers, the fox is blamed for his own death. The fact that he continues searching for the thief shows that the episode of the fox does not match up accordingly with his experience as a victim of theft: the fox is to blame for his own hardship while the cleric still blames the rogue. The rejection of this first exemplum “a ojo del religioso” is meaningful, as it shows that the cleric’s schema for understanding the world is incompatible with the example, in other words, it is impotent and the cleric is unable to direct an inter-diegetic colonization. The schema that will eventually determine a potent relationship must be different from the one held by the holy man at this moment, as the example does not alter his trajectory, but rather is rejected as inconsequential.

As the stories proceed they increase in complexity, but the expanding possibilities for interpretation are limited by the holy man’s system of interpreting the events that he sees. Each event is witnessed by the cleric and his interpretive process is revealed by his actions after watching what occurs. The constant rejection of dissimilar cases demonstrates the cleric’s critical process for interpreting incidents in the world, allowing the reader to witness the pattern that emerges. The common strategy that the cleric uses to understand his world is a schema, and it is also the schema that Calila expects Dimna to hold at the start of the inter-diegetic narrative cycle. The guiding logic for the religious man is one that looks at each example with the goal of assigning the roles of a perceived victim and an assumed abuser; if the assumed abuser is to blame, as the thief is, then the victim should be free of guilt, as the cleric is. Similarly, Dimna views himself as the
guiltless victim in the court of the Lion, and the Lion as the abuser. Traveling on, however, the father’s initial schema is complicated by what he sees, and he eventually must alter his understanding of the world in order to reconcile the inconsistencies between the exempla and his experience.

The second exemplum is more complex, but the initial schema limits it as well. In the case of the alcahueta, she is the actor and victim of her actions in that she ingests the poison due to her sneezing at the moment she is to blow the poison through a straw into her intended victim’s mouth. That she did it to herself is not in question, but opposed to the fox, who could not possibly execute his plan without getting hurt, the alcahueta would logically expect to survive the administration of the poison, but due to unforeseeable complications she dies at her own hand. This also occurs “a ojo del religioso”, and again the cleric exits the space in search of his antagonist. Because the father is still searching for the thief, we can determine that the new schema has not yet replaced his original one.

The third intercalated story maintains its connection with the two previous ones by describing the events and stating, “veyendo esto el religioso”, but in addition it reinforces the examination of the schema by concluding with a court case with a perceived victim, an assumed abuser, and a need to establish guilt. The story is also the most elaborate and complicated of the three, and requires a summary: A carpenter, suspecting his wife of cuckolding him ties her to a post before leaving. The adulteress convinces a friend (who is also her go-between) to untie her and take her place so she can
go meet her gentleman friend while her husband is away. Returning home inebriated and still angry, the carpenter cuts off the nose of the friend, believing her to be his wife. The adulteress returns home, resumes her place at the pole, curses her husband for his wickedness, and pleads loudly to God to restore her nose if she is innocent. To the carpenter’s amazement her nose is whole again, and he begs her forgiveness. Meanwhile, the go-between friend invents a plan at her own home. She angers her husband, and he throws his barber knife at her in the dark. She drops her nose, screams, and accuses him of unjustly cutting it off. Her family takes the barber before the mayor to demand justice. It is at this moment that the cleric reappears, and claims to be able to resolve the problem, saying: “sabed qu’ el ladrón non furtó a mí los paños, nin la gulpeja non la mataron los cabrones, nin el alcahueta non la mató la vedeganbre, nin la muger del alhajeme non le tajó su marido las narzes, mas nós mismos le fezimos” (141). It is after this event that the religious man abandons his search for the thief, demonstrating through his action that he has taken his own advice.

A change has certainly occurred in the cleric’s schema, and while it is certainly correct to explain that the schema changed because of his experience, the inter-diegetic narrative cycle has also opened up for examination the process of that change. It has

---

4 Blecua and Lacarra state, “[I]a gran novedad del sistema reside en la incidencia de los cuentos sobre el religioso, quien comprende así cuál fue su error”, which holds true if the reader accepts the stated moral of the inter-diegetic narrative cycle that is professed by
shown us how it changed. As with the previous two stories, the cleric’s original schema does not allow for a mirroring of scenarios between his own case with the thief, and the case of the nose-less wife and the barber (or of the adulteress and the carpenter). At the trial the barber is prosecuted for having abused his wife, ostensibly making him the assumed abuser and her the perceived victim. This is clearly incompatible for the cleric, as the barber did not cut her nose off. The wife, however, is also the go-between (“alcahueta”) for the adulteress, and while the carpenter punished her mistakenly, she was guilty of being an intermediary for a married woman. The very judgments of “guilt” and the cleric that each victim is to blame for his or her own misfortune (137). Lacarra dedicates more space to this topic in La cuentística medieval en España, in which she argues that each story contains “un esquema triangular”, where a third party inserts itself within the relationship of the other two, always to the detriment of the interloper (62-64). Parker does not examine this topic in the same detail, but does suggest a myriad of potential connections between the stories of the narrative cycle and other events in the same chapter (29). María del Pilar Palomo does not look into the meaning of this narrative cycle, but does use it as the basis of her argument that the interrelations within the work form a system and have a structure (317).

5 The Siete partidas of Alfonso X prescribes capital punishment for this crime: “…decimos que qualquier que alcahotease á su muger, debe morir por ende. Esa misma pena debe haber el que alcahotease á otra muger casada, ó virgin, ó religiosa ó vibda de
“innocence”, along with the roles of “abuser” and “victim”, not only do not operate according to the cleric’s schema, but they are convoluted within this case itself. The guilty person in the scenario is the go-between (along with the adulteress and her amante, who do not reappear), and the barber is actually the innocent victim, but he is presented outwardly to the public and the mayor as the abuser. The lack of clarity of the third situation witnessed by the cleric requires him to separate the pieces, which, upon closer inspection, reveal that the whole event is an additional frame/tale. In order to demonstrate the barber’s innocence, the religious man must make sense of the scenario of the barber and his wife through the context of the adulteress and her husband, and not his own quest for the thief. In short, the pressure to resolve the conflict so another innocent man is not unjustly punished motivates the cleric to seek a different schema: the go-between did it to herself.

The cleric, recognizing the continuity of characters (she is actually the same woman in both frame and tale) links the go-between at the trial with the framing context of the case of the adulteress and her husband. The husband of the frame is an innocent victim to his wife’s trickery, as is the husband at the trial. The schema that emerges is that the go-between did it to herself, or more generally, victims contribute to their own misfortune. This new schema deems such a relationship between frame and tale as potent, buena fama … Et lo que diximos en este título de los alcahuetes ha lugar otrosi en las mugeres que se trabajan en fecho de facer alcahuetería” (v.3 666-667, VII.22.2).
and the cleric drives an inter-diegetic colonization that smooths over the gaps and produces a monovalent meaning for the frame/tale. This process animates the schema to become a plan. The plan then replicates its authority by colonizing other frame/tales, interjecting its schema into the repertoire of schemata to the cases of the alcahueta and the fox. This new schema, now finding the previous frame/tales potent, allows the cleric to direct inter-diegetic colonization over and over, augmenting the authority of the plan until it reaches the goal of applying itself to the personal life of the cleric.

Because the religious man tells everyone at the trial that “el ladrón non furtó a mí los paños, nin la gulpeja non la mataron los cabrones, nin el alcahueta non la mató la vedeganbre, nin la mugger del alhajeme non le tajó su marido las narzes, mas nós mismos le fezimos”, and because he tells the judge “toda la estoria fasta en cabo”, it can be understood that the religious man used the case at hand in order to inform the interpretation of the two previous exempla, and then apply that wisdom to his life. By telling the whole story “fasta en cabo”, the cleric, like Dimna, makes use of the telling of exempla in order to implant a new schema into his listeners’ repertoire at the trial, augmenting the authority of his plan/moral. The barber, falsely accused of cutting off the nose of his wife does not suffer the fate of his situation (though all evidence in the case is against him), the go-between actually suffers the punishment of another woman, she is not directly punished for being a go-between, and the woman who cuckolds her husband receives no punishment are the facts of the case. But because the exemplum proposes a new schema for reading the world that finds the frame/tale potent, the cleric can drive the
inter-diegetic process to limit its hermeneutic possibilities and subject it to a monovalent meaning. At the trial, the cleric becomes the narrator of an autobiographic inter-diegetic narrative cycle, the conclusion of which is his summary of the events told from the perspective of the monovalent meaning. The religious man as narrator, thus conscientiously fixes the exempla under the authority of his moral, subjugating all potential meanings to his goals.

This is all contained in the exemplum that Calila tells Dimna. The result of this manipulation of exempla and subjugation of their authority to the religious man’s goals is an application to his life that at once contradicts the receiver’s expectations (we know that the thief plotted to abuse the trust of the cleric to steal the garments) while smoothing over the inconsistencies with the objective of creating the appearance of continuity. The religious man, least to blame for the active theft of the royal garments, is recast as initiator of his own misfortune. Only through the process of inserting a new schema can the religious man effectively make himself responsible for the deceptive acts of another. The case of the fox and that of the religious man differ too significantly to maintain the status of analogy. The fox disregards the information in front of him, and places himself in harm’s way. The religious man, in contrast, is presented with an object that is not as it seems. The thief devised an “arte cómmo gelos furtase” (138). The thief tells the religious man, “Quiérote fazer compañía et aprender de ti”, and as a result, “el religioso otorgó gelo, et fizo vida con él, et servióle bien, atanto que se aseguró el religioso en él, et fio dél, et puso su fazienda en su mano” (138). This was not a mistake of quick judgment
or failure to withstand temptation; the religious man was fully deceived. At this point, however, we are not driven to seek analogy between this exemplum and its frame. The case of the fox is close enough, however, to that of the alcahueta in that both the fox and the alcahueta actively choose to place themselves in proximity to danger and, as a result, die. The plan formed by the third exemplum witnessed by the cleric takes advantage of the similarity of the two cases and the slippage between them in order to expand the scope of the moral to include unpredictable fate. The creation and subsequent reinforcement of the plan both directs the interpretation of future cases and, once established, recasts itself upon a previously understood situation and conforms the previous understanding to its authority. The sententia, “nós mismos le fezimos”, therefore, succinctly unites the meanings of these exempla by suppressing alternative interpretations and forming a plan for application to one’s own life. This is reinforced through the didactic voice of the religious man in the cycle, and then again by Dimna, who applies the moral to his own life: “entendido he lo que dixiste, et semeja a mi fazienda, et por buena fè non me mata a mí sinon yo mesmo”.

As I stated above, Dimna’s response to the inter-diegetic narrative cycle is both curious and telling. Evidenced through the repetition of the sentencia, Dimna sees the value of the exempla and the message Calila is attempting to illuminate. Dimna’s response, however, calls attention to the complexity of exempla framing by asking immediately afterward, “Enpero, ¿qué faré agora?” The matter has not been resolved and Dimna remains in need of advice. How did this happen?
Returning to the opening of the cycle, a similar shifting of analogies between Dimna’s situation and the conclusion provided in the *sententia* has taken place. Dimna arrived to speak to Calila upset and with great envy of Sençeaba, and said to him, “Hermano, no te maravilles de mi mal seso et de mi locura, et de cómmo pensé en pro del león, et trabajé en le traer el buey que me ha echado de mi dinidat” (137). Calila responds, “Pues acaeció a ti lo que acaeció al religioso”. Through the telling of the first *exemplum* of the cycle, the analogy with Dimna’s matter appears quite logical. Dimna assisted and instructed another (in his case, the Lion), and then at the moment Dimna felt secure of his new position, the Lion separated himself from Dimna and the rest of his court. Likewise, the religious man assisted and instructed a disciple (the thief), who stole away with the rich garments once the cleric trusted the relationship. Because the religious man pursues the thief, the expectation is that Calila will explain how the cleric resolves his problem, and using another analogy, or series of analogies, Calila will provide Dimna with a solution to his dilemma with a moral to direct him in his own life and goal.

This does and does not happen. Within the cycle, the religious man takes control of the trial in the final *exemplum* and, through retelling the other *exempla*, manipulates the expected analogies of the different stories to create a plan for application to the trial. That all characters present accept his schema for the trial is evidenced in that they all abandon the tribunal and let things be as they were. Since the religious man included his own life into the final declaration, exclaiming that “nós mismos le fezimos”, the application of this moral to one’s life results not in advice on what action to take, but
rather advice on abstaining from action. This is precisely the course that Calila hopes Dimna will take with regards to interacting with the court of the Lion. In order to convince Dimna to abandon courtly life he, like the religious man, uses the stacking of seemingly analogous exempla to insert a schema into Dimna’s repertoire and attempts to force Dimna to animate that schema in interpreting the matter in his own life. Just as the exempla of the fox, the go-between, and the trial get recast onto the case of the cleric and the stolen garments, so is this plan forged by the narrative abilities of Calila cast back upon the matter of Dimna’s court position. Dimna’s response to the cycle, thus, shows that he understands the message of the exemplum, but is unsatisfied with the application, “entendido he lo que dixiste, et semeja a mi fazienda, et por buena fe non me mata a mí sinon yo mesmo. Enpero, ¿qué faré agora?” Dimna understands the schema, but decides the relationship between the exemplum and his life is not potent, rejecting the ascetic moral as the solution to his problem. Calila wryly retorts, “Dime, tú, qué es el tu consejo a esto” (141). The chapter continues, and while there is certainly more to look into, I understand the most immediate aspects of the cycle to conclude here.6

____________________

6 I am of the opinion that there are more inter-relations between the exempla of this chapter to be explored, and that there are connections between this chapter and the work as a whole, as well. I say immediate here because I think this statement by Calila provides a useful and logical stopping place, as the dialogue shifts to speak about what plan of action Dimna will take. It also reinforces my claim that Dimna’s rejection of the
I choose this line as the immediate conclusion to the cycle because it reinforces the deeper message about *exempla* and framing that the cycle exhibits. Dimna is unsatisfied with the cycle precisely because he did not initially understand the action performed by Calila of displaying the function and use of *exempla* and their framing. Calila’s statement, “Dime, tú, qué es el tu consejo a esto”, places the burden of advice and action on Dimna, and insists on an important temporal distinction between the religious man’s *sententia* and the moral Dimna has understood. The message Dimna ultimately receives is not one of hindsight, “nós mismos le fezimos”, but one of responsibility for future outcomes, “non me mata a mí sinon yo mismo”. Dimna has accepted his part in the creation of his present dilemma, but looking forward he does not want to give up on his goal of social ascension. Furthermore he recognizes that in order to be successful in the court of the Lion, like the cleric at the end of Calila’s *exemplum*, true craft must be employed.

The next phase of story-telling in the work, this time told by Dimna to Calila, deals with exemplifying how strength can be overcome through craft. As will be seen in the next section, the inter-diegetic narrative cycle of *exempla* about the religious man occurs at an important point in the chapter; it marks a shift in the rhetorical use of moral is a moment for the reader to pause and reflect, as Calila’s statement requires Dimna to do just that: to pause, reflect, and expound on what he thinks is the best course of action for his life.
exempla. Dimna’s reason for telling exempla up until this point in the work has been to reveal a truth in order to prudently counsel the Lion. After this exchange with Calila, Dimna turns his wits to devise how to breed mistrust between the Lion and the Ox. In order to accomplish his goal, a focus on the art of framing must be used in place of solely selecting an appropriate exemplum for an already determined frame.

Crafting a Frame

If we are to pursue a more nuanced reading of the CeD and other compendios de castigos, one that pushes beyond the belief that these collections are solely collections of material for sermons or that the didactic lesson is clear, obvious, and guileless, we should not just recognize areas of the work that put the rhetorical use of exemplarity on display, but we should also follow that course of potential instruction through to that lesson’s end. In the previous section I attempted to show that the inter-diegetic narrative cycle of the cleric in Chapter III exposes the practice of applying the lessons from exempla to one’s life, as well as illuminating the way that exempla can be organized and manipulated in their presentation in order to provide agency and authority to an argument. Another way of saying this is that the narrative cycle teaches Dimna about a hidden rhetorical potential of exempla: the moral of the exemplum does not have to fulfill its proposed objectives.

Dimna learns the lesson on the use of exempla, but finds himself at an impasse on how to apply the lesson to his life (“Enpero, ¿qué faré agora?”). Calila’s reply (“Dime, tú, qué es el tu consejo a esto”) is similar to the resolution to the Gordian knot, in that whatever Dimna decides to do is the correct course of action as long as he recognizes that
the result is of his own making; in other words, “tanto monta cortar como desatar”. The subtle message being conveyed to Dimna is that in order to influence someone with the lesson of an exemplum, one must have an appropriate frame through which to understand it. Whether scholars decide to classify Calila’s use of the narrative cycle as an attempt to manipulate Dimna into abandoning his affairs at court, or as an instructive lesson on the rhetorical potential of exempla, or both, is beside my immediate point; either way, it is my belief that after the cycle about the cleric, Chapter III changes its focus from the use or application of exempla to that of demonstrating the relationship between an exemplum and its frame. This change is embodied in the character of Dimna as his motivation shifts from providing honest counsel to manipulating the Lion through the guise of providing honest counsel. The latter part of Chapter III, I contend, focuses on an art of framing to display how successful manipulation hinges on the artful crafting of both frame and tale.

Following the cycle, Dimna decides that he will take action to restore his place in the court of the Lion by killing Senceba. Calila asks him, “¿Cómo puedes tú matar a Senseba, que es más valiente que tú et más fuerte, et [ha] más mando, et ha más vasallos et más amigos?” to which Dimna replies, “Non cates a eso, ca todas las cosas non se fazen por fuerça, et algunt flaco llegó con su faldrimiento et con sus artes et con su enseñamiento a lo que non pueden fazer muchos fuertes et muchos valientes” (142). Dimna then tells the exemplum of “El cuervo y la culebra”, which contains a second exemplum, “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo” embedded within, and concludes his “enxenplo” by reminding Calila that the arts of deception can do things that strength
cannot (“que las artes fazen por ventura algunas cosas que la fuerça non puede fazer” 145). Calila listens to Dimna’s tales but is unconvinced, as Sençeba is both strong and intelligent: “Si Sençeba commo es fuerte et valiente non fuese de buen seso, seria así; mas, aun demás de la valentía que te dixe que ha en sí, es muy bueno et sabio et de buen consejo” (145). Dimna acknowledges that fact, but is unwavered. Dimna is certain that his trickery is still more powerful: “Verdaderamente tal es Sençeba commo tú dizes, enpero es engañado en mí, et fía por mí; et por esto lo puedo yo engañar et aterrar sin falta, así commo fizo la liebre al león” (145). Dimna then tells the exemplum of “Las liebres y el león”. Before entering into the lessons on manipulation and framing exposed in these three exempla, it is important to pause and address, again, Dimna’s language with respect to time.

As mentioned above, Dimna understands the meaning of the cleric’s cycle, but is left with no counsel on what he should do next. The temporal shift in his language regarding the moral, from a recognition of past action (“nós mismos le fezimos”) to an acceptance of present, and potentially future, actions (“non me mata a mí sinon yo mismo”), emphasizes the interplay between lived experiences, exempla, and actions to be performed based on the wisdom gained from the exemplum. In other words, Dimna’s lived experiences are similar to conditions or a context, and the exemplum is like an agent that when applied along a set of predetermined hermeneutic strategies yields a result or action. In the present case, the sequence is not past to present, but present conversation to implied future outcome, “et por esto lo puedo yo engañar et aterrar sin falta, así commo
fizo la liebre al león”. Dimna wants the Lion to perform a specific action (result), so he needs to construct the appropriate conditions (life experiences), provide a corresponding agent (exemplum), and guarantee that his subject, the Lion, applies that agent correctly (along a predetermined set of hermeneutic strategies). The conversation between the two jackals goes beyond this, however, as it directs a reading of the death of Sençeba in comparison with the exemplum of “las liebres y el león”, as Dimna makes explicit: “así comomo fizo la liebra al león”. As I will demonstrate through the analysis of these exempla along with the intermittent conversations between Calila and Dimna, the focus shifts from deriving a moral from an exemplum already within a given frame (past), to crafting both an exemplum and its frame within a known practice of hermeneutics that leads another to a specifically desired outcome (future). This temporal shift occurs at the same moment that Dimna’s intention changes, indicating to the reader on levels of plot and grammar that the hidden lesson is changing. What follows is a discussion about “arte”, in which the lessons are not a repeated declaration that “wicked men deceive”, but rather they present an exposé of how one deceives.

Dimna’s first set of exempla, “El cuervo y la culebra” and “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo”, demonstrate the necessary elements of deception and manipulation. While serving the function of exhibiting to Calila “ca todas las cosas non se fazen por fuerça”, the progression of Dimna’s exempla about craft (“artes”) and trickery (“engañar”) provide the reader with increasingly complex models of how to enact such tactics in life. “El cuervo y la culebra” is a short tale about a crow that has a nest near a snake hole, and
each time the crow lays eggs, the snake eats them. The crow, in great need, complains to her friend the lynx, and proposes attacking the snake directly: “Quiero ir a la culebra, et picarle he los ojos et por ventura quebrantágelos he; et si tú me lo consejares, avré asperança de folgar” (143). The lynx rejects the plan, surprised by the “mala arte” that the crow proposes: “¡Ay, qué mala arte es esa que tú cuidas fazer! Trabájate de ál por que ayas lo que quieres et que te non faga ella mal, et guárdate que non seas tal commo la garça que quiso matar al cangrejo et mató a sise” (143). The lynx’s reaction is clearly not about the crow’s desire to do harm to the snake, which he condones, but rather at the plan of action itself. The lynx calls the crow’s idea of directly attacking the snake in physical combat “mala arte” precisely because there is no “arte”, or craft, in such an approach. The first rule of good deception is to not engage directly in physical warfare with an enemy, already established by Dimna but now reinforced through his exemplum.

7 This exemplum also appears to be a potential insult/joke on Calila, as the lynx basically calls the crow stupid for wanting to attack the snake directly, which is what Calila assumed Dimna would do to Sençeba when Dimna first says he wanted to kill Sençeba. There are a number of “comical” moments throughout the text where it seems that one character is subtly insulting another. Further study into such instances, which is outside of the scope of this dissertation, would be an important contribution since there are no monographic studies of humor in the Calila e Dimna.
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The embedded *exemplum*, “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo”, told by the lynx, builds off of this first rule of good deception, and adds the element of telling a lie. In the *exemplum*, a heron who built her nest near a pond has grown old and becomes unable to fish as before. She feigns grief to a crab who in turn asks her why she is upset. She told the crab that she overheard some fishermen talking who happened upon the animals’ little pond on their way to a larger pond and that they agreed to return and cast their nets in this small pond after catching all of the fish in the larger pond. The heron explained that once the men return and catch all the trout, she would starve. The crab communicated this lie to the trout, who then went to the heron for council, reasoning that even an enemy can be useful when they both have something to gain through mutual aid: “el omne entendido no dixa de consejar con su enemigo, seyendo de buen consejo, en las cosas que se puede dél ayudar. Et en bivir nós as tú pro, et bien puedes conseja[r]nos” (144). The heron replies that she knows of another large lake where they all can live well, and they agree that she will fly two of them to the other lake each day. For some time she picks up two fish each day, but she eats them in a nearby riverbank, apparently accomplishing her goal. One day, the crab comes to her and requests that she carry him to the new lake, as he fears remaining any longer in the small pond. The heron agrees, but when they approach the riverbank, the crab sees the scattered fish bones and comprehends that the heron has been eating the fish and plans to eat him as well. He then clamps his claw around her neck and kills her. Returning to the pond, he tells the trout about the heron and how she killed the trout she carried away each day, and so the crab and the remaining trout continued living in the small pond.
After the lynx finishes its story, he tells the crow: “Et yo non te di este enxenplo sinon por que sepas que algunas artes son que matan al que las faze” (145). He continues on to tell the crow to lure some men to the snake hole with a precious string of gems, and to throw the jewels into the snake hole so that when the men fetch them, they will kill the snake. The crow does as the lynx advises and it happens as planned, and the crow is freed from the snake.

The embedded exemplum completes two tasks for Dimna. On one hand, by including it along with the moral “algunas artes son que matan al que faze”, Dimna demonstrates that he anticipates a retort from Calila on the matter, and on the other he disarms a response that would seek to point out that deception can end poorly for the trickster. On the level of putting on display the necessary components of deceit, the double exemplum that Dimna tells teaches three important items about trickery. First, deception requires “artes”. Second, simply telling a lie, especially one that can be discovered, is dangerous, as the heron learns too late. Third, the successful trick involves getting a third party to execute the plan for you.

Calila accepts that “sería así”, but only if Sençebe were only strong and valiant, and not also intelligent (145). It is at this point that Dimna relates the exemplum of “Las liebres y el león”, before which he tells Calila, “enpero es enganado en mí, et fía por mí; et por esto lo puedo yo engañar et aterrarr sin falta, así commo fizo la liebre al león”. As mentioned above, Dimna declares a direct analogy between the exemplum he is about to narrate and the life events that are to culminate in Sençebe’s demise. While this
declaration reinforces the notion that critics have stressed regarding the need to approach the work through a comparative process that crosses diegetic levels, which I have been applying to the text thus far, I add that of equal importance is the study into how these cases are similar (Lacarra 77-97, Blecua and Lacarra 30-40; Parker 22-41). What exactly does Dimna explain through the exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” about how he will accomplish his goals? Furthermore, in a chapter of the text that has already exhibited a rhetoric concerning frames and exempla, what does the exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” and its analogous part, the case of Sençeba and the Lion, teach the reader about frames and exempla?

The exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” is concise and straightforward. The animals of a bountiful land make a pact with the local lion-king, that they will offer up one animal freely to the lion-king each day so that they do not have to constantly fear him, and the king does not have to hunt for his food. The different animal types take turns having one from their ranks sacrificed to the king until it is a hare’s turn. The hare selected to be sacrificed, however, tells the animals that he has a plan that will not cause any of them harm, will get rid of the lion-king’s privilege, and will allow him to escape death: “Si me quisiéredes escuchar, dezirvos he cosa que vos non sería ñaño et vos será pro. Cuidarvos ía sacar desta premia deste león, et estorçería yo de muerte” (146). The others agree to do as the hare says, which is to delay the delivery of the daily sacrifice past the agreed upon hour. The king, irritated with the delay of his meal and the breaking of the contract, starts to pace in anger when the hare busts in. The lion demands to know
what is going on and why the animals have broken the pact, and the hare tells him that another lion intercepted the delivery of the sacrificial hare and claimed to have more rights to it than the lion-king. The hare also tells the king that this other lion took the hare and that he wishes to fight the king. The king becomes enraged and ordered the hare to take him to this other lion. The hare leads the lion to a well, and asks the king to pick him up so he can point out the intruder. The lion looks into the well, sees his own reflection holding the hare, and believes it to be the trespassing lion, sets the hare on the ground and then leaps into the well to his death.

Following Dimna’s statement that we should compare his example to the case of Sençeba and the Lion, it is important to first understand the exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” with regards to how trickery is employed so that the comparison is of like items. Dimna does not declare that he will use any “arte”; he specifically states that his deception will be enacted in a particular way: “así como fizo la liebra al león”. In the second part of the chapter, the focus is equally on the need for trickery in order to manipulate as it is on the way one uses trickery. Dimna’s previous two exempla introduce both of these points so that once the reader arrives at this third exemplum, placed in direct analogy with the events of the remainder of the chapter, the reader is prepared to focus on the way the hare deceives the lion, which I contend is to focus on the hare’s framing strategy. The two earlier exempla, therefore, assist in teaching the “seso encubierto” of the second part of the chapter: what makes for successful acts of deception. That this
second part is particularly concerned with deception is seen through the repeated use of
the word “arte” along with the juxtaposition of failed tricks with successful ones.

The term “arte” is used five times within the context of these two exempla. Dimna’s introduction to the double-exemplum uses the term twice, first while stating his
purpose for telling the exempla (“ca todas las cosas non se fazen por fuerça, et algunt
flaco llegó con su faldrimiento et con sus artes et con su enseñamiento a lo que non
pueden fazer muchos fuertes et muchos valientes”), and the second when presenting the
exemplum material (“¿Non te dixieron de cómmo mató un cuervo a una culebra con su
arte et con su enseñamiento et con su suavidat?”). Within the exemplum of “El cuervo y
la culebra”, the lynx protests the crow’s plan to peck out the snake’s eyes by exclaiming:
“¡Ay, qué mala arte es esa que tú cuidas fazer!” The lynx uses the term a second time
after telling the embedded exemplum of “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo”, stating, “Et
yo no te di este enxemplo sinon por que sepas que algunas artes son que matan al que las
faze”. The fifth usage of the term is used by Dimna again to give the sententia to the
exempla he just told: “Et non te di este enxemplo sinon por que sepas que las artes fazen
por ventura algunas cosas que la fuerça non puede fazer” (145). The repetition of the term
arte is particular to these two exempla, and directs the reader to focus specifically on craft
and deception.

At the same time that this occurs, Dimna provides two exempla that function in
contrast with each other, with their nexus being successful versus unsuccessful tricks.
The juxtaposition then also points to an instruction of successful arte through the
comparison of the two *exempla*, a theme that will be carried into the next *exemplum* (“Las liebres y el león”) and the case of Sençeba and the Lion by way of developing increasingly complex cases of trickery. Similar to how the inter-diegetic narrative cycle of the cleric contained a “seso encobierto” that demonstrated how to suggest a new schema into the repertoire of a listener, this double-*exemplum* told by Dimna prepares the reader to “read” the following *exemplum* and its corresponding case between Sençeba and the Lion along a specific hermeneutics, critically questioning exactly what is done to successfully employ *arte* to serve one’s goals. In other words, by directing the reader to focus on the topics of *engaño* and *arte*, Dimna is teaching us about framing by providing us an explicit schema through which to approach the material. The variable of the frame/tale this time, however, will be the frame as all of the framed material will be about deception.

The lack of *arte*, or “mala arte”, in the crow’s original plan (the direct attack on the snake by pecking out its eyes), is rejected by the lynx in favor of a plan that implements real craft, or “arte”, “enseñamiento”, and “suavidat”, to use Dimna’s words (143). The comparative elements called to the attention of the reader, both implicitly and explicitly, during the telling of these tales all guide the reader to consider the craft of manipulation, leading her to reposition her focus on the frame. The *exemplum* of “El cuervo y la culebra” is itself built on juxtaposition. The “mala arte” of the crow is to be judged against the “arte”, “enseñamiento”, and “suavidat” of the lynx in providing a plan of action that will yield the intended goal, in this case to kill the snake. The embedded
exemplum of “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo” buttresses the comparative aspects of the exemplum of “El cuervo y la culebra” through providing a case of failed arte which through its negative aspects seeks comparison with a positive counter-example, found in the good arte of the lynx. Implicitly the tales themselves use comparison through contrast and juxtaposition to focus the audience’s attention on successful arte, then, explicitly, Dimna, as mentioned above, directly asks Calila to compare his exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” with how he will eventually snare Sençeba, this time directing the reader to look for similarities.

The exemplum of “Las liebres y el león” provides a case where the creation of a successful trick is dependent on the ability to craft an appropriate frame with a corresponding exemplum. The exemplum to be “read” by the lion-king is his reflection in the pool at the bottom of the well. The potential meanings of the image the lion-king observes while peering at his reflection with the hare under his arm are subjugated to the framing information provided by the hare prior to viewing, or “reading”, the proof/exemplum.8 The hare’s successful arte is demonstrated through his ability to not

8 While I have mainly discussed exempla literature as contemplative advice, it should be remembered that one primary function of exempla is to establish the speaker as a trustworthy, authoritative source. Exempla are commonly used as proof or corroboration of the veracity of a previous claim or statement. Dimna has just told the exemplum of “El cuervo y la culebra”, for example, as proof that craft can do things that sometimes force
only construct an *exemplum* for the lion-king to read but, more importantly, to direct the way in which the *exemplum* is read through proper framing. The schema that the lion-king selects in order to find the frame/tale as potent was not implanted through the *exemplum* this time, but rather was provided explicitly by the hare through crafting the frame for the *exemplum*. On any other day, if the lion-king were to hold a hare and look into a well, he would not necessarily conclude that he was looking at an enemy. The lion-king only selects this schema at this moment because the hare provided it through the proper construction of a frame. The schema is potent and allows the lion to direct an inter-diegetic colonization that animates the schema to become a plan with a monovalent meaning: the reflection is his enemy (“et él cató al fondo del pozo et vio su sombra et la de la liebre en el agua; et puso la liebre en tierra, et saltó en el pozo por lidiar con el león, non dubdando qu’él era el león, et afogóse en el pozo” 147).

cannot achieve. Larry Scanlon, while analyzing John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*, argues that *exempla* contain authority through two aspects of their narrative, stating: “The narrative convinces both as *dicta* and as *facta*, that is, both as authoritative utterance and incontrovertible evidence” (95). The “authoritative utterance” is the *dicta*, derived from a named or unnamed historical authority that is ventriloquized by the speaker of the *exemplum*. The “incontrovertible evidence” is the *facta*, proof or corroboration with a previous claim, that then lends that authoritative power to the speaker of the *exemplum*. 
Another way of approaching the analysis of how the characters build effective frames for frame/tales is through the idea of expectation. The hare constructs a narrative that leads the lion to expect a certain outcome for the frame/tale. The creation of expectation is similar to Genette’s understanding of “genre as paratext”, or Fish’s idea of an “interpretive community” (Genette Paratexts 94-103; Fish 483). By explaining the logic of the schema, the hare has brought the lion into a shared interpretive community, and she is able to anticipate the lion’s selection of a potent schema that the lion will use to direct an inter-diegetic colonization, this time colonizing the exemplum, and arrive at a monovalent meaning to the “tale” told in the reflection in the well. The hare accomplishes this in the following way: He arrives late, agitating the lion (“¿Dónde venís et dó son las bestias? ¿Et por qué me mintieron el pleito que avían comigo puesto” 147). The disturbance opens a space for dialogue in which the hare explains what happened: “Non mande Dios, señor; yo só mandadero de las bestias para vos et traíavos una liebra que vos enbiavan que yantásedes; et yo que venía cerca, fálome un león et tomómela, et dixo: -Mayor derecho he yo de comer esta liebra que el otro a quien la levades” (147).

His tardiness is both proof and argument; it is the first layer of proof that what he says is true, as the meal did not arrive for a reason, yet it is also part of the frame-building since the exemplum the lion-king is to read is not one of seeing his own reflection with the messenger-hare, but rather to see an intruder-lion with the hare that was to be his dinner. The lion has been successfully fooled because the schema introduced by the hare in the framing material is selected as potent for the relationship between the exemplum and the frame. The lion thus directs an inter-diegetic colonization that fulfills what he expects the
exemplum to fulfill based on the hare’s appropriate framing of the information. Framing, thus, is more than simple context, it is the very shaping of expectation, and frames that explicitly provide a schema can also be understood as attempting to bring the recipient into a shared interpretive community.

Upon arrival to the well, the hare asks the lion-king to lift him and hold him under his arm so that he can indicate where the other lion is located: “Este es el lugar que vos dixe” (147). The lion-king takes the hare in his arm, and then sees his own reflection in the pool along with the reflection of the hare. The image in the water (a lion holding a hare) becomes a narrative through its relationship with other events that have been ordered and presented through a speaker, in this case the hare. The lion-king, relying on his own experience and senses (specifically sight), chooses to act based upon the very “real” events presented to him. Privy to the machinations put in place by the hare/author, a recurring privilege to readers of exempla collections, onlookers from “outside” the narrative are being exposed to not just the events, but the organization of the events as well. The lion-king, lacking such a position of privilege, is forced to rely on techniques of verification, in this case visual, in order to make meaning by connecting disparate events. Anticipating the need for “objective” proof, the hare builds a frame that effectively writes himself out of being the agent of meaning-making for the lion, transferring the agency to the lion-king to actively participate in his own demise. The hare’s arte is not found in the lie about the reflection, it is his ability to insert a schema into the repertoire of the lion and then provide an example that he hopes will lead the lion to select that schema as
potent, so that the lion is driving the inter-diegetic colonization and determining the meaning on his own.

The similarities between Dimna’s plan of action, as outlined in his *exemplum* “Las liebres y el león”, and the final execution of his ploy are remarkable. Dimna enters the Lion’s presence in an emotional state, “triste e marrido”, manipulating the shared space between them to be one filtered through emotion over reason (148). In the *exemplum* of “La garza, las truchas y el cangrejo” the heron “demostró muy grant tristeza et cuidado” in order to provoke concern on the part of the crab while in “Las liebres y el león”, the hare arrives late in order to make the lion “sollón et muy sañudo”. Dimna, like the hare, manipulates the space through emotions from the start. This first phase of the deception both creates the context and then serves as the first proof to the fabricated story that Dimna will tell. The hare’s late arrival has three effects: it emotionally distresses the lion-king; it provokes the lion-king to inquire about the problem; and, it serves as evidence that verifies the hare’s story, for the hare truly is late. Equally, Dimna’s sadness provokes the Lion to ask him what has happened to cause his mood, and Dimna’s response also opens a space to ensnare the Lion’s emotions: “Acaesció cosa que non querríades vos nin nos” (148). Instead of sharing some personal woe, however, Dimna implies that the Lion would feel the same if he knew what Dimna knows, an agitating idea spoken for the sole purpose of creating emotional distress. When prompted to finally tell the case, the (false) bad news of Sençeba’s ploy to betray the Lion, Dimna’s sadness and affliction become logical and justified emotions for such a situation, thus reinforcing
the veracity of Dimna’s fabricated story and providing a reason for the Lion to be truly angry.

The fabricated story within all of these *exempla* does not just establish a threat to the listener, it also indirectly threatens the established hierarchy of the Lion’s court. This threat, articulated through the identification of insiders and outsiders, allows for the reaffirmation of the power relations of the society by establishing common interests among groups jockeying for power in order to successfully challenge the threat. Submitting to the established rule of authority is not simply logical, but an imperative for maintaining that order along with survival itself. The heron tells the story that fishermen are coming to the pond, and this outside entity directly threatens the trout and crab, and indirectly threatens the established order of the small ecosystem by depleting the food supply of the heron. The unequal power relations between the heron and the trout, predator and prey, ruler and subject, is recast as a “natural order” of a balanced world, which the outside force threatens to destroy. That the trout submit themselves to this natural order is evidenced through their willingness to be taken by the heron, two per day, away from the pond and to a new home. The only way for the trout to escape the threat of the fishermen is to entrust themselves to the heron, not just temporarily for transportation, but permanently in moving to the new pond, where the traditional order and historical power relations can continue.

The hare accomplishes the same end through his story of an outsider lion that has taken the dinner-hare destined for the lion-king. This case is more explicit in its focus on
courtly relationships, as the animals and the lion-king have established a “pleito” for the mutual good of all. The lion-king is not solely upset over the lack of a dinner, but also because he feels cheated by the animals; he asks the hare “¿Et por qué me mintieron el pleito que avían comigo puesto?” (147). The societal order has been shaken and must be reaffirmed. As before, the disturbance is caused by an outsider, this time a lion who has entered the kingdom, stolen the lion-king’s dinner, and challenged the supremacy of the great cat, having said, according to the hare, “que quería lidiar convusco, maguer sodes rey” (147). Again, the conflictive relationship between subject and ruler, prey and predator, which exists between the hare and the lion-king, is solidified and reiterated as natural, good, and needing protection against the outside threat of the invading lion. The defense of the “pleito” is a defense of the established order, and the hare demonstrates his subjugation to the good of the established law code by assisting the lion-king in his execution of justice: the seeking out and challenging of the outsider-lion. While the deception is going in the opposite direction in this exemplum compared to that of the heron, it is the powerful tricking the weak in the case of the heron whereas here it is the weak (hare) tricking the powerful (lion-king), in both situations the devised solution to countering the outsider is through reaffirming the established order of power. The willingness of the hare to assist the lion-king, to the extreme of submitting his whole body under his complete physical control (“Mas tomadme so vuestro sobaco et mostrárvoslo he”, he tells the lion-king, 147), is both further proof of the hare’s story about the outsider-lion and a demonstration of his complete acceptance of and subjugation to the lion-king, the “pleito”, and the established social order.
The hare’s “engaño” is not simply an emotionally manipulative trick, despite the important role that emotions play within the execution of successful, deceptive “arte”. The “engaño” also obligates the lion-king to take action in order to affirm his role within the established order as well. As protector of his subjects and the law he must not harm the hare, who is not his dinner but a messenger, and the “pleito” stipulates that he is only to kill and eat the animal chosen by his subjects. Furthermore, it is his duty to enact justice in the realm, meaning he must seek out and kill, or at least drive off, the invader-lion who has disturbed the social order. While the aligning of the hare and the lion-king serves both of their interests with regards to maintaining traditional power-relations, it is the role of the good king to reestablish order through executing justice. This effectively puts the responsibility on the ruler to uphold his end of the social contract. The hare cunningly inserts an allusion to the “pleito” while reporting to the lion-king his interaction with the interloper-lion, claiming to have said, “[m]al fazedes, que este conducho [comida] es del león que es rey de las bestias, que gelo enbían para yantar” (147). By affirming that the lion is “rey de las bestias” the hare stresses the social position of the lion, along with the duties his position is bound to execute. He also reminds the lion-king that the beasts have continued the “pleito” in good faith in pointing out that the beasts sent the “conducho” for the lion-king to eat. The lion-king, therefore, is not simply emotionally inspired to attack the outsider over a stolen dinner, and he is not solely protecting his own interests by protecting the established hierarchy, but he is also contractually and socially required to resolve the problem because of the pleito.
The case of the friendship of the Lion and the Ox is more complicated for Dimna. Unlike the previous two exempla, which both have fictional antagonists that never exist in material reality, Dimna works to turn the target’s friend into an antagonist. In order to accomplish this feat, Dimna similarly constructs a threat to the social order through creating an outsider who is threatening the norms of the court and the established social hierarchy in order to obligate the Lion to execute justice. He first works to manipulate the Lion by making him aware of the problems in the social court.

While Dimna uses emotional manipulation to start the process of “arte”, he quickly turns the case into a problem concerning the social order, specifically a challenge to the Lion’s position as sovereign, by way of emphasizing the social contracts held between subjects and rulers. After positioning himself as being fearful of telling the information that he has, lest he be harmed for saying unpopular truths, Dimna evokes his obligations to his ruler, stating, “quando yo me remienbre que las nuestras almas de todas las bestias son colgadas de la vuesta, non puede ser que non faga lo que devo, maguer non me lo preguntades et maguer yo tema que non me lo creedes” (148). Similar to the way the hare used the “pleito”, Dimna calls on the contractual agreements between subject and ruler as both a protective measure and a call to action. He protects himself from immediate harm from the king through acknowledging his side of the social contract and in calling the king “de grande seso et de buen consejo”, possibly better understood as Dimna reminding the Lion of how he should be, rather than a simple
description of how he is (148). The Lion, obligated by the practices of the court, is now adequately prepared to receive Dimna’s bad news.

Dimna then reports to the Lion that Sençeba is disloyal and plans to challenge him as king, but while he has the floor he uses it to turn the situation into a philosophical debate rather than discuss the immediate facts revolving around Sençeba. Dimna also displaces the information from himself by another degree by stating that he was told the story by “el fiel verdadero” (148). As the conversation continues, the Lion consistently attempts to return the discussion to the specific case of Sençeba, while Dimna continually finds ways to engage hypothetical topics of societal obligations in order to insert commentary on what good and just kings must do in those imagined situations. Dimna first asserts, after hearing what Sençeba allegedly said to the knights of the realm, that he came to understand that Sençeba was a traitor (“[e]t pues que esto me dixieron, entendí que era traidor et falso”) but then he immediately changes the topic to speak about threats of insubordination and the importance of acting quickly and being on guard (“ca dizan que quando el rey sabe que algunos de sus pueblos se quieren fazer ser eguales en consejo et en dignidad, et aver compañía, mátelos, o si non, ellos matarán a él” 148). The new topic merits elaboration, so Dimna tells an *exemplum* about being “anviso”, afterwhich he reiterates that he advises the Lion to take precaution.

The *exemplum*, “Las tres truchas”, is about three trout, “Anvisa”, “Delibre”, and “Perezosa”, who lived in an undiscovered pond. One day a couple of fishermen happened onto the secret watering hole, saw the trout, and decided to return with their nets.
“Anvisa” was suspicious and became fearful of the men, and taking precautions swam out by way of the stream that fed the pond. “Delibre” did not take precaution, and curses herself for her lack of forethought. She must now use “arte” to get herself out of danger. She swam to the surface and feigned being dead. The men, falling for her trick, picked her up and tossed her on the shore, and she slipped back into the water and swam away.

“Perezoso” did nothing at all but swim back and forth until they fished her. Dimna concludes his first argument by saying, “[e]t yo, señor, dote por consejo de ser anviso” (150).

The Lion acknowledges Dimna’s advice, but returns the conversation to the topic of Sençeba, and that he sees no reason for Sençeba to want to harm him, especially after all he has done for the Ox. Dimna claims that Sençeba has become accustomed to always rising socially, and that there is no place left for him to aspire except to the throne, but then again retreats back into the hypothetical in order to talk about the qualities of a “vil desconocido” and return to the topic of social responsibility (150). He juxtaposes the self-interested, fear-based service that the “falso vil” provides a king to gain power and personal enrichment with the obligation that a ruler has towards “sus leales vasallos” to believe and follow their advice. In doing so he also reaffirms his own obligation to the king by stating: “[e]t el privado del rey deve consejarle lo más lealmente que pudiere lo que le estará bien et lo que le fará pro, et dévele redrar su mal” (151). He concludes his current argument by comparing kings: “el más noble rey es aquel que non es rabinoso nin açedado […] et el más perezoso rey es aquel que se da a vagares quando le viene la cuita,
et despreçiala el apónela a sus parientes et a sus amigos, et dize que le viene por ellos” (151). The continual insertion of ideals about rulers, the role of advisers, and the obligations kings have to their counselors, friends, and relatives is a bold reminder to the Lion about his societal duties in order to force him to entertain the hypothetical case of what he must do if there truly is a threat to the social order from Sençeba.

Dimna is successful and the king entertains the possibility that Sençeba could seek to wrong him. While apparently a minor concession, it is a considerably important shift.9 Primarily, it will be difficult for the Lion to prove Sençeba to be innocent once he is suspected of sedition, and placing that burden on the Lion is far more advantageous for Dimna than having to prove that Sençeba is guilty. Because Dimna works from the hypothetical he avoids having to prove Sençeba’s crime, and by maintaining the conversation continually in the hypothetical, Dimna shifts the debate to deal with the way that the Lion should act, as opposed to officially charging Sençeba with treason.

As stated, the Lion opens the possibility that Sençeba may be his enemy, but he immediately rejects the potential danger based on the fact that Sençeba is an herbivore and the Lion a carnivore, arguing, “si Senseba [sic] fuese mi enemigo, commo tú dizes, non me podría mal fazer; ¿et commo lo podría fazer?, ca él comme yerva et yo commo

9 The legal content of the collection is another under-researched area. See Blecua and Lacarra’s note 94 on page 190 regarding connections between the following chapter and medieval Muslim and Hispano-Muslim law.
carne, et él es mio comer et yo non só suyo” (151-2). The Lion reiterates his lack of conviction that Sençeba seeks to dethrone him, arguing that he has given the Ox many honors, but Dimna’s rhetoric on courtly customs and duties begins to infiltrate the king’s speech. For example, the Lion concludes his argument by asserting that he would be acting dishonorably by impulsively removing Sençeba from the position of honor in which he has been kept, stating, “si ésto yo mudare, será grant vergüença et grant torpedat de mí, et faría grant traiçión” (152). The Lion still may not see Sençeba as a threat, but unwittingly he has become concerned with his obligations and duties to maintain the social order.

Dimna then responds with a two-fold argument, finally bringing into play the specter of an outsider in combination with a threat to the social order. The thrust of his explicit argument is that Sençeba has the resources available to challenge the Lion with the aid of other discontented vassals, arguing “si te non temes de Çençeba [sic], témete de sus vasallos que ha hecho atrevidos contra ti et te ha omiziado contra ellos” (153). At the same time Dimna exploits the limited ambiguity of an exemplum, “El piojo y la pulga”, to make an implicit argument to lead the Lion to see Sençeba as an outsider having unfamiliar customs. The artful conclusion that Dimna provides when the Lion finally asks him what he should do is a return back to the original proposal that he made at the start of the conversation: The Lion should kill Sençeba as a preemptive precaution.

One striking aspect about the final exemplum Dimna tells the Lion during this conversation (“El piojo y la pulga”) is the dual force of its rhetorical implementation.
Two distinct meanings are ultimately derived from this single exemplum. Dimna directly states the first when he explains his reason for telling the story to the Lion. The second is the transparent sententia that functions as the story’s frame. The story is as follows: A louse enjoys his comfort in the splendid bed of a wealthy man, when one day a flea asks to stay over for the night. The louse graciously accepts him as his guest and during the night the flea bites the man, and then hops from the bed. The man wakes up and calls his servants, who strip the bed, find the louse, and kill it. When Dimna concludes the story, he tells the Lion, “[e]t yo non te di este enxemplo sinon por que sepas et entiendas que el mal omne sienpre está aparejado para fazer mal, así commo el alacrán, que sienpre está aparejado para ferir” (153). The framing of the story, however, prepares the Lion (and the reader) for a different interpretation of the exemplum. Dimna frames the story with a sentential phrase, “[e]t dizen: –Si posare contigo algunt huésped una ora del día et tú non conocieras sus costunbres, non te segures dél, et guádate non te avenga por él lo que avino al piojo por ospedar a la pulga”, suggesting that the lesson of the exemplum is to know the customs and habits of one’s guests and cohort (152). The sententia does not prepare the Lion for Dimna’s interpretation of the story: that an evil man is always looking to do harm to others (152). The double-message of this exemplum, or dual-force of its rhetorical implementation, demonstrates a second strand of craft that Dimna has been affecting upon the Lion: the preparation of the Lion as a reader of exempla. In order to successfully manipulate the Lion, Dimna must create the frame (also called, context or condition), provide a tale (exemplum or agent), and make sure that the subject interprets
the tale correctly, that is, uses a shared hermeneutics or the same process of meaning-making.

Throughout the conversation Dimna has drifted back and forth between the hypothetical and the concrete. The central concern at hand is that Sençeba is a traitor, but Dimna has also discussed hypothetical scenarios in order to make the Lion consider his obligations and duties to maintain the social order. Dimna juggles more than just content as he shifts between these two topics; he has also been manipulating form and reception by providing interpolated stories in order to prepare the Lion to first read Sençeba into the exempla (for comparison), and then eventually to read him as an exempla (where Sençeba and his actions become signifiers for meaning-making). Because the Lion consistently returns to addressing Dimna’s claim that Sençeba is conspiring against him, we can observe that in spite of Dimna’s apparently tangential lectures, for the Lion the topic of Sençeba is present throughout the entire conversation. We can therefore see that part of the Lion’s response to what Dimna says is an application of the information to his life, specifically his relationship to Sençeba.

Similarly to the inter-diegetic narrative cycle about the cleric, Dimna’s stacking of exempla throughout the conversation is an attempt to insert a new schema into the Lion’s repertoire and animate it. The Lion accepts the general moral of the tale but outright rejects that Dimna’s first exemplum is analogous to his relationship with Sençeba, stating, “[e]ntendido he lo que dexiste, mas non cuido que Senseba [sic] me buscase mal” (150). This is very similar to how Dimna responded to Calila’s exemplum of the religioso
robado, and allows an outside viewer to recognize the conflict of schemas. The Lion responds in a similar way to Dimna’s second argument, mostly focused on the obligations of the just king, declaring, “[b]ronzamente me has fablado et esto deve ser sofrido al leal consejero. Et si Senseba [sic] fuese mi enemigo, commo tú dizes, non me podría fazer mal” (151). As before, he affirms the general values of the advice, demonstrated in recognizing that such blunt statements “deve ser sofrido al leal consejero”. but again he rejects the application of the proposed schema to his relationship with Sençeba.

The sleight that Dimna has been working on the Lion proves fruitful after the final exemplum of their conversation, “El piojo y la pulga”. After Dimna gives his final argument, we are shown that Dimna has successfully inserted the new schema into the Lion’s thinking: “al león cayóle esta palabra en el corazón, et dixo a Digna: –Pues, ¿qué tienes por bien que faga?” (153). The Lion has apparently accepted the morals of the last exemplum along with the application of the exemplum to his relationship with Sençeba. Dimna replies to the Lion’s question with a set of maxims, all of which speak of extracting or eliminating that which is troubling: “[e]l que ha el diente podrido que le faze doler nunca fuelga fasta que lo saca; et la vianda mala que faze fastidio non fuelga el omne della fasta que la eche; et el enemigo, cuyo daño es temido, non ha otra melezina sinon en lo matar” (153). By the end of these sententiae, the Lion repents that he priveliged Sençeba, stating “[m]ucho me has fecho aborreçer la privança de Sençeba” (153).
As with the religious man in the inter-diegetic narrative cycle, the Lion repeatedly rejects the application of the new schema to his experience, informing the reader about his own schema concerning his relationship with Sençeba. At the same time, distinct from the cycle about the cleric, Dimna does not force the application of the meaning of the frame/tales that he tells onto the relationship of the Lion and the Ox, but rather simply seeks confirmation in the logic of the schema itself. It is after the final exemplum of the louse and the flea that the Lion changes his thinking, so it is there that we must look for the animation of the new schema.

As with all of the frame/tales that Dimna tells the Lion, the sententia that frames this exemplum and the content of the story are easily animated by a schema that the Lion accepts. With this frame/tale, however, Dimna recasts the meaning of the story by inserting a new schema onto a frame/tale unit that the Lion has already created a meaning for. The framing moral is the following: “Si posare contigo algunt huésped una ora del día et tú non conocieras sus costumbres, non te segures dél, et guádate non te avenga por él lo que avino al piojo por ospedar a la pulga” (152). The polyvalent story, nonetheless, is subjugated to the authority of the sententia through the Lion applying the schema from the moral to the frame/tale and deeming the relationship potent, which allows him to proceed with the inter-diegetic colonization of the exemplum. The Lion has agreed with Dimna’s logic games up until this point, while still rejecting the plans that emerge by considering them impotent with regards to the application to his own life. We can then assume that the same has occurred up to this point with this frame/tale, except this
frame/tale is potent when applied to his relationship with Sençeba: Sençeba is an outsider and the Lion does not know his customs. This schema is not new to the conversation, and while the Lion has admitted that he can entertain the possibility of Sençeba being disloyal, the lack of knowing is not the same as confirming a threat.

Dimna’s second moral to the story, however, recasts the meaning of the *exemplum*, which the Lion has already accepted as being analogous to his relationship with Sençeba. Confronted with the new schema, which claims that an evil man always seeks to do harm, which is immediately followed by another short *exemplum* about the scorpion, the new schema is made into a plan that then colonizes his previous understanding. This new schema frames the *exemplum* of the scorpion, and the Lion finds the relationship potent and so he directs the colonization of the *exemplum* of the scorpion so the whole frame/tale becomes monovalent. The plan then seeks to augment its authority by recasting itself onto the story of the louse. The Lion finds this relationship potent as well, and the plan colonizes the story. The Lion has already accepted that tale of the louse and his experience in life concerning his relationship with Sençeba is potent, so he either must allow the plan to continue to colonize or he must reject that the relationship is potent immediately after confirming it as potent. We know that he allowed the authority of the plan to subjugate his previous viewpoint because he demonstrated a shift in his thinking when he said: “[m]ucho me has fecho aborrecer la privança de Sençeba” (153). The new plan maintains that Sençeba is an outsider, but it also turns him into a threat to the established hierarchy by labeling him a “mal omne”. By accepting
Dimna’s recasting of the meaning of the *exemplum*, like “el mal omne” and the scorpion, Sençeba is also viewed as always being prepared to cause harm as long as he is allowed to remain.

Dimna’s maxims reinforce his arguments by outlining the process of application of his previous *exempla*. Working backwards through the conversation, the maxims, and then *exempla*, direct the Lion back to the original argument that a king has no option but to destroy contenders within the realm: “quando el rey sabe que algunos de sus pueblos se quieren fazer ser eguales en consejo et en dignidat, et aver compañía, mátelos, o si non, ellos matarán a él”. The maxims assist in the application of this moral to his relationship with Sençeba through returning the discussion to the topic of the need of a ruler to be “anviso” (148). The first and second maxims, “[e]l que ha el diente podrido que le faze doler nunca fuelga fasta que lo saca; et la vianda mala que faze fastidio non fuelga el omne della fasta que la eche”, speak of an ailment that is causing harm in the present, while the third maxim, “el enemigo, *cuyo daño es temido*, non ha otra melezina sinon en lo matar”, speaks of an imagined, future threat, with real emotional consequences, that has not yet truly become manifest (my emphasis). The Lion can only ensure that the court returns to health by removing the “mal omne”, Sençeba, as if he were the rotted tooth or the spoiled food in the maxims. The “mal omne” is a real and constant threat as long as he is present, a notion emphasized by the comparison of the evil man to the scorpion that is always prepared to cause injury. This interpretation folds back onto the *exemplum* to make the very presence of the “pulga” a truly dangerous threat that will ultimately kill his
host, the louse, in contrast to being a hypothetical hazard because he has unknown customs. By analogy, Sençebe is a real threat that will kill the Lion if not extracted from the society.

As a result of the authority of the new plan, the meaning of the maxim and the new interpretation of “El piojo y la pulga” will colonize the Lion’s understanding of the first exemplum of the conversation, “Las tres truchas”. Originally he rejected this analogy outright because he did not believe that Sençebe desired to harm him (“non cuido que Senseba [sic] me buscase mal”). However, now that he does fear that Sençebe seeks to harm him, as the fishermen had the intention of catching the trout from the moment they spied them in the pond, the Lion must choose which fish will be his analogous pair. Clearly, to be “Anviso” is the safest example to follow. The Lion decides to send Sençebe away from the court before he is able to cause more harm, evidence that the Lion has taken Dimna’s advice: “yo enbiarle he dezir lo que tengo en el coraçon, et mandarle he que se vaya do quisiere” (153).

As explained in the previous section, the cleric’s cycle displays how to subjugate exempla to the framer’s intention by inserting a new schema into the recipient’s repertoire and then animating that schema into a plan that will augment the authority of the framer’s moral. In the conversation between Dimna and the Lion, it is not solely the moral of the exempla that gets subjugated to the framer’s intention, but also the interpretive strategies of the receiver of the exempla that become altered. Dimna is not just concerned with the meaning of the exempla, but more significantly, he is concerned
with the way in which the Lion approaches the material. Dimna recognizes the important interplay between frame and exemplum, and therefore he also takes care to make sure that the Lion shares his same interpretive community. Dimna’s use of exempla with the Lion throughout the chapter exhibits varying degrees of restraint and freedom, always depending on how Dimna chooses to present new schemata. His strategies include presenting exempla that are dissimilar to the Lion’s expectations, prescribing a frame and explaining why the schema is a trustworthy interpretive strategy, or a combination of the two.

The very first exemplum that Dimna tells the Lion is “La zorra y el tambor”. At this point in the story, Sençeba has just wandered into the kingdom of the Lion and is baying loudly. The Lion, unfamiliar with oxen and the sound they make, becomes afraid of the great shouts coming from the unknown animal, even though he has not seen it. Dimna sees this as his opportunity to advise the king wisely so as to rise socially, and he tells him the exemplum about the fox and the drum. Dimna frames and drives the interpretation of the exemplum with a plan in the form of a proverb: “et esto se departe en un proverbio que dize: –Non se deve omne temer de todas bozes” (135). The plan contains the schema that he wishes to insert– that one should not fear all voices or sounds– and because it is explanatory material he exposes the interpretive process that makes its selection potent. The tale is about a hungry fox that hears the noise made by the wind beating a drum with its branches. Seeing the bulk of the drum she believes it to be quite meaty and attacks the drum, only to find out that it is hollow. The fox, reflecting on
the situation, states the conclusion that sometimes the weakest things have large bodies and loud voices: “por ventura las más flacas cosas han mayores personas et más altas bozes” (135). After finishing the story, Dimna then explains the relationships between the proverb, the tale, and the personal situation of the Lion, instructing the Lion in the way he is to read the frame/tale and then apply it to his life: “[e]t yo, señor, non te di este en xenplo sinon porque he esperança que sea esta cosa, cuya boz te espantó, atal commo el atanbor; et si a ella te llegases, más lijera te semejaría que tú non cuidas” (135). Dimna leaves no interpretive space for the Lion as he clearly links the two “voices” (that of the drum to that of the ox), and through analogy the king is clearly linked to the fox, in which case the sentential statement made by the fox at the end, as well as the meaning with which Dimna furnished the proverb beforehand, appropriately applies to the Lion’s situation.\footnote{I have argued throughout this dissertation that the work as a whole, and particularly this chapter of the CeD, is concerned with the presentation of exempla, their rhetorical uses, and the interplay between the multiple diegetic levels involved in the act of framing tales. The scope of the current study does not allow for a complete comparison of the various ways in which each character introduces and closes the framed stories they tell, but I believe my previous statements on this subject along with the current focus on the way Dimna tells exempla to the Lion provide sufficient support for future work to be done on this topic.} Dimna’s explanation of the frame/tale deconstructs its pieces for direct
application to the Lion’s situation, after which he recommends a plan of action, which the Lion fully embraces. There is no deception or arte in this interaction, at least in the specific way that arte is implemented in the second part of this chapter, and the full explanation that Dimna gives the Lion is akin to explicit instruction on how to read frame/tales. Dimna offers up a schema to be added to the Lion’s repertoire, provides a frame/tale for which to apply the schema, and then demonstrates the inter-diegetic colonization process that takes place by connecting the analogous parts. The first lesson, the moral that first impressions are not always accurate, is an important lesson for rulers, but that lesson could have been achieved without the additional explanation that exposes the hermeneutic process of meaning-making for this specific interpretive community.11

The extended elucidation of the process, therefore, is another example of how this chapter of CeD has a “seso encubierto” that is about the elements of the frame/tale and the ways they can be used by a narrator.

From the perspective of rhetoric we can conclude that Dimna’s use of the exemplum is successful, but one major distinction between this exemplum and others told in this chapter is that Dimna unpacks the analogous parts of the tale for the Lion. In addition to this tale being fairly simple and straightforward with regards to its argument, the fox within the story relates the moral, directly eliminating the need to preface the

11 Parker also notes that this frame/tale could be applied to the way that the Lion has treated Dimna (28).
story with its moral or explain it afterwards. Dimna, as stated above, is not merely providing the Lion with advice, he is teaching the Lion about how to read *exempla* and apply the reading to his life. In the language of Fish, Dimna is instructing the Lion in the practices of a specific interpretive community so that the present text becomes the “same text” for both characters (483). Once Dimna has established that he and the Lion belong to the same interpretive community, that is, they both approach texts with the same hermeneutic strategies, Dimna can be more confident that future “texts” will also be the “same” for both as well. The grouping of various texts that are “read” with similar expectations and interpretive practices by a specific community is reminiscent of Genette’s arguments for why “genre” is also a paratext (*Paratexts* 7, 94-103).

The second *exemplum* that Dimna tells the Lion is that of “Las tres truchas”, and it, as well, contains uniquely instructive elements on how to read *exempla*. As mentioned in the synopsis above, the three trout all have aptonyms such as “Anvisa”, “Delibre”, and “Perezosa”, and they each act out their names in each of their situations. Anvisa effectively anticipates and avoids trouble through preemptive action. Delibre does not look ahead to avoid her troubles, but once the fishermen arrive to fish, she successfully devises and executes a plan of escape. Perezosa does nothing, and is caught. Similar to the first *exemplum*, Dimna explains the moral of the tale beforehand, and the *exemplum* serves as the proof to the sentential remarks he makes before. Afterwards he advises the Lion to be “anviso”, but he does not directly unpack the characters of the story to the analogous situation in the Lion’s life, as he did before. Taken together, these two *exempla*
can both been seen as instructional guides on reading *exempla* and how to apply them to one’s life. As already shown above, the Lion demonstrates his ability to apply the *exemplum* through analogy to his relationship with Sençeba by his initial rejection of the result that makes Sençeba an invading outsider, a fisherman that he can avoid through being “amviso”. He expresses his understanding of the frame/tale rejection and simultaneous rejection of its application to his life by stating: “[e]ntendido he lo que dexiste, mas non cuido que Senseba [sic] me buscase mal” (150).

The third *exemplum* told by Dimna to the Lion, “El piojo y la pulga”, shows that Dimna trusts more that he and the Lion are members of the same interpretive community and that the texts that they are reading are “same”, in that the Lion is entrusted with more interpretive freedom. Dimna again frames the tale through a *sententia*, but the characters do not carry aptonyms. By looking at the changes to the way Dimna relates *exempla* to the Lion, it can be observed that the jackal releases explicit authorial control over the interpretation and application of the story to the king’s life as the counselor gains confidence that he and the ruler share one interpretive community. Because Dimna created and is directing this community, it can also be observed that the Lion’s interpretive process is becoming increasingly subjugated to Dimna’s authority.\(^\text{12}\) As

\(^\text{12}\) In anticipation of future chapters, Chapter 3 of the *CeD* here demonstrates how establishing and directing discourses is a way of enacting power and authority. Many
analyzed above, Dimna’s shift in providing a change in the meaning of this *exemplum*, after he has told the story to illuminate a truth about a different sentential saying, provokes the Lion to adopt a different schema and subsequently revise his perception of Sençeba through reinterpreting the aspects of the conversation in reverse. That the Lion accepts the revision and retroactively reads back to the start of their conversation is demonstrated through his admission that he laments privileging Sençeba: “[m]ucho me has fecho aborreçer la privança de Sençeba”. One could look at Dimna’s manipulation of the interpretation of the story about the louse as both a declaration of his true authorial control over the narrative and its meanings, as well as a test to check if the Lion is learning how to read *exempla* in the way Dimna prescribes. The king is accepting Dimna’s framing of *exempla*, and has therefore unwittingly become a member of Dimna’s interpretive community and submitted himself to Dimna’s narrative authority. As a result, he not only revises his perception of his relationship with Sençeba, but also asks for Dimna’s advice on what to do and follows that advice. The solution is Dimna’s objective: the Lion decides that he must cast the Ox out of the kingdom.

The act of turning Sençeba into an outside threat required more intricate steps than the creation of a fictional antagonist, as in the *exemplum* with the hare, but the parallel between these two cases is clear. Up to this point, both the hare and Dimna have scholars have studied the relationship between discourse and power, perhaps the most well known being Foucault who addresses the topic across various projects.
emotionally distressed their targets, created an outsider who threatens the target and the social hierarchy, and emphasized the ruler’s responsibility to return the realm to peace. While an instructional program is not described regarding the hare and the lion-king, in the way that one is presented through the way Dimna trains the Lion to interpret *exempla*, the hare does create an interpretive frame through which the lion-king is to read the image of his reflection at the bottom of the well. As stated before, the frame is not solely context, but also expectation, a schema. Likewise, Dimna has shifted the context of the relationship between the Lion and Šençeba, but he still needs to shape the Lion’s expectation to fully create a frame through which to read the Ox’s actions.

The expectation in both of these cases is built by telling the target what he is going to find. As discussed above regarding the hare and the lion-king, the lion-king directs an inter-diegetic retrospective reading that fulfills what he expects the *exemplum* to fulfill based on the hare’s appropriate framing of the information. Through manipulating the lion-king’s expectations the hare brings about a future event that will fulfill that expectation: the lion-king peering into the well with the hare under his arm. The image itself serves as proof for the hare’s story. The lion-king, reading the *exemplum* in the pool of water, then decides to attack on his own volition. Built into the proof is an independent *verification* of the claims, a situation also crafted by the deceiver but ostensibly unrelated. From the perspective of the lion-king, the hare is not interpreting the information he is acquiring when he looks into the well, and he is also not constructing
that image. The king is relying on his own senses, specifically that of sight, to verify a manifest truth: he sees a lion with a hare under his arm.

Dimna works to cause a similar conclusion between the Lion and Sençeba. Once the Lion has determined to send Sençeba away, Dimna knows that any conversation between the Lion and the Ox will unweave the net of lies he has been carefully crafting if he does not first get a chance to bind Sençeba in the net as well. He convinces the Lion to let him play the part of messenger to Sençeba, eliminating his need to covertly engage in conversation with the Ox and therefore removing the possibility of the Lion suspecting him of treachery. Dimna induces the Lion to follow his advice by suggesting that to do otherwise would potentially damage his image as a just ruler, something that already deeply concerns him. The Lion has few options. If he preemptively kills Sençeba he could be judged as treacherous, yet if he speaks candidly to Sençeba he could be fooled, “escarnido”, and face a different humiliation. He has no other option but to follow Dimna’s prescription. After entreating the Lion to enact justice, speaking again about the way a just king responds to crime, the Lion counters Dimna’s reasoning by declaring that he has no proof: “[e]t yo no só bien cierto del pecado de Sençeba, ni sé ende sinon lo que tú me dexiste” (154). Just as the lion-king had no proof except the emotional display and words of the hare, this Lion will need evidence as well. Dimna is fully prepared to supply the proof, telling the Lion that in only seeing Sençeba he will know his intentions: “[e]t yo tengo que, si tú lo ovieses visto, entenderías et sabrías qué grant cosa cuida cometer” (154). Taking advantage of the moment to craft the specific frame for how he desires the
Lion to read Sençeba, Dimna then describes the “señales” that Sençeba will show prior to attacking: “Et alguna[s] de las señales desto son éstas: que verás tenblar sus miembros et catando a diestro et a siniestro, et enderesçando sus cuernos así commo que cuida pujar” (154). The Lion accepts this as acceptable proof, stating, “[y]o tomaré tu consejo, et si yo viere en él lo que tú dizes, non dubdaré en ello”, letting Dimna know that the Lion will correctly read the frame/tale, if presented with the appropriate signs (154).

Dimna’s advice to the Lion about how to read Sençeba’s actions conforms to the pattern of Dimna’s instruction to the Lion about how to read exempla. Similar to how Dimna has previously guided the Lion’s interpretation of exempla by introducing them with sentential statements, so here has Dimna provided a “consejo” to the Lion about how to interpret Sençeba’s actions. As the story before acted as proof to the truth of the sententiae, so too will Sençeba’s actions, once performed, serve as proof for Dimna’s “consejo”. Dimna, like the hare, has constructed a formidable frame through which the Lion will read Sençeba. The expectation of a specific outcome (schema) becomes the preferred choice from the repertoire of schemata. Then, by constructing a context (frame) that is placed in relation to a particular situation (tale), the desired schema will be deemed potent, allowing both lions to drive an inter-diegetic colonization of their corresponding exemplum. The colonization process will subjugate the multivalent tale to the monovalent meaning of the schema, leading each lion to act according to his own volition, unwittingly performing the will of his manipulator. In this way, the appropriate construction of a frame is essential if one seeks to guide the hermeneutic practice of
another. The only task left for each protagonist (Dimna/the hare) is to create an appropriate *exemplum* to place within the frame in order to achieve his objective. The hare must conjure a lion holding a hare. Dimna must successfully mold Sençeba into enacting the “señales” that the Lion will then read through the hermeneutic practices of his interpretive community, that is, Dimna’s “consejo”.

The Lion sends Dimna to retrieve Sençeba, and Dimna takes advantage of the assignment to manipulate Sençeba into performing the “señales” that he told the Lion to look out for. Sençeba also must first be persuaded into doubting the Lion’s loyalty, and then requests independent verification of what Dimna tells him, as well: “[d]ígote que yo non mostraré al león enemistad nin me camiaré de commo estaba con él, nin en celado nin en paladinjas,fasta que vea de lo que me yo temo” (167). Dimna, concerned that his whole plan may fail if Sençeba merely goes and speaks to the Lion without being instructed to read the Lion’s actions, approves of Sençeba’s desire for visual, independent proof, telling him, “Vete, ca manifiestamente verás, quando entrares al león, la fortidumbre de lo que te yo dixe dél”, and then quickly adding, “[s]i tú vieras al león, quando a él entrares el lo vieres agachado contra ti, moviendo los pechos et catándote firme, et firiendo con la cola en tierra, et abriendo la boca, et bostezando, et

---

13 An elaborate analysis of the interaction between Dimna and Sençeba, while a worthy undertaking, would be superfulous at this point, as it would be more of the same. Furthermore, mush of its content will be discussed in the following chapter.
relamiéndose, et aguzando las orejas, sepas que te quiere matar, et apercíbete et non te engañe” (167). Sençeba accepts Dimna’s friendly words of advice, declaring, “[s]i yo viere con el león lo que tú dizes, non avré ý dubda” (167). Dimna has successfully provided a schema to each of the two friends and a supposedly unmanipulated frame/tale for each to interpret along the practices of the interpretive community that Dimna built. As the Lion and Sençeba go to meet one another, each prepared to read his friend as an *exemplum*, each one will independently subjugate the meaning of the other’s actions to the sentential wisdom that Dimna has provided. As I have shown through the length of this chapter, the *filósofo* does not only provide an *exemplum* about a false traitor who separates two friends; he also shows how process is carried out along each step of the way.

Dimna rushes to find Calila so that the two may observe the result of his machinations. As expected, Sençeba enters the scene to find the Lion acting as Dimna predicted, “[…] acachado contra él, et las orejas agudas, et la boca abierta, et firiendo con la cola en tierra” (168). He recognizes the “señales” and prepares to defend himself against the Lion’s attack, and in so doing gives the “señales” that Dimna had provided the Lion: “[e]t cátolo el león, et vio lo que le dixiera Digna, et non dubdó que se viniera sinon por lidiar con él” (168). It is a violent battle and both combatants are bloodied, but the

14 Note the similarity of this statement with that said by the Lion: “[y]o tomaré tu consejo, et si yo viere en él lo que tú dizes, non dubdaré en ello” (154).
Lion emerges as victor and kills Sençeba. Dimna has successfully imposed and animated a schema through crafting a frame/tale for the Lion. Because they share the same interpretive community, Dimna anticipates how the Lion will read Sençeba, who is made into an *exemplum*, in the same way that the hare created a frame through which the lion-king read his own image in the pool at the bottom of the well in the tale Dimna told Calila. Again, one meaning that a reader would understand from placing these two cases in relation to one another is that “las artes fazen por ventura algunas cosas que la fuerça non puede fazer”, and Dimna explicitly tells Calila to compare the two cases when he says “et por esto lo puedo yo engañar et aterrar sin falta, así commo fizo la liebre al león” (145). But a deeper, hidden meaning lays beneath the surface of this chapter, and that is a lesson about harnessing the rhetorical abilities of frame/tales.

For the reader of this chapter of *CeD*, the *exemplum* of “Las liebres y el león” does not only explain what will happen in the court of the Lion through Dimna’s use of *arte*, it also creates a new frame for “reading”, doubling the “exemplarity” of the remainder of the chapter. The case of Sençeba and the Lion is the “proof” or “example” of Dimna’s framing tale (Las liebres y el león). At the same time, Sençeba and the Lion both become reflecting *exempla* within frames constructed by Dimna. Dimna’s craftsmanship proves successful as both the Lion and Sençeba act on their own volition to the ruin of their friendship, which results in the death of Sençeba and the ascension of Dimna to a higher place of honor in the court of the Lion. This execution and exposé of the power of crafting frames should be taken all the more seriously with regards to how
to read the *Calila e Dimna*, as this is not just the central *exemplum* and purpose for the chapter (“Dame agora enxenplo de los dos que se aman et los departe el mesturero, falso, mentiroso”), but is also the *exemplum*-cycle for which the work receives its name (122). Similarly to the inter-diegetic narrative cycle of the “Religioso robado” which brings multiple *exempla* together for comparative scrutiny near the beginning of the chapter, the story of “Las liebres y el león” further complicates the comparison of *exempla* through serving as both an analogous example for the *arte* Dimna plans to use on the Lion and Sençeba, as well as creating the frame, both context and expectation, through which we are to read the remainder of the chapter.

Dimna uses Sençeba as his own structural piece for a lived-out frame/tale. What Dimna makes Sençeba do is as important as selecting the correct *exemplum* for a frame, as frames and *exempla* must be well paired to serve a specific end, just as the frame through which the Lion will read Sençeba’s actions must be well crafted in order to predispose the Lion along an intended path of interpretation. Returning to the initial frame of the chapter, the adviser has successfully instructed the King on how a false traitor and liar can destroy the love between two friends. One can exploit the rhetoric of frame/tales in more transparent ways, as demonstrated by the use of *exempla* up until the inter-diegetic narrative cycle, but in order to deceive, one must work to build an interpretive community, craft a frame, and make manifest the appropriate *exemplum* so that the target, properly equipped with the correct interpretive strategies, will read along a desired hermeneutic by selecting and animating the desired schema. The *arte* of properly
crafting a frame/tale, within a shared interpretive community, will guide the target to carry out the action of the manipulator, while believing that he acts out of his own free will.
Chapter 3: Literary Conquest and Colonization in Medieval Castile:

Calila e Dimna

The current chapter changes objectives from defending the argument that chapter three of Calila e Dimna has a “seso encubierto”, specifically one that instructs how frame/tales can be used to manipulate other people, to applying the process of inter-diegetic colonization to the political content of chapters three and four, and then outward to the peritexts and epitexts of the Calila e Dimna. The first, and main section of this chapter will look at the political content of Chapter Three and Chapter Four in order to show how “continuation” is able to influence and recast the meaning of previous material, focusing on how the inserted Chapter Four, “De la pesquisa de Dimna”, is able to colonize the characters and meaning of Chapter Three, “Del león y del buey”.¹ Although the preservation of the history of translation of CeD within the text offers a counter-example to Genette’s claim that “continuators of yore were not concerned with displaying their devices or acknowledging their debt”, Genette makes a useful assertion

¹ Genette discusses the idea of “continuation” in Palimpsests, as a type of “imitation” and “pastiche” (161-71). Genette defines continuation as “a more restricted imitation than the autonomous apocryphal text; […] it is an imitation with a partially restricted prescribed subject” (163).
that “they [continuators of yore] destroyed the projects that had more or less directly
inspired them” (*Palimpsests* 163). For this chapter of the dissertation, it is important to
remember that the inserted Chapter Four was read as part of the authentic or complete
text, and that only modern scholarship has recognized its historical relationship to the
work as an inserted section. At the same time, the act of “continuation” in this case is also
misleading, as it has led scholars to not treat the chapters as separate entities, but as a
whole, when the manuscript and textual evidence clearly show them to be separate
“chapters”.

The colonization of Chapter Three affects the chapter’s meaning concerning one
of the central aspects to the literary manifestation of *adab*: the training of rulers and
courtiers. One goal of such training is for courtiers to learn how to interpret and react to
diverse problems and propositions, particularly across rank from lord to vassal and vassal
to lord. This ability, however, rests on a foundation of comprehending the obligations
expected of each party involved. In short, being able to understand and successfully apply
the lessons from wisdom books within the *adab* tradition depends in large part on
knowing the obligations that the members of the court owe to one another, specifically
with regards to both etiquette and law. Modern scholars of thirteenth-century Iberia have
thus been turning more to wisdom literature, especially works translated into Castilian
and coming from the *abad* tradition, in order to study the political philosophy of the
period in which these works first appeared in the vernacular (Bizzarri *Castigos*; Haro
Cortés *Los compendios, La imagen*; Palafox *Los Castigos*). The more narrative-based of
these works tend to focus on interpreting complex philosophical problems through the comparison of *exempla* and often inform readers about the obligations of courtiers and kings through implicit means, which may be why scholars frequently do not include them in their studies. The *Sendebar* and *CeD* are both works that rarely make the cut in studies concentrated on political philosophy and wisdom literature of the thirteenth century, although critics have long recognized their political content (Lacarra *La cuentística* 33-46; Parker 12-15). In contrast, works such as *Bocados de oro*, *Poridad de poridades*, *Libro de los doce sabios*, and *Libro de cien capítulos* have, understandably, been the center of such studies since many of the maxims, proverbs, and *sententia* they contain explicitly articulate courtly obligations and expectations.

As Hugo O. Bizarri and María Haro Cortéz have demonstrated through their work on political wisdom literature collections in thirteenth-century Iberia, the sentential sayings ideologically express a desired political reality, as opposed to describing an actual one (Bizarri “Proverbia”; Haro Cortés *Los compendios* 270-75; *La imagen* 51-56). Within texts that implement more balanced uses of implicit and explicit means of communicating such ideologies, without one necessarily conveying a *realidad histórica* over another, explicit practices appear to control and contain interpretation as they attempt to subjugate one’s perspective of a topic to a truth expressed within the saw, whereas the implied reality expressed through character interactions, while no less ideological than the former, is didactically messy due to the nature of implied discourse. The contrast between the two techniques creates a space of tension or competition
between a universal truth expressed explicitly by the saying, and the description of an
immediate situation that may or may not agree with the universal ideology expressed by
the saw. The criticism or exaltation of a described interaction is thus determined by its
relationship with the expressed universal truth communicated through the sayings, where
praise is given when characters act in agreement with the maxim, and critique occurs
when characters’ interactions are in disaccord with the saw. Leaving aside the praise or
criticism, explicit didactic speech acts within a political context in the form of maxims,
*sententia*, proverbs, and, most importantly here, *razones* contain a judgment regarding the
way reality *should be* or *should not be*, independent of whether or not the contemporary
reality confirms that ideal or (unfortunate) truth. Through comparing the representations
of the court that both these practices display in Chapter Three and Chapter Four, I argue
that the two chapters have distinct depictions of of courtly life, and that they advocate for
contrary ideals regarding the relationships between kings and their vassals. I conclude the
main section by arguing that the colonization of Chapter Three, made possible by its
continuation in Chapter Four, is also a colonization of ideology where the less centralized
authority and more equal power-dynamic between king and vassal that exists in the
former is subjugated and forced to conform to the more centralized and omnipresent
authority of the monarchy found in the latter.

The second section turns to look at the peritextual items of the various inserted
prologues in order to discuss the tradition of literary conquest recorded into the work
itself, as well as to show that the work’s history has long made the work an example of
campaigns of cultural conquest. The colonizing effect of continuation, as shown in the first section, demonstrates that a parallel process to that of inter-diegetic colonization in frame/tales also occurs in continuation, in that “successful” situations of continuation are those that allow readers to drive a colonizing process of meaning-making. The colonization involved in continuation, like that for frame/tales, also requires the subjugation of alternative schemata and the generation of authority for the emerging monovalent meaning, or plan. The colonization process in continuation, as will be seen, is not separate from the propagation of ideological material, but rather one of the ways through which ideological discourses can be normalized for consumption. The various schemata that become animated for meaning-making that determine a continuation to be “successful” is therefore the pathway through which ideological material from the colonizing text can overwrite that of the colonized text. The degree of continuation found in CeD is as complex as the practices of framing found within, and similarly to the plan that emerges from frame/tale inter-diegetic colonization, which seeks to replicate itself with the ultimate goal of being applied to the recipient’s life, the exploitation of continuation can serve to normalize an ideology (or ideological material) in the recipient’s understanding of society.

The second section, and chapter, concludes by looking at the inserted epilogue by the scriptorium of Alfonso X and how the king, or the king’s men, is using this work to colonize Castilian history for the purpose of rebranding the monarchy. The Calila e Dimna, read through the didactic frame/tale genre that it explains and the frame/tale
structure that makes up its composition, can be seen as an exemplum in the socio-political frame within which it was ordered to be made. Through the ability of exempla to insert new schemata into the repertoire of its audience, I argue that the medieval reader of the work in Castile of the 1250s would find the new schema to be potential, and would direct a successful inter-diegetic colonization of the history of the kingdom, the monarch, and the Reconquista. Simultaneously, the peritexts of the work, and specifically the postscript/colophon added by Alfonso’s scriptorium, participate in the continuation of the story of the text’s transfer from burgeoning civilization to burgeoning civilization. The schemata that have been animated by the reader in the frame/tale of the work as exemplum and through the acceptance of a “successful” continuation of the history of the text, together build a pathway through which the ideology of the work is normalized in the reader’s understanding of his world and society.

*Dimna’s Trial, or, Continuation and Colonization*

Although there is no extant copy of Ibn al-Muqaffa’’s Arabic rendition of the *Kalila wa Dimna*, scholars have determined which sections of the *CeD* al-Muqaffa’ interpolated through comparative studies of the numerous versions of the work. Some items are more difficult to attribute to al-Muqaffa’, such as whether or not he expanded specific dialogues, while other parts are easily identifiable as his, such as the insertion of his introduction and chapter four (Blecua and Lacarra 9-19; Lacarra *Cuentistica* 12-15; Parker 9-15). Other likely alterations by ibn al-Muqaffa’ include the reworking of the beginning and end of Chapter Three, “Del Leon et del Buey”, the elision of an
introductory frame to Chapter Three about a king and the education of his three sons, the transformation of the framing characters from three princes and their master to a king and his advisor/filósofo, and the addition of an undetermined number of stories after Chapter Nine, “Del Gato y del Mur”, which corresponds to part of the fifth book of the *Panchatantra*. Regardless of the extent to which al-Muqaffa’ altered his Pahlevi exemplar, or of any other changes in the work that are preserved in the Castilian renditions, this chapter, and this dissertation, is interested in the reception of the work in Castile in 1251.²

² Many scholars have attempted to explain what motivated al-Muqaffa’ to alter his exemplar during the act of translation, a topic that falls well outside of the scope of this dissertation. Instead of attempting to enter into that polemic, I am approaching the work from the perspective of reception, opposed to trying to reconstruct or uncover a lost original text. While I may use such language as “al-Muqaffa’’s intention” or “motivation” during the review of criticism, this is to remain more faithful to the opinions of the critics of whom I am citing or reviewing, and should not be misunderstood as being my views on the matter. During my analysis of the work, I will refrain from speculating about al-Muqaffa’, his version, or his exemplar, though I may discuss the effects of certain items being present in the Castilian version, or of differences in style or ideology in different parts of the work.
Current criticism agrees that al-Muqaffa’s motivations for altering and expanding the stories related to the Ox and the Lion are founded in a desire to eliminate the moral ambiguity of the conclusion to the *exemplum* of the Lion and the Ox.\(^3\) What is of interest to the current study, however, is not why al-Muqaffa made the changes he did, but rather what resulted from those changes as they manifest in the Castilian renditions, and specifically what these insertions do to meaning and what they do to the processes of meaning-making that readers experience upon engagement with the material.

Two peculiarities in the work direct me, as they have directed critics before me, to take a special interest in the two chapters concerning the jackals, Calila and Dimna. The first, as mentioned by Blecua and Lacarra, is that in the entire collection, only these two chapters have specific characters within the intercalated stories that reappear in a different chapter; the framed story of Chapter Four is a continuation of that of Chapter Three, and in no other part of the work does a character reemerge or have his story continued (179).\(^4\) The second peculiarity is that not only is Chapter Three the longest and

---

\(^3\) See Blecua and Lacarra pg 179

\(^4\) The novelty of this being the only case of “specific characters within the intercalated stories that reappear in a different chapter” must be clarified, as it is the only case within what is considered the main text of the work, that is within the greater frame/tale of the dialogues between a king of India, Diçelem, and a *filósofo*, Burduben. As will be explored later, Chapters One and Two also have the same protagonist, Berzebuey, who is
most diegetically complex, but, furthermore, apart from Chapter Six, “De los cuervos et de los búos”, the intricacy of the embedded exempla throughout the rest of the text becomes less convoluted. One result of the abundance of diegetic levels expressed through unsynchronized interpolated exempla is the difficulty it imposes on the receiver of the work to maintain a coherent and exact tally of comparative elements. As discussed above, the intra-diegetic narrative cycle of “El religioso robado” is a rhetorical slight-of-hand that functions, in part, through distracting the receiver away from the main frame/tale, which is claimed to be the driving example the king requests to receive. Leaving aside authorial intention, the effect caused by both of these peculiarities occurring within these two chapters is that readers become compelled to return to them and question them anew, as I believe the history of scholarship surrounding the text supports.

the physical-philosopher who goes to India in search of medicinal “leaves” that “revive the dead” that turn out to be the pages of the Panchatantra, which he translates into Pahlavi and brings to the Emperor of Persia, Khosrau I (501–79 AD).

5 I do not mean to diminish the importance of the cycle of stories about the “Crows and the Owls”, but in order to maintain a certain scope for this project such discussion and analysis must be excluded. It should be noted, nonetheless, that Chapter Four is neither as long nor as diegetically complicated as is Chapter Three.
The division of Chapters Three and Four is a slightly complicated matter because in the extant manuscripts of the *CeD* some contain chapter divisions by numbers and others by title, and they do not always match up perfectly. Nevertheless, one of the best indicators of chapter divisions in frame/tale works is the repetition of a specific framing mechanism that can occur at the beginning of a new chapter or as an opening and closing of each chapter. In the *CeD*, the clearest divider of chapters is at the start of each when the king either requests to hear an *exemplum* about a specific topic, or when the king states he has now heard the preceding story and he requests another on a different theme. Due to these framing mechanisms, whether a specific chapter break is numbered explicitly or not, or whether or not the title conflates chapters, as MS B does with Chapters Three and Four, a reader of any manuscript would recognize the divisions inherent in the structure of the text itself. Because of this, I argue that Chapter Three has a recognizable conclusion through the exercised framing mechanisms of the text, and the argument of the chapter ends with the narrator stating, “[E]t quando esto oyó el león, creólo et aprívólo et púsolo en mayor dignidat” (178). Scholars have asserted that al-Muqaffà’ inserted at the start of Chapter Three a diatribe against one who joins and then

6 An example of the second type, where the framing mechanism opens and closes each chapter can be seen in the *CL* where the Count opens each chapter by telling Patronio about a problem he is having, and each chapter concludes with the *viessos* added by Don Juan Manuel himself.
splits friends, calling him “el mesturero, falso, mentiroso”, as an ethical condemnation of someone who uses such trickery to advance one’s self at court, and they maintain that as additional assurance that one would not read the chapter as potentially too ethically ambivalent, he created an entirely new chapter (Four) with a second diatribe against Dimna in its framing mechanism (Blecua and Lacarra 179; Lacarra \textit{Cuentística} 14-15; Parker 32).

Regardless of al-Muqaffa’s intention as an author, since it is only scholars’ best guess as to the motives behind his inclusion of another chapter, what can be more objectively analyzed is the effect that the addition of Chapter Four has upon the text itself. Chapter Three on its own is ethically dubious in a similar way as to the \textit{Libro de buen amor} (=\textit{LBA}) in that the ethical condemnations of the actions performed by the works’ protagonists do not adequately defend against the assertion that both works can be read as guidebooks for doing the very unethical activities they purport to argue against.\textsuperscript{7} Dimna’s actions are criticized on a moral and spiritual level at various moments throughout the chapter, but the conclusion of the chapter is still one that rewards Dimna within the court of the Lion: “[E]t quando esto oyó el león, creólo et aprívólo et púsolo en mayor dignidat” (178). Chapter Three, despite its moralizing, still instructs the ambitious

\textsuperscript{7} Parker comments on the similarity of \textit{CeD} and \textit{LBA}, stating: “Like a later and also very popular work, \textit{El libro de buen amor}, \textit{Calila e Digna} [sic] portrays an integration, a harmony in the opposites of human beings” (96).
courtier in the art of manipulation. An interesting question to pursue elsewhere would be to ask why al-Muqaffa’ chose to take such extreme liberties in altering his Persian exemplar as to add entire chapters, his own introduction with exempla, ethical commentary at the start of Chapter Three, and possibly more items that have yet to be assigned to his hand, while still permitting Chapter Three to conclude as it does and leave the punishment of Dimna to a separate section. If my hypothesis is correct, that the CeD is a text that exhibits the multiple directions of influence between connected narratives and how the relationships between frame and exemplum can be subjugated in different ways in order to augment the authority of a selected argument, perhaps al-Muqaffa’ intentionally left the conclusion of Chapter Three with Dimna garnering the Lion’s favor in order to be able to build on the text’s didactic goal. Independent of whether he intended it or not, the exemplar used to turn the work into a Castillian product and, thus, all the extant Castillian manuscripts, maintain this ending and have Dimna in an improved position in the court. Chapter Four alters this conclusion by supplementing the story with additional information.

One effect that the inclusion of Chapter Four has on the work is that it links Chapters Three and Four in a unique way compared to how the other chapters of the collection may (or may not) relate to one another. The continuation of the story about Calila, Dimna, and the Lion textually interweaves these two chapters and obligates one upon reading Chapter Four to re-evaluate the information from Chapter Three. This point may appear self-evident, but when approached from a structural level of the work what
emerges is a text that, once again, is requiring its readers to place two of its parts, this time two chapters, in relation to each other with the goal of requiring the reader to find a schema that finds the relationship of the two chapters potent. Scholars have shown that certain chapters have similarities that beg comparison, such as Chapters Three and Four which both share the spaces of courts and the tool of deception is used to accomplish one’s goals (Parker 41, 73-74). Chapters Three and Four, however, do not need supplemental information and analysis for one seeking to connect, as the very text makes such arguments superfluous. At the same time, I argue that these two chapters, like any other chapter in the collection, can and should also be read as individual chapters that are able to stand on their own for their own purpose.\(^8\) The effectiveness that the inclusion of Chapter Four has had on altering the reading of Chapter Three is superficially evidenced by the lack of scholarly attention paid to Chapter Three or Chapter Four that treats either chapter as its own complete narrative unit, in the way that the rest of the chapters of the collection have primarily been treated.

\(^8\) This is not the only case in medieval Castilian framed-tale collections where works to greater and lesser degrees obligate readers to partake in a practice of analyzing two parts in tandem. An example that underscores the current case is found in the CL, where Chapter 33 directs the reader back to Chapter 3, complicating the reading for both chapters as they become inextricably entangled.
If we separate the two chapters from each other, the conclusion of Chapter Three remains ethically questionable with only the moral condemnation at the start of the chapter to guide readers to view Dimna’s actions as wrong. But spiritually damning actions are not always to be avoided, and sometimes can be the preferred choice, as evidenced through *exempla* within the *CL* concerning waging war against fellow Christians, such as in *exempla* 3 and 33. It is only through reconsidering the conclusion of Chapter Three through the reading of Chapter Four that a non-ethical or spiritual argument is made against the actions of Dimna. In other words, actions that at first benefited Dimna through improving his social position only result in being the cause of his death after one reads Chapter Four and applies its resolution back onto Chapter Three. Unlike the conclusions of other chapters in the work that could potentially be used as counter arguments to the deceitful path towards a better life that Dimna takes, such as Chapter Five which is the chapter about true friends, “cómo comienza su amistad entre ellos et cómo se ayudan et se aprovechan unos de otros”, Chapter Four is constructed to colonize the interpretation of Chapter Three. Furthermore, by altering how one reads

9 Dr. Burgoyne in the third chapter of his book demonstrates Patronio’s support of engaging in war against Christians through his reading of *exempla* 3 and 33 of the *CL*. Other authors that engage in this conversation are Ian Macpherson in his article “Dios y el mundo”, Brian Tate in his article “The Infante Don Juan de Aragón”, and Aníbal Biglieri in his *Hacia una poética del relato didáctico*.  
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Chapter Three, Chapter Four subjugates the ideology of Chapter Three to its own. In order to achieve this, Chapter Four appropriates the characters of Chapter Three and the events of its history to create the background to its own narrative while altering the focus of that history away from its initial protagonist, Dimna, to a new protagonist, the Lion.

Chapter Four, taken on its own, is more interested in the law and royal authority and less interested in the relationships among courtiers than Chapter Three. One way that the story shifts from focusing on courtiers (Chapter Three) to focusing on the king (Chapter Four) is in the locations where characters carry out conversation. Almost all of the conversations and events of Chapter Four happen either in the Lion’s presence or in the presence of a specter of his authority. In contrast, the private conversations of Chapter Three feel secluded and free from *personae non grata*. Almost the whole of Chapter Three, in addition, takes place in private conversations between the characters, whereas the second half of Chapter Four occurs in a public tribunal under the supervision of the Lion. In Chapter Three for example, Dimna listens to the Lion reveal his fears about the ox, he speaks with Calila about his plans to seed distrust between the two friends, and he counsels Sençeba about how to act before the king, all conversations that must be carried out in private, without the text specifying that secured locations were always sought out. In contrast, in Chapter Four privacy is continually invaded in order to advance royal interests. In the plot of the storyline, the two witnesses that the Lion finds to testify against Dimna are both born out of situations of eavesdropping on supposedly private conversations. Chapter Four also addresses the topics of privacy, secrecy, and confidence
in conversations, as between the Lioness and the Lion who debate privacy rights and the extent to which the crown can demand disclosure of private information. The characters of Chapter Three enjoy a level of protection of privacy that is not afforded in Chapter Four, as even seemingly clandestine conversations, and their supposedly private spaces, get turned into publicized information for the king to scrutinize at Dimna’s public hearing and sentencing. If one were to call the Lion from Chapter Three a *primus inter pares*, in that the court has a sense of negotiated authority and the king recognizes the autonomy of his subjects, the Lion of Chapter Four has an unquestionable authority that subjugates the will of his subjects to his own based on the innate superiority of his birthright.

Another way Chapter Four becomes more interested in the character of the King, as opposed to that of the courtiers is in the choice each narrator makes regarding who to follow. While the narrator(s) of both chapters are omnipresent, the narrator of Chapter Three follows the life of Dimna and his interactions with other characters, while the one of Chapter Four is primarily concerned with the Lion and the varying representations of his royal authority. There are two moments in Chapter Three after the introduction of Calila and Dimna where the narrator appears to abandon his focus on Dimna. The first occurs near the beginning of the chapter when Dimna leaves the Lion to go speak to Sençeba and the narrator relates the thoughts and psychology of the Lion for a short time, which then gets interrupted by Dimna’s return. The second occurs close to the end of the chapter when the narrator focuses on the thoughts of the Lion and Sençeba as they enter into battle; however, immediately after the death of Sençeba the narrator states,
“[Q]uando esto vio Calila, dixo a Dimna […]”, revealing that the fight was actually to some degree public, and that Dimna was watching it. In contrast, the narrator of Chapter Four relates conversations between Calila and Dimna, Dimna and the court, the león pardo and the Lioness, and the Lioness and her son, the Lion, on multiple occasions. Whereas all of Chapter Three occurs in spaces in which the authority of the space is primarily negotiated by those participating in a given conversation, with the possible exception being that of the battle between the Lion and the Ox, all of Chapter Four occurs, in one way or another, in spaces either directly under the asserted domain of the Lion, or in spaces penetrated by agents of the Lion who listen in on the conversations, unbeknownst to the speakers. The león pardo eavesdrops on a conversation at Calila’s house between the two jackals. The león pardo then relates the information to the Lioness, after she has promised not to tell anyone. The next morning, nonetheless, she goes to counsel her son. After this conversation, Dimna is called to the court, accused of his crimes, and placed in jail. All remaining conversations then take place in a private space of the king’s, under the Lion’s direction during the tribunal, or in the jail, where the wolf becomes the second witness by becoming an informant against Dimna. Dimna knows not of his presence during his conversations with Calila, who is eventually convicted once the two witnesses of the ostensibly private conversations step forward.

The shift in narratorial focus that occurs between Chapters Three and Four contributes to the ultimate subjugation of Chapter Three’s meaning to the authority of Chapter Four, and in consequence, the ethical condemnation of Dimna’s actions becomes
subjugated in order to reinforce the ideology of the political philosophy espoused in Chapter Four. One change that occurs as a result of the shift in narratorial focus from Dimna to the Lion is the flattening of Dimna’s character. Despite the remarks of the king during the framing mechanism of Chapter Three, Dimna is humanized in many ways and Calila, though disagreeing with Dimna’s ambition, twice validates Dimna’s frustration with the way the Lion rules. When the two jackals are introduced, they both are praised as being very intelligent (“muy ardidos et agudos”), but Dimna is recognized as having the more noble heart, as being from the greater estate, and as being the one who felt least appreciated (“de más noble coraçón, et de mayor fazienda, et el que menos se tenia por pagado del estado en que era” 125). Calila attempts to dissuade Dimna from pursuing his goals by relating the already discussed intra-diegetic narrative cycle of “El religioso robado”, but the base of the exemplum belies that Calila recognizes that Dimna labored to do something good and, like the religious man, was robbed of the dignity originally given to him by the king. One reason Calila tells the cycle about the cleric is to advocate an ascetic existence, but the initial connection between Dimna and the holy man is that someone else is wrongfully enjoying their royal privileges. After more discussion with Dimna, Calila ultimately concedes that under certain circumstances, his actions could be acceptable: “[s]i tú pudieras matar a Sençeba sin daño del león, fazlo, ca la su privança nos ha hecho mal a nos et a los otros vasallos. Et si non pudieras matar sinon quebrantando la fe del león, non lo fagas, ca seria traiçión de nos et de ti, et deslealtad et maldad” (147). Despite the claim that Calila is the prudent or good foil to the wicked Dimna, the Calila of Chapter Three is better understood as fearful of ira regia than a
character with strong moral beliefs. As can be seen within his consent to Dimna’s plan to kill Sençebe, Calila acknowledges that Lion has ruled poorly and seeded discontent among the nobles (“ca la su privança nos ha hecho mal a nos et a los otros vasallos” 147).

Without dismissing the value that humility has in Christian culture, and thus the potential desire by some to prefer Calila’s acceptance of his social position compared to Dimna’s “ambition”, various conversations in this chapter suggest that the distinction between the two jackals actually has little to do with humility or ambition, but rather ascetic non-action versus noble activity. Dimna’s initial problem is not one of vice, but rather that Dimna does not occupy the status appropriate to a vassal of his worth or lineage. Some of Dimna’s reasons for wanting to present himself to the king are the following: nobles should seek to overcome obstacles (“[…] pujar a la nobleza es muy noble cosa” 127); to improve his lineage and estates (“para mejorar la mi fazienda et la tua” 128); difficult tasks should not impede the valiant (“[e]l omne valiente so la grant carga, maguer que le apesgue, levántase, et la grant carga non alça al omne valiente ni al

10 I am using the literal, now possibly arcane, sense of the word “ambition”, a pejorative word with connection to pride and vainglory, and not the more popular meaning of post-industrial United States which has stripped the word of its original meaning of “an inordinate or overreaching desire for wealth, power, or social status” and replaced it with “an earnest desire for self-improvement” (Oxford Online Dictionary, Online Etymology Dictionary). It is my understanding that I am following the use by other scholars.
pesado” 128). The Lion affirms the wise statements that Dimna says, and is pleased with his wisdom and hopes to make use of him, demonstrating that Dimna’s desire to be in his rightful social position is not ambition, but the noble drive to overcome challenges ("[e]t pues que ovo acabado Dina [sic], pagóse más el león dél, et plógole más con él, et respondióle siempre mejor” 133). Demonstrating his approval of Dimna, the Lion states that the true worth of men makes itself known and praises Dimna by reminding all the nobles that nobility is found in the heart, and not only in the lineage, of a man: “[e]l omne sabio et de noble coraçón et bueno et agudo, maguer sea de menor guise et de baxa dignidat, la nobleza de su coraçón non quiere fuera paresçer et mostrarse, así commo la çentella del fuego que omne asconde et ella non quiere sinon açenderse” (131). The Lion also participates in discussing the role of the king in doling out privileges, again putting emphasis on deeds over descent: “[e]l rey non apriva a los omnes por la privança de sus padres, nin los despreçia por non conoçer a sus padres” (133). The political and social content of these discussions, which may have been added by al-Muqaffa’, establish that Dimna’s pursuit of access to the court are actually in line with the values of the court and society for someone of that life path. Calila’s preference for non-action may indicate that he has a different vocation than Dimna, who expresses a socially acceptable attitude for a courtier.  

11 Gómez Redondo argues that the “seso encubierto” of the collection is that it educates two vocations simultaneously, that of the philosopher-scholar and that of the noble-
One of the recurring topics of these discussions is that of the obligations a king has to his subjects, and specifically the responsibility of the Lion to appropriately reward his subjects. As already cited above, Calila condones Dimna’s actions provided they do not make the Lion lose his faith (possibly a reference to his religious calling), and he confirms that the Lion has abused the nobles through his privileging of Sençeba. Similarly, at the heart of Dimna’s arguments against Sençeba rests the truth about the Lion’s failure to dole out privileges appropriately among his vassals (although Dimna often transfers his discontent onto other nobles when he interacts with the Lion). Even the Lion confesses to Dimna, after Dimna’s manipulation, that he laments the honors he gave Sençeba, stating, “[m]ucho me has fecho aborrêcer la privança de Sençeba” (153). This Dimna of Chapter Three has true reasons to be upset with the Lion and to be discontented with his social status in the kingdom, despite his decision to unethically use manipulation and arte to achieve his goals.

The Dimna in Chapter Three is psychologically complex. His character is dynamic and changes. One of the common threads of his personality, nonetheless, is his desire to gain his appropriate position in the court. If we accept that this desire motivates Dimna’s actions, then hypothetically, had the Lion been a good king and appropriately given out privileges, one could argue that Dimna would not have carried out his plan to courtier (183-213).
have the Lion kill Sençeba. The complexity of the interactions between the characters, and also of the characters themselves, functions to humanize Dimna and open a space for empathy with his plight. Before Dimna revels his plan to use arte to destroy the friendship between the Lion and the Ox, there is no indication that he is in any way a “falso mesturero” or “mentiroso”, and with his character it would be easy to empathize. Furthermore, when we consider that his complaint is actually well founded, the schema proposed in the frame of the chapter (that the exemplum is about a wicked man) could result as impotent for some readers and the frame/tale could fail to provide a monovalent meaning as the content and the frame could be perceived as excessively disparate. The reception history of the work, however, indicates that scholars have found the current text potent, and Dimna is unequivocally described as the villain. I believe this occurs because scholars retroactively impose their reading of Chapter Four onto their understanding of Chapter Three, and the complexities of Dimna’s personality found in Chapter Three become flattened and subjugated to the portrayal of Dimna in Chapter Four: Chapter Four colonizes Chapter Three.

____________________

12 Parker does not defend Dimna in any way, but she does point out that had the Lion corrected his errors sooner, he might have removed the motivation for Dimna’s plan (29).
In Chapter Four, Dimna’s character is mostly flat, unchanging, and without any positive attributes aside from his astuteness and rhetorical expertise. At the start of the chapter he acknowledges his wrongdoings and, in place arguing his previous case that the Lion failed to correctly reward and value him, he laments that his envy and avarice “forced him” to act as he did: “la cobdiçia et la enbidia me forçaron en ello” (180). Calila begs him to confess and argues that it is better to face justice in this world than lasting suffering in the next. Dimna, in turn, recognizes the correctness of his friend’s reasoning but demonstrates his obstinacy by replying, “bien me as aconsejado et dizes verdat; enpero veré a qué tornará la mi çima de mi fazienda et qué mandarán de mi fazer” (190). Whereas in Chapter Three there are ways in which the reader can comprehend Dimna’s motives and empathize with his undeserved, inferior status, in Chapter Four his character is unchanging and he aptly fits the description of a “falso mesturero” and “mentiroso”. His cunning, devious speeches and Calila’s pleas for him to confess only confirm in the lector’s mind that Dimna is dangerously deceitful and undeserving of pity.

Throughout the entire chapter, Dimna exercises one of the dirtiest, or subtlest, of tricks, which is to lie by telling the truth. He accomplishes this primarily by agreeing with the philosophical arguments of his accusers, while maintaining that he always counseled

13 Even the attributes of astuteness and having rhetorical expertise are not necessarily portrayed as positive in Chapter Four; I list them because they could be potentially useful examples for a reader wanting to learn these qualities.
the king wisely. He defends himself by arguing that his accusers are the ones who are misleading the king, and that they are driven by their jealousy of Dimna’s recent ascension in the court. One example of Dimna’s skill, which also reinforces his villainy for the reader, is his dispute with the cook. Arguably a scene of comic relief, the cook attempts to prove through physiognomy that Dimna’s features indicate that he is inwardly evil, calling him “mesturero et falso et traedor” (193). Dimna responds boldly: first, he disputes the pseudoscience of physiognomy; second, he tells a funny exemplum, “El labrador y sus dos mujeres”; and third, he applies the exemplum to his situation by pointing out the cook’s negative aspects. In the exemplum, a worker and his two wives are taken captive by invaders who abuse them in many ways, one of which is forcing the women to go about nude. One of the wives finds a scrap of cloth with which to partially cover herself. The other wife points out to their husband how ridiculous the semi-clothed wife looks in the rag, thinking he will find it amusing. The husband, however, is quick to

14 There is not the space in the scope of this project to compare how Dimna uses sententia differently in the two chapter, but it is worth noting that in Chapter Three Dimna uses sententia and stacked exempla as rhetorical tactics to guide interpretation and limit the possible meanings available for the receiver, while in Chapter Four he exploits the ambiguity and rhetorical slippage in such utterances in order to unhinge specific arguments against him by leading the conversation into a space of relativism where it becomes his word against another’s.
criticize the still naked wife, pointing out that she fails to cover her own “shame” while
laughing at the one who did the best she could to keep her modesty: “[a]strosa, non pares
mientes en ti que estás descubierta et riebas a la otra que cubrió su vergüenza con lo que
pudo aver” (195). Dimna applies the *exemplum*, recommending that the cook consider his
own position, cover himself and shut up: “[e]t tú deves parar mientes en cobrir a ti et
callar” (195). By echoing the husband in the tale, Dimna connects the cook with the wife
who doesn’t attempt to cover her “vergüenza” while criticizing another, and associates
himself with the husband who is fully clothed (his “vergüenza” is not out in public) and
therefore capable of truly chastising another. Dimna then divulges the numerous illnesses
and parasites that afflict the cook and reveals that everyone in the court, except the king,
has been aware of his disgusting state and all have chosen to keep quiet. The trial is
recorded, and when the transcript reaches the king, he fires the cook.

This scene is a marvelous display of Dimna’s duplicitous speaking abilities, as he
punishes his adversary, threatens the court, and manipulates the crown simultaneously,
and all through the application and expansion of an *exemplum*. The case of the cook and
his punishment brings the *exemplum* of the “El labrador y sus dos mujeres” to life, as
Dimna makes the connections between the two explicit in his threat to the cook by
reiterating “parar mientes”, “cobrir”, and “callar”, key concepts of the moral of the
*exemplum*. This threat, however, is more than playful language; it is the concise inception
of a new schema into the court. The moral of the exemplum (“tú deves parar mientes en
cobrir a ti et callar”) is found potent and allows Dimna, the cook, the court, and the Lion,
to activate an inter-diegetic colonization which animates the schema to become a plan. This plan now replicates itself outward, making the cook the first space of colonization. The new frame/tale of the cook is intended for everyone at court to see and take as a warning. Dimna ensures that the court analyze this new frame/tale by including the rest of the court, including himself, in the maintenance of the secret about the cook’s disgusting health; he says: “[e]t non vi yo solo las tachas, mas quantos aquí son de la mesnada del rey lo saben” (195). Dimna then exposes his own “vergüenza” by confessing his reason for not reporting what he knew about the cook to the Lion at an earlier time: “[e]t yo encobrílo fasta oy, et non lo dexé de mostrar sinon porque dezía en mi coraçón: –A mí non nuze la honra qu’ el rey faze a otri, nin me faze pro afrontarlo, mas dévelo encobrir” (195). The act of his confession, however, is also the covering of his “vergüenza”, showing that he has taken his own advice. Anyone in the court who does not follow his example by exposing his wrongdoings, would then effectively be paired with the cook and the naked wife. By joining himself to the court he reminds everyone present that there are secrets that each wants to be kept from the Lion, just as the two wives should each want to cover her “vergüença”. The punishment of the cook, then, compounds with the tale, creating both a warning to the members of the court to mind their own “vergüença”, and a threat to anyone who may wish to pursue the trial against Dimna by showing what will happen to someone who doesn’t “parar mientes et cobrir […] et callar”.
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In addition, due to the fact that the entire situation is transcribed and given to the Lion, who fires the cook based on the transcriptions, the entire situation becomes evidence in Dimna’s defense. Through the transcriptions, the court’s “vergüença” is put on display for the king, since they all kept the truth of the cook’s inflicted body a secret from the king. This interaction may be the reason why the “pesquisa de Dimna” ultimately fails as a legal proceeding and it becomes impossible to implicate him through the process of the trial over seven days. Assuming members of the court took the threat seriously, the failure of the court to descubrir Dimna’s guilt, or “vergüença”, would lead the Lion to suspect that they all were trying to find their own “trapo viejo” in order to “cobr[ir] con él su vergüença”. If Dimna is guilty, as the Lion believes, then the failure of the nobles to convict him quickly increases the probability that they are attempting to cover their shame instead of pointing out Dimna’s at the trial; whereas if the nobles are truly attempting to convict him and they are unable to do so at the end of the seven days, then Dimna will appear even more so to be the victim of envious nobles. This creates a further complication for the Lion, as the Lioness and the león pardo have spoken the most aggressively against Dimna and would be the ones responsible for the vicious rumors. They are the closest to the Lion, so either his court is full of liars, or his most intimate confidants are trying to manipulate him into killing a loyal subject; the very crime for which Dimna is on trial. The Lion’s indecision and reluctance to simply put Dimna to death could be a result of this difficult position that Dimna has helped weave. The Lion fears committing the same error twice, that of rashly and unjustly killing one of his vassals like he did to Sençeba, but he also fears failing to exact justice properly. As the
trial drags on without a conviction, the chance of a just resolution, which condemns Dimna to death, diminishes since the nobles in charge of the *pesquisa* fail to cut through Dimna’s rhetoric. Because the reader is privy to the private conversations between Calila and Dimna, however, the more complex and manipulative Dimna’s defense becomes, the more his character is seen as simply malicious, unscrupulous, and a clear threat to the court of the Lion.

Thus, through reading the two chapters together, Chapter Four effectively colonizes the events of Chapter Three, in addition to merely continuing the story. It accomplishes this by recasting Dimna as the undisputed villain of the story, by shifting the narratorial focus away from the struggles of Dimna and onto those of the Lion, and by changing the types of spaces where the characters converse. Chapter Four invalidates Dimna’s claims of abuse in Chapter Three by flattening out his character so that, in hindsight, he becomes an undeserving noble with ambitious pretensions, opposed to an overlooked vassal who has not been properly rewarded for his abilities. The presence of such a devious traitor, from the perspective of authority, justifies the ethically dubious actions of the king, and by focusing on the Lion’s troubles the narrative voice distances the reader from Dimna’s perspective. If we were imagine the perspective of the Dimna from Chapter Three in the context of Chapter Four, it would likely be more apparent that respected areas, in which privacy is never questioned or compromised, become areas vulnerable to royal authority. From this point of view, Chapter Four is not the lush prairie into which Sençeba wandered, but a place where neighbors spy on each other, hidden
informants lurk in the shadows, and information revealed during tribunals result in employees being dismissed from royal positions. But this Dimna’s perspective is silenced, rewritten to be nefarious opposed to simply self-interested, and then overwritten by the image of the guilty Dimna of Chapter Four. Furthermore, all these changes coincide with a change in the description of courtly relationships, specifically between the obligations that both king and vassal owe one another.

Chapter Three of CeD is a surprisingly balanced section, concerning how it expresses information about the social relationships of the court, often using both explicit saws and implicit descriptions of the interactions between the characters. The majority of the information focuses on the responsibilities that a king owes his vassals and the dangers that vassals face by becoming involved in the affairs of a monarch. Prior to engaging with the Lion for the first time, Calila tries to dissuade Dimna from his plan to ingratiate himself to the king, and he becomes ever bolder with his assertions against rulers. He starts his speech softly with a statement that hardly criticizes kings but certainly suggests that outsiders are generally overlooked for not being “cercano”, a status that makes proving one’s “truthfulness” difficult: “[e]l rey non honrará al atrevido por su atrevençia, mas honra al verdadero et al cercano dél” (128). But Calila then expands on the importance of being “close” with the king, with its corresponding danger, in a way that suggests that being “truthful” is actually a far less important attribute than being “cercano”, making Dimna’s fantasy of entering the court even more remote. “Cadizen los sabios” asserts Calila, “que el que es de la compañia del rey et de la muger que
Calila’s description becomes increasingly negative while tactfully evading any direct criticism of the king through first linking the king’s behavior to that of women, and then building a simile that is based in an ambiguous antecedent. Being a member of the king’s court starts out as being based in one’s honesty and closeness, but soon turns out to be only a capricious choice akin to female sexual depravity which is solely dependent on the closest available man (vassal). What little benefit the selected companion may hope to glean from the situation is quickly revealed to be chimeric when Calila adds the final simile, which turns the vassal into a tree that is claimed by a vine. The king, like an unchecked vine, and like a woman with an uncontrolled sexuality, will wrap his grip around the closest vassal available and use the vassal to lift himself up further despite the fact that he will suffocate the subject in his clutches. Furthermore, the fruit that the vine potentially bears will never improve the lot of the entangled, death-gripped tree, nor will the children of a prostitute or mistress ever be of benefit to the master or john, and by association, the gains of the king will never truly advance the quality of life of the noble. Calila seems to be less concerned with Dimna’s desire to improve his lot in life itself, as he is about his friend’s desire to be a part of the Lion’s consort.

Through Calila’s protestations, and Dimna’s counter-reasoning, Chapter Three presents a Calila who is not, as many authors have contended, the wiser of the two jackals, but rather the more cynical of the two concerning the workings of the court.
Dimna, in contrast to how many have interpreted his character, displays high regard for the king, innocently and earnestly believing that the Lion will live up to the ideals of the position, ideals expressed through the positive attributes expounded through the various saws in the chapter. When Dimna first explains his plans, he states that, “[q]uíérome mostrar al león en tal razón, ca él es de flaco consejo et de flaco corazón, et es escandalizado en su fazienda con sus vasallos. Et por aventura en llegándome a él en este punto averé dél alguna dignidat o alguna honra, et averé dél lo que he menester” (128). Like a good counselor, Dimna hopes to point out the errors he sees in the court and to guide the king towards better customs, and in return he expects the king to repay him with increased “dignity or honor”. Calila, rightly suspicious of the Lion’s true character, attempts to lead Dimna to a more nuanced understanding of the royal figure by asking him, “¿[o]nde sabes que el león está así commo tú dizes?” suggesting that actual kings may not always embody the values of their fictional ideals. Dimna, unable or unwilling to consider that the way a king should act may not always be the way a king does act, affirms that he can tell by his rank and position as king: “[c]uídol’, et tengo que es así, que el omne agudo de buen entendimiento a las vezes sabe el estado de sus amigos et su poridat, por lo que le semeja et por lo que vee de su estado et de su fazienda, et, poniéndose en ello, sábelo çierto” (128). Dimna does not want to listen to Calila. Dimna is committed to believing that the Lion will honor him for his future services, despite having just argued contradicting statements: first, that the Lion “es de flaco consejo et de flaco corazón, et es escandalizado en su fazienda con sus vasallos”; and second, that through observing the Lion and his “fazienda” he can assure Calila that the Lion is a good
ruler. Calila is cynical and distrusts the workings of the Lion’s court, where Dimna is blinded to Calila’s arguments by his hopeful disposition of receiving an appropriate compensation for his services; humility and ambition do not appear to be accurate descriptions within this context.

Calila, perceiving that Dimna is not merely musing over his misguided aspiration but that “esto tiene así a coraçón”, changes his strategy to a more direct approach by telling Dimna that royal service is dangerous: “quiérote fazer temer serviciio del rey por el grant peligro que ý ha” (130). He supports his statement, saying:

Que dizen los sabios que tres cosas son a que se non atreve sinon omne loco, nin estuerçe dellas sinon el sabio: la una es servir rey; la otra es meter las mugeres en su poridat; la terçera bever vidiganbre a prueba. Et los sabios fazian semejança del rey et su privança al monte muy agro en que ha las sabrosas frutas, et es manida de las bestias fieras; onde subir a él es muy fuerte cosa et estar sin el bien que en él ha es más amargo et más fuerte. (Blecua and Lacarra 130)

Calila’s remarks, again, subtly express distrust of rulers while not directly making the king the subject of the critique. The action of “servir el rey” is stated first and could be interpreted as the one to be avoided most. By itself, it does not declare whence the danger comes, but after adding the subsequent actions it should be understood that Calila wants Dimna to fear the Lion himself, since women and the poison are the respective dangers in the other two items. His second exemplum also contains a slight about kings along with a negative portrayal of the court itself. The “bestias fieras” that make one’s journey to gain
the “privança” of the king “muy fuerte” are the other nobles of the court, both guarding and coveting the “sabrosas frutas”. The contrast given, however, is between successfully reaching the goal, which is itself difficult (“muy fuerte cosa”) and simply being there trying to reach the goal (“estar sin el bien que en él ha”) which even worse (“es más amargo et más fuerte”). The combination of these two examples warn Dimna against the dangers of the court for those attempting to gain the favor of the king, portraying both courtier and king as a source of potential death.

Dimns, still too enchanted by his fantasy that confuses fictional with real kings, is unable to heed the warnings against the monarch and misunderstands Calila’s warning. Rather than interpreting the admonitions against the king and the court, Dimna maintains his position that the Lion is a just ruler who will reward him properly. Dimna fails to understand that even if he is able to procure and consume some of the “sabrosas frutas” from the top of the craggy mountain, the peril from the “bestias fieras” is continuous, whether climbing the cliffs or picking the fruit. Furthermore, because the reward is of ephemeral existence, like time spent in the presence of the king, to seek or spend time with the king is always a dangerous activity and without security. Instead, Dimna recasts the meaning of Calila’s statements by converting the temporary nature of the reward into a permanent one, arguing, “mas sepas que quien non se entremete a los grandes peligros non ha las cosas que cobdiça” (130, emphasis my own). It is through the rejection of Calila’s schema that Dimna’s schema can be more accurately observed. He continues by speaking about the need for having a “noble heart”, something he considers himself to
have and that the story has already declared during the introduction of the two protagonists (“[e]t era Di[m]na de más noble coraçon”), comparing service in the court to other honorable, yet intrinsically dangerous deeds: “[e]t dizien que tres cosas son que non puede fazer ninguno sinon con ayuda de noble coraçon et a gran peligro: la una es oficio del rey; la otra mercaduría sobre mar, et la otra lidiar con enemigo” (130). Dimna has converted the action of Calila’s *sententia* to fit his own ends, where successful service to the king yields long-lasting benefits akin to the riches of a prosperous trading voyage and the fame of conquering an enemy. Similarly, it would appear that Dimna has turned the momentary sweetness of the fruits into ambrosia, bestowing him eternal life in the court once he has taken a single bite, opposed to the ephemeral reality of court privileges. Apparently frustrated by the conversation, Calila takes his leave of Dimna, ending the discussion abruptly and offering Dimna only a prayer for good returns on his endeavors, which suggests that Calila may only see a positive outcome if God intercedes on Dimna’s behalf (“[h]ermano, Dios te lo ençime en bien esto que tú quieres fazer” 131).

Dimna’s early interaction with the Lion would never be characterized in the negative, duplicitous way that scholars read into all of his interactions if it were not for the opening remarks of the framing material and the addition of Chapter Four. For example, once granted permission to speak to the Lion, he exhibits his good education and etiquette: first he expresses that he has been an ever-loyal subject: second, he demonstrates humility and deference; and third, he gives his reason for his presence at the court, that although the king has not sought his assistance before, even the lowliest of
servants can be improved if they have something of use for the ruler (131). Dimna then shows his training by implementing a simile that reinforces his use of humility by comparing himself to a weed, stating “ca la fuste que yase en tierra ayúdase omne dél a las veces para rascar su oreja, et álçalo de tierra et ráscala con él, o para ál, quanto más el animal, que es sabidor de las cosas” (131). The descriptive level of his razón serves to heighten the distance between the Lion and Dimna and increase the force of Dimna’s humility and deference by portraying himself as a plant on the ground that “a man [the Lion] raises from the earth” to be used as a tool for scratching behind his ears. The example also communicates the great potential that Dimna could have in serving his lord by its conclusion, which converts the inanimate plant “que yase en tierra” into an animate being (“animal”) who possesses “knowledge of things” (“que es sabidor de las cosas”). In a self-reflexive way, Dimna beautifully fulfills his own example, as he is by nature an animate being, and through the implementation of his speech he demonstrates that he “es sabidor de las cosas” through employing Aristotelian language and divisions for comparing the uses of two distinct physical categories, the inanimate and the animate. The plant, inanimate in nature and of the Earth, is “raised from the ground” physically by the man and metaphysically when converted, or animated, into an “animal”. The implied message is that the Lion should take advantage of the knowledge that Dimna has and “raise” him from the ground, like the plant, and animate his social status which is currently immobile, or inanimate. That this discourse is self-serving is undeniable, but its intelligence and depth should not be confused with arte or “engaño”, as scholars are wont
to do. At this point in the exemplum itself, provided by the filósofo to the king, there has been nothing to point to Dimna as a malevolent character.

The conversation that ensues is not a manifestation of Dimna’s immoral personality either, but is better understood as a scene in which a protagonist demonstrates his wisdom. Dimna and the Lion next discuss courtly values; and despite the erudition of the content or rhetorical ability of either, such discussions are commonplace in didactic literature in general, and in this specific case the conversation is devoid of arte. The parallel action of “raising” the lowly plant, physically and metaphysically, gives the Lion hope that Dimna will provide good counsel and he expresses that he is pleased multiple times throughout their exchange. At the same time, the Lion is evasive in his responses so as not to commit in haste to accepting Dimna into the court. For example, the king announces to the nobles present, “[e]l omne sabio et de noble coraçón et bueno et agudo, maguar sea de menor guisa et de baxa dignidat, la nobleza de su coraçón non quiere fueras paresçer et mostrarse, así commo la çentella del fuego que omne asconde et ella non quiere sinon açenderse”, implying that Dimna is an “omne sabio et de noble coraçón et bueno et agudo” while not making any concrete statements that would potentially obligate him further (131). He is pleased with Dimna and expresses his gratitude, and he acknowledges that Dimna has spoken truthfully regarding true nobility and one’s lineage,  _________________

15 Other examples of such scenes can also be found in Sendebar, La donzella Teodor, and the Book of Daniel.
but he stops short of proclaiming that Dimna possesses these attributes directly as such a declaration would obligate him raise his station.

Dimna leaps on this invitation to continue speaking precisely because it grants him the opportunity to prove his “good counsel” and “noble heart”, and ultimately prove Calila wrong about the danger of pursuing the king’s favor. Nonetheless, we also observe that Dimna is concerned that people might suggest that the Lion honors him because he is “conosçido” and they may think him undeserving: “Digna en todo esto quería aver honra del león, et todos sabían que non lo faría porque l’oviese conosçido, mas porque era de noble coraçón et de buen consejo” (133). The public display of his wisdom forces the king and court to enact the values which they claim to believe and follow, but also protects Dimna and the king from the potential attack from detractors who would argue that Dimna was only accepted into the king’s circle “porque l’oviese conosçido”. By exposing Dimna’s desire to publicly demonstrate his worth, a connection is made between Calila’s warning about the Lion only privileging those who are “mas cercano”, and Dimna’s belief that the Lion properly fulfills his title. While not mutually exclusive, the Lion’s action of advancing Dimna’s status to that of counselor does provide Dimna with “proof” that the Lion is not only interested in the “conosçidos” of the court, allowing him to maintain his idyllic notion of the monarchy. Dimna wants to do things openly and honestly, as he believes the Lion does as well. Dimna, at this point in the story, is not an “omne falso” as he is often portrayed in scholarship, and the fact that the omnipresent
narrator provides us with this information counters any claim that Dimna is speaking with a forked tongue during these conversations.

In summary, Dimna continues speaking once he is convinced that the king is pleased with his initial statements in order to display his worthiness as a counselor to the court. He shifts his discourse, however, once he has a chance to direct the conversation, changing the topic from the more abstract one of unforeseen utility to the more concrete one of political philosophy concerning courtly relations. Astute and to his advantage? Yes. Devious or malicious? No. He deftly picks the topic of vassalage and courtly obligations because it helps him accomplish two goals: He is able to show that he understands his duties to his king, and he can also subtly remind the Lion of the responsibilities that a good king owes a good servant.

The subject matter of this lengthy speech is twofold. He first speaks about the need of vassals to demonstrate their abilities to the king, so that the king may fulfill his responsibility to maintain social order though appropriately assigning rank and privileges. He intermixes his razones with similes for rhetorical emphasis, but doing so also offers a compact unit that functions as a frame/tale where the razón is the disclosed explanation of the schema that frames the simile that acts as a gnomic “tale”. For example, Dimna states: “Los pueblos de los reyes et los de su corte tenudos son de le fazer entender las noblezas de sus coraçones et su saber, et de le dar leal consejo, et amerlo. Ca él non los porná en las dignidades que deven et que meresçen sinon por esto, así commo la simiente soterrada que ninguno non sabe su bondat fasta que sale et paresçe sobre la tierra” (132).
The qualities of the men must make themselves known in order for the king to properly order the realm, says the razón, and this schema easily finds the relationship with the gnomic simile potent, allowing the listeners to drive a process of colonization that produces a monovalent meaning to Dimna’s argument. The plan that emerges is goal-driven to replicate, but through expressing a culturally accepted paradigm, the comparative relationship that surfaces is one where it remains the framing material, and lived experiences are the exempla. Dimna, therefore, is like the “seed” that leaves its subterranean space to make its “bondat” known, and in so doing, he allows the king to give him the proper rank.16 Indirectly through his speech, Dimna is urging the king to re-evaluate his position in the court.

This is not the only instance where Dimna emphasizes the importance of subjects being properly placed and rewarded. Throughout the conversation, Dimna continually reinforces the argument that this is the job of the king through various statements, such

16 A full treatment of Dimna’s use of Aristotelian categories, unfortunately, does not fit within the scope of this dissertation. I would like to point out the richness of these metaphors and similes, nonetheless, particularly the connection between inanimate plants and the king’s role as providing the animus for lesser nobles to have access to social mobility. In thirteenth-century Castile, this would be yet another metaphor that connects kings to the Heavenly Lord in order to justify the centralization of authority under their rule as God’s appointed justices.
as: “[e]l rey deve pujar a cada uno a su dignidat” (132); “[e]l rey non deve menospresçiar la nobleza de coraçón” (133); “[el rey] faze lo que tiene por bien en ponerlos en la medida que deve” (133). Dimna stresses the value of putting things in their correct order through courtly and plebian exempla, on one hand causing the veracity of his argument to appear universally true while one the other always maintaining a link to kings (implicitly or explicitly). Examples of implicit references to the king and his duty are statements such as: “[c]a dizen que dos cosas non deve ninguno poner ninguna dellas fuera de su lugar ni tollerla de su lugar; et son los omnes et los ornamentos” (132) and “[e]l los muchos vasallos, si provados non fueren, traen daño al fecho, ca non se cunple la cosa con muchas vasallos mas con los buenos de ellos, maguer sean pocos” (133). The implied ruler is in charge of making sure his vassals are properly ordered in the first case, and properly vetted for war in the second. Dimna makes clear where the blame falls as well, stating that: “[c]a esto non es menospresçiamiento a estas cosas sobredichas, mas es nesçidad del que faze” (132). Alternating with the implicit references to monarchs are explicit ones, such as: “[n]on fagas conpañía con omne que non sepa quál es su diestra et su siniestra; ca non sosaca[n] lo que los entendidos saben sinon sus mayores, non lo que pueden los cavalleros sinon sus reyes, non lo que ha en la ley et en su entendimiento sinon los theólogos et los divinos” (132); and “la pequeña cosa por ventura engrandesçe mucho, así comço el nervio que es tomado de la cosa muerta, et fazen dél cuerda de la ballesta et dóblase con él, et ala menester el rey para tirar et para jugar” (133). Through mixing exempla with courtly and quotidian loci, Dimna on one hand makes the case that it is important for all people to properly order their lives, universalizing the application of
his wise statements, while on the other hand he singles out royal authority as unique in that the king, unlike other men, is specifically in charge of controlling the order of the realm through imposing order based on the “nobleza de coraçón” of his subjects.

The second focus is the concept of “nobleza de coraçón” that Dimna frequently reiterates. While this topic overlaps and is dependent on the first, it serves a second function: to destabilize the tradition of nobility by birth by focusing on the personal attributes of an individual, despite his origin. As seen, Dimna builds his case by beginning with the responsibility of subjects to display their abilities to the king so that he can place them in their appropriate locations. Then he shifts to the importance of order itself, with an emphasis on the king’s responsibility to order the realm. His final step is a short treatment of cases where quality is to be valued over quantity, which allows him to conclude that in order to fulfill each of these arguments, which the Lion and the court have agreed with individually, a king must look past lineage and reward vassals by their service. Dimna concludes his speech by adducing that “el rey non apriva a los omnes por la privança de sus padres, nin los despresçia por non conosçer a sus padres, mas cata qué saben et en qué los ha menester” (133). The speech is successful because Dimna proves his value as a counselor through detailing the process by which a king should select his counselors, effectively writing himself into his role as counselor through demonstrating his knowledge of courtly practices and then exploiting the rules of the system. Disagreement with Dimna’s concluding argument, that “el rey non apriva a los omnes por la privança de sus padres, nin los despresçia por non conosçer a sus padres, mas cata qué
saben et en qué los ha menester”, is not an option for the Lion or the court, as it would contradict the previously stated values of order to which they have all just agreed.

The ideas expressed in the statement also reenact the previous arguments that construct the king’s authority as unique. Unlike other men, the sovereign is not solely in charge of properly ordering his personal life but is the chosen man who must also place order among men. In previous statements about royal obligations, Dimna uses modal verbs to describe the attributes of an ideal king; for example he proclaims that the king “ought” (or “ought not”) do certain things, such as “el rey deve pujar a cada uno a su dignidat” or “el rey non deve menospresçiar la nobleza de coraçón”(132-133). In contrast, in this statement he declares simply what a king does or does not do: “el rey non apriva a los omnes por la privança de sus padres, nin los despresçia por non conosçer a sus padres, mas cata qué saben et en qué los ha menester”. The change in mood reflects a change from obligation to description, from describing idealized standards to definitive characteristics. While privileging or discriminating against people based on lineage may be permitted of, or practiced by, men in general, such activity is contrary to the very definition of being a king. The king is to treat his subjects equally, arbitrate impartially, and make laws justly, these being the reasons for his unique status above other men.

The Lion responds to Dimna, and once again clouds his statement so as not to be committed one way or another to Dimna’s proposal. In both of the responses that the Lion gives his court, he affirms a general aspect of the conversation, but stops short of actually confirming the duties that Dimna puts forth. After listening to Dimna’s lengthy
speech, for example, “pagóse más el león dél, et plógolo más con él, et respondióle sienpre major”, indicating that the Lion was impressed with Dimna’s speaking ability and pleased by the possibility that he would be a good counselor. The Lion’s response shows, however, that despite such praise the Lion did not consent to, nor deny, the suggested duties. Instead, the Lion inverts the process and makes the king the driver of the relationship and the vassel the recipient: “[n]on deve el rey porfiar en fazer perder su derecho al que ha derecho en bien et es bueno et de noble coraçón, mas dévele refazer lo que le non fizo. Et aquel a quien lo fiziere dévele fazer graçias et conosçerlo” (134). The king initiates the exchange of duties and the noble is the one who must respond correctly to the ruler’s actions; the noble is the one who is indebted to the king, the king is not obliged to give any specific reward.

The Lion continues to make his own two-pointed arguments: first to assert that it is the king who forges realtionships of courtly obligation, and the noble who must accept; and second, to push the conversation towards the topic of subjects and away from monarchs. For example, the Lion states: “ca los omnes son de dos guisas: el uno es de mala natura et as así commo la culebra que, si alguno la pisa et non le muerde, non deve tornar a ella de cabo; et el otro es de buena natura et de blandas costumbres, et es tal commo el sándalo frío que, si mucho es fregado, tórnase caliente et quema” (134). The Lion’s similes echo his initial statement, which cast the king in the active role of creating relationships of duty, by making the king the undefined actor that avoids men who are like snakes and who rubs the sandalwood, thus determining its temperature.
Simultaneously, the undefined actor (the ruler) is not the protagonist. The similes are specifically about the nature of vassals, some are tractable and others are not. Following the Lion’s proposal, good vassals should recognize the generosity of their ruler and give him thanks, but since men are of two manners, some are like snakes and become a threat to the ruler, and others are like sandalwood and are easily maleable to the king’s needs. The similes, when read through the initial claim, then, further emphasize the subjugation of vassals to a king’s will. Bad natured vassals are like serpents, a traditionally despised animal, and even when accidentally grieved or disturbed, such as being stepped on, turn into a mortal enemy, forever to be avoided. The implied contrast in this first simile prompts good vassals to be forgiving of a king when he grieves you, and not respond like the snake. The second simile contends that good natured subjects are like sandalwood, a highly valued wood, and when rubbed correctly they change their state from cold to hot, or are easily swayed to the king’s desires. By contrast, bad natured vassals remain intractable despite the effort exerted by a ruler to please them.

Despite the lack of agreement in the conversation, which the text suggests continues on though unrecorded for the reader, the Lion comes to accept Dimna as a confidant.\textsuperscript{17} When Dimna next speaks, the intimacy of the subject matter suggests that the

\textsuperscript{17} The text, which reads, “[e]t pues que se ovo solazado Dimna con el león, dixo […]” (134), permits a flexibility in the text that suggests that the conversation continued further. This would be an ideal place to insert additional discussion regarding the duties
two have retreated away from the other members of the court and that they are speaking in private. The Lion, who does not want Dimna to know about his fear of the unknown beast (Sençeba), tries to hide his shameful cowardice by lying (“Et el león non quería que supiese Dimna que lo fazia con cobardez, et dixo: -non es por mied” 134), but quickly reveals his fear of Sençeba’s breying when he hears another strong cry from the ox. As discussed above, Dimna uses this opportunity to tell the Lion an exemplum, and to gain the Lion’s trust he volunteers to seek out the animal making the great noises. While Dimna is on the errand, the Lion has a partial psychological breakdown which illuminates readers on some of the Lion’s education but also sets the character up to be judged by his own values, which he fails to live up to:

Et fuese Dina, et pensó el león en su fazienda, et dixo en su coraçón: –Non fize bien en fiarme en este para enbiarlo al lugar do lo enbío, ca el ome, si es de casa del rey et es por luengo tiempo desdeñado non lo meresçiendo [...] non deve el rey meter su fazienda en sus manos, ni fiar en ellos, nin segurarse. Et Dina es discreto et sabidor, et tanto fue despreçiado et desdeñado a mi puerta et olvidado, et seméjame que tenía mala voluntad, et esto [le] fizo engañarme et meterme en mal; et si por aventura fallare aquel animal que brama que es más fuerte que yo, o

and obligations of vassals to kings, and kings to vassals, and, considering that the collection has been adapted multiple times, it is not unlikely that such contributions have occurred.
Dimna returns and gives his report to the Lion, assuring him that if it were to please him, he could beseech the strange animal to become a subject of the crown. The Lion is pleased and sends Dimna on this second task. Dimna brings Sençeba to the Lion, and after hearing Sençeba’s story the Lion invites him to stay, saying, “[b]live comigo et fazerte he onra” (137).

Comparing the description of the subsequent treatment of Sençeba to that of Dimna, and keeping in mind the anxious inner-monologue of the Lion, an image of the courtly practices of the Lion emerges which, at this point in the story, portrays the Lion as duplicitous and weak, and Dimna as a good vassal. The Lion commits many errors concerning his privileging of Sençeba, some of which were described in his internal monologue and others based in his conversation with Dimna. For example, after inviting Sençeba to stay and live with them, he quickly gives the Ox privileges at court and tells Sençeba of his private affairs: “el buey gradeçiógelo mucho et omillósele. Desí el león aprivólo et allególe a sí, et tomó consejo dél, et metiólo en sus poridades et en sus cosas. Et duró así el buey un tienpo, et ívale toda vía queriendo más et pagándose más dél, atanto que fue el más privado de su conpaña, et el que más él amava et preçíaba” (137). Dimna publicly demonstrates his intelligence and learning in political philosophy precisely because he wanted the court to know that he was noble of heart and provided sound counsel (“era de noble coraçón et de buen consejo”) and, moreover, that he did not
receive privileges simply because the Lion “l’oviese conocido”. Sençeba, in contrast, is immediately taken in by the king, and the Lion fancifully gives him praise, privileges, private counsel, and royal secrets (“aprívólo et allególe a sí, et tomó consejo dél, et metiólo en sus poridades et en sus cosas”). It appears that the Lion put his education behind him when he dispatched his fear of Sençeba, since it is the very act of uncovering “poridades” hastily which sent him into a panic about Dimna, as expressed at the start of his internal monologue (“[n]on fize bien en fiarme en este para enbíarlo al lugar do lo enbío”). Furthermore, so great is his guilt over not treating Dimna fairly that the Lion becomes paranoid, believing that Dimna is actually double-crossing him (“[e]t non cesó el león de fablar consígo mismo et de se maltraer, tanto que se levantó del lugar donde estava, et arrufávase de mala manera” 136). If the story were to end here, the schema proposed by the king and reiterated by his filósofo as content of the exemplum would certainly require altering before one could deem the relationship of the frame/tale potent.

Dimna, by comparison, is a good vassal and completes his assignments diligently. If a fault can be assigned to Dimna, it is his failure to heed Calila’s advice about the nature of kings and the danger of engaging with the court. Despite the fact that, as the Lion recognizes, “Dina es discreto et sabidor, et tanto fue despreçiado et desdeñado a mi puerta et olvidado”, Dimna continued to assist the Lion and bring the Ox into his service. Even after Dimna decides that Sençeba must die, his reasoning for doing so is based in a common problem that arises when a king chooses a favorite, especially when he is an outsider, someone of another faith, or of ignoble lineage, since such appointments always
disrupt the traditional relations of power within a court.\textsuperscript{18} While Dimna’s motivation is more than partially self-interested, the truth of his argument that the Lion has disproportionately privileged Sençeba, and the potential ramifications of such unfair royal privileging, do convince Calila and the Lion of the problem and the Lion eventually admits: “mucho me has fecho aborreçer la privança de Sençeba”. The Lion, then, not only failed at the beginning of the tale, through leaving Dimna “despreciado et desdeñado a [su] puerta et olvidado”, but he repeats this failure as soon as Sençeba is brought to the court, and on a greater scale that impacts the entire court.

In the previous chapter I focused on the intra-diegetic narrative cycle of “El religioso robado”, where part of my argument is that Calila demonstrates one rhetorical use of frame/tales to Dimna. As stated, another important aspect of that narrative cycle is that it is when Dimna decides to use \textit{arte} to achieve his goals. Within the context of the political arguments espoused in the chapter, this is also the scene when Dimna revises his understanding of the court and adopts Calila’s more cynical understanding of kings: they do not always embody the idealized versions of monarchs as promoted in the \textit{compendios de castigos}. This change in Dimna’s character, nonetheless, has gone unnoticed because of the authority ascribed to Chapter Four which unmistakably flattens his character to the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{18} Some case examples from Castilla include: Isaac ben Sid or “Rabiçag”, Don Álvaro de Luna, Beltrán de la Cueva, Francisco Gómez de Sandoval (1st Duke of Lerma), Gaspar de Guzmán (Count-Duke of Olivares).}
expectations laid out in the framing material of Chapter Three that describe him as a false
confidant and traitor. Concerning the political razones that Dimna provides, they become
half-truths and machinations of manipulation which the Lion prudently “corrects”.
Chapter Four’s colonization of Chapter Three drives the monovalent message that Dimna
“does not […] take his own advice” and that “Digna [sic] is considered to be unjust
because he causes an innocent person, the king, to suffer undeservedly for his deeds”
(Parker 68, 73). The influential power of the continuation of the story can be seen in the
dominant viewpoints of the criticism with regards to the characterization of Dimna.

The negative portrait of the Lion is also reversed, as blame is placed on Dimna
and his astucia and ambicia. The Lion’s viewpoints during his conversations with Dimna
become exalted, and Dimna’s become tarnished. The Lion is seen as a victim of

19 Parker’s statement is not extreme or unique. For example, Blecua and Lacarra conclude
that “[e]l error del león (III) consistió en no conocer la maldad de Dimna y obrar
erróneamente por su consejo” (27); Gómez Redondo describes Dimna as “ese falso
consejero que, en todo momento, sólo busca su beneficio particular, aprovechándose de
la debilidad –el miedo– del león” (202); and Lacarra, who recurrently refers to Dimna as
“el mesturero”, states that “[L]a antítesis del buen consejero será aquel que actúe sin ser
llamado (como hace Dimna), nunca lleve la contraria del rey (también Dimna […]), y se
guíe más por sus intereses que por el bien del estado […] No hay nada reprochable en las
advertencias de Dimna […] el engaño sólo se aprecia en el conjunto de la historia” (160).
malevolent advisors, and such wickedness can only be resolved by a strengthening of royal authority through the centralizing of power under the monarchy, the pervasive ideological message of Chapter Four. The informants of the Lion in Chapter Four become heroes and exemplary courtiers to be contrasted with the scheming Dimna, and his associate Calila. The philosophy that Dimna advocates, one in which kings have obligations towards nobles, is crushed under the centralizing authority of Chapter Four while the Lion’s philosophy, that nobles should be grateful for what the king bestows upon them, survives.

Colonizing the Reconquest

Continuation is not separate, or even divisible, from colonization. This is particularly visible in a work such as Calila e Dimna that allows readers to witness the

20 It would seem that colonization is actually intrinsic to any project of continuation that one would deem successful, in that either the original or the continuation successfully colonizes the other to a degree that a reader accepts their relational status and accepts the term continuation (or “sequel”, if by the same author), or the reader rejects this relationship. For example, the Quijote de Avellaneda (or Quijote apócrofo), despite its early popularity in 1614, is accepted as a continuation, strictly speaking, but not a very successful one in modern circles, as it rarely makes reading lists except in the case of specialists in the study Early Modern Hispanic Narrative. Even then, however, no one would speak of Alonso Quijano’s adventures in that continuation, or any of the others, as
process of frame/tale meaning-making and the rhetorical power and authority gained by properly crafting frame/tales. Additionally, the various types of continuations that make up the peritexts of the work (three introductions and one postscript/colophon) create a second narrative that is both outside and inside the text: a story about the transfer of the text from flourishing civilization to flourishing civilization. Distinct from continuations that are fictional inventions of “Literature”, the continuations that are the introductions and postscript in the CeD are also historiography, in that they record the history of the movement of the text while also becoming that text. If successful continuation is one pathway through which ideology is normalized and transferred to a recipient, then the medieval readers who judged the translation project of CeD to be a successful continuation of the work’s story would become susceptible to the ideological material of the work. For such readers, CeD assisted in normalizing aspects of Alfonso X’s cultural campaign, particularly concerning the objectives and yields of the Reconquista.

From the vantage-point of posterity, one cannot help but sympathize with Lacarra’s sentiment that it is truly a shame that Alfonso X did not insert a prologue of his own before the “Introducción de al-Muqaffa’” and close what in the Hispanist’s words would be “un círculo perfecto” (“Las primeras traducciones” 8). After the addition of three prior introductions to the work, it is in some ways confusing that Alfonso X would

true experiences of the fictional protagonist, whose one real story is contained in Cervantes’ authentic Parts One and Two.
only leave his mark on the work in a short colophon, and as a postscript. The first addition is a (pseudo-)autobiographic prologue about the great Persian philosopher Berzebuey’s conflict between leading a secular (or active) versus a philosophical (or contemplative) existence, and was placed in front of what was originally the first chapter, “Del león y del buey”.\textsuperscript{21} The second addition was placed in front of the autobiography, and reports the journey of Berzebuey to India, where he translated the text into Pahlavi, and his return to Persia and reception by Khosrau I (501-79 AD), the famed Emperor (Blecua and Lacarra 99).\textsuperscript{22} The third addition is the introduction written by al-Muqaffa’

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21} I am describing the added introductions more by location in the text than chronology. The chronology is difficult to determine for the two chapters concerning Berzebuey, though from the study of Arabic manuscripts it appears that both histories were part of the version in Pahlavi. Scholars believe al-Muqaffa’ altered aspects of “Estoria de Berzebuey el menge” (Chapter Two), though they still debate to what degree (Pardo 91). It is clear, nevertheless, that al-Muqaffa’s introduction was added when he translated the text from Pahlavi to Arabic, and that Alfonso’s postscript was added after its translation to Castilian.

\textsuperscript{22} Khosrau Anushiruwān I (also Chosroes Anusisvan), was better known in Persian as Anushiruwān I. His name appears in Chapter One (“reinando el rey Sirechuel, que fue fijo de Cades”) as he sent the physician Borzūya (also Borzuya, Burzōy, and, in the Castilian text, “Berzebuey”) to India. The Castilian text is an alteration from the Arabic,
which he placed at the front of the entire work. His introduction is elaborate and erudite, and with its addition he also repurposed both previous prologues to the role of chapters. Finally, with the translation of the text into Castilian, the scriptorium of Alfonso X added the following colophon:


(Blecua and Lacarra 355)

 Yet, despite its meager existence, scholars have long discussed the colophon as a continuation of the book’s history that links Alfonso to Khosrau I, both patrons of wisdom, and Alfonso to Berzebuey (and al-Muqaffā’), as the agent who brought the work from outside, into his own culture for the benefit of the people. From the perspective of which used his epithet Anushiruwan “of the Immortal Soul”. “Cades” suffered a similar fate through translation, and is better known as Kavadh I (c. 473-531) (Blecua and Lacarra 99; Frye 325).

23 Blecua and Lacarra comment on the conclusion of the text, noting the many layers of kings and philosophers/counselors that cohabitate the opening and closing matter of the book (355). Parker makes connections between the didactic goals of Alfonso X and the
a modern reader and scholar, I certainly would enjoy having the opportunity to read an elaborate introduction for this work produced by the Alfonsine scriptorium that would rival the others, but I believe that the lack of such an introduction is also significant. But, what does the lack of a detailed history of the works arrival into Castilian mean? What was already seen in the work that made such an addition superfluous with regards to Alfonso’s cultural campaign? Does the absence of an Alfonsine introduction, but the insertion of a postscript-colophon, also participate in the continuation of the text’s historiography, and to what end?

The short answer to all these questions, for me, is that the work already contains the necessary parts of its own historiography inscribed into itself so that any reproduction of CeD can insert itself into the text as a continuation of that historiography with as little as a colophon. Zeitler, through analyzing the provenance of the text, states: “(t)he motivation behind the translation of this venerated work links to imperial ideology that legitimized their reign through the translation and incorporation of such knowledge into didacticism of CeD (96). Wacks and Zeitler both focus on the “act of translation and reception” within the context of Evan-Zohar’s concept of “literary systems” (Wacks 88-128, Zeitler 184-96). Gómez Redondo analyzes the aspects of CeD that would interest Alfonso, and the distinct goals for reception between the two versions of the journey of Berzebuey, one a fragment of CeD interpolated in the General estoria and the other a chapter in the CeD (181-87).
their collection”, essentially arguing that by the time of Alfonso’s reign, the text itself had already acquired a symbolic meaning by which its very possession signified the greatness of its sovereign patron.24 The insertion of the colophon then, on one hand, makes certain that the translation is attributed to Alfonso X, as a guarantor of that symbolic greatness that he now obtains by the very possession of the book. On the other, it is a textual continuation of the story of the text’s history, meaning Alfonso’s scriptorium has written him into that narrative, and the acceptance of his addition as a successful continuation assists in a process of normalization of identifiable ideological material that will influence the preferences for choosing schemata from the repertoire of the recipient.

In order to identify the ideological material, and then analyze how it interacts with the recipient’s views of society and history, it is necessary to outline the story of the text’s history as expressed in its multiple introductions and consider the relationship

24 Zeitler expresses this value in terms of “cultural capital” and through the polysystems theory of “cultural repertoires” in order to discuss the cultural relationship between the translation of *Kalīla wa-Dīmna* and contemporaneous power dynamics (193). I prefer to not express “values” in terms of “cultural capital” because I feel such metaphors require an acceptance of supply/demand economics as something natural and universal, which I reject, though do I recognize the utility of such metaphors for our current, capitalist culture, and I do not ascribe any particular ideological convictions to the authors who choose to use them.
between that story and the colophon. This is a similar task to the one undertaken in the
previous section that looked at the Chapters Three and Four, separately, in order to
discuss the effect that the insertion of Chapter Four, a continuation, had on the process of
meaning-making for a reader of Chapter Three concerning its ideological material.

One unique aspect of the introductions is that Berzebuey is the protagonist of two
of them, both subsequently repurposed as Chapters One and Two by al-Muqaffa’ after the
addition of his own introduction. While it is unknown which, if either, appeared first, it
can be observed that both interweave the plot elements of the other so effectively that
either chapter can function as context (and frame) for the other, which becomes an
exemplum. Using a different methodology and terminology than I do, Gómez Redondo
proposes that CeD has two target audiences, and that the duality of its purpose is
perfectly exposed in these two prologues. He states:

El Calila explorará la relación básica que se establece entre “rey” y “consejero” a
través de diversos parejas, que aparecen prefiguradas en este segundo dominio de
significados que constituye la historia del libro: en efect, el cap. I, aunque
describe el descubrimiento del “saber” que protagoniza Berzebuey, se centra
sobre todo en el modo en que el rey acogerá ese singular conocimiento que su
físico le trae; por lo mismo, el cap. II se dedica a analizar, mediante la forma de la
autobiografía, la compleja personalidad de Berzebuey, pensada como imagen del
receptor que ha de acercarse al interior del libro. (Gómez Redondo 192)
The book itself is a tool for exploration for both implied recipients, be it the tool that permits the necessary exploration of the self that all philosophers must undertake or the tool for the exploration of courtly relationships which a ruler must make with a counselor as a guide. The distinct, yet intertwined, pursuit of knowledge (“el saber”) is the goal of both paths, which CeD explores in the “relación básica que se establece entre ‘rey’ y ‘consejero’”, making the text both the means and the end of its own existence. But in order for one, king or counselor, to make that exploration he must first acquire the book (Chapter One) and then be, or have someone, capable of penetrating its “seso encubierto” (Chapter Two).

Both chapters, as well as the introduction by al-Muqaffa’, stress the importance of uncovering the “hidden meanings” within the pages of the text, and both demonstrate different ways that one can gain access to the deeper content in work. The first is through good counsel, as Berzebuey learns during his voyage to India. The great physician gains support from Khosrau I to go to the mountains of India and collect the plants and leaves there to make a medicine capable of reviving the dead. After much labor and time, he is unable to make the medicine and prepares to return home to Persia, having failed in his mission. He complains about his shameful situation to the King of India’s philosophers, and they correct him in how he has been reading his books: the leaves he seeks are the pages in which the philosophers have recorded their knowledge, which is medicine for the uneducated, who are the dead who return to life once their mind is enlightened by the wisdom of the sages. In this chapter, the “hidden meaning” must be explained to
Berzebuey, exemplifying that one can gain access to the wisdom of the text through the good counsel of a more learned advisor. Simultaneously, however, knowing that the books of philosophers are written in metaphor does not explain their inner truths, it only provides the tool through which that wisdom can be obtained. Good counseling assists one in properly reading complex symbolic interactions, but to become wise one must incorporate this way of reading into one’s own life, and explore the philosophical self.

The second chapter shows another way in which one can access the wisdom of the text, which is through searching ever more deeply into oneself. This chapter describes the inner journey of Berzebuey as he seeks the proper way to order his life in order to live the best he can while also gaining acceptance into the afterlife. The autobiographical chapter walks the reader through the various professions that Berzebuey pursued in order to achieve this goal, and through the search he comes to the conclusion that the best path is to follow is that of religion, that is, to lead a good and honest life. Once decided, he stops his searching, turns to follow religion, and corrects his deeds as best he can (“Et tornóse mi fazeinda a querer ser [en] [sic] religión et emender mis obras quanto podiese” 121). But “querer ser en religión”, in the context of CeD, is not the life of an ascetic, or even a strictly contemplative life; Berzebuey completes his task of translating the Indian text and returns to Persia. Berzebuey explains:

Et así avría guardado mi parte para folgar, et sería seguro de mi alma ante que moriese. Et saber esto es muy noble cosa, et perseveré en este estado atal at tornéme de las tierras de India a mi tierra, después que ove trasladado este libro.
Et tove que traía algo en él para quien le entendiese, et rogué a Dios por los oídores dél, que fuesen entendedores de las sus sentencias et del meollo que yaze en ellas. (Blecua and Lacarra 121)

Berzebuey, through studying the texts and applying their lessons to his life, advances in his internal journey to find the balance between the demands of this world and those of the next. This balanced life, or “ser religión”, is not the end, however, it is a practice of life, which for Berzebuey overlaps with his career as an advisor to Khosrau I. Through his philosophical approach to the text, he has uncovered the “meollo que yaze” in the “sentencias” of the book, which means he is prepared to counsel the Emperor properly in pursuing the balanced life. His training at uncovering the “meollo”, his exploration of the philosophical self, is what allows him to apply this wisdom for practical purposes in life, the active role as a counselor.

The book’s historiography, as expressed in these two introductions, is both a material and philosophical history. The book contains within itself its own *translatio studii*, in that the history of the work is a history of “traducción” and “translación”, the movement of a wisdom itself, and the means of penetrating that wisdom, from one language and location to another language and location. The book’s story is that of the movement of an object, specifically “wisdom”, and also of the tool for accessing that object, both of which are manifested as one in the same as the text itself. The movement of the book, is therefore not just the acquisition of a knowledge or a science, but it is also
the training in that knowledge, so that to truly “possess” the text one must acquire it materially and philosophically.

The next possessor of the work was al-Muqaffā’, an Islamic neophyte of Persian ancestry. Similarly to Berzebuey, al-Muqaffā’ moves the text culturally and physically and also inscribes his act of moving the book into work itself. When al-Muqaffā’ makes a traducción of the text into Arabic and a translación of the work to Bagdad, the act of that translatio itself places him in the same position, and presumably esteem, as his co-ethnic predecessor. The activity converts him into a “Berzebuey” (an exemplary sage) who implicitly has penetrated the wisdom of the text, has incorporated its knowledge into his own life, and, thus, is able to communicate that knowledge through good counseling. As further proof of his position as a sage, or ulamā, he inserts his own introduction which doubles as a continuation of the embedded story of the book’s historiography.

A marked difference between Berzebuey’s introductions and that of al-Muqaffā’, however, is the implied user of the text. Berzebuey’s translatio of the work is in the direct service of the emperor, and the content of the work is for his benefit (“Et este rey era muy acuñioso en allegar al saber et an amar los filósofos más que a orti, et trabajávase en aprender el saber et amávalo más que a muchos deleites en que los reyes se entremeten” 101). Pleased with the text, Khosrau I chooses to disseminate the text throughout the land for the benefit of his people, and he specifically gives copies to his favorite counselors (102). Khosrau desires to educate his people and, because the book impresses him, he adds it to a number of works that pertain to his cultural campaign (“Et el uno de aquestos
ertsos es aqueste libro de Calila et Dina” 102), but Berzebuey brings the book to Persia as a service to the emperor. The introduction of al-Muqaffa’, in contrast, does not describe a *translatio* under caliphal patronage, but rather speaks to a courtly class, shown by his emphasis on three objectives: following the precepts of a good life, working to improve one’s position, and cohabitating peacefully with other men (“Et dizen que en tres cosas se deve el seglar debe emender: en la su vida, et afiar la su ánima por ella; et la segunda es por la fazienda deste siglo et por la fazienda de su vida; et bivir entre los omes” 98). While al-Muqaffa’ may have been interested in impressing Caliph al-Mansur, who later executed al-Muqaffa’ in 856, those who he envisions benefitting from the work are members of courtly circles. Al-Muqaffa’’s actions, if we are to compare them with those of the characters of the first *translatio*, can be seen as usurping the role of Khosrau I, in that he both moves the book to Bagdad and declares its importance for the education of the courtly class, imitating the role of both the sage and the sovereign. The continuation of the story of the book’s history places these two goals of the *translatio* of the work in opposition: is the work to be translated and brought to the monarch (who will then decide how to use it), or is it to be given to courtly circles for their own education and benefit? What the continuation does not confound, nonetheless, is that the person who moves the work is indisputably a sage.

The insertion of the colophon at the end of the work, through relating another act of *translatio*, can also be understood as a continuation of the story about the book’s history. The colophon participates in the continuation of the story by fixing a time and
agent of the singular act of *translatio*. Without the colophon, the *traducción* of the work would be inferred from language of the text, but knowledge of when, where, and by whom would remain unknown. Similarly, the *traslación* of the work, the movement of the physical object, would also be evident, but equally obscure in history. The colophon is a continuation because it unites these two aspects of *translatio* under the activity of named character, Alfonso X. The already established story of the works *translatio* through languages, time, and space, colonizes the colophon in order to complete the informational gaps that the Alfonsine continuation leaves out. Once the reader determines the colophon to be a successful continuation of the story of the book’s history, the previous introductions can colonize the image of Alfonso X presented in the colophon, making him another Berzebuey, another Khosrau I, and another Ibn al-Muqaffâ’ (Zeitler 194).

Re-imagining Alfonso X through the characters of the introductions, however, is also an act of re-imagining Castile, as kings and their kingdoms are each metonyms for the other, like two sides of a coin. The cultural contexts of Berzebuey, of Khosrau I, and of Ibn al-Muqaffâ’, all previous moments of *translatio*, would similarly colonize the reader’s imagined vision of Castile under Alfonso X. The colophon, through the acts of colonization that it enables, participates in opening a space for the work’s reception in Castile as symbolic of greatness to come. As the introductions portray through the telling of the book’s *translatio*, each movement of the text is paired with the flourishing of a civilization. The arrival of the text in Persia coincides with the flowering of the Second Golden Age of the Persian Empire under Khosrau I, whose accomplishments and
reknown were so great that for the Arabs, his name became a metonym for all Sasanian rulers ("Kisra"), similarly to how in Europe the name Caesar came to title all Roman rulers (Frye 325). Although the *Panchatantra* was not originally associated with empire, the story of its movement from India to Persia cannot be separated from the context of the military and political expansion of Khosrau I’s rule. As an historical figure, Khosrau I embodied both ideals through expanding his kingdom’s importance both in territory and cultural projects (Frye 325). The movement of the book from Persia to Bagdad occurred under similar circumstances. The expansion of Islam in the seventh and eighth centuries was followed by what has been deemed the Islamic Golden Age, and the *translatio* of the work, along with many other texts, marks the beginning of the flourishing cultural and political empire under Islam (Zeitler 185). The text, object of wisdom and means for accessing that object, through its various stages of *translatio* in connection with the burgeoning of civilizations symbolically becomes an example of what a civilization acquires on the precipice of prominence.

Ibn al-Muqaffa’ may have already been making this point when he inserted his introduction at the front of the work and subjugated the previous prologues to the role of chapters. While not framed by the diegesis of King Diçelem and his counselor Burduben, the introduction by al-Muqaffa’ already contains within it five *exempla* and its conclusion explicitly asks the reader to read his introduction as an *exemplum*: “Pues el que este libro leyere piense en este enxenplo et començe en él, ca quien sopiere lo que en él está escusará con él otros, si Dios quisiere” (98). The two chapters about Berzebuey, and
about the *translatio* of the book from India to Persia, are not just historical information, but examples that should be considered both for understanding al-Muqaffa’s introduction and for the benefit of one’s life. Al-Muqaffa, through his introduction that turns itself into an *exemplum*, creates a Chinese box effect for reading the entire collection that can only end with the work itself becoming an example for the greatness of the culture that possesses it.

Wacks and Zeitler have both written about the “act of translation” and what bringing the work into Castilian meant, how it affected the literary polysystems of its new milieu, and particularly how the translation of the work was made possible through, and was symbolic of, the expanding hegemony of Christian kingdoms in the peninsula (Wacks 128; Zeitler 192). More than a spoil of war, the *translatio* of the work, as these scholars have discussed, altered the literary landscape of Castile and “set the stage” for the emergence of the frametale in European vernacular (Wacks 128). But it also altered the way that thirteenth-century Castile would tell its history. After the translation of *CeD*, as will be seen in Chapter Four of this dissertation, the discourse of the Reconquest shifts away from the language of Crusade and towards that of the pursuit of wisdom. Successful conquest becomes contingent on wise rulers, and the quest for wisdom becomes the means through which expansive power naturally accumulates under the patron of wisdom. While his father was successful on the battlefield, Alfonso as an *infante* knew that in order to reach the heights of glory, such as Emperor Khosrau I or Caliph al-Mansur, one had to pursue wisdom. The translation of *CeD*, while initially serving as an
example of the spoils of conquest, tells a different story of the infante’s goals through its instruction in frame/tale reading strategies and the multiple continuations which build a secondary story of the work’s history. Alfonso, still infante, uses the Calila e Dimna to distinguish his participation in the Reconquest from that of his father, telling a story of a prince who successfully ventured beyond the borders of his kingdom to obtain the wisdom that would bring about the next great civilization in history. Like the work itself that is wisdom and the means to access it, the Castilian Calila e Dimna becomes symbolic of both the reason to conquer al-Andalus, as well as the success of Castile in that endeavor.
Chapter 4: Sendebar:¹ A Literary Rebellion

The story of Sinbad is believed to have had its origin in India and to have migrated from East to West like the other popular short-story collections of Calila e Dimna, Barlaam y Josafat, and the Thousand and One Arabian Nights.² While distant relatives of the story existed in the West at the same time, the version of the story that

¹ Sendebar will always refer to the Castilian text that Fadrique had translated in 1253. Sinbad will always refer to the Eastern branch of the story-cycle (found in Hebrew, Greek, Persian, and Castilian). Seven Sages of Rome (=SSR) will refer to the Western branch, where seven wise men replace the character of the teacher (Sinbad, Syntipas, Sendebar, Çendebute, etc.).

² A review of the translation history of Sendebar from India to Castile is described by George T. Artola (40-42); Fradejas Lebrero (9-13); Gómez Redondo (214-16); Haro Cortés (Los compendios 32-35); Lacarra (Cuentística 22-31; Sendebar 13-21); Orazi (20-24); and Palencia (311-12). Morris Epstein explores the influence of Jewish intellectuals on its translation history in “Mishle Sendebar: New Light on the Transmission of Folklore from East to West” and Tales of Sendebar (3-37). In support of a Persian or Near East origin of the work, see B. E. Perry (84-94), also reviewed in Lacarra’s introduction to Cuentos de la edad media (23). Artola explains the translation history of the names Çendebute and Alcos (40-41).
emerged in Iberia during the second half of the thirteenth century belongs to an Eastern tradition of story-telling and wisdom literature which should not be confused with the appearance of the Western branch known as The Seven Sages of Rome. The movement of the text through the Islamic Golden Age, and the cultural domestication of the story that occurred, additionally influenced the text’s content and reception. While Sendebar is solidly a part of the Castilian literary canon, an appreciation for the narrative techniques of Arabic adab literature are critical when approaching the work. The only extant version that has survived in manuscript form of Sendebar is from the late-fourteenth or early-fifteenth century, and is found within the codex Puñonrostro, now known as MS 15 of the Real Academia Española.

The fifteenth-century manuscript status of RAE 15, however, does not automatically lead us to an appreciation of thirteenth-century reading practices and the

3 Patricia Cañizares Ferriz discusses the differences between the Eastern and Western branches of the Sinbad-cycle (21-22).

4 Lacarra (Cuentística 30-31; Sendebar 18-19) explains the dating of the translation of the work from Arabic to Castilian to 1253 opposed to the year stated in the manuscript, 1291. The earlier date also resolves any possible confusion over the patronage of the work, which was ordered to be made by Fernando III’s segundón, the infante don Fadrique. The only extant manuscript copy of Fadrique’s translation project is found in RAE 15. Two years earlier, 1251, Calila e Dimna was brought into Castilian from Arabic under the order of then infante don Alfonso, soon to be Alfonso X.
multicultural space in which *Sendebar* would have been read. Burgoyne, for example, suggests that RAE 15 is an anthology designed as a sourcebook for preachers, but one of his main arguments is that the inclusion of the *Conde Lucanor*, and I would add *Sendebar*, is a result of the reading practice of its fifteenth-century compiler, and should not be used to limit the horizon of expectations to solely the ecclesiastical realm (*Reading* 143). As mentioned, RAE 15 has the only known version of *Sendebar*, and study of the work has been complicated due to damage to the folios and errors in the text, some so grave that they render the text illegible. Errors and emendations, however, can

---

5 The probable use of *Sendebar* for the instruction of the nobility or monarchy is treated by Lacarra (*Sendebar* 41), Gómez Redondo (180-82), and Orazi (17-19, 32-38). For studies dealing with medieval hermeneutics and *exempla* see Burgoyne (“Flowers”), de Looze, Palafóx (*Las éticas*), Seidenspinner-Núñez, Walde Moheno.

6 RAE 15 contains secular and non-secular works related to the conduct of the nobility, as exampled by the list of titles fols. 1ra-62vb *Conde Lucanor*; fols. 63ra-79vb *El libro de los engaños*; fols. 80ra-85ra *Glosa del Pater Noster*; fols. 85ra-va *Testamento*; fols. 85va-86v *Carta de Gobernación de la Casa*; fols. 87ra-159vb *Lucidario*.

7 Artola (38-39), Bravo, (358-71), Keller (*El libro de los engaños* xi-xii), Lacarra (*Sendebar* 49-51), and Orazi (63-66) all discuss the errors, emendations, and particularities of the manuscript text. On the debate over how to title the collection, see Artola (39-40), Keller (*El libro de los engaños* vi), and Lacarra (*Sendebar* 49, footnote 41).
potentially provide insight into the reading practices and expectations of medieval readers; for example, in the case of Sendebar we believe the scribe mistakenly read the word in his exemplar “India”, and confused a gothic “n” for a “u”, copying the word as “Judea” in RAE 15 (Keller, El libro de los engaños xi). Another important observation made by Keller is the emendation made to the word engañados in the prologue of the work by a second hand, most likely of the sixteenth century. Keller suggests that the amender crossed out the letters “-ad-” from the text, changing the word engañados to engaños, effectively making the title Libro de los engaños, rather than Libro de los engañados (El libro de los engaños vi). The former title prepares a reader for a misogynist reading about the “wiles of women”, where the latter points the reader towards considering how one is tricked or possibly even what tricks prove successful, with whom, and why. Additional information about a work can also be extracted by observing the organizational methods of the text on the page, such as sections divided by rubricated running titles.\textsuperscript{8} In Sendebar, these rubricated running titles do not match up perfectly with observed organizational practices in the SSR.

Aside from running titles, there are no other methods to index the divisions within the narrative. Central to my understanding of the didactic lesson of the collection is the fact that the manuscript does not include a separate running title for the interpolated tale “Leo”, but rather includes it under the running title of the second enxenplo of the work. Although it has been suggested that an error occurred at some point during the

\textsuperscript{8} For more on medieval book organization and reading practices, see Malcolm Parkes.
transmission history of the collection, which resulted in the accidental inclusion of “Leo” within the second enxenplo, a cursory look at the running titles in Sendebar reveal that the collection is not organized by the interpolated status of the stories. The first three running titles as they appear in the manuscript sufficiently demonstrate that what the collection explicitly calls an enxenplo is not limited to the interpolated tales, and that the framing material for the work, the diegetic level of King Alcos and his court, is also presented as exemplary content: “enxenplo del consejo de su muger”, “enxenplo de la muger, en cómo apartó al Infante en el palacio e cómo, por lo que ella le dixo, olvidó lo que castigara su maestro”, and “enxenplo del omne e de la muger e del papagayo e de su moça” (63r-66v).  

The general organization of the work, and its plot, is as follows: There is a prologue, containing a description of when and why don Fadrique ordered the book to be translated from Arabic into Castilian, and it is from the prologue that scholars have selected the title, Libro de los engaños, though whether it contains the title is highly debatable. There is a main story, or frame, that opens in the first two enxenplos and is

\[9\] Citations of text and transcription style of Sendebar are from Lacarra’s edition. For references to the manuscript, see the facsimile edition of RAE 15, Codice de Puñonrostro: El Conde Lucanor y otros textos medievales, published by the Real Academia Española.

\[10\] I use the tradition terms for the sequences of the work, though the manuscript does not
the primary diegesis of the story. It consists of a description of the heirless King Alcos, how he comes to have a son and the troubles regarding the Infante’s education, and the requirement to not speak for seven days. The introduction of the madrastra, King Alcos’s new favorite wife, occurs in the second enxenplo and describes how she proposes to the mute Infante that they kill the king and rule together, which he rejects. This prompts her to falsely accuse the Infante of trying to violate her, which in turn incites the King to order his execution. The intervention of one of the four sabios, who also happens to be the first privado, tells the first interpolated exemplum, recognized as the start of what has been called “the trial”. The trial starts in enxenplo two, and ends with enxenplo XX. In it, over the course of six more days, the madrastra attempts to persuade King Alcos to execute the Infante, while the privados attempt to delay the execution. The section where the Infante demonstrates his successful education starts on the eighth day. In enxenplo XXI, the Infante speaks, and he reports the truth about the madrastra and have any of these organizational items.

11 According to Artola: “The Pahlavi translator, one may suppose, made mention of King Khusrū, which through the Syriac version was interpreted by the Arabic translator as Al-Khsr (without vowel-pointing) and the name was ultimately transcribed Alcos in our Spanish text” (41). This is the same Khosrau I that is found in Calila e Dimna who allows the physician Berzebuey to journey to India where he find the writings of sages to bring back to Persia.
then tells his own five exempla, XXII-XXVI. At the end of what is still enxempllo XXVI, the madrastra is put to death, and the work ends.

This chapter proposes three main conclusions: first, that it is important to read Sendebar as a Castilian original, as opposed to a version of the SSR that must be corrected in order to better fit the structure and reading of the works that make up its greater family; second, that the theme of good governance through the avoidance of saña, not the theme of misogyny, emerges as the unifying topic of Sendebar; and third, that

---

12 The word saña in Medieval Spanish maintains its base meaning of insanity, irrationality, and madness and with a shift towards “rage” and “fury”, as in “furor, enojo ciego” (Alonso, “saña”). I understand the meaning of saña as rational cognitive functioning overtaken by emotional anger. The word is rooted in the Latin insanía, defined as “I. unsoundness of mind. A. a disease, madness, insanity B. as a personal quality, madness, frenzy, folly, senselessness” (Lewis and Short, “insanía”). Fradejas Lebrero (21-23) and Gómez-Redondo (224-31) have similar readings of Sendebar which argue that “saña/ira regia” is a negative characteristic of the monarch, but maintain that this error is corrected by the wise men and the Infante. Agapito Rey reviews the frequent discussion of the humors and personality types in wisdom literature, and of particular interest here is the description of persons of a choleric nature: “Aman justicia, pero no sirven para ejecutarla, pues dominados por la cólera son como carniceros, crueles y vengativos; cuando se les pasa se arrepienten” (98). For more on Alfonso X’s cultural
by uniting the text with the theme of *saña* in relation to wisdom and rulers, a possible thirteenth-century reading of the work challenges the cultural campaign of Alfonso X, which sought to recast his image as a sovereign who possessed and had access to arcane knowledge and wisdom.¹³

The first topic occupies the first section of this chapter, and discusses the differences between *Sendebar* and *SSR* in order to show why the Castilian text should be read differently. I conclude the first section by comparing a reading of the frame/tale “Leo” in *Sendebar* with the one of the *Mishle Sendebar* (the Hebrew version, considered the closest one to the Castilian version) in order to emphasize that even within the “Eastern” branch of the family of this frame/tale collection, the Castilian text has significant and meaningful differences. In the second section of this chapter, I focus my attention on the story “Leo” and its particular usage within *Sendebar* in order to demonstrate its central role in understanding the meaning of the work as a whole.¹⁴ The campaign, see Burns, ed., Fierro, “Alfonso X ‘The Wise’: The Last Almohad Caliph?”, and O’Callaghan.

¹³ For studies dealing with *compendios de castigos* and ideologies of royal authority in thirteenth-century Castile see Bizzari, Gómez Redondo, Haro Cortés, Lacarra, Palafóx.

¹⁴ I will use the word *exemplum* (pl. *exempla*) as the term for the medieval practice of using “examples”, whereas *enxenplo* (pl. *enxenplos*) refers specifically to those sections of *Sendebar* as found in Real Academia Española, MS 15 that are divided by rubricated
third section of this chapter serves as the conclusion, in which I situate my reading of the text in the socio-political milieu of 1253 in order to propose a possible interpretation of the work by contemporary Castilian elites that is critical of Alfonso X.

*Distinguishing Sendebar from the Seven Sages of Rome*

The second book of Castilian prose fiction was translated out of Arabic and into Castilian in 1253 under the order of the *infante* don Fadrique, the second son of the late king, Fernando III, and brother of the residing monarch, Alfonso X. Amador de los Ríos first described the text in 1863 and gave it the title *Libro de los engaños*, and subsequently, in 1869, Domenico Comparetti published the first edition under the title *Libro di Sindibad* and immediately located it within the *Sindbad/Seven Sages of Rome* (=SSR) story-cycle, “che ha per base comune il racconto dei *Sette Savi*” (1). Two of the unfortunate outcomes of his observation and categorization of *Sendebar* has been a critical tradition that is, first, almost exclusively comparative in nature and, second, has a tendency to highlight either its differences or similarities to the story-cycle of the SSR.

Running titles. *Exempla*, according to this division, are always on a different diacritic level to the plot and are either told or enacted by the protagonists of the tale. To distinguish these interpolated elements within the story from the paratextual reading aid of the rubricated, running title divisions within the manuscript, I will refer to *exempla* by their apocryphal, Latin titles (‘Leo’, ‘Lac venenatum’, ‘Puer 5 annorum’, etc.) when possible, or by direct citation.
This has led the modern history of reception to primarily focus on Western traditions when approaching Sendebar. The association has also led to a critical reception of Sendebar that seeks to interpret it through the drama and structure of the SSR because the two have always been connected in the minds of scholars. While the general story is loosely maintained in both branches, differences abound. John E. Keller asserts that, “whatever its genesis may have been, the western branch differs so radically from all the members of the eastern branch that it must have separate treatment and classification” (“Some Stylistic” 5). Despite the differences between the two branches, much of the critical bibliography on Sendebar attempts to correct the imperfections of the Castilian text through addressing the sources and historical transmission of the work in constant comparison with the SSR. The consequence of reading and editing Sendebar through our knowledge of the SSR is that the particular nuances of the Castilian work are suppressed, ignored, or corrected. Some examples of the effects of this critical reception, which I will discuss individually, include the confusion of the distinct roles and characters of the

15 Cañizares Ferriz’s work focuses on the later translations from Latin of the SSR, but does discuss Sendebar and the differences between the two branches (21-22); Epstein argues that the Hebrew version is the source text for both branches (Tales of Sendebar 31-37). Lacarra (Cuentística 28-30, Sendebar 13-21), Fradejas Lebrero (“Introducción” 9-13), Cañizares Ferriz (21-24), Kantor (“Introducción” 9-33), Keller (El libro de los engaños viii-xi) and Orazi (21-22) all discuss the genealogy of Sendebar and the diversity of exempla found in Sendebar compared to the SSR.
sabios and the privados, ignoring the enxenplo of the madrastra on the seventh day, and
the preference to separate the interpolated story “Leo” from the larger enxenplo in which
it appears in the manuscript. These changes have led scholars to impose readings that
may not be as accurately applied to the Sendebar as to the SSR. One consequence of
concern for this dissertation is that they suppress the complicated use of diegetic levels
found in the Sendebar that opens up the whole work for consideration as the site of
didactic instruction, rather than only the contest between the madrastra and the privados.

Although in other versions there are either sages or counselors, Sendebar contains
both. The sabios are in charge of education and divination/astrological readings, whereas
privados specifically counsel King Alcos on formal matters. The confusion between the
sabios and the privados often causes scholars to collapse both of these societal roles into
one, muddying the differences between then, eliminating structural ties throughout the
work, and obscuring possible allusions. One reason this confusion occurs is that one
character performs the role of both sabio and privado (the first privado to speak, 66r).
Critical editions tend either describe the shift from sabios to privados as incoherent or
simply edit out the difference in numbers between the four sages and the seven
counselors so that the number is always seven and the words sabio and privado become
interchangeable terms (Lacarra Sendebar 76).

Maintaining the separation between these two roles, however, is important, as the
text certainly portrays sabios as being diviners and masters of secret knowledge, whereas
the privados are advisors on practical matter and not associated with the occult. For
example, after the birth of the infante, King Alcos calls all the sages of the land to come
and read the prince’s horoscope: “enbió el Rey por quantos sabios avía en todo su regno, que viniesen a él e que catasen la ora e el punto en que nasçiera su fijo […] E díxoles: - Catad su estrella del mi fijo e vet qué verná su fazienda” (67). The sabios drop out of the text for the seven days of the trial, but as soon as the infante speaks again, and is therefore able to be tested in his education, the sages return to the plot. Their role as diviners and educators is also what separates Çendebute from the privados, as he educates the prince and reads his horoscope before returning him to his father in the palace. The loss of this distinction also obscures a possibly important allusion in the text to the Book of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar orders the Chaldeans to educate Daniel and his companions, and when none of his sages can explain his dreams he threatens to kill them all. Daniel humbles himself before God and is blessed with true divination, and he saves everyone from the king’s wrath and Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges the supremacy of Daniel’s god, to the chagrin of the Chaldeans. Daniel is raised above all of the other wise men as counselor, and he and his companions are placed in control of the province of Babylon (Dan. 2.1-49). While the allusion is not completely erased through the confusion of these distinct character types, maintaining the separation does allow a more direct comparison between the sabios of Sendebar and the Chaldeans of Daniel, a connection that I believe to be important for the overall meaning of the work.

Another difference between Sendebar and the SSR is the last enxenplo of the madrastra. Whereas in the SSR the madrastra tells another exemplum like any of the other days, in Sendebar she enacts her example. The running title states: “Enxenplo de cómo vino la muger al setano día ant’el Rey quexándose, e dixo que se quería quemar, e
el Rey mandó matar su fijo apriesa, antes qu’ella se quemase”; and, as the running title explains, on the seventh day the step-mother builds a pyre around herself and orders that she be burnt (74r). The exemplum, however, is not actually told by the wife, but rather it is enacted. The wife, following the development and articulation of emotionally based rhetorical techniques, makes manifest the true importance of wisdom in its application to the world by physically becoming the persuasive practice of telling exempla. At this point the King once again (“ante que se quemase”) orders his son’s death, but the seventh counselor steps in before it can happen and persuades the King to not kill him that day.¹⁶ Unlike the other interpolated tales, this “enxenplo” occurs on the same diegetic level as the main frame of the collection. Similarly to the way the Lion and the Ox in Calila e Dimna both read each other as exempla, here King Alcos must interpret the meaning of the madrastra’s actions and apply the message to his current situation in life, as she becomes her own exemplum.

A third distinguishing feature in Sendebar is the final interpolated story of the collection, “Enxenplo de la muger e del clerigo e del frayle” (apocryphally given the name “Abbas”, 79v). Told by the Infante, “Abbas” is not found in any other version, and is believed to be an addition by the translator. It has interesting elements that connect it to the first interpolated exemplum of the collection, “Leo”, but many comparative studies simply leave it out of the discussion due to it being unique to the Castilian Sendebar. Similarly to the distinction between sabios and privados, the connections between this

¹⁶ See Walde Moheno for a reading on the Madrastra’s failures at wielding rhetoric.
final exemplum and the first interpolated story of “Leo” leads readers of the work to
compare the content of Sendebar, often across diegetic divides.

Finally, there is the case of the interpolated tale “Leo”, the discussion of which
will occupy the rest of this section and much of the next. While there are versions that do
not have running titles or organizational aids, as mentioned above, Sendebar does.
Nonetheless, “Leo” does not have its own running title as a separate “enxenplo”, as do
the other exempla that are interpolated during the period of the trial. Bravo (358-71),
Lacarra (Sendebar 81-81) and Orazi (Sendebar 39-42) all recognize the symbolic
importance of the story “Leo”, but because they separate this story from the running title
to which it belongs in the manuscript, their reading changes the context of the story from
being a counter-example to the first half of the second enxenplo to the first exemplum
within the context of the trial. In contrast, the divisions within the manuscript require us
to look at the encounter between the Infante and the madrastra and the subsequent telling
of “Leo” by one of the wise men as part of a single framed enxenplo, despite their distinct
diegeses.

Through focusing on these differences, I believe the Sendebar also displays a
variety of metadiegetic techniques that teach a similar “hidden lesson” as seen in Calila e
Dimna. In no place in the text is this better seen than in the interpolated frame/tale of
“Leo”.

As can be seen by the rubricated running title, the second enxenplo of the
collection is called “enxenplo dela muger en como aparto al ynfante enel palaçio et como
por lo que ella le dixo oluido lo que le castigara su maestro”, yet in the middle of this
second *exemplum* is “Leo”, with no title or indication that it is separate from the framing material. At the moment of this interpolated *exemplum* in the story, we are presented with a Chinase box of *exempla*, first with the *exemplum* about a King, Alcos, who is about to receive an *exemplum* from one of his *privados*.

The purpose of telling “Leo” is to convince King Alcos not to execute the *Infante*, and the first *exemplum* of the first *privado* is as follows:

There once was a king whose love of women was his only fault. One day he spotted a woman, but when approached she replied that she could not submit on account of her husband. The king sent the husband away, and the woman acquiesced. The king went to her house, and she gave him a book to read, while she prepared herself. The king, shameful of his intention after reading about the laws of rulers, left, but forgot his shoes. The husband returned, but on seeing the shoes decided never again to sleep with his wife. The wife told her family, and they got the husband and all went to the king. They then told an allegory to the king about having given the husband land, which he would not longer labor. The husband told the king that he saw a sign that a lion had been there, and he was afraid to return. The king told the man that the lion had done no harm, and that he was to return and work his land. The man then questioned his wife, and she verified the king’s story, and he trusted her more than ever before.

A closer look at the text shows how the metadiegetic techniques are put on display. First, the book the chaste wife gives the king is suggestive of an *especulum principis*, or *compendio de castigos*: “diol vn libro de su marido en q<ue> auia leyes (2 Juyzios delos rreyes de como escarme<n>taua<n> alas muger<r>s q<ue> fazia<n>
adulterio (2 (2 dixo señor ley por ese libro fasta q<ue> me afeynte (2 el rey abrio el libro” (66r). Within the *compendio de castigos* of *Sendebar*, is a primary story example about a king hearing *exempla*, one of which is a story about a king who corrects his error from reading a *compendio de castigos*. Next, in Leo, the chaste wife’s family decides to give the king an *enxenplo*, creating a similar embedding of an *enxenplo*, within an *enxenplo*, as the *compendio de castigos* did just before. But unlike the *compendio de castigos*, the family explains what they are doing: “dixero<n> vayamos al rey (2 agora demos le enxenplo de aq<ue>ste hecho dela muger et no<n> le declaremos el hecho dela muger (2 si el entendido fuere luego lo entendera” (66v). The statement displays how life circumstances, the “hecho de la mujer”, can be made into *exempla*, and how a good king, if he is “entendido”, would understand the *exemplum* and be able to unpack it and give sound counsel.

This metadiegetic content is unique to the Castilian *Sendebar*. For example, in the Hebrew text *Mishle Sendebar*, where “Leo” is also the first *exemplum* told in defense of the *Infante*, there are no running titles distinguishing any of the interpolated stories. Furthermore, the story itself lacks the explicit metadiegetic techniques just observed in the Castilian text. First, the wife gives the king scripture to read, but the content of the book is deduced and not declared as in *Sendebar*:

Then she took a certain book and placed the book open before him and said to him: ‘Let my lord read in this book until I come to you.’ And the king read in the book and he found it was written therein: ‘And the man that lieth, etc.’ And she fled from door to door unto her father’s home. And the king sat in the house. And
when the king saw that the woman did not come, he was very remorseful and he hastened and arose and went to his house. And he forgot to take with him the golden scepter which was in his hand. (Epstein Tales 95)

The book the wife gives the King in Mishle Sendebar is a moral code, being from Leviticus 20.12, though 20.12 is against homosexuality and 20.10 would have been more appropriate for adultery (Epstein Tales 95). Furthermore, the king did not correct his failed morals, but rather is actually tricked by the woman. He left because he realized she had left, where in Sendebar, the king corrects his inappropriate action and leaves while she is still present and preparing herself. The story continues:

And she told her father and brother the words of the king. Then they arose and went to the king and cried out before him, saying: ‘Our lord king! Concerning a certain man do we cry out. If it be your will, order him to appear before you!’[…]

And the king understood the meaning of their allegory/riddle and he said to the husband: ‘It is true that the lion did come there and found the cluster of grapes lovely and good; he did not however eat of the fruit nor did he break down the fence, nor will [h]e return there again.’ And the man returned to his wife’s house as before, and the king was very remorseful concerning his scepter and his shame.’

‘And so my lord, do not trust in the words of a woman […]’

(Epstein Tales 97-101)

In Mishle Sendebar, the family is not testing the king to see if he is “entendido”, as is the case in Sendebar. Furthermore, the king in the Hebrew text is not depicted as
powerful, but defeated. While they both communicate that the Lion did no harm, the King in Sendebar corrects the man’s behavior by telling him to “take his land and work it”, whereas in Mishle Sendebar, the focus is on the king’s failure, as he assures the man that he will not try to seduce his wife again. Additionally, the text then returns to this failed king again, and states that “the king was very remorseful concerning his scepter and his shame”, implying a type of impotence on the part of the king: he has lost his scepter, a phallic metaphor for both his potency as a king as well as his ability to successfully copulate. This is then confirmed, as the sage’s remarks about “not trusting women” can only make sense if the king was indeed tricked, fooled out of making love to the woman. In Sendebar, the king is not a failure, but rather a great ruler. The moral of the story makes more sense in the Castilian text if the husband is who erred, having decided that his wife cheated without knowing all the information. That the husband does not change his judgment easily confirms that he has learned his lesson from the king, as he prudently compares the “señales” given by the king to his wife’s story.

While the general events of the two versions are the same, the text of Mishle Sendebar does not take advantage of as many opportunities to make use of metadiegetic techniques as seen in the Castilian version. Mishle Sendebar is considered one of the closest versions to the Castilian one, both of them belong to the Eastern branch of the greater story-cycle, and yet they are significantly different. The gap separating Sendebar from the SSR is even larger, and while recognizing their familial ties for historical studies of sources and origin are certainly fruitful, scholars must be cautious and strive to avoid allowing such circumstantial information to overly influence their reading of the work.
Saña, Prudencia, and Engañados del mundo

By following the manuscript text and avoiding a subjugation of Sendebar to the organizational practices of the SSR, a different reading of the work emerges. Scholars who approach the work as adab recognize that Sendebar is concerned with the practices of good governance, but they often associate King Alcos as a model ruler, where I contend that he serves as a negative example. Through focusing first on the interpolation of “Leo” within the second enxenplo, and then applying its didactic lesson to the rest of the collection, I contend that the plot of whether or not King Alcos will have an heir is central to the work’s meaning, and that his evaluation is levied by the dichotomous theme of prudencia/saña.

The dichotomous theme of the work is present from the start. The first enxenplo is a pious illustration of submitting one’s will to God and seeking good counsel for emotionally disturbing situations. King Alcos, upset over the lack of an heir, avoids seeking counsel until his favorite wife convinces him to reveal the cause of his anxiety (65). She had previously advised him well on “algunas cosas”, so he trusted her judgment. The mental distress of the monarch is apparent—“fue muy triste e comenzó de rebolverse en la cama con muy mal cuidado que avía” (65)—but she once again provides him sound counsel (she recommends that they pray to God for assistance) and he sires an

---

17 The topic of good governance has been discussed by Deyermond (160-64), Fradejas Lebrero (21-23), Gómez-Redondo (224-34), Lacarra (Cuentística 154-68, Sendebar 24-49), Orazi, (7-50), and Palafóx (Las éticas 49-57).
heir. The first wife is one of two female characters of the framing story, and she is the wise counselor. The placement of a good woman in the first enxenplo of the collection, however, is not considered significant enough for critics to abandon the claim that the book is primarily a misogynistic work.

The second enxenplo diverges from acting on good counsel and instead takes up the practice of showing what troubles are wrought from making decisions while insanely enraged (saña). For example, the problems for the Infante begin precisely because he becomes irate. He is the first character to express saña, a negative characteristic for a future king, and the second enxenplo repeats many aspects of the Infante’s affliction when it later describes King Alcos’s rage: “tomó el moço gran saña e estonçes se olvidó lo que le castigara su maestro e todo lo que l’ mandara” (75). The king reacts to the false testimony of the madrastra in a similar way, also described as a “gran saña”, which suggests the father and son both suffer from this unfortunate trait: “[e] el Rey, cuando esto oyó, creçiól’ gran saña por matar su hijo, e fue muy bravo e mandólo matar” (75-6).

At this point in the tale we have only arrived at the start of the trial, but one can see that the examples based in the dichotomous theme of prudencia/saña actually begin with the first enxenplo.

In addition to this theme, this first diegesis of the collection (the story up to the telling of “Leo”) is characterized by a series of conflicts put in motion by a privation that
inverts the expected roles of the characters (Bravo 364). The first privation depicts King Alcos as an impotent king, unable to sire a son. Each following privation, while not directly about Alcos, nonetheless returns to the topic of his impotence and his initial privation of not having an heir. In other words, the text incessantly makes each conflict and privation about Alcos and his impotency, and by extension his (in)ability to rule. Even before the trial, the text is preparing the reader for an evaluation of King Alcos as a ruler, so the final question on a textual level should be to ask whether he is a rex potens or rex impotens.

The second enxenplo begins as the continuation of the diegesis with King Alcos into what is known as the trial, when the privados and the madrastra attempt to persuade King Alcos through the use of exempla. The first exemplum told during the trial is the interpolated tale of “Leo”. “Leo”, as mentioned, is not divided and set off by its own rubricated running title in RAE 15 as its own enxenplo; rather it is presented as part of the second enxenplo of the Castilian Sendebar (66r). The theme of prudencia/saña, along with an overarching evaluation of King Alcos’ potency, first introduced by the beginning two enxenplos, is here more specifically explored and emphasized in the juxtaposition of the two-part, second enxenplo. Editors have divided the second enxenplo into separate parts so that Sendebar coincides more structurally with the other versions of the

18 These privations are seen in an intelligent, but uneducated prince; an educated prince who is mute (unable to perform his role); a wife who desires to kill her mate; a (step)mother who tries to kill her (step)child.
SSR/Book of Sinbad cycle, but the result is that the very frames through which the reader is to make comparative analysis become altered.

In the first part of the second *exemplum*, the excess of rage is the unifying reaction of the *Infante*, stepmother, and King when confronted by potential crisis. As stated above, the *Infante* becomes enraged with *saña* at the *madrastra*’s proposition of regicide and breaks his vow of silence: “tomó el moço *gran saña* e estonçes *se olvidó* lo que le castigara su maestro e todo lo que l’ mandara” (my emphasis 75). The punishment for his thoughtless rage is that he is nearly put to death by his father. Similarly, when the stepmother hears that she has misinterpreted the “sign” of the *Infante*’s silence, which the *Infante* blurts out in rage, she displays her fury as if she had great *saña*, “entendió ella que sería en peligro de muerte e dio bozes e garpiós’ e començó de mesar sus cabellos” (75). In her state of irrational ire, the stepmother conceives of a poorly devised plan to save herself, and accuses the mute *Infante* of attempting to rape her so as to inspire the King to execute his only heir. Her plan is initially successful in that she enrages the King: “[e] el Rey, quando esto oyó, creçiól’ *gran saña* por matar su hijo, e fue muy bravo e mandólo matar” (75-6). Because in this diegesis the King’s desire to have an heir forms the largest narrative frame for the collection, the condemnation of his only son to death is an act that will cause him and his kingdom the most harm. It also would return him to

19 Palafóx discusses the importance of this first *exemplum* told by the first *privado*, stating that it funciona “como una especie de espejo, o «mise en abyme» en relación con

193
his initial point in the work – the first privation that sets the story in motion: his impotence. This is where “Leo” is interpolated.

Multiple topics are explored in “Leo” that are common throughout the collection, and the tale becomes both the nexus of the work and a guide for reading Sendebar. Central to the story’s meaning is the dichotomous theme of prudencia/sañã. The primary characters of “Leo” protect themselves from ira regia through the use of exempla, and in so doing demonstrate a way to contest royal authority or action. At the start of the story the King is reminded of his moral obligations when he reads a compendio de castigos given to him by the virtuous wife. The content description of the book, “en que avía leyes et juizios de los reyes”, communicates to the listener of the tale, King Alcos (and on a different diegesis, the reader), that it was a type of speculum principis, and that by following its advice the King corrected his own behavior (79). This first situation exhibits a prudent king who can take a text (literally, here, a book) and apply it to a situation in his personal life (his desire to sleep with the married woman) to produce a just outcome for all. The normally good judgment of the King was clouded by his emotions, in this case, lujuria, and the chaste woman assisted him in clearing his mind with a compedio de castigos.

The husband, despite his wife’s virtuous action, abandons her, and explains the case to her family directly and without the use of metaphor, stating “[y]o fallé los el resto del libro” (“E yo tomava” 78). Bravo discusses the auto-reflexive content of “Leo” by comparing it to Cortázar’s Continuidad de los parques (367).
arcorcoles del Rey en mi casa e *he miedo*, e por eso *no me oso llegar a ella*” (my emphasis, 80). The fear of *ira regia* drove the man to leave his wife, but her family convinces him to take the case to the court by suggesting the following solution:

“[v]ayamos al Rey e agora démosle enxenplo de aqueste fecho de la muger, e non le declaremos el fecho de la muger e, si él entendido fuere, luego lo entenderá” (80). The implied reasoning of the in-laws is that if the King is “entendido”, he will penetrate the “enxenplo” and learn the lesson, and a king who can successfully apply an *exemplum* to his life will also be expected to be prudent and provide a sound judgment for the case. When the husband speaks to the King, he speaks figuratively: “[v]erdat dizien, que me dieron una tierra así como ellos dizien e quando fui un día por la tierra, fallé rastro del león e ovo miedo que me conbrié. Por ende dexé la tierra por labrar” (80). This wise King understands the man’s allegorical tale, and tells him that “a lion” did enter but that it did no harm. The King then orders the man to “take your land and work it”, a command that is obeyed by the subject (80). The husband returns home to his wife, who corroborates the King’s “señales”, and the man then has more faith in her than before (81). Lacarra points out that, “[e]l Rey, que supo avergonzarse a tiempo, también sabrá interpretar el ‘enxenplo’, como tiene que hacerlo el rey Alcos”, but that Alcos does not do this is exactly the problem (82).

The two parts of “Leo”, just explored, structurally and thematically parallel the relationship of “Leo” to the first half of the second *enxenplo*. The book the chaste wife gives the king returns him to correct action, just as “Leo” is to return King Alcos to proper behavior. The King in “Leo” then unties the “enxenplo” told by the husband and
the chaste wife’s family, and uses his prudence to correct the error of his subject by ordering the man to return to his land and to work it. Similarly, Alcos should use prudence when making decisions and he should correct the error of misjudging the Infante. But the court of Alcos is ruled by emotional decision making, specifically saña, and while Alcos is provided with the exemplum of “Leo”, the reader of Sendebar is provided with the second enxeplo of the collection. What we then observe is that in “Leo” prudencia is embraced, and saña (emotional decision making) is absent, and in the court of Alcos, saña is embraced, and prudencia is absent.

Just prior to the telling of “Leo”, everyone in the royal household is overcome with saña. The Infante has just returned from six months of training to make him the wisest man in the kingdom, but despite being educated, he is unable to demonstrate his knowledge. Perhaps the education of the prince is not yet complete, and through the subsequent experiences in the world he will learn to apply his lessons to good governance, the real goal of his education. If this is correct, and the Infante has more to

20 Terms such as “life”, “experience”, and the “world” can cause confusion when discussing texts, and even more so when a work contains multiple diegetic levels in the way frametales do. I understand terms like “life”, “experience”, and “the world” to occur on the same level as the person or character occupying that diegetic level. I believe that frametale collections with an overarching frame, like Calila e Dimna, Sendebar, Conde Lucanor, 1001 Nights, The Canterbury Tales, and the Decameron, are designed to expose the relationship between diegetic levels for rhetorical and didactic purposes. They expose
learn through observing the interactions in the court over seven days, then he will repeatedly see the failure of King Alcos to prudently select good counsel and make just decisions. If the Infante originally had been taught to observe his father as a positive example of good governance, it would explain why he had failed to learn, and also why Çendebute had to remove the prince from the court in order to teach him (72). The training the Infante received outside of the court would be more theoretical than applied, since he was isolated from society, so the vow of silence may be the final aspect of his education (Bravo 366). Back in the court and unaccustomed to making learned decisions when under emotional stress, the Infante forgets both his lessons and his assigned task of keeping silent. As a result, the subsequent events will require him to observe his father while reflecting on his own failure. The Infante, like the reader, has been placed in the position of observer at the end of the first half of this exemplum that once again returns the narrative to Alcos as a rex (im)potens.

The separation of “Leo” from the larger frame reduces the scope of the critique of saña to the space of the trial and the character of King Alcos. When, however, “Leo” remains a part of the larger frame, it functions as an example of prudencia which contrasts with the negative example of saña exhibited in the first half of the exemplum. Through its juxtaposition with the first part of the exemplum, “Leo” imposes its ethical criticism onto the actions of the Infante, madrastra, and King Alcos, whose lack of differences between frames and stories; the question/problem and the exemplum; lives and texts.
prudence has brought about the very need for the trial. The comparison of these two fictional kings, then, becomes a model for the dualism throughout the text. The binary reading of Sendebar is perfectly displayed in this frame/tale, as all the basic dichotomies are neatly expressed: woman/man, saña/prudencia, madrastra/privados, silence/speech, rex impotens/rex potens.

During the course of the trial, three significant features surface while the King listens to the madrastra and the privados: 1) the debate centers on the topic of sound counsel and the king’s access to trustworthy counselors, not what decision the king should ultimately make; 2) the madrastra becomes more emotional and irrational over the course of the seven days; and 3) King Alcos is stymied and can never make his own definitive decision.

When focusing only on the interpolated stories directly connected to the trial (“Leo” through “Ingenia”), almost half of the stories end with the king being advised to either wait until he knows the truth, or to not listen to his “evil” privados. If, however, we understand “woman” to be an abstract symbol of saña personified by the madrastra and 

21 Palafóx’s article, “E yo tomava aquella masa en escuso e fazíala pan’: el lugar de la comida en el exemplum medieval, el caso del Sendebar castellano”, provides an excellent reading of “Leo” among other tales dealing with food, consumption, and disgust in Sendebar. T. A. Perry compares the Old Spanish, Hebrew, Syriac, and Latin texts of “Leo”, with particular attention given to Biblical parallels to better compare the King in “Leo” to Alcos (39-48).
developed along the binary codes presented in the second enxenplo of the text, then fifteen of the eighteen enxenplos (nineteen stories) that occupy the debate urge the king to be prudent.

Understandably, the madrastra finds it increasingly difficult to advocate both action and prudence, since she only has seven days to achieve her goal. To increase the force of her arguments she appeals to pathos, and the madrastra—the embodiment of saña—becomes more hysterical with each passing day. On the second day of the debates, she is calm and simply tells her story. On the third day, she cries and screams: “lloró y dio bozes ante el Rey” (96). On the fourth day she concludes her story by saying, “yo he fiuza que me ayudará Dios contra tus malos privados” (103). On the fifth day she threatens the King with the wrath of God, “Mas yo sé que te será demandado ante Dios”, and by the time she finishes the King is so afraid that he acquiesces without further prompting (112). On the sixth day she repeats her faith in God, insisting that He will help her against the evil sages, both before and after she tells her exemplum (121-22). On the seventh day she builds a pyre around herself and orders that she be burnt (128).

The seventh day marks the last day of silence for the Infante, the most desperate exemplum given by the madrastra, and for most critics it marks the last day of the trial, but for the thematic dichotomy of prudencia/saña, it marks the last day in which saña rules the court. During the entire trial, King Alcos cannot make a definitive, prudent decision as orders constantly change depending on his emotional state. It is only through the intervention of his privados that he does not execute the prince. One could claim that through the efforts of his privados he has learned to be prudent, but there is no indication
in the text that his decision to delay the execution of his son is any different on the seventh day than on any of the previous days. The actions of the Infante on the morning of the eighth day confirm that King Alcos has not learned anything, as the prince wakes up early to send a message to his father and ensure that the madrastra does not have an opportunity to initiate another day of litigation. It is the Infante, through speech, who brings the trial to a close, not King Alcos. But prior to the trial and then again on the eighth day King Alcos’ saña is not the exact problem within the court. The deeper problem is that he only makes decisions when emotionally motivated, and to rule, one must use prudence to make decisions, like the King in “Leo”.

King Alcos never resolves a single problem through prudent leadership, as all of his decisions are emotionally influenced. For example, during the first enxenplo the King reveals the cause of his anxiousness to his favorite wife, who is described as “aquella qu’él más quería, e era cuerda e entendida, e avía el provado en algunas cosas” (64). While this suggests that she is the favorite because of her intelligence and proven faithfulness, in the following enxenplo King Alcos places his trust in another woman, his new favorite wife, who is described as “la qual más amava e onrávala más que a todas las otras mugeres qu’él avía” (74). As T. A. Perry points out, King Alcos seems have the same weakness for beautiful women as David and Solomon, and “Leo” may be evoking the Biblical kings of Judah, symbolized by a lion, in order to suggest to Alcos, “rey en Judea”, that he not fall into the same sin of lust that brought trouble for his predecessors (42-48). King Alcos never vetted the wife of the second enxenplo, who is the madrastra for the remainder of the collection, yet he continues to take counsel from her for the
seven days of the trial. The first wife (*prudencia*) and the second wife (*saña*) personify the thematic dichotomy of the two *enxenplos*, but also illuminate the fact that King Alcos only makes decisions when emotionally compelled. If we accept Perry’s claim that Alcos has a weakness for beautiful women, it is not likely that he rationally chose to listen to the first wife because she gave good counsel, but rather that he listens to her because she is “aquella qu’él más quería”.

The general consensus is that over the course of the trial King Alcos corrects his failings, having learned to restrain his emotions and become prudent, but this claim lacks evidence. For example, once the court is called on the eighth day, King Alcos asks the court a hypothetical question as he wonders which of the four protagonists (Çendebute, himself, the *madrastra*, or the *Infante*) would have been responsible for the death of the *Infante* had he been executed. The four sages cannot agree on a judgment for the hypothetical problem, but they do provide guidance on the different ways to reasonably blame each protagonist. King Alcos, however, is unable to synthesize the information and perform the role of king in order to resolve his own question. Immediately afterward, the *Infante*’s first story, “Lac venenatum”, confounds Alcos and his court again, exposing once more that he is not a competent ruler, as he is not able to solve even fictitious problems.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\) The subjects of King Alcos’ question (Çendebute, Alcos, the *madrastra*, the *Infante*) coincide with the subjects of the *Infante*’s riddle (the guest, the host, the snake, the girl).
While the court may be afflicted by an incompetent, emotionally driven king, King Alcos is still concerned with ensuring that he has an heir. The crisis is resolved when the Infante answers the riddle to his first story, “Lac venenatum”, and King Alcos transfers oral authority to the Infante, who symbolically inherits the throne. The prince effectively outwits the King, who is unable to solve the riddle, along with the entire court. The King himself recognizes the deficiencies of his court when he says, “[t]odos estos dizien nada, mas dime tú cúya es la culpa” (140). At this point the Infante symbolically surpasses his father as king, as both King Alcos and his court turn to him for wisdom and leadership.

The topics of voice and authority are present throughout the work, making the verbal dominance of the Infante symbolic of his ascendency. As the plot transitions from the trial to the exempla told by the prince, for example, Çendebute declares that “el mayor saber que en el mundo ay es dezir”, which prompts the Infante to tell “Lac venenatum”. After the failure of the court to answer the riddle, King Alcos, Çendebute, Bravo argues that “las palabras son a la madrastra lo que el veneno es a la serpiente”, as they are both third in the sequence (Bravo 367).

Orazi argues that the frame of the trial concludes when the four wise men reappear and that the text re-initiates the frame focused on the education of the Infante (127). She contends, furthermore, that the Infante proves himself after he tells his third exemplum, “Puer 5 annorum”, since these first three exempla demonstrate his knowledge of the limits of wisdom itself (30).
and the four sages discuss the result of the Infante’s education. Çendebute rejects an offer made by the King to continue educating the prince because there is nothing more for him to teach the youth: “Señor, yo non sé cosa en el mundo que yo non le mostré, e bien creo que non la ay en el mundo, e non ay más sabio qu’él” (140). We are told through reported speech that the sages agreed, though after the King states that “[t]odos estos dizien nada” the sages never actually use direct speech again in the work, and this instance of reported speech is the final act of communication with them (140). Çendebute also becomes silent after his final declaration about the Infante’s wisdom, making King Alcos and the Infante the only characters with a voice for the remaining three enxenplos. King Alcos from the trial on almost never speaks, except with formulaic responses common to frametale traditions, so after the trial ends, effectively all members of the court eventually become silent except the prince.

24 Bravo argues that the initial silence of the Infante introduces “la dialéctica palabra / mutismo”, proposing that “[l]a totalidad del Sendebar se construye, así, en torno a un vacío estructurador -el silencio- sin el cual, sencillamente, el libro no existiría” (366).

25 King Alcos provides formulaic responses common to the framedtale genre, as evidenced in the Calila e Dimna and Conde Lucanor, during the four final exempla: “¿Cómo fueron estos más sabio que tú?” (“Puer 4 annorum” 142); “Pues, di” (“Puer 5 annorum” 145); “¿Cómo fue eso?” (“Senex caecus” 148, and “Abbas” 154). These reactions serve to portray a sense of interest, but lack agency as the Infante decides what will be told next.
The emergence of the prince as a rex potens, contrasted to the rex impotens of his father, is revealed in his powerful use of speech as a tool of persuasion and authority. The indirect statement of the wise men, which is then followed by their silence, when viewed along these lines is both a recognition that they find no fault in the Infante’s training as well as a submission to his authority. The cacophony of voices is hushed as all ears turn to hear what the Infante has to say. From this moment, at the end of “Lac venenatum”, until the conclusion of Sendebar, the Infante dominates all direct speech, essentially controlling the entire linguistic space of the court. The linguistic domination of the court by the Infante constitutes a transfer of authority as the court, including King Alcos, responds to enact the Infante’s commands, making the prince’s oral dominance symbolic of his successful inheritance of the throne.

Once the Infante has linguistic control, he demonstrates his understanding of the power of persuasive exempla and the importance of wise and prudent decision making in the real world. Over the final four enxenplos he slowly makes a shift from telling non-contextualized stories to framing exempla in order to effect change in the world. The two stories, “Puer 4 annorum” and “Puer 5 annorum”, demonstrate his control over abstract material while the “enxenplo del mercador del sándalo, e del otro mercador” aptly demonstrates the manipulative practice of meaning-making by linguistically outmaneuvering competitors. At the end of this story the Infante starts to contextualize his exempla in order to start the process of making his case to the King that the madrastra be executed, stating, “Señor, non te di este enxenplo sinon por que sepas las artes del mundo” (152). An enactment of the Infante’s new place of power is finalized when he
gives his closing exemplum about the woman who sleeps with an abbot and then manages to sneak him out of the house even after the husband has returned, “Abbas” (154). The Infante explains his story as a demonstration of the wiles of women, artfully using the rhetoric that he observed over the last seven days. He then applies his wisdom to the world and successfully incites the King to execute his deceitful madrastra.

It is also significant that this story, second to last of the collection, is a story of how those attempting to deceive (enganar) become the deceived (enganados), and how an old woman here aids the merchant in undoing the tricks of the “enganadores” of the town (149). In the story the protagonist is fooled, but with the helpful guidance of an old woman he is able to reverse the tricks played on him. For a misogynist book about the evils of women, this story does a poor job of casting women in a bad light. It is specifically the men of the town who routinely cheat foreigners, and this woman helps to save the merchant from economic ruin. Similarly, “Leo”, the first interpolated exemplum of the collection also contains a positive depiction of women, the chaste wife who provides a speculum principis to the king to help him correct his own error. Adding the first enxenplo with the wife of King Alcos, who provides him good counsel, a total of three exemplary women are presented, each at significant moments in the work. It could also be claimed that the woman from the final exemplum of the trial, “Ingenia”, is also a good woman, although she does successfully pull one over on the protagonist. The man who will not marry until he collects all the wiles of women in a book, although fooled by his host’s wife, is corrected by her trick, and abandons his impossible task. The wife of this story does not commit adultery or any other sin, although the man is certainly willing
to do so, and through her slightly embarrassing prank she teaches the man a lesson without causing him any harm. From these examples I conclude that the didactic aim of the collection is not to promote misogyny. That said, I do believe that the \textit{Infante} crafts a rhetorical argument over the course of the final two \textit{enxenplos} in order to provoke King Alcos to have the \textit{madrastra} put to death.

The subtle themes at play in the final parts of \textit{Sendebar} link the world with the wiles of women through the various warnings against being tricked in the last two \textit{exempla}. The prince contextualizes and defines the meaning of the penultimate story as a warning against “las artes del mundo”, and then further narrows the scope of his advice after the final story by saying, “señor, non te di este enxenplo sinon que non creas a las mugeres que son malas” (154). This is the world –full of \textit{enagños} and \textit{engañadores}– that the learned King must know how to decipher in order to avoid deception. The final \textit{enxenplo} of the text, furthermore, concludes with another example of the world, this time spoken metaphorically, “que dize el sabio que ‘aunque se tornase la tierra papel, el mar tinta e los peçes d’ella péndolas, que non podrían escritar las maldades de las mugeres’” (154-55). Trickery, women, and the world are all bound into the same sign in the last two \textit{enxenplos}, and even the learned King is incapable of controlling them all. The world, as the \textit{sententia} figuratively explains, becomes a book filled with the “maldades de las mugeres”, yet at the same time this book is itself insufficient to contain all the knowledge needed to resolve all problems. The young monarch achieves authority not only through demonstrating the wise self-awareness of his own shortcomings and an acknowledgment of the limitations of wisdom in the world itself, which includes that found in books, but
also by the application of prudent wisdom for making decisions in an uncontrollable world.

As this approach to *Sendebar* demonstrates, the collection itself guides its readers through its own interpretative process by providing examples and outcomes along multiple diegetic levels. The King of the story “Leo” is given a mirror for princes, with which he is to observe the good examples held within and apply them to his current life as a king. Similarly, this same King is tested with an “enxenplo” given by his people in order to determine whether he is “entendido” or not. The wise ruler can penetrate the *exempla* for application in his own life, and the good ruler employs his wisdom to resolve the problems of his kingdom.

As the story of the court of King Alcos advances over eight days, in direct comparison to the King from “Leo”, it can be seen that Alcos is not successful at prudently applying *exempla* to his own life. He is provoked to *saña* each day, and then is subsequently moved to undo the emotionally made decision. At the conclusion of the seven days during which the *Infante* did not speak, King Alcos is still stymied by the problem of the *madrastra* in his court, and it is only through the speech of the *Infante* that the trial comes to an end. Because King Alcos has shown that he cannot resolve the problem of the *madrastra*, the *Infante* implements the rhetorical strategies that he has observed over the past week and interprets the *exempla* for Alcos, walking him step by step towards the execution of the stepmother. The *Infante*, by the end of *Sendebar*, has become the king of the *exemplum* in “Leo” who uses the knowledge of books to protect himself from falling from virtue and making decisions based on his passions, while
having the ability to decipher the *exemplum* of the lion in the world. The dichotomous themes of the second *enxenplo* that recycle throughout the collection, therefore, continually return the reader to consider the evaluation of kings in order to ensure a solution to the work as a whole that appreciates the character of King Alcos from start to finish.

*King Alcos/King Alfonso and the Subversion of an Ideal*

I contend that the readership of Alfonso’s court would have understood the didactic lesson presented in the second *enxenplo* and the interpolated story “Leo”, which warns against a ruler whose decisions are emotionally driven, especially one prone to *saña*. Additionally, the readership would have applied the lesson to their contemporary political situation as their horizon of expectation would connect this style of *compendio de castigos* to other works of the *adab* tradition, which would inevitably lead them to assess the qualities of Alfonso and his court. The ‘*exemplum* of Alcos’, whether approached through the inscribed reading aids of the text itself or read in comparison with other works of *adab* literature, ultimately becomes a mirror for princes; a looking glass for the nobility to examine and compare the rulers of the world. For Castilian readers of 1253, the immediate example would be Alfonso X.

Literary history has looked favorably on the Alfonsine court, but political historians have viewed Alfonso X’s rule as one of inefficient bureaucracy and political uncertainty. While philosophically and intellectually versed, he quickly bankrupted Castile through his unsuccessful campaign to become Holy Roman Emperor and repeatedly had to stay revolts led by nobles and relations. One of the most noteworthy
family members with whom he contended was his son Sancho IV, who successfully
ascended to the throne despite not being his first-born son. Early in his rule, however,
one of his greatest adversaries was his brother, the infante don Enrique, aided by the
second eldest of the royal siblings, the infante don Fadrique. The historian H. Salvador
Martínez describes the relation between the two brothers while discussing Alfonso’s
decision to have Fadrique strangled to death in the following way:

Alfonso, tras una larga serie de conflictos personales con Fadrique, habría perdido
la paciencia con él. [...] Fadrique era amigo de complot y conjuras, a pesar de su
inteligencia y buenas cualidades. Tenía, en realidad, una personalidad
descabellada que a Alfonso le había proporcionado muchos disgustos, aliándose
con sus enemigos y corriendo aventuras en el sur de Europa y norte de África [...].
La historia de animosidad entre los dos hermanos venía de lejos. (Salvador
Martínez 409)

Fadrique was next in line for the crown, and the birth of Fernando de la Cerda in 1253
would not necessarily put Fadrique out of the running if the king were to die while the
heredero was still a child. Fadrique also ordered the Sendebar to be translated from
Arabic to Castilian this same year. Scholars today are beginning to recognize the way that

26 For more on the tragic conclusion to Alfonso X’s reign, especially concerning the
inheritance of Sancho IV, see Ballesteros-Beretta (953-1049); H. Salvador Martínez (cap.
13 and 14); and Nieto Soria (Sancho IV 37-47). For more on Alfonso’s reign, see
O’Callaghan.
the production of literature, and in particular the appropriation of wisdom literature from Arabic and Hebrew, was a conscientious means of conquest and empire building.\textsuperscript{27} The encyclopedic productions and translations of wisdom literature provided a basis for using the secular language of Castilian as a means to communicate science and philosophy, while simultaneously providing a means of extending the information to a larger audience. If Alfonso had successfully used translations and book patronage as one of many means for establishing political authority and propagating his image as a “Rey Sabio”, as my analysis of \textit{Calila e Dimna} has shown, I believe it is reasonable to look at \textit{Sendebar} as an attempt to achieve similar political objectives. Taking into consideration the relationship between Alfonso and Fadrique, however, perhaps the book was not made in appreciation and admiration of the wise king, but rather as a way of contesting his authority and cultural program of consolidating royal power and centralizing political and

\textsuperscript{27} Anthony Pym continues the metaphor of translation-as-weapon (and library-as-armory) by claiming that translations were used in conquest, and that the study of Arabic was advanced to further the conquest of Islam (24). Dodds, Menocal, and Krasner Balbale (217-39), Fierro (186-93), and Menocal (198-202) discuss the appropriation of wisdom literature and culture from the \textit{reinas taifas} by Castile under Alfonso X. Zeitler studies this topic through the specific translation and appropriation history of the \textit{Kalila wa-Dimna}, focusing on the prologues and paratexts that were added during its domestication process in Arabic, and its subsequent adoption by Alfonso X (184-96).
Comparing the events and situations in *Sendebar* with the political scene of mid-thirteenth century Castile yields an unexpected number of similarities, many of which are noted by scholars such as Alan Deyermond and Richard Kinkade. A rivalry between the two brothers for the crown of Castile is well documented. Kinkade speaks of Fadrique’s lifelong hatred of Alfonso X, which started when Alfonso first attempted to usurp Fadrique’s maternal birthright, the duchy of Swabia in 1240 (292 n30). Considering the conspiracies, appropriation of lands, robbing of titles, banishment from the kingdom, and the final execution of Fadrique in 1277, the possible underhanded attack of *Sendebar* does not appear to be an unlikely story.\(^2\) Considering that Fadrique assisted in his brother Enrique’s rebellion against Alfonso in 1255, just two years after ordering the

\(^2\) Alfonso’s attempt to consolidate royal authority is described by Ballesteros-Beretta (104-05) and Salvador Martínez (317-20). Haro Cortés (*La imagen del poder real* 54-56) and Palafóx (*Las éticas del exemplum* 49-57) discuss the relationship between literary works of late thirteenth-century Castile and political theory about the role of the king, while Nieto Soria’s *Fundamentos ideológicos del poder real en Castilla (siglos XIII-XVI)* considers the construction of the ideology of the royal image in juridical and historiographic works.

\(^2\) Ballesteros-Beretta (818-27), Deyermond (165-67), Kinkade (292, n30), and Salvador Martínez (408-18), have recognized that Fadrique participated in multiple aggressions against Alfonso.
translation of *Sendebar*, a biting portrayal of political incompetence in a book about a useless, star-gazing king, unaware of the plots against his throne, with complications of succession and difficulty in securing an heir, could have served as a useful literary weapon against Alfonso, whose throne was under constant threat throughout his reign. The first half of the decade of 1250 must have been difficult for the young king, whose first legitimate child died shortly after birth, and whose second was a girl, with little to no chance of ascending to the throne in light of the on-going fratricidal struggles. Some tranquility may have been hoped for with the birth of Fernando de la Cerda in 1253, the same year that Fadrique ordered the book to be made, but then the rebellion in 1255 which was led by his younger brother Enrique almost ended Alfonso’s rule (Deyermond 164).

As witnessed by Sancho IV’s successful rise to the throne, minority claims and the passage of succession following the line of the first-born son were not always respected. Within this context, the messages of *Sendebar*, particularly as they pertain to kingship, take on a discrete political relevance. Contemporary audiences would have initially compared Alfonso to Alcos due to familiarity with other works of a similar nature that we now recognize as *adab* literature, but additional similarities between the two monarchs would have strengthened their likeness and lead readers to a critical view of the Castilian king. For example, Alfonso’s first translation project, the *Lapidario* completed in 1250, is a book dedicated to astrology and the qualities and uses of precious
and semi-precious gems. The wise king also had a competing image as someone who was an avid reader of stars and who maintained heterodox practices, an image buttressed by his close connection with the translation projects of Toledo which some perceived as enterprises into the occult, necromancy, and arcane magic. According to Dodds, Menocal, and Krasner Balbale, “Toledo’s image as Spain’s magical center, the place where the arts of necromancy and divination flourished, would become even more entrenched under Alfonso X, the first Castilian monarch to take direct control of translation enterprise, and make scholarship itself vital to the image of kingship” (205). Later documents describe the execution of Fadrique as being connected to a reading of the heavens conducted by or for Alfonso X (Salvador Martínez 410).

Finally, Alfonso X himself had already proposed the connection between him and Khosrau I two years earlier with his translation of *Calila e Dimna*. The negative example of Khosrau I in Fadrique’s book would not be lost on readers of Alfonso’s celebrated translation, and this would hardly be the last time opponents would attempt to portray

30 Peter Linehan states that the *Lapidario* “was the earliest of the seven scientific (or pseudo-scientific) works translated from Arabic between then [1250] and the completion of the *Libro de las Cruces* in February 1259” (*Spain* 134).

31 See Ballesteros-Beretta (246), Burnett (1047), Dodds, Menocal, and Krasner Balbale (205), Salvador Martínez (566-79).
Alfonso as lacking emotional control, particularly concerning saña.\textsuperscript{32} The \textit{adab} and \textit{exemplum}, which had merged in the period and provided the literary basis for a recasting of the role of the monarch as the intellectual head of state, could also be implemented for potentially subversive discourses that highlight the fear of the abuse of royal authority. By adding on the context of the period in which \textit{Sendebar} arrives on the Castilian scene, specifically taking into consideration the patron and his noted opposition to the Alfonsine campaign, the work could have been understood as a counter-argument to the crown’s attempt to re-brand the monarchy.

In this chapter I have attempted to situate \textit{Sendebar} in its historical, social, and political milieu, and then to offer a reading of the collection based on an imagined medieval readership living at the time of its translation into Castilian. The history of the work, along with its content, places it within the tradition of Arabic \textit{adab} literature, a specific style of wisdom literature that was used for the education and correction of rulers. The society of mid-thirteenth-century Castile, and particularly the nobility of Alfonso X’s “Arabized” court, was culturally porous and intimately involved in the consumption, if not continuation, of an Andalusī cultural inheritance that produced \textit{abad} along with poetry, music, dress, food, architecture, science, and literature. I have used the manuscript evidence available to us from the only extant copy of the work to support my

\textsuperscript{32} Doubleday analyzes how antagonists sought to negatively portray Alfonso X as an emotionally unbalanced ruler who was prone to anger, and contests such a claim.
analysis and to suggest that modern scholars have relied too heavily on comparative material and scribal emendations when approaching Sendebar. I study the specific case of the second enxenplo of the text, which contains the interpolated story of “Leo”, to show how a reading based on the text of the manuscript reveals a work that is greatly concerned with the limits of royal authority, the abuse of royal power, the instability of royal inheritance, and the inconsistency of royal passions, particularly saña, as opposed to a collection of funny tales that use the wiles of women as the butt of their jokes, or a speculum principis that has little more to instruct than misogyny (Escobar 51). Misogyny abounds in Sendebar and the Sinbad/SSR-cycles, but I am not convinced that the dismissal of women’s voices is the main argument of the Castilian rendition of the work.33 The inclusion of the prudent, wise, and helpful women, along with the multiple instances that link the concept of woman with that of the world, all problematize the argument that women are only mischievous, untrustworthy, and wicked tricksters. The various exempla that depict good women are out-of-place in a collection whose very purpose is to denigrate females, yet all are quite in-place in the Castilian Sendebar. Later reading practices may have shaped the reception history of the work, leading scholars to see misogyny as its primary goal, but I contend that readers of mid-thirteenth-century Castile would have also been interested in the way the text engaged in the political topics that were currently being debated, particularly those concerning royal authority and its

33 See Cantarino for a discussion on medieval Castilian anti-feminist trends in literature, and possible symbolic meanings to creating gender binaries.
The limits of regal power were to be expanded considerably by the early legal codes proposed by Alfonso X at the beginning of his reign, projects that certainly began while Alfonso was still *heredero*. Castilian nobles revolted in 1255, and many of the complaints made were about Alfonso X’s attempt to consolidate and centralize power under the monarchy. I contend that the Castilian elite would feel their concerns exemplified in the story of King Alcos, especially only two years after Alfonso commissioned a translation of *Calila e Dimna* that sought to unite his image with that of Khosrau I. The patron of the work’s translation in 1253, Fradrique, had a deep-seated dislike for Alfonso and had the most to gain from a successful revolt. Second-born son of Fernando III, Fadrique spent four years in tutelage in the imperial court of Frederick II, his namesake, only to have his brother Alfonso X write to the Pope to contest his claim to the Duchy of Swabia (Salvador Martínez 146). A participant in the revolt of 1255, along with other conspiracies and acts of insubordination, I maintain that Fadrique would not have chosen a book to translate that could be compared favorably with Alfonso’s campaign, but rather that the mid-thirteenth-century translation of *Sendebar* represents a contestation to Alfonso’s social and cultural program. Perhaps in 1253 Enrique and Fadrique did not have the support for a full revolt against the fledgling monarch, so Fadrique turned to the very tools that Alfonso was using to build his royal image as a wise ruler, the translation of Arabic wisdom and knowledge, in an attempt to gain support for his own cause by bringing *Sendebar* to a larger Castilian audience in order to stoke the flames of rebellion.
Chapter 5: Harnessing Historiography:

*Libro de los doze sabios o Tractado de la nobleza y lealtad*

The Manuscripts and the Text

In the Introduction to his indispensable 1975 critical edition for the *Libro de los doze sabios* (=LDS), John K. Walsh asks, “Siendo tal su valor, ¿cómo se explica la escasa atención que ha recibido a manos del investigador moderno?”, a question that, lamentably, still lingers in the air. In the four decades since Walsh’s edition his question remains relevant to the field today, despite the excellent work done by a small collection of critics (7). Hugo O. Bizzarri, Marta Haro Cortés, Fernando Gómez Redondo, and François Foronda are the only scholars to carry the torch after Walsh, either through the publication of scholarly articles or the inclusion of the text within a larger monograph, and to date no one has undertaken the challenge of producing a new critical edition, despite the uncovering of a new manuscript containing the text in Oviedo in 1993.1

1 While scholars do include LDS as a source for historical research, there has been little development in the study of the work itself: Engagement with LDS is found in José Manuel Nieto Soria’s *Fundamentos ideológicos del poder real en Castilla* (siglos XIII-XVI); Francisco Márquez Villanueva’s *El concepto cultural alfonsí*; Marta Haro Cortés’ *Los compendios de castigos del siglo XIII: Técnicas narrativas y contenido ético.*
Furthermore, although academics at the Universidad de Oviedo published a manuscript edition of the newly revealed codex, the only additional attention that this discovery has received has been from scholars interested in Juan Manuel Studies, such as Jonathan Burgoyne, who recently published an article on the *viessos* of the *Conde Lucanor* which are found inserted at the end of *LDS*. The Oviedo manuscript is almost certainly the *exemplar* to the Santander codex, which also contains the *LDS* followed by the *viessos* of the *Conde Lucanor* in a similar script and organizational practice. Both codices also conclude with the *Crónica del despensero de la Reina Doña Leonor* (which describes the reigns of Castilian monarchs from Pelayo to Enrique de Trastámara). The current chapter seeks to bring together the various proposals made regarding the cohesion of the work in order to question the claim that Fernando III participated in the creation of the text, and then to posit that the *Libro de los doze sabios* is wholly a product of Alfonso X’s historical and cultural reform.

Whereas Gómez Redondo’s *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*; Haro Cortés’ *La imagen del poder real a través de los compendios de castigos castellanos del siglo XIII*; and Bizzarri’s articles all discuss the work in more detail or as a primary subject of investigation. Most recently, François Foronda has looked at the historical practice in Castilla of monarchs holding weekly open sessions with the public, with *LDS* representing possibly the oldest record of the practice in legal or political writing.
The complete text is found in six extant manuscripts and one 1502 print version. One of the six manuscripts was only recently uncovered in Oviedo and does not figure into the most recent critical edition of the work by John K. Walsh from 1975, but a critical edition of the Oviedo manuscript itself has been made. Unlike many works that were ordered to be made under Alfonso X that we possess today, none of the extant versions of LDS were produced by the royal scriptorium. The earliest version is most likely MS. 12.733 (B), housed in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, currently believed to be from the late fourteenth, or early fifteenth, century (Walsh 52). As Walsh has noted, because the codex also contains a version of López de Ayala’s Castilian translation of Boccaccio’s De casibus virorum illustrium that immediately precedes LDS, written in a different hand but on the same paper, and López de Ayala died in 1407, we can be certain that a late fourteenth-century date is the absolute earliest for the entire codex (52). My own research into the watermarks of LDS folios of the codex confirm the current beliefs about the dating of MS. B. Following Briquet’s descriptions and categorization in Papiers et filigranes des archives de Gênes 1154 à 1700, the watermark of MS. B is clearly “Trois Monts dans un cercle” (“Three Mountains in a circle”) found in examples 450, 451, 452, 456, and 458 (120). Example 450 is almost an exact match and is also the

2 All citations of LDS will be made from Walsh’s edition, except when otherwise indicated. See Uría Maqua and González Álvarez for the Oviedo text.
oldest, dating to 1394, placing a reasonable date of compilation of the manuscript to the start of the fifteenth century (237).

The presence of other texts that were not created until the late fourteenth century also assist in dating MSS. M-497 (O) and M-92 A-77 (M), respectively housed in the Biblioteca de la Universidad de Oviedo in Oviedo, Asturias and the Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo in Santander, Cantabria. Critics originally dated the Santander MS. M to the sixteenth century, but this date has now been brought into question since the discovery of MS. O, which is most likely the exemplar from which MS. M was made (Burgoyne “Los versos” 143; Uría Maqua and González Álvarez 23; Walsh 55). Contained in both manuscripts are the Libro de los doze sabios, the viessos from Juan Manuel’s Conde Lucanor, and the Crónica del despensero de la Reina Doña Leonor, in the stated order. The Crónica del despensero de la Reina Doña Leonor is the latest of the three texts as it ends with a description of Enrique de Trastámara and recognizes him as “nuestro sennor que agora reyna en Castilla e en León” (146). The limiting date of composition should then be during his reign (1369-79 AD), which supports a possible late fourteenth-century date for the completion of the manuscript. Isabel Uría Maqua and Jaime González Álvarez, editors of the Oviedo codex, however, claim two copyists worked on the manuscript and date LDS and the viessos to the first half of the fourteenth century, arguing that the inclusion of the Relación de los reyes de León y Castilla, also known as Crónica del despensero de la Reina Doña Leonor, occurred “unos sesenta años” later, placing only the final text of the codex at the end of the fourteenth or
beginning of the fifteenth century (9). My own research disagrees with this conclusion. Consistent throughout the manuscript are watermarks of what are best described as a “char à deux roues” (“two-wheeled chariot”), and following the descriptions and examples 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, and 73 found in Briquet’s collection, the earliest recorded example of such watermarks, example 67, dates from 1414 (120). Even if the three texts were copied into the codex at different times, the physical evidence of the watermark sets the earliest date of production of the paper used in the Oviedo manuscript at 1414 (146). This date, in my estimation, is still too early, given that the majority of watermarks in Briquet’s work categorized as “char à deux roues” date from the years 1428-1433 (examples 68, 69, 70, 72, and 73), where only example 67 is dated before 1428 (120). Certainly more research into the watermarks is needed, in addition to further studies into other physical aspects of the codex, but as the evidence stands today, I believe MS. O was made between 1430 and 1440.

The similarity between MS. O and MS. M is so great that MS. M is almost surely a direct copy of MS. O (Burgoyne “Los versos” 143; Uría Maqua and González Álvarez 23). Walsh (55) and Uria Maqua and González Álvarez (24) all agree that MS. M was made in the sixteenth century based on its script, orthography, and provenance. If this is the case, an early sixteenth-century date of creation is more likely, as my research into the watermarks of this codex reveal that the paper was most likely made in the late fifteenth century. The codex contains the watermark of a “gantelet” (“gantlet” or “glove”) on most of the folios and dispersed throughout the entire manuscript, suggesting that the
sheets were all made at the same time and by the same papermaker. However, complicating the matter slightly, there are variations of “gantelets” when folios are closely compared. For example, (A) on fol. 2 the flower extending from the middle finger of the glove appears to have five petals whereas that of fol. 8 appears to have six; (B) fol. 15 has a flower whose petals are touching along their edges, like a pimpernel, where fols. 2, 3, 8, and 14 the petals are separate and only touch at the carpel of the flower, like a lily; and (C) fols. 3 and 8 have a heart-shape on the cuff, fols. 13 and 14 the heart is upside-down, and fols. 2 and 15 appear to have a fold for the cuff but no heart. Briquet dates the use of the “gantelet” watermark from 1440 to 1598 (91). According to Briquet’s dating, the watermarks in MS. M most likely pertains to “gantelet type c”, which was commonly made between 1471 and 1495 (92). While Briquet has examples of later marks that are similar, a clear shift in trends occurs late in the fifteenth century where papermakers more frequently included significant letters or personal initials in or below the glove as a way to distinguish their product while using a popular image for watermarks (91-92). It is more likely that the paper made for MS. M predates this trend, suggesting that it was made late in the fifteenth (or very early in the sixteenth century).

The only other version of LDS that could possibly be of early composition is MS. &.II.8 (E) which is housed in the Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, in San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Madrid. The codex contains other didactic works such as Flores de filosofía and Tratado de la comunidad, and was most likely compiled during the fifteenth or sixteenth century, but the texts of Tratado de la comunidad and
Tractado de nobleza y lealtad. Compuesto por doce sabios: por mandado del muy noble rey don Fernando: que ganó a sevilla (another title for our work in question, LDS), which were made by the same hand, may have been written as early as the end of the fourteenth century (Walsh 54). The title for our work is a modern addition to the manuscript. The codex itself is a compilation of multiple manuscripts, so using information from works made with different paper or written by other hands would only assist scholars in dating the copying of LDS through very detailed comparative work, assuming the other works can be accurately dated. Fortunately, the folios containing LDS also have watermarks; unfortunately, the “couronne” (“crown”) is one of the more common and long-lasting watermarks used by papermakers, extending from 1313 to 1499 (80). The “couronne” of MS. E appears to be most closely related to “type b” (from 1381) or one of the eighteen (or more) varieties of “type d” (found from 1424 to 1499), and is most similar to example 188, dated to 1381, and example 192, dated to 1424 (81). The watermark from MS. E in shape is closest to example 188, except that example 188 lacks a second half-circle line making a band around the bottom part of the crown. The shape of the watermark is also very close to that of example 192, which contains the band, except the points of the crown are more like those of example 188. Additionally, the watermark of the manuscript contains a small cross in a circle above it, a feature that no other crown in Briquet’s catalogue has (81).

3 Because such crosses occur before the fifteenth century, its appearance should not be a limiting factor in the dating, but in the future it may prove useful for identifying the
located, I conclude that LDS in MS. E was likely made between 1425 and 1435, conservatively basing my conclusion on the fact that example 192 is the earliest depiction of a crown with the band. It is almost certain that the copy was made during the first half of the fifteenth century, though a late fourteenth-century date (1381-1399) is not inconceivable, just as a production date from the first decade of the sixteenth century is also not impossible.

The final two manuscript versions of the *Libro de los doze sabios* are both housed in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. MMS. 9.934 (C) and 18.653 (D) are both dated to the eighteenth century, though Walsh agrees with the previous claim by Amador de los Ríos that MS. D is from the seventeenth century based on the handwriting (56-57). Both manuscripts appear to be copies of MS. E, but of vastly different quality. MS. C, according to Walsh, is “relativamente fiel”, whereas MS. D “[e]stá plagado de yerros y omisiones” (56-57). MS. C is part of a compilation of various manuscripts that were brought together and carries the title “Tractado dela nobleça y Lealtad comp. por 12 sabios, por mandado del Rey Don Fernando que ganó a Sevilla”. MS. D appears to have once been bound, though that is no longer the case and it now exists as loose-leafs folios.

In addition to the extant manuscript versions, there are two historical print editions of the text. The earliest is titled *Tractado dela nobleza y lealtad. Compuesto por doze sabios: por mandado del muy noble rey don Fernando que gano a sevilla* and papermaker.
contains a printer’s note by one Diego de Gumiel, at the end, that dates it to 1502. The only verified copy of the Gumiel Edition (G) is kept at the Real Biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, though another copy was once reported at the Biblioteca Colombina which has since gone missing (Walsh 57). The other edition of historical importance is that of father Burriel (1719-1762) who left his manuscript to Miguel de Manuel Rodriguez who in turn published it in the collection Memorias para la vida del santo rey don Fernando III in 1800. The edition by Burriel (ed. Burriel) was titled “Libro de la Nobleza y Lealtad”, and it appears to have used both MS. E and the 1502 ed. G as exemplars.

The structure of the work is complicated and rich. The text as found in the manuscripts is divided into a prologue and sixty-six chapters, however, contemporary criticism sub-divides the work into the following categories: the Prologue, Chapters I-XX, Chapters XXI-LXV, and Chapter LXVI.4

The Prologue introduces the setting and raison d’être of the book. Spoken from the perspective of the twelve wise men, the Prologue presents itself to be the written account of an assembly of sages convened at the request of Fernando III in order to give sound advice to rulers:

__________________________

4 This chapter will maintain the critical practice of dividing the work into the grouped sections noted above.
E señor [Fernando III], a lo que agora mandades que vos demos por escripto todas las cosas que todo príncipe e regidor de reyno debe aver en sý, e de como deve obrar en aquello que a él mismo pertenece. E otrosý de como deve regir, e castigar, e mandar, e conoçer a los del su reyno, para que vos a los nobles señores ynfantes vuestros fijos tengades esta nuestra escriptura para la estudiar e mirar en ella como en espejo. (Walsh 71)

The narrative voice is that of the twelve sages who are speaking in the first person plural, nosotros, and addressing Fernando III with the formal second person singular, vos. A common element throughout the Prologue is the “pro de las ánimas e de los cuerpos” that will be made available to the readers of the text, presumably the infantes and other future rulers of Castile and León. The Prologue ends with a general description of the content of the chapters, which is worth citing in full:

E señor, pónese luego primeramente en esta escriptura de la lealtança que deven aver los omnes en sý. E luego después de la lealtança se pone la codiçia que es cosa ynfernal, la qual es enemiga e mucho contraria de la lealtança. E después vienen las virtudes que todo rey o regidor de reyno deve aver en sý, e que tal deve ser, e que a todo regidor de reyno cunple en él ser de la sangre e señorío real, e que sea fuerte e poderoso e esforçado, e sabio e enbiso, e casto, e tenprado e sanudo, largo e escaso, amigo e enemigo, piadoso e cruel, amador de justiçia e de poca codiçia, e de buena abdiençia a las gentes. E adelante está como se entiende
cada una destas condiciones e por qué manera debe usar de cada una dellas.

(Walsh 72)

It should be noted that the only manuscript to have a title is MS. C, which was added apocryphally. The four earliest manuscripts, MMS. B, O, M, and E, have no title for the work and do not call this introductory part of the work “prólogo” or use any other categorical paratext. All other chapters are separated by running titles with calderon markers.

Chapters I-LXVI of the text are all introduced with a running title that summarizes the content of the chapter. Chapters I-XX, grouped together as the first part by critics, change from direct speech, vos, to an undefined, third-person narrator and follow the outline of the content described in the Prologue, up to and including the topic of “buena abdiençia a las gentes”. While not all of the first twenty chapters end with a series of sententiae, comprised of one sentential statement told by each of the first eleven sages and one longer series of sentential remarks given by the twelfth, the sages become absent after Chapter XVIII and do not reappear in the text until Chapter LXVI. Finally, Chapters I-XX have three possible forms: an undefined narrator describes a quality (to be followed or avoided) of an ideal ruler; a brief transitional phrase followed by the reported speech (sententiae) of the sages; or, a combination of the two, always having the section with the sententiae second. For example, Chapter III begins as follows:

Primeramente dixieron estos sabios que fuese de la sangre real, por quanto non sería cosa cunplida nin razonable que el menor regiese al mayor, nin el siervo al
El primero sabio dellos dijo: "Esfuerzo e fortaleza son señores de las batallas". El segundo sabio dijo: "Esfuerzo e fortaleza son aparicioneros de la fortuna" [...] El honzeno sabio dijo: "Esfuerzo e fortaleza son cámara de caballería e ensalzamiento de señoría, temor a los cayentes, fama onrrosa, mundano ensalzamiento". E por ende en los maníficos son gracios ynonparáviles e muy cunplideras, como fallamos que todavía el esfuerzo e fortaleza fueron vencedores e non vençidos, mas cunple que sean tenplados con seso. (Walsh 76-77)

As evidenced from the above citation, not all of the statements by all of the sages have been preserved and, occasionally, one will be skipped and the count simply continues to twelve, or, as seen above, the twelfth wise man is eliminated and all the statements are shifted down by one. The third form is a stacking of the two just seen, with the description of the ideal ruler first and the reported speech of the philosophers second. Despite expectations, eleven of the first twenty chapters correspond to the first form,
three to the second form, and six to the third form, meaning that only nine of the twenty chapters contains the lists of *sententiae*.

Chapters XXI-LXV, identified as the second part by scholars, have running titles like the first part but abandon the undefined narrator and instead use the familiar, second-person address of *tú*, as if directly speaking to the future ruler who is reading the work. The philosophers do not give maxims or sentential advice during these chapters, and there are no abstract descriptions of an ideal ruler. The length of the chapters in this section vary widely, with larger chapters tending to be first and shorter chapters coming later, though some notably short chapters do occur early on (such as Chapters XXII, XXIII, and XXV). The shortest chapters, towards the end, are sometimes only slightly longer than their running title, as is the case with Chapter LXIII, which has the title “En quel rey quando se viere en mayor poderío, que estonçes sea en mayor omildança” and reads, “Quando te vieres en mayor poderio, estonçes sea en ty maior omildança, como Dios ensalçe a los omildosos e abaxe los sobervios” (Walsh 116).

Chapter LXVI is divided from the preceding chapters and discussed on its own by scholars on account of the return of many of the styles and forms found in the Prologue and Chapters I-XX. Similarly to the Prologue, Chapter LXVI describes another assembly of philosophers, but this time it is a third person narrator and not the wise men who give the details:

Después que fynó este santo e bienaventurado rey don Fernando, que ganó a Sevilla e a Córdova e a toda la frontera de los moros, reynó el ynfante don
Alfonso, su fijo primero, heredero en estos reynos de Castilla y de León. E porque a poco tiempo después que este rey don Alfón reynó acaeció grandes discordias por algunos de los ynfantes sus hermanos e de los sus ricos omnes de Castilla e de León, faziéndose ellos todos contra este rey don Alfonso unos, por ende enbió el rey por los doze grandes sabios e filósofos que enbiara el rey don Fernando su padre para aver su consejo con ellos, así en lo espiritual como en lo tenporal, segund que lo feziera este rey santo su padre. (Walsh 117)

Alfonso listens to the sages and resolves his problem, after which the philosophers implore the king to put their wise sayings on the tomb of his father, Fernando III:

E esto así acabado, dixieron al rey estos grandes sabios: <<Señor, a nos otros parece que en sepultura de tan alto e de tan noble rey como fue el rey don Fernando vuestro padre, que tanto serviçio fizo a Dios, e que tanto enobleçió e enriqueció los sus reynos en el ganar e conquerir como él ganó e conquirió de los enemigos de la fe, que la su sepultura deste bienaventurado rey don Fernando vuestro padre deve ser titulada de los dichos de cada uno de nos otros, porque la su santa e buena memoria finque dél en el mundo para syenpre>>. (Walsh 117)

The chapter and text concludes with the *dichos* of the twelve sages in honor of Fernando III, but instead of providing advice they praise the monarch. The formula is almost identical to the previous lists of *sententiae* in earlier chapters, except that they are spoken directly to the deceased ruler:
Dixo el primer sabio dellos: <<Mejor es tu fin que tu comienzo>>. El segundo sabio dijo: <<En la muerte fallecen los saberes, e en la deste rey creció la sabiduría>> [...] El honzeno sabio dijo: <<Más conoçido serás muerto que bivo>>. El dozeno sabio dijo: <<Fasta aquí te loavan los que te conocían, e agora loarte han los que te non conoçen>>. (Walsh 118)

The similarities between this chapter and the Prologue and first twenty chapters is striking, not only because the philosophers return to give their dichos, but because they speak with the same pronoun and conjugation, vos, as in the first half of the text. Because Chapter LXVI speaks of the death of Fernando III and the ascension to the throne of Alfonso X, it is clear that, in the least, this final chapter was created after the passing of Fernando III. But how is that possible, if the Prologue and the work itself is the recorded events of an assembly of sages that Fernando III himself ordered? Is only the final chapter an addition that occurred later, or are the other stylistic and formalistic changes that occur between the Prologue and Chapter LXVI indications of addition, elision, or alteration?

*Critical Approaches to Understanding the ‘Libro de los doze sabios’ and Difficulties in Determining its Genesis*

To talk of “consensus” within the academic community with regards to these questions about LDS is a troubled endeavor in and of itself. First there is the lack of published arguments. Second, and closely related, is the scarcity of space available for exploration within the parameters staked out in the current scholarly debate. If we
maintain the veracity of the beginning and ending sections of the text, then we are only
left with the questions of “how much?” and “which parts?” Furthermore, the answer to
these questions yield little information from which to work. Walsh and Bizzarri have both
developed their theories along this model. Another approach, proposed by Gómez
Redondo, has been to question the historical veracity of the sections in question, though
his conclusion still defends a certain level of historical truth regarding the events
discussed in the text. Following the development of these arguments, which have
progressively moved towards seeing the text as more of an invention of Alfonso’s
scriptorium than primarily a work begun under Fernando III and subsequently finished by
his son, this chapter proposes that the work is solely a production of the cultural program
of Alfonso X, without any contribution by Fernando III.

To date, one problem concerning the debate over the genesis of LDS is that any
radical departure from the currently accepted conclusions on patronage would necessarily
provoke a substantial re-evaluation of both monarchs. The scholarship, therefore, has

5 The currently accepted division of the text into two parts (the first part consisting of
chapters I-XX and the second part being chapters XXI-LXV) is solely based on thematic
and linguistic elements within the work. It is now generally accepted that the author of
the “prólogo“ is the same as the author of the first part (I-XX). The addition of chapter
LXVI, which is a sort of concluding or post-text, is believed to have occurred under the
patronage of Alfonso X, most likely around the year 1255.
illuminated fascinating details about the text, on which my own work depends, but
because the framing question is almost invariably How much did Fernando III/Alfonso X
contribute to the making of the text? Criticism has accepted from the point of departure
that both kings participated in the creation of LDS. I believe a more fruitful port of
embarkment would be the question: what evidence is there to support the argument that
Fernando III had any participation in the creation of the text?

Interest in LDS, as Walsh was certainly aware, has not always been so faint. Like
many of the works within the medieval genre of wisdom literature, and specifically those
pertaining to collections of exempla and/or castigos, LDS should be considered the
medieval and early modern equivalent of a “best seller” when one takes into account the
extant collection of manuscripts we possess of the text, in addition to early print copies.
Walsh’s question about the lack of scholarly attention paid to the text becomes that much
more pressing when one considers the length and degree of popularity that the text
enjoyed for more than five hundred years, and how only in the past two hundred years
has it been essentially removed from the canon.

One possible reason for the diminished interest in the work has been the
acceptance of the text’s introducing and concluding sections as historically accurate
descriptions, more closely related to a chronicle (ie. History) than to the genre of
compendios de castigos (or simply as Literature). The belief that this material was
historically accurate may have been one of the contributing factors to its great success
over five centuries, but with the separation of texts into genres and the formalization of
disciplines during the nineteenth-century, *LDS* became a source for historical citations and little more. Apart from the recent scholars mentioned above, *LDS* is most often used to justify one or more of the following claims: one, that Fernando III was also a ruler interested in cultural reform, but that he died before being able to fulfill his aspirations; two, that Fernando III was interested and involved in the acquisition of Andalusī culture and learning; three, that Alfonso X was expanding projects already begun by his father, especially with regards to the use of the vernacular; and four, that Alfonso X was specifically educated by *LDS* and similar works of a hybridized nature.¹ These conclusions are all reasonable if we accept that the introductory and concluding sections

---

¹ Doubleday uses the *LDS* to help him construct the emotional regimes present in the court while Alfonso was an *infante* (67-69); Linehan discusses the education of the infantes Alfonso, Fadrique, and Enrique by the *LDS*, and he also reads the convocation of the *sabios* as an historical event (*Spain* 137); Salvador Martínez uses *LDS* as a central part of the political training of Alfonso X. He also discusses Gómez Redondo’s argument that *LDS* is solely a work by Alfonso X, and rejects it (85-95); Walsh discusses the education of Alfonso X and cultural aspects of the court of Fernando III in his critical edition (23-33); O’Callaghan covers the topic of law codes in the vernacular and the continuation of Fernando’s plans under Alfonso X (*A History* 450-51); and concerning the use of the vernacular as more necessary than ideological, see Márquez Villanueva (50-53).
of the work are faithful accounts of real events, a position I do not hold. Through the course of this chapter, I propose a different set of claims: one, that Fernando III had no hand in the creation of *LDS*; two, that Alfonso X, through the royal *scriptorium*, fabricated the entire work; three, *LDS* was begun by Alfonso X when the nobles declared themselves *desnaturados* in 1254, not after the rebellion in 1255; and four, the work is an imitation of the *especulum principis*, but was made for a larger courtly audience and to be read as a work of *adab* opposed to being made for training *infantes* to become monarchs, as is typically the case for the *especulum principis*.

The task of advocating for any satisfactory resolution concerning the creation of *LDS* is tenuous, but it is further complicated by the formalistic aspects of the text itself which appear inconsistent at best, or fractured and disjointed at worst. The change in verbal subjects and the disappearance of the twelve sages at chapter eighteen, the shift in the style of exposition and the noticeable reduction in chapter length of the second half of the text, and the return of the sages in the final and largest chapter make the job of defending a comprehensive, unified reading of the work difficult. On the other hand, the text claims to be the product of both monarchs and, as such, superficially resolves such complications by attributing the inconsistency to its own history of composition. However, even if scholars accepted the lack of consistency by ascribing the peculiarities of the text to being the result of the compilation and expansion undertaken by the two kings, the text still remains problematic. As a simple example, the final chapter contains stylistic elements similar to both halves and connects its historical narrative to the
introductory section, bringing into question the authenticity of the framing narrative describing the history of the collection.

Another possible reason scholars may have been hesitant to challenge the authenticity of the contained history is that the currently accepted interpretation lends itself to easily serve the needs of scholars of Fernando III and Alfonso X. The complicated characteristics of the text suggest on the surface that the work was indeed begun by Fernando III and finished by Alfonso X, as it has similarities to other works completed in a like way. The acceptance of the claim that both monarchs participated in the making of LDS allows scholars to claim the text for one king or the other, often with divergent and conflicting ends. At one extreme, for example, it has been contended that

7 I do not mean to suggest that scholars are manipulating or obscuring an accepted truth about the text, but rather that texts change meaning based on their “interpretive community”, to use Stanley Fish’s term. The variation of interpretations regarding LDS exemplifies the way a given genre, or disciplinary tradition, like one of Genette’s many types of “paratext”, informs readers about how to interpret a text.

8 Fernando de Rojas’ *Comedia de Calisto y Melibea* has a similar debate over authorship while also providing a “history” of its construction as a text. Cervantes’ first part to the *Quijote* expects its audience to be familiar with the practice of continuing or expanding on an inherited or found manuscript, without which his playful use of narrators becomes an undue burden.
the whole work, except for the final section, belongs to Fernando III (Walsh), while at the other, it has been argued that only the *sententiae* of the wise men are potentially from Fernando III and that the work is primarily a product of Alfonso X (Gómez-Redondo). The amount a critic ascribes to each king is closely associated to the degree she believes the introductory and concluding material to be either historically accurate, and thus the larger contribution made by Fernando III, or fictional/invented, with Alfonso X providing the majority of the material. Both strategies begin with information from within the text and then seek to connect that information to one ruler or the other, in other words, the text informs us about the context in which it was created. In addition to using this approach as other scholars have, this chapter will compare aspects of *LDS* with other works of the Alphonsine corpus in order to demonstrate that the text is best understood when approached as a product of his royal *scriptorium*.

Before entering into my own analysis and argument, a survey of the three positions on the composition of *LDS* will inform my reader of the current claims.

Walsh, in the “Introduction” to his 1975 edition of the work, proposed that *LDS* demonstrates a clear “composición consciente de un manual completo y original” (22). Based on the information in the Introduction, Walsh concludes that Fernando III ordered the making of the Introduction and chapters 1 through 65, likely around the year 1237; then, based on the content of chapter 66, Alfonso X expanded the work by adding the final chapter, around 1255 or later. As Walsh declares, “[e]n resumen, nuestro análisis del texto nos convence que un solo autor anónimo concibió y escribió el prólogo y el cuerpo
en 1237 o muy poco después. Pero el epílogo, añadido hacia 1255, fue compuesto por otro, tal vez el copista o un consejero en la corte de Alfonso X” (33). He supports his reading with the following observations: 1) The Introduction is written in the voice of the 12 sages speaking to Fernando III: “Los doze sabios que la vuestra merçed mandó que veniésemos[…] para vos dar consejo en lo espiritual e tenporal”; 2) The narrative voice of the Introduction states the reason for which the text was made: “a lo que agora mandades que vos demos por escripto todas las cosas que todo prinçipe e regidor de reyno deve aver en sý”; 3) The same narrative voice also states for whom it was made: “dar a cada uno de los altos señores ynfantes vuestros fijos el traslado della”; and, 4) The final part of the Introduction declares what the “breve escriptura” contains:9

E señor, pónese luego primeramente en esta escriptura de la lealtança que deven aver los omnes en sý [I]. E luego después de la lealtança se pone la codiçia que es cosa ynfernal, la qual es enemiga e mucho contraria de la lealtança [II]. E después vienen las virtudes que todo rey o regidor de reyno debe aver en sý, e que tal deve de ser, e que a todo regidor de reyno cunple de él ser de la sangre e señorío real [III], e que sea fuerte, e poderoso [IV] e esforçado [V], e sabio [VI] e enbiso [VII], e casto [VIII], e tenprado e sañudo [IX], largo [XII] e escaso [XIII], amigo [XIV] e enemigo [XV], piadoso [XVI] e cruel [XVII], amador de justiçia [XVIII] e

9 I have introduced the chapter numbers using roman numerals within brackets to Walsh’s argument.
Walsh discovered that the topics stated at the end of the Introduction correspond to the topics covered in the first 20 chapters in precise order, and argues that the final sentence, “[e] adelante está como se entiende cada una destas condiciones e por qué manera deve usar de cada una dellas”, explains that chapters 21 to 65 are the application of the more abstract lessons presented in the earlier chapters (72). He further notes that “los capítulos XXXVIII-L y LIV-LXV son reconsideraciones o resúmenes de temas o imperativos ya declarados en la primera parte”, and he supports this claim through thematic analysis and textual comparison, noting that later chapters cite earlier ones “casi exactamente” (22).

According to Walsh, the concluding chapter, LXVI, is the only addition that Alfonso X makes to the compendio his father gifted him as a youth, which was added “después de la muerte de Fernando III, por mandado de Alfonso X” (14). Walsh asserts, and subsequent critics agree, that the “grandes discordias por algunos de los ynfantes sus hermanos e de los sus ricos omnes” that is describ in chapter 65 most likely refers to the events of 1255 (30-31). In addition to arguing that the Introduction and chapters 1-65 were composed together, Walsh concludes that “[u]n análisis detenido del prólogo y los sesenta y cinco capítulos del cuerpo del texto revela que se relacionan perfectamente, y que el mismo autor anónimo del texto escribió ambas partes. Es decir, el prólogo no forma un tratado aparte del cuerpo; es una introducción o bosquejo de la materia que
sigue” (32). Walsh, as seen by his analysis and argument, maintains that the historical information of the prologue and chapter LXVI is reliable and accurate, except that the specific assembly of the twelve sages was most likely fictional (14).

Walsh calls particular attention to chapter 29 in order to posit a likely date of composition. In chapter 29, the use of the word “mançebo” occurs in conjunction with a statement that the recipient of the lesson has participated in battle (“començado as guerra”), which leads Walsh to limit the text to the late 1230s. Walsh’s dating is based on this internal textual information which limits Alfonso’s age to the period of “mançebía”, and life experience to having already participated in warfare. Alfonso likely first participated in battle as more than an observer around 1236, at the conquest of Córdoba, and Walsh deems “mançebo” an inappropriate term for the heredero after about age 21, when he first led the conquest of Murcia (and had already sired two illegitimate children). 10 Acceptance of these arguments then limits the possible years of when the advice given in chapters 20-65 could have occurred, if we accept the historical veracity of the text, creating a window from roughly 1236 to 1242, and Walsh proposes 1237, being the year immediately following Alfonso’s participation in the campaigns for Córdoba.

10 Historians believe Alfonso was an observer at Jeréz (1231) and Trujillo (1233). We know he was participating in battles at age 19 (1240), and leading them by 1243, in Murcia.
Hugo O. Bizzarri, following Walsh’s suggestion that the framing mechanism of the 12 sages is likely a literary trope opposed to factual events in history, is the first to assert that the concept of the 12 wise men is most certainly fictional, but he maintains that the use of the literary trope does not mean the work was not made under Fernando’s order. Bizzarri, relying on Walsh’s scholarship, proposes a modified version of the above description through highlighting the differences between the two parts of LDS (“Consideraciones” 86-88; “La idea” 21). According to him, four textual characteristics indicate separate authorship for the two blocks of chapters into which the work gets divided: one, the Introduction uses pronouns of vos while starting with chapter XXI verbs are conjugated using command forms of tú; two, chapters I-XX are impersonal and describe characteristics of ideal rulers, while chapters XXI-LXV speak directly to the recipient of the lesson; three, the twelve sabios only speak in chapters I-XX, dealing primarily with virtues and vices, and then reappear in chapter LXVI; and four, when the twelve sabios return in the final chapter they eulogize Fernando III, where all their speech in chapters I-XX is indirect. Whereas Walsh concluded that Alfonso had simply mimicked the style of the work found in the Introduction and chapters 1-65 to craft his epilogue, Bizzarri suggests that Alfonso is the true author of the framing material. To support this claim, he points to the following items: First, the framing material of the 12 sages is fictional, based on the fact that the statements given to Alfonso by the wise men never made it onto Fernando’s tomb; second, the trope of kings calling forth wise men for assistance in education or matters of the State has prevalent literary models (Daniel, Sendebar); and, third, taking into consideration the practice of the Alfonsine corpus to
commonly employ numerology, or symbolically important numerical organization for its works, as in the _Lapidario_, _Setenario_, and _Siete partidas_, the fictional frame along with the text’s organization are more similar to works made under the order of Alfonso than of Fernando. This leads Bizzarri to question which material can be attributed to the father and which to the heir.

From these observations, Bizzarri concludes that the first version of _LDS_ consisted of what we today consider to be chapters 21-65, and it was ordered to be made by Fernando III around the year 1237, as Walsh had earlier argued (“La idea…” 21). Bizzarri reasons that Fernando or Alfonso, while still an _infante_, later redacted the work and added the part of the prologue that describes the content of the work and chapters 1-20, but no codex of this version has survived. Finally, after the death of Fernando III and the revolt lead by Enrique and Fadrique in 1255, Alfonso had the work expanded again through the addition of chapter 66. Thus, the only versions of the text that we have available to us today are derived from the final version created by the royal _scriptorium_ of Alfonso X, but the original 1237 text has been maintained and according to Bizzarri, “[n]o podemos saber si Alfonso retocó otras partes [apart from chapter sixty-six], pero es poco probable. Más bien se ciñó al esquema del libro y lo repitió, eligiendo la forma expositiva de la reunión de sabios” (21).

Part two of the text (chapters 21-65), concludes Bizzarri, is thus the remnant of the original “tratado militar” that was directed at Alfonso and his siblings. He further supports this claim by also pointing to the use of the word _mançebo_ in Chapter 29, which
must have been directed at the young infante. For Bizzarri, the advice in this second part is primarily concerned with conducting war, a topic on which Fernando III would be an expert and on which a young Alfonso would need to be educated. The use of the familiar tú form for verbs, along with the use of “mançebo” to describe the receiver of the lessons, paint a clear image of the transfer of wisdom from the monarch to the heredero. The first redaction of the work, imagined by Bizzarri to have occurred during the 1240s, exhibits the influence of oriental material on the Military Orders and on Alfonso during these years, and is an example of the popularity of this literary trend:

Don Femando parece haber delegado parte de la formación de su hijo a la Orden. La compañía de Pelay Pérez Correa, maestre de la Orden, en la campaña de Murcia pone esto de manifiesto. Para la instrucción moral de su hijo debió hacer lo mismo, y para eso ordenó componer un tratado que, adaptado al gusto literario del momento, inculcara la idea más cara a la Orden de Santiago y al Rey: la Reconquista. (Bizzarri “La idea” 29)

Then, after the events of 1255, Alfonso had the text redacted again, creating the fictional scene of the 12 wise men at the beginning of the Introduction, and crafting Chapter 66. From this history of the making of the work, Bizzarri then shows how such a fiction would be advantageous for the young monarch in dealing with the uprising of 1255, and possible future disharmonies in the court. As can be observed, Bizzarri maintains the intrinsic veracity of the internal narrative of LDS, which claims that Fernando III originally prompted the making of the work as an educational tool for subsequent
monarchs, despite having to accept that there is no evidence for his proposed process of revision and redaction, and that the framing content for the entire work is itself an invention of Alfonso X. Bizzarri provides important insights about the work, but ultimately reinforces the viewpoint that both monarchs contributed to its genesis, stating, “[t]enemos, pues, que Doze sabios es la suma de tres textos de diferente naturaleza: espejo de principes + tratado militar + alabanza final” ("La idea" 21).

Fernando Gómez Redondo is the third scholar to address the question of the genesis of the work. Gómez Redondo builds on the previous scholars’ studies to form the position that the entire work should be attributed to the court of Alfonso X. Gómez Redondo takes Walsh’s argument for the cohesion of the first part (Chs. 1-20) based in the Introduction, but concludes that the primary subject matter of lealtança and codičia is the heart of the work, as they are also the heart of Alfonso’s problems in 1255 (256-57). However, he rejects Walsh’s claim that the second part (Chs. 21-65) is also described in the Introduction and follows the same pattern as the first part. Likewise, he agrees with Bizzarri that the change in subject at chapter 21 is important, but that the advice given in chapters 21-65 (which he calls consejos, 251), is not the advice that Alfonso receives as an infante, but rather the advice that the new convocation of sages gives Alfonso X as king in order to assist him with the rebellion of 1255. In effect, according to Gómez Redondo, both “parts” are constructed as propaganda for Alfonso X and they directly connect to the rebellion of 1255 (250-60).
The conclusion for Gómez Redondo that both parts serve the ideological needs of Alfonso X in 1255 leads him to reassess the contents of the chapters. He understands the declaration in the final part of the Introduction about lealtança and codiçia to be a lens through which to read the entire work, concluding that the true genre of the text is a treatise on lealtança and codiçia, and not so much a speculum principe. Approaching the second part of the work through this lens of loyalty or cupidity, he propose a new organization pattern for the section of consejos (Part 2), dividing them in the following way: Chapters 21-25, “descripción de la corte”; 26-35, “Regimiento militar”; 36-45, “Regimiento de paz”; 46-52, “Regimiento religioso”; and 53-65, “Regimiento político” (257-59). Gómez Redondo then argues, based on his division of the consejos into these themes, that the second part details the course of action that the young monarch must follow in order to resolve the rebellion of the nobles. He explains,

Nótese, sobre todo, el orden en que se imbrican los “regimientos” de los que depende esa corte como garante de la justicia: primero hay que saber actuar en tiempo de guerra (y en él se encuentra sumido el joven monarca: cap. XXIX) pero sin olvidar que la tierra deberá pacificarse, mediante el despliegue de esas perspectivas religiosas sobre las que tendrá que reposar la ideología letrada y caballeresca (política, entonces) del rey.” (Gómez Redondo 259)

The result of Gómez Redondo’s reading of the text, while markedly different from the readings proposed by the previous two scholars, is still one that attempts to attach itself to an historically accurate moment both within and outside of the text. Despite detaching the
work from Fernando III, this reading also attempts to locate the precise historical event in
which the advice given in the text, in this reading the consejos, was transferred to
Alfonso X. The packaging of the content, as argued by Gómez Redondo, appears to
resolve the interior conflicts of the text, but it depends on certain assumptions that may
not be the bedrock needed to uphold the edifice he constructs.

First, Gómez Redondo does not explain why each consejo belongs in the grouping
it does, and he does not address the fact that many of the consejos, especially those
pertaining to “Descripción de la corte”, “Regimiento de paz”, and “Regimiento poíctico”,
could easily be placed in a different category. For example, chapters XXII, “Como el rey
deve ser graçioso e palanciano e de buena palabra a los que a él venieren”, XXIV, “Que
fabla de los leales e tenprados e syn codiçia”, and XXV, “De como el rey non desespere a
los buenos que le demandaren merçed” could just as easily be categorized under the
categories “Regimiento de paz” or “Regimiento poíctico” as they can remain within
“Descripción de la corte”. The first chapter categorized under “Regimiento de paz”,
XXXVI, “En quel rey non despreçie el consejo de los synples”, considering its content
would better fit under “Descripción de la corte” or “Regimiento religioso”. The primary
topic of the chapter instructs the king on how to receive people in the court, as do
chapters XXII and XXV, and it is also one of the few consejos that discusses anything
related to God outside of the grouping “Regimiento religioso”. Other than its location in
the text, there is little reason for it to be grouped within “Regimiento de paz”. A detailed
comparison of all the consejos and their groups reveals that only the “Regimiento militar”
and “Regimiento religioso” hold together as possible groupings of similar subject matter; this system of categorization as a whole is far from perfect.

The second problem of Gómez Redondo’s proposed organization of the second part is that the groupings are not as obviously recognized as his depiction would lead one to believe, and the units within each group do not conform to the accuracy that one would expect from Alfonso, or his scriptorium. As just discussed above, many of the chapters could pertain to another one of Gómez Redondo’s categories, and the moveability of many of the chapters also demonstrate a lack of clear division or transition between categories. Apart from the material evidence that there is no observed division in the manuscripts for grouping the consejos into these categories, by copyists or readers, the content of the chapters themselves do not obviously suggest such divisions either. Furthermore, the units within each category are unbalanced, which is uncharacteristic for an item produced under Alfonso X. Examples of organization practices for texts made under Alfonso’s watchful eye include, though are not limited to, the following: Lapidario (1250), organized around the twelve houses of the zodiac; Setenario (c. 1256), dividing topics into groups of seven; Siete partidas (c. 1265), also organized primarily by sevens, but including other complex numerological divisions; Libro de acedrex, dados e tablas (1283), organized with numerological patterns of seven and twelve (Golladay 1048); and I add, Libro de los doze sabios (c. 1255), organized around the frame of receiving advice from the twelve sages. Gómez Redondo’s categories follow a division of 5-10-10-7-13 consejos for each corresponding category, and while I do not argue that this section of the
work follows a specific numerological pattern, if such categories did exist, the practices of the workshop under Alfonso’s scrutiny would have organized them into more recognizable groups or patterns.

Third, Gómez Redondo’s proposal addresses Bizzarri’s division of the body chapters, but it does not contest Walsh’s argument that the consejos of the second part are examples of practical application of the material from the first part. Before abandoning Walsh’s well-supported argument for the cohesion of the text as being a narrative that initially provides gnomic wisdom surrounding the virtues of a good ruler and then exhorts the young prince to follow very specific guidelines through the application of that wisdom, we must question whether the text itself, independent of the events of 1255, is actually directed at Alfonso at this stage in his life. This final aspect is the linchpin of his specific reading and it depends on the use of the word “mançebo” in Chapter 29.

Gómez-Redondo pulls from the Setenario (Ley 11) the following definition of “mançebo”: “mançebo es de que ua creçiendo en ssu vida ffasta que llega a los quarenta annos e es omne conplido”. Gómez Redondo calculates that in 1255 Alfonso would be 34, and thus still a “mançebo” by the king’s own definition in the Setenario, meaning that the consejos that form the second part of LDS could be those that the wise men gave the young ruler in order to quell the uprising. In addition, he contends that the assertion in Ch 29 that “començado as guerra” is in direct reference to the conflict of 1255, and that in
conjunction with the term “mançebo”, the consejos must be directed at the “jóven rey” who is green in matters of the court, having only ruled for three years at this point.¹¹

One problem with this argument is the use of the quote from the Setenario. By reading more of the section, it seems more reasonable that the term “mançebo” may be used up until age 40 for those who become an “omne conplido” late in life, but no one is considered “mançebo” once forty is reached, regardless of mental and physical development. The full section reads:

Ende ninnez, que es la primera, dure mientras el ninno non ssabe nin puede comer, e mama. Moçedat es quando ssale de ninno e comienza a sser moço e aprende las cosas, quáles sson en ssí e cómmo han nonbre. Et esto dura ya ffasta que es mançebo e entra en edat que podría casar e auer fijos; que dallí adelante câmiassele el nonbre e llámanle mançebo. Mançebo es de que ua creçiendo en su vida ffasta que llega a los quarenta annos e es omne conplido e a toda ssu ffuerça

¹¹ Susana M. Belmartino discusses the social descriptions that accompany the different life stages during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Castilla and León, in which she argues term youth (mançebo) is used “para indicar la edad de tomar armas”, possibly connected to the knigting ceremony, typically occuring in kings around seventeen to nineteen, but also as early as eleven (301, 306). This is not universal, however, and Belmartino also points to the more “biological” use of adolescent discriptions in romances as indicating “la posibilidad de contraer matrimonio” (305).
As can be seen, specific age does not determine the stage in life, but rather the description of the individual’s development. While marriage and having children can vary widely, based in the description of “moçedat” and “omne con sesso/conplido” we can see that once a youth is physically capable to marry and have children (12-15) he has entered “mançebia”, and once he has “toda ssu ffuerça que deue auer” he is no longer a “mançebo”, regardless of whether he has reached 40 or not. Modern ideas about age and semantic change of words certainly cloud our understanding when approaching medieval decriptions of the life cycle, but through comparing both the descriptions of the individual ages provided in the Setenario and the language used to describe the relationship between two consecutive ages, we can approach a fairly accurate
understanding of the medieval use of the categories (*ninnez*, *moçedad*, *mançebia*, *omne con sseso*, *flaqueza*, *veiedat*, and *ffallesçimiento*), all of which are described in relation to one another and not as fully independent periods of one’s lifetime.

Two important features of this section of the *Setenario* should not be overlooked when attempting to understand the idea of *mançebia* for the workers in Alfonso’s *scriptorium*, and likely for the king himself. First, it should be noted that the subsequent age always eclipses the previous one, signifying that what appears to be concluding limits in the section do not actually mark the span of a given age, but rather mark an arbitrary moment in which it is impossible or inconceivable that the subsequent phase has not already eclipsed the previous one. *Ninnez*, while characterized by breastfeeding and not knowing how to eat (in contrast to drinking breastmilk), is defined by a lack of consciousness which gets eclipsed at the moment he “comiença a ssér moço e aprende las cosas, quáles sson en ssí e cómmo han nonbre”. This definition of *moçedad* is applied to a child who has begun to use language, not just in the identification of objects, but specifically in the ability to correctly name the things in the world around him. Similarly, *mançebia* eclipses *moçedad* at the time the child “entra en edat que podría casar e auer fíjos”. While *mançebia* extends through “de que ua creciendo en su vida ffasta que llega a los quarenta annos e es omne conplido e a toda ssu ffuerça que deue auer”, the description of being an *omne conplido* also will cut short *mançebia*, a shift that certainly occurs before age 40.
That 40 is an arbitrary marker to indicate an inconceiveable image of *mançebía* becomes even more clear with the descriptions of more advanced ages. The *omne conplido/con sseso* is when a man has reached his full strength in body and continues until the moment he begins to weaken. *Flaqueza* is an age in itself when following the definitions provided in the *Setenario* and, while spanning years, it is separate from *veiedat*. Approaching the material from the opposite direction, it is important to recognize that *ffallesçimiento* is not “death”, but rather an age of life potentially lasting years in which the man “va enfllaqueçiendo la natura e pierde el ssentido e torna a sser commo ninno en su manera, de guisa que non cobdiçia ssinon comer e auer plazer” (my emphasis). It is specifically the loss of functioning cognition that marks the end of being *vieio* and the start of being *ffallesçido*, a marker that is further accentuated by the elaborate description of *veiedat* which repeatedly stresses the value of wisdom which comes with this age, stating that the *vieio* “ha visto e prouado todas las cosas e las connosçe çiertamente, quáles sson e cómmo deue obrar dellas”. Furthermore, despite losing strength, the *vieio* “torna a auer en ssí assesegamiento e a sser sabio de guisa por que pueda mostrar a otro”. By far the longest description of any age, this description ends by reminding the reader that “tales vieios commo éstos deuen sser enuergonçados e onrrados”. While the shift from *fflagueza* to *veiedat* occurs as a transition, much like puberty and the change from *moçedat* to *mançebía*, the extended description of *veiedat* allows us to understand the clear distinction made when one reaches *ffallesçimiento*, marked by the loss of cognitive ability, the exact inverse of the distinction between *ninnez* and *moçedat*, which the author of the *Setenario* also calls attention to by stating
that he “torna a sser commo ninno”. The pattern of eclipsing definitions is the guiding rule for how to understand the Setenario’s divisions for the stages of life.

The second feature we should not overlook is the symmetry employed when describing the stages of life. As mentioned above, the author of the Setenario explicitly connects the age of fallesçimento with ninnez by both describing them in similar terms and depicting the moment of transition that separated each from its next closest age in the sequence. If we understand the direct inverse of ninnez to be fallesçimento, each of which border a mixed space of the material and spiritual worlds in the processes of birth and death, and the transition of vieidat to fallesçimento to also be the inverse of the shift of ninnez to moçedat, then it is possible that each of the ages reflect across the central one (omne conplido) upon each other. Looking at each stage, this appears to be the case, as moçedad is primarily defined by acquiring knowledge and veiedat is characterized by disseminating it. Mançebía, initiated by the ability to procreate would then logically contrast with fflaqueza, which has a seemingly delicate description of losing one’s strength, “e le enffraqueçen los mienbros e va perdiendo la ffuerça que ssuele auer”, that may in fact be a quite direct statement about impotency. Omne conplido/con sseso, understood by these conditions, would then have to occupy a central space in the progression of one’s life.

If the symmetrical properties correspond exactly, as I propose they do, then we can use the numerical figures provided in the text to calculate the range of each age quite precisely. Furthermore, misinterpretation of the text would also readily become apparent.
For example, if *mançebla* extends to age 40, a conservative 25 years if we start *mançecla* at age 15, and being an *omne complido* is a twenty year period from 40 to 60, then *fflaqueza* should span another 25 years (age 85), *veiedat* another 13 (age 98), and *ffallesçimiento* should occupy another 2 years before death at age 100. This does not match current archaeological or textual evidence regarding the lived or imaged lifespan of people during the Middle Ages. However, if the numbers in the text correspond to the middle of the ages of *omne complido* and *fflaqueza*, not the endpoints, then an exceptionally accurate depiction of the stages of life emerges from the *Setenario*: *ninnez* from birth to about age two (2 years), *moçedat* until about age 12 (10 years), *mançebla* until around 28 (16 years), *omne complido* until about 52 (24 years, age of 40 is centered at twelve years after *mançebla* ends and twelve years before *fflaqueza* begins), *fflaqueza* starts at 52 and runs 8 years to the marked age of 60, and another 8 years before *veiedat* begins at 68 (a total of 16 years), *veiedat* lasts until age 78 (10 years), and *ffallesçimiento* lasts another two years until death at age 80. Not only does this timeline for life make sense concerning the symmetry in the text and observed human lifespan, it also corresponds with the recognized changes in human development and aging. Applying this model to the statement in *LDS* regarding *mançebla*, it would not be inconceivable to refer to Alfonso at age 34 as a *mançebo* as Gómez Redondo contends (he certainly is not forty yet, when that word would certainly be inaccurate), but the use would be a stretch of meaning and would require additional support from the text to buttress the usage, which does not occur.
When we look at Ch 29 of LDS as a whole, and in comparison to the rest of the consejos, it is more realistic to conclude that these consejos are directed at someone with little experience in battle, such as a 14 to 21 year-old Alfonso, opposed to a 34 year-old Alfonso who would be a well-seasoned veteran of war, having led his first campaign more than a decade prior. The topic of Chapter 29 is “De las gentes quel rey non deve levar a las sus guerras”, and starts off by saying, “Otrosý non cunple levar a la guerra en la tu merçed gentes nin compañas ricas nin codiciosas, e que non son para tomar armas nin usar dellas, e que su entençión es más de mercadoría que de alcançar onrra e prez” (100). It reasons that such men will steal the king’s treasure and glory, as they are not true confidants. Later in the chapter, it states:

Ca eres mançebo e fuerte e casto e de buena entençión, e cometes hecho, e obra de Dios e a su voluntad. E por ende non te enbargará fortuna, antes será tu amiga, e cercana de ty e toda tuya en todos tus fechos. E seyendo tú fuerte e osado e los tuyos, e faziendo obra de Dios, ¿quál cosa te podrá enbargar, e quál tan poderoso nin esforçado enbargará la tu carrera e non fuyrá ante ty? Non creas que ninguno. Todas las tierras serán a tu jurediçión, e Dios será contigo, e las gentes con amor loarán tu nombre, e todos desearán ser tuyos por la tu bondat. (Walsh 102)

The use of conjecture and the lack of specific reference to the troubles of 1255, as Gómez Redondo claims to exist in this section, suggest to me that the imagined recipient of this advice is not someone who has fought often in battle, and certainly not to the extent that Alfonso X has at age 34. I also disagree that the meaning of “començado as guerra” is
exactly what Gómez Redondo claims it to mean. If we are to understand it as “you have initiated/begun/started war”, then the voice would be declaring that Alfonso was the instigator of the problems, and not the victim of “codiçios”. However, if we understand it to mean that “you have engaged in/experienced war”, which would make more sense given the context, then there is little left to maintain that these consejos are directed to King Alfonso in 1255. The larger context for the quote speaks about the bad deeds that a covetous man does during battle, and asserts, “non esperas dél golpe de lança nin espada, nin palabra osada, nin ningûnd buen fecho. E pues començado as guerra, bien creo que abrás visto algumas destas cosas e serás en conoçimiento dellas” (101-2). Removing this argument from Gómez Redondo’s claim, nowhere else in the consejos do the sages speak about the conflict of 1255 in a direct manner that clearly links the advice given to that specific situation.

Finally, there is a conflict in language regarding the magnitude of the troubles of 1255 if we accept Gómez Redondo’s proposal that “començado as guerra” is in reference to the same conflicts of 1255 as the description we receive of them in chapter 66. In chapter 66, which speaks about the conflicts between Alfonso and the nobles which culminated in the rebellion of 1255, the rebellion is downplayed to what could be understood as an impasse of negotiations at court; “acaeçió grandes discordias” and some of his brothers and nobles “faziéndose todos ellos contra este rey don Alonso unos, por ende enbió el rey por los doze grandes sabios e filósofos que enbiara el rey don Fernando su padre”. While the conflict did result in a battle, the use of the term “guerra” is not used
to describe the events, making the statement in chapter 29 rare if not unique in using such a description. While later chronicles, such as *Crónica de Alfonso X* (*CAX*), and *cantiga* poetry, such as verses from poet Gonzalo Eanes do Vinhal, aggrandize the bloodshed of the battle, a few important facts about the event, and the sources just mentioned, assist us in better understanding the size of the conflict and other events surrounding the rebellion.

The *Crónica de Alfonso X*, a primary source for much information about the Learned King, is both historically flawed and biased against its protagonist (Doubleday 66). As Ballesteros-Beretta points out in relation to this very event, “queremos analizar este pasaje de la *Crónica*, porque su yerro mayúsculo ha hecho equivocar a muchos investigadores […] Alfonso no estaba en Sevilla, como afirma la *Crónica*, porque tanto en el año 1255 como en el 1259 estuvo el rey ausente de Andalucía” (117). The acclaimed biographer corrects the *CAX* in four ways just in relation to this conflict: the date (1255 not 1259); the location of the battle (campos de Morón, not Lebrija); the residency of the king during the battle (the north, not Sevilla); and, from whom reinforcements for Alfonso’s side came the night following the battle (Sancho Martínez de Xodar, adelantado de la Frontera, not Alfonso X) (117). Despite its errors, the *CAX* refers to the events as a “pelea”. Regarding the poem by Eanes do Vinhal, it is written in the voice of the queen, doña Juana, second-wife of Fernando III and infante Enrique and Alfonso X’s step-mother, with whom it was alleged that Enrique maintained an affair. While the poem supplies many accurate details about the battle, it is still fictional, written as a performance of courtly love poetry, and in the voice of a supporter of the rebellious
infante Enrique (Ballesteros-Beretta 116). The poem focuses on the duel between Enrique and don Nuño González de Lara, used to determine the winning side and avoid more bloodshed, and never refers to the event as a “guerra”, preferring to simply say that they “lidieron os de Mouron / con aquestes d’el-rey [...]” (116).

From chronicles and other sources we know that fighting occurred, but the magnitude of the rebellion is inconsistent with the content of chapter 29, and all the chapters that Gómez Redondo categorizes as part of the “Regimiento militar”. Historians agree that the opposing sides entered into battle for less than a day, and Ballesteros-Beretta, despite stating that “[e]l choque fue violento, los dos bandos pelearon con igual ardor”, also recognized that don Nuño González de Lara and don Rodrigo Alfonso, who were sent to arrest the infante Enrique for pillaging the towns south of Sevilla, “no tenían muchas fuerzas, pero sí las suficientes para oponerse con ventaja a las de Don [sic] Enrique” (115). After the confrontation in the countryside outside of Morón, news of reinforcements from Sevilla to support the king caused the disloyal nobles to scatter, with infante Enrique catching a boat in Cadiz to Valencia and then another away from the Peninsula into exile (Ballesteros-Beretta 118, Salvador Martínez 330-1). Such a short-lived rebellion could hardly be the subject of consejo 29 when the interlocutor says “començado as guerra”, and the advice for wartime in the other related consejos (26-35) are equally inappropriate, as they primarily are concerned with preparation for conquering new territory (consejos 26, 27, 28, 29, 32) and proper payment for soldiers
and vassals (30, 33, 35). The magnitude of the rebellion historically does not match the concept of “guerra” that is discussed in these chapters, which includes chapter 29.

The description of the rebellion of the nobles in chapter 66, in contrast, is much closer to the version that modern historians take on the event. The perfidy of the nobles who allied with the rebellious Enrique had been spreading since Alfonso redistributed the Repartamiento de Sevilla in 1253. The new Repartamiento stripped Enrique of a great wealth of property and estates originally gifted to him by their father, Fernando III, as Enrique had distinguished himself as a most valuable warrior during the conquests in Andalucia (Salvador Martínez 328). Nevertheless, the actual combat of the rebellion, as we have seen, lasted less than a day, and by the time Alfonso would have received news in the north of the battle, the rebellion would have already ended. If we are to believe that the consejos were given to Alfonso X in relation to the rebellion, they certainly would not pertain to military aspects of the conflict. Chapter 66, in contrast to what scholars have argued, describes the political and legal difficulties at court. There is never a reference to physical conflict, and emphasis is on Alfonso’s need of advice: “E porque a poco tiempo después que este rey don Alfon reynó acaeció grandes discordias por algunos de los ynfantes sus hermanos e de los sus ricos omnes de Castilla e de León, faziendose ellos todos contra este rey don Alfonso unos, por ende enbió el rey por los doze grandes sabios e filósofos” (117). If the section of consejos was composed of, or to appear to be, the advice this second convocation of “sabios e filósofos” gave to Alfonso X at the time of the conflict, then it would only make sense that the description of the rebellion in chapter
would also hyperbolically refer to the “guerra” that had begun, and not reduce the events to “grandes discordias”. However, if the work itself was created prior to the rebellion of late 1255, such as 1254, “grandes discordias” would accurately describe the situation at hand.

Despite my rejection of the proposal that the consejos were given to Alfonso X in 1255 to help him defeat the rebellion, Gómez Redondo’s claim that the work as a whole appears to address the conflicts in the Castilian court around 1253-1255 is still quite valid, as is his assertion that the entire text is a product of Alfonso’s scriptorium. Once we fully detach the internal narrative of the text from the historical moment which catalyzed its making, we no longer need to resolve the problem of specifying when Alfonso received any part of the work from anyone; there was no original especulum principum passed down from his father, nor was there ever a council of wise men who presented an organized set of consejos to the infante or rey Alfonso (and especially not these consejos). The difficulties that Alfonso X encountered at the start of his reign, and which would plague him for the rest of his life, were political and legal, and LDS is an early attempt to address those problems.

‘Libro de los doze sabios’: An Early Exercise in Alfonsine Historiography and the Making of Historical Exempla Narratives

Castile of 1252 was not the same kingdom that it had been in 1217 when Alfonso’s father took the throne. The unification of the crowns of Castilla and Leon in 1230 brought together two distinct legal practices and traditions, or fueros, and with the
addition of Galicia in 1231, Fernando became the ruler of a kingdom now doubled in size since his ascension in 1217. By the time of his death, Trujillo, Jaén, Córdoba, Murcia, and Sevilla would all be added to the Crown of Castile, and Fernando III would be eyeing the land across the strait, with little interest in the long-term good of his greatly expanded territories if we look at the original Repartimiento de Sevilla. Change was occurring rapidly, and change is difficult for a society rooted in tradition. LDS is one of the earliest examples of how Alfonso X attempted to effect change in his kingdom, a cultural campaign that touched on every aspect of Castilian life, but in order to do so he had to change the past, starting with his father.

The reason LDS can so easily be read through the events of 1255 is that the rebellion of 1255 was the first violent resistance that the nobles gave to the cultural campaign of the young monarch. The rebellion, however, was not the first major act of defiance that the nobles had orchestrated against the new king. Discord, even hatred, existed between Alfonso and his oldest siblings, dating back at least to the mid-1240s (Ballesteros-Beretta 104-20; Haro Cortés La imagen real 40; Salvador Martínez 328-9). Loyalty and subordination were never part Enrique’s character: the infante refused to swear allegiance to his brother as heredero at the behest of their father in 1246 (Ballesteros-Beretta 108-9; Haro Cortés La imagen real 40); in 1254 Enrique conspires with don Diego López de Haro against Alfonso, and in secret swears fidelity to Jaime I of Aragón (Ballesteros-Beretta 111); Enrique leads the rebellion of 1255, attacking the towns of Morón and Lebrija (Ballesteros-Beretta 115-8; Haro Cortés La imagen real 40-
and later he would provide knights and financial support to Charles d’Anjou, Alfonso’s rival in European affairs, in 1267 (Salvador Martínez 196). In addition to familial enmity, Alfonso placed himself in the middle of a long-standing rivalry between the Lara and Haro clans, the former of which occupied a favored place in his father’s court, and the latter of which was selected definitively as Alfonso’s favored vassal with the Repartimiento de Sevilla in 1253 (Ballesteros-Beretta 111). The disgruntlement of the nobles that appears to have only been held at bay by the ceaseless activity of conquest under Fernando III acquired an unexpected ally in the Church in 1254, when a letter from Pope Innocent IV removed his threat of excommunion for nobles who wished to renounce their bond of vassalage to the Castilian monarch and oppose his rule (Salvador Martínez 321). August of that same year, the infante Enrique, the Lara clan, and other important nobles of Castile abandoned Castile, declared themselves desnaturados, and kissed the hand of Jaime I in Aragón (Salvador Martínez 322). From the content of chapter 66 of LDS, this event in the summer of 1254, more than a full year before the rebellion of 1255, appears to be what stimulated the composition of the work.

Whether this is the case or not, the internal workings of the text from the Introduction through chapter 65 do not indicate that the advice given, whether as gnomic sententia about the virtues of rulers or as directly stated consejos (or castigos), was only applicable to the immediate problems of Alfonso X. In other words, without the supplementary information that chapter 66 contributes to the work as a whole, critics would have no reason to believe that the advice had anything to do with the reign of
Alfonso at all. It is only through the increased scrutinization of chapter 66 that scholars have begun to problematize the collection.

The readings provided by Walsh, Bizzarri, and Gómez Redondo of LDS, on one hand, demonstrate the lack of consensus among scholars with regards to unpacking this richly complex text. On the other hand, the central arguments from each of their proposals can be harmonized when slightly altered, placed in dialogue with one another, and contextualized within the greater project of “Alfonsine historiography”.

The subject of “Alfonsine historiography” spans an exceptionally large terrain of topics, disciplines, and manuscripts, and scholars who work within the field know that a comprehensive knowledge of just the source material requires a lifetime of study. The great Hispanist Ramón Menéndez Pidal was one of the first modern scholars to dedicate his life to sorting and defining the multiple manuscript witnesses of Alfonso’s two great historiographic projects, the General historia (=GE) and the Estoria de Espanna (=EE), but it was his nephew, Diego Catalán, who first recognized that Alfonso manipulated the telling of history to suit his immediate political needs.\(^\text{12}\) For example, Peter Linehan in a

\(^{12}\)The increased interest on the part of literary scholars in Alfonsine historiography is primarily a result of the individual and collaborative projects of Diego Catalán. Other noteworthy contributors to this field are Inés Fernández-Ordóñez, Jesús Rodríguez Velasco, Francisco Márquez Villanueva, Reinaldo Ayerbe-Chaux, Fernando Gómez Redondo, and Joseph O’Callaghan, though this list is in no way exhaustive.
recent book, *Spain, 1157-1300: A Partible Inheritance* (2008), asserts, “[a]s to the national history, in its exploitation and manipulation of the histories of Lucas of Tuy and Rodrigo of Toledo, Alfonso’s ideological purpose is never far from the surface, and in his treatment of those volumes ‘in ancient script’ –Statius, Virgil, Ovid, etc., the Bible, and many more– it was rampant” (163). Similarly, Inés Fernández-Ordóñoz has stated that, “[t]anto en su estructura […] como en sus contenidos, la concepción de las *Estorias* alfonsíes nos revela […] que Alfonso utilizó la Historia al servicio de sus labores de gobernante, de la difusión de un pensamiento político” (“*El taller historiográfico*” 115). Emphasizing the disjunction between how critics have approached the legal opposed to historical works of Alfonso’s *scriptorium*, Fernández-Ordóñoz goes on to say, “[m]ientras que nunca se ha dudado del valor político de las obras legislativas, se ha privado, en cambio, a las obras históricas del papel importantísimo que jugaron en el proyecto político anfonsí” (“*El taller historiográfico*” 115). In structure and content, Alfonsine works exploit and manipulate previous texts to serve the political ideology of the monarch.

History created with the intention to educate –as in the case of Alfonsine legal and historical works– while not wisdom literature, *per se*, is in many ways an idealized form of the *exemplum*. Examining the *intentio* and *dispositio* of the *EE* and the *GE*, Inés Fernández-Ordóñoz argues that:

Alfonso pretende fundamentar las bases de su gobierno a través del ejercicio de la razón, a la cual se accede gracias al saber, a los conocimientos que difunden sus
obras. Esa meta esencial determina que sus producciones estén escritas en lengua vulgar y otorga un lugar principal a la Historia debido a su carácter exhaustivo, globalizador, que permite el conocimiento auténtico y profundo de todos los hechos pasados como ejemplo y enseñanza para el presente y el futuro. (115)

Although the sources used to create *LDS* remain unknown, the dissemination of the text as an *exemplum* of good government to his public, the nobility, should certainly be scrutinized for containing practices of “exploitation and manipulation” that are similar to what scholars have found in the national histories. Additionally, the insertion of Alfonso X, himself, and his father as primary characters in the *LDS* certainly suggests that the work was intended to be read as a ‘history’ in the way that other Alfonsine ‘histories’ are read. As such, reading *LDS* should seek to use literary strategies for interpreting *exempla*, since this work exploits History in the same way as *GE* and *EE* do, “como ejemplo y enseñanza para el presente y el futuro”.

To study the exemplarity of *LDS* is not a new topic, but to parse the collection as one would an *exemplum* is. The conclusions made by Walsh, Bizzarri, and Gómez Redondo certainly contribute to the understanding of how medieval readers of the work might have applied the internal *consejos* and *sententiae* to the contemporary events of 1255, but they rarely take into consideration the conclusion of the text which contains the *dichos* of each of the sages that are to be inscribed on Fernando’s sepulcher. Dividing the work into the formal elements of *exempla* literature, such as was done with *Calila e
Dimna and Sendebar in the preceding chapters, permits a richer analysis of the work as a whole that better allows it to fit within the larger cultural programe of Alfonso X.

The “Introduction” of LDS does more than introduce the text, since it is also of the same diegesis as the body chapters. Unlike most narrative exempla, LDS does not begin with a frame, but rather it begins with the exemplum. On the same diegestic level as the Introduction, when strictly following the progression of events and the information in the text itself, are chapters one through sixty-five, which purport to be the advice and consejos given by the sages to Alfonso and his siblings during their mançeibia under the order of their father, Fernando III. It is only when one reaches chapter sixty-six that the diegetic level of the text changes, and the exemplum of Fernando III and the twelve wise men concludes. The next episode in the text is the first half of chapter sixty-five, which relates the problems of the young king Alfonso X. The new king, having problems with the nobles early in his reign, uses the ‘history’ of his father’s relationship with sages as en exemplum of good governance, and calls the sages back to court to provide him counsel. This second exemplum concludes when we learn that “el rey se tovo por muy pagado e bien aconsejado de sus consejos. E esto así acabado, dixieron al rey estos grandes sabios […]” (117). The specifics of what Alfonso did to resolve the “grandes discordias” is unimportant to the lesson that one should learn from this exemplum; what is important is that he used the events of history as an exemplum to help guide him in his actions. The final exemplum then concludes the collection, in which the sabios reward Alfonso for his wise decision making and his use of history as a source of exemplary wisdom by praising
his father, Fernando III, the educator of Alfonso X, the perfect historical *exemplum* of a prudent ruler, and the catalyst for the work itself.

The text, however, does not begin with the image of Fernando III as being the possessor of great wisdom. In the *prólogo*, he is simply recognized as “[e]l muy alto e muy noble, poderoso e bienaventurado señor rey don Ferrando de Castilla e de León”, and his request for council of the sages is “para que vos e los nobles señores ynfantes vuestrros fijos tengades esta nuestra escriptura para la estudiar e mirar en ella como en espejo” (71). The advice, although requested by the king, is also directed towards the king. Both he and his children receive the “escriptura” in order to “mirar en ella como en espejo”. At this moment, according to the text, Fernando III has not conquered the kingdoms of Murcia, Córdoba, or Sevilla, as they are not included in his title at the beginning of the collection. This historical Fernando III who called the *concilio* of sages as king of “Castilla e de León”, must therefore be understood to exist between 1230, the year he was crowned king of León, and 1236, the year he conquered Córdoba.\(^\text{13}\) The

\(^{13}\) One could speculate that the year in which Fernando III ordered the twelve *sabios* to advise him was precisely 1230, based on the fact that he inherited Galicia in 1231, but if this were the case then we would expect it to also be mentioned in chapter sixty-six, and it is not. Without the mentioning of the kingdom of Galicia, it is impossible to limit further the imagined space of time for this historical council, which is why I contend that we are to imagine it to have occurred between 1230 and 1236.
imprecision of the occasion, along with the other historical discrepancies in the work, however, do not detract from the lesson of this exemplum, as the diegesis as a whole is to be understood as occurring early in Fernando’s rule over both inherited kingdoms. For a reader of LDS in 1254, or later, this imagined Fernando of the prólogo is also the one who would conquer Córdoba and Sevilla, among other territories, and it would be impossible to detach that knowledge from the character in the text since he is the only recent Fernando who would be addressed in this way. Because the audience is to understand that the year of the congress of sages occurred prior to Fernando’s military successes in Córdoba and Sevilla, the text proposes that this crusading monarch is first and foremost a ruler who values the wisdom of sages and the proper education of his progeny.

14 Fernando I, while also king over León and Castilla, was first Count of Castilla and then later King of León. He was the first to declare himself Emperor of Spain (1051), a title he would carry in the literature and histories. Fernando II of León was king over León and Galicia, but never Castilla. While nothing in the text before chapter sixty-six clarifies which “Ferrando” is the historical persona of the start of the work, chapter sixty-six does, and, as I contend the work is solely a production of Alfonso’s scriptorium, Fernando III becomes the only option. Without chapter sixty-six, Fernando I would be the only other possibility from history, but it is unlikely that a reader would first think of Fernando I before the recently deceased Fernando III.
The description of the sovereign as a parton of wisdom is further reinforced over the course of the collection. At the start of what I call the second exemplum, the first half of chapter sixty-six, Alfonso has ascended to the throne and Fernando III has become an historical character. The historical example that Fernando III now provides to the present has become enriched with the passage of time, and the text uses the physical conquest of kingdoms to highten the prestige of the monarch. Twice in the chapter the text makes references to Fernando III’s successful war campaigns, first at the start of the chapter when an omnipresent narrator states, “Después que fynó este santo e bienaventurado rey don Fernando, que ganó a Sevilla e a Córdova e a toda la frontera de los moros, reynó el ynfante don Alfonso, su fijo primero, heredero en estos reynos de Castilla e de León”, and again during the second half of the chapter (117). This opening sentence links the recently departed Fernando, “que ganó a Sevilla e a Córdova e a toda la frontera de los moros”, to the “Ferrando” of the prólogo through the phrase, “[d]espués que fynó este santo e bienaventurado rey don Fernando”, and thus connecting his patronage of wisdom to military victory. Alfonso, prudently using history “como exemplo y enseñanza”, mimics the actions of his father, from when Fernando was just crowned King of Castilla and León, in the hopes that he will be equally as prosperous as his father was (“por ende embió el rey [Alfonso] por los doze grandes sabios e filósofos que embiara el rey don Fernando su padre para aver su consejo con ellos, así en lo espiritual como en lo temporal, segund que lo feziera este rey santo su padre” 117). Alfonso’s willingness to look to history for instruction results in the positive resolution of the “grandes discordias”, as he receives the sound guidance of the twelve wise men in the same way
that his father did. This favorable *exemplum* of his father, a king who first turned to
wisdom in order to achieve greater worldly power, Alfonso applies to his life, and with his
troubles satisfactorily resolved, this *exemplum* about the king Alfonso, who used history
to guide him through his problems, concludes. The positive resolution of this *exemplum*,
therefore, reinforces the veracity of the events of the previous *exemplum* by historicizing
those events and by serving as further proof that the patronage of wisdom is a necessary
precursor to prosperous endeavors.

Despite the repeated recognition of Fernando’s territorial conquests, the emphasis
on his contributions to wisdom becomes his highest achievements at the end of the text.
The transition that occurs in the text passes easily without recognition, as the final
eulogies are first proposed and then performed by the sages. A close look at the reasons
for which the wise men propose to honor Fernando III and the actual statements they
provide for his sepulcher, however, reveal a leap in topics that can only be bridged by
returning, again, to the Fernando of the *prólogo* who first defined his rule by the pursuit
of wisdom. The accomplishments that the twelve sages describe at the start of what I am
calling the third historical *exemplum* of the collection are what any contemporary of
Alfonso X would expect to hear:

Señor, a nos otros parece que en sepultura de tan alto e de tan noble rey como
fue el rey don Fernando vuestro padre, que tanto servicio fizo a Dios, e que tanto
enobleció e enriqueció a los sus reynos en el ganar e conquirir de los enemigos
de la fe, que la su sepultura deste bienaventurado rey don Fernando vuestro padre
The material gains of Fernando III are many, and because he was such a “beinaventurado rey” the wise men claim to desire to honor him by having their sayings engraved into his sepulcher so that “la su santa e buena memoria finque dél en el mundo para syenpre”.

This assertion, however, is not precisely what they will be doing for Fernando III, as it is not his great deeds that are to be inscribed into his tomb, but “los dichos de cada uno de nos otros”. The Alfonso of the text, very pleased by their offer to do “tan onrrada obra”, asks that they write down their dichos so that he may later place them “en la su sepoltura de letras de oro, muy ricamente obradas, segund que a él perteneçía” (117-18). The connection between wise sayings in gilded letters and an exaltation of wisdom is unequivocally being made, but also at play is the subjugation of Fernando III’s wordly accomplishments. Alfonso has already penetrated the historical exemplum of his father, demonstrated in the previous section when he imitated his father’s actions by calling forth the wise men to provide him good counsel, but others may not correctly understand exactly what aspect of Fernando’s kingship was exemplary. In order to ensure a correct reading of the exemplum, it is necessary to carve sententiae in gold into his tomb, “un claro recuerdo del legendario tema de la tumba de oro de Alejandro Magno” (Lacarra and Blecua, Historia de la literatura... 395). In doing so, Alfonso and the sages accentuate that it was Fernando’s patronage of wisdom and learning that characterized his rule, and that such prudent action brings about great rewardeds in this world and the next. For the
reader of the text, this change in the description of the known historical person of
Fernando III from war-hero to education-enthusiast would appear to be counter-intuitive
without the Fernando of the prólogo, but instead, for someone reading the text as an
historical exempla narrative, this conclusion is a perfect fit.

The text concludes with the dichos that Alfonso requested the twelve sages to
write down so that they could be carved into his father’s sepulcher. Unlike the sententiae
that the first colloquium of philosophers gave at Fernando’s bidding, the dichos to be
incised in gilded letters into his tomb are addressed directly to the deceased conqueror.
All of the dichos praise him for his knowledge and for his promotion of wisdom. The
only statement that makes a reference to any territorial conquest, the activity for which
Fernando III is most celebrated, actually compares Fernando’s deeds to the achievements
of Alexander the Great, and declares Fernando’s “conquest” as better: “Mayor fecho es el
tuyo que de los que conquistaron el mundo” (118). The juxtaposition of “fechos” of
Fernando and Alexander the Great on the microlevel of the golden-lettered sepulcher and
the dicho both support the same conclusion of the whole text on the macrolevel: the
pursuit of wisdom is greater than the pursuit of territorial conquest. On the one hand,
Fernando was a great warrior who conquered many kingdoms, but the total territory
under his domain was only a small portion of the entire world. On the other, Alexander
the Great, according to medievals, was a wise ruler who was tutored by the great

15 Please refer to the end of this chapter for a complete reproduction of the dichos.
philosopher Aristotle, and yet Fernando’s “fecho” is greater than Alexander’s and it is his wisdom that earns him “tan onrrada obra” as to have the dichos enscribed in gilded letters on his tomb. The dichos, the majority of which are more direct in their declaration of highest esteem for the departed king’s contribution to knowledge than the one just examined, thus participate in the edifying of Fernando’s new image in both their content and presentation.

According to the material evidence of Fernando’s real tomb, these dichos were never engraved into it; but on the level of the text we must imagine as if they had been. Envisioning the sepulcher in this way, the gilded letters, used for enshrining heroes and associated with wisdom texts, replace the praises of the former king as a conquerer of Sevilla and Córdoba with praises of his intellectual pursuits, holding Fernando up as an exemplary figure for future rulers. Fernando’s sepulcher, in the text, becomes the espejo in which future rulers are to look for guidance in proper governance. This final historical exemplum of the text functions as both the result of pursuing wisdom and the physical manifestation of using history as exemplum. The Fernando of the prólogo who chose to surround himself with philosophers is now immortalized by the sayings of philosophers which surround him in death.

It was not gilded engravings on his tomb, nonetheless, that turned Fernando III into a conquerer of both kingdoms and knowledge; it was a book. A book composed by the scriptorium of Alfonso X in order to make History look to him as the logical next step in a natural progression of culture and law. Walsh’s reading of the work is textually
sound in describing the diegesis of the text from the Introduction to chapter sixty-five. Concerning chapter sixty-six, the second diegesis of the work, it also acceptably explains what occurs and rationally connects it to historical events witnessed in chronicles and histories. But it does not reflect the authentic history of the work’s composition. Walsh’s reading of the work’s (fictional) composition is precisely the conclusion that Alfonso X wanted his audience to receive and believe as historical truth.

Central to the project of historiography for Alfonso X, in the case of LDS, is the use of events and figures that occurred or existed in the recent past in order to lend a stronger sense of truth or veracity to the text, while simultaneously forcing those events and figures to conform to his larger political and ideological needs. In LDS, the repetition of the familial connection between father and son reinforces the idea of inheritance and lineage, and naturalizes the cultural legacy that Fernando III leaves his descendants, at least in the text. For example, while Fernando’s conquest of Sevilla and Córdoba are mentioned twice in chapter sixty-five, references to the relationship between “padre” and “fijo” occur six times (seven when counting the running title), and they occur without fail whenever Fernando’s name appears (117). Compared to the mention of Fernando’s territorial conquest, the text emphatically and repeatedly associates the ideas of lineage and wisdom, and successfully becomes the proof to its own argument. Fernando III, never known as a king particularly interested in cultural affairs prior to the production of works under Alfonso X’s reign (unlike Alfonso X himself who was known in his day as stupor mundi), nevertheless would go down in History as a parton of wisdom and an
intimately-involved educator of his children, thanks to *LDS*. However, despite the work’s veil of credible history, the evidence contradicts the version of events as told by the text, suggesting a fictionalized history of its genesis, and more specifically one that serves to assist Alfonso X in his political endeavors.

This is not the only case of manipulation and adaptation of History on the part of the royal *scriptorium* under Alfonso X, but it may be the earliest. For example, in the *Setenario* (c. 1256), Alfonso X asserts that “este libro [...] nos comenzamos por mandado del rrey don Ffernando, que ffué nuestro padre naturalmente e nuestro sennor” (8). Modern scholars reject this claim, yet that same skepticism regarding authorship has not been rigorously applied to *LDS* (Gómez Redondo 304; 307-15). Similarly to the other works of Alfonsine historiography, the degree to which Alfonso manipulated *LDS*, and the other historical works, to better suit his immediate political needs has been more difficult to uncover, undoubtedly because they are the same sources on which we rely to construct the foundation for our own understanding of the historical period. One aspect of the historical works of Alfonso X that has not gone unnoticed, nonetheless, is his dependence on lineage as a divine, observable, and rational argument for his preeminence among princes and, therefore, to being the rightful ‘heir’ to the position of Holy Roman Emperor.

Despite clear familial allegiances and a traceable genealogical practice of inheritance, the title of Holy Roman Emperor was decided on by election and, in theory, awarded to the candidate who would best represent and advance the cultural and spiritual
program of the Roman Church. Certain noble titles and families, over time, observably became more closely associated with the position, such as the Hohenstaufen lineage and the Duchy of Swabia, but such inheritable attributes through parentage in no way guaranteed the path of succession nor disqualified contenders who were not direct descendants of Charlamagne. While a large part of Alfonsine historiography sought to use History as an exempla narrative that educated its readers along specific ideological pathways, another significant part Alfonso’s cultural project was to construct the most favorable lineage possible along hereditary and cultural lines.

Along hereditary lines, Alfonso relied primarily on his maternal lineage. After multiple attempts to create an alliance through marriage with the Hohenstaufens of central Europe, Berenguela of Castilla finally negotiated a successful arrangement between her son, Fernando III, and Beatriz of Swabia, the fourth daughter of Phillip I, Duke of Swabia and King of the Germans. At the time of their marriage in 1219, her first cousin, Frederick II, was already Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1212/1215-1250). Regarding his paternal lineage, Alfonso used it to establish a cultural inheritance through tracing the military and cultural triumphs of his Ibreian predecessors. Regarding these doctored histories, Linehand states:

In the General Estoria [sic], with whatever civilizing purpose they begin – whether with Jupiter, Alexander the Great or the Trojans – all furrows lead to Rome, and from Rome, and most recently from the Emperor Frederick II, to
Alfonso X. In this reading of the past with its regular reference to the present, ‘universal history becomes family history’. (Spain 163)

While a genealogical inheritance was certainly emphasized, an inheritance of Wisdom and jurisprudence was equally important.

One example that effectively demonstrates the extent that the Alfonsine scriptorium manipulated, and inserted its ideology into, the figures of Alfonso’s cultural ancestors is the reworking of the story of Hercules in the EE and GE.\textsuperscript{16} Analysis of the EE, in which the history of Hercules’ achievements in Iberia take up a significant portion, led Charles F. Fraker to propose “that the Crónica [i.e., the EE] was to have ended sounding loudly the note of Alfonso’s Roman and imperial heritage” (101). In order to achieve this in his histories, Alfonso X forged associations between prominent historical figures and himself, recasting gods and heroes in his own image so that a reader would connect the image of the great ruler past with the Castilian candidate for Holy Roman

\textsuperscript{16} While the dating of these two works is still inconclusive, many scholars have noticed a trend in the redacting of the later versions of both histories as attempting to clarify the associations between Alfonso and historical figures, or to more directly steer the exemplary meaning of specific events. See Fraker concerning the association between Alfonso X and Espan; see Peter Mahoney for an analysis of the embedded story of the Siete infantes de Lara, whom I thank for generously sharing his research with me after attending his talk at the Kentucky Foreign Language Conference in April of 2015.
Emperor. One interesting aspect of the stories is the construction of a lineage that, like the title of Holy Roman Emperor, is not exclusively genealogical, but that also does not avoid describing familial networks. The complex interweaving of cultural and familial inheritance allows Alfonso to be each historical figure in its glory, while simultaneously being the heir of each as well. For example, in the *General estoria*, Alfonso states that Jupiter “ayuntó todos los fueros e todas las leyes e tornólas en escrito, e fizo libros d’ellas, e mandó que por allí se librassen todos los pleitos e se mantoviessen los pueblos, e non por uso nin por alvedrío por que vinié yerro e se olbidavan más aína las cosas”, an accurate description of Alfonso’s legal projects of the *Fuero Real* (1255) and the *Espéculo* (c. 1255) which establishes a comparative link between Alfonso X and Jupiter (1ª parte, *Génesis VII*, XLII: 390). This connection is further strengthened through

17 Particularly of interest here is Francisco Rico’s discussion of Jupiter in his book *Alfonso X el Sabio y la ‘General Estoria’* (1984), “En las páginas que la General estoria dedica al Padre de los dioses, además, ¿no parece como si Alfonso quisiera resaltar en Júpiter perfiles que le complacían en su propio retrato?” (115). Concerning the similarities between Alfonso and the figures of Hercules and Espan, see Anthony J. Cárdenas.

18 I leave the *Setenario* (c. 1256) and *Siete Partidas* (c. 1255-65) out of this grouping because they are more descriptive of how society is, or should be, and are more closely related with legal philosophy than legal codes or *fueros*. 
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pseudo-geneaological legacies in the following chapter where Jupiter is written as a uniter of different kingdoms by way of his sagacious laws and as the father of European nobility: “d’él [Jupiter] vinieron todos los reyes de de Troya e los de Grecia, e Eneas e Rómulo e los césares e los emperadores, e el primero don Frederic, que fue primero emperador de los romanos, e don Frederic su nieto el segundo. D’este don Frederic, que fue éste otrossí emperador de Roma que alcançó fasta’l nuestro tiempo” (GE, 1ª parte, Génesis VII, XLII: 392). Francisco Rico has pointed out that Alfonso, as Romanorum rex, is both connected to the first law-giver, through the descriptive image of Jupiter, and the current one, through his maternal line to Frederick II, and that these associations influence the construction of Alfonso’s royal image and lineage as, contends Rico: “la consanguinidad se convierte en afinidad intelectual” (115). Alfonso is seen to have the positive qualities of Jupiter, and as such he is both reflected in the especulum of the exemplum of Jupiter and concurrently an heir to a cultural legacy and pseudo-parantage, traced from Jupiter to Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, with whom he shares his great-grandfather, Frederick I Barbarroja.

The characters and relationships reflected in the historical exempla, however, are never so explicit that they are immutable, which allows Alfonso to become the point of entry into each moment of the progressive history. Furthermore, the ambitious cultural project of Alfonso X is multifaceted and heterogeneous, spanning so many disciplines and arenas that he is able to be coupled with each of these great historical rulers. For example, while Alfonso is reflected in Jupiter for his legal projects, later on he is also
replicated in the description of Hercules: “In the *General estoria* Hercules manifests a striking appreciation of the stars as does Alfonso in real life. Hercules fosters and seeks knowledge just as Alfonso records himself as doing in real life in the *Cruces*” (Cárdenas 12). During the description of each character in its particular section, familial links span out from the protagonist (Alfonso X), so that previous rulers, once tapped for their positive attributes, become the backdrop against which the new qualities are contrasted. Jupiter, while never negative, remains in his eastern kindom, while Hercules takes his civilizing mission across the sea to Africa and then north to Iberia, just as Alfonso X promised to continue his father’s expansion of Castilian, and Christian, hegemony across the same Strait into Africa (Alfonso X *Primera crónica* V: 8). Despite Hercules’ personae as the conquerer of Iberia, an obvious parallel with Fernando III, the constant interjections from the narrator to remind the reader of Hercules’ true nature as a *sabio*, and that he is expanding his civilization both independent of and under the contented gaze of his father Jupiter, most clearly link him to Alfonso X, the wisdom loving *infante* who also conquered Murcia and assisted his father in the conquest of Sevilla.

The positive example of Hercules, like that of Jupiter before him, must eventually be cast off, nevertheless, as the next great hero of Alfonso’s lineage emerges, Espan. Cárdenas, discussing the “unquivical association” that the *General estoria* makes between Espan and Alfonso X, states that “if this link between Alfonso and Espan is tenuously presented in the *Estoria de España*, perhaps even mostly dependent upon reader response/conjecture, the *General estoria*, on the other hand, unequivocally
associates the two” (10). Whereas immediately before Hercules was the protagonist, and the character with whom the reader was to associate Alfonso X, as soon as the position of protagonist shifts to Espan, Hercules ceases to be the mirror he was before. In this particular case, Espan and Alfonso are one in their works to populate the Peninsula and improve the condition of life for the people. According to Cárdenas, “[i]n his own history [General estoria] Alfonso becomes a third-person character whose action parallels that of Espan. Espan builds the aqueduct to keep the city viable, and Alfonso refurbishes it ‘ca auia ya grand tiempo que non venie [agua] por y’” (10). Furthermore, now that the reader is connecting Alfonso X with Espan, Hercules is recast into a new register for a greater emphasis on the parallels. As noted by Cárdeno, “[i]f one were looking for real life correspondences for this passage, one would have to say that Alfonso’s father Fernando III could be equivalent to Hercules” (9). Since we now know that Alfonso inherited a kingdom in disarray regarding the organization of laws and the need to populate recently conquered lands, the description of Espan’s early activity even more clearly reflects the efforts of Alfonso X: “Espan, sobrino dErcules, que finco por senhor de Espanna, andudo por la tierra e fizo la poblar y endereçar, ca era muy maltrecha y destroyda por la grand guerra que fiziera Hercules; e com era omne sabio y entendudo, soposse apoderar della” (Alfonso X Primera crónica IX: 11; Cárdenas 9).

The three historical characters just described, Jupiter, Hercules, and Espan, reinforce the lineage of Alfonso X through an interweaving of pseudo-genealogy and cultural inheritance, each being linked directly to Alfonso X when in the role of
protagonist, and then shifting to familial relations once the successor becomes the new protagonist. For example, there is an entire section describing the birth of Hercules that reinforces his position as the son of Jupiter, which would likewise recast Jupiter as Fernando III. Likewise, Espan inherits Spain from Hercules, his uncle, because Hercules desired to continue looking for “grandes fechos que y fallasse” and he “non quiso que fincasse la tierra sin omnes de so linage” (I, 10). The flexibility of “linage” is expressed here in a way that is analogous to how the title of Holy Roman Emperor was awarded to members of a network of families that were connected through an idea of “linage” that was a mixture of ancestry and culture. While the association with Hercules, once Espan is given the crown of Spain, more accurately shifts to an association with Fernando III, the expanded concept of “linage” as cultural is simultaneously expressed through the transfer of the crown of Spain from uncle (Hercules) to nephew (Espan), which would find its reflection in the transfer of the title of Holy Roman Emperor from Frederick II (uncle) to Alfonso X (nephew). While familial ties were important for the establishment of a claim, the cultural legacy had to necessarily be the most important for Alfonso X to have any opportunity of becoming Holy Roman Emperor, as Frederick II had an heir in Conrado IV.19

19 Although Conrado IV died of fever in 1254, four years after his father Frederick II, he had sired an heir, Conradino of Hohenstaufen (1252-1268).
In order to achieve his goal, Alfonso X had to delicately balance his genetic and cultural ancestry, by building an inheritance that culminated in his logical placement on the throne of the Empire. With the death of Frederick II in 1250 and then that of Conrad IV in 1254, an opportunity opened for Alfonso to request that he be recognized as the rightful heir to the Duchy of Suabia through his mother’s line, a claim that was initially upheld by Pope Alexander IV in February of 1255 (Salvador Martínez 148). Whether spurred on by the death of Conrad IV in 1254, the death of Guillermo of Holand in 1256 (briefly elected Rex romanorum in 1247), or by the disconcerting Double Election of Reges romanorum in 1257, these years coincide with a period of time in which Alfonso X was constructing his improved ancestry, as evidenced in the Estoria de Espanna, Espéculo, and the Setenario, and these are the same years in which Alfonso X ordered the scriptorium to produce LDS.

As seen from other works of Alfonsine historiography, Alfonso was interested in forging a cultural legacy that would more than compensate for any indirect inheritance that might take place along genealogical lines. To achieve this he wrote himself into the descriptions of historical figures such as Jupiter, Hercules, and Espan, while also fashioning familial legacies from Jupiter to Espan, on one hand, and Jupiter to Frederick II, on the other. In the process of crafting his ancestors, whether directly related or not, the most important attribute that had to echo across the ages was that of being a sage and proponent of wisdom. From Jupiter (organizer of the fueros and laws), Hercules (sage and astronomer), and Espan (astronomer, sage, and nation builder), to Frederick II
(stupor mundi and Holy Roman Emperor) along one line and to Fernando III (conqueror) along the other, in Alphonsine historiography, all exemplary ancestors had to conform to the project. As a result, Fernando III would have to live up to his lineage and be both a champion of war and a champion of letters. Like Jupiter, he must do more than rule, he must unify and organize the law codes, and like Hercules, he must also pursue wisdom. Fernando III, already recognized for his deeds in battle, however, does not appear to have lived up to his son’s expectations regarding the patronage of Arts. Such circumstances, nevertheless, did not stop Alfonso from correcting the history of his lineage in other works over the length of his reign, so why should we consider this text the exception? Knowing the precarious position of the recently expanded kingdom of Castilla, Alfonso used the successful campaigns for territory as historical evidence for the invention of a myth about his father: that Fernando III was first a developer of wisdom and learning, and that conquest was his second greatest achievement. In this way, what Fernando could not accomplish in life, Alfonso’s wise men made certain that he achieved it in death, ensuring an unbroken chain of cultural inheritance in Spain to match the one he received from his Hohenstaufen mother, and claiming a precedence in his father to justify the cultural program that he initiated when he ascended to the throne in 1252.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

The goal of this dissertation was not to demonstrate that the Alfonsine cultural campaign crafted a new image of the monarchy, nor was it to study all the ways in which it attempted to exercise its power and centralize authority under the king; the former being already accepted and the latter being much too large of an undertaking for a dissertation, and possibly even for one individual’s life work. Rather, this dissertation sought to focus on the last years of Fernando III’s life and the first few years of Alfonso’s reign (1251-1255), a period in which Alfonso was attempting to establish himself as a ruler while negotiating a path of both continuity and change vis-à-vis his father’s legacy. Moreover, the selection of the texts further limited the scope of the project to specifically look at how early endeavors of Alfonso’s campaign utilized visibly Arabic literary traditions for the dissemination of knowledge, *adab*, in order to participate in larger cultural discourses, such as the conquest of Muslim territory, the ideal role of a monarch, and the proper relationships between vassals and sovereigns.

The three selected texts have never been rigorously studied collectively, and certainly have not been placed in such close proximity for a study of their reception or genre. When appearing jointly, they are subdivided either into separate formal groupings, as “prosa exemplar” and “prosa gnóstica”, or separate groupings based on origin, as “de origin oriental” and “de origin occidental/castellana”, or both (Haro Cortés *Los
compendios; La imagen; Lacarra Cuento y novela).¹ The project initially began as a study of the changes in ideology concerning the image of the monarchy as expressed in Arabic and Arabic-inspired wisdom literature in the Castilian courts from Fernando III to Sancho IV. Similar in concept to the works of Haro Cortés (La imagen) and Palafóx (Las éticas), my interest in both the exemplum and the sententia quickly made apparent the overly ambitious reality of covering what was originally conceived as four texts over roughly sixty years and three sovereigns. The fortuitous decision to select the works based on chronological proximity, as opposed to already observed generic affiliation, proved more fruitful that I could have imagined.

Despite the obvious culmination of many aspects of the Calila e Dimna, Sendebar, and Libro de los doze sabios found in the Castigos del rey don Sancho IV, the abscission of Sancho el Bravo’s document initially permitted a more thorough study of a reduced period of time. The unanticipated result, however, was a reversal in the approach of how I looked at the relationship between the three earlier works. The current criticism on Calila e Dimna and Sendebar argues that these two works participate in the same

¹ As can be expected, Libro de los doze sabios is commonly placed in the category of gnostic prose collections from Castilla, despite its exemplary content and the clear influence from Eastern models, and Calila e Dimna and Sendebar are discussed as exemplary prose from Oriental origins, in spite of their gnostic content and probable circulation in the Islamic West for centuries.
milieu as the various *compendios de castigos* that were popular during the second half of the thirteenth century in Castile, often making a formalist link via *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV* to the *Conde Lucanor* as a narrative tradition, opposed to a strictly gnostic one, of exemplary fiction made for the education of courtiers and kings alike. By removing the *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, often seen as the site for the blending of these two distinct literary traditions of the gnostic and the exemplary, the project proposed a new lens for approaching all three works.² How did one read *Calila e Dimna* and *Sendebar* as a work of esoteric knowledge with occulted lessons that had to be uncovered? How did one read the *Libro de los doze sabios* as an exemplary narrative? What sort of reception would seem plausible, if not probable, of these works by mid-

² For example, Haro Cortés states: “A medio camino entre ambas categorías los *Castigos de Sancho IV* combinan razonamiento doctrinales, apólogos y sentencias” (*La imagen* 13). She also explores this concept in her previous book, *Los compendios de castigos del siglo XIII* (71). Palafóx echoes this claim, saying: “los *Castigos e documentos del rey don Sancho IV, El conde Lucanor y el Libro de buen amor* cuentan entre los herederos más importantes de las diversas tradiciones didácticas relacionadas con el uso del *exemplum*”, specifically pointing out the translation activity of “prosa didáctica oriental (narrativa y gnómica)” during the reign of Alfonso X and the tradition of the *especulum principis*, of which the *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV* is the second of original creation in Castilian after the *Libro de los doze sabios* (30-34).
thirteenth century Castilians? The more focused scope of the dissertation provoked me to consider these previously under-investigated questions.

By way of conclusion for the project, the following pages seek to harmonize some of the connected, yet disparate, conclusions of the individual chapters in order to emphasize certain shared qualities of these texts, and to stake out areas for future research.

The first argument is my desire to emphasize the blended aspects of all three of these texts, most importantly the “hidden lessons” of exemplary prose collections (**Calila e Dimna** and **Sendebar**) and the exemplary aspects of a collection considered to be gnostic in nature (**Libro de los doze sabios**). The strictly formal divisions that traditionally categorize these texts, and others, into exemplary or gnostic groupings obscure the ways that they collectively participate in the formally heterogeneous genre of the Castilian **compendio de castigos**. One goal of each chapter was to show how all three of these texts participate in both exemplary and gnostic fields, but the cumulative objective is to demonstrate that this more bifurcated method is a characteristic of the thirteenth-century genre that unites these works.

Recognition of this genre, and its specific characteristics, will help scholars nuance the way they speak about literary traditions within Castilian letters. For example, while I agree with Zeitler’s (and Wacks’) argument that Alfonso X uses translation as a way to appropriate the “famed adab literary tradition from the dominant (Arab) literary polysystem” in order to self-fashion his royal image as a “founder and promulgator of
knowledge, seen through the nascent Castilian literary polysystem and literary language”,

I feel that the implied separation of religions, cultures, and polysystems along an

Arabic/Castilian divide overstates the degree to which Castilians would find these texts to be “foreign” (Zeitler 190-94). Unlike other objects of conquest and display, books also possessed a second value in the content of the text within. The worth of the object and of its content is negotiated by its reception, and when considering literary texts, the greater proximity of the various interpretive communities from the two literary polysystems will increase the value of the text, and also object, in question. The subsequent fact that

scholars would trace a tradition of prose fiction backwards to the *Calila e Dimna* (and *Sendebar*) in order to uncover a medieval, primitive seed to the fully flourished works of

Cervantes does not mean that Castilians of the thirteenth-century approached these texts as the foundation of a future, more developed literary culture of narrative fiction. The use of these texts for inspiration in later literary endeavors, such as the *Castigos de Sancho IV*, the *Conde Lucanor*, and the *Novelas ejemplares*, similarly, does not detract from the role that these works played in their primary social milieu at the time of their appearance in the Castilian language. Opposed to bringing something foreign into Castilian, the royal patronage of *Calila e Dimna* is symbolically potent because it, pertaining to the Arabic genre of *adab*, already obtains a valuable status within the Iberian literary polysystem.³

³ As time continues, the multi-linguistic polysystem of the Iberian Peninsula, composed of the intellectual elite, will abandon Arabic, creating the illusion through the bias of
Future research into this already existent, Iberian polysystem would certainly prove fruitful for the understanding of these Castilian works, as well as of the genre of the *compendio de castigos* as a whole. One aspect in particular would be to better classify the attributes of this genre as imagined by thirteenth-century participants. Some examples that illustrate the diversity of works associated with the genre: In one version of the *Donzella Teodor*, there is a prolonged explanation of the humors of the human body and medicinal remedies (Francomano 93); In the *Libro del caballero Zifar*, under the heading of “Castigos del rey Mentón”, appears a version of *Flores de filosofía* (González Muela)

history that such translation projects “bridged” separate polysystems across a crevasse of unintelligibility. I believe that such a divide was minimal prior to the end of the thirteenth century, a century that witnessed two of the most powerful Christian courts celebrating arabized fashion, learning, and culture; that of Frederick II and that of Alfonso X. The *studium generale* of Seville and the *madrasa* of Murcia both suggest Castilian contexts for the institutionalized fostering of such Iberian literary polysystems privileging Arabic studies akin to how the Universities of Salamanca and Palencia privileged Latin Studies. The School of Translators in Toledo, functioning in greater and lesser degree since the twelfth century, and the Court of Translators in Toledo under Alfonso X are examples of sanctioned spaces for the convening of members of the multi-lingual Iberian literary polysystem, a polysystem that certainly existed and had participating members outside of the walls of Toledo.
and the quite understudied *Libro de juegos*, ordered to be made by Alfonso X in 1283, uses the circumstances of the various games as *exempla* for the instruction of rulers and courtiers in “wise living” (Gollarday 90). I am not advocating that these works fulfill all of the generic qualities of a “pure” *compendio de castigos*, however, I do propose that there is an as-yet-undefined genre that has up to this point been described as a *compendio de castigos*, though such a generic title may prove unsatisfactory after further investigation.

While needing separate classification and description from the *roman à thèse*, the focus of Suleiman’s book, her theoretical approach for understanding genres is possibly a good place for scholars to start in order to better define what is taking place in medieval Castile concerning didactic texts connected with courtly practices, conduct, and the governing of hierarchical interactions. She states that “[t]he genre […] is not the product of a one to one correspondence between a single structural model and a mode; it is, rather, the result of an intersection between a general model (or more than one) and a set of specific model traits”, where the general model is based on what she calls “modal traits”, the traits that “allow us to define the ‘essence of the genre’ independently of the narrative or thematic structures that might be realized by an individual work that belongs to the genre” (63-64). While a given text may be more or less participatory in the modal traits of the genre, the classification and definition of these traits in conjunction with a better understanding of the expectations that a medieval audience would place on the
recognition of those traits, would allow scholars to more effectively interpret these works within their socio-cultural milieu.

Another argument developed in each of these chapters, and certainly an important characterization of the greater genre, is the proximity of these collections with works of historiography. This association is discussed primarily in Chapter 5, concerning the *Libro de los doze sabios*, but both the *Sendebar* and *Calila e Dimna* connect with the field of Alfonsine historiography beyond the basic connection of Alfonso’s exemplary use of history for the education of his subjects. The crossing of these *compendios* with historiography occurs in a variety of ways, some subtle and others more overt. For example, the journey of Berzebuey to India under the order of Emporer Kousrau I is incorporated into the *General historia* of Alfonso X in book VII, chapter XLI where it states: “Onde fallamos un exiemplo d’esto en un libro que fue hecho en India, e à nombre Calida e Dina [sic]. E diz que un rey de Persia…” (386). As I argued in Chapter 5, part of the authority that the exemplary narratives about Fernando III and Alfonso X appropriate is that of historiography, as the textual association with the historiographic practices of the time adds verisimilitude to the events which then reinforces the veracity of the content within. Concerning the content of *Sendebar*, I am not convinced that a medieval audience would interpret the greater frame of the work, the story about King Alcos (a.k.a. Kousrau I), as a tale of fiction and not as a retelling of historical events. While the field of historiography in recent years has successfully found ample applications of literary theory for better understanding texts that present themselves as documenting history, it
may be beneficial to look at the *compendios de castigos* as works attempting to document history as well, where the less recognizably fictitious content would be regarded as historical *exempla* to be used for the scrutiny of concurrent events in society.

Additionally, I have tried to avoid in each of these chapters an over-simplified characterization of the relationship between these texts and the socio-cultural setting in which they existed. While on one hand, evidence from these texts can be collected in order to propose an argument about the society in which they were created and, on the other, it is undeniable that works are the product of humans living in a localized place of time and space, works of art do not reproduce a society or reflect real, lived human experiences, and likewise, these *compendios* do not communicate the lived courtly relationships within medieval Castile. They present ideals, and circumstances to be avoided, that must be negotiated by the audience within the greater context of their culture, neither of which have a single, monovalent meaning without the other. Instead of declaring that these texts impose a direct influence on culture, in each of the chapters of this dissertation I have attempted to describe the way in which members of a thirteenth-century Iberian literary polysystem would negotiate the meaning-making process for applying the lessons from these texts to their own society.

Either symbolically or expressly, the monarch Alfonso X is depicted in all of these works from the early 1250s. Similarly to how the texts themselves that must be negotiated by their readers within the context of their culture, so must the image of Alfonso X be negotiated through a process of meaning-making by the recipients of the
work within the context of their culture, with the addition that their culture also contains
the true Alfonso X. Haro Cortés describes the use of the figure of the monarch in these
works in the following way: “[…] aunque la figura central de estas obras sea el príncipe
en su calidad de individuo y de gobernante, la imagen del monarca que se nos ofrece
siempre está conectada e influída por la ideología política de esa época determinada, y
que en cierto modo forma parte del propósito de la obra” (La imagen 26). In the case of
Alfonso X, promoter of two of the works and object of comparison for the third, we can
more acutely pinpoint the political ideology most likely at work in each of the texts for
members of the Iberian literary polysystem.

Haro Cortés further contends that by observing the descriptions of the monarch in
these compendios (and I would expand the object of concern to all courtly relations), we
can uncover “preocupaciones políticas medievales, tales como la controversia entre
iglesia y estado, la teoría de derecho divino, la distinción entre dominium politicum y
dominium regale, el concepto y extensión de ley” (La imagen 26). While I have touched
on this topic in each of the chapters, certainly more can be said concerning the
“preocupaciones políticas” that each of these works exhibit, with Sendebar potentially
occupying an uncommon, thirteenth-century stand-point of exposing political concerns
from the point of view of the nobility. Fruitful projects for the Calila e Dimna and Libro
de los doze sabios within this context would certainly find fertile ground in strong-
containment theories, adopting the position that the potentially heterovalent messages
expressed in each of the texts are a way for Alfonso X to address discord within his court
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in order to contain the discourse and subjugate it for his own benefit. This certainly appears to have been the case concerning the *Libro de los doze sabios*.

Finally, certain historically accepted claims have been challenged regarding the two protagonist monarchs of this dissertation, Alfonso X and Fernando III. Starting with the elder, I must first clarify that I do not intend to detract from the accomplishments of Fernando III, and that I believe the greatest service that can be done for this monarch, and history in general, is the pursuit of a more accurate understanding of him and his reign. At the same time, I contend that the *Libro de los doze sabios* is an Alfonsine creation without origin under Fernando III. As suggested before, if we remove this work from Fernando’s patronage we significantly impoverish the well of royally mandated texts from which historians have drawn for the nourishment of upholding his legacy as a patron of oriental wisdom. At the same time, because we depend so much on works from Alfonso’s scriptorium to tell us about his father, and specifically his father’s (intended) intellectual pursuits, I believe we must tread carefully while peeling back the layers of fact and fiction for both rulers. Nonetheless, the removal of the *Libro de los doze sabios* from the list of works that Fernando promulgated will certainly require a substantial revision of our understanding of the monarch, not the least his role in the education of the various *infantes*, and particularly when concerning the education provided to Alfonso, Fadrique, Enrique, and Manuel.

With regards to Alfonso X, scholars must achieve a more complex understanding of the Wise King’s relationship to his father, and moreover, they must abandon the use of
citing a singular text as a means of advocating a totalizing view of this relationship. One example of this is the over-used citation from the Estoria de España where Alfonso claims that his father while on his deathbed told him the following:

&Snsor te dexo de toda la tierra de la mar aca, que los moros del rey Rodgigo de Espanna ganado ovieron; et en tu sennorio finca toda: la vna conquerida, la otra tributada. Sy la en este estado en que te la yo dexo la sopieres guardar, eres tan buen rey commo yo; et sy ganares por ti mas, eres meior que yo; et si desto menguas, non eres tan bueno commo yo. (1132: 772b-73a)

A more appealing story through which to compare the two monarchs could not be asked for, except for maybe the Libro de los doze sabios; but it should not be surprising that no further evidence of such a conversation is recorded. External evidence to verify the communication is unlikely to ever emerge, and a concerted effort by scholars to ever locate such proof will likely be as fruitful as uncovering the historical twelve sages spoken of in the Libro de los doze sabios. Both historical events are, before anything else, inextricable from Alfonso’s cultural campaign and produced by a scriptorium that brazenly manipulated and invented “history” to suit its political needs. One of the consequences of this dissertation, along with the increasing evidence produced in the study of Alfonsine historiography, is that yet another work produced under Alfonso X ultimately tells us more about him than it does about its given subject, be it Jupiter, Hercules, or Fernando III. Despite their status as translations, the same can be said of Calila e Dimna and Sendebar.
In conclusion, this dissertation addresses one of the ways that Alfonso X became Alfonso el Sabio. The general consensus is that Fernando III would be a hard act to follow for any ruler; exalted by most as a model monarch of Christendom, a tradition begun by Alfonso X, Fernando III’s impeccable image, nonetheless, is conspicuously dependent on the projects of his heir. In contrast, despite the lack of territorial acquisition during his reign, the continuous animosity of the Church and the nobility, and the underwhelming conclusion to his life, Alfonso X managed to forge for himself a space in history as the Father of the Castilian language, as a patron of the arts and sciences par excellence, and as an erudite sovereign, in combination earning him the epithet of el Sabio and the distinction of being “Spain’s most celebrated medieval king” (Rodgers 58).

Through analyzing the exemplary content and the “hidden lessons” of the three works in question, this dissertation demonstrates how these works participated in negotiating contemporary understandings of politics and history at the moment of their production in Castilian. Like the continuous movement of diegeses found within their pages, these texts shift roles between being frames through which to read history, and the exempla that must be interpreted within their Castilian, socio-historical frame. At the center of the negotiation process, made inextricable by direct insertion or symbolism, is the royal image of Alfonso X. Concerning this image, one objective of the cultural campaign that is expressed through these texts is the desire to position Alfonso as an inheritor of a great tradition of Iberian civilizers, wise/warrior-kings who conquer territory through the pursuit and exaltation of wisdom. Unable to continue the same
policies as his father due to the recent territorial acquisitions, for which he was also significantly responsible, Alfonso’s cultural campaign changed the discourses of conquest through rewriting the history of his lineage and repurposing the Reconquista objectives away from a strictly territorial goal and towards the pursuit of knowledge. At the heart of this objective, nonetheless, is a political struggle between monarchical power and that of the nobility, as the acceptance of the proposed schema, which asserts the attractiveness of a supremely-wise ruler, consequentially reduces the value of the participation of the nobility in government. Unlike at the beginning Fernando III’s reign, Castile in 1252 did not border multiple taifa kingdoms that could potentially become large land grants for the appeasement of the nobles. After the Repartimiento de Sevilla Alfonso would have had even fewer tools at his disposal to assert his will over the nobility. Alfonso knew the circumstances had changed, and for the new conditions, new rules had to be made. In order to force the nobility into submission within the context of the new political make-up of the Iberian Peninsula, Alfonso’s cultural campaign turned to the uncountable wealth of Arabic wisdom as an ideologically driven political arm. Promoting a vision of history where successful campaigns are the fruits of war for a civilization that pursues wisdom, the texts materially symbolize the past success of Castile’s conquests, the appropriate spoils for a war in the name of knowledge. Simultaneously, they promise through the exaltation of their content even greater prosperity than that already achieved, on the condition that nobility and monarchy conform to the prescribed social organization.
The self-reflective didactic texts of *Calila e Dimna* and *Libro de los doze sabios*, both the historiographical means and end of their own existence, re-imagine Alfonso as both the solution and the one to solve Castile’s problems. In opposition to this proposition, *Sendebar* appropriates the very symbolism used by the campaign’s translation of *Calila e Dimna*, most prominently the already forged association between Kousrau I and Alfonso X, in order to contest the proposed social organization that prefers centralizing authority under the monarchy and to challenge the very image that the royal campaign desires to construct for Alfonso X. Changing tactics, the campaign’s production of the *Libro de los doze sabios* reasserts the objectives of *Calila e Dimna*, but recasts the exemplary content onto Fernando III, appropriating the positive image of his father and infusing it with the ideals that Alfonso possesses and the objectives that he wishes to pursue. Dominating the discourse through the production of legal, scientific, and historiographic texts, the continued translation and creation of material under the royal *scriptorium* turns each text into additional evidence of Alfonso’s power, authority, and success as a king, not only making him *el Sabio*, but also making such an epithet the most celebrated of all.
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Appendix A: Praises of Fernando III

*LDS* (Chapter 66): *Dichos* to be inscribed on Fernando III’s sepulcher (Walsh 118):

Dixo el primer sabio:
“Mejor es tu fyn que tu comienço”.

El segundo sabio dixo:
“En la muerte falleçen los saberes, e en la deste rey creçio la sabiduría”.

E el terçero sabio dixo:
“Fueste simple en la vida con mucha bondad e eres sabio en la muerte”.

E quarto sabio dixo:
“Más será tu remenbrança que el tiempo de tu vida”.

El quinto sabio dixo:
“Mayor fecho es el tuyo que de los que conquistaron el mundo”.

El sesto sabio dixo:
“Preçiaste las cosas enfinidas, e fasta la fyn será el tu nonbre”.

El seteno sabio dixo:
“Non te queda ál de la tu seória synon del mandamiento que dexaste a los sabios e el bien que feziste”.

El otavo sabio dixo:
“Prestaste el saber e syenpre te loarán los sabios”.

El nobeno sabio dixo:
“Feziste fermosa casa con pocos dineros”.

El dezeno sabio dixo:
“En la vida oviste la fermosura del cuerpo, e en la muerte mostraste fermosura del alma”.

El honzeno sabio dixo:
“Más conocido serás muerto que bivo”.

El derecho sabio dixo:
“Fasta aquí te loavan los que te conoçían, e agora loarte han los que te non nonoçen”.
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