This dissertation has been 63-2580
microfilmed exactly as received

ZAHAREAS, Anthony Nicholas, 1930-
THE ART OF JUAN RUIZ, ARCHPRIEST OF HITL.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1962
Language and Literature, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE ART OF JUAN RUIZ

ARCHPRIEST OF HITA

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Anthony Nicholas Zahareas, B. A., M. A.

The Ohio State University

1962

Approved by

Kenneth R. Scholberg
Adviser
Department of Romance Languages

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first thank Carlos Blanco Aguinaga who taught me the importance of combining imagination and discipline in literary studies. I am indebted to Professor Morris Weitz for his lectures on aesthetics. I am thankful to my adviser, Professor Kenneth Scholberg, for encouraging me with the topic, for urging me in my research and for his helpful suggestions in discussing the manuscript. I am especially grateful to Mr. Jerome Mandel of the English Department for his constant help both in style and content; his patient reading of the manuscript, his sound advice, and his constant encouragement were invaluable. But above all, I am grateful to my wife, Louise, without whose help this disseration could not have been written. Instead of acknowledging my gratitude I simply dedicate this work to her with deep affection.

PREFACE

This study explores the manner and methods of Juan Ruiz that constitute the artistry of the Libro de Buen Amor. The method is to derive a meaning from the structure. If the results seem acceptable, the method is justified, at least, on aesthetic grounds. A constant difficulty, however, is the problem of whether such a method conflicts with the data of the historian and the philologist. Previously, critics have raised the question of whether it is possible to analyze the Libro as a work of art without first establishing a set of defining properties for medieval literature and which may be applied to most medieval works. To analyze the Libro as a medieval work implies that it has certain properties. But to claim that these properties must be present for a medieval work to be authentic is to claim that the properties can be defined and codified and to offer an absolute theory of what is a medieval literary work. Such a claim does not apply to the Libro de Buen Amor.

There are at least two well-defined positions concerning the makeup of the Middle Ages. One view stresses the uniformity and stability of medieval culture:

The priority of faith and the unquestioned supremacy of the goal of salvation directed and controlled scholastic currents. . . . scholars, theologians, poets, and artist-craftsmen, worked and wrought . . . a consistent and rational system . . . which included

human knowledge and human life . . . Medieval man sought to think and imagine in unbroken patterns and whole schemes (Henry O. Taylor, "Placing the Middle Ages," Speculum, XI 1936 , 441-442, 443. 445).

An opposing view offers strong evidence to point out that the medieval period was one of great tension, of peculiarly sharp, even though often concealed, conflicts.

It was impossible for a medieval writer to make any use of the principle of plenitude without verging upon heresies. For that conception, when taken over into Christianity, had to be accommodated to very different principles, drawn from other sources, which forbade its literal interpretation; to carry it through to what seemed to be its necessary implications was to be sure of falling into one theological pitfall or another" (Arthur O. Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being, Harvard University Press Cambridge, 1936 , p. 69).

The above opposite views, both sound, should indicate that insistence upon the "uniformity" of the Middle Ages often gives a misleading picture of medieval culture and consequently several medieval literary productions appear more unified than they really are. The Libro is a good example; a preconceived notion of what is a "medieval work," does not solve the problems concerning its art.

I use the paleographic edition of J. Ducamin, Bibliothèque Meridionale (Toulouse, 1901). I generally follow the MS of Salamanca (1345), but, at times, I include quotes from MSS G and T as variants. I have modernized some of the spelling to facilitate reading. Italics are mine.

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	11
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
I The Major Critics of the <u>Libro</u>	2
II Juan Ruiz's "Plaint": The Text vs. Traditional Criticism.....	12
III Aesthetic Method and the <u>Libro</u>	24
CHAPTER TWO--THE STRUCTURE OF THE <u>LIBRO DE BUEN AMOR</u> ..	29
I The Structure of Autobiography: The Arch- priest as Narrator and Commentator.....	34
II The Archpriest's Art of Ambiguity.....	52
III The Archpriest's Art of Irony.....	66
IV Fusion of Narrator and Commentator.....	84
V Juan Ruiz and the Didactic Structure: (The Art of Humor).....	91
<u>The Disputation between the Greeks and</u> <u>the Romans</u>	111
VI Summary and Conclusions.....	125
CHAPTER THREE--THE COMMENTS ON ART: THEORY AND PRACTICE.....	128
I The <u>Libro</u> as a Lesson in Versification and Composition.....	129
II The <u>Libro</u> as a Source of Entertainment.....	143
1. Juan Ruiz and the Jongleurs.....	153
<u>Troba cacurra</u>	154
2. Juan Ruiz and the Fabliaux.....	165
<u>The youth who wished to marry three</u> <u>women</u>	167
<u>Two lazy men who wished to marry</u> <u>Pitas Payas</u>	172
Summary.....	177
3. Juan Ruiz and the Goliards.....	190
<u>The Canonical Hours</u>	191
<u>The Property of Money</u>	195
<u>The Archpriests of Talavera</u>	209
Summary.....	221
4. Juan Ruiz and Invective.....	236
5. Summary: The <u>Libro</u> as a Source of Entertainment.....	238
	252

	Page
III The <u>Libro</u> and Rhetoric.....	255
1. Rhetorical devices.....	260
<u>Apostrophatio</u> ; <u>Occupatio</u> ; <u>Digressio</u> ; <u>Interpretatio</u> ; <u>Amplificatio</u>	
Summary.....	283
2. <u>Descriptio</u> : The Rhetorical Portrait.....	284
The <u>Archpriest</u> : The <u>Sensual Portrait</u>	285
The <u>Mountain Girl</u> from <u>Tablada</u> : The	
<u>Art of the Grotesque</u>	293
<u>Dona Endrina</u> : <u>Animation of Portrait</u>	301
<u>Trotaconventos</u> : <u>From Portrait to</u>	
<u>Character</u>	313
3. <u>Summary, Rhetoric</u> : The <u>One in a</u>	
<u>Thousand Figure</u>	334
IV The Envoi.....	338
CHAPTER FOUR--ART AND CONTENT: THE COMMENTS ON LOVE..	350
I Elaboration of Aristotle.....	353
II Astrology: Worldly Love and Free Will.....	367
III <u>Buen Amor</u> and <u>Loco Amor</u>	386
CONCLUSION.....	395
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	400
AUTOBIOGRAPHY.....	412

CHAPTER ONE

Studies concerning the Libro de Buen Amor are numerous, yet relatively little has been done which throws light upon Juan Ruiz's literary art. The major critical studies have concentrated upon the traditional sources of the Libro, its autobiographical form, and its didactic or non-didactic intentions. Aesthetic approaches have been few, partial, and mostly incidental to historical studies. Almost all critics relegate whatever may be Juan Ruiz's artistic craft to his manner of retelling traditional stories and regard the commentaries on the love adventures as merely a part of the Libro's moral purpose. They attribute any complexities to the elusiveness of the author's view, not to his artistry. Thus most of the critical work, valuable in clarifying the Libro's position in the medieval tradition, is peripheral to its "art." Viewed as a whole, such criticism seems rather limited in that it fails to give much consideration to the possibility that Juan Ruiz held artistic as well as moral convictions. As a result, Juan Ruiz the artist is subordinated to Juan Ruiz the Medievalist.¹

¹This critical emphasis endures despite constant reminders that an examination of the Libro's artistry is necessary. Leo Spitzer, for example, complains that no one has dealt with the Archpriest as I. Siciliano has with Villon and suggests that "el ceñirse al texto modelo--y sabemos cuanto representaba un texto para el escritor medieval . . . --no prejuzga en absoluto sobre la calidad artística." In his review of Félix Lecoy's Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, archiprêtre de Hita (Paris, 1938), RPH, 3 (1939), 266-274.

The aims of this chapter are: first, to take a close look at the achievements of the Libro scholarship as exemplified by selected literary critics and historians. This is essential because from Menéndez Pidal's early contributions to María Rosa Lida de Malkiel's recent studies, much new light has been thrown both upon the Libro itself as well as upon the intellectual and cultural milieu of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Second, to note how their techniques have perhaps limited their contribution to an understanding of the Libro's meaning and Juan Ruiz's artistry. Third, to illustrate the achievements and inadequacies of such criticism with a textual example, the famous lament of the Archpriest on the death of Trotaconventos. Fourth, to demonstrate the need for an aesthetic approach and to suggest some procedures for analyzing the art of the Libro de Buen Amor.²

I

The Major Critics of the Libro

Ramón Menéndez Pidal³ claims that the Libro is best understood if examined in terms of two well-established

²What I do not intend to do is study the various critical theories or definitions, or even specific literary judgments. I am interested not in what the Libro critics say but in what they do, i.e., in the essence of their work. Thus while Leo Spitzer is known for his contributions in "stylistics" and has contributed many studies in connection with modern criticism, such a reputation is secondary to his specific contribution to the Libro: the transmutation of a didactic tradition into what Juan Ruiz writes.

³In three works: Poesía juglaresca y juglares (Madrid, 1924) (Second edition [1957] retitled Poesía juglaresca y

traditions: that of the popular minstrels and that of the scholarly Goliards. He feels the work is not didactic because the Archpriest's sincerity as a moralist is at best relative.⁴ Its boisterous humor is typical of the critical period of the Middle Ages when the mundane spirit (exemplified by profane love) was rebelling against the ascetic (exemplified by spiritual love). The Libro's intention is to burlesque; it is a parody of medieval didacticism. Juan Ruiz's comments on buen amor recall somewhat the end of the Decameron where Boccaccio ironically blesses God for the help of His divine grace in finishing a book of such fine teachings.⁵ G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny carries Menéndez Pidal's view further, relating the Libro's form and wording to the courtly genre of erotic pseudo-autobiography.⁶ Its form is a mocking parody

orígenes de las literaturas románicas), "Título que el Arcipreste de Hita dio al libro de sus poesías," in Poesía árabe y europea (Buenos Aires, 1943), pp. 109-114. "Nota sobre una fabula de don Juan Manuel y de Juan Ruiz" (reprod. in Poesía árabe y poesía europea, Colección Austral Buenos Aires, 1943, pp. 118-123).

⁴The Libro is not "un libro didáctico en serio; es un brote muy tardío . . . la despedida humorística a la época didáctica de la literatura medieval" (Poesía juglaresca, p. 209).

⁵Two other critics de-emphasize the Archpriest's moral intentions. O. Tacke (in Die Fabeln des Erzpriesters von Hita [Breslau, 1911]) believes that Juan Ruiz moralizes in order to cover up his licentious life, to excuse himself, and to keep the freedom to express whatever he wants. W. Kellerman, in "Zur Charakteristik des Libro del Arcipreste de Hita," ZRPh, 67 (1951), 224-254, claims that the Archpriest favors sin over good love.

⁶"Autobiography in the Libro de buen amor in the light of some literary comparisons," BHS, 39 (1957), 63-78. Gybbon-Monypenny demonstrates that most attempts to relate the Libro to a tradition have turned out to be mere "plausibilities."

of the courtly "autobiography."

Leo Spitzer, on the other hand, declares enseignement to be the chief aim of the Libro.⁷ He rejects all theories of personal or jongleresque art: "Juan Ruiz permanece en absoluta conexión con la Edad Media en la esfera de lo dogmático y cultural" ("En torno," p. 105). Even though the Archpriest may often seem to be over-indulgent in his attitude toward worldly love, he is teaching good love, i.e., Christian charity. Spitzer feels the autobiographical form is proof that the Archpriest offers the details of his own life as an example of sinfulness; that is, he claims to commit in actuality that of which he feels man to be potentially capable. By introducing himself into his poem he is not unlike Dante, for both preach the ordo caritatis: "the one [Dante] by showing how man can have access to 'l'amor che muove il sole e l'altre stelle,' the other [Juan Ruiz] by throwing light on the basic weakness of man who is prone to forget the ideal of buen amor."⁸ Thus the Libro's humor, which is for Menéndez Pidal part of Juan Ruiz's mundane spirit, is for Spitzer an integral part of the Archpriest's religious orientation: "El Libro de buen amor cuenta locuras, porque

⁷"En torno al arte del Arcipreste de Hita," in Linguística e historia literaria, ed. Gredos (Madrid, 1955), pp. 103-160.

⁸"Note on the Poetic and the Empirical 'I' in Medieval Authors," Traditio, IV (1946), 422.

la necia conducta de los hombres es también en el orden querido por Dios" ("En torno," p. 134).⁹

Félix Lecoy situates the Libro's various forms and themes in their particular traditions, compares them to other European parallels, and thus integrates them into the literary and moral climate of the Latin Middle Ages.¹⁰ He stresses above all the Latin substratum, available to all clerics. He concludes that the Libro has no unity either from the doctrinal or the moral point of view. The two worlds of good and worldly love are felt sincerely but do not unify. Simply, Juan Ruiz is a better artist when he handles scandalous love affairs than when dealing with Christian doctrinal material.¹¹ Lecoy claims that he obviously assembled

⁹ Thomas Hart (in La alegoría en el Libro de buen amor Madrid, 1959, carries Spitzer's view further and attempts to prove that the Libro is allegorical. His arguments are based on the medieval tendency for allegory which was reinforced by Christianity's predilection for the "figure" and the vision, which need interpretation. His arguments are refuted by María Rosa Lida (see her book review in RPh, XIV, No. 4 May, 1961, 342) on the grounds that Hart does not consider what the Archpriest himself has to say about his didactic comments. She furnishes ample proof that medieval writers made their intentions clear whenever they prepared an allegory for the public (Berceo, Don Juan Manuel, the Ovide moralisé, etc.).

¹⁰ Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, archiprêtre de Hita (Paris, 1938). This is a very important study of Juan Ruiz's sources, a kind of traditional atlas, indispensable for any study of the Libro. Lecoy completely avoids any discussion concerning the Libro's artistic coherence; he comes to some definite conclusions concerning its forms and meaning which I discuss.

¹¹ Lecoy agrees with the earlier interpretation of Salvatore Battaglia ("Il Libro de Buen Amor," La Cultura, IX 1930, 721-735) that although Juan Ruiz's moral intention is most probably sincere, he is not good at preaching while

fragments in one book and gave it unity by an autobiographical form and an ars amatoria.¹² This view, based on the Libro's duality gives Lecoy the opportunity to examine the sources as individual literary nuggets and to determine clearly their traditions.

I shall present somewhat more fully the views of Américo Castro because he initiated a new way of approaching the Libro which has, consciously or unconsciously, influenced all subsequent critical considerations.¹³ According to

he excels in the plastic representation of life. The Arch-priest thus fails in his moral attempts to portray life as it ought to be, but succeeds in painting life as it is.

¹²"Le véritable sens de l'ouvrage est contenu dans la petite phrase de cette même préface, où l'auteur déclare qu'après tout, si ses vers ne doivent pas profiter à ceux qui veulent assurer leur pas dans la marche vers le salut, ils pourront en tout cas servir de guide à ceux qui s'engageront dans la carrière du loco amor" (p. 361). Thus the term itself, buen amor, should be taken in its profane meaning which approximates the fine amour of the courtly poets.

¹³In "El Libro de Buen Amor del Arcipreste de Hita," OL, IV (1952), 193-213, Castro attempts to clarify his ideas of España en su historia (Buenos Aires, 1948). I shall cite principally from the above article and from the revision of España, titled La realidad histórica de España (Mexico, 1954). Although his interests are historical, Castro is one of the few critics to concentrate on the text. Many of his textual observations (such as the "shifting perspective") are brilliant while the historical comments to which he subjects his textual findings are arguable. Castro's intent is historical more than scholarly as he himself explains (in "Mozarabic poetry and Castille: A rejoinder to Mr. Leo Spitzer," OL, IV 1952, 188), "I did not write my book as an abstract scholarly exercise but to express how the Spaniards of yesterday and today have felt and feel about themselves. This is a serious problem. It is my problem." His specific interest in Juan Ruiz is to show that "El tema del Libro enlaza con las posibilidades de la vividura hispana" ("El Libro," op. cit., p. 195).

Castro, the Libro cannot be a didactic work because Juan Ruiz does not write from the detached, idealistic, "life-as-it-should-be" point of view, but rather from within a vital, fluctuating, problematic reality in which are fused all aspects of human life. Love merely serves as the point of departure, not as the central focus of all the other values. Thus the Archpriest, as he reveals himself in his Libro, is not primarily concerned with vice and virtue, but with man's basic preoccupations. He does not judge actions as good or bad, but rather as effectual or ineffectual. Concerning the Libro's traditions, Castro points out that the terms of contrast between good love and profane love, between the abstract and the concrete, can be found in other European Christian works, as Lecoy, Spitzer, and María Rosa Lida have pointed out. In the Libro, however, these extreme positions are presented as a continuous gliding of one into the other, until sometimes good love and profane love, or humor and seriousness, cannot be distinguished definitely one from the other.

Castro uses his findings to show that although Juan Ruiz took what material he wanted from European Christian traditions, the structure of fused and alternating allegory, passion, humor, and sensual elements is unprecedented in Christian Europe, and is actually a reflection of Arabic models. The Libro is thus one more literary example which demonstrates the major thesis of his book: the close

relationship between Arabic and Spanish literature.¹⁴ He describes the world of Arabic literature as one which is presented in an environment of gliding, shifting appearances, in which not only the appearances, but the concepts beneath them fuse and reflect one another. It is therefore erroneous to compare the Libro's didactic framework with the European tradition because when Juan Ruiz explains the meaning of his work while constantly shifting his ground, he differs from the tradition of Christian exegesis which emphasizes what is solid and firm.¹⁵

María Rosa Lida de Malkiel agrees with Castro that there are no analogies for the Libro in the Christian tradition and finds a precedent in the Judeo-Arabic maqamāt.¹⁶ On the

¹⁴"El Libro de Buen Amor es un reflejo castellano de modelos árabes" (la realidad, p. 378). "El Cancionero del Arcipreste pudiera compararse a una obra mudéjar" (p. 413). Castro claims that the amazing variety of content, the alternations between narrative and lyrical forms, the oscillation from one episode to another and his coplas for the blind, are further proofs of the Libro's relationship to Arabic works.

¹⁵Stephen Gilman (in "The Juvenile Intuition of Juan Ruiz," Symposium, IV, No. 2 November, 1950) attempts "to follow the direction of Castro's thought," (i.e., that apparently Juan Ruiz is unable to choose and follow a single intention of lece or buen amor) and suggests that the Archpriest has created "a poetic world which in many of its perspectives and much of its content resembles that of a child" (p. 301).

¹⁶The most important of her critical contributions on the Libro are gathered in her last two major studies: "Nuevas notas para la interpretación del Libro de Buen Amor," NRFE, XIII (1959), 17-82. Two Spanish Masterpieces: The Book of Good Love and The Celestina, Univ. of Illinois Press (Urbana, 1961), pp. 1-51. I shall refer constantly to her works in my study.

other hand, she agrees with Spitzer that the Libro offers many similarities between Juan Ruiz's morally-oriented statements and typical didactic medieval comments such as Berceo's "tolgamos la corteza, el meollo entremos." Above all, she stresses, favoring Spitzer and opposing Castro, the didactic basis of the Libro, "obra de poesía amena con intención didáctica (siendo la conducta humana la materia principal pero no exclusiva de su didactismo), en enlace íntimo con obras de idéntica intención de la literatura árabe y la hebrea" ("Nuevas notas," Note 11, p. 20). She cites Juan Ruiz's expressions of intent in the prologue, the preliminary stanzas, the beginnings and endings of many episodes (Coplas 76, 105, 161, etc), and the final epilogue. She argues that the basic relationship between Juan Ruiz and the Arabic tradition is not based on the Libro's oscillations but on didacticism: "The Book of Good Love belongs to the literary genre of the semitic maqāmat, an essentially didactic genre. The teaching of the maqāmat is, above all, moralizing" (Two Masterpieces, p. 22). María Rosa Lida produces a vast body of scholarly annotations to show in detail the extent of Juan Ruiz's reliance on the didactic commonplaces available to him in both Arabic and Christian writings: "In short, the Book of Good Love, a work of mudéjar art, fits its Christian motifs into the structure of the Hispano-Hebraic maqāmat" (Two Masterpieces, p. 32).

The above critics have raised many issues but have been principally concerned with grounding the Libro in a tradition and determining Juan Ruiz's intentions.¹⁷ All have analyzed the themes, expressions, and even techniques as annotations of existing traditional elements. In any given passage, they examine the traditional elements, compare them to their original source, and finally interpret the role of the elements in terms of the Libro's ideological or cultural importance.¹⁸ They do not view the Libro as an artistic integration of traditional cultures but rather as an accumulation of elements taken from different traditions. They conclude that Juan Ruiz has somehow improved the traditions he has borrowed because he had added a more subjective

¹⁷ Their findings can be easily schematized: Menéndez Pidal: no didactic intention, European tradition; Spitzer: European tradition but didactic intention; Lecoy: moral and non-moral intention, Latin European tradition; Castro: no moral intention, influence of Arabic tradition; María Rosa Lida: Judeo-Arabic tradition but moral-didactic intention.

¹⁸ The following is perhaps an exaggerated case of Libro criticism but it is symptomatic of those critics who utilize the Libro to illustrate cultural conditions: "Las cuatro cantigas de serrana de Juan Ruiz y los episodios narrativos que las preceden, contienen una serie de detalles realistas, de los que podemos aprender mucho sobre la clase social en que se inspiraron" Ester Pérez de King, "El realismo en las 'cantigas de serrana' de Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita," Hispania, 21 (1938), 85. A later statement betrays the interest in the historical importance of the Libro: "Como fuente para un estudio de costumbres, la poesía que remedeó el arcipreste no tiene igual" (p. 85).

quality in his use of them;¹⁹ and that he has not always improved the tradition, for his artistic creation is suffocated amidst a compilation of literary commonplaces and thus his vision is not as precise or as clear as in some of the representatives of the tradition he follows.²⁰

The objections to the above critical procedures are that, specifically, the meaning derived through traditional sources (Latin or Arabic) does not explain many of the central elements in the Libro.²¹ The critics' interpretations

¹⁹"Desde el ángulo artístico anuncia ya una época nueva con su capacidad mimética de vivir los personajes de una manera tangible y palpable, personal e individual" (Spitzer, "En torno," p. 105). Castro especially stresses the poet's personality: "El tema primario y orientador sería, más bien, la tensa y animada actividad del vivir voluntarioso, atraída por el amor y espoleada por la alegría" ("El Libro," p. 193).

²⁰Félix Lecoy constantly alludes to Juan Ruiz's inability to understand clearly the tradition he borrows, or in any case to his not improving it: "Il semble avoir peu ajouté de sa propre Minerve" (p. 212) is a typical remark concerning Juan Ruiz's utilization of traditional sources.

²¹Harry Levin points out some of the inherent limitations of "traditional" studies. "For tradition begs the question of origins; hence, in speaking of it, we hardly know where to begin. We personify it and invoke our personification whenever the authorship of a work is lost, or whenever we find ourselves at a loss for more logical arguments. Using the word with increasing frequency, but ignoring the different contexts in which we use it, we come to regard it as a single entity and to introduce it by the definite article" ("The Tradition of Tradition," in Contexts of Criticism, Harvard University Press Cambridge, Mass., 1957, p. 55).

of the data are unsatisfactory from the aesthetic viewpoint, because they do not consider Juan Ruiz's special handling of what he inherits from tradition and thus ignore any artistic intention that may underlie the Libro. I should therefore like to propose a study of the Libro based on textual analysis. Out of Juan Ruiz's text might come a revelation which could then be checked and compared with tradition. My purpose is to clarify certain elements which, on one hand, are basic and characteristic to Juan Ruiz's treatment and which, on the other hand, are not very dependent upon the borrowed or imitated motifs and figures of speech which Juan Ruiz employs. An analysis of the Archpriest's reaction to the death of Trotaconventos should illustrate two things: first, that critics stress more the traditional elements than Juan Ruiz's transformation of them and second, that a study of Juan Ruiz's changes is invaluable in understanding his art.

II

Juan Ruiz's "Plaint": The Text vs. Traditional Criticism

The structure of the Archpriest's imprecation against death (1520-1575) is very similar to the traditional form of planctus, a genre which expresses the medieval pre-occupation with death and voices the consequent reminder of the perishable nature of all things and frailty of earthly

glory.²² Juan Ruiz's text begins with an apostrophe to death (1520-1567):

¡ay muerte! ¡muerta sseas, muerta e mal andante!
(1520a)

This section contains all the traditional motifs concerning the qualities of Death: equalizer (1521c), fearful (1526d), surprising (1533d), horrifying (1546a), omnipotent (1552d); it continues with the Archpriest's regrets and expression of sadness (1569-70):

¡ay! ¡mi trota conventos, mi leal verdadera! (1569a);
then follow a prayer for the rest of the deceased's soul
and a promise that she will not be forgotten (1571-1572):

a dios merçed le pido que te de la su gloria
que mas leal trotera nunca ffue en memoria.
(1571a,b)

²²J. Huizinga devotes a whole chapter to this subject in his famous book, The Waning of the Middle Ages (London, 1924). "Since the thirteenth century, the popular preaching of the mendicant orders had made the eternal admonition to remember death swell into a sombre chorus ringing throughout the world" (p. 124). He analyzes the three basic traditional motifs of the planctus: the ubi sunt theme ("Nunc ubi Regulus? aut ubi Romulus, aut ubi Remus?") which is a recollection of all those who once filled the world with their splendour; the contemptu mundi theme based on the horror of physical decomposition: "In exhibiting the horrors awaiting all human beauty . . . these preachers of contempt for the world express, indeed, a very materialistic sentiment, namely, that all beauty and all happiness are worthless because they are bound to end soon" (p. 126); and finally, the theme of equalization upon death which gave rise later to the "Dance of Death" genre. I. Siciliano (François Villon et les themes poetiques du Moyen Age [Paris, 1934]), also traces excellently the history of the medieval plaint and its motifs and shows how it symbolized the general anguish and melancholy: "S'étant emparé de la formule, le moyen âge ne la lâcha plus. Il lui fit subir la destinée qui pèse sur toutes ses idées: elle devint lieu commun" (p. 257).

and finally, the praise of the dead (1573-1575):

non se ome nin dueña, que tal oviese perdida,
que non tomase tristeza e pesar syn medida.
(1574c,d).

This scheme would seem to correspond exactly to the motifs of the traditional planctus: those once alive are now gone: the frightful spectacle of human beauty gone to decay; death dragging along humans of all conditions and ages; the horror inspired in those left behind; the anxiety of inheritors; the reminder that death strikes suddenly and therefore men should avoid vice and practice virtue; eulogy of the dead; and prayer or epitaph. Since Juan Ruiz constantly opens himself to the influence of traditional patterns of style, one is tempted to draw the conclusion that he imitates with little variation. Lecoy in fact concludes that Juan Ruiz's plaint is an accumulation of literary commonplaces: "Le texte de Juan Ruiz ne sort toutefois pas de la banalité" (p. 204). "Il accumule les reproches, multiplie les imprécations, couvre d'injures l'ennemie devant laquelle il reste impuissant" (p. 208). María Rosa Lida, on the other hand, believes that Juan Ruiz has preserved almost intact the spirit of the traditional planctus, i.e., the stoical acceptance of death, basic to Christian dogma: "Casi parece chiste, dado el temperamento y las condiciones culturales del poeta, anunciar que su reacción ante la muerte no es estoica" (p. 37). She stresses the last phase of the traditional

planctus which usually deals with a meditation upon the consolations of religion.

There is, however, a significant difference between tradition and Juan Ruiz in spite of the almost complete identity of motifs and structure. The Libro's plaint is the product of Juan Ruiz's selection of, and imaginative building upon, traditional motifs and expressions. It is a new creation bearing the stamp of Juan Ruiz's unique artistry. This stamp of artistry is composed of many qualities, but for the sake of an introductory convenience I shall briefly consider only three categories, all usually ignored by critics and yet very essential to Juan Ruiz's art. The first is the "personal" interpretation he gives to the traditional reaction toward death. The second is the remarkable awareness he demonstrates in elaborating tradition. The third is the channelling of style to create humor.

1) The first telling difference which contributes to Juan Ruiz's "personal" interpretation is the framework. The traditional planctus normally begins with a general death motif or an apostrophe to death; it usually ends with an expression of sadness and an acceptance of death based on Christian consolation. The difference of Juan Ruiz's rendition is that, as opposed to traditional custom, the Archpriest prefaces his apostrophe by explaining specifically

why Trota's death is causing him sadness (1518-19). Trota died while in his service and consequently "non anda nin trota" for him; this is not only sad but above all inconvenient ("lo que me descomfuerta") since it creates personal difficulties in procuring women ("que mucha buena puerta / me fue despues cerrada, que antes me era abierta," 1519c,d). Furthermore, he does not end by resigning himself to her death; rather, he asks to be understood in his sadness on the grounds that, had others been served by Trota as he was, they too would understand and cry (1573). Thus in the Libro the plaint becomes a direct expression of the Archpriest's grief. He is concerned with particulars and immediacies, and his complaint is not so much the result of loss but of personal inconvenience. Juan Ruiz's planctus shifts the tradition to give a picture of earthly preoccupations and expresses an attitude derived from the here and now of love experience. This framework is, moreover, intensified by a series of interjections which again stress only the speaker's personal loss: (a) the abrupt change from general discourse to direct address in the second person which is the traditional form of the apostrophe (¡ay muerte! muerta sseas), gains a sense of immediacy because Juan Ruiz expresses his private complaint side by side with his attack on death: "Matasteme mi vieja: ¡matasses ami ante!" (1520b); (b) following an orthodox presentation concerning Death and

God (1567), he immediately moves to his own concern and practical damage: "¿que oviste con migo? ¿mi leal vieja, dola? / ¿que me la mataste, muerte!" (1568); c) then in the midst of a prayer for her, he again shifts attention to himself: "¿quien te me rrebato, vieja por mi sienpre lasrada?" (1570d). Each personal comment reiterates the speaker's immediate and practical loss. Thus the whole plaint appears direct, concrete, and limited, distinctly different from the preceding and succeeding traditions which paraphrase again and again the generalized effects of death on man, and the posture which man must assume.²³

Juan Ruiz knows very well that the essential form of the traditional planctus is a warning of death (memento mori), death's omnipotence, and a final resignation to it. Since the traditional patterns do not suit his artistic purposes, however, he seeks to impose upon tradition (i.e., his raw material) some pattern of his own making. The critics are correct in pointing out that he gathers the planctus motifs. However, when these motifs converge they do not lead only to a general attack upon Death and to a reconciliation of the speaker with it. Juan Ruiz

²³The codified elegiacal tradition (resignation, acceptance, consequent preference of eternal over temporal life, consideration of this life as a way to a higher one which we earn by our works, and finally, the serene reception of death) which is part of the Christianization of stoicism and the commonplaces of moral literature originating in the Bible, is preserved intact by Jorge Manrique but not by Juan Ruiz. See P. Salinas, Jorge Manrique: o tradición y originalidad (Buenos Aires, 1947).

develops a new style of the religious plaint based on a new approach to the idea of stoical reconciliation, an approach less general, less dogmatic, much more emotional, and seemingly based on direct and immediate experience. The effect of death on man is not veiled by traditionally-bound figurative consolation but rather expanded with a direct appeal of "what happens to me, now that you are dead"; that is, emotion is not expressed merely by the order of themes as prescribed by tradition, but by an overt utterance of personal disadvantage. It is Juan Ruiz the artist who varies and transforms a tradition; who introduces different tones, attitudes, and emotions to set off the required literary commonplaces. By opposing to a literary convention of fixed themes and procedures the immediate, concrete reaction of the lamenting speaker, he adds, from the artistic viewpoint, a more plausible dimension to the planctus. The degree of emotional intensity is not exaggerated because the death situation is examined in terms of immediate loss; there is (to borrow T. S. Eliot's term) an objective correlative between grief and death because death represents, in the Archpriest's case, a material loss.²⁴

²⁴The display of candor, sensuality and, as we shall see, humor within a religious framework relates Juan Ruiz, at least in poetic temperament, to François Villon more than to any other medieval poet. Juan Ruiz in his plaint and Villon in his lament of the ladies of yesteryear or in his poems on death (he added something new to the tradition by

2) Juan Ruiz is perfectly conscious, as are all great artists, of the changes he brings about. It is not merely that the plaint expresses his interpretation of death, but that he himself makes it clear that the general interpretation receives a special artistic expression at his hands. The Archpriest steps out of the role assigned by the tradition of planctus in order to explain why he is reacting strongly to death. He first addresses Death and then the deceased as prescribed by tradition.²⁵ Then suddenly, and without warning, he directs his address to the listeners:

Dueñas, ¡non me rretebdes [sic] nin me llamedes nequelo!
 ¡que sy a vos serviera, ovierades della duelo!
 (1573a,b)

He anticipates the listeners' thoughts and realizes that they may wonder at the exaggerated tone of his personal complaints. He therefore explains by arguing: don't call me foolish, for if you were in my place (i.e., had lost

having the dead speak) exhibit an immediate and striking awareness of the human condition fated with the inevitable putrefaction of the human body. They are more realistic than Manrique, especially in the spontaneous and personal way with which they express a preoccupation of their own person in the face of death.

²⁵Lecoy provides us with an invaluable study of Juan Ruiz's use of the "plaint" artifices. For example, his address to death and the deceased is a means of literary dilation, part of the rhetorical amplificatio. It is clearly spelled out by Geoffroi de Vinsauf in his explanation of the "plainte funèbre" (reproduced in Edmund Faral's, Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècles [Paris, 1924], pp. 367-430). Vinsauf explains that the apostrophe is the fourth means of lingering by which the writer may detain the subject. Juan Ruiz knows and uses this rhetorical artifice: "Esses utinam mors mortua!" vs. "Ay muerte, muerta sseas."

someone you need) you would likewise be pained. Such an attempt to justify what seems to be an exaggerated emotional response to his Trota's death, is a remarkable mannerism in that it demonstrates both his sense of humor and his awareness that his attitude toward traditional material is different. The new pattern he imposes upon the planctus and his awareness of it reveal an artistic intent in manipulating traditional sources and a rigorous planning which belie Lecoy's conception of Juan Ruiz as total imitator.

Precisely because he knows the traditional form well he can transform it to suit his artistic purposes. This is further demonstrated if we examine the traditional elements which he purposely leaves out of his plaint. Usually the climax of the meditation upon death is the ubi sunt motif which dramatizes the inevitable finality of death by asking the rhetorical question of what has happened to a number of famous people.²⁶ Juan Ruiz does not use this motif in his plaint. Yet he knew it well, for he consciously parodies the form elsewhere in the Libro, in the "Enssienplo del cauvallo e del asno" (237-245) where the ass sarcastically

²⁶The motif creates a contrast of what was and what is and was very popular during the Middle Ages, especially from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. See Huizinga, op. cit., p. 125ff for several examples. Stylistically, it relies on the repetition of the word ubi (where): "where is now your glory, Babylon, where is now the famous Cyrus?" Or, "Say where is Solomon, once so noble, or Samson where is he?" This motif can be used easily to urge man to abandon his worldly interests and concentrate upon the salvation of his soul.

recalls the horse's past glory.²⁷ The function of the ubi sunt in a Christian lament is to remind one and all that in the face of death all earthly preoccupations are puny and vain; that it is time to concentrate on the behavior that would save one's soul. If Juan Ruiz's intentions had been mainly didactic, logically and according to the medieval pattern, this would have been the perfect place to remind the reader of the transience, frailty, and vanity of the accomplishments of loco amor. That is, he would have utilized a traditional motif perfectly suited for didactic purposes both in form and content. I should like to suggest that Juan Ruiz does not include the ubi sunt where it normally belongs because its traditional function conflicts with his immediate artistic purpose.

3) It is typical of Juan Ruiz to exploit an opportunity to create a humorous situation. To review: (a) the Archpriest feels Trota's death strongly, for it creates personal inconvenience; (b) he is perfectly aware of this and tries to spell out the reasons while enlisting the reader's sympathy. This leads to the eulogy of the dead, a standard commonplace in the planctus. Juan Ruiz praises in Trota-conventos precisely those qualities which were beneficial to him: her talents as a procuress, nothing else. One must

²⁷The arrogant horse loses its lustre. The ass offers a contrast between what was and what is, repeating the ubi sunt formula: "¿do es tu noble freno e tu dorada silla? / ¿do es tu soberuía? ¿do es la tu rrençilla?" (244a,b).

therefore weep for her "sotil ansuelo!" which is so effective that whenever she went after someone "todas yuan por el suele " (not a cynical comment of the medieval moralist but a concrete, picturesque image which portrays procuring and surrender as ordinary experience). As death spares no one, so Trota spared no woman: "alta muger nin baxa, encerrada nin ascondida, / non sele detenia, do fasia debatida" [abatyda in T] (1574a,b). This description not only stresses Trota's value to the Archpriest and thus justifies his emotional and personal intrusions, but it also creates humor by stressing the incongruous aspects of prayer and eulogy. It is for her procuring that the Archpriest explicitly praises Trota. A little before he tells us with penetrating irony that because of her suffering in this world she is now sitting in heaven side by side with the martyrs, ("sienpre en el mundo fuste por dios martyriada " 1570c). First, he attributes the quality of suffering, proper to saints, to one who procures. Next, he creates a contrast between what is expected (according to his earlier warnings only buen amor saves man), and what actually happens (those furthering the pursuit of carnal love are nevertheless in Paradise also). That is, does loco amor lead to the same rewards as buen amor? This paradox reduces traditional eulogy to absurdity with the primary aim being to amuse. The dogmatic issues inherent in the traditional planctus, which is never interrupted by humor, are avoided.

Juan Ruiz's conscious creation of humor is now evident. He imitates the characteristic manner and spirit of traditional eulogy with crucial substitutions that make his version appear incongruous. For example, in an elegy whatever activity made the deceased famous is always recalled.²⁸ Thus the saint was famous for his martyrdom. Juan Ruiz simply substitutes a term (procuring becomes Trota's martyrdom on earth) in such an obvious way that the reader recognizes the model of which the artist gives him a distorted reflection. Juan Ruiz transposes in a comic vein what is in tradition the serious form and spirit of eulogy within a planctus. The alternation of motifs and expressions render the eulogy, in contrast to traditional custom, comic and entertaining instead of serious and didactic. It is basic in analyzing the art of Juan Ruiz to understand that the essential quality of his irony which leads to humor is a duality of intent; saying one thing and meaning another. Thus one of the innovations of "tradition" which Juan Ruiz

²⁸The theme of fame is an integral part of the traditional elegy. The ubi sunt motif is traditionally followed by an enumeration of the accomplishments which made the deceased famous, i.e., fame is important in the eulogy of human qualities. The orthodox religious view of this motif is that man should exhibit those human qualities that will help save his soul since the glory of the other life surpasses easily the fame of this one (see Manrique's "Coplas" stanzas 25-37). If we recall that the fame of Trota is her procuring, according to the Archpriest's statement about her accomplishments, Juan Ruiz's humorous intent becomes clear.

introduces in the Libro is a crucial shift from the "general-passive" to the "active" sense, from unconscious oddity (as in the case of the planctus) to a conscious comic manner of writing.

III

Aesthetic Method and the Libro

The grief expressed in the traditional planctus is appropriate to a general situation in which man ponders the effects of death. The emotion almost always appears in a void. The reader does not know specifically why the speaker is sad. Juan Ruiz obviously suspects that such sorrow is disproportionate and contains inherent incongruities. Because he tells us why he grieves, he becomes personal by candidly admitting the immediate motives of his grief, and humorous by overstating his plight. A careful examination of the text reveals that the Archpriest's personal expressions and humorous inclinations occupy such a position in the structure of his lament that they draw all the attention and infuse a unique reality into the traditional planctus. Such a reality (selfish preoccupation, humorous reaction) is authentic as a human experience, but it might be difficult to define because it does not depend totally upon the borrowed, well-established planctus tradition. There are

no easily traced defining characteristics for purposes of comparison. We must accept Lecoy's findings concerning Juan Ruiz's sources, but we must also see that the accumulation of traditional elements can lead to a different reality which, since it is uniquely expressed could be as valid as, and perhaps more attractive than, the tradition from which Juan Ruiz's plaint deviates. We should therefore consider the possibility that the manner of accumulating and expressing traditional elements is a clue to the artistic makeup of the Libro.²⁹

I shall deal with the ideas and forms of the Libro not only in terms of their medieval tradition but also in relation to the whole work. This is an aesthetic approach³⁰ which relies on an understanding of the medieval background; the "medieval" elements are to be analyzed in conjunction with Juan Ruiz's artistic use of them. My study is based

²⁹The critics' problem is often to determine to what extent is a medieval author such as Juan Ruiz original since most of the formulas come to him almost unchanged. Yet these formulas acquire an original direction as Edgar de Bruyne, basically a "traditionalist" in criticism, has observed: "Une première raison s'en trouve évidemment dans les contenus divers auxquels elles s'appliquent" L'Esthétique du Moyen Age (Louvain, 1947), p. 59.

³⁰For a discussion of the aesthetic approach and its major representatives see Sister Clare Eileen Craddock, Style Theories as Found in Stylistic Studies of Romance Scholars (1900-1950), Cath. Univ. of America (Washington, 1952). There are, of course, many works on this subject. Spitzer explains the aesthetic position as opposed to the historical one in his review of Lecoy's book (op. cit., p. 268): "La corriente poética transforma la materia prima" " . . . una vez reconocido 'el milagro' de la potencia creadora, ya no puede tratarse de ejercicios de escolar."

on the assumption that he is aware of his own craft and conscious of the changes he brings about. I shall often have to examine traditional material such as rhetorical theories and genres which influence the intuition of Juan Ruiz in bringing out a desirable form. Traditional features, therefore, do not block the vision of Juan Ruiz (who seems able to measure them), but rather provide the key to our understanding of the man's artistry; his vision need not be incompatible at all with an aesthetic approach. Juan Ruiz is not simply unique as a medieval artist; he can individualize himself by his particular way of forming what Hatzfeldt calls "historically conditioned poeticizable material."³¹ What is needed for the Libro is a study of Juan Ruiz's unique expression, by investigating, examining, and analyzing the process which takes place between Juan Ruiz the artist and the so-called forma formante. My critical-aesthetic approach is compatible with the historical method;³² it

³¹ Helmut Hatzfeldt, "Recent Italian Stylistic Theory and Stylistic Criticism," in Studia Philologica et Litteraria in Honorem L. Spitzer (Switzerland, 1958), p. 228. See also his earlier "Esthetic Criticism Applied to Medieval Literature," RPh, I (1947-48), 305-327. He argues for a unity between the aesthetic and historic methods: "For the latter is bound to control the former according to the rule that facts and experience have to check intuition and speculation" (p. 325).

³² To ignore the pertinent historical facts of the Libro is also a great danger: F. Weisser, in "Sprachliche Kunstmittel des Erzpriesters von Hita," VKR, VII (1934), 164-243; 281-348, makes an exhaustive analysis of the means of artistic expression used by Juan Ruiz. His literary explication (stylistic onomatology, stylistic interpretation of whole consecutive passages, etc) does not take into consideration the traditions which Juan Ruiz employs. In reviewing this

will be called upon to solve problems of medieval scholarship with which the historical method has been unable to cope since the historical method refuses to deal with the formative process of Juan Ruiz which produced the final form of the Libro.³³

To María Rosa Lida's view, therefore, that the Libro is an artistic composition with a didactic purpose, I should like to oppose the view, that it is a didactic work with an artistic purpose. The following are some aspects of his art

study, Hatzfeld comments that "Weisser evidently lacked knowledge of medieval theory" (see "Esthetic Criticism," op. cit., p. 324). Ulrich Leo, in Zur dichterischen originalität des Arzypreste de Hita, Analecta Romanica, VI (Frankfurt, 1958), works with the artistic insight of Juan Ruiz, basing his interpretations only on textual lines. Thus Leo believes that Juan Ruiz intended to write an epic of Trotaconventos but never finished it; he analyzes the psychic behavior of Trota and suggests the various ways in which he would have her punished or killed. Doña Garroza's death is a happy ending since it allows the lover to pursue new adventures and the poet to continue writing his book. He goes to the Sierra for he feels somewhat responsible for the girl's death. Leo does not adhere closely to the text and stresses the psychological state of Juan Ruiz. See María Rosa Lida's review, "Una interpretación más de Juan Ruiz," RPh, XIV (Feb, 1961), 228-237. She cites Leo's method as he explains it ". . . hay que hallar en él por medio de la lectura cuanto pueda averiguarse sobre las posibilidades anímicas del poeta" (p. 30). That is, he reflects on the subconscious of Juan Ruiz and does not consider the historical evidence.

³³The fact is that Spitzer's and Castro's textual interpretations have made the Libro more accessible than the historical commentaries of the majority of the critics. Those interested mainly in sources have not been able to reveal the complexities and beauties of the development of Trotaconventos that Spitzer and Castro examine. On the other hand, María Rosa Lida's own artistic analysis of Juan Ruiz's language (concreteness, plasticity, etc) has been at least as helpful in explaining the Libro's artistry as all her historical inquiries of medieval didactic traditions.

which need illustration: how the Archpriest acts as the central narrative personality; how his judgments on meaning or art are always present; how he assumes a diverting character of his own; how he presents his moral discourses in a comic vein; how he sustains the viewpoint and tone of irony; how he pretends to guide the reader's understanding but leads him to ambiguities and contradictions; and how he often shatters splendidly the illusion of traditional authority, the better to point up humor. It is therefore important to catch first from the narrator's own words and the tone of his expression the artistic intent behind the traditional literary commonplaces, that special use of which does not relegate them to the ordinary or mechanical, but enlivens them, transforms them into spiritual substance, and thus converts them into original art.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STRUCTURE OF THE LIBRO DE BUEN AMOR

The structural unity of the Libro de Buen Amor is due to the author's personality as revealed in the autobiographical form. The coherence of the work resides primarily in the role of the Archpriest as the dramatized narrator of his own love experiences. Most critics agree that the autobiography is a literary form and not Juan Ruiz's real life.¹ Some dismiss the first person as unimportant and see in the form only a way to collect material which the poet has written before.² Alfonso Reyes and Leo Spitzer are the

¹The major exponents of the view that the events of the Libro are biographical are Elisha K. Kane, "The personal appearance of Juan Ruiz," MLN, XLV (1930), 103-108, and the introduction of his translation, The "Book of good love" of Archpriest of Hita; Claudio Sánchez-Albornóz y Menduina, España, un enigma histórico (Buenos Aires, 1956). He refers to the Archpriest as a typical "burgués"; Damaso Alonso, "La cárcel del Arcipreste," CuH (1957), pp. 165-177, analyzed carefully by María Rosa Lida in "Nuevas notas para la interpretación del Libro de Buen Amor," NRFH, XIII (1959), 73-82. The above critics usually base their findings upon critical impressions not taking into consideration such well-established literary commonplaces and forms as an "ideal prison," "erotic autobiographies," "pastourelle," "pseudobiographies" etc. Cf. Ulrich Leo, Zur dichterischen originalität des Arcipreste de Hita (Frankfurt, 1958). He uses a very modern approach and stresses the psychological dimension of the narrator. See María Rosa Lida's review, "Una interpretación más de Juan Ruiz," RPh, XIV (Feb. 1961), 228-237.

²Besides Lecoy (Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita Paris, 1938, conclusion), W. Kellerman assumes that "La magna obra del poeta es haber enlazado tantos materiales y géneros mediante la representación del yo" ("Zur Charakteristick des Libro del Arcipreste de Hita," ZRPh, 67 (1951), 238. Above is María Rosa Lida's translation of the original. This view has been influenced mainly by Menéndez Pidal's studies on oral and minstrel poetry.

earliest critics to discuss the use of the first person in the light of the medieval objective-vs.-empirical "I."³ Spitzer in particular argues that Juan Ruiz, in a manner typical of the Middle Ages, appropriates material from other sources and presents it as personal experience with no attempt to conceal his sources; this poetic "I" is typically the didactic or satirical "I" of medieval authors.⁴ The first critic to suggest a literary source for Juan Ruiz's use of the first person is Américo Castro, who relates the Libro to the erotic autobiography of Ibn Hazm's El collar de la paloma.⁵ Arguing that Arabic literature is not much

Also Rafael Lapesa, "Pudo influir también la costumbre juglaresca de vivificarla narración presentándose como actor o testigo de los hechos. In Diccionario de Literatura Española (Madrid, 1953), p. 42.

³A. Reyes, "El Arcipreste de Hita y su Libro de buen amor," in Capítulos de literatura española, I (Mexico, 1939), 1-14. The view is that the duality between the vital pleasure of worldly love and the ascetic renunciation of good love does not represent a conflict. By being comical ("el yo es hoy sagrado; entonces más bien era cómico"), the "I" is satirical, that is, the author does not only point out faults but presents himself as the object of ridicule, as being exemplary of what he preaches. Thus the personality of the narrator is collective, typical of the "I" of other medieval moralists.

⁴"Su experiencia es, desde luego, colectiva, por muy 'personal' que parezca--y pueda ser como en Dante" (Leo Spitzer, "En torno al arte del Arcipreste de Hita," Linguística e historia literaria, ed. Gredos [Madrid, 1955], p. 133).

⁵Américo Castro's view (España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos [Buenos Aires, 1948]. Retitled La realidad histórica de España [Mexico, 1954]) has been challenged by a number of critics who base their arguments on the investigations of E. García Gómez in the introduction of his translation, El collar de paloma (Madrid, 1952), p. 48ff.

richer in autobiographical themes than European literature, Gybbon-Monypenny claims that Juan Ruiz made use of traditional European forms (allegory of Don Amor, Pamphillus, pastourelle) in such a way that he could not avoid the first person narration.⁶ Finally, María Rosa Lida agrees with Reyes and Spitzer concerning the didactic exemplarity of the narrator, but attempts to show that the humoristic-didactic qualities of the Judeo-Arabic maqāmat provide the framework for the Libro.⁷

The objection is that as opposed to the Libro, El collar is basically a didactic work whose unity is theoretical (typical of the risāla form) and its tone aristocratic. Any similarities are too general and not exclusive to the Libro. (See also Gybbon-Monypenny, "Autobiography in the Libro de buen amor in the light of some literary comparisons," BHS, 39 1957, pp. 67-68 and María Rosa Lida, "Nuevas notas," pp. 23-25.)

⁶In an attempt to demonstrate how Medieval European Literature provides a number of analogies for the Libro, Gybbon-Monypenny succeeds in proving that such theories are only plausibilities. Ironically, he seems to realize that his own attempt does not fare better: "Certainly it is no more improbable than a borrowing from Ibn Hazm or from other Arabic literature" (op. cit., p. 74). María Rosa Lida comments that "Lo que de veras demuestra este esfuerzo por hallar análogos a la autobiografía del Buen amor dentro de la literatura cristiana, es que no los hay, y que al buscarlos en la literatura medieval no cristiana, la intuición de Castro es certera" ("Nuevas notas," p. 23).

⁷The maqāmat is usually written in rhymed prose, interspersed with strict verse, the latter introduced by some such phrase as, "And thus hath the poet said." María Rosa Lida refers principally to The Book of Delights by Joseph Ben Meir Zabara, late twelfth century, for purposes of comparison. She points out the following similarities with the Libro: literary and moral preoccupation of the prologue; lyrical variations of what is told in prose; narrative protagonist often identified with the author; narrator is visited by a giant, "his future interlocutor throughout the rest of

The above critics have sought to explain the autobiographical form of the Libro de Buen Amor either by relating it to some tradition or by explaining its didactic

the work, a situation which recalls the appearance of Sir Love and 'a tall man' (181c), who is Juan Ruiz's interlocutor in the most important debate in his poems" (Two Spanish Masterpieces: The Book of Good Love and The Celestina, Univ. of Illinois Press [Urbana, 1961], p. 22); after discussion, the narrator decides to travel with the giant; they exchange various stories interspersed with proverbs, liturgical parodies, physiognomies, caricatures, invective against wine, jokes; finally, this maqāmat is a fictitious autobiography which includes, however, a great deal of personal knowledge (medicine here vs. religion in the Libro). She believes that Juan Ruiz chose the maqāmat framework for his Libro since "the books that medieval learned men held dearest authorized the spontaneous habit of instructing in the first person" (Two Spanish Masterpieces, p. 23). The above comparison is a good example why Juan Ruiz's artistry has been overlooked. Although it is not my intention to refute these findings, I shall point out that again Maria Rosa Lida emphasizes a tradition more than Juan Ruiz's text. Her own wording of the problem betrays her intention: "... toda clase de virtuosismo verbal . . . lo cual concuerda mucho más con el Buen amor que la refinada risāla de Ibn Hazm" ("Nuevas notas," p. 24). That is she substitutes a maqāmat for a risāla as Juan Ruiz's autobiographical source. Her comparative connections, however, are as general and as vague as Castro's. 1) As opposed to the Archpriest's constant participation in the love stories he relates, Joseph, the protagonist, intervenes only in one vague action which serves merely as a framework for all sorts of stories. That is, of course, a popular device for medieval story-telling both European and Oriental. "There is, further, the interesting fact that the mold into which Zabara cast his work was a favorite one also with his Christian contemporaries." The Book of Delights, translated by Moses Hadas, Columbia Univ. Press (New York, 1932), Introduction; 2) The two personages, narrator vs interlocutor who appear throughout the work, resemble more Calila and Dimna or conceivably Patronio and Lucanor than the unique, forceful "I" of the Libro. 3) This maqāmat does not deal at all with an amorous theme. In fact, love is not even mentioned. 4) The stories (fifteen plus anecdotes) are, like exempla, always intended to point a moral, which is not always a certainty in the Libro. 5) The mixture of rhymed prose and lyrics is certainly not a unique property of the maqāmat, or even of the Arabic tradition. "There is also rhymed prose, already mentioned; and, finally, mixed prose--that is, texts in which

function.⁸ None, however, has attempted an analysis of Juan Ruiz's use of the first person as a narrative technique, i.e., none has made an examination of the text itself in order

prose alternates with verse inserts. Such texts are called prosimetra." See Ernst Curtius, "System of Medieval Styles," in European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (New York, 1953), p. 151. In fact, there are many other objectionable points (such as comparing an authentic giant [Enan] with Don Amor, "un grand hombre," certainly no different from the Roman "vellaco," also "un grand hombre ") but I shall close with an appropriate warning from a maqamat specialist: "The device of inventing a framework in which to place disconnected stories, dialogues and moral or scientific instruction was so common in the Middle Ages, that corroboration from some other source is certainly necessary before one accepts such a frame as a record of fact" (The Book of Delights, translation, Introduction, p. 11.). In the meantime the Libro's narrative framework has been ignored.

⁸ A constant debate among critics concerning the narrator's dual role in the Libro centers around the episode of Doña Endrina derived from a well-known Latin work, Pamphilus. María Rosa Lida claims that "el enamorado de Doña Endrina es un personaje independiente del protagonista narrador del Libro" ("Nuevas notas," p. 20); A. Castro again attributes the switch of names (from Archpriest to Don Melón) to the shifting perspective of the whole Libro, to the failure to objectify personages which is typical of Arabic literature; Leo Spitzer believes that, without much warning, Melón and the narrator's "I" part company, Melón marrying Endrina (obviously an impossibility for an ecclesiastic) while the poetic "I," once the Pamphilus episode is over, goes on to fresh adventures, typical of medieval didactic literature. There are two stumbling blocks in all attempts to explain the above shift: 1) It is the Archpriest who talks with Venus in the introduction of the narrative; that is, it was the Archpriest-lover who fell in love with Endrina, who praises her beauty, who asks Venus for help. 2) Once the narrator has become Don Melón and the story has progressed, we come to copla 845 where Endrina herself refers to the Archpriest as her pretender: "Que yo mucho faria por mi amor de Fyta." This cannot be a slip since "Fyta" is the recipient of the rhyme. This line has never been adequately described.

to explain the use of the first person in all the artistic devices exploited by Juan Ruiz. I would suggest that perceiving the essence of Juan Ruiz's artistic consciousness necessitates waiving questions of traditional autobiography and concentrating upon the figure of the Archpriest in his role as narrator and commentator. The argument which I propose is that the "I" of the Libro is not only Juan Ruiz the man, not only the minstrel, not merely the satirical-didactic "I" of the sinner, but also--and above all--Juan Ruiz the poet. The narrator-commentator of the Libro's action is a persona created for ironic situations by Juan Ruiz and is therefore an artistic creation more than a didactic necessity. To demonstrate this view, I shall analyze the Libro's framework, the ambiguity of the Archpriest's didactic comments about good love, his ironic devices and the effect they have on the didactic comments; establish the close relationship between narrator and commentator; and finally offer some conclusions about the art and morality of the Libro.

I

The Structure of Autobiography:

The Archpriest as Narrator and Commentator

The author states the purpose of his work in a prose prologue: he will offer some examples of worldly love so

that the reader might understand its dangers and turn his attention to the love of God. In seventy preliminary stanzas he tells us that he is an archpriest, he warns that the reader must not be fooled by the Libro's apparent emphasis on worldly love, he cites some authorities concerning the need for laughter, he tells an amusing story, and finally he instructs the reader, in an ambiguous manner, how to read his book of love; in short, he establishes the humorous-didactic tone of the whole work. In the next six stanzas (71-76), and without previous warning, he introduces himself as the protagonist of what is going to be a series of attempted love affairs. He is the protagonist because, like any other sinner, he too has felt the need for physical love; and since he wants to teach us, he will now tell us about his private experiences. The rest of the book centers on his attempts and failures to seduce women. They are interspersed with fables, apologues, stories, "exempla," an ars amatoria, parodies, allegories, satires, and various lyric poems both secular and religious. The Libro oscillates between the narration of the archpriest's love affairs and the narrator's moral-didactic comments supposedly drawn from them. The narrative itself ends with the author telling the readers that henceforth they will "obviously" perform their Christian duties better for having read his book about

love.⁹

From the structural viewpoint, we see that one Juan Ruiz, who is an Archpriest from Hita, writes a book in order to instruct man in the way to God's love; he is both the protagonist of the love affairs and the interpreter of their spiritual meaning. Further, he periodically reminds the reader that his narrative is well written. Thus the author projects himself in his own artistic creation as one who has had experiences in worldly love; as a narrator who can articulate and expand upon these experiences; and as a commentator who interrupts the narrative to tell the reader about the spiritual meaning of his secular love experiences and about the artistic manner in which they are told. By fictionalizing himself, the author Juan Ruiz can embody two separate viewpoints in the autobiographical structure: that of the medieval interpreter of "love" who insists upon making explicit the meaning of his narration, and that of the medieval poet who insists upon clearly pointing out the artistic quality and worth of the stories told. An aesthetic study of the Libro must therefore consider the Archpriest at least as two distinct and separate personae: the narrator and the commentator. Each persona clearly reveals the author's artistic consciousness.

⁹Although in the manuscript of Salamanca (which appeared in 1343) the epilogue is followed by the story of the Talavera archpriests and a few lyrical poems, the role of the Archpriest as the narrator of his own love adventures ends with the epilogue. I shall discuss the differences of the manuscripts in a later chapter.

The Archpriest, as far as I know, has never been studied as a poet who continually reminds the reader about his literary craftsmanship. I shall consider him as such in the next chapter. Here I shall concentrate on the roles of narrator and moral interpreter which the Archpriest assumes throughout the Libro. The problem is to determine the relationship between the narrator who relates the story and discusses the immediate action involving the lover, and the commentator who interprets the action in terms of Christian man's moral behavior; that is, to establish the proximity or distance between the story-teller and the preacher. Such a problem is troublesome: we may understand the author's various intrusions in the narrative as interpreter of and commentator upon the love adventures which he himself relates, but we cannot easily explain the ambivalent attitude of the Archpriest's constant attacks upon, yet surrender to "loco amor." We cannot always account for the simultaneous praise and mockery of "buen amor." One must consider the attitude and manner that the Archpriest assumes toward the readers because any understanding of his role depends upon understanding his intrusion in the narrative. We are not allowed, presumably, to judge the love experiences presented in the Libro for ourselves but are, instead, obliged, by the point of view which the Archpriest adopts, to accept the love experiences and the tributary stories only in terms of their relationship to his moral comments. To restate this rather complex problem: whether the narrator's

comments are moral or ironic, serious or playful, the Libro is presented from a supposedly well-defined and consistent point of view; the reader is first to accompany the "I" of the Libro in the action and then, through the remarks of this same "I," is to understand what is the meaning of this action. The Libro is constructed in such a manner (the "I" is hero, exemplifier, and interpreter) that it becomes necessary for the reader to evaluate the comments of the Archpriest not in isolation but entirely in terms of their relation to the first person who represents the central intelligence of the poem.

Most critics who insist upon the didactic intention of the Libro stress as fundamental to its autobiographic structure the distinction between the Archpriest commenting as author and the Archpriest narrating as lover. He supposedly maintains a distance between himself as a moralist and himself as a narrator.¹⁰ This distance is seemingly

¹⁰The whole wording is mine since the critics never point out explicitly this difference. They imply strongly, however, this distinction between what the Archpriest does and what he wants to teach. For example in regard to the Libro's first person: "Es un yo satírico en que el poeta censor, en lugar de señalar desde su terre los extravíos del vulgo necio, presenta para escarmiento su propio tropiezo" María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, Libro de Buen Amor (Selección), Edición con estudio y notas (Buenos Aires, 1941), p. 18. I will refer to this book as Edición con estudio. Spitzer is even more elaborate: "I would suggest that the Archpriest, in using this self-incriminating procedure, wished to depict that potential sinner which existed in himself, as in all human beings: he reveals himself, not as having committed the sins he describes, but as capable, in his human weakness, of having committed them"

typical of the religious medieval method of explaining reality. The Archpriest's subject matter, love, is therefore presented according to well-developed didactic principles. Specifically, the critics find that the love stories are told from the point of view of a narrator who stands within the action as a protagonist, but outside the action as a moral commentator.¹¹ Thus the point of view of the Libro is external, objective, dogmatic. As a priest he does not identify himself with the circumstances of his fictitious

"Note on the poetic and empirical 'I' in medieval authors," Traditio, IV (1946), 419. Of course, usually all fiction--even without considering Spitzer's and Rosa Lida's observations on the literary commonplace of the "I"--including that told in the first person by the author himself, of necessity excludes the author from literal participation in the action. Narrative literature like the Libro, Canterbury Tales, or the Decameron is fiction even if the author may have chosen to give his stories a realistic or a didactic framework.

¹¹Since the Libro is divided into a number of episodes, each complete in itself and connected with those episodes which precede or follow only by the same character, some critics believe that the Libro resembles the form of the picaresque novel. For María Rosa Lida the resemblance lies in the biography narrated in the first person, the comic conception of the hero and the didactic intent: "Y, por cómico, expediente oportuno del autor doctrinal quien, para poner a su público en guardia contra el error, se finge héroe de la risible contraprueba, uniendo así a la eficacia del ridículo la del ejemplo real y acaecido, y no el mero precepto abstracto" (Edición con estudio, p. 17-18). Thus she assumes the gap between narrator and commentator to be absolute as in Guzmán de Alfarache.

"I" protagonist;¹² he simply (and according to medieval tradition) comments frankly as the author-moralist. Upon examining the Libro's narrator-vs.-commentator relationship, these critics conclude that as commentator, the Archpriest is responsible mainly for the meaning, the enseignement of the stories narrated. By continually setting forth his reactions to, and interpretations of, the circumstances of the love story, the commentator becomes a type of raisonneur who seems to speak for Juan Ruiz the moralist and who gives religious significance to secular events.

I believe that textual evidence will not support the above contentions. On the contrary, a careful examination of the Archpriest's form of expression reveals that although it is typically didactic as the critics claim, it contains so much irony that the reader, recognizing the irony, eventually anticipates an outcome but is led to consequences different from those anticipated. The result is that the distance between narrator and commentator is only apparent. The implied consequences of the critics' findings concerning

¹²The description of the Archpriest by Trotaconventos (1485-1491) is usually regarded to represent the sensual and erotic qualities of a medieval man. She stresses the physical details (bulging neck, dark hair, long nose, deep voice, big mouth, broad shoulders, etc) that would attract a woman and the details of personality (lively, musical talent, gaiety) that would charm her. For a full but impressionistic study, see E. K. Kane, "The Personal Appearance of Juan Ruiz," MLN, XLV (February, 1930), 103-108.

the role of the "I"-narrator-commentator must be considered. First, the narrator presents himself as a sinner ("E yo, porque ssoy ome, como otro, pecador" 76a)--a typical medieval didactic pattern, as María Rosa Lida explains: "I will speak as the sinner that every man is, like the pilgrim Gonzalo de Berceo" (Two Spanish Masterpieces, p. 26).¹³ By being the protagonist, the narrator is, according to medieval tradition, exemplary more than personal: " . . . el poner en primera persona las aventuras amorosas siempre fallidas cuadraba con la intención didáctica que guiaba su [Juan Ruiz's] pluma" ("Nuevas notas," p. 28).¹⁴ Second, the narrator himself makes sure to remind the reader both of his exemplarity and of the "other," "higher" meaning which his love adventures hide; his purpose is supposedly to secure a complete understanding of the book's intention. That is,

¹³In the attempt to relate Juan Ruiz to a definite tradition, María Rosa Lida compares him erroneously to Berceo. There are no two writers who are as diametrically opposed in artistic manner as these two. The difference is spelled out particularly in their use of the term "pecador." For Berceo, a sinner is a human being, divorced from the order of God by Adam's fall; for Juan Ruiz, the word sinner has a double meaning with the preferred connotation of a man who indulges in the pleasures of carnal love. I shall discuss this later in the analysis of Juan Ruiz's use of Aristotle.

¹⁴Gibbon-Monypenny ("Autobiography in the Libro") argues with fairly good evidence that not all first person biographies were didactic. "Medieval European literature contains a small number of works which form a separate genre to which we may give the self-explanatory title of erotic pseudo-autobiography" (p. 70). "The object of these 'autobiographies' is clearly to convey to the reader or audience a flattering impression of the author as a Courtly lover and a lyric lover" (p. 71). "There is no question here of the yo being merely a didactic device, or having no subjective associations" (p. 72).

the narrator justifies his participation in "loco amor" just as medieval writers justify the poetry of Pagans and the Old Testament by stressing its "implications." Spitzer argues that as Pagans, according to medieval exegesis, supposedly hid their "philosophy" in fables, so Juan Ruiz is hiding his "buen amor" in a book of "loco amor."¹⁵ Finally, the narrator imparts a knowledge of moral value by setting forth, seemingly, clearly, and definitely, the elements of love. That is, if he is didactic, his enseignement has to be directly related to love. To review the Libro's narrative scheme according to these critics: to understand Juan Ruiz's versions of "love," is to grasp the Libro's intention as exemplified and interpreted by the narrator-commentator.

Assuming the accuracy of these observations, the next problem would be to spell out clearly the theme of love. Its essential characteristics, when derived from the Arch-priest's comments and from the tradition he follows, are that love is a movement, a desire for good, deeply rooted in the very nature of man; its goodness or evil is determined by man's end to which the movement of the mind is directed: it is good when directed to God and subordinates all other

¹⁵Spitzer develops this argument in comparing the meaning of "gloss" in Juan Ruiz and Marie de France. "The Prologue to the Lais of Marie de France and Medieval Poetics," MPhil, XLI (November, 1943), 96-102. I shall refer to this article as "Lais."

conclude from the narrator's comments that although "buen amor" (charity) does not rule out self-love or love for other humans, it shifts the emphasis of love to God. Thus the doctrine of charity appears to be the informing principle of the Archpriest's interpretative commentary which gives thematic unity to the secular love affairs, fables, and all loose episodes which might otherwise be unrelated.¹⁹

In assuming that the moral side of the author stresses a viewpoint other than that of the narrator, many critics insist that the fluctuating attitudes toward good and worldly love (as uttered by the Archpriest) are not all ironic or humorous, that they do have a precise significance, and that they should be considered seriously. One might test this contention by a textual analysis of copla 105, one of the morally-oriented statements constantly used as evidence of the author's didactic intentions. After failing in his first love attempt, the Archpriest states:

Como dize Salame, e dize la verdat,
que las cosas del mundo todas son vanidat,
todas' son pasaderas, van se con la hedat,
ssaluo amor de dios, todas sson lyuiandat. . . . (105)

For María Rosa Lida ("Nuevas notas," p. 42), " . . . el juzgar todo vanidad salvo el amor de Dios, conforme al

¹⁹The doctrine of charity permeated many secular works and often provided a framework for them. Chaucer and Villon (in part) are counted among the many examples. For a sound discussion of this incorporation of "charity" to secular works, see Sister Mary Raynelda Makarewicz, The Patristic Influence on Chaucer, Catholic University of America Press (Washington, D.C., 1953).

loves to that, or bad when it tends to disrupt this order, that is, whenever an object inferior to God (man, woman) becomes the recipient of what is rightly due to the Superior Being. Thus love is considered under two categories: divine and profane, or as the narrator calls it buen (lynpyo) and loco.¹⁶ This distinction which the Archpriest apparently establishes, follows a well-established tradition, crystalized early in Saint Augustin's definition of "charity."¹⁷ Charity is that which regulates the relation between man and his Creator, and consequently "buen amor" (which leads to good deeds) stands for charity, as Spitzer has pointed out. It is this doctrine which brings about an integration between the temporal and the eternal and forms the basis of medieval thought and teaching.¹⁸ One must

¹⁶From the prologue: "E desque esta informada e instruyda el alma, que se ha de salvar en el cuerpo limpio, pienssa e ama e desea ome el buen amor de dios e sus mandamientos. . . . E otrosi desecha e aborresce el alma el pecado del amor loco deste mundo."

¹⁷De Doctrina Christiana. The doctrine of charity (love of God) is constantly mentioned (3, 10, 15, 22, 21, 34, 72). According to St. Augustin God "suffers no stream to be drawn off from itself by whose diversion its own volume would be diminished."

¹⁸For a discussion of this and other important doctrines of the Middle Ages see E. Gilson, The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy (New York, 1940). Gilson argues that the doctrine of charity becomes one of the informing principles of the Middle Ages and is central in an understanding of St. Augustin and St. Thomas Aquinas. See also Gerald G. Walsh, Medieval Humanism (New York, 1942).

Eclesiastés . . ." means that ". . . el reiterado fracaso amoroso debe conectarse con el didactismo del Libro, maravillosamente glosado por el poeta al meditar sobre la primera derrota . . ." (p. 54).

The eminent critic arrives at her conclusions by treating this stanza out of context, by assuming an inherent dichotomy between narrator and moral commentator in the autobiographical form, and, above all, by examining its meaning in relation to the medieval method of systematic instruction through the use of amplificatio.²⁰ Being a medieval poet, Juan Ruiz chooses one principal subject,²¹ love of God; he then proceeds to elaborate upon each of the component parts of love by use of the various conventional

²⁰ María Rosa Lida does not refer to this term but her argument is based on the assumption that Juan Ruiz uses both concepts and their expressions according to traditional use. In any case, Juan Ruiz seems here to follow a formula. Edmund Faral defines amplificatio in his interpretation of medieval rhetorical method: "Le terme d'amplification (amplificatio, dilatatio) vient de loin: il était déjà employé par les rhéteurs de l'antiquité; mais c'est dans une acception toute nouvelle que le prend le moyen âge. Par 'amplifier,' les anciens entendaient 'rehausser (une idée), la faire valoir' (Quintilien, VIII, 4); ainsi font encore, à une époque tardive, certains de leurs imitateurs directs, comme Alcuin. Mais les théoriciens du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle entendent par là 'développer, allonger (un sujet)'" (Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècles, [Paris, 1924], p. 61). Also for the background of the theory of rhetorical amplificatio, see Charles S. Baldwin, Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (New York, 1928), pp. 228-257.

²¹ One of the most notable of medieval rhetoricians was Geoffroi de Vinsauf, early 13th c., the author of a verse Poetria Nova, to be found in Faral (op. cit., pp. 197-262). Vinsauf discusses the choosing of only one subject and its amplification in lines 220-225 (in Faral, p. 198).

devices of amplification. "Vanity" becomes a thematic amplification of "Christian charity." However meandering the course of the Archpriest's moral arguments, he yet maintains a certain unity; expressions such as "vanidat" are amplifications and become subordinate themes involved in the exposition of a component part of the central theme of good love. Apparently, the Archpriest (as commentator speaking for the moral author) points out explicitly and in all seriousness the lesson of his first disappointment in secular love: if all is empty and useless except the love of God, then specifically, worldly love is devoid of worth. It would seem that there is an absolute separation between narrator and moral commentator; the one tells of his desire to love and subsequent failure, the other takes an objective view of this event and points out to the reader the vanity of earthly pursuits such as carnal love.

Copla 105 should not be examined, however, only in terms of a tradition but also in context, in relation to what follows (copla 106), a continuation of the Archpriest's commentary on the same love affair. The key word of 105 is "vanidat." The Archpriest employs the same term and, as is his habit, shifts its meaning in the very next copla:

. . . dixen: "Querer do non me quieren, ffaría una nada,
 rresponder do non llaman, es vanidat provada."
 Partí me de su pleito, pues de mí es rredrada.
 (106)

The vanity here is not "everything except love for God," but the fact that it would be foolish to pursue a woman who has

obviously rejected the Archpriest. The lesson to learn is that one should not waste his time, since what matters is to succeed in love. The whole commentary of the narrator is certainly more than a simple meditation on his first failure, as some critics claim. In fact, if we follow his arguments in the text (105-112), the narrator explicitly states that he does not want a woman who does not want him; that, nevertheless, women are good for men: "ca en muger loçana, ferosa e cortés / todo bien del mundo e todo plazer es" (108c,d); and that consequently, he had better search for another love which might be more rewarding than the first:

E yo, como estava solo, syn compania,
cediçia tener lo que otro para sy tenia;
puse el ojo en otra non santa, mas sentia;
(112a,b,c)²²

Thus the Archpriest begins his "morally-oriented statement" in a way resembling the didactic method of medieval rhetoric, only to shift the interest by equivocation to a more specific situation: the vanity of not loving God becomes suddenly the vanity of waiting and not participating in worldly love.

²²The expression "non santa" is ambiguous. I believe that it refers to a woman who would not be so virtuous (or at least pretend to be) or so morally preoccupied; one who, like the Archpriest, would participate in worldly love. I base this interpretation on the advice of Don Amor to the Archpriest: "non quieras amar dueñas, que a ty non ayene" (428b). That is, keep away from "santas." Also this "non santa" does participate in "loco amor," only, ironically, not with the Archpriest but with his messenger.

Such an ironic effect is related not to the Libro's didactic orientation, but to Juan Ruiz's artistic consciousness. One way to evaluate Juan Ruiz's intentions is to examine his purposeful manipulation, arrangement and grafting of traditional formulas. "Staying away from those who reject one" is a recurring theme in the narrator's adventures. When his bawd fails to procure a widow for him, she sadly tells the Archpriest: "'do non te quieren mucho, non vayais amenudo'" (1320d). This well-known literary commonplace is based on the following reasoning: "It is certainly idle and useless to sit around doing nothing if one fails; it is better to try something else." Francois Villon is one of the many poets to utilize this theme later. In the early part of his "legacy" (Le Lais), Villon complains of a woman and explains why he must depart:

Et me faillent au grant besoiing [her sweet looks].
 Planter me fault autres complans
 Et frapper en ung autre coing.
 (IV, 30-32)²³

Juan Ruiz has juxtaposed a religious commonplace (it is useless to love anything except God) and a secular one (it is

²³The Complete Works of Francois Villon, translated by Anthony Bonner, Bantam Classics (New York, 1960). (This edition contains the Old French and a translation.) The idea of cultivating another field and minting a different kind of coin is, of course, a traditional theme cast in a series of obscene double-entendres. "Planter," for example, means literally "to plant," but in slang it also means "to copulate." As Juan Ruiz, Villon plays on words and converts a serious commonplace to a riotous expression.

useless to love one who does not love you). He dexterously grafts the two by transplanting the religious term "vanidad" to the secular situation of the rejected lover. The religious and secular uses of "vanity" are fused to create an ironic situation. And of course, we can no longer be certain of the distance between the moral commentator and the narrator since one or the other reciprocates the opposing connotations of the term, and we cannot be sure that what the Archpriest says is not in jest. There can be no doubt that the Archpriest is perfectly conscious of the complete reversal of the term because it reappears again. The disillusioned lover attacks Don Amor on the grounds that carnal love is evil, harmful, and vain. But when Don Amor answers, he uses the same commonplace and the terms are again reversed:

Para todas mugeres tu amor non conviene,
non quieras amar duenas, que a ty non ayene;
es un amor baldio, de grand locura viene,
syempre sera mesquino quien Amor vano tyene.
(428)

The result of "locura" here is loving in vain. Vain love, as in copla 106, is, ironically, loving the wrong women, i.e., those who do not respond to the Archpriest. The religiously-oriented concept of vanity as established in copla 105 has been purposely twisted for ironic and humorous purposes.

Since the narrator's references to authority (Solomon) are not simply didactic but also tinged with humorous irony

("e dize la verdad" the Archpriest slyly adds), we can understand better the statement "Que todas las cosas del mundo son vanidad" with its exact counterpart, "rresponder do non llaman, es vanidad provada." Read within their immediate context (as, of course, they are meant to be) such apparent moralities often can mean the exact reverse of their face value. The above example is not isolated; it is a favorite technique of Juan Ruiz's literary craftsmanship.²⁴ Perhaps we do not as yet understand the running

²⁴Another good example is Juan Ruiz's dual use of the didactic expression "Asy en feo libro yaze saber non feo," or "So fea letra yaze saber de grant dotor." Leo Spitzer explains that these expressions are derived from the medieval idea that the external form is not important; what matters is the cortex underneath for there is a sense, a substance, a hidden and mysterious content. Stylistically the prepositions en or so are typical: what lies underneath is always more meaningful. This explanation is, of course, perfectly valid. Spitzer, however, finds a parallel of this stylistic device in copla 1612:

Como en chica rrosa esta mucho color,
 en oro muy poco grand preçio E grand valor,
 como en poco blamo yase grand buen olor,
 ansy en dueña chica yase muy grand amor (Spitzer cites MST).

"Lo que el poeta pretende es dar a entender que la posibilidad de un amor grande pertenece a las 'propiedades' de las mujeres pequeñas" ("En torno," note 3). This "amor grande," however, is spelled out clearly in the text: "son frias como la nieve e arden mas qu' el fuego" (1608d). Since the word "fuego" has already been defined by the Archpriest as passion and worldly love (strophes 71-76) we know that "grand amor" is "loco amor." Or even in the same context, "son frias de fuera; en el amor ardientes. / En cama solaz, trebejo, plasenteras e rrientes" (1609a,b). In fact, the whole passage on the qualities of small women is delightfully cast in a frame of didactic expressions. He begins with a formal, didactic warning: "del mal tomar lo menos, dizelo el sabidor" (1617c). (Also in Sem Tob, "Tomar del mal lo menos" 158a.) As in the example of "vanidad" he backs his warning with an authority (Salomo; here "sabidor"). This

commentary of the Libro; instead of taking for granted the narrator's moral purpose, we must first decide as best we can who it is that is telling us about the appearance, actions, peculiarities, ideas, characteristics as well as stories and interpretations which involve himself and his adventures in love. Critics have mistaken Juan Ruiz's intentions by limiting them to only one and have consequently slighted his artistic complexity by relating what is obviously purposeful ambiguity to the clearly established tradition of Christian charity (buen amor). Such a critical interpretation becomes inevitable only if one views the hero-narrator of the Libro's adventures as a fictional creation with a personality which is meant to illustrate the poet-moralist's ideas. That is, many see in the sinful lover a distinct personality of his own which is very unlike that of his creator, Juan Ruiz, the morally-preoccupied priest-poet. The lover is only an amiable, anxious, often naive pretender, who is concerned with success in physical love. The contrast between the lover's action and the didactic clarity of the narrator's moral outlook is what, in most critics' opinion, chiefly makes for the Libro's complex,

scholastic formalism is next grafted to an advice concerning pleasure in carnal love: "Por ende de las mugeres la mejor es la menor" (1617b). The technique of grafting a religious with a secular expression is the same. Spitzer and María Rosa Lida do not consider in these two cases the Arch-priest's playfulness and his artistic capacity for parody.

ironic, comic, but also serious vision of the world.

I do not believe, however, that the Archpriest's remarks in the prologue and the running commentary support this theory. The morally oriented reporter of the lover's adventures seems acutely aware of the significance of what he observes but often, for ironic emphasis, interprets the evidence presented (comments or stories) in a fashion directly contrary to what we might expect. That is, the Archpriest appears aware of the manifold ironic possibilities of a given situation and not merely of its religious significance, no matter how sharply he sees this significance. The problem, as opposed to other critics, is not to discover that the narrator is the spokesman of Juan Ruiz the priest, but to try to catch from the Archpriest's words and the tone of his expression to what extent his viewpoints are morally or artistically valid.

II

The Archpriest's Art of Ambiguity

Let us begin with the prose prologue, where Juan Ruiz introduces himself successively as a Christian author, as a moral writer, and as the commentator of his work. First, he cites the prophet David's "intellectum tibi dabo" and makes it the central motif of his exposition. The understanding which the author wishes to impart is "fear of God,"

the beginning of all worthwhile wisdom. The really wise man is he who craves the love of God and rejects worldly love in order to save his soul. He can learn to save himself: ". . . porque se acuerde dello, trae al cuerpo a fazer buenas obras, por las cuales se salva el ome" (prologue). Thus Juan Ruiz clearly establishes a Christian meaning of the expression "I shall give thee understanding." Then, he recognizes that humans are weak and are inclined by nature to do evil more than good. He happens to know some aspects of worldly behavior which cause the soul to be lost; his book's intention is to glorify good by dealing precisely with the "sotilezas engañosas del loco amor del mundo que usan algunos para pecar" (prologue). Here Juan Ruiz utilizes the medieval topos of "exordium" ("The possession of knowledge makes it a duty to impart it"),²⁵ and introduces himself as a didactic, moral writer who will instruct the reader about the differences between divine and carnal love through "intellectum." Finally, he presents himself as a commentator by indicating to the reader how he should approach his book, how he should interpret the events of worldly love, and how he will benefit by choosing the way of truth. Those of "good understanding" will amplify what is good; those of "little understanding" will be able to contemplate the evil they desire to do, will not wish to hold their reputation in contempt, and will abhor the evil

²⁵Curtius, op. cit., p. 87.

dominion of sinful love. Suddenly, and without any warning, the commentator indicates a new advantage for those who read his book:

enpero, por que es umanal cosa el pecar, si algunos (lo que non los conssejo) quisieren usar del loco amor, aqui fallaran algunas maneras para ello. E ansi este mi libro a todo ome o muger, al cuerdo E al non cuerdo, al que entendiere el bien e escogiере salvacion E obrare bien Amando a dios, otrosi al que quisiere el amor loco en la carrera que andudiere, puede cada uno bien dezir: intellectum tibi dabo e cetera.

He introduces a new idea, the contradictory or contrasting nature of which is clear by the disjunctive quality of the logical connective "however." The alternate benefit is related to the recognition of human weakness, an idea mentioned earlier in the Libro. What is peculiar, however, is the use of the expression "intellectum" in a different context. The commentator, in telling how to profit by reading a book which exemplifies sinful love, purposely distorts the original doctrinal meaning of "intellectum" as defined by the Biblical author and established by the moral writer. The term is taken out of its Christian texture, and it is no longer restricted to that understanding which inspires man to fear God.

The commentator initiates the reader early to the seeming contradictions concerning his intentions as a moral writer and his subject matter, the Christian interpretation of love. He expresses these contradictions by the literary devices of contrast and paradox. "Intellectum" is related

simultaneously to the fear of God which rejects sinful love and to human weakness which seeks it. When the commentator says that he will give understanding, he is contradicting himself. The Libro will not only impart understanding to avoid the traps of carnal love but will also provide the same understanding which will help man succeed in it. The reader is made to see in the term a contrast between one kind of knowledge (which rejects earthly pleasure and leads to God) and another (which accepts pleasure and rejects divine love). Thus the "intention" and the "theme" of the book are indicated from the beginning in a paradoxical manner: understanding which leads to the recognition of God may also lead man to abandon him; for an understanding of wicked love, which should lead man to abhor it, may also lead him to participate in it. The agent of the paradoxical presentation of theme and intent is the contradictory use of "intellectum."

From the opening comments of the Archpriest, we are dealing with the artistic problem of ambiguity and the ramifications of meaning.²⁶ The term "intellectum," which is central in exposing the intention of the author and the theme of the book, becomes imprecise. This imprecision is

²⁶For a fascinating study of ambiguity in traditional writers, see William Empson, Seven Types of Ambiguity (London, 1930). His textual criticism of many classic passages has influenced my critical thinking.
Empson, Seven Types of Ambiguity
textual criticism of many classic
ed my critical thinking.

one of Juan Ruiz's chief artistic devices and becomes central in any attempt to determine the meaning of the Libro. From the first, the commentator, by using "intellectum" ambiguously, appears consciously imprecise as to what he means; he reveals that his statement may have several meanings, for he forces upon the reader the probability that by "intellectum" he means one or another or both of two things. The two ideas become connected because the commentator makes them both relevant in the context by using the identical word to represent each. Yet the two connotations of "intellectum" are antipodal: they combine to reveal the greater complexity of the commentator's intentions. By the use of ambiguity, Juan Ruiz sustains intricacy of thought and purpose; as such, the Libro's ambiguity is to be respected as an artistic accomplishment, not a slavish imitation in a didactic vein. In an otherwise straight, dogmatic exposition, the reader is suddenly forced to ask several questions: What is the exact reference of the traditional leit-motif, "a todos fabla la escriptura"? Does "todos" refer to those of "buen entendimiento," to those of "mal entendimiento," or to both? Is the parenthetical expression "lo que non los conssejo," matter-of-fact, contradictory, or ironic? Is the introduction of a new purpose for the book serious? amusing? a mixture of the two? In what way do words serve the writer's intention and not vice-versa? Is the commentator sympathetic with man's weakness ("flaqueza")?

Condemning? Is he both? In short, what really are the intentions behind the writing of a book which contains examples and manners of worldly love? Finally, what is the exact meaning of the two motifs, "intellectum" and "buen amor"? The ambiguity and ironic tone of the prose prologue are determined by the Archpriest's verbal interpretation of tradition: what is meant to give spiritual profit to the reader is verbalized in a way that it will offer him also physical profit.

In his prose prologue, Juan Ruiz utilizes the traditional "exordium," a literary commonplace in which the author claims that he knows something and feels obliged to share his knowledge with others. In a typical medieval "exordium," the writer focuses the reader's attention on a single topic and presents a sustained point of view which establishes a precise, point-by-point correspondence between one statement and another.²⁷ Juan Ruiz not only implies two or more possible meanings from two or more possible points of view but does so in the key, crucial explanation of his exposition. "Buen Amor" represents, after all, the central idea

²⁷ Berceo's Los Milagros de Nuestra Señora is a good example. In the Introduction the narrator ("Yo maestro Gonçalvo de Berceo nomnado") wants to share with his audience an experience he had ("yendo en romeria caeci en un prado"). He describes this experience but then explains point by point the allegorical meaning of it. There is a precise correspondence between the narrator's experience at the meadow and his explanation of it. As opposed to Juan Ruiz, Berceo makes sure to clarify the distinction between the "corteza" and the "meollo."

or impression developed in the Libro; the intention, to teach or to give understanding, is the unifying principle according to which the Archpriest will select and order the details of content and argument. The prose prologue is, in fact, a miniature exemplification of the Libro's moral exposition in that the commentator is ambiguous both in stating his intentions and in explaining his theme. Contrary to traditional practice, he does not concentrate on the one dimension of his explanatory remarks. He sacrifices a degree of clarity concerning his intentions and theme, but he achieves greater variety and ironic appeal. His technique is first to present a well-known comment ("intellectum") in order seemingly to achieve a momentary clarity (avoid sin) and then to dissolve this comment in a mist of plural meanings (either good or sinful). Juan Ruiz's artistry is evident in the manner in which he exploits effectively the ambiguity inherent in traditional figures of didactic exposition ("intellectum," "vanidat," "amor").

The two ambiguities concerning theme and intention revealed in the prose prologue are expanded throughout the Libro. Whenever the Archpriest refers to the theme of "buen amor," for example, the reader is not sure if he is referring to divine love (nowhere in the Spanish tradition is "buen amor" used for the love of God), to the courtly "bona amors," to sexual love, or to a combination of

meanings.²⁸ The examples are many and have often been discussed.²⁹ The ambiguity is intentional and is obvious when

²⁸ Many arguments have been proposed concerning the meaning of the title, "Buen Amor." The critics are divided. For some "buen amor" derives from courtly love (Menéndez Pidal, "Título que el Arcipreste de Hita dió al libro de sus poesías," Poesía árabe y europea. [Buenos Aires, 1941], pp. 109-114; Lecoy, pp. 361-362); for others it is the love of God (Spitzer "En torno," note 7, p. 113; note 17, p. 127; note 2, p. 130; also Cejador y Frauca throughout his edition and Thomas Hart, La alegoría en el Libro de buen amor, [Madrid, 1959]); for María Rosa Lida it means either according to the context, "Nuevas notas," p. 39. She allots a variable meaning to the term in different parts of the Libro. Gybbon-Monypenny devotes a whole study on this problem: "Lo que buen amor dize con rrazon te lo pruebo," BHS, XXXVIII (January, 1961), 13-25. He points out that elsewhere in Spanish literature the love of God is referred by "verdadero amor," "puro amor" or "limpio amor." In Spanish, "de buen amor" usually means "de grado." In the troubador language, however, "fina amours" is a synonym for "bona amors." It refers to a form of sexual love of high, almost spiritual, esteem. "Bona amors" in Provencal and other languages is used in three senses: sexual love, brotherly love and divine love. (The same is true for "fina amors.") Gybbon-Monypenny believes that the manifold use of "buen amor" by courtly poets is the source of Juan Ruiz: "But the fact that its normally accepted sense, sexual love, is also the dominant theme of the Libro is a strong indication" (p. 22). For provencal influence see also A. H. Schutz, "La tradición cortesana en dos coplas de Juan Ruiz," NRFH, VIII (1954), 63-71. Many of the critics interpret "buen amor," of course, depending on the views they hold concerning Juan Ruiz's intentions and as a result many of the arguments are arbitrary. What matters in our study is that Juan Ruiz is purposely variable and ambiguous in employing a term which crystalizes his central topic.

²⁹ Following are two different interpretations of 933: Spitzer "¿Cómo es posible que creyera este erudito (Bonilla y San Martín) que libro de buen amor equivalía a "libro de alcahuetería," porque una vez Juan Ruiz insinúa de broma que ha titulado su libro de buen amor por la tercera?" ("En torno," note 21, p. 130). Juan Ruiz does, however, contradict himself. Gybbon-Monypenny: "It seems to underline the point that the pursuit of women is inseparable from association with the alcahueta, the evil genius of the social order depicted" ("Lo que buen amor," op. cit., p. 24).

he relates "buen amor" to the Trota as in the case of the famous "llamatme buen amor" (932b), or "Por amor de la vieja e por desir Raçon, / buen amor dixé al libro e a ella toda saçon" (933a,b). The term "buen amor," like "intellectum," is alternately distinct and blurred, but mostly ambiguous. Its ambiguity creates a greater excitement than the clearer traditional meaning (Christian charity), which, revealing its meaning more exactly, often empties itself of artistic potentialities. In particular, the ambiguity of "buen amor" creates a thematic contradiction, which in turn implies tension and suspense; the more prominent the contradiction involving the theme of love, the greater the tension.³⁰ Usually "buen amor" implies one thing but in context is effective in several ways at once. Other times it seems to be open and not say much, as though it were an irrelevant statement; thus the reader is forced

³⁰ A good example of this tension is the Archpriest's reaction to Doña Garroza. He says that he wants her chastity respected and that till her death, he served her with "limpio amor" (we are not sure whether "limpio" is "buen" or Platonic love). Yet this is a love relationship on which--and on nuns in general--the Archpriest has some acid comments to make. His first impression upon seeing her:

alto cuello de garça, color fresco de grana;
desaguisado fiso quien le mando vestir lana. (1499c,d)

or

valme santa maria, mis manos me aprieto,
quien dyo a blanca rrosa abito, velo prieto,
mal valdrie a la ferosa tener fijos e nieta ,
que atal velo prieto nin que abitos ciento. (1500)

The Archpriest's language is strong, offering a contrast between his early reaction to the nun as a physical being and his later acceptance of her as a person.

to invent his own interpretations which are liable to conflict with one another (Gybbon-Monypenny's analysis of "ca non ha grado nin graçia el Buen Amor conplado" is a good example: "In stanza 1630, too, buen amor lacks special significance; it is merely used as an ingenious device to introduce the juglaresque plea that the Libro should be circulated without thought of profit," "Lo que buen amor dize," p. 15.) Ambiguity and consequent contradiction arise from, and are justified by, the peculiar requirements of the Archpriest's situation. The art of Juan Ruiz depends on a delicate balance of thematic ambiguities within which the orthodox and serious aspects are mixed with the ironic and the humorous, creating a central theme which simultaneously points in several directions.

The ambiguity concerning the book's "intention" as developed in the prologue is extended and amplified to permeate the whole work. The Archpriest elaborates on the intention of his book in strophes 44-70. This is the central didactic passage according to all critics. It is important in the autobiographic structure because the Archpriest introduces himself as the narrator of the stories immediately before he becomes also the protagonist of the narrative. The explicit purpose of this section is to clarify the manner in which the narrative must be read and understood.

Consequently, it should be clear and precise.³¹ Actually it is not. The narrator cites an authority (Caton) on the fact that excessive sadness is bad and that some fun is necessary; following the suggestions of this authority, he decides to open with "algunas bulrras" (45b); he warns the reader that these jests should not be taken very seriously save in their manner and style (45d); he then shifts to a previously expressed idea that the reader must comb well whatever he reads and should not misunderstand things (46a,b); he proceeds to tell a story which deals with the reciprocal misunderstanding of a Greek and a Roman's intentions in order to illustrate the importance of understanding the real purpose of his work; at the story's end he quotes a proverb as authority, "non ha mala palabra, si non es a mal tenuta" (64b); then, surprisingly, he tells the reader bluntly that if the book is understood well (properly), "avras dueña garrida" (64d).³² He adds, again shifting

³¹In fact, many critics, including Maria Rosa Lida and Leo Spitzer, treat this section as though it were a straight, unambiguous exposition of the book's intentions, no different than Berceo or other medieval writers. A more reasonable approach is that these strophes "constituyen uno de los contados trozos en que expone en primera persona sus fines didácticos, sean burlas o veras" Stephen Reckert, "Auras dueña garrida," RFE, 37 (1953), 227.

³²See Stephen Reckert, op. cit. : He calls this line "la abrupta y desconcertante caída de lo didáctico a lo chocarrero" (p. 232). He believes that such clashes are evident in the Libro but not here: "Pero los aspectos curiosos del verso no se reducen a la relativa tosquedad de su ironía" (p. 233). He concludes that the text has been corrupted and that the line should read "entiende bien

ground, that the capacity to poetize and adorn the bad in terms of the beautiful is a rare craft belonging to the few (65c,d); he finally reminds the reader that like an instrument, his book is for all: its success depends upon how each reader tunes it.

Within a didactic section the narrator, whose intent is to help the reader so that he will not misunderstand the purpose of the book, establishes at least four intentions. All four are valid because they seem explicitly and clearly

my dicho e avras buena guarida." His arguments are as follows: Juan Ruiz often uses the word "entendimiento" in its theological sense; if so, its use corresponds with Sem Tob's "Diol Dios entendimiento / Por que busque guarida"; "duena" could be a corruption for "buena" since the tilde is used capriciously in the Libro; in MS. G. he reads duena; as for b = d, "basta hojear un manual de paleografía para comprobar la facilidad con que en varios estilos de escritura española del siglo XIV una leve inclinación a la derecha en el trazo vertical de una b podría hacer que se tomase por d" (pp. 235-236); "garrida" could be a mistake for "guarida" since terms involving gua = ga were frequently confused (offers an example of 1317). His summation: ". . . se me antoja plenamente demostrada también la vehemente probabilidad de que el verso 64d debe leerse 'entiende bien my dicho e avras buena guarida'" (p. 237). The above is certainly a very sound argument but it is not conclusive: Juan Ruiz does use "entendimiento" in a non-theological (and very ambiguous) way (see my arguments on "intellectum"); the fact that MS. G. has duena is no proof that MS. S (dueña) is the wrong version, precisely because tildes alternate capriciously; that b and d are graphically similar is no proof that they were confused by trained copyists of the fourteenth century (in fact, Reckert does not offer any such examples, see p. 236); that "garrida" is an error for "guarida" excludes the possibility of Juan Ruiz's play with terms. (See my note no. 40, Chapter II.) Even María Rosa Lida still accepts "dueña garrida" (see "Edición con estudio").

stated; they have been mentioned before and will be brought up again later. 1) The book is meant to entertain: "entreponga plazer e alegre la rrazon" (44c) corresponds to "puedan solaz tomar" (12d) and later "por vos dar solas" (1633b). 2) The narrator emphasizes the artistic quality of his writing: "Salvo en la manera del trobar e dezir" (45d) corresponds to "ffablar mas apostado" (15d), to ". . . muestra de metrificar e rrimar e de trobar" of the prose prologue, and to the narrator's various comments concerning his art throughout the Libro which I discuss in the next chapter. 3) The narrator, as the commentator in the prologue, warns the reader that he must judge him and the book by their good intentions: "la manera del libro entiendela sutil" (65b). This is probably the most puzzling and ambivalent expression and corresponds to most of his allusions concerning "buen amor." Also the statement that if the reader understands the "subtlety" of the book, then "siempre me avras en miente," is very mystifying for it is not clear-cut or precise. 4) The narrator reminds the reader that a good or "subtle" understanding of his narrative can also serve those who insist upon participating in worldly love: "avras dueña garrida," corresponds to "aqui fallaran algunas maneras para ello" of the prologue and to the constant advice concerning success in obtaining women.

Thus are offered four readings, and the most ambiguous is the one which refers to the correct understanding of the

book's intention to teach the love of God. Since the stated intentions are manifold, we must conclude that both as a moral commentator in the prologue and as a narrator ready to plunge into the stories of worldly love, the Archpriest is ambiguous while stating his intentions and while explaining his theme of love. Four or more intentions are added to the original single, clear-cut intention of the Christian writer who began with the well-known authoritative "intellectum tibi dabo." The four intentions or meanings of the book, i.e., the several values of ambiguity, are opposites defined by the context; the total effect of the early didactic passages, differing from tradition, shows a fundamental division in the narrator-commentator's mind. The meanings of these "didactic" comments are open to analysis as are most complex aspects of human experience; they are not closed, determined concepts.³³ The conscious ambiguity of the narrator-commentator's early introductory remarks destroys the illusory clarity of the first person didactic staging; it becomes difficult for the reader to reinstitute the early, traditional focal point which is precise because it separates the storyteller from the moral interpreter. It is ambiguity and destruction of didactic precision in the moral comments that opens the way to irony.

³³ Any evaluation of Juan Ruiz's ambiguity is certainly, at least in part, subjective and relative. I happen to agree with Empson's ideas about the general effect of ambiguity: ". . . the reasons that make a line of verse likely to give pleasure, I believe, are the reasons for anything

III

The Archpriest's Art of Irony

Much of the irony in the Libro results from the Archpriest's continued pursuit of the ramifications of ambiguity. Juan Ruiz's irony consists either in a statement that says one thing but insinuates another, or in a situation presenting a contrast between what is expected and what actually happens.³⁴ The evidence presented concerning the Archpriest's ambiguity in his introductory remarks reveals that Juan Ruiz is conscious of the opposing schemes of value that war within his topic and intentions. Moreover, the Libro's artistic significance depends upon the Archpriest's

else; one can reason about them" (Seven Types of Ambiguity, [London, 1930]).

³⁴I am not using the word irony in a modern Bergsonian sense but in its traditional meaning. It originally meant to "dissemble." It comes from Greek (*εἰρωνεία*) and was at first used to designate the sly and resourceful character who triumphed in comedies (the eiron) by his ingenuity and skill in dissembling his knowledge and powers. His opponent was the boastful alazon (*αλαζών*) who sought to win by deception. The word "irony" still retains the essence of this original meaning. The difficulty is that its range and possibilities are infinite. From a minute rhetorical verbal phenomenon, it may expand to inform a whole style, or even become a habit of thought (Socrates, Cervantes, Shakespeare). It was codified by Greek and Roman writers and passed on to all rhetorical treatises, sometimes with the same name other times with a substitute. In Cicero, for example, the equivalent of the Greek eironia is dissimulatio but it means to say something other than one wishes to make understood. ". . . l'ironie dont Cicéron donne ensuite un exemple conscient sous formes d'antiphrase figurera plus tard, chez les grammairiens et rhéteurs, comme une des espèces de l'allégorie; Charisius, puis Diomède qui en énumèrent sept la placent en tête suivie de l'antiphrase." Auguste Haury, L'ironie et l'humour chez Cicéron (Leiden, 1955), p. 10. I shall discuss later in the chapter the affinities between irony, allegory and humor.

systematic pluralism, i.e., in the consciously designed pattern of contradiction in the comments concerning his earthly and heavenly intentions. We saw that the Archpriest acts as a narrator when he recounts an adventure and when he limits his comments specifically to the situation at hand; he acts as a commentator when he addresses his reader in order to point out something of value, or to generalize about human nature, or to give advice, especially when he dwells on the moral significance of his adventures. But by twisting ironically the moral traditional commonplaces, Juan Ruiz provides a unique point of view which transcends the limited vision of the (otherwise) one-dimensional moral narrator.

Important in the contrasts of the moral commentary is a device which is so fundamental to irony that it is less an artifice than an integral part of the Archpriest's ironic perspective: this is feigned humility. Time and again the Archpriest presents himself as a commentator of limited knowledge:

Escolar so muy rrudo, nin maestro nin doctor,
aprendi e se poco para ser demonstrator . . .
(1135a,b)

This posture of self-depreciation is, of course, a well-known medieval topos.³⁵ By feigning a coarse ignorance, however,

³⁵The origin of this topos is probably related to Socrates who constantly pretended not to know much but who managed to ridicule those who did not think he did. Cicero defined clearly the irony of feigned humility: "Ainsi

the Archpriest creates an impression of naïveté and unsophistication which serves his ironic manner since he readily furnishes all the information needed. For example, wishing to stress the human compulsion for physical love, he says that he does not know much about the power of astrologers ("Non sse astrologia nin so ende maestro" 151a); yet he has just given an unusually detailed example (story of five correct predictions by five astrologers), with an elaborate discussion concerning the power of the stars as well as the counter argument about human will and the power of God. Also when he first introduces this topic of physical love, he quotes an authority, Aristotle, and goes out of his way to stress and reiterate Aristotle's worth and his own unimportance:

Sy lo dexiese de mio, seria de culpar;
dizelo grand filosofo: non so yo de Reptar;
de lo que dize el sabio non devemos dubdar,
que por obra se prueba el sabio e su fablar.
(72)

It is this insistence that makes his statement the opposite of what he means. He mimics in jest the commonplace of humility³⁶ (comparable to a rich man who constantly protests

disait-il [Socrates] autre chose que ce qu'il pensait, et cette feinte, dont il était coutumier, constitue ce que les Grecs appellent l'ironie" (translated in Haury, op. cit., p. 14).

³⁶Often this topos is used both ironically and humorously in the Middle Ages: Chaucer for example uses it like Juan Ruiz (and unlike Berceo):

Also I prey yow to feryeve it me,
Al have I nat set folk in hir degree
Heere in this tale, as that they sholde stonde.

My wit is short, ye may wel understonde (lines 743-747
F.N., Robinson edition, 1957).

that he is the poorest of all men). He exaggerates the authority of a philosopher and understates the fact that as author, the Archpriest should not be challenged (non so yo de reptar) in such a way that the importance of his own contribution becomes obvious.

His expressed naïveté creates an ironic contrast between semblance and reality, between what the Archpriest's knowledge is assumed to be and what it actually proves to be. The point of view in the commentary shifts back and forth fancifully between that of a narrator with a supposedly limited vision and that of an ironic interpreter of the action. Obviously the ironic commentator is put forward or withdrawn at will in order to suit the needs of the artist. If Juan Ruiz were completely serious about the narrator's moral comments (as many critics claim), that is, if he presented a fully conceived serious commentator with a distinct personality, the opposite of the narrator (hero-lover), he would surely have allowed that commentator to function more regularly, instead of only at intervals, and to function with more consistency. Otherwise, there seems little reason for the emphasis placed only on the moral value of the commentator.³⁷

³⁷ There are autobiographical works in the Middle Ages which have a gradation of theme. The Pearl, a fourteenth century English poem, deals with the experience of one person who is the participant, narrator and commentator. The answer to the main question of the poem and its climax (a man visits the spot where he has lost a lovely pearl, he

While commenting on his adventures or on life, the narrator-commentator shows many shades of difference that allow for ironic play. The Archpriest is witty in the ingenuity of his plays upon words, sophisticated in the critical subtlety of his interplay of ideas, and above all playful in his use of ambivalent arguments, so that the reader can hardly accept anything at its face value. Since these are artistic devices by which Juan Ruiz provides an ironic existence for his moral conceptions, they deserve more careful examination.

The narrator's wit is ingenious not only in his play on words but also in the way which he exploits that play on words. Using a word in more than one sense is only the beginning: for example, he sees a beautiful woman, "rrogando muy devota ante la majestad" (1322b); he immediately takes advantage of the double meaning of the verb "rogar" (pray-beseech): "rrogue a la mi vieja que me oviese piedat" (1322c); he shows ingenuity in taking advantage of the ramifications of the verb "rogar" and creates a pun from the religious expression "aver piedat"; he next reinforces his witticism by marking it with an unexpected turn of the

has a dream of a stream and a girl-child, he has a vision of Jerusalem and wakes up trying to cross the stream) occur at the end of the action--a fact that underlines the unity of structure in this narrative. The emphasis lies on the progressive action (starting point, rising action, resolution) while the Libro does not have a progressive and gradating action. (For some discussion on medieval structure see Rene Wellek, "The Pearl: An Interpretation of the Middle-English Poem," Studies in English, Charles Univ., IV [Prague, 1933], 1-33.)

idea: "E que andudiese por mi passos de caridat" (1322d), a Biblical borrowing (María Rosa Lida, "Edición con estudio"). The narrator not only perverts the meaning of caridat-buen amor but lets us know that he is aware of conceptual playing by artistically exploiting the ironical possibilities inherent in the situation: a woman praying in a church creates a devout atmosphere; in this atmosphere another person beseeches his bawd and ask for "mercy"; "charity" supposedly is what Christ (la majestad) inspires in the one who prays; just as a bawd is asked to perform "passos de caridat." That is, the image of the lover beseeching before his bawd (symbol of loco amor) parallels the picture of the woman (object of his love) praying before Christ (symbol of buen amor). Or, what Christ can give to one devout person, the bawd can give to another; charity. The process from a play on the word "rogar," to the distortion of the idea of "piedad" to the reciprocity of the concept of charity (with the implication that the Trota's "passos de caridat" would reach over to the devout woman who is praying for charity) reveals Juan Ruiz's capacity for irony: he prompts a response in the reader by skillfully playing upon the double property of religious words. They state what they mean, but above all they insinuate as much as they mean. There are many such witticisms which exploit the specific and suggestive

meanings of words.³⁸ The Archpriest states, for example, that a small woman "Terrenal parayso es e consolaçon" (1616b). Paradise, according to religion, becomes a reality on earth only if man receives consolation from the love of God (buen amor). Here it is a woman, described as the best kind of woman for "loco amor" (1609-1612), who consoles and who converts paradise from abstraction to concrete reality. But again the narrator carries the idea further, gaining vividness by a concise and rapid alternation between earthly and religious realities "solas E alegria, plaser E bendición" (1616c).³⁹ Since he mixes pleasure with Church rites (heavenly blessing) in a situation for which he has carefully prepared, we must assume that the narrator is aware of all the ironic possibilities. Thus in this ironic device, based on a trick of style, Juan Ruiz uses words to withhold a part of their literal meaning, or to suggest in some other way an idea different from that actually expressed.

The narrator's sophistication is displayed in his authoritative citations. He begins to explain the outcome

³⁸Other examples: Don Melón, (or the Archpriest) comments on the prospects of seducing Doña Endrina: "pero syn dios todo esto non puede aprovechar" (693d). Or, concerning Doña Garroza: "en el nombre de dios, fuy amisa de mañana" (1499), i.e., to meet a nun he wishes to seduce. On Trota's death: "Cyerto en parayso estas tu assentada" (1570a). Or, "a dios merçed le pido que te de la su gloria, / que mas leal trotera nunca ffue en memoria" (1571a,b).

³⁹The use of "bendición" with a secular connotation should be further evidence that Juan Ruiz was well aware of the distinction garrida-guarida (see Reckert, op. cit.).

of a love affair: "segund diz' jhesuxristo, non ay cossa escondida" (90a). This statement (from St. Mathew, 10, 26) crystallizes the Christian idea that in the eyes of God whatever is covered will be laid bare and whatever is hidden will be revealed. A phrase with spiritual connotations serves to introduce the Archpriest's explanation about the fact that his love secret was disclosed in public: "ffue la mi poridat luego a plaza salida" (90c). This is a very sophisticated way of saying that he lost the woman through a public scandal. We see an association of two realities which depends for its ironic value not so much upon the essential truth of the comparison as upon the ingenuity displayed by Juan Ruiz in detecting any similarity at all between what Christ said about "open secrecy" and his own "public secret." He again manages to translate the abstract into something concrete, to convert a general religious idea on "secrecy" into his specific secular love difficulty. He creates an irony of statement and situation by the use of allusion, by suggesting a passage the recognition of which reveals the Archpriest's subtlety. Such a witty and sophisticated narrator-commentator, has a dual role: he pretends to serve the moralist but is constantly in the service of the artist, i.e., he uses terms that are moral but presents them with devices (ironic) which are artistic.

One of the strong arguments against a straight, didactic, one-dimensional narrator is that he would have to be

inflexible and unbending in his orthodoxy and would therefore cease to be interesting or exciting. It is incredible that a priest of even--as Lecoy claims--a very low theological training should fail to recognize that he is contradicting himself in his use of well-known religious expressions and ideas. For example, he often delivers important remarks with sudden and naive matter-of-factness which destroys their solemnity; or, apparently serious statements reveal, through the narrator's use of juxtaposition and seeming irrelevance a playful instead of a serious tone. Juan Ruiz gains ironic effect through the device of antithesis. The hero's reaction to a nun is a good example.

The Archpriest goes to meet Doña Garroza; he sees her praying and is struck by her physical beauty ("vy estar a la monja en oraçion loçana" 1499b); he next records his reactions and thoughts while watching her:

- a) Peroque sea errança contra nuestro Señor
 - b) el pecado de monja a ome doñeador,
 - c) ¡ay dios! ¡E yo lo fuese aqueste pecador
 - d) que feçiese penitencia desto fecho error!
- (1501)

First, he thinks as one who knows his rules: he realizes it is sinful (an adultery against God theologically) for a nun to be compromised by a suitor. Second, he expresses the feelings of an anxious lover: he would to God that he might be that sinner. The abrupt change from ordinary explanation to direct exclamation (¡ay, dios!) adds immediacy and a

dramatic quality to the narrator's reaction. Finally, he rationalizes as one who knows his religion: after sinning he could always repent and do penance. Notable is the rapidity with which the Archpriest shifts from the narrator-lover (who talks of his physical reaction to the nun) to the narrator-commentator (who talks about what he or others can do once they sin). The irony arises from a contrast between divergent judgments of the prospects of loving a nun: the commentator feels it would be a sin to love her, but the narrator-lover feels it would also be a "sin" not to love her--in any case, one can always repent. The ironic situation obliges the reader to re-examine the two roles of the Archpriest: instead of the commentator warning the lover further about the implications of his wish being granted he, ironically, provides him with the possible way to overcome sin, repentance. The result is a careful balance of one condition against another for the purpose of ironic contrast. The Archpriest pretends to yield to morality by accusing himself of sin were he to love the nun. Here is a perfect opportunity for the Archpriest to show his didactic intention; he could disapprove of the lover by reiterating the original explanation that sinning with the nun is incompatible with moral, religious thinking and therefore ridiculous or contemptible. But he chooses to present the lover's thought as compatible with Christian thinking and therefore natural or humorous but not ludicrous.

Juan Ruiz accomplishes this ironic contrast by a device which for lack of a name we might call deviating afterthought: the afterthought (penance) modifies the preceding thought (sin). The deviating afterthought is Juan Ruiz's artistic manner of getting around the one-dimensional didactic form.

Juan Ruiz's awareness and sophistication become even more evident when we realize that this is not the first time he has the narrator raise the question of physical love in relation to nuns. The narrator does not participate personally in the story about the fight between Sir Carnal and Lady Lent; he simply relates it. But he makes one comment, the most insinuating in the whole story. During the triumphal entrance of Don Amor, many urge him not to stay with nuns because they are deceiving, full of "gestos amorosos" (1257). The narrator comments on the course that Amor ought to follow:

Myo señor don amor, si el a mi creyera
el conbid de las monjas, aqueste rrescribiera;
todo vicio del mundo E todo plazer oviera,
sy a dormitorio entrara, nunca se arrepentiera.
(1258)

It is interesting to contrast "nunca se arrepentiera" (in this case "not to regret," but it is also the expression used if one sins, namely, repent) with the later "feçiese penitencia" : one will not regret loving a nun physically, or, if he does, he can repent.

These passages cited are devised in a vein of conscious and craftsman-like irony by an artist. In the prologue, the

early commentaries, and all the didactic passages of the Libro, we are exposed to an ambivalence of theme and intent created by the narrator's tone. The problem is whether this narrator is more akin to the moralist or the artist. I do not believe that there is any evidence to point out a difference between the narrator and the artist. The Archpriest narrates and comments in the style of a craftsman who knows how to exploit the ambivalent, striking, and ironic possibilities of the moral statements.

The narrator is not blind to the church's objections toward an Archpriest who channels his life's efforts to worldly love. In one place after another the so-called evil habits of man and especially clergy--the same bad habits which the narrator somehow tries to justify in himself--are mentioned and often elaborated. Following the seduction of Endrina, for example, the narrator warns women (with the ever-present possibility that he is being jocular) not to trust bawds nor allow them in their homes. Yet not only does he show no concern lest his other remarks offend the church; he states that he called the book "Buen Amor" for the love of his bawd (933a,b). A brief examination of the whole section (912-933) reveals clearly Juan Ruiz's ironic use of Christian didactic terms as well as his artistic skill in creating humor. The Archpriest needs help in a love affair and seeks out his bawd, "que siguiese este viaje" (912c); he gives reasons: "que estas [Trotas]

son comienzo para el santo pasaje" (912d). This is an ironic image of the Christian pilgrimage to Rome which is symbolic of buen amor; "pasaje" (pilgrimage = charity) rhymes with "este viaje" (the present undertaking of "loco amor"). Both expressions, viaje-passage, are images of "loco amor." The device which leads to irony lies in the emphasis given to those qualities (journey or pilgrimage to seduction) which form the basis of similarity in two themes (secular and religious) compared. After many such puns (Trota: "llamatme, buen amor," etc), which center around the quarrel with her which disrupts his love pursuits, we come to the climax, their reconciliation, which will enable him to continue his love endeavors:

- a) Por amor de la vieja e por desir Raçon,
 - b) buen amor dixie al libro e a ella toda saçon;
 - c) desque bien la guarde ella me dio mucho don;
 - d) non ay pecado syn pena, nin bien syn gualardon.
- (933)

If his earlier statement, "Lo que buen amor dize con razon te lo pruevo," includes the meaning of devotion (see also strophe 13), then the book's theme is the result not only of devotion ("e por deçir racon") but also the result of worldly love ("por amor de la vieja" refers either to her type of love or to the way the Archpriest loves her because she is indispensable to him). This simultaneous presentation of two contradictory reasons (devotion vs. enjoyment) is reinforced by the next two lines: an abstract, religious, conventional expression is again concretized by being applied

to the results of the Archpriest's reconciliation with his bawd. The device involves both comparison and contrast. The situation becomes ironic when the reader assumes that the concrete experience of reconciliation may be codified in a conventionalized motto of religion and when he reinterprets the circumstances of the fight and reconciliation in terms of such a religious expression. It is above all the Archpriest's matter-of-fact gravity of tone (there is no sin without punishment) which gives to religious, didactic words a contrary meaning.⁴⁰ It is incredible that the narrator, given his habit of irony and humor, is not perfectly aware of the double-entendre of theological-didactic words such as "pecado," "pena," "bien."⁴¹ The sin was his abuse of the bawd; the punishment, his loss of women without her help; the good deed, his kindness to the bawd; the reward, her willingness to help him again in his pursuits of love.⁴² In

⁴⁰Stylistically the contrast is obvious. Lines a,b,c are narrated in the first person. Line d (the moral saying) has no subject; it is general, abstract, authoritative.

⁴¹The following are some other examples of these words which demonstrate further Juan Ruiz's conscious use of them: "non querades vos penar por ajeno pecador" (1154d); "fue quita E absuelta de culpa e de pena" (1141d); "faze injuria e dapno e meresçe grand pena" (1146d).

⁴²A review outline of the passage will reveal Juan Ruiz's conscious design of contradiction: 1) The Archpriest seeks out his Trota to help him with a seduction (este viaje); 2) He does so because Trotas are the best for the santo pasaje (buen amor); 3) To make sure one succeeds in love he must not call his bawd names related to "loco amor" (tya, "trotera, aunque por ti corra"); 4) Rather, one should act as she suggests: "llamatme buen amor"; 5) Consequently, the Archpriest called his book Buen Amor for her (offering

typical fashion, Juan Ruiz next exploits the comical possibilities of the expression "nin bien syn gualardon." In order to help re-establish the Archpriest's reputation (essential in the success of love) which she herself ruined (as a punishment for his sin), the bawd feigns madness, running naked in public so that the people will disregard her earlier derogatory remarks. Since her action somewhat parallels St. Francis' feigned madness,⁴³ the humorous outcome is part of this balance between religious material and its artistic use, i.e., the description as an unthinkable absurdity (Trota's public action) of what is known to be a revered and consecrated ritual (St. Francis' similar action). Thus the Archpriest begins by instructing women how to avoid go-betweens but concentrates on entertaining the reader with a description of religious and secular activities which are parallel in form, but quite different in meaning. To what extent they are parallel is subtle, and above all, humorously suggested.⁴⁴

a contrast to his early request for God to inspire him to write a book on love divine, 13c); 6) Thus everything turned out well since there is no sin without punishment nor reward; 7) What turned out well is that she continued procuring for him.

⁴³"... hizo la pícara vieja como San Francisco para que le tuviesen por loco, que fue ponerse en medio de la plaza a amasar el barro con los pies" (Cejador y Frauca, Edición, II, note 934, 22). After her action, Juan Ruiz comments: "quien tal vieja toviere, guardela como al alma" (936d).

⁴⁴Additional examples: "solas tan plasertero e tan grande alegria, / quisome dios bien giar e la ventura mia" (687c,d); "por esto anda el mundo en levantar e en caer; /

The ironic devices of the Libro are not limited to the Archpriest when he is the narrator of his own story but function also whenever he records the narrative of someone else. This is especially true in the comments of his interlocutor, Don Amor. One of the evils of wine is that it is against God: "a dios lo yerran mucho, del mundo des fallescen" (546d); one realizes upon reflexion that this Christian thought is uttered by Don Amor, the arch-enemy of Christian love, who is telling the Archpriest that wine-drinking fouls the breath which in turn nauseates women; that is, drinking wine is one of the habits that can ruin success in love.⁴⁵ His advice (which begins like a Christian warning by referring to God's punishment and which uses Christian clichés and a basically Christian exemplum) is intended to show the Archpriest how to succeed in "loco" not "buen amor": "si amar quieres dueña del vyno byen te guarda" (545d). This conscious miscasting of speaker and speech resembles the transposition of the word "vanidat." Similarly, Don Amor earlier advised the Archpriest how to choose the suitable woman and then the appropriate procuress. He first praises these go-betweens for their skill; then unexpectedly, and in

dios e el trabajo grande pueden los fados vencer" (692c,d); "el [dios] guie la mi obra, el mi trabajo provea" (694b). In the above examples God is asked to help or inspire the lover in his pursuits (ventura, trabajo, obras).

⁴⁵Also in Chaucer, "Pardoner's Tale": "O dronke man disfigured is thi face / Sour is thi breth, foul artow to embrace." The deterrent factor of wine in love was a well known topos, not limited to Arabic literature as Castro suggests.

the manner of the Archpriest, he comments morally and ironically on their effectiveness: "¡ay! ¡quanto mal saben estas viejas arlotas!" (439d).⁴⁶ The "mal" is, of course, ironic, for it is directly related to the effectiveness of a bawd whom Don Amor recommends strongly. The ambiguity of "mal," the ironic tone of "ay" (exclamative "oh how much!"), and the incongruity of Don Amor talking as a morally preoccupied priest would make one suspect that perhaps the narrator is parodying his own didactic comments, delivered while attacking Don Amor and worldly love (181-422). It would seem that both the form and the spirit of the Archpriest are given, ironically and comically to Don Amor. Just as the Archpriest, in his attacks against worldly love, changes his ground by shifting the interest to his particular failures in love ("¿que te fize? ¿por que me non diste dicha / en quantas que ame, nin de la dueña bendicha?" 215b,c), so Don Amor, in his praises of worldly love, shifts his ground and stresses what is essential in divine love. This artistic device consists in designating a contrary (evil of Trotas) by its opposite (Don Amor). Such amusing, humorous shams imply a rejection of the didactic moralist by means of selective imitation (Don Amor in his comments mixes terms as the Archpriest), exaggeration

⁴⁶Don Amor's reference to trotas as "viejas arlotas" is also ironic since they are, after all, his chief agents in bringing about a love affair. It would seem that his reference is a parody of his own advice.

(he carries a topic too far as in the case of wine), and mild ridicule (he makes sport of the bawd's skills which he highly recommends).

If we cannot see the Archpriest's use of irony while commenting upon and interpreting the lover's adventures, we will miss all the nuances of most of the stories and the narrator's delightful and playful arguments. It is the artist's sensibility and craft, evident in the narrator's ironic manner, that record these nuances. This self-styled moralist uses many stories, changes them, and exaggerates them in a spirit of pure, rollicking fun designed to amuse and entertain the reader (which is one of the tasks of the medieval artist). He burlesques sermons, plays with words and ideas, teases the theologian, and finally, perhaps even laughs at the whole didactic scheme of his own moral commentary. To see the Archpriest, commentator or narrator, as anyone other than a marvelously alert and ironic master of every situation is to miss the artistic quality of the Libro. His ironic manner attracts the attention of the reader and compels him to explore the imaginative implications of his statements. The narrator-commentator thus invites us to read between the borrowed traditional didactic lines. He accomplishes this by beginning with a statement which seems to convey a literal (usually moral) meaning and then shifting immediately to an ironic playful tone which suggests that the reader must realize that the narrator is

not to be understood literally. The total effect of the narrator's commentary is to underlie the ironic contrast between the serious and humorous, moral and entertaining, general and concrete interpretation of love.

Juan Ruiz does not merely burlesque or parody traditional moralities; rather, he effectively opposes authentic points of view, divine vs. human preoccupations. The distinction is above all artistic, and cannot be too greatly stressed. It describes Juan Ruiz's basic relation to his traditional material. If Juan Ruiz wanted a definition of "buen amor," he had the answer in tradition; it is his presentation of a contradiction that makes his theme ironic and indefinable. But a theme is not necessarily unrepresentable. On the contrary: "buen amor" is presented in an endless series of more or less imprecise moral intimations. These intimations have, in the course of the Archpriest's commentary, assumed a didactic precision and become the raison d'être of Juan Ruiz's artistic impulse to present the contradiction, sound it, and give it ironic shape.

IV

Fusion of Narrator and Commentator

The conscious contradictions of the commentary prevent an absolute separation, typical of medieval didactic literature, of narrator and commentator. Since both are ironic, the effect of the narrator's stories and the commentator's

moralizations is distinct from the supposed intention. I should like to examine strophe 1628 as evidence of my contention. Here the Archpriest, in his role as moral commentator, tells the reader that his book can lead man to the upright conduct which he associates with Christian charity (prayers, offerings, hearing Mass, etc). It is one of the decisive comments because of its position (epilogue) and its matter-of-fact tone concerning the effect that a book exemplifying the wiles of worldly love has on man. It is also the climax of the ironic perspective which was introduced in the prose prologue because the commentator and narrator reflect each other both in their views and in their ironic manner of verbal expression.

The strophe seems to be serious and therefore doctrinal. The Archpriest's comments appear religious in that they deal specifically with deeds of Christian charity; they seem didactic in that they pretend to establish the moral exemplarity of the love adventures. If the comments are somewhat sudden and unanticipated, the Archpriest, like other medieval authors, follows a clearly defined literary tradition: the one in which a statement of Christian ideals comes at the end of a presumably secular work.⁴⁷ The

⁴⁷ Many critics have been preoccupied with this problem. For example, "Critics have been at pains to explain how the Troilus can end with an epilogue during Christian renunciation when everything that goes before has seemed 'courtly,' pagan, secular. Similarly, Andreas Capellanus' De amore, after dealing at length with the proper manner of conduct in courtly love, ends unexpectedly with a chapter on the 'rejection' of love, in which the author exhorts his pupil

Archpriest simply says that his love tales ought to show the way to the only worth-while love, which is charity.⁴⁸ This is, after all, the leit-motif of "buenas obras" clearly established in the prologue and now reiterated. The problem is as follows: if the commentator, as representative of charity, is supposedly expressing an ideal of buen amor completely opposed to that of the indulger, it is strange that his brief, fragmentary instructions on Christian charity should so closely resemble those ironic and parodying comments which the narrator made on the occasion of Trota's death. Juan Ruiz, in creating a persona who guides the reader through his love adventures, does not create a real, authentic distance between action and intention, between the indulger of "loco amor" and the preacher of "buen amor." In fact, Juan Ruiz is aware of all the ironic possibilities and at the end, in the epilogue, as if to make sure, has the commentator join the narrator by making the former

to turn his thoughts to God. Even Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, for all its concentration on chivalry, ends with the passage in which it is explained that the tiny wound was inflicted because of the knight's undue love of his own life. The pattern occurs again and again in late medieval literature--the ironic juxtaposition of actual worldly abuses against an unfollowed and never wholly attainable Christian ideal" Donald R. Howard, "The Conclusion of the Marriage Group: Chaucer and the Human Condition," MPh, LVII (May, 1960), 230.

⁴⁸ The idea of making offerings to the Church is also a well-known topos. From the Livre des manières (a work which attacks clerical abuses): "Si en iglise te velz meitre, / Prente au doner, lei le premeitre (64-65). In Mary Merton Wood, The Spirit of Protest in Old French, Columbia Univ. Press (New York, 1917), p. 77.

interpret the book precisely in the same way (thematically and stylistically) as the narrator earlier interpreted the lesson he got from Trota's death.

1. The Archpriest as Narrator: he describes the action and his statements apply only to his immediate situation.

Toward the end of the "planctus," the narrator asks God to bless his go-between, for there was never a better "trotera" (1571). First, he will write an epitaph for her; next, he will follow the upright conduct of a good Christian:

Dare por ty lymosna e fare oraçion,
fare cantar misas e dare oblaçion;
la mi trotaconventos, idios te de rredepnçion! ["bendçion"
el que salvo el mundo iel te de salvaçion! in ms. T]
(1572)

2. The Archpriest as Commentator: he interprets the action and his comments apply to the condition of man in general.

The love affairs of the Archpriest concluded, and the narrative ended, the commentator states that his Libro is profitable to all; especially to the man with an ugly wife, or the woman with an ugly husband, who by hearing the Book will want to serve God (1627).

desea oyr misas E faser oblaçones [sic],
desea dar a pobres bodigos rraçiones,
faser mucha lymosna E desyr oraçiones,
dios con esto se sirve, bien lo vedes, varones.
(1628)

In the above, two stanzas occupy a key position in the narrative: the end of procuring and the last moral warning. They also represent a stylistic merging of the story-teller

and the moralizer. The religiously-oriented comment of the narrator-lover drawn from an immediate happening of worldly love, and the morally-oriented suggestion of the commentator applied to the whole book reflect each other. Both are obvious and deliberate exaggerations which emphasize the strong contrast behind the moral assertion. Here in the epilogue (central to a didactic structure, as María Rosa Lida has pointed out), where the reader is told what benefits he should derive from the book and how he should read it, we see that the commentator is in fact imitating his narrator in the content, in the ironic tone and even in the wording itself. Through the device of association with a previous situation, Juan Ruiz succeeds in suggesting something about the hero and the Libro by stressing the contrary. Is this not, then, another instance of the Archpriest's conscious use of irony, the idea being, of course, that the primary influence of worldly love (or a book dealing with such love) would do anything but lead a man to charity? It parallels the earlier idea that the loss of a skillful procuress would lead the dejected lover to hearing Mass. In both cases the device consists in suggesting something of "loco amor" by pretending not to say it.

A closer analysis of the similarities of attitude and technique in the above stanzas reveals not only the proximity between narrator and commentator but also the fact that both are one persona in the service not of a

moralist but an artist. Both state seeming contradictions between secular love and spiritual charity, and both express those contradictions by witty contrast, paradox, irony and matter-of-fact understatement. (1) Both situations are ironical, yet the language appears literal. One laments for his lost procuress but will pray, go to Mass, etc.; the other urges the reader to read about his worldly love affairs so that he will be more charitable, etc, i.e., the commentary in each case is contradictory as if in mockery of the traditional fitness of morality. The reader is made to think that the Trota's value was to procure for the Archpriest; that to lose her creates a crisis in "loco amor." If she now inspires him to pray and hear Mass, we call such reaction ironic. The reader next expects the Archpriest to either praise or condemn "loco amor." If he says that worldly love leads also to prayer and alms, we call such moralization ironic.

2) Both exploit the humorous potentialities of the ironic situation. As Robin Hood calls a giant Little John, meaning by this understatement to emphasize his immense size, so the narrator refers to Trota's religious influence to better emphasize by contrast her procuring value; while the commentator, by ironically tagging his book as charity inspiring, emphasizes by understatement the book's bawdiness. A clever bawd is conceived as a model of the good, pure old

woman; a book of risque adventures is described as a model of good, moral intentions. The device is that the same terms can praise or ridicule the same figure. The result is both ironic and humorous.

3) Both play with religious terms. When they talk of "lymosna," or "oraçion," "misas," or "oblaçiones," they imply in each case a contrast between the literal meaning of the words and their connotations: "alms" should not be inspired by a procuress or by a book of worldly love, but they are; "offerings" should not emanate from preoccupation with adjusting to love without a bawd or from reading about the skills of a bawd, but they do; Mass should be related to something devotional, but is not. These paradoxical expressions are short, concise, vivid, and above all challenging; they challenge the reader and compel him to see the ironic contrasts of the book's entire commentary.

Juan Ruiz's irony hits the reader like a flash of lightning which strikes and illuminates; by means of its illumination the reader looks back and sees the artifices used to accumulate a charge contrary to the apparent purpose. The real irony of stanza 1628 is that Juan Ruiz creates with remarkable artistic control the illusion that a real incongruity or conflict between "buen" and "loco amor" is nonexistent; yet he shapes the illusion in such a way that the reader ultimately sees through it and is therefore surprised into a more vivid awareness of that very conflict.

Similarly, there appears to be a distance between the secular narrator and the commentator; yet the distance is constantly bridged in such a way (one reflects the tone of the other) that the reader finally sees that any distance for didactic purposes is only pretentious and illusory.⁴⁹ The two stanzas crystalize the ironic manner of the Archpriest: he is not merely disguising his thought, or saying the contrary of what he thinks; rather, he manages to state, through a continuous humorous tone, dissimulated under a serious posture, something other than the tradition he imitates. It is this continuous jesting tone, hidden under a feigned serious attitude, that characterizes the art of Juan Ruiz's irony.

V

Juan Ruiz and the Didactic Structure (The Art of Humor)

So frequently have the words "moral," "didactic," "satirical," and "exegetical" been applied to Juan Ruiz that

⁴⁹If the Libro were a didactic work, the various comments of Juan Ruiz would represent not ironic oscillations between opposing ideals but rather a progressive revelation like the one we see in the episodes of El Caballero Cifar. Morton Bloomfield examines the role of narrator in Troilus and Criseyde and makes some revealing observations concerning art and meaning in medieval works. "It seems to me that, if we regard the framework of the poem--the role that Chaucer sets himself as commentator--as a meaningful part of the poem and if we consider the various references to fate and destiny in the text, we can only come to the conclusion that the Chaucerian sense of distance and aloofness is the artistic correlative to the concept of predestination" "Distance and

they have become part of the Libro criticism. Almost always such terms refer to the running commentary. In a textual analysis of the comments, however, a distinction must be made between open didacticism and irony, for in his moral comments, Juan Ruiz is much more frequently an ironist than a strict moralist. In fact, the idea of a "hidden thought" which forms the basis of medieval exegesis constitutes the core of the ironical tone of his commentary. To assert that the comments are more frequently ironical than didactic does not mean, however, that the latter note is absent. On the contrary, open morality is prominent in almost all the interpretative comments. It takes the form of allusions to sacred and venerated authorities, darts at sinners, thrusts at immoral practices, warnings to understand the correct meaning of what is written, helpful hints to uncover the "hidden thoughts" of the Libro, and elaboration of stories to illustrate moral views. Many of his statements are constructed almost entirely upon a frame of moral didacticism. However, by far the greater number of his comments in these didactic sections have an ambiguous or paradoxical and hence ironical character. This irony with which the didactic comments are replete is accompanied by humor and amusement.

Now we must take a much closer look at stanzas 44-69 because this section, where the Archpriest attempts to explain what is the real understanding of his Libro, seems to crystalize all the problems which we have discussed in relation to the autobiographic structure and the ironic manner of Juan Ruiz.

The Archpriest claims that good sense (buen seso) does not lead to laughter and so decides to open with "algunas burlas" which are meant to amuse (they do not make one "comedir": meditate); yet he insists that his sayings should be understood correctly and that the reader should avoid misunderstandings such as the one which took place between a learned Greek and a Roman ruffian when Rome asked Greece for knowledge; after the story, he tells the reader that his "jest" should not be considered as base or worthless; on the contrary, "la manera del libro entiendela sotil" (65b), he warns. This motif of "subtlety" has never been adequately explained, and yet upon its interpretation depend both the book's meaning and art. The explanation which I offer is derived principally from the text, and it depends on the evidence and arguments offered earlier concerning the Archpriest's use of ambiguity and irony, and the merging of narrator and commentator. I will attempt, above all, to analyze the relationship between the story of the narrator and the interpretations of the commentator.

The problem is to determine, of course, what the Arch-priest means by "sotil." Elsewhere in the book⁵⁰ he invariably means alert, cunning, artful, sly, and designing. He is certainly aware of the various connotations. Here his meaning lies somewhere between the idea of implication, suggestion, and most probably insinuation. He says that the manner of the book is subtle and that this manner should not be misunderstood simply because it has the appearance of a joke. This joke is related to the story which is meant to illustrate a case of misunderstanding. Consequently, the meaning of "sotil" can be derived only if we can determine the relation between the story and the viewpoint of the comments of which the story is supposedly an illustration. The jestful story is cast in the following frame:

Before:

entiende bien mis dichos e piensa la sentençia,
non me contesca con tigo como el doctor de greçia.
con nel [sic] rribalde Romano e con su poca sabençia.
(46a,b,c)

The Story:

After:

Por esto dize la pastraña de la vieja ardida:
non ha mala palabra si non es a mal tenida;
veras que bien es dicha, si bien fuese entendida;
(64a,b,c)

In the frame the reader is warned not to misunderstand the book and not to take his words the wrong way. He can observe

⁵⁰Some of the various uses of the words "sotil," "sotileza." "Sotil, entendida, cuerda" (96b); "El amor faz sotil al ome que es rrudo" (156a); "Con engaños E lysonjas E sotiles mentiras" (183a); ". . . con tu sotil engaño" (216c); "era sotil [Don Ximio] e sabio . . ." (323d); "todo saber de dueña sabe con sotileza" (168b); "sacole con el pico el veso con sotileza" (253c); "a muchos aprovecha un ardit sotileza" (814b).

what are the consequences of misunderstanding in the story: the Greek takes the Roman's gestures the wrong way; he interprets the latter's gesticulating threats as the wisdom of one who knows the power of God. The Roman likewise misunderstands completely the Greek's signs; he interprets the latter's demonstration of wisdom as a physical challenge and menace to him.

Leo Spitzer makes this story central to his elaborate arguments concerning the Archpriest's didactic function.⁵¹ He claims that Juan Ruiz's motive in selecting as his first story that of the Greek and Roman misunderstanding is to symbolize what happens to a transcendental truth (or attempt to define the properties of God) when applied to practical morality. God has given man ways of communication; these are muddled by man but God "lleva a cabo por encima de los designios de los hombres y a pesar, por decirlo así, de sus equivocaciones un hecho racional (el de la transmutacion de las leyes de los griegos a los romanos)" ("En torno," p. 124). Spitzer's argument (not clear on this issue) implies that despite misunderstandings the word of God is passed on to the people in the same way that, despite the misunderstanding between the two contestants, the Romans

⁵¹Leo Spitzer has influenced all subsequent critics. His early views concerning the medieval and didactic character of the Libro have been used, cited and expanded. He has given the clearest and most elaborate arguments of the relationship between medieval art and didacticism.

received the knowledge and laws of the Greeks.⁵² Similarly, "Dios puede servirse de la mano del rústico y de las equivocaciones de los sabios para alcanzar sus propios y justos fines" (p. 125). I believe that Spitzer insinuates here, according to the Archpriest's commentary, that despite any subtleties or jests the book's message will ultimately get across to the reader in the same way that God's aims are ultimately accomplished, or the wisdom of the Greeks eventually passed over to the Romans. Similarly, the jokes are justified within the ordo rei which the Libro contains; there is no difficulty of a priest telling risque stories. What matters is the subtlety of these stories, i.e., their "hidden," "higher" meaning.⁵³

⁵² Again much of the wording is mine. Spitzer explains aspects of medieval ideology then refers them to the story but does not always explain the particular relations. I am actually carrying his arguments and implications to their logical end.

⁵³ María Rosa Lida agrees with Spitzer: "A decir verdad, la Edad Media, que funda su espiritualidad en la Biblia, apenas si concibe otro libro que el didáctico. . . . La literatura recreativa se justifica ingeniosamente por sus digresiones morales: 'repetiros querria una buena liçion'" ("Edición con estudio," p. 13). It is difficult, in my opinion, to explain many of the elements of the Libro by pointing out their similarities with medieval didactic works. Most of the medieval authors state clearly what is the subtle way of reading their text. This is true of Berceo and Sem Tob (Comunal mente trobado / De filosofia sacado / De glosas moral mente / Segunt aqui va siguiente. 2) The following is from the prologue of Disciplina Clericalis (ed. of Angel Palencia, Madrid, 1948). Unlike the Libro, the author makes sure that the reader knows what the word "subtle" means: "Si alguien repasa este opúsculo con ojos meramente humanos y materiales y en el encuentra algún deslíz de la humana naturaleza, le insto a que vuelva a leerle una y otra vez, pero con ojos sutiles [subtiliori oculo iterum

Spitzer's explanation of the story leaves many questions unanswered. He expands his textual analysis of this section to a general interpretation of the Libro which he assumes to be correct because it parallels a long established tradition. "Locura," he claims, is, according to medieval thinking, both a part of this world and a part of the world of God: ". . . el Libro de buen amor cuenta locuras . . . porque la necia conducta de los hombres entra también en el orden querido por Dios. . . . La Locura está ahí en el mundo; el mundo es locura a los ojos de Dios, pero sólo ella completa el mundo! sin necesidad no hay verdad" ("En torno," p. 129). This interpretation is based on a medieval ramification of the Christian doctrine of Fall and Redemption, exemplified by a God who became Flesh to show that he was himself both sublime and humble, divine and worldly. The dichotomy of world-heaven (or locura-caridad) is basic to the medieval conception of the human condition.⁵⁴ As such, it provides an ideological framework not only for the Libro but for all medieval literature. It is too general to apply to the

et iterum relegere moneo], y, por último, lo someto a su corrección y a la de todos los maestros de la fe católica. Nada hay perfecto en las obras humanas. Según criterio del Filósofo." To read con ojos sutiles" means to interpret the stories of "humana naturaleza" according to "la fe católica."

⁵⁴See Erich Auerbach, Introduction to Romance Languages and Literature, Capricorn Books (New York, 1961), pp. 26-38 for a good discussion of the Christian view and the human condition.

specific uses of it by the Archpriest.⁵⁵ Such an interpretation concentrates not so much on the hilarious situation caused by the misunderstanding, but on the fact that the Romans received the laws, an event which is secondary in Juan Ruiz's version of the story. It does not explain the relationship between the misunderstanding of "señas" and the Archpriest's pleas, "trabaja do fallares las sus señales ciertas" (68b). It does not consider the fact that any moral lesson depends on the fact that not only the ignorant fails to understand the sage, but that the sage likewise does not understand the signs of the ignorant; or the possibility that when the Archpriest tells the reader not to let the situation of the Romans-Greeks happen to him, he at most tells him not to misunderstand his book; only he purposely never says what it is that one should not misunderstand, as we shall see.

The manner of the Archpriest in telling the reader how he should understand his sayings and the expressed idea of subtlety touches upon the problem of interpreting medieval

⁵⁵María Rosa Lida also stresses a view which is too general in that it applies to medieval literature more than to the Libro. The Libro is accordingly divided into the commentary where "Juan Ruiz expresa insistentemente su intención doctrinal," and a series of humorous stories thus creating a juxtaposition of the sacred and the profane. "Por eso el libro medieval encierra entre el incipit y el explicit categorías cuya sola vecindad es una contradicción para el concepto moderno--es decir, grecorromano--de la unidad del arte: Infierno y Paraíso en la Divina comedia, el ladrón y el santo en los Milagros de Nuestra Señora, la cantiga a la Virgen y la trova cazurra en el Libro de buen amor" ("Edición con estudio," p. 11).

texts. Spitzer, María Rosa Lida, and others stress the "allegorical manner" of medieval writers. "Subtlety" is for them a reminder to the reader that the author is presenting another meaning beneath the surface meaning, i.e., the elements he expresses stand for some others (allegory in Greek = something else), for a system of ideas with the meaning implied, not expressly stated. Thus the story of Greeks and Romans is a kind of parable for Spitzer, a fictitious narrative with a moral, used by Juan Ruiz to illustrate concretely the meaning of an abstract idea. Thomas Hart is influenced by Spitzer and bases his study on the allegory of the Libro, specifically, on the "sentencia," the other meaning: "Así Juan Ruiz aplica explícitamente a su propio libro el principio de interpretación que se desprende de la fábula. El libro también debe ser entendido sútilmente; hay en el más de lo que aparece a los ojos del lector descuidado, el cual no debe, por lo tanto, tener demasiada prisa para juzgar el libro y su autor."⁵⁶ There is, of course, a conventional vocabulary in medieval literature which indicates an author's allegorical manner (cortex, essence, gloss, nucleus, cover, inner, outer, sentence) and warns of the "cryptic" meaning. There is also, however, a strong tendency in medieval authors to

⁵⁶ La Alegoría en el Libro de Buen Amor (Madrid, 1959), p. 27. Hart follows closely the critical pattern of both Spitzer and María Rosa Lida: "La teoría medieval de la interpretación alegórica de la literatura descansa a su vez en una interpretación sacramental del universo mismo, es decir, en considerar que Dios se revela en todas las cosas que ha

indicate to the reader what this "cryptic" meaning is.

María Rosa Lida has shown that the medieval author goes to pains to indicate what is allegorical, hidden or "subtly" humorous and low (Berceo, Don Juan Manuel, Sem Tob, etc.):

" . . . si Juan Ruiz destaca una y otra vez que sus versos risueños tienen otro sentido, más valioso, también ha indicado repetidamente el carácter de tal sentido . . ."

(see her review of Hart's La alegoría, op. cit., p. 342).

Before concentrating specifically on these indications and examining their relation to the story, let us take issue with these critics who not only attribute to Juan Ruiz the "allegorical manner" but often carry this view to the unprecedented extreme of interpreting notably secular stories and comments as allegorical treatments of Christian doctrine.⁵⁷ From this point of view, of course, all the comments gyrating around the idea of subtlety in the "didactic" section are doctrinal, and the story is only a means to help the reader penetrate the "cortex" of surface meaning which conceals the "nucleus" of Christian truth.

creado. La Edad Media tomó muy en serio esta interpretación sacramental del universo" (pp. 19-20). His statements are typical of medieval critics known as "pan-allegorists" (Howard, op. cit., p. 224).

⁵⁷This view is crystalized in the attitude that all serious medieval literature is "always allegorical when the message of charity or some corollary of it is not evident on the surface" D. W. Robertson, Jr., "Historical Criticism," English Institute Essays, 1950, ed. Alan S. Downer (New York 1951), p. 14. This view is discussed well by D. Howard, op. cit., pp. 223-224.

I should like to suggest a picture of Juan Ruiz as a writer who is not easily explained by the so-called allegorical procedure. It is necessary to reexamine first the relationship between allegory and irony. One of the most serious students of irony, V. Jankélevitch, has traced their relation from antiquity to modern times: "L'ironie pourrait s'appeler au sens propre du mot une allégorie, car elle pense une chose et, à sa manière, en dit une autre."⁵⁸ That is, they both indicate something other than what they present.

"L'ironie est une variété de l'allégorie ou plutôt de la 'pseudégorie' . . . elle révèle en cachant" (op. cit., p. 44).

The similarity (revealing by hiding) ends here. The difference lies in the fact that allegory does not mean the contrary, as does irony, but rather another thing which is hidden and which the reader, with the author's help, ought to discover for himself. What Juan Ruiz does (as do all medieval authors) is to present an allegorical frame, i.e., one which instructs the reader to see whatever is concrete and visual as a reflection of an invisible moral or spiritual order. This is the "allegorical" explanation of his use of "subtlety." To say, however, that his sayings have another meaning or that what matters is the nucleus of these sayings, is a formula related to the allegorical manner of presenting a topic or a story. But such a

⁵⁸ Vladimir Jankélevitch, L'ironie ou la bonne conscience (Paris, 1950), p. 33.

formula is not necessarily allegorical. In fact, to insinuate, to suggest more than one meaning at once, or to suggest the opposite of what is said is not allegory but irony. Since allegory is utilized for a systematic interpretation, designed to produce in the reader the clear and certain understanding of a "truth," the indications concerning the other meaning are usually clear and precise. If the central element of allegory is clarity, that of irony is paradox or ambiguity. From antiquity, through the Middle Ages to the modern times, one of the functions of irony has been to create humor, to amuse.⁵⁹ It is this difference between allegory and irony that points out definitely the artistic

⁵⁹Auguste Haury comments as follows on his study of Cicero: "Dès les début des recherches il nous était apparu impossible de méconnaître la présence de l'humour et de l'exclure de cette étude. Ses affinités multiples avec l'ironie, leur coexistence ou plutôt leur intrication perpétuelle, leurs alliances, leur jeux, leurs duels l'interdisaient" (p. IX). Cicero and Quintillian also associated irony with humor: "Il [Cicero] définit sommairement cette ironie et en cite plusieurs exemples. Il semble distinguer en elle une figure de style et un trait de caractère. Il attribue à la première une place d'honneur parmi les procédés comiques" (op. cit., p. 21). "Il [Quintillian] la considère en particulier comme un procédé comique apparenté à la plaisanterie (iocus)" (op. cit., p. 25). Haury discusses thoroughly the relationships between irony and humor both theoretically and in tradition (pp. 1-75). Almost all critics have completely overlooked that the opposition of meaning and words constitutes not only "exegesis" or "allegory" but the touchstone of irony with comical intension as indicated by Cicero and Quintillian and practiced by medieval writers such as Boccaccio, Chaucer and Juan Ruiz.

consciousness behind Juan Ruiz's humor.⁶⁰ A close examination of the most important didactic passage of the Libro should provide the evidence.⁶¹

To review: some critics claim that there is humor in the story but that, like other jests, it serves a purpose "subtly," that is, it implies another serious meaning. I believe that the whole section has an "allegorical" frame, i.e., it insists upon a "hidden" meaning and "indicates" continually the manner in which it should be understood. Juan Ruiz shifts the frame, however, so that it becomes ironical and humorous instead of allegorical and serious. The indications come both before and after the story. Some of them are definite and clear, that is, they follow the

⁶⁰It is interesting to trace this problem to some seventeenth century writers. The allegorical manner predominates in Calderón and the one central quality of his plays is the clarity of theme and metaphor; the ironical manner predominates in Racine and the resultant ambiguity is mixed with hypocrisy (especially in Andromache); the ironical manner is mixed with criticism and above all humor in Molière. "Hypocrite, fanfaronne ou ironique, assurément la conscience dans ces trois cas est une conscience labyrinthique, pleine de galeries et de couloirs secrets, . . . le langage n'est plus le clair et fidèle miroir de nos sentiments ou plutôt sa fidélité est si indirecte qu'on ne peut comprendre sans rectifier" (Jankélevitch, op. cit., p. 44).

⁶¹The volume of criticism on Chaucer in the last ten years is evidence of the deficiency which existed in analyzing medieval works of an ironic manner. Some of the results of textual criticism on Chaucer have revealed much of the artistic consciousness of certain writers of the late Middle Ages.

logical procedure (typical of the Middle Ages) of antecedent and consequent; they do not insinuate other meanings.

Others are ambiguous and unclear, that is, either they do not refer to a specific antecedent, or they insinuate more than one.

The definite indications: (a) Sadness is not good for man; (b) Man cannot laugh if serious (de buen sesso); (c) Do not take the burlas seriously⁶² except for the manner in which they are composed (i.e., enjoy their written manner not their meaning); (d) To be able to compose well, especially in converting what is ugly to something beautiful, is a very rare gift (65c,d); (e) In general, the writing is for all ("a todos ffabla la escriptura"), that is, everyone should be able to gain something from reading it (this is a well-known commonplace, of course). The clear indications refer neither to the meaning of the story, nor to the meaning of the book, nor to the intentions of the Archpriest.

⁶²The idea of not taking things seriously is also a theme found in Chaucer. Upon apologizing for the bawdy tales of the Miller and the Reeve which he will relate, he slyly adds:

An harlotrie they tolden bothe two.
Avy seth yow, and put me out of blame:
And eek men shal not maken ernest of game. (3184-86)

This important aspect of medieval tradition, the willingness and capacity to laugh off vices and misery is usually overlooked in medieval studies even in those of the scope of Huizinga's The Waning of the Middle Ages.

They simply state a generality concerning sadness and laughter and point out the worthiness of writing well, the story at hand being an example of good writing. The clearly defined indications have as an antecedent neither the story's meaning nor the Libro's intentions.

The ambiguous indications: The following are all consequences of a previous thought or action, but their antecedent (i.e., the specific intentions or ideas to which the consequence refers) is never clear or definite, either in the text or in tradition; moreover, whenever there is an antecedent it is manifold (i.e., the consequence results from more than one cause). a) "Entiende bien mis dichos e piensa la sentençia" (46a). The reader is not told how he can understand well or correctly, nor how to consider (piensa) the sentençia. b) The reader must not let happen to himself what happened between the Greeks and the Romans. If the story illustrates a misunderstanding, logically, the reader is asked not to misunderstand what the Archpriest says. But in what way his sayings can be misunderstood is never indicated. c) "non ha mala palabra si non es a mal tenida" (64c). This is, in the medieval sense, a true statement (proverb used as an authority) but it has no definite antecedent.⁶³ What can be taken wrongly? Probably

⁶³ Juan Ruiz knows how to use a proverb and make it fit perfectly with what he is elaborating:

- a) ffueron por la loxuria çinco nobles çibdades
- b) quemadas e destruydas, las tres por sus maldades,
- c) las dos non por su culpa mas por las veçindades,
- d) por malas vezindades se pierden eredades. (260)

his sayings, but which sayings specifically (those on buen amor, on loco amor, on art) and in what way? d) If the reader understands the book well, he will be successful with a handsome woman (64d). It would be impossible to determine exactly the difference, if any, between the two identical expressions "entiende bien" when applied to "mis dichos" or "mi libro," and when found in this context of loco amor. e) "trabaja do fallares las sus señales ciertas" (68b). One is not told what are the correct signs (other than the implication that they are opposed to incorrect ones); they can apply to various things including the unmistakable signs of the Greek and the Roman, both however completely misinterpreted. In fact all the rest of the indications follow the same indefinite pattern: "lo que buen amor dize, con rrazon te lo pruevo" (66d), or, "Do coydares que miente [Libro] dize mayor verdat" (69a) when not a word has been uttered to indicate what is the lie and the truth. These indications culminate in the comparison of the book to an instrument: "ssy puntar sopieres sienpre me avras en miente" (70d). This indication is aptly interpreted by Castro: "Ni cabe dar ningún sentido preciso a 'siempre me avras en miente.' Que vamos a guardar en la miente . . . Que cada uno, pues, se detenga en su verdad . . . poética, de instrumento musical" ("El Libro de Buen Amor del Arcipreste de Hita," OL, IV 1952, p. 208). The

The proverb (d) has a direct antecedent (a,b,c). His use of the proverb "Non ha mal palabra" follows the same pattern but is purposely made vague.

Archpriest does not indicate specifically the best way to "tune" his book; neither does he hint what is the subtle way of understanding the book's manner, nor what is the relationship between the event of misunderstanding in the story and the possible misinterpretation of his own comments. Thus all the indications which are directly related to the story's meaning and to the Libro's intentions are purposely stated in an ambiguous, vague, or indefinite manner.

The above analysis leads inevitably to a series of hypotheses concerning the intentions and meanings as uttered by the narrator-commentator in this central passage. (1) the story is either amusing and thus an antidote to the sadness created by "good sense," or it is subtly serious and therefore its coarse appearance should not hamper the ultimate and real understanding of the book (presumably Christian). (2) If the book is like an instrument which needs a correct tuning, it must be attuned as a treatise on love whose lesson is Christian, or else it can remain open to any tuning possibilities the reader wishes. (3) A good, proper or correct understanding of the book must lead to Christian charity, or else it may serve as a procuring manual, or as a source of delightful entertainment (provides laughter), or as an example of well composed verses. (4) The book's subtlety must therefore be that the Archpriest presents a secular meaning of love cast in a Christian frame, or else preaches Christian charity which renounces secular love altogether.

All the above ambivalences are crystalized in the proposed ideas of "subtle understanding" and "various ways of tuning an instrument." The Archpriest, as a narrator or commentator, does not tell us specifically, as a moralist would, how to interpret the book or how to tune the instrument; the trick is that he pretends to tell us by saying that this is the correct way or that is the wrong way, yet always contradicting himself (unlike an allegorical manner) as we see in his presentation of a commonplace:

bien o mal, qual puntares, tal te dira çiertamente.
(70b)

or

dicha buena o mala por puntos la juzgat.
(69c)⁶⁴

Since we apparently cannot determine the exact intentions of the Archpriest and consequently the book's ultimate meaning, we should perhaps consider the possibility that the uniqueness of the Archpriest as narrator-commentator springs

⁶⁴The idea that it is the reader who chooses what he wants from a book is, of course, a well-known commonplace found in Capellanus, Boccaccio and Chaucer. Many medieval writers warn the reader to take the good and abandon the bad. Only Juan Ruiz does not say what is good or bad, or if he does, he reciprocates the values good, bad. As for the other writers there is still much unresolved controversy concerning the purpose of their work; Juan Ruiz is not an exception. One example is whether Boccaccio is didactic or artistic. See articles and rejoinders by Charles Singleton and Angelo Lipari, "On Meaning in the Decameron," Italica, 21 (1944), 117-124; and 22 (1945), 101-108.

from his paradoxical and ironic technique of constantly placing side by side several ideas and ambivalent intentions. We need not read his commentary and his story under the condition that we must choose some parts and disregard others. We may in fact read them precisely because they embody a conflict and an ambiguity which makes an ideological choice (a certainty in allegory) impossible. These ambiguities, ironies and variances of the narrator-commentator are not mere tricks; they reflect the pattern of the entire book, a pattern which has more artistic than ideological solidity. That is, if a juxtaposition of secular material against a Christian utterance is detected in the Archpriest's comments, this pattern need not be consistent with a general prevailing theme but with the artistic spirit of the Libro. What critics have assumed as fundamental in explaining the Archpriest's comments, is that the Libro itself is a miscellany disposed chiefly toward secular notions; that these notions are incorporated into the conventional device of autobiographical frame; and that this frame is intended to teach something serious. Accordingly, unity is given to humor, irony, or contrariedades by the medieval idea of Christian charity--specifically, the notion that good love, being a higher state than foolish love, should be held up as an ideal of conduct.

Given, however, Juan Ruiz's conscious use of tradition, any interpretation of the Archpriest's didactic comments

must of necessity be partial and never complete if it attempts to classify him thematically. There is a constant commitment in all his comments and indications, but it is channelled in various directions, such as art, amusement, charity, worldly love, women, jokes, etc. Basic in most of the comments, and creating a unity for the various directions and inconsistencies, is the continual play with traditional ideas which characterizes the tone of the Archpriest's expression. In short, the Archpriest's disposition is more basic in the running comments than in the various themes; it is the ironic attitude which characterizes both story and commentary, which transforms the many traditional themes and expressive mannerisms, and gives them a semblance of what I choose to call humorous unity.⁶⁵ Such an attitude, since it is neither didactic nor satiric, reflects the work of an artist in that contradictions, varieties, and ambiguities are consciously and purposely created in order to amuse and entertain the reader. It is here that the narrator and commentator, i.e., the two supposedly contrary aspects of the Archpriest, reflect one another. As the commentator

⁶⁵ An old theory held that humor was not important in ancient literature, that it was a by-product of Christianity, that it was given vague forms in the Middle Ages and that it reached its definitive form in the German Romantics. It is now believed that it has always existed but under different names. Above all it was considered a part of irony: "et l'ironie? N'est-il pas vrai que même la plus sérieuse confine à la plaisanterie?" (Quintillian, in Haury, p. 51).

purposely exploits the possibilities for humor in the moral tradition which he imitates, so the narrator, imitating the presentation, diction, and tone of the commentator, will stress in the stories the humorous over the exemplary elements. A detailed examination of the story about the Greeks and Romans reveals that he concentrates upon those devices which create an ironic situation and result consequently in amusement. The ironic manner of the story is a counterpart of the ironic manner of the commentary based on the story. The narrator slights the thematic value and emphasizes the obviously recognizable incongruities of the situation by bringing forth the inherent absurdities of the misunderstanding between the Greeks and the Romans.

La disputaçion que los griegos E los Romanos en uno ovieron

The Greeks claim that the Romans must earn the laws in a dispute; they decide on a contest of señas since the Romans cannot understand the language of the Greeks; the Romans, aware of their intellectual impotence, worry; they choose a vellaco who gestures naturally, as God showed him, and dress him up as a doctor; during the contest the Greek raises calmly one finger while the Roman belligerently responds with three; the Greek shows the palm of his hand and the Roman angrily shakes his fist at him; the Greek decides that the Romans deserve the laws since they understand the meaning

of the Trinity (3 fingers = 3 in 1) and God's power (fist); the Roman, on the other hand, boasts that if the Greek were going to break his eye (one finger), he (the Roman) would in turn break both his eyes and with his thumb the teeth; and if he would slap him, the Roman would punch him; according to the Roman, the Greek then stopped threatening. There are only two known sources before the Archpriest, both from about the end of the thirteenth century.⁶⁶ One, the version of Accurse, is a gloss commentary based on a parody of certain practices in some universities.⁶⁷ The other, found in Placides et Timeo, is included in one of the dialogues dealing with the transmittance of laws from one power to another. That is, the story was either utilized seriously (to demonstrate the importance of law and the difficulty of transmittence) or as a parody (to criticize certain erudite and university practices). Lecoy believes that the story probably circulated among priests accustomed to ridiculing certain monastic rules (op. cit., pp. 167-168). Juan Ruiz's version follows the tradition closely: Roman-Greek background; the use of two proofs; the different linguistic origins of the contestants; the contest between a natural fool and an educated scholar; and the misinterpretation of each other's

⁶⁶ Accurse (Accursio), Digesto, De Origine Juris. 2) Placides et Timeo--ou le livre des secrets aux philosophes. This is a sort of an introduction to philosophical questions and translated into French from Latin. See Lecoy, pp. 164-168.

⁶⁷ It is interesting that Nebrija attacked this version for allowing anachronisms in a serious subject.

gestures. The differences, however, between tradition and Juan Ruiz are important because, more than any other, he concentrates on the misunderstanding and above all on the comical elements which are inherent in such a situation.

1) In the traditional versions the Greeks and Romans assemble in public; among the public there is a "natural" fool who becomes angry upon seeing the Greek gesture and spontaneously gesticulates in response; at the end, after listening to the fool's explanation, everybody laughs. This version is somewhat more plausible whereas in the Libro, the situation is more comical. The vellaco is chosen on the advice of a responsible citizen (Qibdadano). This innovation results in three extra stanzas full of ironic contrasts and comic devices: (a) to let the ruffian use signs as God shows him (naturally) in a situation which demands mental strength, was for them, ironically, "consejo sano"; (b) for such a mental contest they choose one who is both big and bold (ardid); the physical element is stressed but, in contrast, they dress him "como si fuese doctor en la filosofia"; (c) once dressed elegantly, he begins to boast and challenge the Greeks before the contest even begins, thus regarding it as something physical, a "lid." (d) Only in Juan Ruiz's version is the fool dressed as a scholar. Juan Ruiz takes advantage of his own contribution and provides the reader with a detail which underscores the ridiculous atmosphere of this misunderstanding: after pointing three fingers,

"assentose el neçio, catando sus vestidos" (56d). Not at home in such garments, obviously bothered by them yet getting from them a "fantasia vana," the fool appears more ridiculous; the scene gains plasticity and becomes funnier.

(e) In the traditional versions, the crowd laughs at the end of the contest, especially at the fool's misinterpretation of the wise man's signs; Juan Ruiz suddenly fakes seriousness to create another contrast: "levantaronse todos con paz e con sosiego; / grand onrra ovo rroma por un vil andariego" (58c,d). Thus in all his five variations, Juan Ruiz stretches the comic situation by means of statements and situations which are apparently self-contradictory and which carry to the extreme any contradictions of common sense and generally accepted understandings and communication.

2) Even when Juan Ruiz follows tradition closely he introduces a small variation in the details which enhances further his preoccupation with the burlesque quality of the given situation. In the version of Accurse, the fool raises two fingers willingly, the third being a physiological and involuntary action: "e levavit duos (digitos) et cum eis elevavit etiam pollicem, sicut naturaliter evenit." This action leads the Greek to interpret the three fingers as the Trinity. Lecoy claims that the Archpriest did not understand the mechanism very well; he equates Juan Ruiz's "el polgar con otros dos que con el son contenidos" (56b) with Accurse's "sicut naturaliter evenit," and argues that

the Archpriest was then obliged to give a role to the third digit (p. 166). The text itself is a refutation of Lecoy's argument and furnishes us with more evidence concerning the Archpriest's conscious artistic effort to exploit and thus expand a given comical situation. Juan Ruiz does not merely make use of the polgar; he creates an image out of it, "en manera de arpon [sic] " (56c). It is this concrete, visual image which sets the stage for the fool's incongruous explanation, "con dos dedos los ojos, con el pulgar los dientes." Since the thumb has a function only in Juan Ruiz's version we can assume that he is again typically provoking mirth by reducing to absurdity the incongruities of the fool's actions and subsequent explanations. The image of arpon (hook) is designed to render more vivid and humorous what might otherwise appear straight. Juan Ruiz substitutes for three fingers a word which suggests the gesture colorfully and emphasizes that particular element which at the moment is most comical: not merely the Trinity (misunderstanding) but simultaneously with it the teeth (absurdity of misunderstanding).

3) Juan Ruiz's is the only version which states that the choice of señas is due to the language barrier and that communication is only possible by gesturing. This preoccupation with order, and the efforts to explain and make clear the inner relationships of his story add a dimension to the situation of contrasts: from the beginning, the lack

of communication due to language difficulties prepares the ground for the misinterpretations and renders them inevitable. The story thus concentrates on the potential merriment of the misunderstanding. The prevailing mood is one of genial laughter, devoid of the traditional uses of the story for the purpose of satire or serious lesson. Perhaps the most distinct characteristics of Juan Ruiz's version are its bubbling sense of sheer fun and the Archpriest's indulgent delight in relating the absurdities of a linguistic and gesticulating misunderstanding over what appears to be a serious topic.

In relating the story to the indications we notice an ironic disparity between stated intentions (prove knowledge) and general results (prove misunderstanding). The reader is made to look first on one picture, then on the other and compare them. He is urged to place the standard of "meaning" so high above the story itself that any shortcomings stand out sharply in contrast to the original purpose. Juan Ruiz exposes a discrepancy between purpose and effect in the strongest possible light and lures the reader into making the analogy and drawing his own conclusions. He seizes on this discrepancy and with playful exaggeration pierces the very heart of its incongruities. Thus the "allegorical frame" based on a "subtle" understanding of a story is purely comic. It is in this light that the

Archpriest's opening remarks make sense:

E porque de buen seso non puede ome Reyr,
 abre algunas bulrras aqui a enxerir.
 (45a,b)

Perceiving the humorous allure of a "misunderstanding," the Archpriest first carries its possibilities to the funniest extremes, and next plays down its "allegorical" (i.e., other) importance by ambiguously relating its "moral lesson" to a series of ambivalent indications. Such a humorous device, closely related to and a part of the ironic manner, requires nimbleness, inventiveness, and perpetual motion in its exaggerations.

Juan Ruiz is aware of the ambiguities, and his various intentions, paradoxically indicated, serve, in some ironic manner or another, a common purpose leading to humor and amusement. It is therefore probable that Juan Ruiz creates these variations deliberately, since we have at least the evidence that he consciously heightens and exploits them. A brief analysis of some of the technical elements of this section (story and comments), reveals a conscious artistic purpose both on the part of the narrator and the commentator. That is, the sum total of the elements which establish the ironic gestalt of this passage (story and indications) and the humorous attitude of the Archpriest is one which can be best understood by explaining how (in what manner, with what changes, by what use of language) they are brought about. We must now understand not only the "whatness" of

the Archpriest's attitude (a typical medieval attempt to allegorize which has preoccupied most critics) but the "howness" of his attitude which creates a unique form.

The Archpriest's tone: By tone I mean the narrator's or commentator's sense of the situation, that is, how the Archpriest makes the reader conscious of his ironic or humorous manner. a) For example, his effect on the bare sense of expressions is perceptible since by verbalizing it ironically he succeeds in reversing its sense completely: The narrator has the Greek say matter-of-factly that he realized (entendi) the Romans deserved the laws "desque vi que entendien e creyen la Trinidad," meaning of course, that they did not understand; since the Greek himself did not understand the Roman's gestures. Or, when the commentator, after a long series of unquestionable ambiguities and contradictions says "lo que buen amor dize con rrazon te lo pruevo" (66d), he means that he does not prove it. b) The lack of seriousness becomes even clearer when we examine the Archpriest's assumed position toward his readers. He sometimes creates an imaginary audience and replies to an implied question or criticism:

non diras mal del libro que agora rrehiertas.
 ... (68d)

There is something theatrical afoot when we discern a question which no one has asked being answered. We saw this peculiarity of pretending to apologize by commenting on an implied behavior in his address to the dueñas during his lament of

Trotaconventos. In either case, the Archpriest definitely makes the reader aware of the ironic position he assumes and his humorous way of handling it. c) The Archpriest also shifts his manner of addressing the reader, creating a remarkable variety of focus: the shift from the argumentative "if" clause ("ssi la rrazon entiendes") to a warning or suggestive command form ("non contesca contigo," "faz punto e tente.") to a condescending future (fallaras, veras, auras). Moreover, he sometimes shifts the speaker's position, the "I" itself: "Yo, Joan Roiz / Arçipreste de Hita" (19b,c) becomes at the end of this section yo, libro (70a).

The Archpriest's diction: By diction I refer to his selection of language as a means to establish the ironic and humorous tone. a) He likes to pun: he begins by stating that "de buen seso" man cannot laugh; he ends by saying "los cuerdos con buen sesso entendran la cordura" (67b). His technique is to apply the same word or expression in different contexts, (in the next section he refers to lovers as those of "mal sesso"). He constantly alternates the context of words like entiende, bien, and mal. b) Often he likes to surprise the reader by choosing words or expressions in a manner different from their normal usage as we saw earlier in his use of vanidat and bendiçion; here his use of pecado for lastima as the result of sadness and as a reason to open with something amusing is probably purposeful since he earlier elaborated on the word pecado or pecar as

the action and result of worldly love. (In the following section he refers to himself as pecador, i.e., one who has made love to women, like all men.) The device is to switch a term from its natural context to another where it is revealing although incongruous. c) He chooses words which suggest families of associated words from which he can select the next one: he begins relating the story with a situation where one group has to desputar with another; the situation is originally a desputacion, i.e., a controversy, a contention in an argument; since the word also insinuates a "quarrel", he can shift to a related terminology which is, however, more visual and which emphasizes the physical aspects of the contest: "desputar por señas" (53a) becomes "escusanos desta lid" (53b). Appropriately, his selection of lid, porfia, corresponds with the appearance on the scene of the Roman fool.

There are many more devices which characterize the Archpriest's diction and which I will examine with more detail in a later chapter: his exploitation of ambiguous terms, his treatment of abstractions with offhand confidence (buen amor, locura), and his expressions of mock formality ("escoja lo mejor el de buena ventura," 67d). In addition, he derives much of his vocabulary from formal didactic literature but only pretends to use it formally. This ready made didactic diction is a good resource for the Archpriest, for he can draw on some of the potential conflicts and create many kinds of humorous effects.

The Archpriest's narrative skill: By this I refer to his capacity in developing a story in such a way that its forward movement (i.e., the threads of the plot) leads to a series of climaxes, all high points of the hilarity of the situation. We see this in his effective alternation from indirect to direct discourse. The comic sense of the story is a useless disputation by signs where senseless gestures are overdone; the essential feature of this comic sense is the contrast of a famous scholar and a fool debating on a deep theological subject with the prize being "knowledge." Juan Ruiz leads up to this contrast by a series of other comic contrasts. First, the poet represents the speeches and thoughts of the characters indirectly, i.e., he reports them in the form of a summary or paraphrase. Second, this summary is usually a complete incongruity, i.e., it contains the seeds of an absurd situation. Third, this comic summary is always in the past tense. Fourth, each comic summary (or absurd situation) culminates in a brief dramatic presentation of a speech (present tense) which reinforces and brings into focus the incongruity of the situation. In short, an absurdity by indirect discourse has for its climax an equal absurdity by direct discourse. Following are some illustrations: a) During their plight, a Roman citizen suggested that they choose a ruffian. The climax of this incongruity comes when in the face of a serious debate the Romans address this ruffian, almost pleading with him and

promising him everything:

lo que tu quisieres pit
E nos dartelo hemos escusanos desta lid.
(52c,d)

b) Afterwards they dressed him as a doctor of philosophy.

The climax of this absurdity is the contrast between the fool going to his alta catedra and his unintelligent, foolish comment, represented directly:

Doy mays vengan los griegos con toda su porfia.
(53d)

c) Next follows the senseless gesticulation between the learned Greek and fool Roman. The climax of this exchange of "signs" is the sudden decision of the Greek, again a brief speech:

merescen los rromanos las leyes, yo non gelas niego.
(58b)

The first direct speech climaxes the ridiculous preparations for a debate of "knowledge." The next two direct speeches introduce the contestants; complete assurance as opposed to blubbing stupidity is captured by two comically contrasting speeches (both concise, one line), that of the vellaco, the stupid one, and the Greek scholar, the assured one. This prepares the stage of course for the final two speeches (much longer) whereby the Roman and the Greek explain each other's "signs." Thus the story avoids a conclusion and resolution which might help establish a clear meaning. The high point of the action is the incongruity and hilarity of an explanation which was prepared

by a series of small climaxes full of absurdities. The didactic or allegorical intention of the story is rebuffed by a process which we might call cumulative. The events in the story and the "allegorical" indications parallel each other by assuming a cumulative force--specifically, an increase of detail and a heaping of incidents and ideas so that the effect is momentary and humorous, not sustained and serious. For his accumulation of ambiguous indications, Juan Ruiz correspondingly accumulates exaggerated details in his story.

The Archpriest's use of plot and syntax: I refer to his skillful use of syntax, i.e., his skill in arranging words so that at the appropriate moment he expedites the humorous development of the debate: In the first phase of the dispute we are made to see a contrast between the calm movements of the Greek (esmerado, sosegado, de vagar) and the blustering of the Roman (bravo, de malpagar). To stress this humorous contrast, the Archpriest concentrates the second phase of the debate in one stanza with perfect symmetry of the movements of the two contestants:

levantose el griego, tendio la palma llana,
E assentose luego, con su memoria sana;
levantose el vellaco, con fantasia vana,
mostro puño cerrado, de porfia avia gana.
(57)

The Greek rises, acts, and sits down; the one description leaves the impression of a sane man. The Roman rises, in all his vanity, and gestures obstinately and menacingly. By not

having him take his seat again, the Archpriest emphasizes the fool's belligerent actions. The reader can almost see him gesturing and menacing, refusing to sit down. Each one reveals a behavior which is, in a sense, an ironic self-betrayal. The sentences of this stanza are composed of corresponding elements parallel in structure. The effect is one of alternation. The stanza is perfect in its antithetical structure, its movement being correspondingly alternative. By giving a concise, parallel presentation of the two actions (notice that each line begins with the active preterite, each indicating the alternate action of the contestants) Juan Ruiz focuses the reader's attention on the absurdity of the debate; in fact, the dispute of "signs" has degenerated into a brawl. This is brought about by syntactic assistance (good use of short verb-subject) which belongs to the realm of art. The conciseness of the debate's second phase stresses the contrast of the physical actions and thus prepares the ground for the contrast of humorous misinterpretation.

The Archpriest's manner of presenting the subject: I refer to his technical mastery in setting down his theme and intentions in such a way that the reader recognizes both the traditional formula and the deviation from it. This depends on the fact that the Archpriest knows his subject and its implications very well. Because of this knowledge,

he can control or alter elements to create an ironic and humorous effect within a didactic, serious formula. His use of a story to illustrate the problem of misunderstanding (introduction of a problem, a story to illustrate the problem, comments which are meant to relate the story and the problem) follows carefully the pattern of the medieval exemplum; but the changes he introduces (especially the deliberate creation of a vagueness as to the nature of the problem in the way the story is meant to illustrate it, and the establishment of several relations instead of one) create a different tone. We will see in a later chapter how the Archpriest arranges according to scholastic practice although he always manages to introduce a variation which undermines the formula. Indeed, we should no longer ascribe moral solidity to the Archpriest's comments simply because we happen to recognize their traditional counterparts. The fact that the roots of the Archpriest's judgments are ironic and humorous infallibly shows up in the manner of the comments and story, in the Archpriest's management of tone, diction, narrative technique, and syntactical use.

Summary and Conclusions

A textual analysis of the autobiographic form of the Libro de Buen Amor with a careful examination of the manner of the Archpriest in his role as narrator of his love affairs,

and as commentator on their moral significance demonstrates his deliberate ambiguity, his use of irony, and the manner in which the supposed distance between commentator and narrator breaks down. Juan Ruiz knows how to exploit artistically and for amusing purposes the possible contradictions of traditional didactic forms. The comical and amusing effect depends upon a balance between recognition of a formula (allegorical or moral) and Juan Ruiz's surprising shifts within it. While for most critics what matters is the use of the didactic framework, for me that framework is important in that it supplies a mold into which Juan Ruiz pours his comic genius. In fact, not only is Juan Ruiz the supreme exponent of the autobiographic form, but his Libro is unique precisely because it presents the pure form of the didactic "I" in a narrative framework which seemingly realizes to perfection the artistic possibilities of the type; its craftsmanship is so masterful in creating an ironic manner that it defies an out and out didactic interpretation.⁶⁸

⁶⁸Here I may contrast briefly the divergency of critical approach toward the Libro's form. María Rosa Lida: "La esencia de ese yo cómico, es, pues, su ejemplaridad; la personalidad que designa--lo mismo que la de las demás criaturas de Juan Ruiz--no es individual sino colectiva, como lo es, por lo demás, el yo didáctico de los moralistas, que condensa toda la experiencia humana" ("Edición con estudio," p. 18). For me this is only the starting point of my analysis. I am interested in what way Juan Ruiz is different in his use of the yo from the other moralistas. Considering the ambiguities of his moral commentary I suggest that Juan Ruiz deliberately refuses to decide between the possible meanings of his theme and the various directions of his intentions; that he utilizes a story to illustrate his sayings but finally turns the story and the comments on each other for their mutual illumination; that the story-comments relationship

In large measure, the Libro's frame is the ironic counterpart of the didactic frame. Much of what is known about the defining properties of the latter (allegory, gloss, sentence, charity) applies equally to the frame of the Libro. Seemingly, its primary concern is to set forth the circumstances of one individual's love adventures and to create a pattern of exemplification. The emphasis, according to the commentator, is supposedly upon the "other," or universal significance (charity) of the particular situation (worldly love) and the specific individual (a lover Archpriest). The Libro relies upon the exemplarity of stories and a running commentary which pretends to spell out this exemplarity, as do other works of an exegetical nature. Yet we see that the traditional pattern of the allegorical manner is used by Juan Ruiz chiefly as a framework to present a variety of ambiguous intentions and (humorous) stories which are in turn exploited at length for comic entertainment. The principal difference between the didactic use of a persona narrator and Juan Ruiz's use of him is that the Libro presents a divergent view of life and contains a specialized and highly developed ironic technique which is indicative of artistic rather than moral preoccupation.

yields at least four possible movements of thought and all meanings seem important. If we were to render a paraphrase of the section (amusement vs. seriousness, subtlety vs. misunderstanding, etc) we would see that it is the work of a conscious, artistic mind the sum total of which is an artistic tour-de-force; its basic device is to make the reader see one thing in terms of something that, despite appearance, it is not.

CHAPTER THREE

THE COMMENTS ON ART, THEORY AND PRACTICE

Following Don Amor's advice, the Archpriest is ready to resume his narrative. He pauses long enough, however, to remind the reader of his love for composing poetry.

Yo, Johan Ruyz, el sobredicho açipreste de hita,
peroque mi coraçon de trebar non se quita,
(575a,b)

This is a typical comment: the Archpriest never stops referring to himself as a poet. Juan Ruiz's views concerning the artistic quality of his work emphasize an aesthetic interpretation of the Libro. As a commentator, the Archpriest looks in two directions: with regard to content, he is concerned with the meaning of the stories; with regard to form, he is preoccupied with the manner in which they are written. The consequences of his aesthetic views have never, as far as I know, been adequately studied.¹ Yet one wonders at the quantity of Juan Ruiz's artistic

¹Leo Spitzer examines only the comments on "glossing" (1633) and comments on the relationship between "literal words" and "higher" interpretation. Lecoy and María Rosa Lida make only passing references. "Par ailleurs, il a montré qu'il savait tout comme un autre --mieux qu'un autre-- se plier aux règles les plus subtiles de la nouvelle école et justifie ainsi l'affirmation de sa préface, qu'il a composé son livre, entre autre choses, 'a dar algunos leçon . . ." (Félix Lecoy, Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita (Paris, 1938), p. 51). "Fuera de su mérito artístico, la 'muestra de versificar' del Arcipreste tiene un excepcional valor histórico, pues constituye la lírica más antigua que se conozca en lengua castellana" (María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, Libro de Buen Amor, [Selección], Edición con estudio y notas [Buenos Aires, 1941], p. 19). F. Lázaro ("Los amores de Don Melón y Doña Endrina.

commentary. Frequently during an exposition, as an amendment, as a reminder or as an afterthought, he speaks of his role not as a protagonist or moralist but as a craftsman. I plan to compare his statements on the various aspects of his art to the manner in which he practices them. Such a comparison shows Juan Ruiz at work as versifier, composer, humorist, satirist, rhetorician, stylist, and conscientious artist.²

I

The Libro as a Lesson in Versification and Composition

The Archpriest ends his comments in the prose prologue (concerning the "religious" meaning of the love affairs) by discussing the "son feo de las palabras," i.e., the literary

Notas sobre el arte de Juan Ruiz," Arbor, 62 [1951]), in an analysis of Juan Ruiz's art, dismisses any aesthetic value: "Normalmente le guía un interés ejemplar y educativo. Nos lo ha dicho Juan Ruiz, en el prefacio de su obra. Lo estético apenas si será para él algo más que una simple habilidad: versificar" (p. 214).

²It is perhaps unavoidable that to some degree my interpretation of Juan Ruiz's comments on art, as a whole and in context, should often depend on my view of his artistic intentions which I developed in Chapter Two. I shall try, however, to base my interpretation upon evidence derived from an examination of the various ways in which comments on art were used by other medieval writers and the sort of context in which Juan Ruiz or they use them. The inaccessibility of some texts has made the search incomplete, but it may be wide enough to justify my conclusions concerning Juan Ruiz's artistic intentions as revealed in his comments.

texture of his work. He insists that "segund derecho, las palabras sirven a la intençion e non la intençion a las palabras." In a manner typical of medieval writers, he points out that one cannot take the texture (palabras) of the love stories as one pleases but should consider it in the light of the author's intentions. He next introduces a new way of reading the Libro:

E composele otrosi a dar algunos leçion e muestra de metrificar E rimar E de trobar; Ca trobas E notas e rrimas e ditados e versos, que fiz, conplidamente Segund que esta çiencia Requiere.

(p. 7)

Thus the Libro has an extra function: it is a demonstration, a lesson on poetry.

Juan Ruiz looks upon the composition of poetry as a craft which can be learned. Consequently, his treatment of poetry is technical; it is a çiencia, something based on knowledge more than inspiration. The words conplidamente and segund reflect a medieval stylistic formulation which emphasizes reliance on authority rather than individual insight. The comments on artistry in the prose prologue seemingly resemble typical medieval statements which make no distinction between private and public utterance. What is striking, however, is the conjunctive adverb otrosi which introduces the new artistic intention and which parallels the earlier use of enpero. The function of otrosi is connective: to the moral way of reading a love narrative it adds that of

instructing the reader in the proper way of composing verses. Unlike the use of enpero, which, introduces with intentional irony the ambivalent function of the Libro as an illustration of carnal love, otrosi is not used ambiguously. Its function is to add (morality plus art), not to contradict (buen but also loco amor).³ Juan Ruiz is the first Spanish writer to stress on an equal basis with the moral intention, the artistic function and importance of a literary creation as a textbook for artistic composition.

The comments on art in Juan Ruiz's prose prologue reveal, above all, conscious workmanship. By rimar he refers to the correspondence of terminal sounds in his verses.⁴ It resembles the references made to cuaderna via in the Libro de Alixandre, "fablar curso rimado." Both expressions refer to the rhythmic cadence of phrases employed which was a feature of the study of the ars dictaminis.⁵ Such expressions display poetic virtuosity on

³Enpero marries a Biblical citation (intellectum) to the demonstrations of sexual love. The expression "however" is very appropriate in contradicting the morally-oriented opening. The importance of the book's artistic usefulness, however, offers no contradictions whatsoever. The expression "likewise" is thus also appropriate in adding a new level of reading.

⁴See J. Corominas, Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana (Berná, 1954).

⁵For detailed studies of clerical poetry see G. Cirot, "Sur le 'mester de clerecía,'" B. Hisp, XLIV (Jan-March, 1942), 5-16, and Raymond S. Willis, "Mester de Clerecía: A Definition of the Libro de Alexandre," RPh, X (1956-1957), 212-224.

the part of both poets.⁶ By metrificar, Juan Ruiz refers to the arranged and measured rhythm of his verses, i.e., the divisions of syllabic groups. Again it resembles the Libro de Alixandre's allusion to "sílabas contadas." The cuaderna via represents an ordered poetic discipline which stresses uniformity of technical presentation as opposed to the irregularity of form of the jongleurs. Both Juan Ruiz and the author of the Libro de Alixandre are aware of the effective use of a certain rhyme and metrical scheme.⁷ Juan Ruiz goes

⁶There is a tradition which stresses rhyme and syllabication. Lecoy (op. cit., p. 81ff) discusses it in detail.

Or vous commencera l'estoire bien rimée,
Tute faite par metre sanz sillabe fausée,

or

Seignours, oez chancon dont li vers sont bien fait
(from Orson de Beauvais).

In various Spanish works this emphasis became a commonplace: ". . . e demandaron cosas para sacar de aqui lo que quisieron con palabras apuestas e con razones sanas e firmes" Calila y Dimna, Antigua versión castellana (Madrid, 1917), p. 17. Even in works where the interest lies decidedly on the theme, the mention of rhyme has become automatic: Libro de la Miseria de omne, ed., M. Artigas, BEMP, I (1919).

Onde todo omne que quisiere este libro bien pasar
mester es que las palabras sepa bien sylabificar
ca por silaus contadas que es arte de rrimar
e por la quaderna via su curso quier finir. (Str. 4)

Also in the prologue of the editor-commentator of the Libro del Rab Don Santob (ed. by I. González Llubera [Cambridge, 1947]). "Por que escritura rrimada es mejor decorada que non la que va por testo llano" (p. 63). Santob himself wrote a debate in Hebrew (Ma'ase) about the "skillful handling of rhymed prose" (Llubera's introduction p. 2). Chaucer repeats the tradition: "To make bokes, songes, dytees, / In ryme, or elles in cadence, / As thou best canst."

⁷Rhyme had long been a familiar ornament of rhetorical prose and from this it may well have passed into verse. The principles of regular rhythm and of fixed number of syllables were only gradually established. The full perfection of regular rhyme was a slow process. "It is certain that the

further, however, in assuming that his own rhyme and meter are so well executed that they can serve as models to be imitated. The author of Alixandre propagates one pattern of versification as opposed to another genre; Juan Ruiz propagates his personal use of it. He further implies that, in the hands of a master, rhyme and metrical techniques become means of heightening expression.

Levol una mi carta a la missa de prima
troxo me buena rrespuesta de la fermosa Ryma
(1498a,b)

His verses are not only correct (ciencia, conplidamente) but also beautiful and pleasing. Juan Ruiz shows an awareness that artifice can pass over into art and be absorbed by it.

The critics who have studied the Libro's versification believe that Juan Ruiz is accurate in claiming that he rhymes well. He is the best manipulator of the cuaderna via.

composition of rhythmical as well as of quantitative verse was taught in the monastic and cathedral schools in Western Europe" (The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse, ed., F. J. E. Raby [Oxford, 1959], p. xiii). Ernst Curtius ("System of Medieval Styles," European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages [New York, 1953], pp. 388-391) traces the stylistic history of the Latin Middle Ages and its influence on vernacular poetry. "Late antique literary artifice became a technical stimulus and awoke artistic ambition" (p. 389). The possibilities of language were probed to the utmost, and new effects were produced from it, such as rhythm, development of assonance, etc. By the eleventh century there is a tendency to rhyme the lines of a stanza in pairs. This tendency culminates in the Provencal poets who overdo rhyme often at the expense of meaning. "The invention of new metrical schemes from the twelfth century onwards marks the course of the new poetry" (p. 391). The cuaderna via and Juan Ruiz are related to this tradition which emphasizes the technical aspect of poetry.

"El Arcipreste rehúsa torturar el idioma para amoldarlo al rigor de la estrofa extranjera o rellenar la copla con rípios pintorescos, como habían hecho Berceo y Juan Lorenzo el de Astorga; reanudando la tradición del verso popular fluctuante, se vale de la irregularidad nativa para matizar delicadamente las distintas partes de su poema" (María Rosa Lida, "Edición y estudio," p. 21). By irregularity, María Rosa Lida refers to the violation of the seven-line hemistich in the cuaderna vía.⁸ Lecoy traces the violation to the French influence,⁹ while E. A. Llorach believes it is due to the influence of the "irregular" juglaría.¹⁰ Both,

⁸ Juan Ruiz does not refer explicitly to the problem of "silabas contadas," as does the Libro de Alixandre. His lines are not meant to be always regular: "En aucune partie du poème le rythme n'est parfaitement pure. L'auteur mélange constamment les hémistiches de huit et les hémistiches de sept. La proportion de ce mélange est extrêmement variable" (Lecoy, pp. 74-75).

⁹ He shows evidence that the cuaderna vía was borrowed from France (pp. 78-81) and that the Spanish poets had difficulties with the "rythme propre de leur langue" (p. 80) which was based on an irregular meter. Commenting on the poet of Alixandre: "... il se faisait illusion non seulement sur son propre talent--mais aussi sur les possibilités d'adaptation de la forme metrique dont il vantait la valeur" (p. 81). Thus there is a difference in the "poetics" of Alixandre and the Libro. Unlike the poet of Alixandre who insists on "silabas contadas" but who commits frequent irregularities, Juan Ruiz makes no such pretenses and instead partakes in the fluctuation, taking advantage of the variety in seven or eight syllable hemistiches. "... cette variation dans le rythme était consciente, ... Il pouvait en tirer certains effets" (Lecoy, op. cit., p. 75). A similar view is expressed by G. Cirot, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

¹⁰ Following the lead of Menéndez Pidal that Juan Ruiz was a "clérigo ajuglarado," Llorach believes that the irregular tendency of juglaría influenced Juan Ruiz. "Si se

however, insist that the violation is executed with conscious artistic intention and that Juan Ruiz manages with relative perfection the accentual system of his verses which is full of complicated rules.¹¹ What is important here is that careful studies show Juan Ruiz to be a serious student of poetic forms and very proud of his technical mastery of them.¹²

abandonó la cuaderna via no fue por dificultad de aclimatación [as Lecoy claims], sino por motivos artísticos (la pesadez de la estrofa, entre otros)," in his review of Lecoy's book, RFE, 27 (1943), p. 445. Juan Ruiz is the first one to change the cuaderna via effectively.

¹¹There are studies which attempt to show that Juan Ruiz uses consciously the variations of metrical versification. See P. Henríquez Ureña, La versificación irregular (Madrid, 1933), p. 11. (He discusses the problem of free fluctuation between 7-8 syllables in pp. 17, 21.) E. Staaf in Etude sur les Pronoms Abregés en Ancien Espagnol (Upsala-Leipzig, 1906) also claims that the use of octosyllabic lines is not haphazard but is carried through artistically (p. 49). The best study is by H. H. Arnold, "The Octosyllabic 'cuaderna via' of Juan Ruiz," HR, VIII (1940), 125-138. He shows that the shift in meter from seven to eight syllables or the reverse creates changes and anticipations which enliven the action. "The octosyllabic cuaderna via is a stanza of regular composition . . . This stanza is employed by our author abundantly and in lengthy series in one episode. It may begin or end some division of the work and is found in short passages of an illustrative or anecdotal nature" (p. 137). One could add that the diversity of his lyric meters is likewise intentional since Juan Ruiz wishes to give lessons of various rimas.

¹²The effort to establish a workable and uniform practice in the art of Castilian versification is initiated during the fifteenth century by Enrique de Villena and culminates in Juan del Encina, both in his poetry and his precepts on poetry. See Dorothy Clotelle Clarke, "On Juan del Encina's Una arte de poesía castellana," RPh, VI (1952-53), 254-259. The clerecia and above all Juan Ruiz and Pero López de Ayala are part of this tradition which shows a preoccupation with rhyme and meter.

By trobar Juan Ruiz refers both to his ability to compose verses and to his capacity to convert ordinary verses into art. He shows awareness of the diversity of his poetic production by constantly labeling his compositions correctly (caçurras, gozos, plantos, cantigas de serrana, etc), by describing their tone (trova de tristeza, de escarnio, etc), and their function (chançonetas, cantigas de dança, rezos, etc), by mentioning who makes use of them (ciegos, escolares, joglares, etc) and by explaining the appropriate instruments for them ("Para los instrumentos estar byen acordados, / a cantares algunos son mas apropiados" 1515a,b).¹³ Maria Rosa Lida has analyzed his importance in the history of Spanish poetry: ". . . los géneros y formas representados en ella [Castilian lyric] reaparecerán en pleno auge en los cancioneros del siglo siguiente" (Edición con estudio, p. 19). There are many studies which examine the importance of Juan Ruiz's poetical compositions.¹⁴ My interest is to point

¹³Menéndez Pidal (Poesía juglaresca y juglares Madrid, 1924, 2nd edition [1957] retitled Poesía juglaresca y orígenes de las literaturas románicas, pp. 45ff) shows that Juan Ruiz demonstrates an amazing knowledge of existing instruments (fifteen string, nine wind, four percussion) and how each one of them has its specialist juglar. As in his comments on rhyme and meter, Juan Ruiz is correct whenever he relates verse to instrument and musician.

¹⁴For example, see María Rosa Lida, "Notas para la interpretación, influencia, fuentes y texto del Libro de Buen Amor," RFH, II (1940), pp. 105-150; Lecoy, op. cit.; Américo Castro, España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos (Buenos Aires, 1948), retitled La realidad histórica de España (Mexico, 1954); Menéndez Pidal, Poesía juglaresca; and most of the histories of Spanish Literature.

out, through his own comments, how conscious he was of his artistic skill in composing verses. To make sure that the reader views him as a teacher qualified in the subject, he refers to his personal experience: "de los que he provado aqui son Señalados" (1515c). Next he analyzes, qualifies, and evaluates his various compositions, i.e., he uses the word trobar with its connotation of artistic creation.¹⁵

He shows awareness of the qualitative meaning of trobar by telling us why he composes (114c,d), why his poems are gay or sad (1575), how he is inspired (1508), in what way his poems are beautiful (1498a,b) and in what way they are not beautiful or subtle (1507a,b). He points out the difference between form and content when he implies that emotion alone cannot create poetry: "con pesar e tristeza non fue tan sotil fecha" (1507) or "la tristeza me fizo ser rrudo

¹⁵Juan Ruiz is aware of a meaning of trobar which is related to contropare (to speak figuratively or to invent) and which is often used to distinguish between the crude compositions of the juglares and the artistic creations of the troubadours. Menéndez Pidal shows that to be trobador, "ofrecía, además, la ventaja de ser una voz de significación más concreta que la vaga denominación de juglar, pues aludía expresamente al acto de la invención o creación artística, trobar 'hallar'" (Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., pp. 16-17). Leo Spitzer in "Trouver," Romania, LXVI (1941), 1-11, traces the meanings and uses of "trobar" and comes to the same conclusions: ". . . il [trouver] était tout à fait indiqué pour assumer toute la profondeur de sens que le synonyme latin invenire avait acquis par une tradition multiséculaire" (p. 5). He concludes that its origin comes from the semi-Greek τεῖνος and is interrelated in all Romance languages: ". . . dans le fr. trouver 'composer' comme dans esp. trobar, port. trovar un emprunt au prov. trobar" (p. 11).

trobador" (1575b). Menéndez Pidal claims that Juan Ruiz knows that "la emoción que embarga el espíritu no deja este bastande lugar para el arte" (Poesía juglaresca, p. 269). That is, he is aware that a sad content can affect technique.¹⁶ In his use of trobar he offers his personal judgments concerning the artistic worth of his compositions and shows concern for the effect it may have upon the reader.

The comments concerning the versification and composition introduced in the prose prologue are reiterated and expanded throughout the Libro. Thus the poet's intrusions introduce a point of view which clearly establishes the aesthetic dimensions of the narrative. By explicitly stressing the poetic quality of his narrative, by constantly calling attention not only to what is moral but also to what is artful, Juan Ruiz, more than any other Spanish

¹⁶A problem is copla 986:

Desta burla passada ffiz un cantar atal,
non es muncho fermoso creo que nin comunal;
 This is the introduction of the second cantiga de serrana. Since formally this cantiga is perfect (scansion is regular, the refrain is regularly repeated, each strophe has nine lines, each line has eight syllables, the rhyme is llano, etc) and since comunal could refer to the fact that the poem is not "ordinary" in its technical execution, I believe that fermoso refers to the content which deals with a woman attacking a man and to the sexual connotations of "que jugasemos al juego por mal del uno." Another possible explanation is perhaps a half-humorous modesty on Juan Ruiz's part resembling Chaucer's similar expressions.

medieval writer, creates an aesthetic distance¹⁷ by consciously distinguishing between the moral value of love affairs and their literary quality. He infuses the Libro with an aesthetic energy by keeping the reader continually in motion between the irony of the commentator and the artistry of the poet. From the early exposition, Juan Ruiz stages himself as a literary critic, as one who gives himself the role of aesthetic self-evaluator, the role of an author who tells the reader explicitly and clearly, unlike the ironic manner with which he defends the Libro's meaning and intention, that he not only composes verses correctly but that he is a first rate poet and a good teacher.

There existed a long tradition of autocommentary where the poets mentioned their own writing process and warned the reader of their own idiosyncracies.¹⁸ In Spain this tradition is represented both in poetry and prose. Berceo, for example, refers to the language of his poetry as one that

¹⁷The term is borrowed from M. Bloomfield's analysis of the various roles of narrator, "Distance and Predestination in Troilus and Criseyde," PMLA (March, 1957), 14-26.

¹⁸See L. Jenaro MacLennan, "Autocomentario en Dante y comentarismo latino," Vox Romanica (Jan-June, 1960), 982ff. He shows that, removed from any artistic pretensions, the autocommentaries are to be considered as proof of a certain medieval pedantry or custom. Thus Juan Ruiz's artistic autocommentary is part of a long established tradition but stresses his artistic pretensions. See also A. Schiaffini, Traduzione e poesia nella prosa d'arte italiana dalla latinità medievale a G. Boccaccio (Rome, 1943), p. 98ff.

everyone can understand. He is part of a tradition which stresses understanding ("que pueda saber toda la gent"). Juan Ruiz, on the other hand, is never concerned with the problem of cognitive knowledge but with that of pleasant and artistic craft in the making of a work. Other members of mester de clerecía lay more claim than Berceo to the technical aspect of what the Libro de Apolonio calls nueva maestría. The Libro de Alixandre further relates this new mastery of verse to the scholar's calling: "The text, as distinct from the matter, was executed in accordance with the most learned canons of poetic and rhetoric, and not just in correct meter."¹⁹ The poet attempts to manipulate his language with ingenuity of pattern and idea. The repetition of mester reveals an obligation upon the poet to make himself master of his science and to distinguish himself from juglaría. In the autocommentary, the poet of Alixandre attempts to subordinate mundane knowledge to a higher ethical and religious truth.²⁰ This is never the case with Juan Ruiz. His comments on art refer to art alone,

¹⁹Raymond S. Willis, op. cit., p. 224.

²⁰For example, Alexander's death is the consequence of his failure to see that there is a "superior wisdom transcending earthly knowledge" (Willis, op. cit., p. 221). The comments on art do not refer to art alone but are part of clerical morals and instruction.

never to morals. He is the first of the clerecia writers to give an artistic dimension to his work.

We can see the uniqueness of Juan Ruiz better if we compare his comments on art with those of Don Juan Manuel who also shows unusual concern for the texture of his works. Juan Manuel emphasizes clarity and purity of words, conciseness of style, and brevity of expression. Unlike Juan Ruiz, for whom subtlety enriches expression, Juan Manuel tries to avoid subtlety. He praises Alfonso X, for example, because "non quiso poner palabras nin Razones muy sotiles."²¹ While

²¹Crónica abreviada, ed., R. Grismer (Minneapolis, 1958), p. 38. Juan Manuel, like Alfonso X, wishes to facilitate reading. "Et porque sea mas ligero de entender e estudiar es fecho a capitulos" (Libro Infinito, ed., J. Blecuá [Madrid, 1952], p. 9). Menéndez Pidal spells out Juan Manuel's literary preoccupation. Alfonso was preoccupied mainly with two qualities, "la concisión y el purismo; sobre todo la concisión, es lo que don Juan Manuel más estimaba" in Menéndez Pidal's introduction of his edition of Primera crónica general de España, ed., Gredos (Madrid, 1955). It is interesting to note that when Alfonso seems to deviate from Juan Manuel's praise that he wrote his history "en las menos palabras que se podía poner," Juan Manuel himself remains brief. Such is the case with the lament of Spain where Alfonso indulges in a remarkable adjectival vocabulary in praising Spain: ". . . rica de metales, de plomo, de estaño, de argent vivo, de fierro de arambre, de piedras preciosas," etc, or "miesses, deleytosa de fructas, sabrosa de leche," etc (Pra cronica general de España, ed., Menendez Pidal [Madrid, 1906], part 558, p. 311). Juan Manuel, who gives a good resume of each chapter to Alfonso's Crónica, is unusually brief: "En el cv capitulo dize que los godos conquerieron muchas tierras e muchos Reynos mas nunca fallaron tierra tan viçiosa nin tan abondada como espana" (Crónica abreviada, op. cit., p. 110). Brevity was, of course, a common property of medieval style and was part of the ars dictaminis (see Curtius, op. cit., p. 353, note 17). Dante refers constantly to the stylistic ideal of brevity. This sylistic preoccupation in Spain culminates in Gracian's Agudeza y arte de ingenio.

Juan Ruiz stresses the beauty of words and their capacity to please, Juan Manuel emphasizes their Castilian purity, their prudent use and the ease with which they are understood. For Juan Manuel, pleasantness of expression is related to content and meaning: ". . . que leyendo el libro, por las palabras halagadoras y pullidas que en el hallaran, no podran menos de leer las cosas provechosas que van mezcladas alli"²² Juan Ruiz flatly states that something is well written: "E porque mejor de todos escuchade" (5a), "rrazon mas plazentera, ffablar mas apostado (15c). Juan Manuel's pride in his craft is crystallized in his comments in the Libro de los Estados: ". . . todas las razones que en el se contienen son dichas por muy buenas palabras e por los mas fermosos latines que yo nunca oy dezir en libro que fuese fecho en romance e complida la razon que quiere dezir ponerlo en las menos palabras que puede seer" (Chap. XO). Thus stylistically preoccupied with brevity and clarity, like Alfonso X, Juan Manuel is somewhat concerned with the beauty of words, but principally with the linguistic development of the vernacular. His preoccupation is never the concentrated aesthetic effort of Juan Ruiz.

The artistic tradition of Spain before and during Juan Ruiz's time can be summarized as follows: (1) vernacular, clarity, brevity, and external form seen in the prose of

²²Prologue of El Conde Lucanor.

Alfonso and don Juan Manuel; 2) attempt to reach all people through attractive verses in Berceo; 3) the attempt to be learned, serious, and technically correct, rather than popular and entertaining in clerecía; 4) well-rhymed verses in clerecía, and the courtly Razon feita d'amor. Juan Ruiz is not primarily interested in any of the four. Even his efforts for pure technique (rrimar, metrificar) are only one part of his constant aesthetic activity in composing beautiful and subtle poetry (trobar). Unlike anyone else before him, he consciously maintains a distance between his art and didactic intent. He makes sure to tell the reader that as a poet he knows what, why and how he is composing. His artistically oriented commentary transcends traditional commentary. It shows a remarkable concern with the mechanics of presentation (i.e., with the devices and methods whereby he provides an artistic texture for his story), and a preoccupation with the mechanics of appeal (i.e., with the devices and methods whereby he engages the interest of the reader and prompts an aesthetic response to his craft).

II

The Libro as a source of entertainment

After the prose prologue, the author asks God for inspiration in composing his Libro:

El que fizo el cielo la tierra E la mar
el me done su gracia e me quiera alunbrar

que pueda de cantares un librete rimar
que los que lo oyeren puedan solaz tomar.

Tu, señor, dios mio, quel ome crieste,
enforma e ayuda a mi, tu acipreste,
que pueda fazer libro de buen amor aqueste,
que los cuerpos alegre e a las almas preste.
(12-13)

To the moral and artistic intentions proclaimed earlier, Juan Ruiz adds another: to entertain. The Archpriest clearly is concerned that his account of love affairs should be a source of delight to readers. That is, God should inspire (alumbrar) and help his Archpriest to compose a book of poetry whose subject is good love but which will amuse the hearers and cause their time to pass pleasantly (puedan solaz tomar).²³ After singing the praises of the Virgin Mary, the Archpriest spells out further his intentions to give solaz to the reader:

- a) Palabras son de sabio e dixo caton,
- b) que ome a sus coydados que tienen en coraçon
- c) entre ponga plazeres e alegre la rrazon,
- d) que la mucha tristeza mucho coydado pon.

- a) E porque de buen seso non puede ome Reyr,
- b) abre algunas bulrras aqui a enxerir:
- c) cada que las oyerdes non querades comedir,
- d) salvo en la manera del trobar E dezir.
(44-45)

In the first stanza, the Archpriest deals with the problem of entertainment from the general, philosophical point of

²³According to María Rosa Lida to buoy the body and benefit the soul (13d) is typical of the aims of all didactic literature, "prodesse et delectare" ("Nuevas notas," p. 47). The relation between rhyme and gaiety is expressed also in the Roman de la Rose, ed. E. Langlois (Paris, 1914-24): "Usel cel songe rimeier, / Por voz cuers plus fair e esgaier (132-3133).

view. Relying on the "authority" of Cato,²⁴ he suggests that inasmuch as sadness makes one wretched, man should engage in delightful pleasures whenever he has cares and anxieties. His views parallel the medieval tendency to mingle jest and earnest. In stanza 45, the Archpriest relates this general problem of cares and enjoyment to literature and, specifically, to the function of his Libro. He demonstrates a strong awareness of the problems involved by shifting from the general to the specific and by utilizing an "authoritative" view to reinforce his own plans. The reasoning line by line is as follows: (a) A man loses his sense of merriment if dominated by good sense. Buen seso is, of course, virtually a synonym for buen entendimiento and, by implication, stands for the wisdom which leads man to buen amor. (For example, the third woman who rejects the Archpriest outright on religious grounds, "non perdere yo a dios," is described as "cuerda E de buen seso" [168c] and justifies her action by "non soy yo tan sayn sesso" [173c].) Thus the specific topic of the love of God becomes in Juan Ruiz's insinuations a part of Cato's coyadado and tristeza, i.e., Juan Ruiz is hinting here that the love of God is a serious preoccupation which limits man's capacity for enjoyment. b) The meaning of the second line depends on

²⁴Cato, also cited in the prologue, was often cited in the Middle Ages and his maxims on sadness and pleasure were very popular. See Cejador y Frauca, note 44. The "Disticha Catonis": "Interpone tuis interdum gaudia curis / Ut possis animo quemvis sufferre laborem."

the stylistic structure of the first. The key word there is porque: "Since one cannot laugh if serious," clearly implies that one should not be serious but instead should be able to laugh. Consequently, the Archpriest opens his narrative of good love with burlas.²⁵ He writes burlas with an eye for the potential fun in a situation; his jests deal with ludicrous incidents or circumstances and are intended to provoke laughter. Their manner, as opposed to that of buen seso, is frivolous and gay. The jests of his literary work correspond to the plazeres of Cato's philosophical comments. c) The Archpriest next addresses his hearer directly and suggests in what way he should react to the inserted humorous stories. Whenever one hears them he should not meditate upon them, i.e., he should not take them very seriously. The humorous stories are not to provide food for moral thought. The jokes are to divert the reader

²⁵ Shifting and loose as the value of the term burla has become, it was more precise in the Middle Ages, and here, of course, it is restricted by its context. It is almost impossible to define humor broadly enough to cover all periods and all categories. Louis Cazamian, in his extensive and ambitious study, The Development of English Humor, Duke University Press (North Carolina, 1952), attempts to define humor and its attributes both literally and psychologically. "Let us then say simply that we make a thing humorous by expressing it with a certain twist, a queer reserve, an inappropriateness, and as it were an unconsciousness of what we all the time feel it to be. . . . The method is most natural, and works best, when applied to themes which in themselves possess more or less of the value called 'comic,' that raises laughter" (p. 5). My consideration of humor will be technical more than philosophical or psychological.

from serious preoccupations and their function corresponds to Cato's "alegre la rrazon."²⁶ d) The Archpriest introduces next something new and surprising. The key word here is salvo. There is one sense in which his entertaining jokes are to be considered seriously: the manner in which they are composed (trobar) and expressed (dezir). Since Juan Ruiz defines and explains these terms, their meaning and importance are unmistakable. He might deviate from his serious topic as developed in the prose prologue but not from his art. The craft of writing poetry is related directly to entertainment. What is striking is that Juan Ruiz specifically relates the effect of humor to his technical accomplishment, an accomplishment about which he boasts throughout the Libro.

These comments relate Juan Ruiz to the medieval tradition of the buoyant and the serious in literature. "The mixture of jest and earnest was among the stylistic norms which were

²⁶That certain literary subjects should not be taken in earnest belongs to a well-established tradition. Chaucer suggests that one should not always "maken ernest of game" (Geoffrey Chaucer, Complete Works, ed. F. N. Robinson, I [Boston, 1933], 3186); Jean de Meun stresses the poet's amusement: "Je n'ifaz riens fors reciter, / Se, par mon jeu, qui po vous couste, / Quelque parole n'i ajouste, / Si con font entr'ans li poete" (15234-238); an Arab poet stresses the poet's entertaining function: "It was said by a man of acute mind that gay poetry raises a laugh, while grave poetry is fiction: therefore the poet has no choice but to tell lies or to make people laugh" (Comment of R. A. Nicholson, Studies in Islamic Poetry, [Cambridge, 1921]; reproduced by Castro, La realidad, op. cit., p. 408).

known and practiced by the medieval poet, even if he perhaps nowhere found them expressly formulated" (Curtius, op. cit., p. 424).²⁷ Juan Ruiz is not merely part of the medieval phenomenon that loved hybrids and mixtures of jest and earnest,²⁸ for a summary of his views shows him also to be a formulator, one who does not simply repeat a commonplace.

²⁷ Humor, for example, is a part of the style of the serious vita sancti but was never justified in theory. There are also comic interpolations in epic material. "Humor in the chansons de geste is not a corruption and not an after-thought, but an integral element, subordinated of course to the predominantly tragic mood, but often inextricably involved with it" Norman Suskind, "Humor in the Chansons de Geste," Symposium, XV, No. 3 (Fall, 1961), p. 196. There is no specific theory to justify such interpolations; they are part of a general view of life: "The sacred and the profane--that is the fundamental division in the medieval intellectual world. Within the realm of the profane the ludicra have their place" (Curtius, op. cit., p. 430). That is, the ideas concerning the sacred and the profane were not a strictly literary formulation.

²⁸ See Ernst Curtius, op. cit. chapter on "Jest and Earnest in Medieval Literature" (pp. 417-423) for a discussion of the background of the problem. John Chrysostom taught that Christ had never laughed. The antique idea of dignity was taken over by early Christian monasticism. We see in Latin medieval literature constant reminders that the content is not light or jestful. "In the twelfth century, however, there is a cautious acceptance of laughter. John of Salisbury permits a 'modesta hilaritas' now and then; so long as everything is done decently, the man of wisdom too may attend entertaining performances" (p. 421). Afterwards, the problem was debated but was never formulated clearly. The strongest statements in favor of laughter are attributed to Felippo Neri whose maxim was, "Lo spirito allegro acquista piu facilmente la perfezione cristiana che non lo spirito malinconico" (Curtius, p. 422).

He clearly implies that laughter and entertainment represent as forceful and as vital a need as the serious discussion of buen amor. Accordingly, he employs comic writing for its usefulness in relaxing and amusing the reader. He does not attribute any moral utility (such as preaching) to laughter. In this he differs from most other medieval writers, for he does not claim that the pleasurable makes the useful more viable. He claims for entertaining writing the necessity for artistic composition, a reiteration of the quality which he earlier offered as a demonstration to composing poetry.

In the medieval Christianization of the philosophy of art, the antique conception of the useful and the agreeable was retained. The veritable content makes the work of art useful while its harmonious form makes it pleasing. Evidently, the reader is to prefer the truth of the content (which is spiritual) to the charm of the form (which is superficial). More and more beauty was related to the inner truth: "les joies qui découlent de l'assimilation d'un beau contenu sont supérieures aux délectations plus vaines de la belle expression."²⁹ At least this was the view held on the theoretical level. Juan Ruiz deviates from this position on two counts. First, he justifies the use of humor at the

²⁹Edgar de Bruyne, L'Esthétique de Moyen Age (Louvain, 1947), p. 189.

expense of serious content, since the latter "much coydado pon" and creates boredom or sadness. Second, he does not subordinate form to content but instead clearly states that poetic composition should be considered paramount in the delivery of entertaining stories. He is the first medieval writer, as far as I know, to insist on an inextricable connection between amusement and art.

One must see to what extent does Juan Ruiz put his theory into practice, i.e., how careful he is in the artistic composition and expression of his burlas. His amusing stories necessarily spring from his own temperament as well as from the medieval tradition within which he works. The whole literature of amusement, flowing in direct and indirect written and oral streams throughout the Latin and vernacular Middle Ages, is responsible for the particular type Juan Ruiz chooses. Therefore, to understand the stylistic claims of his humorous stories better, we must lay bare, at least generally and briefly, the kind of threads out of which his humorous tissue is woven. The difficulty of this task derives from the fact that medieval humor is still a debatable problem. Most modern scholars, for example, take issue with Cazamian's view that modern humor hardly came into its own until the Renaissance and that the mental complexity which humor requires was not very widely diffused

during the Middle Ages.³⁰ There was certainly much conscious and sophisticated amusement during the Middle Ages. "Even in Middle English before Chaucer there is plenty of developed sense of the absurd, meant to provoke a flitting smile or short laugh in a discriminating person."³¹ Cazamian himself seems to reverse his stand somewhat and states that "there runs thus a broad vein of gaiety, mischievousness, and fun, of a free, popular, rather coarse type; not hidden and repressed, but displayed. . . . The mirth of the crowd is pretty much the same everywhere; one tenor of spontaneous merry-making, at all events, seems to have prevailed over Western Europe, in the cosmopolitan culture of the Middle Ages" (op. cit., p. 23). If we now recall many of the striking cases of humor in the Libro we observe that some occur in

³⁰Louis Cazamian's important study on medieval humor (op. cit.) is not limited to English works but attempts to give a broad picture of Western Europe.

³¹J. S. P. Tatlock, "Mediaeval Laughter," Speculum, XXI (1946), 290. Studies on medieval humor are rare and usually inadequate. I know of no important study concerning the humorous aspect and the comic devices of the Libro or of any Spanish medieval work. Critical comments are reduced to simply pointing out that here and there Juan Ruiz is funny. The subject is not easy since it is difficult to determine always what was considered amusing and what not. The problem of humor and scholarship is crystallized in the comment of Cazamian, (op. cit., p. 3): "Shall then that single matter be excepted from the universal curiosity and hunger of scholarship, because to treat of it seriously is the unpardonable sin against artistic fitness, and to treat of it in a manner that suits the argument is to baffle the aim of serious inquiry?"

passages or stories taken from well-known sources, while others are original. Thus by examining the amusing stories of Juan Ruiz in relation to their sources,³² we may establish the influences underlying his use of comic devices and determine the validity of his claims concerning the relationship of art and entertainment. From Juan Ruiz's vast heritage³³ of literature of entertainment, I shall consider the jongleurs and their scurrilous songs; the fabliaux, those short amusing tales, often bawdy, obscene and simultaneously satirical against women, clergy and marriage; the goliards, those truant clerics who cheered convents with their Latin rhymes while giving vent to a startling display of irreverence

³²I will necessarily give some space not only to comparisons with originals but also to discussion of hypothetical sources, thus venturing at times into dangerous fields. No attempt will be made to note all the cases of comic devices in Juan Ruiz's humorous tales; rather, I will concentrate on those elements which clearly throw light on the nature and extent of his artistry within inherited comical traditions.

³³The few works on "poetics" which we have tell us nothing of the medieval humorous genres. Medieval literature shows some awareness, though vague, of separation between genres or forms ("non es de juglaria"). The comic or the burlesque was one such genre. The medieval "poetics" establish three stylistic levels gravis stylus, mediocris stylus, humilis stylus (Edmund Faral, Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècles [Paris, 1924], p. 87). Some of the writers even warn of the errors of transplanting styles. The contes-a-rire are part of the humilis stylus. "Le style bas est l'essence de tout ce qui était considéré comme étranger à la noblesse et propre aux roturiers: vulgarité, paillardise, lourdeur, bêtise, bas instincts, laideur et saleté" Per Nykrog, Les Fabliaux (Copenhagen, 1957), p. 235.

and profanity; finally, invective literature whose criticism contains much laughable ridicule.

1. Juan Ruiz and the jongleurs: The term "jongleur" has a broad meaning: it refers to all professional wandering entertainers who sang, played instruments and performed juggling acts. Their literary production is cheerful and gregarious; it depicts life from its seamier side. The jongleurs devised all sorts of entertainment in order to delight the spectators. "Los juglares tienen por oficio alegrar a la gente."³⁴ Juan Ruiz often assumes the role of jongleur especially in his claims of giving solaz, a central expression in the relation of jongleurs to the audience.

Señores, hevos servido con poca sabidoria,
por vos dar solaz a todos, fablevos en jugleria.
(1633a,b)

He proceeds to use most of their formulas related to amusement: "de la que te non pagares, veyla e Rye e calla" (1021d); "el oydor cortes tenga presto El perdon" (949d); "Sy queredes, senores, oyr un buen solaz / escuchad el rromanze, sosegadvos en paz" (14a,b). As Menéndez Pidal points out: "El Arcipreste de Hita, que 'sabía los instrumentos e todas juglerías,' no es propiamente un

³⁴Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Poesía juglaresca y juglares, Coleccion Austral (Buenos Aires, 1942), p. 12. This book is, of course, the major study on jongleurs tracing their history, discussing all their forms of poetry and analyzing their importance in Spanish literature.

clérigo juglar ni un clérigo vagabundo, pues su arciprestazgo se opone a que lo consideremos como tal; pero es por su espíritu uno de esos" (Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., p. 32).

One of the basic similarities between Juan Ruiz and the jongleurs is telling jokes for no other reason than to entertain: ". . . el antiguo nombre 'juglar' quedó como sinónimo de 'chocarrero que trata y habla siempre de burlas'" (Poesía juglaresca, p. 23). In contrast to Juan Ruiz, however, who claims to be a composer with style and order, the jongleur seems rarely to have composed; chiefly he reworks songs, lyrics, ballads, and humorous stories into popular forms and disseminates these literary materials by his performances. Since the jongleur makes no pretenses to artistic skill, it is important to observe how Juan Ruiz puts into practice his claims of "trobar e dezir" within a medium which makes no claims of formal composition.

Juan Ruiz's troba caçurra: The caçurros were considered to be the lowest class of jongleurs. Juan Ruiz refers often to their mocking and burlesque compositions. For example, "conssentyd entre los ssesos una tal bavoquia" (948d). Juan Ruiz repeats the earlier idea of offering something foolish to counteract seriousness. This bavoquia is related to "versos caçurros," a coarse type of narrative poem used to amuse. According to Menéndez Pidal, caçurros were

"aquellos hombres faltos de buen porte, que dicen versos sin argumento, que por calles y plazas ejercitan vilmente su vil repertorio, sin regla ninguna" (op. cit., p. 179). That is, Juan Ruiz borrows his humorous form and tale from a tradition whose purpose is to amuse but which has a reputation for bad taste and, above all, crude art. This is how the caçurros are described in Las Siete Partidas: ". . . palabras que se dicen sobre razones feas et sin pro, que non son fermosas nin apuestas al que las fabla . . ." (In Poesía Juglaresca, p. 179). The Archpriest decides upon a punning troba caçurra to describe the failure of his second love affair. He had chosen a woman of lower caliber, but his messenger, who was more prompt, deceived him and won her for himself. He decides at least to entertain his audience by composing a joke to describe his failure:

ca devrien me dezir neçio e mas que bestia burra,
sy de tan grand escarnio yo non trobase burla.
(114c,d)

Juan Ruiz is aware of the tradition he is imitating.

". . . El Arcipreste no pide excusa a las dueñas por motivo de honestidad, sino por presentarles una trova no cortesana, versificada en vulgar estribote" (Poesía juglaresca, p. 180).³⁵

³⁵Menéndez Pidal has offered evidence of the differences between the jongleresque poetry and Juan Ruiz. ". . . pues los juglares habían venido a dar a los versos un ritmo muchísimo más irregular que en el original del Arcipreste, habían mezclado sin tino consonantes y asonantes y habían entreverado a los de Buen Amor otros versos que nunca el Arcipreste pensó en escribir semejantes" (p. 184). Technically, Juan Ruiz's lyric form (estribote) is flawless: octosyllable, estribillo, three-line strophes with

To this tradition he brings a rhetorical ornamentation and greater complexity in metrics and stylistics.

Juan Ruiz tightens the structure of the burla by carefully organizing the movement of its language toward a definite end. The Archpriest's point is simple: some one else got the woman he was helping the Archpriest to seduce. This causes him much suffering which he compares to a crucifixion. The tale is told on two levels: First, there is an introduction in cuaderna via which explains the situation of attempt and failure. The estribote itself, i.e., the lyric form, is a gloss of the situation; it is similar to the technique (probably jongleresque) of the serranillas. Second, within the estribote, the refrain (estribillo) crystalizes the play on words while the remainder is a gloss of the pun. Thus we have a gloss of the action but also a "verbal" gloss of the image cruz. Juan Ruiz reinforces the narrative with imagery. He exploits to the fullest the possibilities offered by this form. He keeps the narrative structure simple ("I sent a messenger; he kept her; I was ridiculed"), but he molds the verbal structure intricately by a complex interweaving of word play and parody. Taken together, the images of crucifixion form one vivid composite image of suffering in a burlesque key. The

mono-rhyme followed by a vuelta (fourth line in strophe) which takes up the rhyme of the estribillo. See Lecoy, op. cit., pp. 84-86. Juan Ruiz leaves no question concerning the technical aspect of his caçurra.

following analysis reveals that Juan Ruiz skillfully introduces, shapes, and develops an organic image within a genre known for its inorganic and careless structure.

(1) The Archpriest, not discouraged by his first failure, has his eye on a new prospect:

puse el ojo en otra non santa, mas sentia,
(112c)

He effectively introduces the religious setting by the word santa which sets a dichotomy between the spiritual and the secular.³⁶

(2) Yo cruyziava por ella, otro la avie val dia (112d). He next suggests his suffering is a crucifixion. He establishes specifically the choice of religious imagery and prepares the stage for the lady's name, "Cruz." The ironic play becomes clearer: she should have been an easy conquest, being non santa, but turns out to be his "cross," and the affair becomes his "crucifixion." His messenger had her cheaply (de valdie). In just two lines, Juan Ruiz introduces

³⁶The verb sentia here means to regret. Juan Ruiz employs sentir elsewhere meaning "to regret."

Vino luego un frayle para lo convertyr,
comengole a pedricar, en dios a partyr,
ovose don carnal luego mucho a sentyr,
demando penitencia con grand arrepentyr. (1128)
It is used ironically: the non-saintly one made him regret, and by implication suffer even more than he did earlier in a situation which will be compared to religious suffering. The ms. does not indicate whether mas is accented or not. If it means "but" the general effect will not be lost. She was not saintly but he "felt" it.

the pattern of his stylistic device.³⁷ Now he will concentrate on the artistic development of the situation of suffering-crucifixion.

(3) He next introduces his messenger: "a un mi companero: sopome el clavo echar" (113c). "Echar el clavo" means to play a trick or to get the better of someone. The word clavo also refers to the idea of crucifixion. The trick his friend plays, by implication, helps "nail" him to the cross (clavo is stylistically related to cruziava); or, the means he uses to get the better of the Archpriest is the "nail."

(4) He decides to compose an amusing story based on his loss and suffering which he calls "tan grand escarnio" (114d). Escarnio is a joke or a trick; it is also the

³⁷ Juan Ruiz's technique within this jongleresque genre is somewhat related to the Goliardic play upon words based on hymnology. The goliards, whom the Archpriest knew well, constantly interchanged religious and profane names. For example:

Flos florum

Take thou this rose, O Rose! the lover
in the rose reposes
I with love of the rose am caught
at the winter's close:

Take thou this flower, my flower . . .

From Wine, Women, and Song: Medieval Latin Students' Songs, trans. by John A. Symonds (London, 1884), No. 30. Such plays on words come from ecclesiastic hymns.

In retelling the story, he carries the pun of crucifixion further. He adds cruzada, "por el sonsonete de Cruz y por lo que a el le crució, esto es, Cruz, por quien el crució, por consiguiente, cruzada para él" (Oejador y Frauca, note 116). He also introduces a new image, panadera, which is the lady's profession and which he will unfold later. Finally, he chooses Garcia to present his suit, i.e., he will be his guide (duz) to the path which leads to the crucifixion.³⁸

- (c) Fizo se de la Cruz privado:
a mi dio rrumiar salvado
el comio el pan mas duz,
(118b,c,d)

Here we see Juan Ruiz's stylistic subtlety transcend an otherwise crude form. He intertwines the image of Cruz and pan. The messenger ate the woman's bread, she being a baker. There is perhaps a sacrilegious use of the term pan since it refers to Christ's body and since the messenger becomes the favorite of Cruz.

- (d) Prometiol por mi conssejo
trigo que tenia Añejo,
E presentol un conejo,
el traydor falso marfuz.
(119)

³⁸The comic implications of the religious image are probably extended, perhaps, by a contrast between the word senda (which often refers to a religious path) and the term carrera (which refers to a secular one). The distinction between senda and carrera is evident if we consider that carrera is explicitly related to loco amor in the Libro. The Archpriest asks Venus "qual carrera tomare que me non vaya matar?" (590a). Venus tells him that in order to succeed he must get a messenger "que sepa sabiamente andar esta carrera" (645b).

The wheat promised is necessary in the production of bread, but it is stale wheat (anejo = year old), and reflects the bad guidance of the messenger which brings about crucifixion. Such a man is clearly a traydor, i.e., Judas the former friend who betrays Christ and perpetrates his crucifixion.

(e) The Archpriest ends the lyric version in a jongleresque manner by cursing his messenger and calling him conejero, i.e., a dog who does not bring the game to the master. According to Spitzer, Juan Ruiz is again using a pun: ". . . juego de palabras con presentó un conejo que sin duda hay que entender en sentido erótico. . . . cf. francés medieval connim, conil con la misma significación" ("En torno," op. cit., note 27, p. 141).

(6) The Archpriest returns to the cuaderna via for a summary of the situation

quando la cruz veyá, yo sienpre me omillava,
santiguava me a ella do quier que la fallava;
 el compañ de cerca en la cruz adorava
 del mal de la cruzada yo non me rreguardava.
 (121)

Most of the images are crystalized and reviewed; "to humble" and "to cross" oneself have sacrilegious connotations similar to goliardic use of liturgical terms to refer to worldly love. There is a difference between the distance implied by omillava and the proximity of adorava, the word adorar having sensual and sexual connotations. "Ad-orar se dijo de llevar al os boca, del besar" (Cejador y Frauca,

note 121). In the last line, Juan Ruiz intentionally makes the word cruzada lose much of its religious connotation: it now suggests not suffering but an unfortunate affair which no longer tortures or worries the Archpriest inasmuch as he is getting ready to make his third attempt (123ff).

The central image is "Cruz." Having found one word which represents a group of other associations to his satisfaction, Juan Ruiz embroiders this word with all kinds of attributes and implications: cruz, cruyziar, cruzada, santa, clavo, escarnio, luz, senda, pan, traydor, omillar, santiguar, adorar. Together the terms are used to depict a state of passionate suffering and to discharge a feeling of exasperation. "Cross" and its attributes describe a lover's pains in terms of the suffering of Christ. The common quality that links the lover and Christ is passion (in the sense of suffering); what links the lady and the cross is martyrdom. Thus, one extended, vivid image compresses effectively two worlds of experience: the worlds of physical and spiritual love, or, the ridiculous and the sublime. The humorous experience of the caçurra is consequently enriched and intensified by metaphorical extension and adds to its aesthetic horizon. Its incongruously trivial language gains precision and direction. Upon a low base of comical and amusing crudities, Juan Ruiz piles his capacity to pun and organize, thus encircling the coarse form of the

caçurra with his "manera del trobar," i.e., good form. He writes it so that the image carries the action.

Juan Ruiz so controls and disciplines his sense of comic absurdity (inherent in a caçurra) that he elevates a common joke to the level of carefully composed art. What should be a situation of absurd suffering is pictured, through a recognition of the subtle use of puns, as a sophisticated view of martyrdom. Juan Ruiz develops a delightful contrast between the displayed emotion of a love failure and the portrayal of it as a crucifixion. If a misfortune elicits compassion, he does not convey the appropriate response to the situation it presents; he purposely exaggerates the effect of the misfortune on the lover. He describes the misfortune by comparing the lover's suffering to a crucifixion and his failure to Christ's mockery. This comparison is, of course, a parody of the exaggerated complaints at a loss of love typical of troubador poetry. The Archpriest responds to the loss, or rather fails really to respond to it, by converting the whole situation into a joke as he readily admits (122). He duplicates the mannerisms and attitudes of a forlorn lover but exaggerates the feelings which result from the failure and reduces them to absurdity. In a situation in which are exhibited intense feelings comparable only to the highest martyrdom (crucifixion) but without any grounds to support them, what stands out is the humorous and aesthetic

experience. His parody is funny because he plasters the terms of the passion of Christ which is tragic in another context on a common love failure. The situation gains aesthetic dimension by a careful organization of the language to create verbal action.

Summation: The humorous poetry of the jongleurs tends to raise a laugh and amuse the hearer by free, coarse statements. Its aim is to satisfy only a popular audience and it appeals to elemental emotions. Menendez Pidal offers some examples of their art:

Desque pesa mas el vino que el seso dos o tres meajas
por eso se contienen coitas e males e dolores e barajas;
departian los onbres como picaças e grajas,
el mucho vino es bueno en cubas e tinajas,
mas non aca en las cabeças.

(In Poesía juglaresca, p. 183)³⁹

The line added, "mas non aca en las cabeças," betrays a tendency to explain a joke and to render the moral obvious. Stylistic subtlety is lacking. Juan Ruiz is interested in this broad current of fun of the caçurros, and borrows what

³⁹ Compare with stanza 547 of the Libro:

Ado mas puja el vyno quel seso dos meajas,
fazen rroydo los beodos como puercos e grajas;
por ende vyenen muertes, contyendas e barajas:
el mucho vyno es bueno en cubas e en tinajas.

The anonymous jongleur has transposed the lines and deemphasized Juan Ruiz's formal texture. As Menéndez Pidal comments, "... el cazurro no muestra el menor cuidado de exactitud" (Poesía juglaresca, p. 183).

is obscene, gross, and absurd from them. He invests this grossness and absurdity, however, with his own art and refinement, especially a subtle use of figurative language. He tells an otherwise gross situation of love more concisely, more rhythmically, and even more humorously than do the jongleurs. He thus gives literary importance to the crude genre of the cacurra by adapting it both to his own condition (love-failure) and to his specific poetic aim.

2. Juan Ruiz and the Fabliaux: The fabliaux are versified, short, amusing tales, often satirical and usually directed against women, clergy, and marriage. They deal with bourgeois or lower-class personages who are often entangled in comic, obscene, and far-fetched situations. The characters are usually stock, i.e., the unfaithful wife, the clever rogue, the foolish husband, the lecherous monk, the braggart. The humor of the fabliaux arises from an intrigue, a practical joke, or a situation of "poetic justice" where the hypocrite is exposed, the trickster is tricked, and the braggart has his bluff called. In short, the world of the fabliaux is realistic in detail, moral in intent, and humorous in execution.⁴⁰ They belong to what Bedier calls

⁴⁰The fabliaux flourished mainly in France. There are some examples in England and Spain but they hardly occur outside Chaucer and Juan Ruiz. Chaucer has best elaborated their literary form especially in the famous Miller's and the Reeve's Tales.

the group of contes plaisants or contes-à-rire.⁴¹ Their authors, clerics or jongleurs and often referred to as *trouveres*, have no "prétentions littéraires et stylées." Consequently, the versification is often neglected and their style is crude. Moreover, these amusing, coarse tales almost always preach a moral or demonstrate a lesson: ". . . il s'agit presque toujours de sa fin, et d'un autre il ne s'agit pas d'une réflexion quelconque, mais bien d'une leçon ou d'une moralité en bonne et due forme, tirée du sujet lui-même du conte."⁴² Their subject matter is generally sensual love, adultery, and fornication; the stress is on woman, regarded as a worthy disciple of Eve, who makes a fool out of man.⁴³ Juan Ruiz thus inherits a

⁴¹ Joseph Bédier, Les Fabliaux. Études de littérature populaire et d'histoire littéraire du moyen âge (Paris, 1928), p. 59. Bédier emphasizes the popular nature of the fabliaux and their entertaining qualities. "Une époque est responsable des récits dont elle s'est amusée, même si elle ne les a pas inventés" (p. 290).

⁴² Per Nykrog, Les Fabliaux (Copenhagen, 1957), p. 103. Nykrog attacks the thesis of Bédier. Their burlesque quality is based both on a parody of courtly literature and on a morality related to misogyny: "leur force comique dérive directement de la doctrine de l'amour courtois, dont ils prennent systématiquement le contre-pied" (p. 228).

⁴³ The most famous example is "Le lai d'Aristote"; Aristotle attempts to convince Alexandre of the bad influence that a certain woman has on him. This woman eventually corrupts Aristotle and rides on his back. Whereupon Aristotle reiterates his point that, if such a woman can corrupt an old wise man like him, her effect on the young will be even stronger.

genre whose essence is what Nykrog calls a "certain effet de comique méprisant" (p. 235). The fabliaux are also known for their high-spiritedness, gaiety, and rapidity of action. Such qualities are ideal for Juan Ruiz's entertaining purposes. He takes more than a hint from the fabliaux, but his art transforms much of what he takes.

Under the heading of fabliaux I shall discuss, irrespective of the literary genre to which their sources may have belonged, three tales treated by Juan Ruiz in the fabliau spirit or, at least, in a spirit a little more suggestive of the fabliaux than of other literary genres. Two of his fabliaux deal with situations of bragging; the other deals with the "triangle" of husband, wife, and lover.

a. Enssienpro del garçon, que queria cassar con tres mugeres
(188-197)

A vigorous youth desires to marry three women. His family finally convinces him to marry only two, first the younger and next the older one. After a month he states that his brother need not marry; he suggests that he and his brother can share his wife who would suffice for both of them. He has lost his strength and he can no longer stop the spinning stone of his father's grinding mill, an easy chore before he got married. He never takes the second wife since the first one is more than he can handle.

This story is the first example which the Archpriest employs to attack Don Amor. He intends to show that love harms people by weakening them, by sapping their strength (188). The story is related to, and perhaps influenced by, the fabliau Le Valet aux douze Femmes (see Lecoy, pp. 157-158). There are, however, more differences than similarities. In the French version the youth wants no less than twelve women;⁴⁴ he decides to wait one year before marrying the second; his father proposes the second marriage. Above all the woman plays an active role, for she enjoys ruining her husband's strength. At the end of the story the youth suggests giving the woman to a recently captured wolf because that would be the worst possible punishment one could inflict upon the wolf. Most of the details of the French fabliau reflect the popular medieval antifeminist view; the fabliau derives much of its humor by emphasizing the destructive powers of woman.

The Archpriest uses this story, whose effect is one of a comique méprisant, appropriately in his attempt to vent his seemingly bitter anger against fraudulent love. Now,

⁴⁴That the French youth should want to marry twelve women is, of course, quite unnatural. But the fabliau writer will pay any price, including remorseless sacrifice of verisimilitude, for the pleasure of pointing out an incongruous demand. In some fables, Juan Ruiz follows this technique of hyperbole, but often, as in this case, his stricter adherence to reality puts him on his guard against unnatural situations.

the author-reader relationship is a delicate affair whenever the author wants the reader to reject anything. The Arch-priest could succeed in getting the reader to reject love by swaying the reader to his side of the moral issue, by convincing him that this point of view is correct, and by delicately leading him to join in the accusation that love weakens man. The French fabliau succeeds in this by stressing the fact that the woman is aware of her power over man;⁴⁵ by having the young man violently reject a second marriage; and, finally, by the moral implicit in torturing the wolf by handing him the woman. The emphasis lies on the strength of the youth and the outside force (woman) which destroys it. On the other hand, Juan Ruiz does not want the reader to reject love; he does not involve the reader in the moral issue. In the end, he places all the emphasis on the young man by not giving a role to the woman at all; by making the youth volunteer to share his wife with his brother before anyone even proposes the second marriage; and finally, by the youth's reflection that the stone is strong because, unlike him, it is not married. The emphasis lies on his tendency to boast and exaggerate.⁴⁶ Juan Ruiz focuses his

⁴⁵"L'insatiabilité de la femme est le sujet principal de plusieurs contes, comme p. ex. celui du Valet aux-XII Femmes" (Nykrog, p. 189).

⁴⁶The device of exaggeration used by Juan Ruiz parallels closely the rhetorical device of irony which deals with boasting, known in antique times as alazoneia (αλαζονεία).

tale on the presumptuousness of the young man and sharply reveals the ironic contrast between the young man's thought of handling three women and the fact that even one proves too much of a burden for him in only a month. It is an amusing contrast between his intoxication with his own strength and his sobriety at his weakness. Contrary to the French fabliau, Juan Ruiz does not coerce the details of the situation to prove a point; he shifts the relationship of author-reader by de-emphasizing the implications that he might be criticizing love and by presenting the story with a laughing and apparently uncritical amusement.

The contrast and incongruity between the foolish confidence of the youth and the exaggerated state of his failure is revealed in two situations. The first is his brother's marriage. When the youth is told that his brother is about to marry, he answers that there is no need: "que el tenia muger enque ambos a dos oviesen" (192b). This is the comment which reveals that the youth knows he had previously deceived himself. His ironic suggestion contrasts sharply with the adjective valiente (strong or brave) used to describe him earlier. The focus of this scene is not so much upon the corruptive power of love as upon the disparity between what man, even if valiente, really is and what the garçon loco had imagined man to be. Up to this point, with the exception of a few details, the French

fabliau supplies the main irony. But to the French *trouvère*, the incongruity inherent in the plot is entirely satisfying and sufficient to motivate the youth's action in the story of the wolf; the joke and the moral are derived from the situation of woman corrupting man. Hence, there is a complete disregard of biographical details as a possible method of sharpening contrasts in the French fabliau. It is here that Juan Ruiz uses the rhetorical device of digressio effectively when he recalls the young man's history. He reveals to the reader the past experience of the youth with the mill-stone in such a way that the reader becomes even more aware of the young man's pride in his own strength. That is, he digresses to a detail of the youth's earlier life in order to heighten the contrast between his attempt to be powerful and his failure. This biographical detail is an illustrative parallel and leads to the most humorous line of the story: the youth's comment when he is knocked end over end in his attempt to stop the spinning stone: "diz: ¡ay! ¡molyno Rezio, avn te vea casado!" (195d). The comparison between youth and stone is effectively crystalized through the device of apostrophe and personification. The young man addresses the inanimate stone directly as though it were a living person; he thus endows what is solid and durable with the qualities of disintegration and weakness which are applicable to men. Telling "I'll see you married yet" to a stone captures the humorous aspect of the sapping

of strength through union with woman. The image of stone melting is a humorous exaggeration of the youth's original insistence upon marrying three women.

It is this digressive look backward, funny in itself and probably based on some folk tale, that creates a strong contrast between the young man's expectations and his realizations as well as the unquestionable pleasure which the reader derives from the picturesque detail of the personification of the stone. Not only can the youth not do what he thought he could, but he can no longer perform what was, in the past, an easy task. The last difference between the French fabliau and the version of Juan Ruiz is significant: while the trouvère, consistently interested in morality and criticism, is content to tell us how the husband, having learned his lesson, offers the woman to the wolf, the Spanish artist, primarily interested in the humorous possibilities of the youth's boasting, gives us, as the climax, the image of the mill-stone. He leaves no doubts in his summary that his interest lies in the extravagance of the youth, not in antifeminism.

"ansy su deuaneco al garçon loco domo.
(196d)

- b. Enssienplo delos dos perezosos que querian cassar con una dueña (457-467).

Two lazy men, one blind in one eye, the other crippled

in one leg, propose marriage to a woman. She answers that she will marry the laziest. Each proceeds to brag, explaining how laziness led to the loss of an eye and the laming of a leg. The woman ridicules them and tells them to look elsewhere.

We do not have a definite source for this story. Laziness offered as some sort of proof is part of a story (Gesta Romanorum, ch. 91) in which the king puts his sons through a test of laziness. "Il est fort possible, en conséquence, que notre auteur ait puisé à une source populaire ou d'inspiration populaire que nous ignorons" (Lecoy, p. 156). The grossly comical allure, the grotesque exaggeration of details, and above all the element of bragging would seem to relate this story to the fabliaux. The basic pattern of development is one of inverted eulogy: since laziness, which is hardly worthy of praise, is highly esteemed, such praise is completely inverted.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Don Amor tells the story to the Archpriest as part of his instruction how to succeed in love. Juan Ruiz's is the only version which relates a ridicule of laziness to the instruction of physical love and specifically how laziness affects a woman. The story is used as an exemplum, and the arguments of Don Amor again recall some of the attitudes expressed in the fabliaux: if a man is not lazy with a woman, he helps her to lose her sense of shame. A shameless woman, as in the spirit of the fabliaux, "mas diabluras faze que quantas ome quier" (468d). Juan Ruiz presents the story as a mock encomium; it is the emphasis placed upon a disparity between the reality of two ugly, lazy men and their expectation of marrying an attractive woman that provokes the comic spirit of the story.

Juan Ruiz is working within the tradition of mock panegyric, i.e., the satirical ridicule of the character and personality of men. The formal pattern is meant to ridicule or parody the vanity a man has in some desirable quality which evidently does not belong to him. It would be tantamount to a liar bragging about his honesty. The traditional, regular pattern would be as follows: the two suitors pretend to themselves and to the woman that they possess more of a certain virtue than they actually have; such men are to be ridiculed for being vain. But here the two suitors brag not about a virtue but about a vice which is not at all desirable or praiseworthy. It would be tantamount to a liar bragging about his lying. Vanity here arises, paradoxically, from a disproportionate evaluation of laziness which is the opposite of a virtue in love. Their vanity is not merely founded upon ignorance of true value; it is a false evaluation, yet offered to the woman for her applause.

Juan Ruiz exploits the burlesque possibilities of the pattern of mock encomium in three stages.⁴⁸ (1) Don Amor

⁴⁸This became one of the favorite satirical and comical devices of the Renaissance. In Rabelais it is burlesque; Celestina is vain about her success as a corruptor of virgins. It gains even more precision and subtlety in the theatre. Iago praises himself, while facing the audience, for the villainous advice he has just given Cassio. Alceste, in many effective comic scenes, brags about his misanthropy. In the Middle Ages we see it in Chaucer's Pardoner who is so vain about his confidence game that he tries it on the

tells the Archpriest about two suitors of a woman: "eran muy byen apuestos E veras quan fermosos" (457d). Don Amor constantly advises the Archpriest that a suitor must be elegant. The verb veras and the exclamation quan betray the jeering tone of the implied contrast. Their elegance and beauty is blindness and lameness. The lover's standard appearance is held so high above them that their shortcomings not only stand out sharply by contrast, they are downright ridiculous from the beginning. (2) The woman answers (as in the medieval romance tradition) that she will marry the best of the two,⁴⁹ i.e., the one who shows more excellence in the "virtue" of laziness. Each pretender connects his particular defect (that which seemingly makes him elegant and beautiful) to the extreme practice of his laziness (viewed as a virtue). Each story becomes a mock epic miniature. Both treat a ludicrous subject with the pomp of adventure and the style of heroism. The grave introduction of the first one, ". . . oyd primero la mi Razon" (460a), sets the tone of heroism, depicted as

pilgrims and expects to be rewarded. This device is related to the Socratic conception of what is ridiculous: the exhibition in man of the quality, "know not thyself." It is a very effective device both in satire and burlesque.

⁴⁹In many medieval romances the choice between two excellent knights, given their equal merits, is usually impossible. They must undertake some exploit or go through some sacrifice so that the lady might better distinguish between them. A famous example is the tradition of the two young knights in love with a lady of the court, developed in Boccaccio's Teseide and Chaucer's The Knight's Tale.

suffering ("perdiame de sed") and sacrifice of abstention, and captured mockingly by the climactic heroic line "que por non abrir la boca, de sed perdy el fablar mio" (461d); the romantic introduction of the second, "yo era enamorado d'vna duena en abryl" contrasted with the vulgar and paltry "vyno me descendimiento a las narizes muy vyl," ends by paralleling the heroic style of the first in order to compete with it: "por peresa de alimpiarme [sic] me perdy la dueña gentil" (463). The effect is pure burlesque. Juan Ruiz adapts very effectively the epic technique of recalling a past exploit (notice the use of por) related to lofty themes. Since the subject is the reverse, the discrepancy between unheroic laziness and heroic pretenses results in absurdity and hilarity. (3) After such feats of heroism, the woman has difficulty in choosing between them, since both have demonstrated an equal degree of laziness:

veo vos, torpe coxo, de qual pie coxeades;
veo, tuerto suçio, que sienpre mal catades.
 (466c,d)

The direct address, the use of epithet (torpe, suçio), the realization that their blindness and lameness is the result of their "virtue," reinforce the feigned difficulty of choice and underscore the more her sarcasm and taunts. These reach a height of mockery by the effective use of parallelism which sums up the difficult choice between two extraordinary feats of laziness.

Juan Ruiz's story is further amusing if we consider its role as an exemplum. While telling the Archpriest why he should not be lazy in love, Don Amor offers a travesty of laziness more than a lesson in love. The defects and self-praise of the lazy characters are treated with such a grotesque extravagance, and the style and images are so exaggerated and comical, that the story becomes a caricature of the exemplum. The emphasis is not so much on laziness as on self-delusion; that by being lazy, i.e., by not acting, one can win a woman. Since each brags about his disadvantage (lameness, blindness) and the vice that caused it, the pretenders appear ridiculous in an amusing, more than in an exemplary manner. This is the opposite of Ovid's technique of exemplification. The emphasis of the story here is mainly on the comic effect, and only incidentally does the story serve to illustrate the role of laziness in love.

c. Enxienplo de lo que contescio adon pitas payas pintor de bretaña (474-485).

Pitas Payas paints a lamb on his wife's navel before departing on a long business trip. In his absence, she takes a lover whose action eventually erases the figure. Immediately before the husband's return, the lover paints a ram with horns to replace the erased

lamb. Upon seeing the new figure, the shocked husband asks for an explanation. The wife innocently tells him that a lamb, naturally, grows into a ram in two years; had he returned earlier he would have found the lamb.

Juan Ruiz's version is the oldest one we have, yet it is most probably an imitation of some fabliau, although no direct source has been discovered for this story. However, its pattern and tone resemble many of the fabliaux: a woman left alone; the clever and opportunist lover; the naive husband; the woman's capacity to outsmart her husband. Even the peculiar accent which Pitas and his wife utilize (a mixture of French, Italian, and Spanish) resembles somewhat the comical jargon of some fabliaux.⁵⁰

⁵⁰A typical element in the fabliaux and part of the attempt to capture "local color" is the use of dialect or pseudo-dialect. "L'emploi d'un jargon mitigé de formes étrangères est un procédé bien connu de la littérature comique et d'on il est difficile de rien conclure" (Lecoy, note 7, p. 159). Leo Spitzer points out the same thing but carries the view further: ". . . las réplicas en francés chapurreado . . . donde la lengua extranjera presta por una parte color local al cuentecillo y por otra lo hace más llamativo al alejarlo de nuestra comprensión" ("En torno al arte del Arcipreste de Hita," Linguística e historia literaria, ed. Gredos [Madrid, 1955], pp. 157-158). I believe that metaphysical interpretations of the use of dialect are rather far-fetched. Rather, such linguistic deformation or dialectal use is part of the realistic and humorous purpose of the fabliaux. We see it in Chaucer's The Reeve's Tale in which the two young clerics, Aleyn and John, sport a twang of Northern dialect with many peculiarities of speech, some of which are not yet confirmed as authentic.

The story of Pitas Payas, if we except the Miller's Tale of Chaucer, is perhaps the highest artistic expression of the fabliaux--so high a one, indeed, that the terms fabliau or conte-à-rire scarcely define it. It comprises two separate problems, one having to do with a husband outsmarted by his young wife, the other with the problem of negligence in love which is part of the ars amatoria. Don Amor, following the procedure of Ovid, advises the Arch-priest not to neglect or slight his love lest she look elsewhere for a compensation. Ovid illustrates his point with the story of Menelaus who was similarly deceived during his absence.⁵¹ In short, Juan Ruiz has Don Amor describe the impractical way to love a woman. He relates a fabliau which does not describe such a procedure but illustrates the cunning of woman.

The story of Pitas Payas is a good representation of the fabliau genre with all its artistic and humorous virtues and with its typically "fabliau" love based on the triangle of one woman and two men. In handling this tale, Juan Ruiz goes far beyond the usual simplicity of the fabliau pattern, yet works within it. His innovations reveal the artistic coherence of his humor.⁵²

⁵¹For a discussion of Ovid's influence, see R. Schevill, Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain, Univ. of California Press (Berkeley, 1913), chapter on Juan Ruiz, pp. 25-55.

⁵²As I warned earlier, I am often forced to point out innovations by referring to hypothetical analogues, i.e., other fabliaux with similar patterns.

(1) The most important innovation of Juan Ruiz is the portrayal of the unfaithful wife. She is described simply as a moça who is beautiful and obedient (476). When her husband is away she shows impatience: "Facia sele ala dona un mes año entero" (477d). The reason given for taking a lover is a natural explanation based on the physical laws of feminine necessity:

Como era la moça nueva mente casada,
 auie con su marido fecha poca morada;
(478a,b)

Given youth, impatience, and circumstances whereby a young woman introduced to physical love needs more of it, the wife of Pitas is vulnerable. This motivation for the young wife is contrary to the conventional item-by-item catalogue of lustful and evil attributes that women have in the fabliaux. The basic difference between the fabliau heroine and this moça is suggested by the fact that the latter is presented largely in her need for physical love while the former is described specifically in terms of seductive and corruptive wiles. The physical desires of fabliau women are bestial and contemptible; here they are biological and understandable. The one's deception of her husband is the deception by a basically promiscuous daughter of Eve; the other's is the deception by an abandoned wife. One description exposes a woman's real and imaginary flaws; the other presents a woman's natural needs. In one, typical of the literature

of misogyny, woman is to be admired for her skills but also ridiculed and scorned; in the other she is not judged at all. In short, the woman of the fabliaux schemes because she wishes to deceive her husband.⁵³ Pitas' wife is not "naturally" adulterous; she is much less cunning and her act is more spontaneous than that of the fabliaux women. She is not so much seductive (premeditating) as she is seduced (needing physical love).⁵⁴

The change of the character of the unfaithful wife has a very important artistic function in Juan Ruiz's version. His first step is the preparation of the ironic effects, for some of the details in his portrayal are

⁵³Above all, woman's tricks are stressed. For example see Dame qui fist battre son Mari. A favorite situation is the clever way the woman answers a husband's reproaches and accusations. In the end of Juan Ruiz's version he was perfectly aware of the method employed in fabliaux to satirize the dangerous wiles of women. Don Amor prepares this story by discussing the evil talents of women in a manner similar to that used in the fabliaux.

¡talante de mugeres quien lo puede entender,
sus malas maestrias e su mucho mal saber?
quando son encendidas E mal quieren fazer
alma e cuerpo e fama todo lo dexan perder.
(469).

⁵⁴Juan Ruiz constantly stresses the fact that love is a physical necessity which dominates man's behavior. Trota expresses the same view concerning dona Endrina: "pues fue casada, creed ya que ella consienta" (711c), i.e., once accustomed to physical love, the woman is vulnerable. Trota follows precisely this reasoning in insinuating tones while attempting to convince Endrina: "mas do non mora ome la casa poco val" (756d). In Pitas' absence his wife simply "poblo la posada."

calculated to strike as strong a contrast as possible with the amusing denouement. As a new wife, she is purposely pictured as naive and obedient so that her natural surrender may contrast with her preposterous yet ingenious and matter-of-fact explanation of it to her husband; she warns Pitas not to forget his home or her person (475d) so that her explanation at the end (had he returned earlier, the lamb would have remained a lamb) will become more ironic; she obediently agrees to the drawing ("fazet vuestra medida"), so that it will contrast with her equal yet ironic willingness to show Pitas the newly-drawn ram.⁵⁵

(2) Juan Ruiz next brings about a slight but telling change in his presentation of the cuckold husband. In the fabliaux, the husband is destined irrevocably to be deceived by his shrewd and cunning wife. His shame is the direct result of his stupidity, his egocentric presumption, and her skillful deception. Pitas, on the other hand, is not a husband of low mentality, i.e., a natural dupe, but rather an unsuccessful lover, an idea related to the argument of Don Amor. That is, rather than a fool, Pitas is a man who

⁵⁵ Nothing in the French fabliaux corresponds to those introductory half-hints by which Juan Ruiz surprises the reader in the second part of the comic story; nothing that could make the reader feel, on the first reading, the irony of the wife's good intentions and obedience, and her husband's assurance in going away.

is more concerned with business than he is with maintaining the integrity of his household; he violates one of the first laws of nature by leaving alone a young woman recently married. By implication he is, in a sense, a weak lover, for he cannot impose and ensure the chastity of his wife in his absence. It follows inexorably that his action will turn him into a cuckold. The irony resulting from this change from natural dupe to insufficient lover is twofold: the young wife offers Pitas a sort of challenge with her warning not to forget, the result of which is her succumbing to seduction; but at the same time Pitas' readiness to accept the challenge by drawing the lamb will make him the only dupe in the end. The second irony is the stronger. In Pitas' explanation of his drawing ("porque seades guardada . . ." 476c) there is more than anticipatory delight in the success of his own stratagem; there is the implication of satisfaction in his protective action: "Pyntol so el onbligo vn pequeño cordero, / fuese don pytas pallas aser novo mercadero" (477a,b). In exact proportion to the assurance of Pitas rises our anticipatory pleasure in the dishonor which awaits him upon his return, when, ironically, he insists on seeing the figure he drew.

Juan Ruiz exploits to the fullest the ironic possibilities of this figure. In most of the traditional versions the figure is a donkey; Juan Ruiz takes advantage of the

connotation of "horns" to reinforce the situation of cuckoldry with that of dishonor. There are two drawings: Pitas draws a lamb which he calls "bona fygura," i.e., the symbol of chastity and the lack of virility; the lover, on the other hand, draws a ram, i.e., a lamb which has acquired virility and has become the symbol of Pitas' dishonor if not of Pitas himself. The irony lies in the fact that Pitas' "bona fygura" not only fails to protect his wife from "altra locura" (476c) but on the contrary becomes a pictorial representation of his shame: Pitas appears self-assured with his innocent lamb so that he may look more ridiculous when confronted with the horned ram; and he is foolishly sure to believe that his drawing will succeed in its purpose so that we may laugh more at his state of shock upon staring "grand carnero con armas de prestar" (483b). We can now compare the form of irony in Juan Ruiz and in traditional analogues: in the fabliaux, the irony lies in the husband's credulity and in his unconscious help to the lovers; in Pitas Payas, the irony lies in Pitas' carefulness and thus in his unconscious furthering of his own dishonor. The incongruity of the husband drawing an animal at the very spot where seduction would erase it, is the basic fabliau situation; in the hands of Juan Ruiz it becomes the irony of Pitas' painting that very animal (lamb) which he should have avoided most

carefully (since it grows horns). Juan Ruiz manipulates the details in such a way that the emphasis lies on the careful husband confronting his own drawing. Since he initiates the problem of honor by drawing the figure as a protection, he himself runs into a snare laid by his own hands. The fact that he is a painter adds to the ironic implications of the situation: it is his lamb which "grows" into a ram, i.e., his laxity which leads to cuckoldry. One could say, borrowing a later title that he is the burlesque, comical version of the painter of his own dishonor.

(3) Juan Ruiz also changes the technique of describing love-making. In the fabliaux the act of physical love often parallels a low life tale of animal grab. Copulation is carried out with strong currents of vulgarity; the sexuality of wife and lover seems to be intrinsically vile. In Juan Ruiz's version the undercurrent of a saucy sexuality is just as strong; but it is suggested in a single subtle and sophisticated line:

tomo un entendedor E poblo la posada,
desfizo se el cordero, que del non fynca nada.
 (478c,d)

"Erasure" and "nothing left" imply perhaps over-indulgence in the sexual act. But it is cleverly suggested by the use of the drawing; it is never coarse, crude, or vulgar.

Usually, there is nothing in the French fabliaux which corresponds to those half-hints of Juan Ruiz's. The lover's only function in the story is to erase the lamb and paint the ram, i.e., symbolically, to end the wife's chastity and to put the horns on Pitas.

(4) Juan Ruiz's appreciation of different ironic contrasts is clearly perceptible in the denouement of the story. Here, the story of Pitas Payas is further removed from the fabliaux so that a comparison of details is not possible. In the usual traditional outcome, the husband discovers the infidelity and the unfaithful wife has to answer. There is little surprise in the fabliaux, given the stock characters of wife, husband, and lover. Because of the implied moral criticism, the laughter at the end is often bitter with a tone of triumphant malice.⁵⁶ Juan Ruiz converts this situation into a remarkable demonstration of pure humor. He shifts the interest from the wife's infidelity to the husband's absence and to the ironic implications of their conversation: "en vez de su [woman's] evidente falta es la falta de su marido la que pasa a primer plano, gracias a la aguda 'risposta'" (Leo Spitzer, "En torno," op. cit., note 17, p. 126). The verbal exchange of husband and wife

⁵⁶Laughter at the end of a fabliau derives from admiration or shock for the woman's cunning revealed in her clever explanation and the reductio ad absurdum of the cuckold, and his helplessness.

is, above all, theatrical based on what the husband sees and what he hears.⁵⁷ She receives the returning husband scornfully. She protests too readily; her offensive includes a strong potentiality for fraud and delusion, and is, at best, concerned with putting on a front.⁵⁸ It is natural that Pitas would not be convinced. An attack of indignation with a strong appeal to emotion should be viewed with even more suspicion. Therefore, "la señal quel feziera non la echo en olvido" (481d). He very politely ("madona, sy vos plaz") asks to see the figure he drew and she obliges ("monseñer, vos mesmo la catat"). Stunned (effectively captured stylistically by the way in which he phrases his question, "Como, madona, es esto"), he asks for an explanation, "que yo pynte corder E trobo este manjar" (483d). We can see Juan Ruiz's conscious elaboration of the figures lamb-ram; he makes Pitas say

⁵⁷ Compare with "Du Chevalier a la robe vermeille; de Montaiglon et Raynaud," III, 45.

Cis fabliaus aus maris promet
Que de folie s'entremet
Qui croit ce que de ses iex voie;
Mes cil qui vait la droite voie,
Doit bien croire sans contredit
Tout ce que sa fame li dit.

⁵⁸ This device of feigning indignation to hide guilt and to take the upper hand is, of course, a very effective humorous trick with much chance for theatricality. We see it in Trota's feint when Don Melón is knocking at the door. It is a useful trick of Chaucer's Wife of Bath to put her husbands on the defensive and keep them under control.

manjar, a term not so common as carnero and with not as damning a connotation, because he does not dare to confess openly his dishonor.⁵⁹ Her answer to his question is comprised first of a question which contains an implied answer: Como, monsseñer, / En dos anos petid corder non se fazer carner!" (484b,c). She feigns surprise, imitating his surprised manner ("como, monsseñer"). Her reasoning, a rhetorical syllogism, is logically fallacious but enables her to gain the advantage and thus make the worse case look the better. Her implied answer includes the fraud and delusion typical of a cunning woman, but is delivered in a very disarming manner. Juan Ruiz reaps here what he had sown in the first part of the story: instead of a stupid husband who is inevitably deceived, we have a seemingly shrewd Pitas waking up to the result of his masterful piece of cleverness; we have the clever painter outsmarted by his young, naive wife. The second part of her answer spells out the husband's error: "Veniesedes tenplano E trobariades corder" (484d). Although she shifts from a pretense of

⁵⁹ Although there is the possibility that Juan Ruiz substitutes the word manjar for the convenience of rhyme, it would be incredible that he should not be aware of the different shades of meaning between manjar and carner. The fact is that the substitution comes at the most appropriate moment, Pitas' reference to the ram and his dishonor. See Cejador y Frauca, op. cit., note 483.

indignation to a pretense of reasoning, her comment is here literally true: had he returned early, he would have found her chaste. The humor results from her mock-innocent tendency to understate what is obviously true. Her rationalization is ironic in that it turns the painting against the painter. The figure which the painter first insisted on drawing and now insists on seeing is, naturally, to be distinctly more detrimental to Pitas than to his wife.

As opposed to the misogynic tendency of the fabliaux, Juan Ruiz dramatizes the triangle with an even-handed justice. The young wife is not evil, while Pitas gets his just deserts. To the heroine of the fabliaux comes retribution; the moça escapes scot-free of any criticism. One often finds the phrase "poetic justice" used in connection with certain fabliaux. There is certainly something like it in the shock of Pitas. But the phrase "poetic justice" seems to put moral values too much in the foreground. The irony in Pitas Payas is pure, unadulterated fun. The critics of Juan Ruiz pay him a very high compliment when they call his tale "delightful" and "realistic." It is time to consider seriously also his imagination and technique; above all, his mastery of ironic humor fulfills, in its very strategy, the artistic imperatives which Juan Ruiz affirms: it does not satirize or judge but amuses with its composition and texture.

Summation of Juan Ruiz's fabliaux: The fabliaux are full of exuberance, gusto, and open guffaw. Time and again the reader is made to expect a fine point⁶⁰ which results in a burst of laughter. It is this aspect that interests Juan Ruiz. These fabliaux are, however, often clumsy; they lack a pleasant gaiety and seem crude and vulgar by comparison to Juan Ruiz's renditions. His style, in reshaping them, is sharp, ordered, and, above all, subtle. Moreover, many of the fabliaux close with a preposterous summary of their incredible events which often leads to a sermon or advice. Juan Ruiz avoids this tendency to arouse moral indignation through an appeal to shame and a ridicule of vices. His comic illustrations in the fabliau manner are more casual and avoid maliciousness. They contain satirical and ridiculing touches, but they are more comic than invective; they do not combine into a single, sustained expose of vice. Consequently, the laughter of Juan Ruiz's "fabliaux" is relatively purposeless while the laughter of the French fabliaux is directed toward a preconceived moral end. The comic illustrations of many fabliaux are artistically awkward while the comic illustrations of Juan Ruiz's "fabliaux" are directed toward a preconceived

⁶⁰The misleading refinement is due to the fact that many fabliaux are related to courtly literature: ". . . on doit les considérer plus spécialement comme un genre courtois burlesque" (Nykrog, op. cit., p. 228).

artistic end as he himself points out.

3. Juan Ruiz and the Goliards: "No parece tampoco que en España haya habido una poesía satírica goliardesca como los *Carmina Burana* o los poemas atribuidos a Walter Map. . . . Pero, sin embargo, el clérigo juglar existió en nuestra península" (Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., p. 31).⁶¹ For Menéndez Pidal, the Archpriest resembles the European goliardic clerics in that he exalts the elementary pleasures of life in his Libro. I would like to recall some of the salient features of goliardic poetry to better point out the role this poetry plays in Juan Ruiz's aim to entertain. The goliardic songs show a bold natural view of life; they stress common human impulses such as physical love and drinking; they express a delight in life and physical enjoyment while at the same time they proclaim a revolt

⁶¹The goliards were young wandering scholars traveling from university to university, without responsibilities, carefree, usually without money and constantly seeking pleasures. They frequented taverns and lecture rooms alike. Unlike other clergy, they did not take orders but they had more affinities with the Church than with laymen. They did not comprise an order but a type of fraternal association. Their hero was one Goliath, but we do not know if he were real or fictional. They were called by the epithets, Clerici, Vagi or Goliardi. They are very important in the life, thought, and literature of the Middle Ages. "It [Goliardic poetry] occupies a position of unique and isolated, if limited, interest; . . . because it is pagan in the sense of being natural; because it is devoid of allegory, and, finally, because it is emphatically humanistic" Wine, Women, and Song: Medieval Latin Students' Songs, trans. with an essay by John Addington Symonds (London, 1884), p. 171.

against the corruption of Papal Rome.⁶² Their poetry and songs are more popular than scholastic, but are composed, however, by men of culture who have a classical learning. The goliards are known for their technical virtuosity and are, above all, well prepared for the manipulation of the Latin language (they pun upon words, exploit commonplaces, and parody hymn rhythms and liturgy phrases).⁶³ They are scholars with the wit of a jongleur; they make great verses out of riotous scandals. They are devoted to entertainment: "the Wandering Students ranked in common estimation with jongleurs, buffoons, and minstrels" (Symonds, op. cit., p. 23). They ridicule everyone from Pope to lowest clergy; they parody saints, Mass, and Gospels, or burlesque sermons until they reduce them to nonsense. In short, as opposed to the theme of contemptu mundi propagated by the Church, the goliardic verse praises the carpe diem philosophy and the beauties and pleasures of the natural world.⁶⁴

⁶²The goliards wrote during the time of the Crusades. They stand opposite the one-sided view of the Middle Ages whose conception of man's fall and the incurable badness of this world result in cynicism and asceticism. Goliardic literature owes nothing to feudal chivalry.

⁶³There are similarities between Juan Ruiz's use of religious terms in secular context and the goliards'. For example, "And the breasts that gently rise / Like the hills of Paradise" (Symonds, op. cit., p. 113) or "Grant this toper, God on high, / Grace and absolution" (ibid., p. 58).

⁶⁴See Helen Waddell's important study, The Wandering Scholars (London, 1949). She examines their historical importance as one of the earliest disintegrating forces in the medieval church, and their literary importance in the

An examination of the satiric character of their verses is important to this study, since the three goliardic sections of the Libro are basically satires against physical love, the power of money, and concubinage among priesthood. The goliards and Juan Ruiz form an important link in the satirical heritage of Western Europe. Juvenal is considered the inventor of rhetorical satire, the form which attacks vices, wrongs, or abuses in a high-spirited strain of impassionate declamatory eloquence.⁶⁵ This form became fixed; its purpose was to expose and chastize in a systematic manner the entire catalogue of public and private vices. This satiric form was blended with humor, wit, and irony in the satiric tales of Petronius and Apuleius. The medieval world, in its inexhaustible capacity and relish

development of satire and the secularization of religious views. She claims that "the Latin poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth century scholars is pagan, as Keats is pagan" (p. 127). The goliardic poetry shows no concern for heaven and hell but for life here and now. "Its altars are to Cupid and his mother" (p. 128).

⁶⁵For a partial history and discussion of the purposes of satire see David Worcester, The Art of Satire (New York, 1960). For a specific analysis of the artistic devices related to satire, see Ruth Cave Flowers, Voltaire's Stylistic Transformation of Rabelaisian Satirical Devices, The Catholic University of America Press (Washington, D.C., 1951). This work contains a meticulous study of satire as a genre with a sound definition and a good explanation of its historical implications. A recent study of the effect of satire through various historical periods is Robert Elliot's The Power of Satire, Magic Ritual Art, Princeton Univ. Press (Princeton, N. J., 1959). Nothing major on medieval satire has been done since Charles Lénient's La Satire en France au moyen âge (Paris, 1883).

for violent passion and abuse,⁶⁶ full of coarse laughter and active humor, quick to poke fun at priests and to ridicule women or lash out at political and religious abuses, had the satiric spirit in abundance. This is evident in the numerous satiric spirit in abundance. This is evident in the numerous satirical songs, visions, fables, fabliaux, etc. preserved from the Middle Ages. However, the Middle Ages have no definite and recognized school of satire. It is generalized and marked mostly by invective or ridicule.

Most representative of the tradition which combines invective and humor, i.e., critical rejection and entertainment, are the goliards. "Satire, mockery, and invective, together with the appetites, revelry, and love longing, are the material of this poetry, of which the collection known as the Carmina Burana gives us the most comprehensive idea" (Curtius, p. 317). The goliards compare themselves (parodically), in their songs, to the Apostles who were given commission to go forth and preach in the whole world; in the same way, some scholars have a vocation to travel and test the hearts of men whenever they have a chance ("Cum 'in orbem universum' decantatur ite!"). Thus a burlesque turn is given to this apostolic function of the vagi. But with the burlesque turn they seriously and strongly hint at a consciousness of a satiric mission,

⁶⁶J. Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages (London, 1924).

a willingness to pose as critics of society from the uninvolved vantage point of a vagabond's life. In fact, they demonstrate a remarkable boldness in their invectives against ecclesiastical abuses such as simony, avarice, venality in the Roman curia, and the ambition of prelates. Juan Ruiz imitates many of the satirical attacks found in goliardic poetry, especially ridicule. What is important in our study is the way he handles the one element which is common to all satire: criticism. His satirical motifs are those of the goliards, but he often directs these motifs to different ends. Juan Ruiz's satirical writing reveals much of his attitude toward moral criticism and conveys, through its tone, the tension between seriousness of purpose and amusement.

a. Las horas canonigas: The parody of portions of the liturgy, uttered by the Archpriest against Don Amor, is recognized as a stylistic tour de force without parallel in medieval European literature. "Tout ce qu'on peut mettre en parallele en France ou en Italie avec sa vigoureuse et verte plaisanterie est court de souffle, pauvre d'imagination, banal de tours ou d'expressions et, pour tout dire, assez inoffensif" (Lecoy, p. 219). Juan Ruiz's version is probably the earliest known parody of canonical hours.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ Although we do not have a definite source for the

It functions in several ways: first, it is meant to be funny in that the distortion of liturgy stresses, in the manner of the goliards' profanation of religious material, erotic intentions;⁶⁸ second, it is used as a satire in that the parody is used to ridicule and reject the practitioners of worldly love. Its position and function in the narrative is subtly devised: (1) The Archpriest has just related a story about the suit in which the wolf brings the fox before the judge, Don Ximio, to illustrate hypocrisy; one thief

canonical hours we do know that sacred parodies exist very early, both in European and Arabic literatures. "We have here but one more example of a tendency which knows no limits of geography or of culture. Juan Ruiz could have conceived his parody as he conceived it, and could have given it the form that he gave it, anywhere in Christian Europe" Otis Green, "On Juan Ruiz's Parody of the Canonical Hours," *HR*, XXI (1958), pp. 16-17. In Spain there was definitely a tradition of sacreligious use of religious texts and services. See María Rosa Lida, "El romance de la misa de amor," *RFH*, III (1941), 41ff; also, "La hipérbole sagrada en la poesía castellana del siglo XV," *RFH*, VIII (1946), 130ff.

⁶⁸The distortion of Biblical and liturgical texts with erotic connotations has a long tradition: "Scriptural parodies, usually erotic as well as blasphemous, were popular pastimes for devout churchmen in the Dark Ages," *The Book of Good Love*, trans. by Elisha Kane (1933), note 1, p. 76. The very act of sin is, of course, a source of the goliardic comic spirit. Their poetry went often to extremes with parody. They are good representatives of what C. S. Lewis calls "the medieval taste for humorous blasphemy," *The Allegory of Love. A Study in Medieval Tradition* (Oxford, 1936), p. 20. Lewis offers various examples of distortions of the liturgy.

(the wolf) pretends to be law-abiding by accusing another thief (the fox). Similarly, the Archpriest accuses Don Amor of being hypocritical, like the wolf, in that he frequents churches although he has no intention of performing works of mercy and charity. (2) In fact, he exploits places of buen amor to further his purposes of loco amor; as the wolf comes to court although he is interested in thievery, so does a lover go to church although interested in seduction. (3) The satirical process is as follows: The Archpriest imitates the manner in which a priest-lover brings about the seduction of a woman in church; he takes advantage of the liturgical expressions, i.e., he quotes to the woman words from the religious service but uses them to imply an offer of seduction. (4) The implied reasoning is that the church is a convenient meeting place of lovers since women frequent them and other difficulties exist outside the church. Thus the lover exploits both a sacred place and a devout ritual for his worldly and lewd purposes:

aobla de piadad tu nunca paras mientes
 nin visitas los presos nin quieres ver dolientes;
 sy non solteros e sanos, mançebos e valyentes;
 ssy loçanas encuentras, fablas les entre los dientes.
 (373)

Juan Ruiz's use of liturgical phrases in Latin to suggest seductive advances is highly complicated but very carefully ordered. "On notera que les versets utilisés ne sont pas pris au hasard parmi les différents offices

la journée et répartis suivant un ordre arbitraire; ils se présentent, au contraire, à une exception près, dans l'ordre même de leur récitation dans la réalité" (Lecoy, p. 226). By deviating from the normal association of the Latin phrases he is both sacrilegious and humorous. His "humorous" deviation creates amusement because something devout is teasingly burlesqued; his "sacrilegious" deviation creates satire because the spokesman for this blasphemy is rejected. The humorous or satirical intensity of this parody is in proportion to the degree of deviation from the liturgical tradition. The critics who have studied this passage attempt to show the disparity between its common liturgical meaning and its erotic use; they agree that this disparity is definitely blasphemous and in certain sections highly lascivious.⁶⁹ I will review the sacrilegious hints briefly in order to illustrate their role in creating an unusually comic satire whose excellent form demonstrates Juan Ruiz's artistic skill in mingling ambiguity with exaggerated condemnation.

⁶⁹The aforementioned scholars are Cejador y Frauca, who provides the exact sources of the Latin liturgical phrases; Elisha Kane, who explains some of their lusty and obscene connotations; Felix Lecoy who explains in what way they are sacrilegious; and finally Otis Green (op. cit.), who sums up many of the previous views and relates the extreme obscenity of these phrases to Juan Ruiz's attempt to create humor.

Following are some of the highlights of Juan Ruiz's punning with liturgical phrases.⁷⁰ Stanza 375 sets the pattern of word-play:

Do tu Amiga mora comienças a leuantar;
domine labia mea, en alta boz acantar,
primo dierum onium, los estrumentos tocar,
nostras preces ut audiat, E fazes los despertar.

The simple meaning is that instruments are played to wake the beloved. The probability is that "playing instruments" may have a scatological meaning; i.e., instruments waken to sounds as well as to other sensations.⁷¹ As the day begins (at the prayer of primes) the lover appeals to the go-between to arrange a tryst in the garden ("Deus in nomine tuo," 377). The "garden tryst" is an old literary motif; and "picking roses" implies "defloration," while the deception of a woman is related to the harvest from the garden of folly.⁷² Next comes the suggestion that her resistance must be overcome with sweet music (the implication

⁷⁰With some exceptions and additions here and there I follow the textual interpretations of the above critics, especially those of Otis Green.

⁷¹By comparison to tradition and in later context, Otis Green shows that levantar signifies sexual erection (op. cit., p. 26).

⁷²Stanza 378 is an intricate play between parody and Biblical allusion: "Quod Eva tristis trae de quicumque vult, redruejas," "from listening to who will come with me and be my love. [quicumque vult?], a fruit no less bitter in its consequences than Quod Eva tristis abstulit as her reward for listening to the serpent" (Otis Green, op. cit., p. 28).

of lips). We next see the lover in church where he wishes to have a "misa de novios" which refers to a private affair (something like the traditional "misa de amantes"). After Mass, he asks his bawd to bring his mistress, telling her of his passion (uter = odre has a scatological meaning and refers to sexual need). The interview begins, but the female prospect puts him off, bidding him return at the religious service of nine ("a la nona"). They go to service together. His exclamation, Mirabilia, does not refer to the Lord but to the lover's bright prospects and great expectations. "Gressus meos dirige" connotes "direct my steps to your room" adding "justus a, Domine," i.e., "I trust in you, my love." The next strophe is the climax of the seduction, as well as of the insinuating word-play.

Nunca vy sacristan que a visperas mejor tanga,
 todos los instrumentos toca con chica manga;
 la que viene a tus visperas, por byen que se rremanga,
 con virgam virtutis tue fazes que ay Retangan.
 (384)

"Con chica manga" means "easily"; "por byen que se rremanga," "in spite of token resistance" with the obvious "generative" connotation of instrumentos.⁷³

⁷³For a detailed explanation of the metaphorical manner medieval thinkers used to allude to the reproductive organs, see Alan M. F. Gunn, The Mirror of Love, Texas Tech Press (Lubbock, Texas, 1952), especially chapters XI ("The Philosophy of Plenitude") and XII ("The Regeneration of Man"). He points out how Alanus in his De Planctu Naturae "mitigates the unpleasantness of the subject by the use of metaphor and allegory" (p. 225). Juan Ruiz definitely takes advantage of this tradition in his reference to man's generating

The rest of the parody refers to new partners for the lover-cleric (385a). The profanation continues, but is related to new conquests. "Vengan hermosas o feas, quier blancas, quier prietas" (386b). "To convert" (386) implies passionate request; "abrir las puertas" is a lewd reference to sex; and "custodi nos" refers perhaps to the woman requesting secrecy to protect her reputation. The last stanza refers to the cunning manner of taking the beloved away in order to avoid gossip; "quod parasti" refers to secrecy while abaxar, related to gloria (387c), crystallizes the lewd connotations of sexual love (gloria is a well established word with lascivious implications). Finally, "salve rregina, dizes, sy de ti se ha quejar" (387d). "If in his haste and through inconsideration, the clérigo should arouse protest, the formula of mollification is ready to hand: 'salve, regina'" (Otis Green, op. cit., p. 32).

Otis Green believes that the function of the parody is strictly humorous: "Even the fact that the parody is interpolated in a lengthy section on the capital sins is not an indication of seriousness--the Archpriest, for all his pelea with Don Amor, finally enlists under his banner"

organs. "The frankness of the vernacular poet in regard to such matters is by no means due to his 'ill-conditioned mind' . . . it derives rather from the most respectable of traditions, and has the most distinguished of precedents to support it" (pp. 226-227).

(Otis Green, op. cit., p. 33). I would now like to probe further Green's general statement, placing the stress upon the inner and outer structure of the famous liturgical parody, i.e., I will examine it in its context. The feminine prospect in similar goliardic parodies is almost always a wench or a wanton woman, i.e., one who is easily seduced. Consequently, the poem concentrates on the parodic word-play and lascivious discussion. To this pattern Juan Ruiz adds the problem of difficulties in seduction. The woman is a dueña and is not easily convinced; to succeed one must know or learn how to proceed correctly. The parody thus acquires a narrative form with a go-between, an attempt and postponement, a meeting, and consumation. In fact, the structure behind the sacrilegious puns is that of a miniature ars amatoria. The background into which the parody is set and the method of seduction which Don Amor advises the Arch-priest to use, are inextricably related. That the action covered in the parody is deliberately patterned and stylized to embody the principle of measure for measure can be more readily seen if we compare it with Don Amor's advice on how to succeed in love (423ff). Briefly, then, the sequence within this parody is as follows: emphasis on physical love; the lover is a priest (sacrystan); there are difficulties in contacting a prospect; an experienced bawd is needed; there is a problem of meeting places; there is a

special manner of coaxing by politeness and suggestion; ideas on how to charm her; the woman has reservations (she postpones); the lover must learn to insist until she gives in (trastorne); her first commitment for a meeting (379) is important; meeting at church to avoid suspicions; the bawd's assistance again; the expression of passion in covered terms; the agreement; the discretion needed to avoid public scandal, etc. All of the above problems and steps parallel the content of Amor's advice. That is, the Archpriest is pretending to condemn a method he really must learn to perform well and pretends to attack the source which will provide the method.

The structure of attack, such as the one which the Archpriest is leveling at Don Amor usually contains two layers⁷⁴: a thesis layer which attacks seduction as a perversion, and an opposite layer which provides, at least by implication, the corrective picture represented by devotion. Juan Ruiz, in an amazing display of control of form, substitutes ambiguity for the corrective picture of the antithetical layer. One of the reasons is that from his position or role of attacker, the Archpriest falls back to his role as lover who needs instruction in order to

⁷⁴For a very intelligent discussion concerning the structural problems of satire, see Maynard Mack, "The Muse of Satire," The Yale Review, XLI (1951), 80-92.

succeed. In a satirical attack, at least by implication, the antithetical layer is to be found in the attacker's position, i.e., his satiric attack fortifies the reader's feeling that, as opposed to the immoral practices of worldly love, buen amor makes moral sense.⁷⁵ In short, if the Archpriest is to be effective and convincing in his expose of Love's wiles, he must be accepted by his audience and by Don Amor as a fundamentally virtuous person who challenges wrongdoings (like profaning the church) whenever they deserve it, and does not do so just to be vindictive. His position should not be ambiguous. Ironically, it is the Archpriest who taught us this satiric approach with his example of the wolf which opens this parody. The role of the Archpriest as a censor is as questionable as the wolf's. Don Amor is not fooled. The Archpriest himself indicates that in his parody of the canon hours he indeed stressed his role as a lover and not his role as a priest. This indication comes in what is perhaps the most delightful and ironic comment in the whole Libro. The Archpriest fails in three love ventures; in his anger he attacks Don Amor; Don Amor gives him sound, detailed advice on how to succeed in love; the Archpriest listens patiently and

⁷⁵"Satire . . . asserts the validity and necessity of norms, systematic values, and meanings that are contained by recognizable codes" (Mack, "Muse," *ibid.*, p. 85).

decides to follow this advice; but he first meditates upon Amor's advice and wonders:

Maraville me mucho, desque en ello pensse,
de como en servir dueñas todo tienpo non canse;
muncho las guarde syenpre, nunca me alabe;
qual fue la Raçon negra por que non Recabde?
(577)

The proof that he had already known much of Amor's advice on love is the miniature ars amatoria which he recited to Amor in order to attack him. It is now evident that Juan Ruiz uses the fable of the wolf to open this parody in order to prepare the amusing situation of one hypocrite attacking another hypocrite. The parallel is very sly but evident: as a thief accuses another thief about thievery, so an opportunist lover attacks another about opportunistic love.

That the Archpriest utilizes his parody against Don Amor because he is disappointed by failure in love is at least implied. He may disguise anxiety by moral indignation; by cloaking his personal desire in the garment of objective moral comment, he is able to pretend that he is concerned not so much with success in love as with the evil of loco amor. The contrast between his moral statements and his implications, constitutes the real comic center of this goliardic satire. The structural devices of this satire reveal an amazing control of form: the two agents of the parody are the Archpriest who speaks and Don Amor who is

addressed. Being the adversary (enemigo as he is called), Don Amor is calculated to be erroneous, if not vile, in his views, values, and actions of love. The complexity begins when we consider the satiric speaker. The Archpriest, we must remember (see Chapter II), reveals himself to Don Amor not as Juan Ruiz but as a character, a lover in fact, in a love narrative.⁷⁶ As the satirical speaker of this liturgical parody, he offers us three distinguishable aspects of his person: first, the high-thinking priest who hates blasphemers and who respects and defends the love of God; secondly, the naive lover, the one of inexperience and awkwardness who has failed--by implication, one who might be anxious to succeed; thirdly, the skillful exposé of the "designs" in worldly, profane love, i.e., the satirist who knows the subterfuges and their effects.

The three aspects together constitute the satirical voice of the Archpriest. The voice of the goliard satirist gains complexity because he is fictionalized. The three aspects of the Archpriest qualify one another but occasionally fuse together. As the indignant satirist, the Archpriest seemingly educates us and arouses our interest in the importance of his subject; he makes us see the vice of a situation where we were fooled and accustomed to see only

⁷⁶I believe that one reason why so many of the excellently constructed stories in the Libro have not been given much critical consideration and, what is worse, have never been considered in their context, is the fact that most

the outer, good part. As an honest priest he shows us that he is stable, that he is one who knows that there is a time to stop fooling around with the obscenities of loco amor. As a lover, finally, he opens to the reader a world where the discernment of worldly love is accompanied by the wish to partake in it. The reader must understand his parody (which depicts a success in love) in terms of his present anxiousness and anger which result from failure and disappointment. Critics would never have made, I think, so many judgments about Juan Ruiz's satiric intentions and art if they had grasped the fact that the attack on Don Amor by the Archpriest is primarily a portrait of the attacker and adversary, dramatized in a particular fictional context at a particular point of the narrative and quite unlike the straight satire of most medieval works including that of the goliards.

Summation: The parody of liturgy clarifies many of the skills and habits of Juan Ruiz as a satirical writer. He follows the pattern of traditional satire but makes the reader forget what is essential in a satire besides its humor: the fact that, as Mack terms it, "one is at war," that there is an adversary to be unmasked and rejected.

critics have fossilized the role of Juan Ruiz as an exemplary persona.

Above all, he gives his satiric parody a subtle ironic twist which fuses both the Archpriest's dissimulation and mockery. Now as a satirist or moralist, the Archpriest should be concerned with both evaluating lascivious love and communicating these judgments to his hearers. The device which he exploits has a long tradition: the satirist speaks contrary to what he actually thinks by inverting these judgments; he pretends to condemn what he means to praise.⁷⁷ Thus the Archpriest freely acknowledges the failings of loco amor, yet, by clever and skillful indirection, he suggests a picture of the way he should succeed as a lover. This dissimulation of his moral attitude is an important method which underlies most of the satire of Juan Ruiz. It should be readily seen that it is also a technique of the skillful humorist and especially of the artist who, as he suggests early in his Libro, expects his reader not to take his grave satire seriously except in that it is entertaining and skillfully written.

⁷⁷ This device, a favorite of the Greeks, was clearly spelled out by Quintilian: "laudis adsimulatione detrahere et vituperationis laudare." See John M. Bullitt's Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire: A Study of Satiric Technique, Harvard University Press (Cambridge, 1953), especially chapter III, "The Rhetoric of Satire," pp. 68-123. This book is perhaps the best study of the history, theory and practice of the most important satirical devices, both as propaganda and as art.

b. Exmienplo de la propiedat que'l dinero ha: The characters exchange roles, but the satirical situation whereby something is simultaneously condemned and praised remains the same. Don Amor gives the Archpriest some tips on how to succeed in love. Money helps in bringing about the seduction of a woman because it has the power to change things. Don Amor offers many examples to demonstrate the power of money. In so doing he satirizes a number of people and institutions that are corrupted by money. Don Amor's criticism is "une vivante satire des ravages exercés dans la société par l'amour des richesses et la soif de l'argent" (Lecoy, p. 237). This is an old theme of moralists; the satirical tradition centering around the corruptive power of money goes back to Juvenal. The tradition is characterized by a tone of anger. The satiric author always appears revolted at the moral laxity or culpable stupidity which money causes; he directs his attack at a person or at clearly recognizable institutions. The goliards inherit this satirical tradition and concentrate it on the abuses of church and the cupidity of woman.

The aptest lecher
Without a purse won't share her stretcher
Money will fetch her ⁷⁸

The submission of man to money ("In terra summus rex est

⁷⁸From Hugo de Orlean's "On runaway Flora," no. 109, in Medieval Latin Poets, trans. Jack Lindsay (London, 1934), p. 176.

hoc tempore nummus") became a commonplace in their poetry. It is their content and tone which Don Amor uses to demonstrate to the Archpriest the power of money.

J. A. Chapman, in a recent study, argues that the satire of money's effectiveness is meant to illustrate the money's destructive power.⁷⁹ The essence of his argument is that parts of the Libro can be interpreted by "the common use of a stylistic formula which may be expressed: X makes Y become Z, where X represents the power of love, money, wine or death, and Y and Z represent opposite qualities" (p. 29-30). This is, of course, the basic rhetorical device of all satire; the goliards, for example, show how money corrupts what is "good" so that it becomes "bad." Such an explanation of the passage is an oversimplification of Juan Ruiz's artistic skill in satire, for it fails to consider that the illustration of money's destructive power appears in a straightforward eulogy; money is praised in that it aids a lover with his beloved. To read the section with attack, vice, or destruction as the center of interest is to overlook

⁷⁹J. A. Chapman, "A suggested interpretation of stanzas 528 to 549a," Romanische Forschungen, VI (1961), 29-39. Although he emphasizes the effect of wine, Chapman discusses the similarities of money, wine, love and death, and their destructive power. He then argues that the destructive powers of these entities are further proof of the didactic intentions of the Libro. All passages are examined outside the realm of the narrative. For example, the fact that Don Amor preaches as a Christian while instructing the Archpriest about Pagan love is never considered.

the fact that, though the attacks on abuses caused by money are valid (and supported by tradition), they are also, if one considers the structure, about the advantages of money.⁸⁰ Satire is one form of literature not easily pigeonholed; the attitude a writer takes toward his object of attack and the tone through which he conveys this attack determine the function and success of his satire. Since it is evident that by its position in the structure of the Libro (similar to the parody of liturgy) it presents problems of devices and techniques already discussed in relation to the horas canonigas, I should like to examine three of the inner elements of the attack in order to better determine the predominant tone of the satire. My contention is that the effect of money is always stressed more than its destructive power.

(1) The satirical tone of this section is better perceived if we compare some of its parts with similar expressions from Pero López de Ayala's Rimado de Palácio. Both works derive their material from the goliardic satire which ridicules the idea that those who have money get preference

⁸⁰ Américo Castro (La realidad, op. cit.) has already argued brilliantly in favor of the ironical use of Juan Ruiz's style: "do son muchos dineros, y es mucha nobleza" (508d), i.e., money performs both good and bad things.

over those who do not. The specific type of abuse which both writers stress is that, through the influence of money, ignorance acquires a degree of veneration to which it is not entitled. The reverse is the case if money is lacking.

Rimado: Aquí es simonia que faze mucho mal;
a quien tiene oro e plata çinco obispados val;
aunque sea letrado, si aquesto le fal,
non le daran benefiçio por la su decretal.
(76)

Ayala defines the effect of money as "simony," i.e., a crime which consists in buying or selling ecclesiastical preferment. He explicitly states that such a crime creates evil ("faze mucho mal"). Then he proceeds to spell out in detail the evils of this crime. If one has money, he advances, if he does not, his worth notwithstanding, he will not be recognized. Ayala stresses the separation between the appearance of worth (letrado) and the reality of moral worthlessness ("non le daran benefiçio"). The essence of Ayala's satirical comment depends on the manner with which he describes the influence of money as something vicious, as something that ought to be corrected. The effect of the power money is seen as corruption.⁸¹

⁸¹ Ayala iterates this same position in a later part of the Rimado:

Non fablo en ximonia nin en otros muchos males
que andan por la corte entre los cardenales
quien les presenta copas buenas con sus sennales
rrecabdara obispados e otras cosas tales.

(228)

Libro: fazie muchos clerigos e muchos ordenados,
muchos monges e mongas, Religiosos sagrados:
el dinero les daua por byen esaminados,
alos pobres dezian que non eran letrados.
(495)

The above stanza is typical of Juan Ruiz's manner in that nowhere in the satirical exposition of "las propiedades del dinero" is the influence of money defined as a crime (such as simony), nor evaluated as evil. The predominant style is matter-of-fact, i.e., this is what money does. In fact, almost each stanza ends with a generalized statement which portrays the influence of money not as something vicious but as something effective and powerful. "El que non ha dineros non es de sy Señor" (491d); "do son muchos dineros esta mucha bendición" (492d); "fazie de verdat mentiras, e mentiras verdades" (494d); "por todo el mundo faze cosas maravillosas" (497d); "muchas almas perdía e muchas salvaba" (498d); and the famous, "do son muchos dineros y es mucha nobleza" (508d). Juan Ruiz's device is clever in that he makes Don Amor convert all the effects of money into maxims, i.e., statements embodying a general observation about what is generally accepted as true concerning the influence of money. The effect is that the maxims, together, sum up the power (without the need to be good or bad) which money has in bringing about changes. The trick here is that, unlike the technique used in the Rimado, the reader is not made to distrust or curse money

but to stand in awe of it and to admire it simultaneously.

Ayala satirizes the power of money in order to expose vice and to arouse, by ridicule, a critical rejection of the follies and corruptions of the court. Much of the criticism or ridicule implied in his ironic presentation of simony is related to a truly tragic involvement with the folly of the church. His satire, even in its ironic and comic moments, satisfies certain objective conditions for moral reform. For Ayala, as opposed to Juan Ruiz, satire is a compelling need, not a cheerful delight. At the very heart of Ayala's satiric perception of simony there is a corrective potentiality; at the very heart of Don Amor's perception of simony there is an ironic demonstration of the power of money. Ayala's satire on money is motivated by an acute moral sensitivity to fraud and deceit and is sharpened by the circumstances of his own experience at the court which corroborates these feelings about the corruption that money spreads. What differentiates Juan Ruiz's ridicule of money from straight satirical and venomous invective is also the manner of the speaker, Don Amor. "Yo vy" he constantly reiterates. Out of what he "sees" personally, he composes maxims on the remarkable changes that money can cause. That is, like the Archpriest earlier, he pretends to attack what he praises. Thus Juan Ruiz has his eye not only on the corruption of money but also on the

witty juxtaposition of speaker-hearer in the attack. He stresses once again a technical virtuosity more than the seriousness of content. Satirical criticism can, of course, be so direct and vituperative that, in the process of reducing an object to what is disgusting, it may lose the control and guidance of its literary form. Juan Ruiz seems to be aware of this possibility.

(2) Juan Ruiz's manipulation of satire to expose religious frauds in the manner of the goliards, is evident in his discussion of religious pardoners.

yo vy amuchos monges, en sus predicaciones
denostar al dinero E asus tentaciones;
en cabo por dyneros otorgan los pendones,
asueluen los ayunos, ansy fazen oraciones.
(503)

This stanza refers to the corrupters of the ecclesiastical system. According to the Church's doctrine, to give money to a charitable enterprise is an act of piety for which the Church may repay the donor by granting him some indulgence for his sins, i.e., metaphorically speaking, a draft on the treasury of God's mercy. Since priests are the qualified agents of the Church hierarchy, they become the chief agents of this exchange, i.e., they can accept contributions. The gifts they collect are, of course, to be used for charitable works. The priests themselves are expected to be ethical, selfless, decent, and sober. Don Amor

satirizes these priests:

Pero quele denuestan los monges por las plaças,
guardan lo convento en vasos e en taças,
conel dinero cunplen sus menguas e sus Raças;
mas condesygos tienen que tordos nin picaças.
(504)

Priest becomes a synonym for money hoarder. His function degenerates to a wholly commercial affair. Medieval satirists attack violently the religious degradation brought about by money; corruption is portrayed as something ugly and deformed. Such criticism is evident in the goliards, in Dante (Inferno, Canto, X), Pero López de Ayala, and it reaches its artistic perfection in Chaucer's portrayal of the Pardoner.⁸² All traditional analogues reflect an ethical aim, i.e., priests or pardoners are portrayed as vicious money hoarders and are supposed to arouse some moral indignation through an appeal to shame. Implicit in the satire of them is a picture of the ideal conduct which priests ought to follow. Juan Ruiz, on the other hand, has *Don Amor* begin with a picture of the vice of simony but end in a ludicrous way. After humorously referring to the fights among priests concerning the spoils (505), *Don Amor* simply ends by posing an insinuating question:

Pues que se dizen pobres, que quieren thessoreroz?
(506d).

⁸²Despite the various arguments on the subject, it seems evident that the Pardoner is made to provoke his own destruction among the pilgrims of the Canterbury Tales. When at the end of his sample sermon he offers to sell his pardon to the pilgrims, he is refused and rejected.

What ought to be a serious vice is identified by ridicule, i.e., with the perception of a discrepancy between what priests have and what they pretend or appear to have. The incongruity is the result of the surprising question. Juan Ruiz's device is ridicule by wit, to present a simple juxtaposition not of vice and irreligiosity, but of how priests claim to be poor while demanding to have treasurers.

While medieval satirists use simony to justify their attack on the corruption of money, Juan Ruiz concentrates on the ridiculous aspect of simony. For the goliards, for Ayala and even for Chaucer, the relation of money to religious fraud has a real existence which is the purpose of the satirist to discover and lay bare. Juan Ruiz, however, is not so much concerned with the vice as with a situation which is truly ridiculous and which he presents by insinuation. Traditional satire describes the vicious form of the habit of simony. Juan Ruiz's satire describes the amusing form of the habit of pretending poverty. Tradition concentrates on a vicious habit, Juan Ruiz on an amusing hypocrisy; for one, exposure should lead to rejection; for the other it is a source of laughter.

(3) Finally, Don Amor constantly interjects reminders of his real purpose into his satire, i.e., the role of money

in the seduction of women.⁸³ Instead of emphasizing the inherent evil of woman, Don Amor portrays woman as potentially corruptable. Money is one of the catalysts. "Fara por los dineros todo quanto le pidieres, / que mucho o poco dal cada que podieres" (489c,d); "Tyra cepos e grillos E cadenas peligrosas / el que non tyene dineros, echan le las esposas:" (497);⁸⁴ "Toda muger del mundo E dueña de altesa / pagase del dinero E de mucha Riqueza; / yo nunca vy ferosa que quisyese pobreza (508a,b,c); "toda muger cobdyçiosa del algo es falaguera" (511). The relation of money to women ends with an image.

por joyas E dineros Salyra de carrera,
el dar quebranta peñas, fyende dura maderas.
(511c,d)

⁸³The goliards present a harsher view of the influence money has upon woman.

For womankind
are very wretchedly designed,
fickle and blind
they always follow
the ringing purse, that bait they'll swallow.
(Lindsay, op. cit., no. 109)

By implication, the influence of money is powerful because woman is evil and easily corruptable.

⁸⁴The goliards:
Coinless, you're booted out
You're left, despised
For poverty that she devised.
She plunders fast;
Bankrupt, you fool, you'll stand at last.
(Lindsay, no. 109)

We see the same theme but an entirely different tone in Juan Ruiz. The goliard again stresses the fact that it is woman who schemes against the man. She is responsible for man's poverty and therefore man is a fool. Don Amor simply offers, as a contrast to the effectiveness of money, the disadvantages if one lacks money.

The image of resistance (peñas, dura madera) is directly related to the resistance of women. The following stanza (512) is a metaphor of the power of money in overcoming obstacles, i.e., its effect in overcoming a woman's resistance.

In fact, Don Amor never deviates from his intention. A good example is stanza 492 where the advantages of money are enthusiastically praised:

Sy tovyeres dyneros, avras consolacion,
plazer E alegria del papa Raçion,
 compraras parayso, ganaras saluacion:
 do son muchos dineros esta mucha bendicion.

On one level, this satirical passage refers to the corruption of the church through money: one can buy what one should not be able to buy, salvation and blessing. On another level, this passage refers only to worldly love: one can enjoy the physical pleasures of women. The religious terms--consolation, paradise, salvation, and blessing--are defined elsewhere in the Libro (see Chapter Two) as relative to the pleasures of worldly love. The double-meaning of terms indicates that critical rejection is only one dimension of Don Amor's satire; the other dimension is praise. Don Amor dissimulates his moral attitude. He slants his presentation so that he appears to say one thing (money corrupts) when in reality he is communicating another (money leads to the joys of love). The teacher of love, who pretends to be

indignant at the abuses of the church which money leads to and who tries to receive credit for an activity which he does not practice, is a hypocrite (as was the Archpriest earlier); it is as if Cupid borrowed Christianity (parayso, salvacion) to sermonize his incompatible cult. The gap between appearance and reality which leads to hypocrisy is here more ridiculous and amusing than critical and serious.

Summation: Most of the criticism concerning the abuses of money in the Libro is either to stress its power or for the sake of fun. Fun lies in the sheer extravagance and in the virtuosity with which Juan Ruiz piles audacity upon audacity.⁸⁵ The catalogue of money's abuses resembles an invective, but its effect upon the reader is to stimulate neither anger nor indignation. Unlike the emotion generated by other medieval satirists, it is not the emotion of corruption that affects the reader but the remarkable variety and exaggerated exuberance with which this corruptive power is expressed. Anticipating Rabelais two centuries later, this satire diverts the reader's attention from money (i.e., the object attacked) to the technique of satirical expression, a stylistic preoccupation which Juan Ruiz

⁸⁵Few satirists have found such a plethora of objectives for their ridicule as does Juan Ruiz. He incorporates into his attack upon money the foibles both of secular and religious professions.

does not abandon. Since the paradoxical situation whereby Don Amor condemns what he means to praise renders the satiric object obscure, the seeming criticism is not criticism at all. At least the reader is made to recognize that most of Don Amor's indignation is wittily spent in verbosity; his criticism is overshadowed by the humor of imagery, irony, and word-play.

c. Cantica de los clerigos de Talavera: This imitation of a goliardic satire appears only in the manuscript of Salamanca. It is attached at the end of the narrative and seems to have no organic value in the Libro.⁸⁶ The Arch-priest does not participate in the action. The story is presented from the point of view of an objective narrator. The traditional story, known as Consultatio Sacerdotum, is a goliardic version of a heated discussion among priests concerning their practice of concubinage. It attempts to ridicule the efforts of virtuous prelates who try to put an end to the private scandalous life of churchmen. There

⁸⁶No one, to my knowledge, has attempted to explain and analyze this story. The prevailing view is that Juan Ruiz tagged it at the end of his work simply because he had already written it as a separate unit for some professional jongleur. It is generally assumed that the 1345 version is the result of Juan Ruiz's final organization of the different sections of the Libro.

are at least three Latin poems based on this situation a century before Juan Ruiz. In all of them the clergy assembles, each cleric takes the stand and offers practical arguments concerning their predicament: they invariably attack the Pope and the Archbishops; they suggest that the king can understand better the natural needs of man; and finally they decide not to obey the dispatched orders. Menéndez Pidal has examined the relations between Juan Ruiz's version and its traditional, goliardic counterparts.⁸⁷ The speakers, for example, are reduced to four in Juan Ruiz's version, but they have their counterparts in the Consultatio Sacerdotum: Archpriest, deacons, treasurer. Despite the basic similarities, however, this version is different. Since there is no way to compare directly, the assumption is that, probably, Juan Ruiz knew various versions of the same theme. "Peut-être a-t-il connu plusieurs versions du même thème, peut-être aussi une version disparue qui groupait les éléments du développement d'une autre façon

⁸⁷ See Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., pp. 160-162 ". . . La cantiga del Arcipreste está inmediatamente tomada de la Consultatio Sacerdotum, tantas veces tratada un siglo antes en los poemas atribuidos a Gualterio Map, y de la cual debió conocer el Arcipreste no una sino varias formas" (p. 160). In general, the clash between the religious and the profane, between the serious and the burlesque, between the moral sermon and the secular vitality of man, are common tendencies for both Juan Ruiz and the goliards. The rebellious goliardic shout, "juvenes non possumus legem sequi dura" is, of course, a point of view very similar to the temperament of Juan Ruiz. There are, consequently, many correspondances between the Consultatio and Talavera.

que celles que nous connaissons: la question est sans grande importance."⁸⁸

Menéndez Pidal and Lecoy believe Juan Ruiz to be original in that he relates this traditional story to contemporary events. The cantica is "inspirada en personas y momentos de la actualidad toledana" (Menéndez Pidal, Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., p. 168); "on peut donc dire qu'en dépit de ses modèles latins, la cantiga de los clérigos de Talavera plonge au plein dans la réalité contemporaine" (Lecoy, op. cit., p. 236). Both critics point out that the situation of the story reflects the restless times, the agitations, the many changes of Popes, the priestly rebellions, and councils.⁸⁹ My interest in the story differs from theirs and is inspired within the context of the Libro. One, Juan Ruiz's technique of humor in this story is typical of his craft elsewhere in the Libro; two, the example of worldly love as a vital, imperative reality

⁸⁸Lecoy, op. cit., p. 232. I do not agree with Lecoy's last comment. It is the careful comparison and contrast of the Libro and sources that reveal Juan Ruiz's artistry. For example, while Pidal and Lecoy point out that the Libro's "que yo dexe a Orabuena la que cobre antano?" comes from the Latin version "Non Malotam deseram dum me durat vita," they do not examine the obvious differences of style, tone, and, consequently, humor. Juan Ruiz, for example, vitalizes the declarative phrase by converting it into a question and by playing with the name Orabuena.

⁸⁹The fact is we do have analogues of this story in the goliardic tradition, which would indicate that Juan Ruiz did not create his narrative out of history.

among clerics is, of course, the basis of the Libro's autobiographical form, i.e., a priest telling about his experiences with carnal love; finally, the story has more order than its traditional counterparts. Juan Ruiz takes from tradition the situation of a religious ban and a local consternation. What he creates, or at least develops a great deal, is a subtler contrast of the situation and a more effective presentation of dramatic irony.⁹⁰

Dramatic irony can be defined simply as the result of a strong contrast between meaning of a speaker's words and their implication. The speaker is not conscious of a possible incongruity but the narrator and reader are. The narrator conveys through the speaker's words something more than the speaker perhaps intends. The four clerics who lament the Archbishop's decree are made to reveal all their wrong-doings in the lamentations themselves; they thus implicate themselves by their own words. Each one in turn complains that enforcement of the decree forbidding concubinage changes a happy situation in which they were able to satisfy their physical needs and pleasures into an unpleasant situation. Through their indignant complaints, the reader

⁹⁰This approach involving irony, a subject leading to polemics among medievalists, has been encouraged by a reading of Germaine Dempster's excellent study, Dramatic Irony in Chaucer, The Humanities Press (New York, 1959).

is made to see the range that the clerics had in violating religious decrees, that they did so in the name of physical need and pleasure, and that they invented schemes to overcome successfully strict religious observances. Since dramatic irony is central to the Consultatio Sacerdotum, adapting the Latin poem provides Juan Ruiz with an opportunity to handle what is perhaps his favorite humorous device. His most important contribution is to establish a progression in the ironical revelations of the four speakers.

(1) The first speaker is the messenger, an archpriest, who brings the distressing news. He sets the emotional tone of calamity. His reaction is one of deep dismay:

¡Ay! ¡viejo mezquino! ¡en que envegeçi!
 ¡En ver lo que veo E en ver lo que vy!
 (1692c,d)

The dolorous style resembles that of the epics and romances in describing loss of sons (Los siete infantes de Larra) or loyal friends (Cantar de Roncesvalles). The overstatements are humorous; nothing contributes more to the sense of absurdity than the confusion between an ordinary misfortune and a show of excessive suffering. Dramatic irony results precisely from this demonstration of excessive and seemingly heart-rending lamentation. The messenger-archpriest reacts as if concubinage is the most vital part of life among the clerics of Talavera.

(2) The second speaker, a deacon, is the first to attempt to clarify and evaluate the situation objectively. His plan is to make an appeal not to a religious authority but to the temporal power of the king. The gist of his argument is that, even though they are priests, they should be treated as subjects of the king.

servimosle muy byen, fuemosle sienpre leales;
 demas que sabe el rrey que todos somos carnales:⁹¹
(1697b,c)

By emphasizing the fact they are carnal, the deacon reveals the distance between the feelings of clergy and their supposed occupation, which is charity in the name of God. Dramatic irony results from the deacon's exposition of the reasons behind concubinage among priests. He does not seem to realize that to claim to be carnal is a violation of what he has learned to say as a religious man, i.e., he is momentarily unaware of the correct evaluation of his own position as a priest. The irony is carried further by his reasoning that since they are loyal subjects of the king, " quered se ha adolecer de aquestos nuestros males!" (1697d). The problem of the priests, however, is that of

⁹¹ Although it was not unusual for religious personnel to appeal to the secular power of the king concerning religious matters, the argument itself concerning the relationship between secular and spiritual powers was a constant debate. See Henry Osborn Taylor, The Medieval Mind (London, 1927).

excommunication from the church (1694d), something in which the king, at least theoretically, cannot interfere. The final touch of irony comes when he states that he cannot abandon his Orabuena; in fact, he would rather give up his prebend, honor, and income (1699a,b). That is, he balances one worldly good against another. In clarifying the situation, the deacon measures everything by secular standards. Such an interpretation of a priest's position is so far removed from the ideal of priesthood but yet it is stated so matter-of-factly that the irony leads to jovial mockery and amusement.

(3) The third speaker, a treasurer, shifts from the deacon's theoretical approach to one of immediate action:

Pero dexare a Talavera E yr me a Oropesa
 Ante que la partyr de toda la mi mesa.
 (1702c,d)

His argument is based on a biological reasoning. His concubine Teresa arouses such a passion in him that it would be sheer pain to be away from her (1703c,d). Juan Ruiz carefully constructs an argument for him which only pretends to be a syllogism and which may be paraphrased as follows: The treasurer admits that it is painful to break away from the custom of love-making; Teresa's presence satisfies his needs for love and thus eliminates the pain of abstention; therefore, it is better to leave Talavera and go elsewhere

than give up his concubine. The irony is twofold: carnal love completely controls the decisions and actions of a religious man. Priests are entrenched in the one habit which negates their spiritual endeavors. The problem of concubinage among priests, i.e., spiritual degradation, is not limited to one location. By implication, it is common practice and he will go where he can get away with it.

(4) The fourth speaker, a church singer and the only priest to be given a name, Sancho Munos, introduces a new attitude. He justifies his actions before the eyes of God:

diz: "aqueste arçobispo non se que se ha con nos,
El quiere acaloñar nos lo que perdono dios:
(1705hc) 92

As opposed to the previous speakers, Muños admits no wrongdoing; instead, he attempts to justify, in the name of God, an action considered to be an offense against God. He first refers to the so-called concubinage among priests not as

⁹²The relations between this humorous episode and the rest of the Libro are evident in the arguments of Muños: "El quiere acaloñarnos lo que perdono Dios" contains echoes of stanza 109: "Ssy Dios, . . . entendiera / que era mala cosa la muger, non la diera / al ome por compañia . . ." Both statements reflect one of Juan Ruiz's favorite arguments of justification, that man commits sin in a world where sins are forgiven by God; or, in a manner similar to that of the Wife of Bath, the speaker rationalizes and demands evidence or proof that what is regarded as sinful, is indeed not sinful at all but merely interpreted as such.

concubinage but as something else:

que sy yo tengo o toue en casa una servienta,
non ha el arçobispo desto porque se sienta,
que non es mi comadre? Que nin es mi parienta?
huerfana la crle, esto, por que non mienta.
(1706)

Dramatic irony obtains when Munos, while explaining that what the Archbishop calls concubinage is only a misunderstanding on his part, exposes, in fact, the schemes and pretexts under which priests are able to keep concubines: the woman is kept in the priest's home as a servant, who is his comadre or his "relative" or an orphan he has protected. We are to understand, by implication, that concubinage was forbidden, but a priest nevertheless knew ways of getting around regulations. The recent decree of the Archbishop is an attempt to enforce regulations, not to create them; he, in fact, tells the priests that their servants are concubines. Munos next argues that the Archbishop slanders what God accepts:

En mantener ome huerfana obra es de piedad,
otrosi a las vibdas: esto es cosa con verdat;
(1707a,b)

He does not say that God accepts concubinage. In fact, Munos does not admit to concubinage at all; on the contrary, he defines the protection of orphan women or widows, which is a cover for keeping a concubine, as an act of piety. Munos is an immoral priest who pretends to be charitable and also expects to be applauded for a virtue he perverts.

Dramatic irony is heightened when Munos carries his viewpoint to an extreme degree of righteousness and turns from hypocritical justification to sarcastic comments against the Archbishop:

por que si el arçobispo tiene que es cosa que es maldad,
dexemos a las buenas E a las malas vos tornad.
(1707c,d) 93

He mocks the decree by implying that the Archbishop calls mal what is in his view an act of God; that if the Archbishop insists on being ridiculous, let the priests abandon protecting worthy women (las buenas) and turn their attention to the bad ones.

At a critical moment of the argument, Juan Ruiz introduces as his final speaker a hypocrite who pretends to a holiness that he does not at all possess. By way of defending himself against the accusation of concubinage, Munos reveals with the utmost candor and the greatest pride the stratagem which, despite a decree, enabled and perhaps

⁹³We find the same situation in the prologue to the Wife of Bath's Tale. The Wife of Bath defends both marriage and sexual indulgence by bringing God or the Gospel to her defense:

Wher can ye seye, in any manere age,
That hye God defended mariage
By express word? I pray yow, telleth me.
Or where comanded he virginitee?

(Robinson, 59-62)

As Munos rationalizes about orphan girls so the Wife of Bath rationalizes about the existence of man's generative members:

Telle me also, to what conclusion
Were members maad of generation,
And of so parfit wys a wight ywroght?
Trusteth right wel, they were not maad for noght.

(Ibid, 115-118)

will continue to enable priests to keep concubines. His explanation spells out the dichotomy between a pretense of Christian virtue or love (protecting an orphan) and the reality of vice and sinful love (keeping a concubine). This situation, in which a lewd priest attempts to justify his carnal action but in reality reveals the full truth, is characteristic of the dramatic irony in the whole Talavera episode: the reason all four clerics are upset is because they cannot go on pretending as before. This is the gist of the episode which interests Juan Ruiz, for the ridicule inherent in dramatic irony, if satirically employed, serves to expose and lay bare the real imposture of pretense: in Talavera ridicule does not become a test of truth but is humorous; it is an incongruity which surprises the mind, not one which disgusts it.

The satirical exposition of both the Consultatio and Talavera is based on two perceptions: the realistic view of priests as they keep concubines and the ideal concept of priests as they ought to conduct their lives. Dramatic irony is employed in both works to illustrate the disparity between what a priest appears to be and what he really is. We perceive a difference in the two works if we examine the motivating forces of their satire as expressed in the structure. The goliard's purpose of exposing the incongruous separation between appearance and reality in a priest's

daily habits is to arouse in the reader a sense of scorn at their hypocrisy; this purpose can, of course, be effectively achieved by an appeal to those emotions which we associate with cynicism. Cynicism results from the violent tone of the criticism, the realization that priestly conduct is motivated wholly by self-interest, and the implication that what appears to be good in priests is merely a sign of naivete on the part of the beholder or hypocrisy on the part of the priest. The cynical tone is reinforced by widespread agreement about what priests ought to be. In short, the exposition of a local concubinage is of interest in that it opens one's eyes to the general problem of perennial abuses among priests. Cynicism is related to the implication that priests are not religious at all, that they only pretend to be devout. Accordingly, the cynical tone excites the reader of this satire simultaneously to laugh at and also to scorn the hypocritical arguments involving concubinage.⁹⁴

Juan Ruiz inherits a situation of ridicule, the laughter of which can go beyond a mere undirected and capricious spirit of play; the laughter of the goliardic

⁹⁴It is inevitable that the consequences of the goliardic satire of priests would be contempt and scorn. Since the goliards were criticized by the Church, it was natural that they should in turn be cynical about priestly righteousness whenever such righteousness was only hypocrisy.

Consultatio is a mixture of ridicule and scorn that is closely allied to cynicism. Juan Ruiz first tightens the form of the story by reducing the speakers to four and by arranging their comments so that they present a progression from utter dismay to a pretence of innocence and righteousness. We can appreciate Juan Ruiz's technical skill if we now examine how his sense of the ridiculous overrides the sense of cynicism and thus prevents laughter from being converted into a serious critical reaction. We said earlier that the cynicism of the Consultatio depends on the relation between the topical issue of local concubinage and the general problem of priestly behavior. Juan Ruiz does not sustain this relation very regularly: the messenger (who brings the news that they must dispose of their "bar-raganas") represents the topical issue; the deacon shifts to the general problem whether priests should be considered as carnal or not; the treasurer refers to the topical issue by deciding to move elsewhere, but talks of the general problem when he mentions the effect of habitual love-making; Munos, finally, pretends to talk generally when he explains the pious act of protecting orphans but actually alludes to the immediate schemes used to keep concubines in Talavera. The progression of ironic revelations culminates in the last incident. After Muños' speech we are introduced to

another priest:

Don Gonçalo, canonigo, segund que vo entendiendo,
 Es este, que va de sus alfajas prendiendo,
 E van se las vesinas por el barrio desiendo
 que la acoge de noche en casa aun que se lo defiando.
 (1708).

The narrator interjects in the action for the first time to point out one priest who, in the face of the decree, still seeks concubines, i.e., he does not end with the general problem but with the way things are at Talavera. What eliminates cynicism above all is the ironic expression "aun que se lo defiando"⁹⁵ which parallels the famous "lo que non los conssejo" of the prose prologue, i.e., despite advice or orders, there are always those who will indulge in worldly love. Such a ridiculous climax elicits amusement and laughter, not cynicism and disgust.

In short, whereas a satire of immoral priests could easily become an attack which stresses contempt for them, the satiric attack of the Talavera episode spends itself in laughter almost devoid of cynicism. What stands out in the four speakers is the manner in which they justify their concubinage and the means they use to get around

⁹⁵Structurally, the first person is inexplicable. The narrator suddenly assumes powers over other clerics of Talavera. Could it be that the narrator is the messenger, also an arcipreste, who has the power to enforce the Archbishop's decree? It is only a speculation which adds to the humor of this satire. The exaggerated tone of the messenger parallels, in fact, the Archpriest's reaction to Trota's death.

ecclesiastical laws (disguising a willing woman as a servant, relative or orphan). Thus, while giving the impression that he deals with the problem of priestly behavior, Juan Ruiz avoids getting involved in a controversy such as the immorality of the clerics, of which he himself as the hero of the Libro is a prime example. The result is that humor takes the place of cynicism and rejection. Because Juan Ruiz employs wit, ridicule, and dramatic irony to relieve the naked intensity of indignation, he tips the side of the satirical balance so that cynicism expires and ridicule emerges.⁹⁶

⁹⁶I should like to suggest a structural role for the Talavera episode. Juan Ruiz is only an objective narrator. He separates himself, however, from the same problems which concern him throughout the Libro, i.e., a priest seeking ways of physical love. Thus the story serves a humorous purpose, but may also have a structural utility: it is a means of varying Juan Ruiz's angle of vision. As the Archpriest shows awareness of his "sinful" acts so does Munos show awareness of the disparity between orphans and concubines. The structure of the story also resembles that of the Libro: we have a realistic view of priests as they indulge in loco amor; this realism stands opposed to another quality with which it cannot be reconciled: the equally intense idealism of priests as they ought to be. He chooses a story which reflects the structure of the Libro, i.e., the unbridgeable disparity between the real experience of worldly love and the ideal perception of Christian charity. As in the Libro, this disparity is perceived with humor, not with indignation. Thus from a technical point of view, Juan Ruiz creates a comedy out of a traditional satire, but through allusions to the same problems and tensions of his Libro he recalls, and perhaps objectifies, his earlier ironic, moral judgments.

Summary: Juan Ruiz and the goliards: In my consideration of the goliardic tradition I have stressed the role of Juan Ruiz as a satirist; I have tried to examine his devices of satire and ridicule as a style and to show that in his elaboration of the goliardic criticism his satire in no way becomes bitter or cynical. His debt to the goliards is enormous and twofold. First, he owes them the situations themselves which, although full of excellent satirical commentary, invite further elaboration. Juan Ruiz enriches these satirical situations by sharpening ironical contrasts, by adding humorous incidents of his own, and by casting his satires in a more sustained narrative, fictional form. Juan Ruiz's second great debt to the goliards is a lesson in satiric technique. The satire of the goliards is striking even today because it is excellent in itself, and because of the goliards' healthy, communicative delight in good jokes and ridicules. Juan Ruiz, consistently faithful to his comments concerning "comedyr vs reyr," avoids any cynicism that might interfere with the delight of a joke.

We also had the opportunity to compare the satirical tone of Juan Ruiz with that of other medieval satirists, especially Pero López de Ayala. Juan Ruiz's satirical temper is expressed less directly, stressing humor, paradox, and irony more than rejection as Ayala does. There is a

great difference between the dramatic irony of Munos' self-revelation and the ironic self-revelation of Ayala's caballero who returns to court only to find everything changed, to undergo the insolence of new pages, and finally to hand himself over in the hands of a Jew.⁹⁷ Dramatic irony in Ayala's satire is painful, bitter and, above all, satirically meaningful. To be a true satirist, one must advance strong intellectual, moral, and social convictions. Ayala has them: because he knows or thinks he knows what is right, he rejects what he knows or thinks he knows is wrong with the church or the court. He is angry at the sins of others and disturbed at his own sins, for which he repents. In the satiric situations of the Libro, however, ambiguity, irony, and humor creep in, and Juan Ruiz does not feel free to say what is right or wrong, true or false.

⁹⁷ Rimado de Palacio, I. Copla 422:

Grant tiempo de mi vida pase mal dispendiendo,
A señores terrenales con grant cura sirviendo;
Agora ya lo veo ello vo entendiendo,
Que quien y mas trabaja, mas ira perdiendo.

Ayala exemplifies this opinion of the court with the example of the returning caballero whose comments reveal much of the existing conditions. He sells almost all he has to satisfy the greed of court officials and finally manages to obtain a warrant for payment of due salary which he can never collect.

Veome desanparado, que daria quanto he
"Señor--digo--tomad," ca vos juro enbuena fe
Que si algo me diere, esta cuenta tal fare,
Que me lo da de lo suyo, asi ge lo gradescere.

(I, 473)

This humiliation is only one part of the general corruption and degradation of the secular and religious powers.

Thus the one central justification of satire, rejection, weakens and is absorbed into the realm of humor on one hand and aesthetics on the other.

Satire involves judgment, and the judgment at the core of the feeling of indignation involves a conviction regarding righteousness. Indignation is the emotional realization of righteousness, and most medieval satirists have been moralists (see Huinzinga, op. cit.). Though Juan Ruiz's three satirical pictures about worldly love, corruption of money, and priestly abuses, if examined critically, are not attractive or cheerful, he does not yield to the morality of an Ayala, the cynicism of the goliards, or the derision of the fabliau writers because morality, cynicism and derision are directed against the very concept of enjoyment and laughter. His satire is constantly limited and tempered by an emphasis on amusement and a preoccupation with art.

4. Juan Ruiz and Invective: I should like to end the section concerning Juan Ruiz's art of amusement by considering his remarks about "non comedyr" in the light of his invective against Don Amor (182-422). In the Middle Ages invective was, as now, a specialized extension of satire. It was a device to attain condemnation by means of censorious expression and explicit denunciation. In the aforementioned section, the Archpriest heaps injury upon injury on Don Amor;

his verbal attack constitutes a savage ridicule and scathing censure designed to render "love" contemptible. The commentary is a combination of direct criticism and a fine stroke of ridicule. We see that Juan Ruiz knows how to manipulate invective like other medieval writers; he can villify an object directly and openly without recourse to wit and with no apparent attempt to arouse the comic spirit. He calls Amor's wiles poisonous; love's influence is deadly for it makes man lose body and soul; with disgust he continuously refers to Amor's victims as neçios or bobos; in short, he does not spare Amor.⁹⁸ The whole passage is a frontal attack on "Love"; it would seem that Juan Ruiz

⁹⁸ Among the extensive commentary, I shall reproduce some of the typical attacks on Don Amor:

- (1) Con engaños e lysonjas e sotiles mentiras
Empoçoñas las lenguas, enervolas tus viras; (183a,b)
- (2) En ti, fasta que el cuerpo e el alma van perder. (184d)
- (3) Quanto mas aqui estas, tanto mas me assaño;
Mas fallo que te diga, veyendo quanto dapño
Syenpre de ti me vino con tu sutil engaño:
Andas urdiendo sienpre, cobierto so mal paño. (216)
- (4) El ome por tus obras es mintroso e perjuro,
Por conplyr tu deseo faze lo herege duro;
Mas cree tus lysonjas el neçio hadeduro,
Que non la fe de dios: ¡vete, yo te conjuro! (389)
- (5) Das muerte perdurable a las almas que fieres,
Das muchos enemigos al cuerpo que rrequieres,
Fazes perder la fama al que mas amor dieres,
A dios pierde e al mundo, Amor, el que mas quieres.
(399)
- (6) Que non han de dios miedo nin de sus amenazas;
El diablo los lyeva preses en tus tenaças. (415c,d)

does not mingle his abuses with sufficient wit or even technical ingenuity to evoke any response other than the vehement emotion of anger and rage.⁹⁹ The substance of his invective is outright denunciation based on religious grounds; the Archpriest proceeds from the conviction that love is evil, hateful and, above all, lethal to a man's spiritual world.

The long invective represents, perhaps, the greatest enigma and obstacle in a consideration of Juan Ruiz's artistic skills. First, the major portion of it is a later interpolation which appears only in the manuscript

All the above and various other censorial comments lack ambiguity, irony, or a sense of humor.

⁹⁹What this invective seems to lack in general is the playfulness of Juan Ruiz which appears in *Mine* after line. There are, however, exceptions. An evidence of his skill is the shift between Amor as a person and Amor as love. 1) He addresses "love" as "ome grande" and the reader is made to feel his presence constantly. 2) He complains of the harms of love and does not wish his compaña (209a), i.e., "love" is both a person and an emotion. 3) Complete fusion of the two:

Ffazeslo andar bolando como la golondrina,
rrebuelveselo a menudo, sumal non adevina:
oras coyda en su saña, oras en Merjelina,
de diversas maneras tu queja lo espina. (211)

In "Your complaint pricks his heart," the Archpriest is complaining of love, i.e., he addresses Amor (tu) but fuses the person into the "emotion of love."

of Salamanca;¹⁰⁰ it is too long and in parts rather tedious.¹⁰¹ Secondly, with the exception of the first fabliau (about the youth who wished to marry three women), the exemplifying stories are fables which do not compare in originality and in execution with the other stories of the Libro.¹⁰² The critics either avoid considering this invective or merely refer to it as one of the serious and didactic sections of the Libro.¹⁰³ I would like to offer some suggestions

¹⁰⁰Stanzas 139-329 are not in ms G and T. This section includes the vision of the Archpriest in which he is visited by Don Amor, the consequent attack, and the connection of the seven deadly sins with Don Amor and the corresponding fables. See Lecoy, op. cit., pp. 37-49, and J. Ducamin, op. cit., pp. XLIX-LV.

¹⁰¹Even many of the images are ordinary and lack subtlety:

So la piel del oveja trayes dientes de lobo,
al que una vez travas, llevastelo en robo. (420a,b)

¹⁰²The fables and stories are about the Frogs who asked for a king, the Dog who carried a piece of meat in his mouth, about the Horse and the Ass, the Wolf and the Crane, the Eagle and the Hunter, the Peacock and the Crow, the Lion and the Horse, and the irate Lion. Only in the story of the Horse and the Ass, where he uses ironically the ubi sunt theme (see Chapter I, note 27) does Juan Ruiz demonstrate better than ordinary skill.

¹⁰³Lecoy traces the origin of the fables but does not comment on the invective itself; María Rosa Lida utilizes some of the lines of the invective (415c,d for example) as proof of the Libro's didactic intent; Gybbon-Monypenny ("Autobiography," op. cit., p. 16), is the only one to express concern about the length of the interpolation but does not attempt any concrete interpretation. The general opinion is that, like the prologue, it is something of an afterthought.

concerning the comments which constitute invective against Don Amor, for I believe that some of the arguments I presented in connection with satire are also applicable here. We should recall first Juan Ruiz's habit of deviating from elements which have a serious purpose; next, we should review the inevitable affinities between satire and humor;¹⁰⁴ and finally, we should consider the fact that, being medieval, Juan Ruiz was especially aware of the proximity of satire to the comic since comedy and satire were considered to be intimately related genres.¹⁰⁵ Three elements within the invective lessen considerably the intensity of moral feeling and create a lighter tone which is, according to Juan Ruiz, a necessary precondition to humor. All three show that Juan Ruiz develops certain techniques which dissociate himself as a serious critic or priest, and consequently dissociate his moral indignation, from any direct vis-a-vis relationship with the object of attack, love.

(1) The enumeration of the seven capital sins, a part of

¹⁰⁴"For the present, there is no necessity for disentangling the exact relationships of irony and humor and satire, but it should be acknowledged that they are of the same stuff and belong to one family," David Worcester, The Art of Satire (New York, 1960), p. 34.

¹⁰⁵There is a study which traces historically the ideas expressed concerning comedy from Isidore onward: Edwin S. Weber, "Comedy as Satire," HR, XXVI (1958), 1-11.

elementary theology and typical of medieval didacticism, forms the essential part of the violent invective; the Archpriest blames Don Amor as the principal fomenter of those sins which are the enemies of the soul. Juan Ruiz uses the capital sins as a kind of amplification, that traditional figure of rhetoric which here consists in the heaping and enlarging of those accusations against love. Juan Ruiz's plan appears to follow tradition closely: "En effet, ce plan, dans sa simplicité, se présentait à l'esprit de tout le monde; c'est celui de tous les catéchismes en latin ou en langue vulgaire qu'on pouvait avoir entre les mains" (Lecoy, p. 178). Lecoy moreover argues that Juan Ruiz's presentation lacks originality or art: ". . . toute souci de la note pittoresque ou vivante, du détail vécu ou personnel fait défaut" (p. 178).

There is, however, an innovation. To refrain from the capital sins forms the basis of practical Christian morality;¹⁰⁶ they are used especially in personal confessions, in debates against existing conditions and plights of moral corruption.¹⁰⁷ They are represented as emanating, like

¹⁰⁶" . . . Un développement sur les péchés capitaux faisait partie obligatoire de tous les traités en prose ou en vers consacrés à l'exposition des principaux points de la foi et des règles essentielles de la vie chrétienne" (Lecoy, p. 176).

¹⁰⁷ Pero López de Ayala uses them in his confession (Rimado de Palacio, I, 63-126); also Pérez de Guzmán;

branches from the trunk of a tree, from one principal sin which is usually pride, the sin associated with Lucifer.¹⁰⁸

Juan Ruiz is the first to relate the capital sins to worldly love, i.e., the first to argue that love is the root out of which branch the sins that destroy the soul of man.¹⁰⁹ This innovation, more than a deliberate exaggeration for the purpose of critical emphasis, becomes incongruous in that it misrepresents the harmful effects and evils of love by overemphasizing them. It would be appropriate in an invective to express the belief that love is harmful, and to do so overtly in scolding, maligning, and debasing terms. Since the tendency is towards the expression of an emotional extreme, it is natural that the Archpriest tends

Juan de Mena uses them in a debate between Reason and Will. The usual process is to give an abstract definition of the sin, its harmful consequences, and then offer an example from history or the Bible.

¹⁰⁸"Ceux-ci avaient, en effet, coutume de symboliser la filiation et les rapports des différents péchés entre eux par un arbre dont le tronc ou la racine représentait le péché essentiel capable de donner naissance à tous les autres, et les branches, parfois ramifiées à l'infini, la descendance de plus en plus lointaine de ce péché initial. Cette image semble apparaître pour la première fois dans un traité d'Hugues de Saint-Victor (1096-1141)" (Lecoy, pp. 173-174).

¹⁰⁹Martínez de Toledo in the following century, influenced by the Libro, also describes the ravages of mortal sins as the result of carnal love. See Corbacho, first part, Chapters XXI-XXVII.

to magnify and exaggerate the viciousness of love and finds his vocabulary in the lexicon of hyperbole and coarsely abusive language.

The incongruity of blaming "love" as the fomenter of mortal sins results in humor because of "disproportion." For example, in accusing love of being the source of pride, the Archpriest calls Amor a highwayman and rapist: "Ffazes con tu sobervia cometer malas cosas, / rrobar camineros las joyas preçiosas, / forçar muchas mugeres cassadas e esposas" (231a,b,c); he next makes him responsible for Lucifer's fall, "Muchos por tu soberbia los feziste perder; / primero muchos angeles, con ellos Luçifer" (233a,b).

There follows a series of ridiculous and ironic misrepresentations: Amor's inordinate desire to wealth makes him so miserly (247-248) that he refuses to give to the poor ("quando vees al poble, caesete el cejo, / fazes como el lobo dolyente en el vallejo" 251c,d); being envious of the good of others, he gets into fights ("Entras en la pelea, non puedes della salyr" 280a) and is connected to Cain's murder of Abel (281); Amor is irreligious in that he never fasts ("desque te conosçí, nunca te vy ayuntar" 292a); his ambition and vainglory make him seek temporal power (305); his irrascibility compares only with that of Sampson and Saul who killed themselves (308-309). The above and many other accusations based on the seven deadly

sins are not at all related to the original purpose of the attack which is that love, because it promises rewards but does not fulfill them, causes a lot of misery.

A necessary precondition to successful invective is the accuser's level-headedness which prevents exaggeration from becoming incongruity. Where there is such critical incongruity and where accusations are directed against something ambiguous or irrelevant, the invective loses its punch. It seems that accusing love of a wrong with which it is not at all connected makes much of Juan Ruiz's invective nullify itself in its excessive zeal. As we saw on other occasions, the relation between accuser and the object of attack is here so out of proportion, and yet expressed with so much matter-of-factness, that the reader may conclude that the verbal abuse involving the capital sins is a humorous more than a serious exaggeration. Disproportion, especially if incongruous, does not beget critical rejection, for the reader suspects that the Arch-priest himself is somewhat detached from any real anger.

(2) Although Juan Ruiz does not sport playfully with language in this invective as he does elsewhere, he, nevertheless, cannot resist the delight of sheer verbal ingenuity if the opportunity presents itself. Throughout the attack, he addresses Amor in person and calls him names; many of these names are used as epithets and give

Amor a vividness, full of gusto and exuberance. Although the description of love is part of the invective, the piling up of these often vulgar epithets gives an effusiveness and gaiety to the invective which takes the edge off the Archpriest's moral indignation. Thus Amor is successively called a treacherous swine (the epic epithet "alevoso traydor" 220a), a trickster (hilarious application of the vulgar term, cuquero, 22c), a thief and rapist, wretched and mean (mesquino used ironically, 249a), crazy and uncontrolled, jealous and rancorous (277), gluttonous (291b) and gourmand (laminero, the comic version of gluttonous, one who has a sweet tooth), ravenous and carnivorous ("lobo carnigero," the exaggerated image of voraciousness), open-mouthed (bocabierto, the comic image of greediness, a belly-slave), laggard or, rogue (the vulgar term "follon" 307d) with its exact contrary not an idler ("nunca esta baldio" 318a), lawyer ("abogado de fuero" used ironically, for he defends wrong causes, 320d), evil adversary (372c), fearless (in the sense of shameless, 391a), vagabond (again a slang, golhin, 393a), a giant in promises a dwarf in giving (401a,b), snarer (bretador, one who sets traps, 406a), destroyer (416a), deceiving (416b) and consequently lover (941c,d), and even the fantastic usurer ("logrero de rrenuevo," 422b). Most of the above constitute a conglomeration of inappropriate, stretched, ironical epithets, with an intermingling of common slang terms and

with hilarious connotations.

The above names are meant to exaggerate the corruptive powers of love, to ridicule Amor as a personality and thus to reinforce the criticism of the invective. However, seen in its effect upon the reader, this catalogue of abusive terms stimulates, through its very exaggeration and misapplication, our laughter more than our contempt and serves comedy more than invective. Together, they impart a feeling of profusion which lessens considerably their latent satirical intensity.

(3) Finally, the structure itself of the invective contributes to lessen its serious effect if we recall first that the Archpriest breaks into this abusive discourse because he is personally discouraged by his repeated failures with love and, second, that Don Amor answers him by explaining to him that he has gone the wrong way about succeeding in love, i.e., he never even considers the Archpriest's abuse as a result of moral indignation. In fact, careful examination of the structure reveals that the invective is interspersed with personal complaints which result in an oscillation between an attack on "love" because it harms the soul, and an attack on "love" because it has not satisfied the Archpriest's expectations of success. Following is a series of comments by the Archpriest which serve to remove both

author and reader from any strong moral indignation.

(a) The Archpriest introduces the invective by explaining clearly that it is not unusual for him to be angry at love:

Ca, segund vos he dicho, de tal ventura seo,
que si lo faz' mi signo o ssy mi mal asseo,
nunca puedo acabar lo medio que deseo:
por esto a las vegadas con el amor peleo.
(180)

He thus tells us that he fights with Amor not because of moral indignation but because he cannot succeed in seduction.

(b) While introducing Amor's appearance in a vision, the Archpriest reiterates his personal anger, not his objections to love's irreligiosity:

pensando en mi ventura, sañudo e non con vino
un ome grande, fermoso, mesurado a mi vino:
(181b,c)

Con saña que tenia fuylo a denostar.
(182a)

Thus he begins insulting Amor because he is angry at his own failures.

(c) He next accuses "love" of not serving well those in love.

al que mejor te syrve, a el fieres, quando tiras,
parteslo del amiga al ome que ayras.
(183c,d)

By implication, the Archpriest has been encouraged in love but has not been rewarded. It is here that the Archpriest develops the motif of "promise vs. disappointment" and expands it so that Amor appears guilty of every conceivable sin among men.

(d) Immediately before embarking on the amplification of the capital sins, the Archpriest, again for personal reasons interrupts his invective. He has related two stories to demonstrate that love saps man's strength and that it causes his perdition for it makes him demand too many things. He next argues that love, by cunning, enslaves one's heart. Then, suddenly:

Responde, ¿que te fiz? ¿por que me non diste dicha
en quantas que ame nin de la dueña bendicha?
de quanto me prometie, luego era desdicha:
 (215a,b,c)

Again his attack emanates from his own shortcomings as a lover.

(e) After enumerating the capital sins, he ends his invective and explains to Amor the reason why he does so:

mucho mas te diria, salvo que non m'atrevo.
 (421d)

Porque de muchas dueñas mal querido seria,
 (422a)

His concern at the end of the invective is not moral or righteous at all; he worries for fear that his abuses may ruin his chances of success with women. The Archpriest thus opens and closes his invective strictly with a personal note and not with a moral-satirical preoccupation.

(f) Finally, Don Amor responds only to this personal revelation of the Archpriest. He counsels him to avoid anger and offers two reasons:

que alas vezes poca agua faze abaxar grand fuego.
 (423d)

One, anger is not conducive to physical love and love is obviously why the Archpriest is conversing with Amor. Two, if he listens carefully to his advice, he will succeed in love:

ssy mis dichos fazes, non te dira muger non.
(425d)

Thus Don Amor bluntly treats the Archpriest as a lover and his invective as a personal frustration. The above comments indicate a dissimulation on the part of the Archpriest (a common rhetorical device): he appears to be an indignant priest in his invective against the harms of physical love while making it apparent to his adversary that he is also something quite different, i.e., a frustrated lover.

We can conclude from the above evidence, I believe, that when Juan Ruiz employs invective he includes some "sly indirection of technique"¹¹⁰ which relieves and interrupts the pattern of contemptuous indignation. He manages to make the reader reflect: capital sins vs. love; humorous-abusive epithets; personal comments. Such temporary relief makes it possible for contempt to be absorbed by humor, for it removes the object of the invective from serious consideration (comedy). Juan Ruiz's most violent attack against loco amor in the whole Libro is, therefore, not without an

¹¹⁰The term is borrowed from J. M. Bullitt, op. cit., in his analysis of the problems concerning the form of serious satire.

element of conscious and technical indirection. Consequently, at the end of his violent attack, in spite of the intensity of feelings usually appropriate in an invective, we see the Archpriest concluding his invective with a very ironic and witty remark, to the effect that he could continue heaping abuses, but will not because of practical purposes; he does not want women to get angry with him. It is such ironic statements, typical of the Libro's commentary, that immediately detach Juan Ruiz from complete moral seriousness and prepare the way for humor.

Summary: The Libro as a source of entertainment: We began this section by considering certain comments of Juan Ruiz to the effect that serious and meditating topics cause boredom, while humorous stories are good because one does not have to take them seriously except, perhaps, in the way they are written. By implication, then, one of the poet's functions is to entertain people (give them solaz) and save them from the sin of boredom. If, next, we ask ourselves what Juan Ruiz knew about entertainment, a short answer would be that he knew every tradition of amusement, everything that was known and practiced during his time. In the Libro, he includes almost the whole humorous body of the Middle Ages, assuming as easily the role of jongleur, as that of goliard, trouvère, satirist, and clerical writer;

everything comes within his power of expression, the antics of a minstrel, the sacrilegious punning of a goliard, the bawdiness of a fabliau writer, the ridicule and the dramatic irony of a satirist, the indignation of a moralist. No other Spanish author until Cervantes and Quevedo has a comparable range of entertainment and humorous expression. But it is not only a question of range, variety, and subtlety in his art of amusement that has concerned us; it is also the conscious workmanship applied to his writing and his awareness of it. It is for this reason that I selected to interpret some of his stories as art-structures: the comic element is always related to the art of its expression, i.e., the practice of Juan Ruiz verifies his theory. Many tales (the fables, for example) hitherto interpreted in the light of exempla, "didactic demonstrations," and "traditional analogues," could be fruitfully reexamined, in the light of Juan Ruiz's "salvo en la manera del trobar," as artistic constructs.

The humorous element is everywhere present in the Libro; it releases itself in a multiplicity of ways which give humor both form and purpose. Sometimes it is a sly comment, other times an open guffaw, while frequently a fine point dissolves in a burst of laughter. It is laughter without malice or cynicism, laughter for the sake of amusement and entertainment, comparable, perhaps, to the wild puns of

Rabelais two centuries later. His stories and comments are, therefore, offered not for instructive or corrective purposes but rather for wholehearted enjoyment. This attempt to entertain, to amuse, to laugh at vices rather than to be indignant about them, combined with the insistence to write well, is evident in the exploitation of traditional comic techniques so diverse and penetrating that Juan Ruiz stands apart from all other medieval writers of humor. Yet, in his achievement, he nevertheless includes most of the humorous outlets (satire, invective, moralities, etc) and techniques of his time. It is remarkable how Juan Ruiz utilizes that tradition of moral satire which is related to the comic exactly in the manner he claimed it would be, i.e., he has divested it of its serious purpose so that he can say to the reader "non quieras comedyr," and has polished and sharpened its style and form so that the reader may consider its "manera del trobar e dezir." In short: if a story arouses a serious reaction, it fails to please and entertain; if a story is not too serious and does not cause meditation, then it becomes a burla that can entertain; the most successful way for a burla to accomplish its goal of entertainment is to be well-structured and well-written. This is, in essence, both the theory and the practice of Juan Ruiz's humorous stories.

III

The Libro and Rhetoric

After his comments concerning entertainment and manner of composition, and following the story about the dispute between the Greeks and the Romans, the Archpriest introduces another aspect of his role as a writer:

saber bien e mal, desir encobierto e doñeguil	ms G.
tu non fallaras uno de trobadores mill.	"desir
(65c,d)	bien"

To say something well, subtly, or elegantly was a quality which, in the Middle Ages, was associated with rhetoric. Juan Ruiz, for example, refers to his power of description which derives from his use of rhetoric. He reinforces this idea by comparing his descriptive skill to that of a tailor who knows how to mend well:

rremendar bien non sabe todo alfayate nuevo:
a' trobar con locura non creas que me nuevo;
(66b,c)

The image of a tailor, like a rhetor, is used as the simple equivalent of skillful poet. Like an experienced tailor, he will not compose in a hap-hazard way; he will be as careful and ordered in his writing as a tailor is with his mending. A writer could boast of his skillful or artistic use of language by pointing out that he could handle rhetorical figures (simile, metaphor, personification, allegory, symbol, etc) which convert what is common and crude into

something literary or artistic.¹¹¹

Although critics constantly discuss the style of Juan Ruiz--the keenness of observation, the depth of understanding popular expressions, the richness of humor, the skill of imagery, the ironic twist, i.e., all the things which help to make Juan Ruiz a great writer--little systematic attention has been paid to his use of language as rhetoric. It is simply assumed that the rules of rhetoric have an enormous effect on the formation of Juan Ruiz's style:

"La obediencia a las normas de la retórica, elemento común

¹¹¹ Almost all medieval poets were familiar with rhetoric: "In the Middle Ages, whoever aspired to become a poet (dictator) had to learn poetics (the ars dictamini)" Curtius, p. 247. Knowledge of rhetorical procedure was usually associated with the capacity of a poet to use artifice in order to describe elements so that they would become more attractive. Chaucer, for example, like Juan Ruiz's "saber bien...desir," stresses the skill needed to describe the beauty of someone:

It moste been a rethor excellent . . .

If he shoulde hire descryven every part.

(The Squire's Tale)

A further comment considers even the study of appropriate gesture:

And, for his tale shoulde seem the bettre,
Accordant to his wordes was his cheere,
As techeth art of speche hem that it leere.

(The Squire's Tale)

Juan Ruiz makes allusions which are customarily related to rhetoric. For example, he is conscious of rhetoric when he evaluates his capacity to describe the interior of a tent:

En la obra de dentro ay tanto de fazer,
que, si lo dezir puedo, merescere el beber.

(1269c,d)

He later credits Amor's literary skill of brevity to the fact that he is "letrado," i.e., learned and, by implication, trained in rhetoric.

El mi Señor Amor, como ome letrado,

en sola una palabra puso todo el tratado. [copla in G]
(1299a,b)

de la enseñanza medieval, estrecha la vinculación de Juan Ruiz con toda la clerecía europea, y explica la presencia de unas mismas características en toda la literatura de la época" (María Rosa Lida, Edición con estudio, p. 22).¹¹² In fact, examples of almost every figure of rhetoric can be found in the Libro.

Rhetoric was, and still is, a body of learning that insisted on the recognition of artifice; a literary expression was considered as a "thing made."¹¹³ There appeared

¹¹²"The cursus was revived at the papal curia in the twelfth century and soon spread from there to the chanceries of cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and even to lay courts" L. J. Paetow, The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric, Univ. of Illinois Studies, Vol. III, No. 7 (Urbana, Champaign, 1910), p. 73.

¹¹³A constant problem in evaluating the style of a medieval author such as Juan Ruiz is that "we still know too little today to give a comprehensive historical presentation of the theory of poetry" (Curtius, op. cit., p. 468). The various difficulties connected with medieval rhetorical studies have been amply discussed. C. S. Baldwin, in Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (New York, 1928), points out that dialectic was dominant and that rhetoric was crowded in medieval education between grammar for boys and dialectic for men (p. 182). He claims that there was no medieval rhetorician who really advanced the study and that the history of rhetoric during the Middle Ages is the account of its misapplications and extensions, such as poetic, for example, being a misapplication of rhetoric to style (pp. 191-195). Richard Mckeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Speculum, 17 (1942), traces the history of rhetoric very carefully and points out that there was no precision in the definition of rhetoric although there were various treatises which dealt with the appropriate manner of literary expressions. "Yet if rhetoric is defined in terms of a single subject matter--such as style, or literature, or discourse--it has no history during the Middle Ages" (p. 32).

several artes poeticae which greatly influenced vernacular writers. "Every educated person in the fourteenth century knew them and admired those who knew how to use them."¹¹⁴ They had come down from Roman times and reached a second flowering in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The scholars of the time, notably Matthieu de Vendôme (1170) and Geoffroi de Vinsauf (1210), had assembled all the known traditions of rhetoric in a number of prose treatises and illustrative verses.¹¹⁵ The general heading under which particular stylistic devices were recommended was that of amplificatio, the art of enlarging and embellishing one's matter. Most educated persons in the fourteenth century

¹¹⁴Nevill Goghill, Geoffrey Chaucer (London, 1956), pp. 15-16. Because of an intimate symbiosis of Latin and vernacular literatures in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, these learned treatises are very important for Romance literature.

¹¹⁵Edmund Faral (op. cit.) traces most of the documents which explain the literary techniques of the Middle Ages and presents some of the doctrines which explain the art of writing in all its manifestations: invention and choice of theme; development; arrangement of ideas; style. He analyzes their importance: "La littérature des XII et XIII siècles a été fortement influencée par les règles de cette sorte" (p. 90). One preoccupation of these writers is the ornament of style and the use of tropes; they stress the use of words "dans un sens différent de leur sens propre" (p. 89), and encourage ingenuity. Matthieu de Vendôme's works seek to further the writing of Latin descriptive verse. For him, poetry is mainly description which proceeds from dilation; the main concern of poetry is style which is regarded as decoration. Geoffroi de Vinsauf devotes most of his book (Poetria Nova) to the rhetorical means of dilation. He elaborates on the apostrophe and description.

knew the guiding principles of the devices of amplificatio. When Juan Ruiz refers to rhetoric (encubierto, doñeguil), he means the craft of writing, the arts and devices by which his subject matter could best be varied, clarified, made more subtle, and elaborated.

Although Juan Ruiz shows awareness of the figures of rhetoric and even though he constantly uses them, he should not be considered as simply a technical rhetorician. His ever-present jocularity alone and his use of popular language lessen considerably complete rhetorical dependence. Much that is rhetorical in the Libro is really, as María Rosa Lida correctly points out, one manifestation or another of the spirit of the age.¹¹⁶ The medieval rhetoricians were, after all, in part holding to the traditions of the classical rhetoricians as they understood them, and in part formulating the literary manners and customs of their contemporaries; they did not create or direct; they simply codified. We may,

¹¹⁶María Rosa Lida's discussion of the Libro's rhetorical devices is very sound (Edición con estudio, pp. 22-25). They are not examined, however, as evidence of Juan Ruiz's artistic skill (which is my preoccupation) but as evidence that the stylistic structure of the Libro follows a rhetorical pattern typical of the Middle Ages. "La que fácilmente predomina en el Libro es la variación retórica (reflejo estilístico de la ejemplificación doctrinal) en todas sus formas" (p. 22). Leo Spitzer ("En torno," op. cit.) examines some of the rhetorical devices (such as the "portrait" or "proverbs" or "names") in order to demonstrate that Juan Ruiz's use of rhetoric, like that of other medieval authors such as Dante or Marie de France, is related to his didactic intentions.

consequently, appreciate Juan Ruiz's rhetorical processes as good specimens of a recognized technique or, by examining his innovations, appreciate his originality and uniqueness. Though many conclusions about the style of Juan Ruiz (graphic, pictorial, humorous, ironic), may be, in large part, correct, they do not offer, even in their aggregate, a good indication of his skill, originality, and, especially, his awareness of manipulating rhetoric. To investigate parts of the Libro in terms of rhetoric is to examine Juan Ruiz's own way of manifesting rhetorical devices.

1. Rhetorical devices: There were eight or ten principal ways of enlarging and embellishing one's literary matter, some with as many as four sub-divisions.¹¹⁷ I will examine some of the major ones (Apostrophatio, Occupatio, Digressio, Interpretatio) in light of Juan Ruiz's comments on rhetoric, especially the term encubierto. His intention is not only to present things well and elegantly but also subtly. Encubierto is to the Libro's style what sotil is to its meaning. Juan Ruiz exploits the ironic possibilities of the traditional devices of rhetoric so that his figures of speech strategically placed almost always suggest more than one meaning.

¹¹⁷C. S. Baldwin (op. cit. pp. 304-305) lists most of them under the heading figurae verborum.

A. Apostrophatio: This rhetorical figure usually has three to four subdivisions: a simple exclamation of feeling (exclamatio): "¡Ay! señora dona venus ssea de vos ayudado" (603d); various forms of a rhetorical question (subjetio and dubitatio): "¿tu que faras, el dia de la afruenta, / quando de tus aueres E de tu mucha rrenta / te demandare dios dela despenssa cuenta?" (249a,b,c); and a series of exclamations each beginning with the same phrase (conduplicatio) "quanto mas te usare menos te presciara / quanto mas te provare menos te amara" (310c,d). The essential characteristic of the apostrophe is a direct address to a person in the narrative, to the reader, or to an imaginary audience; its value is to impart a sense of immediacy and create a dramatic effect. The Libro sparkles with apostrophes; they vary the means of engaging the attention of the hearers and reinforce the ironic and humorous position which Juan Ruiz assumes toward his didactic subject-matter. Following are some examples.

1) The Archpriest is ever ready to ask questions which he proceeds to answer:

(a) He uses the apostrophe to effect "sarcasm" in describing his incapable messenger, Don Furon:

¿non tenie que comer? ¡Ayunava el pecador!
 ¿Non podia comer? ¡Ayunava con dolor!
 (1621b,c) [MS T]

The ironic question and answer capture the contempt for his boasting; it is above all a humorous, keen taunt of Furon's helplessness as a messenger.

(b) The Archpriest describes his own relation to Dona Endrina in a tone meant to awaken feelings of sympathy:
 "cuytado yo que fare que non la puedo catar?" (590b);
 "Coytado sy escapare, grand miedo he de ser muerto!" (651a).
 Both questions and exclamations are overstatements of his feelings and tend to be melodramatic; they suggest theatricality more than authentic sentiments. This special use of the apostrophe is one of Juan Ruiz's favorite devices for humorous exaggeration; he is a master of the pseudo-sentimental style. Note the speeches of Trotaconventos: "Diz' la vieja: "¿Que nuevas? ¿Que se yo que es del? / ¡mesquino e magrillo! ¡non ay mas carne en el / que en pollo yverniso despues de Sant Miguel!" (829b,c,d).

2) The Archpriest reacts to situations with a feigned pathos and thus through overstatement reveals an attitude of humorous affectation rather than deep sorrow:

(a) "¿qual carrera tomare que me non vaya matar?"
 (590a),¹¹⁸ "¿Non veen los vuestros ojos la mi triste catadura?"

¹¹⁸ One must keep in mind Juan Ruiz's tendency to parody whatever is overly sensational or emotional. If a sentimental situation smacks of melodrama, he exaggerates such features as exclamations and questions. Thus Pamphilus exclaims: "Quam prius ipse uiam meliorem carpere possum?"

(605a); "¿qual es la dueña tan brava E tan dura / que al su seruidor non le faga medida?" (606a,b); "¡Ay vieja mata amigos para que me lo dixistes!" (783c).

(b) The same theatrical tone is also evident in exclamations. For example he addresses his eyes solemnly: "penaredes, mis ojos, penar e amortescer" (788d). Trota also overstates: "su color amarillo, la su faz mudada" (831c).

(c) A series of questions produces the same effect. "varon, que as conmigo? ¿qual fue aquel mal debdo, / que tanto me persigues? . . ." (213a,b). The irony here lies in that it is the Archpriest who pursues love, as he admits. "¿por que matas el cuerpo do tyenes tu morada? / ¿por que amas la dueña que non te precia nada?" (786c,d). The series of questions is meant to portray his condition as imminent, as though his misfortunes with love are so acute that any relief must occur immediately. In the same way the style of Pamphilus is often comically transposed.

(i.e., what is the best [and preferred] way one could take?) (line 7); Juan Ruiz imitates this line but exaggerates the meaning with the verb matar: "¿qual carrera tomare, que me non vaya matar?" (590a). (All citations from Pamphilus come from Gustave Cohen's, La "Comédie" latine en France au XII^e siècle; textes établis et traduits, t. II [Paris, 1931], pp. 167-225. Pamphilus is translated into French by Eugène Èvèsque.)

3) The conduplicatio was generally used in serious invocations.¹¹⁹ Juan Ruiz varies it to express comically a state of great distress and affliction and to make a plea for aid and intercession. The Archpriest exclaims his reaction to the bad news of Trota by repeatedly beginning or ending a stanza with the lament Ay. He again imitates the style of Pamphilus¹²⁰ but increases the theatricality:

¡Ay de mí! ¡con que cobro tan malo me venistes! (783a)

¹¹⁹ A typical use of conduplicatio is seen in Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde:

Lo here, of payens corsed olde rites,
Lo here, what alle hire goddes may availle!
Lo here, these wretched worldes appetites!
Lo here, the fyn and guerdoun for travaille
Of Jove, Apollo, of Mars, of swich rascaille!

(Book V, 1849-1853)

Juan Ruiz likes the use of anaphora; he uses it, above all, in imparting advice. Usually the fourth line sums up what is emphasized by the repetition of the word:

Non uses con vellacos nyn seas peleador,
Non quieras ser caçurro nin seas escarnidor,
nyn seas de tí mismo e de fechos loador
ca el que mucho se alaba, de sí mismo es denostador.

(557)

Sey como la paloma, limpio e mesurado,
sey como el pauon, loçano, sosegado,
sey cuerdo, non sañudo, nin triste nin yrado:
En esto se esmera el qu' es enamorado.

(563)

¹²⁰ In Pamphilus this same verbal exchange (451-462) is an obvious exaggeration for the purpose of emphasizing the strong emotion behind Pamphilus' assertion which the old woman (Anus) exploits so she can reiterate her need for money. In the Libro, the emotional exaggeration is humorous, since the question of money is not stressed as in Pamphilus. I'll examine this point in the analysis of Trotaconventos. The Libro offers several cases of a distorted reflexion of the long-winded, grandiose style of rhetorical sentimentality.

¡Ay, viejas pytofleras, malapresas seades! (784a)
 ¡ay! que todos mis mienbros comiençan a tremer (785a)
 ¡Ay, coraçon quevoso, cosa desaguisada! (786a)
 ¡Ay, ojos, los mis ojos! ¿por que vos fuestes poner
 en dueña . . . (788a)

Ay, lengua syn ventura! por que quieres desir (789a)
 ay, cuerpo tan penado, como te vas a moryr! (789d)

He ends his series of lamentations by addressing women, the cause of his suffering:

ay muertas vos veades de tal Ravia e dolor!
 (790d)

The dolorous apostrophe to himself, to his Trota, to his limbs, heart, eyes, tongue, afflicted body, and to women pretends to portray a profoundly unhappy and miserable person who is suffering because he loves in vain. The irony of this state of wretchedness is seen first in the deliberately exaggerated tone of the lover's complaints, and second in Trota's taunting answer to all his expressions of grief:

Diz: "Loco, que avedes, que tanto vos quexades?
 por ese quexo vano vos nada non ganades."
 (792a,b)

She treats his apostrophe as a useless outburst. Like Trota, we need not take the Archpriest's exclamations of pain too seriously; it is his way of making fun of himself.¹²¹

¹²¹Exaggeration is, of course, one of the trademarks of Juan Ruiz's style: "Non te puedo prender, ¡ tanta es tu maestria!" (214a); "tu cada que ami prendes, ¡ tanta es tu orgullya!" (214c. He abounds in hyperboles.

4) The implied answers to rhetorical exclamations or questions often serve as criticism:

- (a) ¡Quien podrie dezir quantos loxuria mata!
 ¡quien dirie tu forniçio e tu mala barata!
 (275a,b)

The implication is that the victims of Love are numerous.

- (b) Talante de mugeres ¡quien lo puede entender,
 Sus malas maestrias e su mucho saber?
 (469a,b)

Don Amor's seeming criticism is amusing since he is implying that women are all wiles, yet he is praising and recommending them. The Libro abounds with similar innocently-stated observations which are very effective in creating irony; they are often inoffensive, yet introduced with feigned seriousness and with the "shock of revelation."

5) Juan Ruiz's most effective use of apostrophe is to introduce a point gradually, artfully, and indirectly. Thus what appears to be a straight, innocent, or obvious comment becomes an ironic thrust full of indirect hints, implications, and suggestions.

(a) He poses an insinuating question in the midst of a critical consideration in order to point out the absurdity of an existing situation. For example, by alluding to parallel cases, he questions the fact the ignorant clerics are allowed to hear confessions and accept penitence. The technique is to substitute, for the answer to the problem

of ignorance, a question which suggests incongruity:

¿que poder ha en Roma el juez de cartagena,
que juzgara en françia el alcalde de rrequena?
(1146)

The rhetorical questions insinuate a situation of the blind leading the blind.

(b) There is often a pause in mid-story to reflect upon the human condition and the world. (1) The Archpriest muses about the good and bad of worldly love. "dixe yo: ' que buen manjar, sy non por el escotar!'" (944d). The "yes, but" formula is typical of his paradoxes. (2) The Archpriest pauses to explain to us why he asked Trota to fetch him a woman: "ca solo syn conpañã era penada vida" (1317d). He likes to apply general statements to his specific and immediate plights or needs. Or, he will pause to make a general comment on life which is of immediate interest to him: "Como es natural cosa el nasçer e el moryr" (943a). With this he explains the death of a woman whom Trota had already procured successfully for him. He philosophizes about life in order to point out the irony of his situation: he lost a woman after all the efforts of Trota to convince her. By altering the normal context of generalizations, he can make serious reflective comments trivial.

(c) Juan Ruiz often ends a story or a commentary with an exclamation which is an understatement of what should be

obviously true, given the evidence of the story or the emphasis of the commentary. (1) After arguing that experience proves that the love of women is pleasurable, he asks the readers to remember similar cases in their lives or personal experience: "provar ome las cosas non es por ende peor" (76c). This is a mock modest tendency to explain his actions. (2) After describing in detail the physical advantages of a small woman, he suggestively teases: "mejor es en la prueba, que en la salutaçion" (1616d). (3) The value of understatement for humorous effect is illustrated by his warning to the audience (didactic use of apostrophe) when he describes a beast-woman: "los que quieren casarse, aqui non sean sordos!" (1014d). (4) He sums up a point by evaluating his own moral advice. "Non puede ser que non yerre ome en grand Raçon" (949c). This is a very wistful way for him to apologise for possible overstatements. He thus manages to relax the reader and to lessen the didacticism of his commentary. (5) Juan Ruiz is especially amusing when he ends an argument with an understated rationalization. Thus he (or Melón) explains why he would have no hopes of enjoying Doña Endrina if she were to get married: "ffasta que su marido pueble el çementerio, / non casara con migo ca serie adulterio" (795a,b). The manner of delivery is amusing because the pause momentarily establishes a tension of expectation, a kind of suspense, which is relieved not

with the expected kind of statement but rather with an understatement.

(d) At times an exclamation, reflection or question ends a story or argument so abruptly that the conclusion becomes ironic and bewildering. (1) He ends his story about a woman who got married with an insinuating comment obviously directed to the reader:

E desque ffue la dueña con otro ya casada,
 escusose de mi e de mi fue escusada
 por non faser pecado opor non ser osada;
toda muger por esto non es de ome usada.
 (1330)

One suspects that he delivers his conclusion about women and marriage with a twinkle in the eye. (2) The Archpriest explains to women that he writes vile verses only because women laugh at them (947c,d); he does not mean to offend them as a poet: ". . . sabed que non querria / aver saña de vos, ca de pesar morria" (948b,c). What is ironic is that he is concerned about women, above all, as a lover; he would be hurt if they were to get angry at him. (3) One of the most bewildering apostrophes in the Libro is the abrupt ending of the first serranilla. The mountain girl invites the Archpriest to a lucha; he apologetically explains to the reader that he had to do what she wished; then he comments on what happened: "creet que ffiz buen barato" (971). However the comment is interpreted, i.e., whether the lucha was a good bargain, whether he got off cheaply,

or whether he finally escaped, it is ambiguous and ironic.¹²²

6) Finally, Juan Ruiz uses the apostrophe to establish an intimate relationship with his audience. He never ignores his hearer; he is supposedly serious about making a point to him, yet he never alarms him, intent upon his moral theme: "por lo perdido non estes mano en mexilla" (179d) he tells his audience before his fight with Don Amor, i.e., a failure is not so bad if one continues and does not sit around pensive. At other times he reminds the audience of evil, as in the case of Trota ("ya vos dixie que estas paran cavas e foyas" 937b), only his statement is meant to praise her successful procuring for him. He especially tries to make the reader share an experience, such as observing an attractive nun: "Oteome de unos ojos que paresçian candela!"

¹²² Juan Ruiz also uses the figure of apostrophe to parody an "epitaph." The epitaph was traditionally used as a short, pointed comment on the death of a person; it attempts to sum up the peculiar qualities of the deceased. Juan Ruiz writes a mock epitaph on the occasion of Trota's death. First, the Archpriest addresses the deceased: "faser te he un petaflo, escrito con estoria: / pues que a ty non viere, vere tu triste estoria" (1571c,d). Next, the deceased (as in tradition) addresses the passers-by and tells them the sad story of her life: "con buena rrazon muchos case, non quise locura" (1576d). Finally, she reminds that all will die (1577) and ends with a paradoxical wish: "e sil de dios buen amor E plaser de amiga" (1578). Both Juan Ruiz and later François Villon (Ballade des Pendus) use the apostrophe to give an ironic view of the epitaph; in one case it is comic irony, in the other, tragic.

(1502a). He is ever ready to exclaim in sympathy, indignation, admiration, pathos, amazement, or supplication, or to address his audience personally with a question not meant to be answered. He exchanges experiences with his readers, consults them, confides in them, pretends to apologise but always touches his apostrophes to them with an ironic wit. His apostrophes gain attention because of their dramatic impact and because they offer a contrast between a sententious, serious address and a light, disarming tone. Together they betray the paradoxical position of an indulger who moralizes, and bring into relief the humorous ambiguities that spring up in the didactic commentary. Finally, the apostrophatio in the Libro designates the attitude by which the Archpriest understates his moral role and the manner by which he softens his didactic warnings: "Señores, acordavos del bien; ¡ si vos lo digo!" (1579a). He over-emphasizes his authority jokingly, and stylistically betrays his ironic habit of thought.

B. Occupatio: With this rhetorical device the narrator explains something about the length or brevity of his description, usually that he is too busy to go into details. One traditional use is to shorten a tale or descriptive passage on the grounds that longevity leads to boredom:

vy muchas en la tienda; mas por non vos detener

E por que enojoso non vos querria ser
 non quiero de la tienda mas o prologo fazer.
 (1301)

Juan Ruiz also utilizes this device humorously. He begins his discussion about the advantages of small women by stressing the shortness of his demonstration:

quiero vos abreviar la predicacion,
 que sienpre me pague de pequeno sermon
 E de dueña pequena e de breve Rason:
 Ca poco e bien dicho afincase el coraçon.
 (1606)

What is incongruous is that he relates "pequeno sermon" to "dueña pequeña" and then proceeds to argue that what is small is really very big. By implication the small sermon is praised in order to stress further that small women yield big advantages.

Occupatio is also used to lengthen a narrative. The author says that he has no time to describe the things which he then proceeds to describe.¹²³ Juan Ruiz heightens the ironic effects of this device by a reversal of its traditional use: he claims that he cannot describe adequately what he has, in fact, already described thoroughly. The concluding statements of the Archpriest's long invective against Don Amor and Death:

(a) Por tanto non te digo el diezmo que podria.
 (422c)

¹²³One of the most famous such cases is found in Chaucer's The Knight's Tale where the narrator offers a striking description of some fifty lines towards the end of the tale enumerating all the features of Arcite's funeral which, he says, he has no time to mention.

(b) Tanto eres en ty, Muerte, syn byen E atal,
 que desir non se puede el diezmo de tu mal.
 (1567a,b)

In both instances, the Archpriest has already performed a dazzling cadenza of many points, enumerating all the features of love or death and heaping a multitude of abuses upon Don Amor and death; yet he only has time to mention one tenth of these exhaustive details. Each invective is a tour de force. Don Amor, similarly, claims that he could say more, after having said more than enough: "Mucho mas te diria, si podies' aqui estar; / mas tengo por el mundo otros muchos de pagar" (574a,b). The innovation here is that Juan Ruiz makes the rhetorical device an integral part of the narrative: the reason for occupatio is an active, practical one: "castigate castigando, sabras otros castigar" (574d).

Related to occupatio is the author's preoccupation with his rhetorical inadequacy; he states that he is incapable of describing a person although he tries. Chaucer, for example, has his narrator first praise good rhetoricians and next claim that he himself is not good enough to capture the heroine's beauty: "I am noon swich, I moot speke as I kan" (The Squire's Tale). This is an ironic device to trick the reader into suspecting that the narrator's wit is slow and then surprise him with his artistic skill; it is part of the topos of "feigned

humility." Juan Ruiz uses this device but reverses its intention:

de quanto que me dixo e de su mala talla
fize bien tres canticas, mas non pud byen pyntalla.
(1021a,b)

What he could not capture, despite his best efforts, is the ugly serrana (1008-1021) whose features the Archpriest has just converted into a caricature. Statements of artistic incapacity are used to eulogise, i.e., no matter how good the artist, he will never match the goodness or beauty of the object described. Juan Ruiz turns this device around for humorous effect: his artistic sluggishness calls attention to what is ugly as if it were beautiful; his caricature cannot do justice to the serrana, in the same manner that the eulogies of traditional poets cannot do justice to beauties. In short, the device of occupatio in the hands of Juan Ruiz is full of hints that are meant to arouse the reader's lively attention.

C. Digressio: The narrator digresses in order to illuminate the story he is telling. A good example is Don Amor's satire against ecclesiastical abuses, used to strengthen his argument concerning the advantages of money in the pursuit of women. Juan Ruiz will often digress, however, not to strengthen an argument but in order to create a humorous incongruity in the narrative. For example, he

describes the battle between the armies of Don Carnal and Dona Cuaresma without interruption until the arrest and imprisonment of Don Carnal who is wounded and, therefore, may need to confess. A frayle is brought to him. Here the narrator involves himself in a long discussion and exemplification about those priests who know nothing about absolution yet are given the right to hear confessions. Since they are ignorant, they cannot discriminate and consequently "a todos los asuelven de todos sus pecados" (1144d). The narrator feigning righteousness, builds up his case against such ignorance with many examples of the misapplication of absolution which is, or should be, the root from which charity springs. This seeming indignation is, however, only a preparation which explodes in irony when, of all people, even Don Carnal is absolved:

El frayle sobredicho, que ya vos he nombrado,
era del papa e del mucho privado:
en la grand' nescesidat a carnal prisionado
asolviole de todo quanto estava ligado.
(1161)

Juan Ruiz packs into one stanza all the ironic and humorous implications of his digression. It has as a framework a parodied confession and absolution and has as its sinner the worst possible offender. Carnal, the great emperor, leader of the world of the flesh, decked out in all his worldly splendor, preceded by a horde of sinful and blasphemous members, can do no more but go through the

motions of penitence and confession to be finally absolved. The parodic digression of the misapplication of Christian rites strengthens the humor of this mock-epic narrative by adding the hilarious incongruity of the digression with the frame story.

Another use of digressio is to develop an idea within the story and directly arising from it. A good example is the Archpriest's shift from a direct attack on death to a description of the hypocritical relatives. Digressio is meant to stress the omnipotence of death, but Juan Ruiz concentrates on the ridiculous feigned sadness of the inheritance hunters. (roban todos el algo, primero lo mejor / el que lleva lo menos tyene se por peor, 1538c,d). The digression reaches a climax in the depiction of the deceased's wife:

Sy dexe muger moça, Rica e paresçiente,
ante de misa dicha, otros la an en miente;
que casara con mas rrico o con moco valiente,
muda el trentanario, a del duelo poco siente.
(1542)

The digression becomes more colorful and consequently more interesting than the exemplification of the omnipotence of death. It relieves the intensity of the invective. The use of the digressio to change a subject or to deemphasize a moral point is a recurring device in the Libro. Don Amor reviews the procedures that help overcome women. He next digresses to an attack against mothers and points out why

women are unprotected and vulnerable:

Devie pensar su madre de quando era donçella,
que su madre non quedava de ferirla e corrella,
que mas la ençendia E pues devia por ella
judgar todas las otras e a su fija bella.
(522)

The emphasis of the digression lies in the humorous view of a mother who should know better since the same thing happened to her. The digression is ironic since Don Amor is trying to illustrate that a woman is vulnerable. In a similar manner, the Archpriest earlier, while attacking Don Amor, digresses to the idea that it is difficult for parents to protect daughters. He elaborates the point that parents wish to marry their daughter off and to honor her (395a,b); yet, under the influence of love, the young girl acts "como mula camuça" (395c) and becomes uncontrollable: "los cabellos en trença, el peynde e el espejo" (397c). The emphasis of the digression lies not so much on the attack as on the picture (very effective due to the nominal sentence) of a girl full of sensual thoughts.

The rhetorical device of digressio is used traditionally to help clarify the meaning of an argument and to point out the didactic intention; it is a part of persuasion and argument. But to understand the digressions throughout the Libro in this light alone would be to mistake their ironical intention, clearly implied by the irrelevance of the digression to the main topic, by the consciously

erroneous interpretation of an argument, and by the burlesque and humorous tone of the digressive examples. The total effect is again to underline the ironic contrast between the seriousness of a stated intention and the frivolity of the result.

D. Interpretatio: This rhetorical device consists of repeating an idea in other words; it is a question of varying a point and yet maintaining the same meaning.¹²⁴ For example, Don Amor warns the Archpriest not to tell his beloved of other love-affairs:

sy non, todo tu afan es sonbra de luna
E es como quien sienbra en rrío o en laguna.
(564c,d)

Line d is actually an interpretatio of line c; the sense of the second image is a forceful repetition of the first image. This is a recurrent device in the Libro: the interpretatio is always more picturesque and more concrete. To sow in a river or lagoon is an extreme image of the futility involved if one commits tactical errors in pursuing a woman.

Juan Ruiz often uses a more subtle construction of the same figure; he not only repeats a stated idea but

¹²⁴Geoffrey Vinsauf said "Varius sis et tamen idem," in De Poetria Nova (Faral, op. cit., p. 63-64).

gives it a new twist. For example, Don Amor relates that he was received badly by religious people at Toledo:

con oracion e lymosna e con mucho ayuno
rredravanme de sy como si fuese lobuno.
(1308c,d)

En caridad fablaúan, mas non me la fazien.
(1309a)

The last line repeats the sense of his treatment but with an ironic twist: he challenges their sense of charity because the priests were not, at least in his case, practicing what they were preaching. The contradiction of the uncharitableness of Christian charity, as of course it should be in matters of worldly love, is humorously discussed and criticized by Don Amor who ought to know. The Libro abounds in such ironic uses of interpretatio. (1) "Ca ome que es solo, tiene muchos cuydados" (1316d) with its general allusion to loneliness is an interpretatio of man being without a woman (1315-1316). (2) "Comedidas, cunplidas e con toda medida," a description of women not involved in worldly love, is the way Trota interprets her original description of nuns whom she recommends as being even better than "las dueñas de sueras" in "el amor del mundo" (1340d). That is, she pretends to contradict the original description of worldly-minded nuns but instead reinforces it by subtly suggesting that not only are nuns good for physical love, but that they are very good in being clever and discreet in the practice of it. (3) The Archpriest

talks about nuns and worldly love: "que para amor del mundo mucho son peligrosas" (1505c); his subsequent interpretation of this generalization leaves the term peligrosas purposely ambiguous: "e son muy escuseras, peresosas, mintrosas" (1505d). Are nuns dangerous for worldly love because they are preoccupied with the love of God or because they are lazy and procrastinating? Are the two ideas related? It is not clear. Neither is it clear whether the Archpriest is praising them or condemning them. (4)

After stressing the advantages of small women, the Archpriest states his preference: "Syenpre quis' muger chica, mas que grand' nin mayor" (1617a); the interpretatio of this preference is a tongue-in-cheek justification of his personal choice: "non es desaguisado de grand mal ser foydor!" (1617b). To choose the small in secular terms is a good thing to do; to run away from the big, in religious terms, is also good. By implication, he justifies a sinful act of worldly love by making it parallel a religious act.

(5) Sometimes the interpretatio is used incongruously, e.g., when it contradicts the original assertion. A woman is described as "dueña de lynaje" and "de virtud" (912). Then, "poco salya de casa: era como salvaje" (912b). The idea of savagery, associated with sensuality, makes one reconsider; she might not only be virtuous, but also passionate and vulnerable.

E. Amplificatio: "Amplifier a été, en effet, pour un très grand nombre d'écrivains du Moyen Age le summum de l'art, le fin du fin. Nous allons surprendre Juan Ruiz pratiquant les recettes de l'école--et les pratiquant sans discrétion" (Lecoy, p. 324). Juan Ruiz amplifies constantly, but he is no slavish imitator. I am using amplificatio in its most general sense of elaborating what is stated. Juan Ruiz adds his own inimitable ironic style and great sense of humor. Following is a very brief list of some of the recurring rhetorical tricks of amplification: (1) He often renders a direct meaning in a roundabout or decorative way. Upon seeing a lazy man, a woman reflects, "¡tomare mi dardo!" meaning by this decorative statement (dardo used also as arrow of love) "I'll chase you away," something like the modern "I'll get my broom" threat. (2) He uses onomatopoeia: "dan grandes apellidos terneras e beçerros: / ¡Abal! ¡Abal! ¡vaqueriços, acorrednos con los perros!" (1188c,d). (3) He constantly alliterates: "enflaquesçes la fuerça" (1548c); "desfases la fechura" (1549b); "que sy byen non abengo nunca mas aberne (578d); "hado bueno vos tienen vuestras fadas fadado" (761d); and the effective description of going down and emerging on the surface: "qual de yuso, qual de suso andavan a mal uso" (412d). (4) Throughout the Libro, he amplifies a meaning by a progression of modifiers. Juan Ruiz's favorite process is to list adjectives or verbs

in groups of two, three, or four, each modifier reinforcing the meaning of the previous one: "vinole vegetat, flaqueza e peoria" (312d); the lover exaggerates his love for Endrina, "non me tira, non me parte, non me suelta, non me dexa" (662c); he uses this device as picturesque effect concerning how one cannot hide love "en gestos o en sospiros o en color o en fablar" (806d); there is amusing emphasis of an unexpected failure by Trota: "mas non pudo trabar, atar, nin dar un nudo" (1320b); he reproduces popular speech to describe secrecy: "non vydo a la mi vieja ome, gato nin can" (the effect is of one "sneaking" somewhere); he reveals the horrible effects of death: "non ay en ty mesura, amor nin piadat / synon dolor, tristeza, pena e crueldad" (1522c,d). (5) He uses parallel constructions to link equalities and thus add emphasis, often comic, to his statements: "por pereza perdieron muchos conpañia mia / por pereza se pierde muger de grand valia" (956c,d). Parallelism gives emphasis to the advice: "non le seas rrefertero en lo que te pediere / nin le seas porfioso contra lo que te dixiere" (453c,d); he often uses parallel constructions to sharpen the anarrative description: "fuyme para la dueña: fablome e fablela; / enamorome la monja e yo enamorela!" (1502); antithesis intensifies the meaning of a statement: "enemiga del bien, e del mal amador." (6) He reiterates an idea by the rhythmical repetition of an expression. The

most famous case is Venus' repetition of "por arte" (600ff) to stress that the task of the lover is not so much to get around the woman but rather to help women get around themselves. Everything in the world has its "art" and the seduction of women most of all. Thus to amplify is, for Juan Ruiz, a means to desir bien and to describe something in a way that it will be doñeguil.

Summary: Rhetorical devices: I have chosen only a few key examples of Juan Ruiz's use of rhetorical figures instead of enumerating long lists of them, but they are an adequate representation. In the hands of Juan Ruiz the rules of the rhetoricians become the instruments of a living and ironic style; as with any great virtuoso, the technical rule or accomplishment, artificial and laborious as it may seem, becomes the means of a greater freedom of stylistic expression. Juan Ruiz's grasp of rhetorical devices sharpens his capacity for making a description vivid and attractive, a situation humorous, a comment ambiguous, and didactic generalizations full of ironic insinuations and suggestions. Above all, it is always a striking expression, wittily placed and ironically stressed so as to surprise the reader, or trick him into consciousness of the ambiguity or shift or subtlety being created. The rhetorical figures undergo transformation into poetic accomplishment with imagination

operating as the catalytic agent. Again there is a correlation between the theory and practice of Juan Ruiz; his rhetorical devices, used to create subtlety, verify our findings concerning his comments on art and rhetoric.

2. Descriptio: The Rhetorical Portrait: Behind the personal descriptions found in the Libro lies a long literary tradition of the "portrait." The portrait was a device of medieval rhetoric and was employed by poets in a variety of art forms primarily to produce a surface impression of elaborate and decorative brilliance. It arose in the late Latin poetry of the Roman Empire as a formal enumeration of physical characteristics.¹²⁵ "The introduction of this literary device into medieval poetry resulted partly, no doubt, from direct imitation of classical practice, and partly from the instruction of medieval rhetoricians, who maintained the tradition of Cornificius and advocated the amplifying of poetical composition through the abundant use of formal personal description."¹²⁶

Personal description in the vernacular was confined mainly to extolling the physical beauty of individuals,

¹²⁵See E. C. Evans, "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XLVI (1935), 43-84; and S. Misener, "Iconistic Portraits," CP, XIX (1924), 97-123.

¹²⁶Robert A. Pratt and Karl Young, "The Literary Framework of the Canterbury Tales," in Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, ed. by N. E. Bryan and G. C. Dempster, Humanities Press (New York, 1958), p. 4.

usually of the upper classes. The structure of the rhetorical portrait consisted of a catalogue of physical features, rigidly listed in strict succession from the head to the feet. Its phraseology was conventional and inflexible, precluding any realistic portrayal or personal differentiation.¹²⁷ How then, did Juan Ruiz, relying upon rhetoric and tradition, adapt the catalogue portrait in creating such portraits as the lover-Archpriest, the ugly serrana, Doña Endrina, and Trotaconventos? In much of his diction, arrangement, and content, Juan Ruiz appears to be similar in style to other conventional medieval usages of portrait. He utilizes more than one portrait prescription; he moves easily among the various prescriptions, and changes the arrangement of presentation and diction so that his portraits become unique and more animated than their models.¹²⁸

a. The Archpriest: The Sensual Portrait: Trotaconventos attempts to compromise a nun, Doña Garoza, for the

¹²⁷There is no personal differentiation among most of the women which the Archpriest attempts to seduce. Each one is highly stylized with a stereotyped diction (cuerda, conplida de byenes, de buenas costunbres, entendida, messurada, de talla muy apuesta, loçana, doñeguil, plazentera, cortes, etc), and with little or no attempt at realistic portrayal.

¹²⁸The great innovator of the rhetorical portrait is, of course, Chaucer. No one had ever before looked at people in literature in the way he looked at the pilgrims of the Canterbury Tales.

Archpriest. She is not too successful until the nun displays curiosity in the Archpriest's appearance: "que de ese arçipreste me digas su fegura, / bien atal qual sea, dime toda su fechura" (1484b,c). The subsequent description appears to be a highly formalized portrait replete with stereotyped diction. In fact, it follows the precepts of Geoffroi de Vinsauf who taught that a description must start at the top of the head and inch its way downwards, detail by detail, to the feet.¹²⁹ Juan Ruiz follows this counsel selectively, stressing the physical elements that indicate sensuality.¹³⁰ Trotaconventos thus presents his body as trefudo (stocky or thick-set) and then proceeds to enumerate its parts: the head is rather large and hairy; he is thick-necked; he has dark hair, long ears, wide-set dark eyebrows, long nose, red gums, deep voice, rather large mouth, red and thick lips, big shoulders, large wrists, small eyes; he is dark-skinned; his chest is thrust forward; his arms

¹²⁹"Poliatur ad unguem," i.e., let it be polished to the toe-nail (see Faral, op. cit., pp. 129-130).

¹³⁰I believe that Spitzer, in his attempt to prove that the art of Juan Ruiz reflects the didactic training of the Middle Ages, oversimplifies the problems involved in the portrait of the Archpriest: "El autoretrato (masculino) que Juan Ruiz pone en boca de su tercera (estr. 1485 sig.), coincide en el método con el retrato femenino (e incluso en algunos detalles, como, por ejemplo, el ya mencionado de cejas apartadas y sobre todo la maliciosa preterición de los genitales), pero se enfoca desde el ángulo de un rasgo fundamental, el de su carácter de hombre emprendedor, enérgico y seguro de sí mismo" ("En torno," op. cit., note 30, p. 145). In fact, there were no "sensual" portraits per se in the rhetorical tradition.

are short and his legs well-built.¹³¹ The portrait seems stereotyped: ". . . the old bawd is merely outlining, after the conventional pattern, a physically perfect lover."¹³²

This is the first case, I believe, where all the parts of a rhetorical portrait are characteristics of sensuality and virility. Erotic symbols have been numerous in tradition; here, they gain precision because they are grafted to a complete, well-ordered portrait. The Archpriest in Trota's description, which is more than a conventional catalogue, emerges as a character representative of a group; his physical parts together sum up the salient characteristics of a typically virile man. The portrait of the Archpriest supposedly includes the physical details attributed to men born under the planet Venus.¹³³

¹³¹The physical appearance of the Archpriest is in stanzas 1485-1488.

¹³²Elisha K. Kane, "The Personal Appearance of Juan Ruiz," *MLN*, XLV (1930), p. 104, examines various traditions to show that the physical parts described possess an erotic significance. For example, in folklore, hairiness stands for sexual potency while white hair indicates burnt out sexual vigor; a heavy voice, as opposed to a squeaky one, stands for masculinity; the size of neck stands for erotic vigor while a long nose was sometimes associated with the male generative member.

¹³³Astrology offered yet another approach to the imagining of a character. The Archpriest introduces himself early in the narrative as a personal representative of astrological forces. He invokes horoscopy and accounts for his love drives by attributing them to the position of the heavenly bodies at his birth (152-153). Those born under the star of Venus are meant to be lovers (152b,c). We see

The portrait gains vividness because of its particular context; it is natural that Trotaconventos should want to describe a sexually virile young man, regardless of the real looks of her employer. Her job is to kindle love and desire in a woman, and thus the seductive portrait becomes a means to her end. She is conscious that she is playing upon a woman's desires, for upon finishing the physical description ("del pie, chico pedaço"), she teasingly adds: "señora, del non vy mas: por su amor vos abraço" (1488d). Her insinuation is telling, precisely because of the sensuality of the portrait. The portrait of the lover is further animated when the narrator intrudes to comment enthusiastically that Trota's description really enticed the nun: "A la dueña mi vieja tan byen que la enduxo!" (1490a).

But the portrait of the Archpriest is not limited to physical description. Juan Ruiz also knew something of Matthiew de Vendôme's doctrine of the rhetorical portrait which holds that a writer must first describe the moral nature and personality of a person and then the physical appearance (Faral, op. cit., pp. 214-215). Juan Ruiz effectively reverses the rhetorical process: he has Trota

a parallel in the Wife of Bath:

For certes, I am al Venerien
 In feelynge, and myn herte is Marcien
 Venus me yaf my lust, my like rousnesse,

 Allas, allas, that ever love was synne!
 (609-614)

first describe the lover physically, and then add something about his exuberant personality (1489) in order to reinforce his virile physique and render it even more seductive.

Trota thus adds that this Archpriest is also agile, bold, a mature youth ("byen mangebo de dias"); he is talented, for he can play instruments, and entertaining, for he knows all the tricks of minstrelsy. Such a man is, indeed ("¡por las gapatas mias!"), "doñeador alegre." The portrait of a virile man gains a dimension of jole-de-vivre.

The portrait of the Archpriest is by no means a copy of earlier models but rather a composite of various traditional elements: the arrangement of features comes from rhetoric (effictio); the content of sensual and sexual allusions comes mostly from popular traditions; the diction is eulogistic and is meant to arouse an enthusiasm for his love-making capacity; finally, the portrait of the lover gains an extra dimension by the addition of his carefree and happy personality. We thus have more than the conventional catalogue of name, sex, place of origin, age, bodily appearance and such qualities of mind and body as are bestowed by nature; we also see something of his manner of life (a covetous cleric, 1491b); his habit, which includes special knowledge (he knows how to play instruments); his feeling, which refers to fleeting passions such as joy (he is alegre); and his interests and achievements in

certain fields (poetry, entertainment).¹³⁴

Finally, the portrait plays an important role in the autobiographic narrative. Apart from humor and an insight into Trotaconventos' manner of procuring, why, one may ask, does the narrator-commentator choose to describe himself indirectly? Indirection is generally a sufficient condition of irony; it allows for a suggestive picture of the Archpriest out of which various interpretations may be derived. I will suggest one: with this portrait the personality of the Archpriest becomes sharper while nevertheless remaining oblique. The priestly ideal is specifically a rejection of the sensuous world in favor of eternity, as the Archpriest himself reminds the reader. But this same Archpriest is described entirely in terms of this sensuous world. He had someone portray him as a virile man whose robust figure has not been mortified by anything religious (fasting, for

¹³⁴The all-aroundness of the portrait of the Archpriest corresponds with many of the portrait attributes in Cicero's doctrine which was current in the Middle Ages. "Ac personis has res attributas putamus; nomen, / naturam, victum, fortunam, habitum, affectionem, / studia, consilia, facta, casus, orationes" (De Inventione, I, XXIV, reproduced in Coghill's Chaucer, op. cit., p. 50). Matthiew de Vendôme also expounds about the attributes in a person's physical and mental habit, his deeds or his speech: "Sunt, igitur attributa personae undecim: nomen, natura, convictus, fortuna, habitus, studium, affectio, consilium, casus, facta, orationes" (I, 77; Faral, p. 136).

example); never does Trota mention one priestly quality. Her portrait simply reinforces her argument: "¡amad, dueñas, amalde tal ome, qual debuxo!" (1490d). That is, the narrator-commentator manages to give a picture of himself which implies that love-making, which he is supposedly attacking, was his ultimate endeavor; almost everything that Trota says in his praise as a robust man reflects unfavorably on his supposedly chosen vocation as priest, and vitiates the dignity which goes with a moralist. If the reader extends to the fictional "I" of the Libro the above portrait, then he must either disbelieve the Archpriest's moral comments or regard the portrait as a satirical one, i.e., he must learn to look for guidance to the moralist, trusting that the Archpriest and the portrait are not by any means identical, that the portrait is one more example of the satirical didactic "I."

We can never be sure of the physical similarity between the writer who creates the portrait and the lover portrayed. If the reader is made to realize that, perhaps, the sensual portrait and the moral priest occupy the same physique and can at any time become the same person, then the lover-portrait seems a joke; if the reader is made to realize that, perhaps, the moral priest decides upon the most unpriestly kind of portraiture in order to satirize priest-lovers, then the portrait is serious. The relation between the painter and the painting implied in this

description is presented by a mind subtle in the breadth of its ironic vision. The solution Juan Ruiz hits upon is to submerge his own artistic personality into the personality of his fictional substitute; he has Trota attribute to the lover the same artistic temperament--talent in verse and music, humor, eagerness to please, capacity to entertain--which he attributes to himself in his comments on art. This similarity in temperament between the artist and the lover is important as a device that again brings into focus the relationship between commentator and narrator. While the narrator-lover is described as gay, talented in poetry and in entertainment, the poet who creates this narrator-lover and uses him in the narrative as the protagonist, is also, he claims, a gay, talented entertainer. Thus we may not see a similarity in the physical appearance between priest and portrait, but we see a glimpse of the poet in the personality attributed to the portrait. Juan Ruiz can suggest similarities, differences and other possibilities of contact without a definite commitment. He works in his own way with the rhetorical portrait: he borrows the pattern of cataloguing features, grafts sensuality to it, adds the gay personality of the artist and integrates it into the ironic texture of his narrative.

b. The mountain-girl from Tablada: The Art of the Grotesque: The episodes dealing with the serranas form one of the most original and fascinating parts of the Libro. The Archpriest crosses the Guadarrama,¹³⁵ meets some mountain girls and has various adventures with them. Each adventure is described first in cuaderna vía and then in a "cantiga de serrana," a pastoral type of lyric.¹³⁶ The content and diction of these serranillas probably come

¹³⁵See Alfonso Reyes' fascinating study of the Archpriest's travels, "Viaje del Arcipreste de Hita por la Sierra de Guadarrama," in Capítulos de literatura española (Mexico, 1939), pp. 15-19.

¹³⁶The convention of a chance meeting with a shepherdess known as the pastourelle was used by the Provençal and Galician troubadors, and also by the Goliards. The story is almost always the same: the poet meets a beautiful shepherdess or cow-girl and attempts to make love to her. In the case of the Provençal and Galician versions, the lover either stops short of love-making or the girl refuses. Because Juan Ruiz stresses the element of sensuality and physical love, it was believed that his serranillas were parodies of the Provençal courtly pastourelles. The sensual element in pastoral poetry is already found, however, in the goliardic pastourelles where the shepherdesses are little likely to refuse any advances made to them. In one such pastoral ("Exiit diluculo," no. 24, in Symonds, op. cit., p. 87) we see a little rustic maiden going out with her white flock.

She looked upon the green sward, where
A student lay at leisure:

"What do you there, young sir, so fair?

"Come, play with me, my treasure!"

In another one called "The wooing" ("Florent omnes," no. 26, in Symonds, p. 89-90) the ending is more explicit: "She
'Now by your words I'm ware / What you wish, what you are; /
You know love well, I swear! / So I'll be loved by you; /
Now I'm on fire too!"

from a popular type of pastoral poetry, diffused in the Iberian peninsula, which deals with encounters in which mountain girls leap on unsuspecting travelers.¹³⁷ In one such meeting Juan Ruiz gives us a grotesque portrait of the mountain girl (1008-1021). The Archpriest, suffering from an icy wind, reaches the summit of the mountain pass. There he meets the most monstrous figure of a woman ever imaginable and proceeds to describe her physical appearance in minute detail.

The artistic procedure of Juan Ruiz is carefully laid out in three steps: (1) He comes upon a serrana and describes her from the head downwards: the hair, eyes, ears, neck, nose, mouth, teeth, eyebrows, chin, knees, leg-shank, ankles, wrist, small finger, breasts, and ribs. In arrangement this is one of the most well-ordered rhetorical portraits in the Middle Ages. Geoffroi de Vinsauf's teaching of description from the top of the head

¹³⁷ See Menéndez Pidal's study on the serranillas in La primitiva lírica española, in Estudios Literarios (Buenos Aires, 1942), pp. 195-264. The typical elements of the popular tradition and the serranillas of the Libro are as follows: realistic landscape, often documented geographically (Riofrio); the climate, usually cold spring; the maiden usually keeps cows; she is aggressive and often demands to get paid for any service offered; there is an element of costumbrismo in the food, the clothing of the serrana and the games of the rustics; the encounter usually ends with a lucha of love.

down to the feet is followed closely.

(2) The content, however, is different: the well-ordered description of the mountain girl becomes a ludicrous distortion of the easily recognizable features given in a rhetorical portrait; what is beautiful, attractive, or sensual becomes an exaggerated physical defect. Thus the head is inordinately large (mucho grande), the hair shiny and black, the eyes deep and red, the ears unusually great (tamañas), the neck black, wide and hairy, the nose very long ("las narizes muy luengas"), a maw instead of a mouth, the teeth wide and long, the eyebrows pitch-black, the chin bearded, the knees big-boned, the ankles very big, the wrist bigger than a fist and the small finger bigger than a thumb, her breasts doubling over to her waist, and her ribs so big, they are sticking out from her black flank. The portrait is dominated by the qualities of darkness and bigness. Each part of the body is exaggerated in terms of size (big or thick), color (black or red), angle (boniness, deepness) and texture (bearded).¹³⁸

(3) Juan Ruiz intensifies the caricature through a grotesque and burlesque diction. He announces that this

¹³⁸ There are hints of such a female portrait earlier in the Libro where Don Amor, after giving the Archpriest a physical portrait of the ideal woman, suggests what kind of woman he should avoid: "Guarte byen que non sea bellosa, nin barbuda" (448a).

horrible apparition is a kind of a monster (vestiglo). He methodically expands this beast simile so that the physical deformities of the serrana are compared to the physical counterparts of some animal. She is mare-like ("yeguerisa trefuda" 1008d); her shape is "de mal geñiglo" (white goose-foot); she looks like a prancing mare ("grand yegua cavallar"); her hair shines like that of a black crow (corneja lysa); her footprint is bigger than that of a bear ("mayor es que de osa"); she has donkey-ears ("d'añal borrico"); her nose is like the beak of a bird ("semejan de garapico"); she has a mastiff's mouth (d'alana); she has horse-like teeth (cavallunos); her eyebrows are blacker than a thrush ("mas negras que tordos"); her blisters are called, "cabras de fuego" and form a flock (manadilla); her ankles are those of a yearling cow ("añal novilla").

Juan Ruiz gives us a description expanded and viewed from close range. There is a shift from the normal point of view of portraiture to that of grotesque caricature. "El retrato grotesco y repulsivo de la serrana . . . da todavía un paso más en el proceso de decomposición de un cuerpo femenino presentado como repelente hasta desintegrarse en una odiosa masa de miembros animales" (Leo Spitzer, "Entorno," op. cit., note 30, p. 145). Menéndez Pidal and others have referred to this portrait as one of comic

realism.¹³⁹ Yet this portrait should be considered as what Spitzer on another occasion labels "réalisme prétendu" and not pure realism.¹⁴⁰ In fact, Juan Ruiz does not render reality as it is; he integrates the technical arrangement of traditional rhetoric with beastiality. He exaggerates; his portrait is grotesque, not realistic.¹⁴¹ His technique is to push within inches of our eyes the repulsive aspects

¹³⁹See Menéndez-Pidal, "La primitiva lírica," Estudios Literarios (op. cit.). Also, Ester Pérez de King, "El realismo en las 'cantigas de serrana' de Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita," Hispania, 21 (1938). In both cases the discussion is general, considering the serranas as realistic figures in a realistic situation, i.e., their role is to serve as guides through the difficult mountain passages while their attitude toward love is one of lust and carnality.

¹⁴⁰Leo Spitzer, "Le prétendu réalisme de Rabelais," MPh, XXXVII (1939-1940), 139ff. Although Spitzer's arguments refer to a different, more modern writer, the subject of Rabelais' "realistic" description is similar to that of Juan Ruiz's portraits. In Spanish literature, descriptive decomposition of bodily parts is imitated by the Arcipreste de Talavera, by Carvajales in some of his serranillas and reaches its climax in Quevedo, especially in the famous sonnet, "A una nariz." Grotesque caricatures were common enough in literature and represented an attempt at crude humor. Inherent in the grotesque is a strain of realism since an ugly portrait is either a mockery or a realistic reaction to the ideal, stereotyped beauties of the rhetorical portraits.

¹⁴¹Juan Ruiz likes to create grotesque descriptions. He portrays a proud horse that has lost all its past splendor:

Tenia dessolladas del yugo las cerviçes,
del inogar a vezes fynchadas las narizes,
rrodillas desolladas, faziendo muchas prizes;
ojos fondos, bermejós como pies de perdizes.
Las quadriles salidos, somidas las yjadas,
el espinazo agudo, las orejas colgadas.

(242-243a,b)

of a portrait; his purpose is to caricature the portrait of a stereotyped shepherdess.¹⁴²

The grotesque portrait, however, may be examined from another point of view; it serves the humorous purpose of Juan Ruiz. (1) The descriptive frame offers evidence that the description of the shepherdess is meant to be satirical. (a) The enumeration of the parts is preceded by a hyperbole: "En el Apocalipsi Sant Juan Evangelista / non vido tal figura nin espantable vista" (1011a,b). The image of an apocalyptic figure shows a preference for the extra-ordinary and the gigantesque, and serves as an amusing introduction and keynote. (b) The enumerations end with the rhetorical device of occupatio where the poet says that he will not portray what he has already portrayed: "digote que non vy mas nin te sera contado" (1020). Only this time he is more ironic than ever because he refers specifically to the hidden parts of the mountain girl: "ca moço mesturero non es buen para mandarlo" (1020d). The insinuation that one should not be curious or meddlesome concerning the unseen aspects of her body is hilarious since he has just added grotesque detail upon grotesque detail until her figure dissolves in animalistic chaos.

¹⁴²The grotesque caricature is presented only in cuaderna vía. In the lyric version, the mountain girl becomes "fermosa, loçana, / E byen colorada" (1024). Thus Juan Ruiz offers a contrast between the ideal and the grotesque version of the mountain girl.

(2) We saw that in the arrangement of the bodily parts, the reader recognizes the model of a serrana, but as a distorted reflection. Juan Ruiz carries the parody further: the characteristics of sensuality and love-making are also satirically imitated so as to make them appear ridiculous.

(a) There are many similarities between the physical parts of Trota's sensual portrait of the Archpriest and this caricature: both are described with the adjective trefudo, and both are hairy and dark skinned; both have a thick neck, big ears, black eyebrows, long nose, heavy voice, large mouth, thick wrists, extended chest.¹⁴³ Thus many striking details parody a characterization of sensual elements; the seductive elements become bestial. For example, the heavy voice which is indicative of sexuality becomes voz gangosa in the serrana, i.e., a grotesque deformation (twang quality) of anything seductive. (b) The parody reaches its climax when the grotesque apparition whom not even the devil could love (1011d) is viewed in the light of pastoral love-making. Lucha is a conventional descriptive euphemism for the sensual love which takes place in these serranillas. This apparition goes through all the

¹⁴³The wording in the Archpriest's portrait reveals the similarities: "cuerpo trefudo," pescuado, "cuello non muy luengo," orejudo, "las cejas apartadas, prietas como carbon," "la su nariz es luenga," "la boca non pequeña," baço, "pechos delanteros."

preliminaries which culminate in the lucha: she meets the traveler, he asks her for shelter, she agrees only if paid, he thanks her and she takes him to her place. There the Archpriest comments:

quien con ella luchase, no s'podria bien fallar;
 sy ella non quisiere, non la podria aballar.
 (1010c,d)

The ironic comment concerning her capacity to resist advances makes the direct hyperbole become ironic hyperbole and causes the reader to view the crudities with amusement and wide-eyed wonder. The incongruity of a grotesque apparition and pastoral love becomes out and out burlesque when the love-struggle is viewed as a brawl: "en grand hato darie gran lucha e grand conquista" (1011c). It is the transposition of a monster in a pastoral milieu that makes the grotesque caricature here so humorous. Her gross physique has its counterpart in the grossness of her "pastoral" actions.

The accomplishment of Juan Ruiz is the fusion of the rhetorical form of portraiture with a parody of the pastoral and sensual view of woman. In his eagerness for exaggeration and humor, in his habit of incongruity and burlesque he is original: he fuses the grotesque with the refined pastoral into one portrait and piles on it all of his own exuberance and mastery of gigantesque imagery with an overflowing, contagious laughter. This laughter culminates in what must

be one of the most humorous descriptions in grotesque literature: the sagging bosom of the mountain girl dancing, even though not well-trained, to sounds of music:

ca estando sençillas [breasts] darl' yen so las yjadas:
a todo son de çitola andarian syn ser mostradas.
(1019c,d)

Is this not the free, unrestrained, grotesque laughter which explodes in the late Middle Ages in Villon's descriptions (cf. his portrait of Fat Margot) and which reaches its perfection in the portraits of Rabelais? It is the same technique of describing crude bodily parts in a series of enlarged close-ups; artistically, it is the shift from realism to grotesqueness, from a sense of artificial proportion to the chaotic lack of measure. Juan Ruiz is one of the masters of this literary technique.

c. Doña Endrina: The animation of the rhetorical portrait: The most extensively described love adventure in the Libro is the episode involving Dona Endrina (576-891) which is an adaptation of a twelfth century Latin comedy, Pamphilus de Amore. The story involves a young man who seduces a young woman with the advice of Venus and the help of an old go-between. With the exception of Trotaconventos, Endrina is Juan Ruiz's best characterization and represents unquestionably his most skillful utilization of the rhetorical portrait. Galatea of Pamphilus is the model of

Endrina. She is a young girl (I, 35),¹⁴⁴ beautiful and of noble birth (38-98); she will allow Pamphilus to talk to her, but only in the presence of others; she knows that embraces and kisses lead to forbidden love but nevertheless consents (213-226); she points out to Pamphilus that no other man has had that favor (239-240); when the old woman approaches her, she readily admits her love and shows concern only for her reputation; upon being reassured of the old woman's skills she readily asks advice on how to behave or what to say to Pamphilus ("Illum cum videam, michi consule quid sibi dicam," 427); she asks the old woman to return the next day with news; the following day she confesses that love overcomes her; at the old woman's suggestion, she immediately visits her house where, despite pleadings and objections, she is seduced by Pamphilus who had been told about her visit by his go-between; at the end, she bitterly and sarcastically reprimands the old woman for her betrayal.

Despite some similarities, Galatea provides no adequate model for Endrina. One obvious difference is due to the fact that Endrina's portrait draws much of its characterization from outside the episode related to Pamphilus.

¹⁴⁴ All citations and references to poetic lines refer to the edition of Eugène Evesque in G. Cohen's collection of medieval Latin comedies, op. cit., pp. 167-225.

Juan Ruiz grafts to the character of the victim a complete rhetorical outline of her physical features (something completely lacking in Galatea) and then refers to them during the episode to create an unusually vivid portrait of her. The structure of the narrative involving Endrina is as follows: Don Amor advises the Archpriest about love and draws him a portrait of the ideal woman to seek for seduction; the Archpriest finds the live counterpart of this portrait in his neighbor Doña Endrina; he goes to Venus for further advice; referring to Amor's recommendations concerning the appropriate woman and ways, Venus comments: "Ya fueste conssejado del Amor, mi marydo" (608a). Thus the portrait of Don Amor is organically linked with Doña Endrina.¹⁴⁵ The innovation here is that Juan Ruiz develops Endrina in several stages so that her portrait is propelled in two directions: from one point of view Endrina is totally literary; from another she is quite realistic. What is literary is the rhetorical outline of her features; what is realistic is the view of these features in an actual situation where they acquire movement.

¹⁴⁵ Of course, the whole episode imitated from Pamphilus is not at all isolated in the Libro but integrated in the whole narrative. All three protagonists play a role outside the bounds of the Latin comedy. Concerning the help of the old go-between, for example, we read: "qual don Amor te dixo, tal sea la trotera" (645c); "busque Trotaconventos, qual me manda el Amor" (718b). Doña Endrina, like Trotaconventos, is introduced outside Pamphilus, in the pelea.

(1) The first stage is Amor's portrait: it is a stereotyped presentation of a charming, beautiful woman; the emphasis is on slenderness of the figure, rectitude of the features, and the smoothness and whiteness of the skin. The portrait resembles a formal catalogue description: "Son conocidas las descripciones, que hacen los antiguos relatos franceses, de la belleza de las heroínas, modeladas según un esquema establecido (enumeración en serie de los miembros corporales de arriba abajo; rasgos individuales fijos: cejas separadas, dientes pequeños, labios rojos, etc)." ¹⁴⁶ Juan Ruiz enlivens this stereotyped portrait in two ways. (a) He relieves the monotony of a rhetorical, artificial vocabulary by the use of the diminutive. Thus the teeth are menudillos or agudillos and perhaps "un poco apretadillos;" the red lips are angostillos; the mouth becomes a boquilla. Such use of the diminutive is especially characteristic of the Spanish language and almost untranslatable. Here it creates an impression of petitness, i.e., little in the sense of small and trim. The diction of the diminutive imparts a quality

¹⁴⁶ Leo Spitzer, "En torno," op. cit., p. 143. Some of the conventional details included in Don Amor's portrait (431-435) are a small head, yellow hair, arched eye-brows, big sparkling eyes, tall neck, small ears, fine-shaped nose, small white teeth, red gums, red narrow lips, small mouth, smooth, clear face.

which fascinates and allures and thus humanizes the rhetorical portrait.¹⁴⁷ (b) Don Amor ends his first version of the portrait with a bawdy, down-to-earth suggestion concerning such a prospect: "puna de aver muger, que la veas syn camisa, / que la talla del cuerpo te dira esto a guisa" (435c,d). This practical advice is not a part of the rhetorical portrait and opens the way to the second aspect of the portrait, actually an amendment to it, a description much more realistic and sensual:

Si dis que los sobacos tiene un poco mojados
e que ha chycas piernas e luengos los costados,
ancheta de caderas, pies chicos, socavados,
tal muger non la fallan en todos los mercados.
(445)

This description has raised the question of sources. Although Lecoy relates "ancheta de caderas" to the "haunches charnues" of Villon's "Belle Heaulmier," the prevailing view now is that some of the descriptions have Arabic sources.¹⁴⁸ For Américo Castro, moist armpits and wide hips are reflections of Arabic sensuality: ". . . lo que hace pensar en intimidades de harem."¹⁴⁹ There is obviously a fusion of

¹⁴⁷ Juan Ruiz handles the diminutive masterfully in his stylistic and psychological elaboration of characters. The descriptions abound with diminutives throughout the Libro; its function is picturesqueness and vividness.

¹⁴⁸ See Damaso Alonso, "La Bella de Juan Ruiz, toda problemas," Insula, No. 79 (July, 1952). D. Alonso argues that even small lips with the special connotation of angosto come from the Arabic, not the Latin or French tradition.

¹⁴⁹ España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos.

courtly and Arabic descriptions in this portrait.¹⁵⁰ What is important is Juan Ruiz's conscious attempt to give life to an ideal portrait by adding voluptuous elements and alluding to nakedness (syn camisa). The portrait is presented in standard rhetorical, stereotyped terms, but Don Amor adds details and realistic insinuations which suggest seduction. The woman, as she appears in the portrait, is not only to be admired but also to be touched and handled. To the idealized abstraction of womanhood, Juan Ruiz grafts highly provocative physical aspects typical of sensuality. The portrait becomes a combination of a fair damsel and a voluptuous wench.

(Buenos Aires, 1948). Retitled La realidad histórica de España (Mexico, 1954), p. 381. In his revision, p. 393, Castro substitutes a word ("intimidades de burdel") to stress the bawdiness that the portrait implies.

¹⁵⁰ The width of hips certainly has an Arabic model. E. W. Lane, Arabian Society in the Middle Ages (London, 1883) gives a long description of the Arabic view concerning what a woman should look like: "Four things in a woman should be black--the hair of the head, the eyebrows, the eyelashes, and the dark part of the eyes: . . . four wide--the forehead, the eyes, the bosom, the hips" (p. 215). (The method of grouping physical parts was common also in Romance literatures, only the number was usually three.) In a recent study, Walter Mettman, "Ancheta de caderas, Libro de buen amor, c. 432 ss," RF, LXXIII (1961), 141-147, reviews all the problems of sources and concludes by favoring the Arabic influence: "Zwei Tatsachen können wohl als gesichert gelten: 1) Ein arabischen Schönheitskanon, nach einem Zahlenschema gegliedert, war seit altersher in Spanien im Umlauf. Keine der drei uns bekannten Versionen (Donzella Handschriften, Donzella Drucke, Hadrian und Epitus) hat die ursprüngliche Fassung getreu bewahrt. 2) Der Arcipreste folgt bei seiner Beschreibung dieser arabischen Tradition, die er wahrscheinlich unter einer Gestalt kennengelernt hat, die den von uns angeführten Beispielen ähnlich war" (p. 147).

The portrait is typically medieval in arrangement, presentation and in most of its content. But Juan Ruiz is very much aware of the limitations of medieval rhetorical devices, and in the catalogue of Endrina's physical parts, he shows himself aware of the dangers of the static portrait he chooses to employ. He interjects such earthy elements and uses the diminutive to permit a number of highly suggestive intimations such as voluptuousness.

(2) The second stage is the version of this portrait by the lover. Many details are added concerning the woman's background: she is a rich widow who comes from Calataud, has good manners, and usually stays home. He tells Venus that many seek her hand but that she scorns all of them; she even scorns the Archpriest who decides to possess her "por arte sutil." The lover next sees her and exclaims about her beauty, enthusiastically singling out precisely the physical parts that were described in the rhetorical portrait ¹⁵¹:

¡ay dios E quan fermosa vyene doña Endrina por la plaça!
 ¡que talle, que donayre, que alto cuello de garga!
 ¡que cabellos, que boquilla, que color, que buenandança!
 con saetas d'amor fyere quando los sus ojos alça.
 (653)

The lover's eye is drawn by her beauty and grace and by the

¹⁵¹In Pamphilus, the description is limited only to one line: "Quam fermosa, Deus, nudis venit illa capillis" (653). Juan Ruiz spells out what makes her beautiful.

attractiveness of her bodily parts, and finally concentrates on the movement of her eyes. The reader sees the lover seeing in flesh and blood the "ideal" woman described as a portrait by Don Amor. The technique is to add an exclamation to these individual parts that go to make the rhetorical portrait; the effect is to add enthusiasm and reality to them.¹⁵²

(3) The third stage is Trotaconventos' version of Endrina's portrait (807-812). In describing her reactions to the lover, she also singles out or alludes to the parts of the portrait: she thus points out the changes of composure (807), the movement of arms (809), the trembling of the lips (810), the change from red to pale, the squeezing of fingers (810d), the intent look of the eyes (811b) or the brightening of them (811c), and the restlessness of the body (811c). Trotaconventos, like Amor, enlivens the portrait with the diminutive (her lips tremble un poquillo, her heart skips a menudillo) and likewise ends with a

¹⁵²Américo Castro points out the difference between Endrina and her Latin counterpart: "La vaga mención de una hermosa mujer en cabellos adquiere líneas, gracia, color y movimiento; por la plaza espaciosa va dejando un rastro de amores su gracil figura, adivinada a través del erguido y rítmico andar" ("El Libro de Buen Amor," op. cit., p. 197). I should like to add that Juan Ruiz makes further use of this picture of Endrina seen in public: Trotaconventos' strongest argument to Endrina is that she should not stay indoors for her beauty will be little seen and sought.

seductively-oriented insinuation: "paresçe que conusco non se estaria dormiendo" (811d). Up to now, the parts of the portrait were static: Don Amor described them attractively; the lover exclaimed about them enthusiastically. In Trota's version the single parts acquire movement and thus arouse the lover's sensual desires. The reader is no longer looking at a stereotyped enumeration of physically attractive parts; he is observing a woman who at least through the reporting of Trotaconventos is reacting visibly to a proposition of love.

(4) We have seen the portrait of Endrina through the eyes of a teacher of love, a lover, and a procuress. The final stage of the portrait is to observe Endrina directly in the narrative. Juan Ruiz takes advantage of the narrative form to add many descriptive touches not found in the portrayal of Galatea.¹⁵³ She thus shows her pride by scorning the lover; she uses popular expressions (the expression "non los preçio dos piñones" animates her speech); she shows a little change, thus becoming "bien mansa e sosegada" (669b); she enters little by little in the doorway; she turns her eyes to the ground (669d), or sits on a stone seat against the wall (669); she argues well and, unlike

¹⁵³ Juan Ruiz's version almost doubles Pamphilus, and a big part of it has a narrative form. It is this narrative which Juan Ruiz exploits in his character portrayal by adding various descriptions.

Galatea, will not consent to embraces; she tells Trota to enter without fear (723d); being a widow she worries about her business and has to continue her mourning; she calls the lover parlero (740b); she rejects Trota's arguments but asks when she can visit Trota. These little touches, some physical, some psychological, add a dimension of naturalness to Endrina. Galatea is never described; her beauty is taken for granted. Endrina is developed both physically and emotionally. She comes to life more vividly than Galatea because her passion is more natural and more realistic, while her looks gain plasticity and suggest sensuality with the movement which the individual parts acquire.

I presented the portrait of Endrina in four stages in order to demonstrate the technique involved in making what is rhetorical come to life and gain more vividness than its models. We might appreciate Juan Ruiz's artistic mastery further if we gloss briefly the attributes of medieval, rhetorical description as applied to Endrina. (a) The name (meaning sloe) itself is a pun of sensuality since Trota will lower "la Rrama" (Endrina's mother) and bring "la Endrina" to the lover.¹⁵⁴ (b) Concerning her physical and mental background, we know her place of origin (Galataud,

¹⁵⁴ According to Corominas, Juan Ruiz plays "con el nombre de un vegetal (como en don Melón, doña Endrina)" (Diccionario, op. cit.).

a realistic detail which adds actuality to the portrait), her family (mother), her bodily appearance and movement in public; we also know that she is bright, that she is affable but that she also can be rude, that she gets impatient, that she has a sense of humor, and that she has other qualities of mind or body bestowed by nature. (c) Manner of life: she stays mostly at home, goes to church, has a few visitors, and has had many proposals of marriage. (d) Fortune: she is a young widow and rich. (e) Feelings: she exhibits fleeting passions such as joy, desires, anger, frustration, fear and vexation. (f) Interests: at the present she is preoccupied with problems of her properties left by her late husband. (g) Purposes: she has no deliberate plans but seeks a good marriage. (h) Accidents: lost her husband soon after their marriage. (i) Conversation: she argues with Trotaconventos and is not easily swayed at first. Thus in the four stages of seeming imitation from rhetoric or Pamphilus, Endrina appears very animated and vital. Juan Ruiz has grasped the essentials of a personality posed for a portrait, but also makes use of what is latent in other ways within a given personality and draws it forth with a surprising vividness.

Juan Ruiz inherits a character who is possessed by pride and fear for her reputation and sexual restlessness due to her youthful desires. On the one hand, he stresses

her pride more by making her scorn the lover and refusing Trotaconventos in her first visit; on the other hand, he relates her sexual restlessness to the fact she is a widow. The ideals of reputation and honor to which Endrina subscribes are strong arguments, but inevitably her dedication to these ideals, which represent a woman's chastity, is not voluntary as she herself hints in her comments concerning the prescribed mourning (759) and the fact that her mother is constantly watching over her. Now we can appreciate the juxtaposition of the ideal and the sensual in her portrait: Endrina is not wholly dedicated to the ideal she preaches. Such a woman naturally is vulnerable and can be compromised by a go-between who knows women's sexual vulnerability. Thus Don Amor ends his portrait with a perfect juxtaposition: "En la cama muy loca, en la casa muy cuerda" (446a). Doña Endrina obviously lives up to this description. In the hands of Juan Ruiz, her pride (typical of Amor's first version of her portrait) is often lost in her physical restlessness, while the cold features of the portrait become enlivened as they are seen in movement. It is characteristic that on her second visit, Trotaconventos calls her gordilla, an adjective of sensual orientation. Thus the descriptions by Don Amor and Trotaconventos keep the traditional portrait but stress within it the hidden passions of Endrina which are ready to explode and which Trota exploits.

d. Trotaconventos: The shift from portrait to character:

The old woman Urraca who procures for the Archpriest is Juan Ruiz's richest creation. As the shrewd, overpowering mistress of the art of love, she appears in startling completeness. Trotaconventos can compete for membership in the select circle of the greatest comic characters in medieval literature. Her subsequent imitations are the Celestina, Gerarda (La Dorotea) and "la tía fingida."¹⁵⁵ Her ancestry extends back through a literary tradition of go-betweens and servants probably older than Ovid, as old as western culture.¹⁵⁶ Such women abound in the Latin comedies and influenced the later development of the go-between type.¹⁵⁷ Trotaconventos is undoubtedly related to the go-betweens of

¹⁵⁵For example: "El caso es que Doña Claudia de Astudillo y Quiñones reproduce todos, absolutamente todos los caracteres principales del tipo celestinesco," A. Bonilla y San Martín, "Antecedentes del tipo celestinesco en la literatura latina," RH, XV (1906), p. 380. This is still one of the soundest studies about the characteristics of Juan Ruiz's Trotaconventos that were developed in later Spanish works.

¹⁵⁶Note the various servants, for example, who act as messengers, such as the servant of Persephone in Aristophanes' The Frogs.

¹⁵⁷"Así pues, la nota que los autores de la Comedia de Calisto y Melibea agregaron a las constitutivas del tipo creado por el Arcipreste de Hita, constaba con toda claridad en el teatro de Plauto, que seguramente conocieron aquellos" (Bonilla y San Martín, op. cit., p. 386). "Mais ces textes [comedies of Plautus] n'ont pas eu d'influence directe sur les auteurs médiévaux" (Lecoy, note 1, p. 319).

Ovid, essential in the seduction of a woman.¹⁵⁸ From later times, one can find certain parallels in the profession of the Auberée in the fabliaux.¹⁵⁹ And she shares some characteristics and attitudes of La Vieille in the second part of the Roman de la Rose.¹⁶⁰ While deriving from various sources, Trotaconventos owes most of her heritage to the Anus of Pamphilus whose successful compromise of Galatea is the kernel of the Endrina episode.¹⁶¹ There is no doubt, however,

¹⁵⁸The relationship is to be found in the advice that each lover should have on his side someone in the service of the woman whom he wants to entice. Ovid's Dipsas (Amores, I, 8) is a chaperone and adviser to a young, inexperienced girl. "Elles [Trota and Dipsas] sont, pour ainsi dire, chacune d'un côté de la barricade. Leur rôle, cependant, n'est pas à ce point différent que les arguments et la science de l'une ne puissent à l'occasion être mis en oeuvre par l'autre" (Lecoy, p. 319).

¹⁵⁹L'Auberée is for example a seamstress, visited by many young women. The relationship is one of being able to contact a female prospect.

¹⁶⁰The idea is that the old one learned of love from years of practical experience ("Bele iere e jeune e nice e fole, / N'onc ne fui d'Amours a escole / Ou l'en leust la theorique / Mais je sais tout par la pratique" 12801-804); it is but right that the old should share her knowledge with the young (12801ff). Also much of her advice to young women (such as they should not stay indoors) parallels that of Trota.

¹⁶¹"Or le Pamphilus est une remarquable manifestation de ce machiavélisme amoureux; témoins le jeu sans scrupules de la vieille" (Eugène Èvesque, ed. Pamphilus, op. cit., p. 171). Following the advice of Venus, Pamphilus approaches an old woman, who is "subtilis et ingeniosa" (I, 281) in the arts of love, and asks her to be her messenger to Galatea; the old woman knows Galatea and talks to her about Pamphilus; she feigns bad news to him in order to pressure him for money which he readily promises; in a second visit

that the ultimate character of Trotaconventos and many of the love episodes in which she appears are largely the creation of Juan Ruiz.

Three salient facts should be noted about the literary ancestry of Trotaconventos: One, she incarnates the concrete version of an ars amandi; she is the catalytic power between the theory and practice of seduction. Two, the skills which make her an expert in the game of love are related to the experience that comes with years of practice, i.e., procuring and old age go together. Three, she comes from the lower classes, is poor and, therefore, procurement is her livelihood. Juan Ruiz's Trota summarizes in her personality almost everything essential that had been related to bawds and pragmatic seduction. But while this tradition is superbly crystallized in her schemes, an improvement is also realized which influences subsequent literary creations. As she goes on trotting, arguing, laughing, advising, joking, lying, and enjoying herself, her traditional cupidity, old age and poverty become woven into a complex of human character that is of a different order from the comparatively simple traditional "bawd." For example, she differs in one

to Galatea, she overcomes her fears and brings her to her home; when Pamphilus, already warned, enters the house despite the old woman's feigned protestations she leaves them alone; upon returning, and in the face of Galatea's accusations, she pretends that she is innocent; she suggests that they get married.

way or another from her counterpart in Pamphilus in her approach, profession, technique, philosophy, expressions, arguments, and, above all, in her personal reactions to love and to her job as a procuress.¹⁶² "Et puis, cette Urraca ne serait-elle pas surtout une survivante littéraire de la vieille du Pamphilus? On pourrait, jusqu'à un certain point, le soutenir, si elle n'apparaissait, en fait, aussi vivante."¹⁶³ It is important to see what makes Trotaconventos different from her traditional models and to examine the originality of Juan Ruiz in recreating a tradition.

It is a tribute to Juan Ruiz's art that scholars attempt to find the literary counterparts of Trota. This kind of investigation provides much historical matter that serves to illustrate better all the characteristics of a bawd, but inevitably undervalues Juan Ruiz's true genius.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶²All the differences are based on the fact that Trotaconventos is more involved, both emotionally and professionally, in her job than Anus. This difference will become clearer as we analyze Trotaconventos.

¹⁶³G. Cirot, "L'épisode de Doña Endrina dans le Libro de Buen Amor," BH, XLV (1943), p. 153. He points out that, in general, Juan Ruiz's vocabulary, turns of phrases, popular expressions, etc. create a different tone in the whole work from that of Pamphilus.

¹⁶⁴I cannot understand Lecoy's conclusions concerning Juan Ruiz's originality. After pointing out the numerous differences between Anus and Trotaconventos (pp. 308-317) he states: "Nous pouvons donc revenir maintenant à notre affirmation du début. L'épisode de doña Endrina et de don Meloñ, dans le Libro de Buen Amor, n'est pas seulement inspiré, comme on l'a dit souvent, du Pamphilus: il n'en est guère

Of course he knew and imitated traditional models, but his genius was to mold them together, to add new elements and thus to create a type which is unique and which reaches its perfection in Celestina.¹⁶⁵ The elements which create the pattern of the so-called "celestinesque" type and of which Trotaconventos is a prototype, are her old age, her experience and capacity for deception, her feigned religiosity, her talkativeness and easy resort to fables or anecdotes, her "profession" of selling cosmetics as a way to enter homes, her claims that she keeps secrets, her alertness to exploit or create favorable circumstances, and finally, that she procures for profit.¹⁶⁶ Juan Ruiz perceives in her characterization that a type can be an individual and an individual a type. He combines the two so that his Trotaconventos is at once almost a perfect type as well as an

qu'une traduction" (p. 327). Since the differences which he himself indicates are central in the characterization of Trota, I find his statement mystifying. G. Cirot, op. cit., takes issue with Lecoys' conclusions concerning Trotaconventos.

¹⁶⁵Menéndez y Pelayo's opinion is still valid: "La anus de la comedia de Pánfilo no tiene carácter: es un espantajo que no hace más que proferir lugares comunes. Trotaconventos muestra ya los principales rasgos de Celestina" (cited by Bonilla y San Martín, op. cit., p. 381). My interest is to examine from the artistic point of view those traits which make Trotaconventos simultaneously the culmination of one tradition and the initiation of another.

¹⁶⁶See Bonilla y San Martín, op. cit., for a detailed analysis of these relationships.

interesting individual. Fernando Rojas brings to artistic perfection what is already embryonic in Trotaconventos.

(1) The first stage in the characterization of Trotaconventos is a static portrait; she is described in detail by Don Amor (437-443) and reinforced somewhat by the lover (697-699). Don Amor ends his portrait with the admonition, "D'aquestas viejas todas esta es la mejor" (443a) while the lover begins his description by "de todas las maestras escogi la mejor" (697b), i.e., the portrait of Trotaconventos sums up the attributes of one who procures; she is simply the best representative of the class which she typifies. She is experienced in love affairs, knows where to look for prospects, has ways of approaching women, and usually succeeds in compromising them.¹⁶⁷ The portrait spells out in detail the appellatives "trotaconventos" and "troya";¹⁶⁸ it sets

¹⁶⁷Specifically, the characteristic traits of the Trotaconventos as described in the portrait are bienrazonada, subtle, good liar, goes to church, wears a rosary, knows how to give advice, knows how to gain sympathy by complaining, knows how to prepare herbs and potions, can act as a midwife, can enter homes, is usually a peddler of something (joyas).

¹⁶⁸Trotaconventos refers, of course, to the fact these viejas often served nuns or priests and procured for them. It was believed that troya referred to the Troy of antiquity and was used to indicate something old: "Jorge Manrique = cosa vieja," José María Aguado, Glosario sobre Juan Ruiz (Madrid, 1929, p. 613. Carlos Clavería, "Libro de Buen Amor, 699 c: '... estas viejas troyas,'" NRPH, II (1948), 268-272, shows that the term refers to puercas ("non a comprar las joyas para la chata troya" 922b) and therefore is an epithet of bad moral character, puta, moza monstruosa, or alcahueta.

forth the qualities of a generic name as permanent characteristics. The design is characteristically medieval: her personality is stereotyped before she reveals herself through significant action.¹⁶⁹ As in the case of Endrina's portrait, however, but even more so, Juan Ruiz interjects a number of insinuating comments about Trota. Thus in the midst of his objective description, Don Amor exclaims, "¡Ay! ¡quanto mal que saben estas viejas arlotas!" (439d), or "estas trotaconventos fassen muchas baratas" (441d), while the Archpriest likewise interjects, "non ay tales maestras, como estas viejas Troyas" (699c). The terms arlotas, trotaconventos, maestras and troyas are no longer simply appellatives: they are exclamation marks which punctuate admiringly or enthusiastically the old woman's talents; the static portrait implies the germs of her upcoming activity. Hers is one of the most striking examples of the vivification of a rhetorical portrait. Yet Juan Ruiz holds much of her character in reserve, and it is not until he puts her in action, first in the seduction of Endrina and later in her procurements for the Archpriest, especially in the case of Dona Garoza, that the fullness of her personality swells the original

¹⁶⁹ It is interesting to consider the whole structure of the Canterbury Tales as an example of the medieval way of characterization. The various pilgrims have many opportunities to exhibit a unique personality (especially the Wife of Bath, the Host, the Reeve, the Pardoner, etc), but first comes the "Prologue" which is a static characterization of the pilgrims.

outline of the rhetorical portrait.

(2) The second stage is a running commentary which analyzes and explains the action, motives, and reactions of Trotaconventos; the static characteristics of the portrait are seen in action. Everything she does exemplifies the behavior connected with her profession; the sum of her acts, comments, and attitudes comprises a picture of a professional at work.¹⁷⁰ The accumulation of characteristics and the variety of her activities are remarkable: she immediately states the motto of her profession: "doblar se ha toda dueña" (711d); procuring is her livelihood ("daqueste ofiçio bivo" 717b); she is not thinking only in terms of Endrina but of procuring other women for her employer ("A esa moça e outras moçetas . . . / yo fare con mi escanto

¹⁷⁰ There are two major interpretations of Juan Ruiz's "generic" characterization of Trotaconventos. One is that the generic presentation helps to spell out the moral intentions of the Libro by satirizing such bawds: "Pero es más notable el interés que Juan Ruiz tiene en prevenir a las mujeres contra las asechanzas de las malvadas Trotaconventos, que ponían sus malas artes al servicio de hombres sin escrúpulos" Fernando Lázaro, "Los amores de don Melón y doña Endrina," Arbor, No. 62 (1951), p. 234. The most extensive arguments are those of Spitzer: he points out the appellative, Trota's use of "we" as the subject pronoun, and her name "Urraca" which he regards as a common, vulgar name like that of Ferrant Garcia, as proof that the Archpriest presents Trotaconventos only in her professional function. He concludes that the mixture of the generic (Trotaconventos) and the individual (Urraca) form a national type. It is a question "de una Urraca que, a pesar de todo, sigue siendo siempre trotaconventos (con minúscula). Asistimos al fenómeno en que lo genérico-profesional cristaliza en un individuo típico y representativo" ("En torno," op. cit., pp. 150-151).

que vengan pas' a pasillo" 718c);¹⁷¹ we see her manner of entering a home with her shouts while selling ("¡por hasalejas!" 723c); her favorite argument, based on biological drives, is that a woman should not be shut in a house, that she should enjoy her youth (725); she relates fables to reinforce her arguments; unlike the Anus, she is not apologetic but sarcastic about the lover's excuses concerning money ("Esto, dixo la vieja, bien se dize feroso" 819a); she is ready for the unexpected as in the case of Endrina's mother (825-826); she has a house ready for such affairs (the irony here is striking; Endrina may not suspect, but Trota really describes her house as a "meeting place" of lovers: "Nunca esta la mi tienda syn fruta a las loçanas," [862a], i.e., the plural is an indication that Endrina is not the only one); she knows how to praise the lover (1327); she is quick to react ("Dixol' doña Garoça: ¿enbiote el a mi? / Dixele: 'non, señora; yo me lo comedi'" 1346a,b); she can feign righteousness if attacked ("¿por que so baldonada? / Cuando traygo presente, so mucho falagada" 1356a,b); she can talk with hidden meanings ("quered su buen amor" 1452b, where she means "loco amor"); she assumes the role of protector to overcome

¹⁷¹The characteristics that I am listing almost always have no counterpart in the old woman of Pamphilus; they are additions or alterations. In fact, there are no literary ancestors that sum up even the minimum of these characteristics.

a woman's fears (1482). These characteristics of Trota are reinforced by the Archpriest's explanations and reactions; each comment is either a reference or a tribute to her skill as a procuress: he calls her madre, name for an alcahueta; he mentions how hard she tries ("en esta pleytesia puso femencia tal" 914c), how dexterously she operates ("poco a poco la aguija" 916c); how she can charm the prospect ("començo a encantalla," 916a; or "somoviola," 918d); he is fascinated by her tricks ("del ojo le guiño"); he calls her his support ("torneme a mi vieja como a buena rama" 936c); and finally, he introduces his famous lament about her death by the comment, "ya non anda nin trota," which is the description of a professional's death, of one whose life or death is related only to trotar, to procuring. The qualities of Trota delineated in the portrait are either exemplified or expanded. The reader is not merely told what she can do but is shown how she does it.

(3) The final stage is to reveal Trota through her own speeches and attitudes, or through the lover's description of her emotional states. The result is a character who stands out from the generality of go-betweens by reason of the unique combination of personal characteristics which differentiate her from others and emphasize her individuality. Following is a schematic presentation of some of her comments which point out some of the important facets of her

character. The order is from her first appearance to her last errand:

"Muchas bodas ayuntamos, que vienen arrepintadas." (705c)	The effects of her profession (Awareness)
"Porque esa vuestra llaga sane por mi melesina." (709c)	Her function is to "medicate" wounds (Professional vocabulary)
"Despues con poco fuego cient vezes sera doblada" (711c)	She will arouse the woman's passion (confidence)
"Salyr e andar en plaça" (775c)	Urging a woman (Argument)
"Mançebillos apostados e de mucha loçania" (726b)	Manner of approaching the subject of love
Dixo Trotaconventos: "¿Qual es? ¡fija, senora!" (738a)	Exclamatory manner to introduce lover (tricks of the trade)
"En el mi cuello echa los sus bracos entramos, Asi una grand pieça en uno nos estamos" (809a,b)	Vivifies a situation with humor and exaggeration
"Entyendo su grand coyta en mas de mill maneras" (841a)	Feigning empathy (Entering one's confidence)
"Señora dona Rama, yo. ¡Por mi mal vos vy!" Que las mis hadas negras non se parten demi" (824c,d)	Monologue, curses under breath; curses unexpected obstacles.
Dixo Trotaconventos: "¡A! ¡la vieja pepita!" (845c)	(Spontaneity)
Veovos byen loçana, byen gordilla, fermosa (828d)	Insinuating compliments to the woman

"Muchas peras e durasnos que gidras e que mançanas! Que castañas, que piñones e que muchas avellanas!" (862b,c)	Elements to entice prospect (Enthusiasm)
"Quando te dan la cabrilla, acorre con la soguilla" (870b)	Practical advice to lover (Cynicism)
"Non queblantedes mis puertas! que del abbad de sant Pablo Las ove ganado ¿Non posistes ay un clavo?" (875c,d)	Feigns surprise (Theatricality)
Sy non parlas' la pycaga mas que la cordorniz, No'l colgarien en plaça nin rreyerien lo que diz (881a,b)	Advice to accept a situation (Wisdom)
"Tal vieja para vos guardadla que conorta, Que 'mano besa ome, que la querria ver corta" (930b,c)	Taunts the lover (Realism; Sarcasm)
E si esta rrecabdamos, nuestra obra non es vana (1318d)	Personal involvement (The "we" subject)
Diz: "Omillome, don Polo: Fe aqui, buen amor, qual buen amiga buscolo (1331c,d)	Teases the lover (Sense of humor)
"Yo las serui un tienpo, more y byen dies años" (1333a)	(Past doings)
"Quien dirie los manjares, los presentes tamaños, Los muchos letuarios nobles e tan estraños!" (1333c,d)	Recollection of past (Sentimentality)
"Desque me parti dellas, tod' este viçio perdy" (1339c)	Past and present
Diz: "Yo lo andare un pequeño rratiello" (1343c)	Assuring her employer
". . . non vos enojedes" (1386d)	Attempt to pacify woman
"con este mançebillo, que vos tornarie moça" (1392d)	Persuasion by insinuation

"Nunca vos he fallado jugando e riendo" (1397c)	Her view of nuns (Philosophy of life)
(Direvos la fabliela, sy dierdes un risete! (1400d)	Pretends to say things harmless (Technique)
"Señora," Diz: "¡mesura, non me querades ferir!" (1424b)	(Fear)
"Que de vos non me parta, en vuestras manos juro: Si de vos me partiere, en mi caya el prejuro (1482c,d)	Capacity to lie
"¡Alahe!" Diz la vieja, "amor non sea laçio" (1492b)	(Exclamation)
Quiero yr a desirtelo ¡Yuy! Como me lo engraçio" (1492c)	Joy of success (Euphoria)
Amigo ¡Dios vos salve! ¡Folgad, sed plasentero! (1495a)	(Good will)
Diz' "quanto vos he dicho, bien atanto perdi: Pues al non me desides, quierome partir d'aquí" (1512b,c)	She knows she is wasting her time (Practicality)

The above expressions of Trota are constantly reinforced by the Archpriest who points out her moods and reactions: her anger ("fue sañuda la vieja tanto" 921c), her vengeance ("toda la poridat fue luego descolorilla" 921d), her willingness ("de grado fue venida" 1317b), her disappointment ("torno a mi muy triste e con coraçon agudo" 1320c), her joviality ("vynome muy alegre" 1328a), her fears ("mucho temio la vieja deste bravo dezir" 1424a), her cunning ("artera e maestra" 628b, "la mi vieja sabiente" 871c), her anxiousness to please ("por me façer plazer" 698d), her

sentimentality ("la mi vieja maestra ovo buena conçiencia" 886c), her reasonableness ("dio . . . una buena sentençia" 886d), her falsity ("guardate de falsa vieja), her effervescence ("vino a mi rreyendo" 1331c), her loyalty ("fue vieja byen leal" 914a), her shrewdness ("ffiso . . . sutil travesura" 934a). The lover describes a personality who is pleasant, enthusiastic, proud of her skills, happy to succeed and eager to do a good job. Her character is crystallized in one of the Archpriest's descriptions:

Vino mi leal vieja alegre e plasentera
 ante del "¡dios vos salve!" dixo la mensajera:
 "el que al lobo enbia, ¡a la fe! carne espera:
 la buena corredera así faze carrera.
 (1494)

She returns happy and full of pleasantness; she is anxious to report the good news and to boast of her success. Her personality is captured, technically, with a variety of style: exclamations, questions, sarcasm, popular expressions, ironic thrusts, apostrophes, proverbs, etc. Her reactions are related to the means and ends of procurement, but they also reveal the significant behavior of an individual who is basically happy with worldly love (quite the opposite of Anus) in a world where such love is forbidden. A concern for what she is doing is the reason for her abundant energy. Despite various difficulties, there remains for her the fun she has in handling the Archpriest's love affairs and in competing and pitting wits with female prospects--the fun

she has had in life itself. It is this motif of unrestrained exuberance and pleasure that comes to dominate her comments and personality throughout her acts of procuring. Her epitaph is a fitting summation of an attitude that is the key to her personality:

en cuanto andude el mundo, ove vicio e soltura.
(1576b)

Trota concentrates on love and enjoys what she is doing; to procure is both a joy and a challenge.

We have seen Trotaconventos described by others (portrait), in action, in her own feelings and in the light of the lover's reaction to her. Both in conception and in artistic presentation Trotaconventos is original. She is a prototype of certain characteristics and a model to be imitated. Because she incarnates all the essential characteristics of the successful go-between, she is the culmination of a tradition (that of "trotaconventos"); because she enlarges the type of procuress with a dimension of personality, she initiates a new one (that of "celestinas"). The one factor in determining Trota's character is that for the first time such a character has an implicit and explicit view toward her profession. Hitherto bawds have been characters typical of an occupation; Trota is typical both of an occupation and of an attitude. Her personal attitude includes certain universal attitudes which can be recognized independently and defined.

She expresses her views both as procuress and as an old woman. As a procuress, her attitude is judicial, i.e., she gives judgments as to why and how young women are compromised. Thus she assumes that a woman, once married, needs love-making and will consent; that women are lost without men; that all women can be enchanted; that in his desires and unscrupulous behavior, don Melon is like all other men; that all women have the same fears and consequently all are foolish. This is the attitude of a cynic; it is the belief that human conduct is motivated wholly by the self-interest of carnal love and that there is no way out of it; it is a complete disbelief in the sincerity of love, the rectitude of lovers, chastity, and, above all, Christian charity. The matter-of-factness of her tone and the imagery she employs to illustrate her views easily betray her cynical attitude: "pues fue casada, creed ya qu'ella consienta: / que non ay mula d'alvarda, que la siella non consienta" (710c,d); "encantador malo saca la culebra del forado" (868c); "ca todos omes fazen como don Melon Ortiz" (881d) (this is her consolation to the seduced Endrina, not found in Pamphilus, 881d); "perdedes vos, cuytadas mujeres, syn varones" (1393d); "todas las otras temen eso que vos temedes" (1444c); "por una synventura muger, que ande rradia, / temedes vos que todas yres por esa via" (1451c,d); "todos nadar desean, los peçes e las rranas" (1491c, i.e., all you nuns enjoy love, whether guardadas or ufanas). She

constantly utters such comments. Trota is cynical in that she believes that all "honor" is a sham, that virginity does not, or should not exist, and that what appears to be pride, honor, or chastity is merely evidence of naivete or hypocrisy. Her reasoning for urging the lover to be bold is typical: "mas val verguença en faz, que en coração mansilla" (870d).¹⁷² Her reasoning is realistic: she examines the evidence of particular instances of the love-cases she has handled and draws conclusions from them. Her view is that men or women do or should simply acquiesce to the power of carnal love since it is a natural force beyond their control. It is, therefore, this cynical and realistic attitude that makes Trotaconventos so bold and so self-assured. Cynicism towards love is the raison-d'être of her profession.

As a human being, the attitude of Trotaconventos is preferential, i.e., she expresses her personal feelings involved in her job of compromising women. Thus she prefers joy to sadness, fun to boredom, friendship to enmity (889), playful talk (1400a) to long-winded litanies (1396c),

¹⁷²The advice of the old woman to Pamphilus is simply not to be indecisive:

Dum locus affuerit, te precor esse uirum.
Mens animusque manet inconstans semper amantis:
Paruaque forte tibi quod petis hora dabit.

(546-548)

Trota carries it further and includes her cynical attitude: better to be satisfied and bear the shame than stay frustrated. Note also the complete reversal in meaning in her use of this sentencia.

laughter to arguments (rriendo vs reniendo, 1397), relaxation to Mass, freedom (seltura) to shelter, indulgence in food to fasting, and praise to condemnation (her argument with the Archpriest). All of these postures are in her speeches. Such reactions resemble sentimentality; it is the feeling that there is joy and good will in her dealings with love, that the evils of corrupting women are either negligible or non-existent. Her reasoning here is not cynical but subjective; she stresses the joy of love with little concern for the actual harm which she knows she is perpetrating. She sets up a positive ideal of pleasure which depends on freedom from the restraints of moral and social mores. Her attitude is that men and women should exult in carnal love since it is a pleasure not to be denied. It is, therefore, this sentimental and subjective attitude that makes Trotaconventos so willing, energetic and gay. Sentimentality towards love is the raison-d'etre of her personality.

The personal reaction of Trotaconventos toward her job is a combination of two forces: she refuses to consider the evils of procuring and clings to the belief that all love is good or can be made so, simultaneously she refuses to have any illusions about love-making, adhering to the cynical belief that corruption of women is common and will not change because women are corruptible. One is a reaction of feeling, the other one of experience; she responds to love simultaneously

with intuition and objectivity. The complexity of this posture is clearly established in the sections imitated from Pamphilus, yet it is not a part of Pamphilus. First she is cynical: "ca todos omes fazen como don Melon Ortiz" (881d); next, she is sentimental: "la mi vieja maestra ovo buena conçiencia" (886c). This attitude embodies a whole way of life; its uniqueness depends both upon her profession and her personality and eventually leads to Celestina.¹⁷³

Trotaconventos begins as a rhetorical portrait but becomes something more; she has implications that reach outside the Libro. Her character is an archetype of world literature, like the Wife of Bath, the early formations of Dr. Faustus and even Tirso's Don Juan. My interest is to examine the meaning of Trotaconventos in the light of all we have said concerning the ironic manner and technical skills of Juan Ruiz, for in her creation are included all the excellences of the Libro's art.

The portrait of Trotaconventos resembles one of those satirical portraits that abound in the Middle Ages. She is,

¹⁷³The two most striking features added to the character of Celestina are her relations to magic and her love for wine. There may be hints of these features in Trota. Her capacity for corruption is described as follows: "Con lagrimas de Moysen escantan las orejas" (438d). Cejador y Frauca (op. cit., 438) believes that the allusion to Moysen is related to books of magic and to demonology. One of the elements which Trota laments after leaving the nuns is wine: "do an vino de toro, non beven de valadi / desque me parti dellas, toda este vicio perdy" (1339b,c).

after all, portrayed as one who precipitates sinful love and one who is blasphemous (for example, she swears falsely to Garoça). What it lacks is the explicit and harsh condemnation which is the core of a satirical portrait. Juan Ruiz makes his Trota glory in doing the very things that she is, satirically or morally, charged as doing; she enjoys and readily confesses to the charges of ruin against old procuresses. She is thus criticized and praised, rejected and accepted at the same time. It is this way of indirection and ambiguity which leads generally to irony; it allows for a pervasive suggestiveness in the character of Trota to which the reader is then free to assign any number of meanings. The irony in the case of Trota provides for the possibility of a sustained paradoxical character, certainly funnier and more complex than most satirical portraits. Yet partly for this reason the satire is also more telling. The commentator's failure or refusal to spell out specifically what are the moral wrongs committed by Trotaconventos emphasizes these wrongs; irony here heightens her skills in corrupting women (the same skills which in *Celestina* acquire a demonic quality). The disconsolate lover, humorously, attributes tremendous powers to her capacity of corrupting everyone she approaches (1573d), while Trotaconventos herself will move from grace to perjury to blasphemy to accomplish her ends. Yet this satirical portrait, while intellectually acute, is

not, thanks to Juan Ruiz's art of irony, emotionally scathing.

The artistic method of Juan Ruiz is to present both halves of the paradox of a bawd and to retain both without allowing the positive and negative values to cancel each other out. Urraca, as a trotaconventos or troya, can be a cynic who must surely be feared by discriminating women and is to be condemned by the moralist ("guardate de falsa vieja" 909c). As an old woman, Urraca is one of the most impressive creatures, and her energy, wisdom, cleverness, sense of humor, and enjoyment of life, although lethal to women, draw both the awe and the appreciation of the lover-narrator. His own evaluation of her postulates the simultaneous existence of mutually exclusive opposites. His apostrophe to the reader after a successful venture by Trota is a very apt comment on her character:

O sy la enfychiso o sy le dyo atynear
O sy le dyo raynela o le dyo mohalinar
O sy le dyo pençoña o algund adamar,
mucho ayna la sopo de su seso sacar.

Como faze venir el señuelo al falcon,
asy fiz' venir Urraca la dueña al ryncon:
ca digoves, amigo, que las fablas verdat son:
se que "el perro viejo non ladra a tocen."
(941-942)

To bewitch, to give drugs, poison, or love potions to someone are actions associated with the wrong-doings of witches and evil women in general. Here the wonder is much more striking

than the wrong-doing. It is a remarkable explanation of Trotaconventos and highly artistic, for it contains all the charges usually leveled against trotas, yet it reveals an appreciation and admiration rather than a condemnation. Thus Trotaconventos, in the hands of Juan Ruiz, ceases to be a mere traditional figure, ceases even to be simply a fascinating procuress, and becomes, instead, a literary archetype, in which cynicism and sentimentality (or experience and enthusiasm) are inextricably mingled.

Summation--Rhetoric: One in a thousand poets:

Que saber bien y mal, decir encubierto y doñeguil,
no hallaras uno de trovadores mil.
 (65c,d)

It is now important to examine the second part of the comments which allude to rhetoric. Juan Ruiz first recognizes the power that transforms the ordinary into the beautiful; next, he emphasizes the rarity of talent in poetic transformation. Hitherto Juan Ruiz has talked about his craft; here he introduces the question of inspiration which leads to art, that rare quality which transcends technique. Juan Ruiz does not conceal his pride in his artistic talent. To write subtly and attractively is, therefore, a gift which belongs to few, to one in a thousand. First, he evaluates his poetry in terms of versification, order, humor, entertainment, beauty, and rhetoric. Next he evaluates, in a

sense, his evaluation. The critic becomes also a judge. He will judge both the technical aspects of his poetry and the talent that is needed to make them possible. He bluntly tells us that his is a rare and unique talent.

It is controversial to evaluate Juan Ruiz's expressed attitudes towards his own art in the light of the medieval conception of literary creation. The theory of poetry as a creative process represents such a sharp break with medieval attitudes that it is almost impossible to trace any direct link with medieval theories of poetry. It is generally assumed that the medieval artist, bound by didacticism, never places his personality or artistic worth above the matter treated.¹⁷⁴ "Medieval poets thought their art an operatio, not a libera creatio, they were not actually poets, because there was only one poet, God, but authors of poetria."¹⁷⁵ This view can be challenged on the grounds that there was a place in the medieval system for notions

¹⁷⁴ Antiquity recognized a "special quality" in artists. Seneca, reflecting on those who venerate the images of the gods but decry the sculptors who make them, represents one of the last stages in the deemphasis of the importance of the individual artist. By the times of Plutarch, artists are already considered secondary to their creations. A strong element of pride does not emerge again, supposedly, until the fourteenth century.

¹⁷⁵ Mario Praz, review of H. H. Glunz, Die Literaturästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters (1937), in English Studies, XXI (1939), p. 167.

of artistic manner and worth. "We can no longer doubt that many masters of the Middle Ages--great as well as mediocre ones--often had highly individual manners of their own."¹⁷⁶ There are stories about artists and writers, and various autocommentaries, inscriptions, and autobiographical references which demonstrate that the Middle Ages, in any case at its later period, associated certain traits with artistic worth.¹⁷⁷ The praise of the arts is, in fact, part of the subject matter of medieval eulogy (see Curtius, op. cit., pp. 155ff), while some literary writers (Dante and

¹⁷⁶Rudolf Wittkower, "Individualism in art and artists: A Renaissance Problem," JHI, XXII (July-September, 1961), p. 300. This is a sound study, well documented, of the resurgence of artistic preoccupation in the fourteenth century.

¹⁷⁷Don Juan Manuel warns the reader that any errors found in his writings are not his fault; other writers, like Dante or Chaucer, give specific criticism, not only of their works, but of that of their contemporaries and of the classical writers; Chaucer, especially, expresses his views regarding style and constantly eulogises the ancient writers that he respected so much for their skill and learning ("And am ful glad if I may fynde an ere / Of any goodly word that they han left" The Legend of Good Women, pp. 76-77); in the second part of the Roman de la Rose (lines 1860ff), Jean de Meun stresses the value of the man of letters over the king and recalls older days when poets were honored; the goliards often regard their art as the highest possible gift: "Yet a gift more sweet, more fine, / Is the lyre of Maro! . . . Should a tyrant rise and say, / 'Give up wine!' I'd do it; / 'Love no girls!' I would obey, / Though my heart should rue it. / 'Dash thy lyre!' suppose he saith, / Naught should bring me to it; / 'Yield thy lyre or die!' my breath, / Dying, should thrill through it!" (No. 49 in Symonds, op. cit.).

Don Juan Manuel, for example) looked upon their artistic accomplishment as something different or special.

Juan Ruiz declares not only the excellence of his work (almost all his comments on trobar) but further proclaims his own rare talent which creates it. Since there is a tradition which eulogizes art, one cannot be sure that apparent individual and distinctive traits in Juan Ruiz's comments are not, in fact, literary topoi. But striking in Juan Ruiz is the abundance of statements concerning the excellences of the Libro and the stress on his talents as trodador. Analysis of his comments reveals that he is a painstaking artist who places a great emphasis on his role as composer; that his claims of artistic eminence, unlike his didactic comments, are clear-cut, precise, and never ambiguous; that he implies in the thousand to one vaunt, an absolute trust in the uniqueness of his stylistic or rhetorical talents. In short, Juan Ruiz is a conscious artist who is unusually perceptive of the aesthetic quality of his own creation. The awareness of his individual achievement and the boasts about his talents reveal an artistic attitude which may not be comparable to that of the Renaissance artist but which certainly goes beyond the implicit dictums of scholastic poetria. If the attitude of the poet to his art is one criterion which decides whether we classify him as belonging to the Middle Ages or the

Renaissance, then the comments of Juan Ruiz represent an embryonic stage of artistic pride which we usually associate with the Renaissance individual's awareness. The bulk of his comments, the emphasis on the skill involved in trobar, and the evaluation of his own talents, in light of his capacity to elaborate tradition and create a figure like Trotaconventos, necessitate at least a compromise in any rigid classification of Juan Ruiz as medieval poet: while there is no concept of "genius" in his "medieval" commentary, there is a specification of his rare talents, backed by the knowledge of rhetoric; he at least acknowledges the special position of being one poet in a thousand.

IV

Juan Ruiz's envoi

I have, I trust, examined the bulk of the commentary in the Libro. The comments on the moral worth of the work attempt to locate the various episodes and give them a didactic order by making a whole out of parts; the comments on the artistic worth of the work establish in the episodes an aesthetic tone which has nothing to do with the didactic purpose. All comments were examined in context and evaluated in the light of a literary analysis of the text; the purpose

was to establish clearly the relationship between the ideas and the practices of Juan Ruiz. If I have taken issue with scholars who treat the comments as though uttered by a stable, consistently didactic persona, it is because textual evidence reveals that Juan Ruiz has two basic viewpoints: as a moral commentator he assumes an imprecise pose; his points of view are either ambiguous or not consistent from comment to comment. This pose displays Juan Ruiz's ironic sensibility at work. As a commentator of his art, he plays a straight role; his point of view concerning good writing is clear, and the judgments concerning his own capacities are consistent throughout the Libro. This pose emphasizes Juan Ruiz's aesthetic sensibility at work.

In the parting comments to his reader ("De como dize el Arçipreste que se ha de entender este su libro," 1626-1634), Juan Ruiz sums up, in one way or another, almost all the attitudes which he expresses through his personae in the course of the narrative. His book can help man to serve God (1628); everyone can benefit from reading it (1627); it should be passed around and be accessible to all (1629); it is a small book, yet it hides a profound, moral meaning (1631); it is beautifully written (1631d); it may have jokes, but it also teaches moral lessons (1632a,b); it can serve as relaxation and entertainment (1632c,d). He ends his envoi with the reminder that the Libro offers

both practical moral teaching and a lesson in the art of writing poetry:

Era de mil y tresçientos y ochenta y un años
fue compuesto el romance, por muchos males y daños
que hacen muchos y muchas a otros con sus engaños,
y por mostrar a los simples fablas y versos extraños.
(1634)

In his envoi, Juan Ruiz skillfully crystallizes the didactic and artistic orientation of the whole commentary in the Libro. A brief analysis of the central comments should confirm both the ironic manner of his moral comments and the aesthetic preoccupation of his assertions on art.

The didactic declarations are summarized in stanza 1631:

Hiceos pequeño libro de texto, mas la glosa
no cree que es chica, ante es bien gran prosa,
que sobre cade fabla se entiende otra cosa,
sin la que se alega en la razon fermosa.

The poet speaks of the "gloss" which the reader usually adds to a text. Glosar, in its medieval use, means to discover the moral or philosophical meaning which is hidden in the literal presentation of a work;¹⁷⁸ it stands for the intellectual rapport between author and reader. A work of art reaches its perfection with the future generation of

¹⁷⁸ See Faral, Les arts poétiques, op. cit., pp. 40-46. The medieval use of "glossing" is related to the early belief that Scriptures were difficult to understand because they were written in a language which was inaccessible to the common believer. Therefore, Scriptures were glossed. Since the word of God ranks high above any particular interpretation imagined by humans, writings are only approximations to the word of God, however subtle their "gloss" may be.

readers because these future readers, by using their own subtlety and with the help of the author's gloss, will be able to discover the immutable Christian truth. According to Leo Spitzer, the reference to glosa relates Juan Ruiz's envoi to the prologue of the Lais of Marie de France;¹⁷⁹ both writers assume that those to come would take care not to deviate in their glosses from the true sense of the text.¹⁸⁰ Marie de France refers to the custom of ancient writers to express obscurely some portions of their books, so that those after them might study with greater diligence to find the thought within their words.¹⁸¹ "Marie de France,

¹⁷⁹Leo Spitzer, "The prologue to the Lais of Marie de France and Medieval Poetics," MP, XLI (1945), 96-102. Spitzer is here influenced by Ernst Curtius' studies on medieval theories of poetry developed in the latter's article, "Theologische Poetik im italienischen Trecento," ZRPh, LX (1940), and where he argues that according to medieval writers, the higher spiritual meaning is inherent or presupposed in the literal event from the beginning--through the word of God.

¹⁸⁰Most of the problems centered on glossing are discussed by Dante in the Convivio: ". . . che vuol dire che lo savio uomo con lo strumento de la sua voce faria mansuescere e umiliare li crudeli cuori, e faria muovere a la sua voluntade coloro che non canno vita di scienza e di arte" (Convivio, II, 1, 3). Jenaro L. MacLennan, "Autocomentario en Dante y comentarismo latino," Vox Romanica (Jan-June, 1960) summarizes most of the views concerning medieval glossing and argues that Dante was the most representative practitioner: "Nadie como Dante manifestó tan categóricamente la doctrina exegética en función de los significados literal y alegórico: a la alegoría no se llega sino por la vía literal y, aun así, la exégesis alegórica no siempre es capaz de descubrir la 'vera sentença' (Conv, II, xi, 9)" (p. 91).

¹⁸¹The pertinent text of the Lais consists of lines 9-22

thinking 'medievally' as did the Archpriest, sees her own book as only another 'text,' which will be 'glossed', after the model of the Old Testament commented on by Tertulian, Augustine, Jerome, etc--after the model of Virgil and Ovid 'moralized'" (Leo Spitzer, "Lais," op. cit., p. 100). Spitzer implies that as time, according to the medieval way of thinking, has given the correct, Christian interpretation of old texts, so time, according to Juan Ruiz, will provide the correct gloss for the Libro's episodes, i.e., the glosa will reveal a pattern (otra cosa) which will transcend the literal narrative ("la que se alega en la razon fermosa").

Juan Ruiz, like Marie de France, refers to a gloss which relies on the efforts and subtlety of the reader for its elucidation; but unlike Marie de France, he does not spell out the procedure of glossing clearly; he is vague in saying that "sobre cada fabla se entiende otra cosa," which, in view of his habitual irony, is at best relative, and which insinuates that the meaning of the Libro depends upon the interpretations of its readers. Further, he saps much of the strength of his invitation to gloss by placing

in the prologue: "Custume fu as anciens, / ceo testimoine
 Preciens, / es livres que jadis faiseient / assez oscurement
 diseient / pur cels ki a venir esteient / e ki aprendre les
 deveient, / que peussent gloser la letre / e de lur sen le
 surplus metre. / Li philesophe le saveient, / por els
 meismes l'entendeient, / cum plus trespasereit li tens,
 / plus serreient sutil de sens / e plus se saveient garder
 / de ceo qu'i ert a trespasser."

alongside it an invitation to amusement:

De la santidat mucha es byen grand lyçionario,
mas de juego E de burla es chico breuiario,
por ende fago punto E çierro mi almario,
Sea vos chica fabla solaz E letuario.
(1632)

Thus the Libro is not only a book of glossed lessons but also a breviary which contains jokes and funny games,¹⁸² i.e., elements which exist for no other raison d'être than that in themselves they are a consolation and a delight (solaz, letuario). Readers are not to study the Libro diligently but to enjoy it; the book is not designed so much to stimulate their intellect as to entertain them. As if to underline his artistic conception, Juan Ruiz, in the pose of a jongleur, invites one and all to add to his work or to make corrections to it.

qual quier ome que lo oya, sy bien trobar sopiere,
mas ay añadir E emendar si quisiere,
ande de mano en mano aquien quier quel pydiere,
como pella alas dueñas, tomelo quien podiere.
(1629)

Unlike Marie de France's comments in her prologue or other such warnings, Juan Ruiz here seemingly acts unconcerned about the fate of his book: "Ses vers, il les a jetes a la foule, abandonnes au public sans se soucier de ce que, par la suite, ils deviendraient" (Lecoy, op. cit., pp. 350-351). In his envoi, the didactic pose becomes the instrument

¹⁸²The term "mas" here means "moreover," thus adding "juego" and "burlas." "Adopta [mas] además las significaciones siguientes: = además.1632b" (J. Aguado, Glosario, op. cit., p. 456).

of irony instead of instruction. But it is the pose of the moralist nonetheless, and his manner of presentation exhibits the same manifold, ambiguous, and paradoxical quality it possesses in the prose prologue and the subsequent commentary.

It is now essential to reexamine stanza 1629 which supposedly opens the book to everybody. All critics agree that the stanza reflects the jongleresque temperament of Juan Ruiz. Menendez Pidal interprets it: "El juglar está dominado por el más entrañable sentimiento de la impersonalidad de la obra literaria. Esto se observa hasta en un autor tan original como el Arcipreste de Hita, del que se ha podido decir (aunque inexactamente) que es el único medieval dotado de estilo propio: como está henchido de espíritu juglaresco, no se cuida de la robusta personalidad de su arte, y ansía verla menoscabada por la refundición popular, pues sabe que ese es el precio a que tiene que pagar el éxito y la gloria que ambiciona: 'Qualquier omme que lo oya, si bien trobar sopiere, / puede mas añadir e enmendar lo que quisiere'" (Menéndez Pidal, Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., p. 273). The assumption is that Juan Ruiz leaves his work open, seemingly like jongleurs, so that anyone can change it to suit his taste. Nothing is further from the truth if one considers the expression "sy bien trobar sopiere" which qualifies "Qualquier omme." Juan Ruiz does not open his book for

additions to all those who listen but only to the few who know about poetry. The conjunction sy has the forceful meaning of "provided that," i.e., it sets down the condition of "bien trobar" and thus establishes the capacity for poetical composition as a requisite to handling the Libro. Juan Ruiz is the only Spanish poet of the Middle Ages to stipulate a knowledge of good versification and composition. Here, then, occurs a decisive shift of perspective from jongleur to poet. The "artistic strategy"¹⁸³ of Juan Ruiz in his envoi is now clearer: first, he limits the didactic vision implied through glosa by assuming the popular and entertaining attitude of the jongleur; next, he limits the openness and looseness of the jongleur by setting down a condition of careful artistic awareness.

The implications of an analysis of the envoi confirm the findings concerning Juan Ruiz's irony and art. Irony is felt immediately through the rapid conversions from santidat to burlas, and the startling juxtapositions of dissimilars such as glosa (related to exegesis) and solaz (related to entertainment). Juan Ruiz first proposes a basic congruence between things which have a patent underlying incongruence. He next presents this incongruence as though the obvious and basic dissimilarity between seriousness and jocularity could not really matter. In fact, the absurd possibility of

¹⁸³The term is borrowed from C. C. Singleton, "On Meaning in the Decameron," Italica, XXI (1944), 117-124.

similarity between the didactic subtlety of glossing and the entertaining coarseness of minstrelsy, or even the equivalent and interchangeable identities of "gran licionario" and "chico breviario" is presented matter-of-factly so that the disparity between moral and entertaining values are heightened. In the didactic comments, irony is the chief instrument of Juan Ruiz's artistic aims. The didactic attitude is, perhaps, his most subtle pose. In the envoi, he seemingly adopts it while actually he does not; he employs it for humorous and ironic purposes while seeming to extract from it the traditional moral seriousness associated with glossing. The envoi thus excellently demonstrates Juan Ruiz's dexterity in handling irony through shifts in point of view.

The artistic consciousness of Juan Ruiz is nowhere more evident than in the deliberate qualification of the jongleresque invitation to the readers. It is usually assumed that the Middle Ages did not foster much creative imagination, stressing, instead, moral, allegorical and symbolical meanings. Yet as Gillet convincingly points out, "Imagination nevertheless often had its way."¹⁸⁴ Dante, Juan Ruiz, Boccaccio, Chaucer are there to prove it.¹⁸⁵ The envoi of

¹⁸⁴Joseph Gillet, "The Autonomous Character in Spanish and European Literature," HR, XXIV (1956), p. 179.

¹⁸⁵The medieval artist's freedom of imagination, however, could not be claimed theoretically since it is not until the Renaissance that a writer controls consciously his expressed

the Libro is actually an open invitation to handle the material of the work; one can either "gloss" its content or "emend" its form. Such an invitation is typical of the implications of didactic or jongleresque art: the author's artistic control is denied, and the basic principle of artistic creation--as in most moral or oral art--is the independence of the material, the fact that it belongs to all. This is why the qualifying condition "sy bien trobar sopieren" is so important. At first glance, it appears to be an invitation to poets. The concept of trobar, however, has gone through many meanings in the Libro. Here it is not uttered by a jongleur but by Juan Ruiz who, on commenting upon his work, stresses all the artistic implications of trobar, from rhyme to composition to talent. Thus the literary raw material, i.e., the stuff which passed from author to author, is here consciously controlled more than in any other Spanish medieval writer. Juan Ruiz is opening the doors of his Libro to other writers, to those who in turn can control the raw material. When Juan Ruiz allows for his literary material to step out of his Libro, he does not give up his control, as do the jongleurs or most of the

material. Something like Cervantes' "de cuyo nombre no quiero acordarme." Consciousness of artistic freedom and imagination was brought about after the translation and commentaries of the classical Poetics in the sixteenth century.

didactic writers.¹⁸⁶ He claims that all can read it, use it, or enjoy it, but only artists can handle it. That is, when his material leaves the Libro and is passed around like a pella, it does not gain complete independence as it would in the oral tradition of the jongleurs or the didactic tradition of medieval moralists. His poetic material is delimited because it is characterized, because it is stamped with the qualification of art: saber, trobar, bien are terms which point out the emergence of writing from mere technique or preaching to a state of conscious artistry.

The envoi thus crystallizes the two basic poses of Juan Ruiz with which he confronts his readers: In the Libro, he pretends undue humility in posing as the moralist and entertainer; however, he assumes superiority in posing as a "one in a thousand" poet. His pose of humility is ironic; that of good artist is straight. Whatever question there may be about the sincerity of the moral and artistic poses, there can be little or none about their aesthetic usefulness. They result in a dual vision: two consciousnesses are at work, that of the moralist and that of the poet. As a moralist, he makes his points in an oblique manner, thus achieving an ambiguous pose and exploiting the aesthetic possibilities of irony; as a poet, he makes his points

¹⁸⁶We do have a coincidence: as Juan Ruiz controls his *Trotaconventos* by characterizing her, so does Rojas control *Celestina* by enriching *Trotaconventos* psychologically.

straight, thus reinforcing the art of irony with the art of trovar. However we consider or evaluate the poses that emerge in the commentary of the Libro, we are dealing with the art of Juan Ruiz.

CHAPTER FOUR

ART AND THEME: THE COMMENTARY ON LOVE

The art of Juan Ruiz lies both in his ironic method and in his technical and inventive brilliance. In the range that results from the union of his artistic skill with his consciousness of it, his achievement as an ironist and humorist becomes almost unique. The intellectual temper of the Middle Ages, the variety of traditions working in the Libro, and the background of literary sources, have hitherto been more thoroughly discussed than have Juan Ruiz's technical accomplishments. In the previous chapters, I concentrated on the latter aspect of his art in the belief that such a study offers a promising means for investigating the complex form of the Libro de Buen Amor. My study so far is concerned with an anatomy of Juan Ruiz's artistic devices. It should not be forgotten, however, that humor and irony are Juan Ruiz's chosen instruments for dissecting the nature of love. Therefore, his artistic devices are not simply imposed on his materials, but are organically related to his perception of the disparity between the realism of loco amor and the idealism of buen amor. I therefore would like to investigate those aspects of Juan Ruiz's craftsmanship which most intimately join with and express the central theme of love.

Juan Ruiz often refers to authority, that is, to the ancient writers from whom came all learning. But there is

another immense authority, that of experience, which Juan Ruiz almost always contrasts with antiquity. It is with an observant and instructed eye that he looks out on the world of love. There are at least three kinds of authoritative sources that we can observe directing Juan Ruiz's understanding of worldly love: works on biology, works on astrology, and treatises on love. He uses various elements from each and contrasts them with experience. To demonstrate his elaboration of some of these theoretical sources is to reveal Juan Ruiz's art in relation to his theme.¹

Juan Ruiz utilizes his authorities in different ways. Although he understands his sources very well, he gives them his own expression and form. Therefore, what matters is not

¹I am using the term "theme," simply, as that part of the Libro which represents, insofar as can be determined, Juan Ruiz's interpretation of his chosen topic, love. An investigation of such a theme consists in analyzing, precisely, the various effects of love as determined by the circumstances, the episodes, and, above all, the comments of the narrator. I have thus entitled this chapter "Art and Theme" instead of "The Art of Theme" because I agree with Stephen Gilman (The Art of La Celestina, Univ. of Wisconsin Press [Madison, 1956]) that "an 'art of theme' is both an impossibility and a contradiction in terms" (p. 119). I am concentrating on Juan Ruiz's technical method of elaborating traditions as he evolves what Pedro Salinas calls his "vital preoccupation." To this extent I have been influenced by Gilman's basic approach: "... the theme which is, on the one hand, an ultimately personal posture towards life can, on the other, be expressed by an author or become known to an author only in terms of a tradition. Precisely because the theme is so personally authentic, a critical understanding of it involves an exploration by the poet of his tradition" (ibid., p. 155).

the similarity between Juan Ruiz and tradition but the dissimilarity, especially as it is revealed in his technique, in his art of reshaping both traditional ideas and expressions to fit his own artistic purposes. If the irony of the moral commentaries which I have suggested is valid; if the comments on art are characteristic of Juan Ruiz's preoccupation with literary devices; and if his imitations of traditional stories are usually humorous and entertaining; then, it is possible that Juan Ruiz uses his authorities with a certain consciousness of technique. His elaborations of authority are directly related to matters of style, composition, and literary devices as we have examined them. Evident in Juan Ruiz's deviations and graftings is a consistent pattern of "authority vs. experience," artistically presented through the manipulation of traditional ideas and expressions, the major points of which are suggested rather than spelled out.²

²Whenever the theme of love is considered by critics, references are made only to the comments that are related to buen amor. The view is still that any thematic unity must be found in those comments which praise charity, warn against the pitfalls of worldly love and in general point out that love leads to failure unless it is the love of God. The fact that virtually each love affair fails is proof, critics claim, that the narrative fits into the medieval notions of Christian decency, i.e., the narrative moves in such a direction that the sum total of failures, with the unifying effect of the commentary on buen amor, promotes charity and condemns cupidity. (For a discussion of the medieval method of interpreting secular failures, see D. W. Robertson, Jr., "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens," Speculum, XXVI [1951], 24ff.) The Libro abounds,

Juan Ruiz's elaboration of Aristotle, traditional astrology, and treatises on love consistently exemplifies Juan Ruiz's art.

I

Elaboration of Aristotle

Juan Ruiz elaborates the views of Aristotle concerning physical love and creates a new way of looking at the physical union. Stanzas 71-77 ("aquí dize de como Segund natura los omes e las otras animalias quieren aver compañía con las fenbras") may be paraphrased as follows:

Aristotle says, correctly, that the world strives for two things: sustenance and union with a pleasing woman. Since a famous philosopher claims this point it should not be challenged. Juntamiento is more important to man than to other animals because man, unlike animals, is not limited in his sexual activity by seasons; he seeks a woman "cada que puede e quiere fazer esta locura." Like fire in ashes which, the more it is kindled, the more it burns, man, compelled by nature, sins. Although man knows that he is falling, "no se parte ende / ca natura lo enriza." The Archpriest, like any other sinner, has experienced love (i.e., has sinned) with women. Consequently, he offers to tell the reader about his love experiences.

This passage is important in the structure of the Libro because it marks the personal appearance of the author

however, with comments concerning the advantages or necessities of carnal love. These comments, amplified and glossed in the course of the narrative, are never examined in critical evaluations of the Libro. Characteristically, the passage of Aristotle, despite its obvious importance both in structure and theme, is rarely, if at all, mentioned in the studies of María Rosa Lida, Leo Spitzer, F. Lázaro, and Lecoy.

as the protagonist of the narrative. The author projects himself into his work as a fictional being and creates the double perspective of persona and author. Juan Ruiz's self-fictionalization establishes an inner relationship between the moralizations on the theme of love and the articulated personal experience of the persona. The author does not merely comment on the views of Aristotle; he becomes the illustrator of them. Thus the passage is central to an understanding of the art of Juan Ruiz; it points up the theme of physical love and offers hints of the viewpoints that will be amplified and varied in the rest of the commentary. Juan Ruiz generalizes about man and immediately emphasizes the question of pleasure and inevitability only hinted at in Aristotle.

No critic has made a thorough investigation and study of this passage. Two writers who have dealt with this have proposed as Juan Ruiz's source the introductory remarks of Politics where Aristotle discusses the need for community, the union of man and woman as the basis of family, and the difference in man's sex habits from those of animals.³ In

³Erasmus Buceta, "La Política de Aristóteles, fuente de unos versos del Arcipreste de Hita," RFE, XIII (1925), 56-60. Buceta establishes the source by pointing out some general similarities and then attempts to locate some other citations from Aristotle in the Libro. Thomas Hart, La alegoría en el Libro de Buen Amor (Madrid, 1959) utilizes Buceta's findings and argues that because Juan Ruiz cites Aristotle incorrectly, he attempts to criticize loco amor as a source of sin.

fact, there are only two passages in the whole of Politics that are even remotely related to Juan Ruiz's citation.⁴ The source hitherto proposed is not the correct one and, what is more serious, Thomas Hart's interpretation is erroneous and the inferences drawn from it distort the picture of Juan Ruiz as an ironic writer.⁵ The source of this passage is Aristotle's biological work, Animalia.⁶

⁴The first coupling together of persons then to which necessity gives rise is that between those who are unable to exist without one another, namely the union of female and male for the continuance of the species . . ." (Politics, Book I, 1): "Hence when devoid of virtue man is the most unscrupulous and savage of animals, and the worst in regard to sexual indulgence and gluttony" (ibid). Hart (Chapter II, "Naturaleza y naturaleza caída" pp. 29-45) forces most of the relationships. In fact, his argument is based on the medieval concepts of "nature," "sin," "fall," and "experience," not on a relationship between Juan Ruiz and Aristotle's writings.

⁵The citation of Aristotle is one of the passages Hart uses to demonstrate certain allegorical categories in the Libro which, he claims, have not been noticed. The passage of Aristotle shows that, "El Libro de Buen Amor puede ser comprendido mejor precisamente como una exposición--y de aquí un ataque--de este tipo de 'locura'" (op. cit., p. 45).

⁶The works of Aristotle in the Middle Ages have been traced by several scholars. See A. Jourdain, Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote (Paris, 1843); Tomas Carreras y Artauau, Historia de filosofía española, vols. I-II (Madrid, 1939); Fernand Van Steenberghen, Aristotle in the West (Louvain, 1955). (He sums up Aristotle's scientific importance: "Aristotle was to be accepted by the Western world, as he had been accepted by the Arabs, because of the exceptional scientific qualities of his work" p. 60.) The work in question was usually referred to as Liber de animalibus or Tractatus de animalibus. Among Aristotle's works, Animalia attracted the least number of commentaries. Pedro Hispano, mid-thirteenth century, was the first scholastic author to comment on it. Aristotle's views on this subject were generally accepted without much variance.

The work had been translated and was accessible before Juan Ruiz's time.⁷ Almost everything in Juan Ruiz's citation has an exact counterpart in Aristotle's study of physical union among humans and animals.

Following are the pertinent excerpts from Animalia⁸:

1) The life of animals, then, may be divided into two acts--procreation and feeding, for on these two acts all their interests and life concentrate . . . And whatsoever is in conformity with nature, is pleasant, and all animals pursue pleasure in keeping with their nature (Bk, VIII, pp. 588b-589a); 2) The faculty of reproduction, then, is common to all alike. If sensibility be superadded, then their lives will differ from one another in respect to sexual intercourse through the varying amount of pleasure derived therefrom, and also in regard to modes of parturition and ways of rearing their young (ibid); 3) . . . with regard to the same phenomenon, there are definite laws followed as regards the season of the year and the age of the animal (Bk V, p. 542a); 4) Man pairs and breeds at all seasons, as is the case also with domesticated animals, owing to the shelter and good feeding they enjoy: that is to say, with those whose period of gestation is also comparatively brief (ibid).

Aristotle's views on reproduction and the differences

⁷For example, Gonzalo Palomeque, who died as bishop of Cuenca, records that in 1273 he possessed 42 Códices and lists "7 cuadernos del libro De Animalibus escriptos de la mano del traslador" (Carreras y Artau, op. cit., II, p. 80). He had scientific contacts with Alfonso X. The question remains what particular work did Juan Ruiz have at hand when he wrote. What is remarkable, as we will see, is his exactness in rendering Aristotle's biological views.

⁸All quotations of Aristotle are taken from The Works of Aristotle, trans., ed. J. A. Smith, W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1910). Volume IV is Historia Animalium, translated by D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson. Underlined words to point out the similarities with Juan Ruiz's citation are mine.

between man and animals form a part of his general studies of organic nature where he conceives the world as "teleological," i.e., a world of purpose, of a constant seeking to become. Animalia is part of these observations: animal life consists of nourishment, sustenance and reproduction; there are, however, basic differences in sexual and reproductive habits between man and animals, for whereas the animal soul is born and perishes with the body whose form it is, mind is unoriginated and imperishable.⁹

Juan Ruiz's technique is interesting in that, despite his free version of Aristotle, there are a number of expressions in much the same wording: "El mundo por dos cosas trabaja"; mantenencia; "por aver juntamiento"; "segunt natura"; "todas a tienpo cierto se juntan con natura." Within these correct citations, however, Juan Ruiz departs from the outline of the Animalia and modifies considerably both Aristotle's content and tone: (1) He cites mantenencia but avoids any discussion of it. Notice the stylistic difference: Aristotle's "divided into two parts" gives equal importance to "these two acts," "procreation and

⁹These physiological discussions are, naturally, detached and general. The style is objective and precise: "It now remains for us to discuss, duly and in order, their several modes of propagation. . . . These modes are many and diverse, and in some respects are like and in other respects are unlike to one another" (Book V, p. 538^b).

feeding"; Juan Ruiz's "la primera" vs. "la otra cosa era" emphasizes one act (juntamiento) and dismisses the other (mantenencia). (2) Juan Ruiz grafts two unlike concepts (mundo and fenbra), something impossible in Aristotle. There is an obvious shift from a general consideration of life (Aristotle's way) to the very particular situation (fenbra, Juan Ruiz's immediate subject). The shift establishes the man-woman theme in the narrative. (3) He unites what is separated in Aristotle: "fenbra plazentera." Aristotle refers to the general pleasure derived from copulation, whereas Juan Ruiz reduces and particularizes the general adjective "pleasant"; he thus gives it precision and focuses his immediate problem as protagonist, that of finding a pleasing woman. (4) Aristotle states that it is natural for all living beings to seek company (as Juan Ruiz, 73b,c), but never does he say or even insinuate "muncho mas el ome," that is, there is no particular or special preoccupation. This is Juan Ruiz's interpolation, followed by the rare expression, "Digo muy mas el ome," as if recognizing his slight deviation from the authority he is citing quite accurately. With a few slight touches Juan Ruiz again shifts the ground of discussion from a general consideration of mundo (toda criatura, Omes, aves, animalias), to the specific consideration of man; he is thus able, logically, to introduce his own, personal adventures since

"E yo, porque so ome," etc. (5) Juan Ruiz cites Aristotle almost exactly with reference to the seasons; he adds, however, two telling variations: Aristotle states that man pairs at all seasons, adding, "as is the case also with domesticated animals"; the non-limitation, according to Aristotle, is "owing to the shelter and good feeding they enjoy," an objective and scientifically-oriented finding. Juan Ruiz avoids any reference to domesticated animals, thus making seasonal non-limitation a characteristic of man only; his reasons, as opposed to Aristotle's impersonal argument, are that man is "de mal sseso," that he indulges "todo tiempo syn mesura," and that the whole activity is a locura. These arguments are more fitting to his particular purposes. The insinuation is that it is not lodging but pleasure and the awareness of it that abolishes seasons and, consequently, temporal limitations. (6) Finally, Juan Ruiz refers to Aristotle's argument concerning Nature's compelling powers. While Aristotle discusses this problem from a scientific point of view ("animals in general seem naturally disposed to this intercourse"). Juan Ruiz presents it in terms of a striking traditional image: fire in ashes which, the more it is stirred, the more it burns;¹⁰ that is, he again shifts

¹⁰ The traditional commonplace of fire = love is purposely un-Aristotelian: "El ffuego ssienpre quiere estar en la ceniza, / como quier que mas arde quanto mas se atiza" (75a,b). The verbs arde and atiza become active words of

the "general" grounds of Aristotle and relates the course of Nature to man's inevitable drives toward pleasure which is to be found in juntamiento.

The emphasis in Aristotle is scientific: the findings on "union" and "reproduction" are part of his arguments concerning the "vital activity" of living beings; he attempts to prove the thesis that among 'living beings,' there is a continuous and gradual ascent from the most imperfect to the highest. There is never at any time a special consideration of pleasure. Such references are incidental or matter-of-fact statements. For example: "It is common to all animals to be most excited by the desire of one sex for the other and by the pleasure derived from copulation" (Book VI, p. 571^b). This observation is followed by a minute and scientific analysis of the male vs. female

expression crystalizing passion and compulsion and suggesting, perhaps, in view of the keynoting "fembra plazertera," pleasure. The image, coming from outside Aristotelian diction, on one hand, shifts the meaning of Aristotle, but, on the other, draws additional strength from Aristotle's argument of "segund natura" and becomes more meaningful. Juan Ruiz, analogously to a painter's careful choice of colors from the palette he intends to use for a proposed picture, selects his expressions from tradition carefully so that he creates a variety of diction and focus. With this image, for example, he shifts the reader's attention from Aristotle to himself, the narrator, who is soon to become the protagonist of love adventures which emanate precisely from this image. It is the allusion to passion and anxiety (ffuego, geniza, arde, atiza) that clearly establish a difference between Aristotle's general statements and the narrator's person experience.

differences. In short, according to Aristotle, what is important in physical union is not pleasure but reproduction which illustrates one of the "vital activities" in the living universe.

Juan Ruiz cites Aristotle correctly on the general question of physical union but introduces variations: a) physical union is imperative, but not for the purposes of reproduction. The implication is that one cannot change human nature in the question of loco amor ("El ome, quando peca, bien vee que desliza; / mas non se parte ende, ca natura lo enriza"); b) there are differences between humans and animals since humans make union a constant habit (man is not limited by seasons); c) the chief considerations of physical union are pleasure, natural compulsion, and sin, all elements applicable to man; d) any differences are due mainly to man's mal sesso, to his lack of mesura.

The emphasis in Juan Ruiz is subjective and pragmatic: the "vital activity" of union is presented only from man's immediate concern, that is, from the viewpoint of its naturalness and its pleasure. The point made is that juntamiento is natural ("por dos cosas trabaja"), necessary ("Quiere, segunt natura, conpañã sienpre nueva"), inevitable ("ca natura lo enriza"), and above all pleasant ("fenbra plazentera"). Consequently, man practices it more than any other living being in the world ("digo muy mas el ome, que

de toda criatura").

Juan Ruiz distorts the general content of Aristotle's Animalia almost completely, not necessarily by misquoting him, but rather, by avoiding certain clarifying references, by grafting expressions, and by interjecting a few images of his own. He thus purposefully shifts the emphasis from Aristotle's abstract observations concerning "human nature" to the "union" itself; specifically, he stresses the fun experienced by humans through this act--an interest contrary to Aristotle's intent. This is evident in a brief examination of the manner with which Aristotle and Juan Ruiz present their findings and arguments. Aristotle follows a straight logical pattern: he introduces the subject of the sexual habits of men and women in detail, in correct, denotative, scientific language; he then gives many illustrations; after discussing their importance and their implications, he gives a resume which is definite: "Such then are the differences between mankind and other animals in regard to the many various modes of completion of the term of pregnancy." There is always a complete correspondence between his proofs and his generalizations. Juan Ruiz's reference to Aristotle as an authority is supposedly a recognition of the

philosopher's knowledge of his subject and his veracity.¹¹

However, he compresses most of Aristotle's findings into a few lines and expressions. He introduces the core of the Aristotelian argument (sustenance and procreation in the living world) in the first stanza; the whole vocabulary is from the Animalia: cosa verdadera; mundo; "por dos cosas trabaja; mantenencia; juntamiento; fenbra plazentera; yet he has introduced new elements whose implications are evident in the rest of the Libro; 1) when Aristotle refers to "world," he points to "male-female" distinctions; by counterpoising fenbra to mundo, Juan Ruiz shifts the emphasis to a "man-woman" relationship. Thus the subject loses its abstract quality and gains immediacy. 2) He drives a wedge between man's two basic realities, mantenencia and juntamiento. By abandoning the one completely and by concentrating strictly on the other he consciously takes from

¹¹In the Middle Ages, ancient writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Virgil, and Cicero were the authorities whose opinions had often a juridical value. "Ils jouissent d'un crédit moral, d'une 'autorité,' sur laquelle on peut s'appuyer pour la solution d'une question ou l'élaboration d'une preuve; ils sont des modèles littéraires pour les grammairiens et les rhétoriciens, des maîtres de science et de pensée pour les philosophes, les théologiens, les juristes. Leur oeuvres . . . constituent même la base de l'enseignement" Gerard Paré, Les idées et les lettres au XIII^e siècle, Bibliothèque de Philosophie (Montreal, 1947), p. 16. Ernst Curtius, Das Buch als Symbol in der Divina Commedia, comes to the same conclusion: "Todo descubrimiento de verdad consiste, ante todo, en la aceptación de las verdades tradicionales y, secundariamente, en concordar racionalmente los textos autoritarios" (trans. by Leo Spitzer in "En torno," op. cit., p. 121).

Aristotle only those elements which are of vital interest to him at the moment (be they moral or artistic preoccupations). 3) Aristotle refers to the possibilities of pleasure in physical union, but nowhere does he refer to a woman as pleasing. Juan Ruiz grafts two different concepts (juntamiento and plazentera) to the man-woman relationship and creates a new perspective. Fembra plazentera is Juan Ruiz's innovation; it bears the stamp of his artistic individuality.

With his flair for ironic and shifting expressions, Juan Ruiz has transposed from Animalia findings and expressions more appropriate to the commentary of the Libro in general. In citing Aristotle, he intimates that man is not limited by seasons in his union with "fembra plazentera" because of the pleasure involved and not because of climate or desire to reproduce, as Aristotle would have us believe. Moreover, he combines the element of pleasure with the element of natural inevitability to make a good case for all the examples of loco amor which are to follow and in which he will be the protagonist. He thus makes a subtle, but definite, insinuation to the reader: "I am a man and consequently a sinner; I cannot help all my actions, but whatever I do, happens to be also very pleasing." Thus what we see in Juan Ruiz's Aristotelian citation is an authoritative view of juntamiento interpreted in terms of

his own personality and, above all, his own experience; this interpretation has received a special ironic, tongue-in-cheek expression by Juan Ruiz, the conscious artist who is aware of the changes he is bringing about.¹² In this elaboration of a well-known authority one is well aware of the artist in the methods (irony, grafting, shifting, insinuation, imagery, antithesis) he employs to achieve his desired effect.

The start of the narrative coincides with the exposition of the theme of love. Juan Ruiz uses Aristotle to point out the biological forces of love, yet he is carried away by the suggestions of pleasure. Consequently, the Animalia itself,

¹²In view of the textual evidence I cannot agree with Maria Rosa Lida's and Leo Spitzer's opinions concerning Juan Ruiz's habit of citing authorities: "También Juan Ruiz, como otros poetas medievales, gusta de mencionar un 'texto,' donde nosotros diríamos 'fuente'; y ello no por ingenuidad, como piensan algunos críticos modernos, sino porque el libro crea autoridad" ("En torno," op. cit., note 13). Besides the obvious distortions of the text he cites, Juan Ruiz is even ironic in the manner with which he refers to his source. For example, within a mere nine lines, he refers to Aristotle no less than five times: 1) "Como dize Aristotiles"; 2) "Si lo dixiese de mio"; 3) "Dicelo grand filosofo"; 4) "De lo que dice el sabio"; 5) "por obra se prueba el sabio." There is a variance in tone in the above allusions. No. 1 introduces his topic, but immediately distorts Aristotle. Therefore, the reiteration of authority, with the added adjective "grand" to reinforce it is ironic. The accumulation of allusions serves to focus his own contribution by pretending not to contribute: "Si lo dixiese de mio, seria de culpar." I would suggest that, at least in this passage, not only is Juan Ruiz ingenious, but he seems to be aware of his ingenuity in pretending to add force to his own views through the authority of a great philosopher.

i.e., his "authority," is not so interesting to Juan Ruiz as the implications he derives from it. Specifically, he uses this treatise to expand the theme of love by contrasting authority with experience. His method of elaboration is as follows: to the Christian thesis that physical love is harmful, he opposes the arguments of Aristotle that reproduction demands such love, while to the Aristotelian argument that physical love is natural, he adds that it is also pleasurable; in terms of theme, to Christian charity he opposes biology, and to the latter he adds passion, on the authority of personal experience. Out of this simple design there emerges in the course of the narrative a commentary on the issues of physical love; in the ensuing episodes, he develops the germinal concept of "naturalness" and "pleasure": what is "natural" in love will become either a habit, or an inevitable helplessness; what is "pleasant" will become an exaltation of the advantages of love. From the aesthetic point of view, what stands out is Juan Ruiz's array of devices used to modify his sources in a uniquely crucial way and to relate effectively these modifications to purposeful comments in the context of the Libro.¹³

¹³There is one critic who sees some semblance of structural unity in the Libro other than one based on a typical medieval pattern: "Dans ce Moyen Age, où la composition rigoureuse, telle que nous l'exigeons aujourd'hui, est inconnue, le 'Livre de Bon Amour' apparaît comme une oeuvre ordonnée, et non comme l'assemblage fantaisiste d'un

II

Astrology: Worldly Love and Free Will

The long passage about the stars (126-165) is important in the structure of the Libro because it links the first "autobiographic" passage with the subsequent love affairs of the hero and because it also carries the arguments of that passage to their logical end: namely, that man cannot resist loco amor and that he can hardly be expected to stop indulging and, consequently, sinning.

Let us set aside for the moment the passage in question and return to the Aristotelian citations. It will be recalled that Juan Ruiz shifts Aristotle's observations to demonstrate that love is pleasant, that in the case of man (unlike animals in general) love is not limited by seasons (time) and that physical indulgence is a biological necessity. Now I would like to move a little ahead and consider the passage which immediately follows that dealing with the stars:

Como dize el sabio, cosa dura e fuerte
es dexar la costunbre el fado e la suerte;
la costunbre es otra natura çierta mente,
a penas non se pierde fasta que viene la muerte.
(166)

After praising love in spite of his two failures, the

amateur de folklore" F. Babillot, "Le Libro de Buen Amor de l'archiprêtre de Hita," BH, XXXVI (1934), p. 500. Unfortunately this argument is very brief (pp. 500-502) and very general.

Archpriest is about to embark on his third love affair. He invokes authority (el sabio probably refers to Aristotle, see E. Buceta, op. cit., p. 58) this time to stress that loco amor is habitual. He utilizes a proverbial expression (based on traditional phrasings such as "la costumbre es otra o segunda naturaleza," or "Lo que demandan las costumbres es mas fuerte que lo que demanda la natura")¹⁴ to imply that man's tendency to love is strengthened by repetition since love is easily accessible and, above all, since it weakens man's resistance. If regularly repeated, love becomes habitual, and the Archpriest will, naturally or necessarily, continue to indulge: "E porque es costunbre, de mançebos usada, / . . . tome amiga nueva, una dueña engerrada" (167). The views developed in the authoritative citation of Aristotle are here completed: Love is not only natural, pleasant, and unlimited but also a custom from which man cannot easily extricate himself. The passage is strongly worded (cosa dura, otra natura, ciertamente, la muerte) to show man's helplessness in avoiding love, a point which recurs throughout the commentary of the Libro. The subtlety with which Juan Ruiz avoids considering the problem of whether man, or the narrator himself, really wants to

¹⁴The idea imparted by this proverb was popular. In La Celestina, book XV, a tone similar to that employed by Juan Ruiz is preserved: "Ya sabes quan duro es dexar lo usado, e que mudar costumbre es a par de muerte."

abandon the practice of love is striking.¹⁵ All of the views on "custom" gain coherence in the story of the stars.

The sources of the story about the astrologer's predictions concerning the fate of King Alaraz's infant (129-139) have been amply investigated.¹⁶ The legend centers around three predictions. Any variations depend on the personae and on the manner in which the predictions are fulfilled. In Vendôme's L'Hermaphrodite, the child of Venus is born a hermaphrodite who later in life falls off a bridge, hangs on a tree which the river overruns, and drowns, thus fulfilling the different predictions of Apollo, Mars, and

¹⁵In a comment similar to that of *costume* ("Como dise un Derecho, que 'coyta non ay ley'" [928]) Cejador y Frauca makes the following observation: "Coyta non ay ley, 'necesitas caret lege,' que la necesidad tiene cara de hereje" (note 928). Juan Ruiz is certainly not a heretic, especially since he is not interested in theological arguments. Neither is he very orthodox, however, in manipulating Christian doctrines.

¹⁶Castro Guisasola, "El horóscopo del hijo del rey Alcaraz en el Libro de buen amor," RFE, X (1923), 396-398, relates it to Matthieu de Vendôme's epigram, L'Hermaphrodite (three gods foretell correctly the fate of sex and death of Venus' as yet unborn child); J. N. Crawford, "El horóscopo del hijo del rey Alcaraz en el Libro de Buen Amor," RFE, XII (1925), 184-190, believes the source to be the legend of Merlin, found in French versions of Arthurian Romances, in Geoffroi de Monmouth's Vita Merlini (1148) and in the Spanish Balardo del sabio Merlin (end of thirteenth); H.L.D. Ward, "Lailoken," Romania, XXII (1893), 504-526 claims that the legend of predictions comes from Scottish stories about Lailoken who predicts his own death; J. Hurtado and A. Gonzalez Palencia, Historia de la literatura española (Madrid, 1943) insist that the origins of the legend are oriental. As good as any is perhaps Crawford's vague statement that the legend is "una combinación interesante de

Juno. The fulfillment of all three predictions underlines Nature's irregular processes, the monstrosities which result from Nature's caprices. What stands out is the freakish quality of the hermaphrodite.¹⁷ In the Merlin tradition some nobles, wishing to prove Merlin a fraud, disguise a baron three different ways and try to trick Merlin into predicting a different manner of death each time.¹⁸ The baron's death (falls off his horse on a bridge, hangs by a tree, and drowns) justifies Merlin's predictions and regains for him the favors of the king. What stands out in this version is intrigue; the emphasis lies more on the fortunes of Merlin or his enemies than in the power of natural forces to determine man's course.¹⁹ In the Scottish version,

elementos orientales y occidentales" (op. cit., p. 190). What matters is that the legend was very popular and easily accessible to Juan Ruiz.

¹⁷The popularity of this story is attested by Cristobal Castillejo's imitation of the epigram: "vir, femina, neutrum / flumina, tela, cruce," becomes, "Al fin merecí, muriendo, / hembra, macho y neutro siendo, / muerte de agua, hierro y cruz."

¹⁸In G. Monmouth's version, Vita Merlini, it is the king's jealous wife who brings her newly-born infant to Merlin disguised three times.

¹⁹This particular episode is only a small part of Merlin's long life in all the versions. (See El balardo del sabio Merlin, 1498, in Libros de Caballerias, NBAE, I [1907], pp. 29-31). For a study of Merlin's prophetic powers see J. Hammer, "A commentary on the Prophetia Merlini," Speculum, X (1935). In every legend, the emphasis lies on the demonic powers of Merlin: "The holy rite annuled the evil purpose of Satan, but, owing to his uncanny origin, the child [Merlin] was gifted with all manner of strange powers, and from the first was marked as a fairy child" Helene A. Guerber, Myths & Legends of the Middle Ages (London, 1909), p. 275.

Lailoken predicts three different deaths for himself; the king, thinking him crazy, puts him in prison. "He is much more a madman than a prophet" (Ward, op. cit., p. 512).

Juan Ruiz draws from a tradition which conceived the story as a dramatic situation: trap, predictions, loss of reputation, the predictions come true, restoration of honor. In each case the stress is on the actors of the drama, and they cause the movement of the narrative. The titles themselves--L'Hermaphrodite, Vita Merlini, Lailoken--underline this observation. I traced the tradition carefully because Juan Ruiz's changes are directly related to his most crucial comments on love: the problem of the power which the stars exercise over man's destiny, and the question of free will in combatting the enticements of pleasurable love. All critics dismiss the variations which Juan Ruiz introduces. Lecoy's comment is representative: "Les modifications que l'on relève dans sa narration (quintuple prédiction attribuée à cinq devins différents) ne sont pas à ce point essentielles qu'on ne puisse les expliquer facilement."²⁰ As a result, the textual commentaries based upon this story and which deal with man's position in the face of loco amor, have been overlooked.

²⁰ Félix Lecoy, Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita (Paris, 1938), p. 163.

In Juan Ruiz's version, an oriental king asks five sabios about "el signo e la planeta del fijo." Each predicts a different death and all predictions are fulfilled; they arrive at their predictions by examining the point of the stars under which the child was born. (a) This is the first time in this tradition that those who prophesy consult the stars, i.e., the first time that this prophesy is directly related to the power of the stars over man's fate. (b) Juan Ruiz increases the predictions from three to five thus emphasizing the power of the stars and the inevitable failure of man's attempts to avoid his fate. Dramatic situation and characterization are deemphasized in order to strengthen the connection between prediction and stars: "quel ome quando nasce luego en su naçençia / el signo en que nasce le juzgan por sentençia" (123c,d). (c) He associates celestial powers with God: "mas como es verdat e non puede faller / en lo que dios ordena en como ha de ser, / segund natural cursso, non se puede estorçer" (136b,c,d). The tone is one of acquiescence to forces beyond man's control. (d) He next introduces the argument of stars vs. free-will and illustrates it with a digressio: only God has the power to change a course set by the stars; or, to use his analogy, a king can change his own laws: God and king are alike in that "quien puede fazer leyes, puede contra ellas yr" (145d). This argument does not center on

man but on the powers outside man. (e) The ending of the argument is revealing: the Archpriest repeats his faith in the astrologers because, through experience (151), he knows that those born under Venus are destined to love (152) --exemplified, of course, by his own case (153).

The design of Juan Ruiz's presentation is now clear: first he changes the traditional story in order to focus better man's helplessness when under a sentencia; next, he introduces the theme of helplessness: the planet is Venus, the "sentencia" is love, and the helpless "victims" are lovers like himself. The story and the commentary merge in such a way that in the face of love's overwhelming power, man is either unable or reluctant to use his free will and escape his fate, i.e., avoid indulging. By insinuation, then, man, and consequently the narrator himself, is meant to participate in love. Juan Ruiz adds the argument concerning God's power over the course of the stars presumably to counter the idea of inevitability, but he quickly dismisses it (151); he shifts to the point he developed in the Aristotle passage and expands it: to love women is not only pleasant and natural; it is also determined and inevitable.

A brief survey of the background against which these arguments are formulated demonstrates the subtlety of Juan Ruiz's mind. The question of stars controlling man's destiny was one of the most debated in the Middle Ages.

It centered on the paradox of human responsibility within a determined universe. One tradition held that "l'homme est régi par des fatalités de nature, qui se traduisent extérieurement par des signes irréfragables."²¹ The view was that some men are led by inclinations imparted by the stars and, therefore, cannot resist certain passions. On the other hand, even if passion could be overcome by the human will, many found in the stars an excuse for abandoning themselves to passion. Another tradition accepted as true that celestial bodies inscribe good or bad dispositions at birth, but argued that practical reason or will could overcome these influences. This was the theological view carefully elaborated by Thomas Aquinas: the stars incline man's will, they do not control it.²² The problem had been debated and clarified in Spain at least a century before

²¹Ernest Langlois, La Vie en France au moyen age, III (Paris, 1924-28), p. 117. See also G. Pare (op. cit., p. 233), "à l'époque où Jean de Meun écrivait son roman, le fatalisme astrologique--avec des doctrines de toutes sortes, issues de l'aristotélisme et de l'arabisme--avait les sympathisants et même des partisans à la faculté des arts de l'Université de Paris."

²²See E. Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy (New York, 1940), discussions on stars. Also, P. Choinsard, Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'influence des astres (Paris, 1926). G. Pare (op. cit., p. 235) sums up most of the theological basis of the argument: "Tout cela exprime en termes littéraires une idée communément admise en doctrine chrétienne à savoir: l'âme humaine, parce qu'intelligente et spirituelle, est créée immédiatement par Dieu; les agents naturels quels qu'ils soient ne participent aucunement à sa production."

Juan Ruiz. In El caballero Zifar one reads: ". . . e maguer que los aparejamientos de las estrellas muestran algunas cosas sobre la nascçencia de algunt ome, la su alma ha poder de lo defender dellos, sy el quesière, por ella es espiritual e es mas alta que las estrellas e mas digna que ellas."²³

There are four major thematic differences between Juan Ruiz and tradition: First, he stresses the power of the stars not only in the story itself where he increases the predictions to five, but also in the commentary (123-127) where he reinforces abstract arguments with concrete imagery. His purpose is to show that man cannot escape his destiny. He offers as an example the many clerics who study long and hard but who actually waste their time because, in the end, they know very little. The "attempt vs. accomplishment" situation is balanced until copla 126. Suddenly the antithesis becomes more pronounced and more dynamic. Juan Ruiz no longer tells us that men fail because "non pueden desmentir a la astrologia"; he fortifies his assertion with an image:

otros sirven Señores con las manos anbas
pero muchos de aquestos dan en tierra de palmas.
(126c,d)

The idea of falling on one's face, in addition to having the same meaning as failing, is distinguished from previous

²³Chapter 130, ed. Wagner (1929), p. 269 (part of "Los castigos del rey de Menton").

expressions related to astrology such as "que su fado les guia," "El signo en que nasce le juzgan por sentençia," "tal es su fado e su don," "en cabo saben poco," "non pueden desmentir a la astrologia." The expression is rich in implications because it is juxtaposed to the other more general, abstract statements. Juan Ruiz with his typical dexterity uses a concrete image as the climax of an argument and thus generates a sudden shift in the tone and meaning. The expression "dar en tierra en palmas" does not mean the same thing as the theoretical argument it illustrates. It suggests comic helplessness rather than mere failure. It introduces a visual picture rather than a concept. When the reader sees "dan en tierra de palmas," he thinks of a literal fall rather than of merely being unsuccessful. Because the argument on the power of the stars is related to this concrete and comic image, the image carries the theme of this crucial passage: despite his best efforts for buen amor, man does not only fail; he falls flat on his face since he cannot stop from indulging in loco amor. The connection between the natural impulses of physical love and the improbability of escape from the power of the stars becomes clearer because of the image. The image becomes simultaneously the subject of the argument and the argument itself. Its concreteness is not relegated to the secondary function of illustration; it becomes the primary vehicle of

meaning. As with the image of fuego-geniza in the passage of Aristotle, so here, Juan Ruiz focuses the problem of theory vs. experience by moving from organized arguments to concrete images.

The second major difference is that he never once mentions free-will which, in a Christian scheme of things, can overcome whatever is ordained by the stars. In such arguments, human reason or free will are almost automatic. Don Juan Manuel, for example, is clear on this subject: "E esta semejança es la rrazon e el saber e el libre albedrio que dios puso en el onbre."²⁴ Juan Ruiz does not include this common view because he knows the orthodox argument of free will contradicts his own argument of man's helplessness which in turn he relates to the refusal to stop indulging in love. One can thus see what part of Juan Ruiz's intentions are clear, what parts are not: the futility of attempting to break the habit of love, ironically,

²⁴The quote is from his prologue to the Crónica abreviada, ed. Grismer (Minneapolis, 1958), p. 38. The same argument of the fatalism of the stars occurs in Le Roman de la Rose. Here "Nature" agrees that the power of the celestial bodies is great but it is not successful against human reason (theologically, reason is the child of God): "Car autrement peut il bien estre, / Que que facent li cors celestre, / Qui mout ont grant poeir, senz faille, / Pour quei Raison encontre n'aïlle; / Mais n'ont poeir contre Raison. / Car bien set chascuns sages on / Qu'il ne sont pas de Raison maistre, / N'il ne la firent mie naistre. (Lines 17093-17100). See G. Pare, op. cit., chapter entitled "Liberté humaine et prescience divine" (pp. 231-252) for an excellent analysis of this problem and its tradition.

humorously, and clearly described, springs from his use of striking images; but the Christian counter-argument, the help of God's grace, is never clearly decided upon for it is presented incompletely.²⁵

Third, any change in man's orientation must come from God and not from man: he stresses the power of stars over man; next, he points out the power of God over the stars; finally, he attempts to balance the two powers:

Non son por todo aquesto los estrelleros mintrosos,
que judgan Segund natura, por sus cuentos fermosos;
ellos e la ciencia son ciertos e non dubdosos,
mas non pueden contra dios yr nin son poderosos.
(150)

Thus he concentrates on two powers external to man and never offers any of the traditional solutions based on man's effort, successful only with the help of God, to combat inclinations such as those which drive man to love. This is characteristic of the whole Libro;²⁶ one does not find the Christian

²⁵Not only in this passage but in the whole Libro Juan Ruiz avoids using ideas related to man's free will. The one time he uses "buen esfuerço," often used as the exercise of free will in the Middle Ages, he presents it contrary to its theological orientation: "Que buen esfuerço vence a la mala ventura / E toda pera dura grand tienpo la madura" (160c,d) refers to his being patient so that he will succeed in love.

²⁶It is interesting to note that even in the prologue, Juan Ruiz cites the religious authorities that portray man as particularly weak and vulnerable. "Ca tener todas las cosas en la memoria e non olvidar algo, mas es de la Divinidad que de la humanidad" (Prologo); or, "la natura humana, que mas aparejada e inclinada es al mal que al bien, e a pecado que a bien" (Prologo). These are orthodox remarks but are not balanced by the equally orthodox views that show confidence in man's power to overcome obstacles.

certainly of El caballero Zifar: "Onde por esto, mios fijos, devedes saber que en poder del ome es que pueda forçar las voluntades de su carne" (op. cit., p. 269). While others stress man's free will, Juan Ruiz emphasizes man's impotence. He acknowledges the imperfection of the human condition (a Christian view) but does not offer the means (in Christian terms) which help to make it more nearly perfect; instead, he concentrates on the futility of seeking in the human condition that power to overcome elements which is possible only in God.²⁷ In a word, he follows Augustine, who acknowledges that success in any human endeavor is a direct function of God's Grace, rather than following Aquinas, who argues for the ultimate importance of the human function.

Finally, in a shift away from a discussion of authorities, he tells the reader that he bases his conclusions not on authority but on his own personal observation. He drives a wedge between authoritative views concerning the stars, and actual experience; what matters is what he himself sees:

Non sse astrologia nin so ende maestro,
nin se astralabio mas que buey de cabestro,
mas por que cada dia veo pasar esto,
por aqueso lo digo; otrossy veo aquesto.
(151)

²⁷ Compare Juan Ruiz's conclusion with that in the Roman de la Rose, as analyzed by G. Paré: "C'est ainsi que l'homme peut se garder du vice ou se détourner de la vertu. Car, sa volonté libre est si puissante qu'il tient toujours le pouvoir de résister a ses mauvaises tendances et de fuir le péché, quoi qu'il en soit de l'influence des corps célestes (17499-578)" (op. cit., p. 247).

The key expression is cada dia (repeated also in 147a, "vemos cada dia pasar esto de fecho"): opinions concerning the relation between free will and the powerful effects of love are formed by what one sees happening daily. This attitude is reinforced by the familiar tone imparted by the popular expression "mas que buey de cabestro." The statements "non sse" and "nin se" are modified differently; the formal declaration of the first is absorbed in the intimate and forthright slang admission. The use of a slang expression at a crucial point of his argument moves the argument out of its theoretical context into the more familiar grounds of experience. His conclusion is twofold: one, those born under the star of Venus will spend their lives loving women (152), i.e., by implication, there is nothing they can do to overcome their carnal desires;²⁸ two, "En este signo atal creo que yo nasci" (153a), i.e., the narrator himself does not have sufficient strength to overcome his destiny.

I suggest that Juan Ruiz's phrasing of this presentation may best be understood in terms of Augustinian theological thinking. This might help to explain what are otherwise open contradictions. The tradition of man's impotence, of which St. Augustine was perhaps the most influential exponent,

²⁸ Juan Ruiz makes it clear (152) that Venus stands for physical passion, unmodified by codes and theories--the fact of sexual desire rather than the refined sentiment. Those under the sway of Venus are ready to throw aside moral principles and use deceit in order to win their ends.

provides at least a general climate of ideas which Juan Ruiz elaborates in his chain of reasoning; specifically, Augustine denies the efficacy of the human will and asserts the importance of predestination.²⁹ Augustine did not have much confidence in the synthetic power of reason or the ultimate triumph of human will, a view which contradicts the guiding principles of Thomas Aquinas and, to a degree, the scholastic arguments against the power of the stars.³⁰ The emphasis on man's impotence shows that Juan Ruiz is attracted by Augustine's theological tendency. Juan Ruiz utilizes from the climate of thought centering around predestination and human impotence such points as illuminate the nature of man

²⁹Many of Augustine's tenets, especially the relation of the human will to God's Grace and foreknowledge were developed in his warfare with Pelagianism. He attacked violently any self-reliance, ethical or moral, as unappreciative of the absolute need of God. In his attacks against Pelagius (who rejected Predestination and Original Sin and claimed for each human being an unqualified freedom of the will), Augustine developed the belief that a majority of mankind were marked out for eternal damnation, while only a minority would attain salvation. From then on many theologians sought to vindicate, to an extent, the freedom of the will. This attempt culminates in Thomas Aquinas and the debate on free will. For an excellent history of these problems, see Henry Osborn Taylor, The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages (New York, 1925).

³⁰These ideas were in the air: "Pre-scholastic Augustinianism (asserting, among other things, the independence of the will from the intellect) was vigorously revived in opposition to Thomas, and Thomas' anti-Augustinian tenets were solemnly condemned three years after his death" Erwin Panofsky, Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism (New York, 1960), p. 9. This is a very imaginative study on the climate of ideas in the Middle Ages. See Carreras y Artau (op. cit., pp. 70ff) for Augustine's influence in medieval Spain.

and love.

A definite pattern is established in Juan Ruiz's elaboration of Aristotle and Augustine: Love is natural, pleasant and not limited by time; constant indulgence converts love into a habit which man cannot easily break; even if he wished to break the habit of love he would not succeed for, like those born under the stars, he cannot overcome his passions ("En este signo atal creo que yo nasci" 153a). To religious love, Juan Ruiz opposes earthly love. These recurrent references to nature, fate and predestination take on the status of a perspective, a theme of love. Following is a summary of the medieval tradition of love:

By reference to religious and philosophical writers from the fifth to the fourteenth century two poles for the axis of the general passion of love have been distinguished. One pole is charity, which is the love of God or the love of creatures subordinated to the love of God and the mean appointed by reason in respect of God. The other pole is cupidity, which is the inordinate love of a creature irrespective of God and the mean of reason set up in regard to God. The religio-philosophical view, according to which the poles exist as a good and an evil pole, occupies the pole of charity. The earthly view occupies the pole of cupidity, which is regarded as good; charity is disregarded or is equivalent to a vice if it interferes with the obtaining or possessing of a cherished creature. ³¹

³¹Eugene E. Slaughter, Virtue According to Love--in Chaucer (New York, 1957), p. 48. This is an excellent study of the various love traditions as inherited not only by Chaucer, but all medieval writers who dealt with this subject.

Juan Ruiz explains the religious view of love with a complete system of virtues, vices, and sins borrowed from the Christian tradition. Although the earthly view appears throughout the Libro, it does not give rise to a complete moral system as does the organized religious view. There are, however, strong hints and implications in Juan Ruiz's elaborations of traditional views and stories. These hints culminate in the explicit praise of worldly love at the end of the arguments on the stars (156-159). There existed, especially in Provencal writers between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries, what may be considered an earthly system of virtues, vices, and sins in respect to sexual love. On this system depends much of the wording of the eulogy on the advantages that love brings to man. Juan Ruiz imitates this eulogy precisely at the end of his argument that due to celestial powers, man partakes of earthly love. The lover's enthusiastic praise of love serves as a counterpoint to the didactic statements condemning it.

El amor faz sutil al ome que es rrudo
 ffazele fabrar feroso al que antes es mudo,
 al ome que es couarde fazelo muy atrevudo,
 al perezoso fazer [sic] ser presto e agudo.
 Al mancebo mantiene mucho en mancebez
 e al viejo faz perder mucho la vejez
 ffaze blanco e feroso del negro como pez,
 lo que non vale una nuez amor le da grand prez.³²
 (156-157)

³² Again it is necessary to mention that, with the possible exception of Américo Castro, the passage of the

This is an embroidering upon a thought of Ovid which was repeated in the tradition of courtly poets. Love is conceived as one of the noblest passions a man can experience, since the effort to render himself worthy of the object of his love raises him above himself.³³ But in the courtly poets it is a refined sentiment; it has no contact with real life and experience. Praise of love is a commonplace, amusing, aristocratic, and charming, but no more (see J. Huizinga, *op. cit.*, pp. 114ff). To that, Juan Ruiz adds a literary expression related to dimensions of everyday reality. He makes the courtly formula come alive by casting it in a different frame. First, he initiates it with the note of pleasure: "que si mucho trabaja, en mucho plazer byue" (155d). The subsequent praise of love is infused with the realistic intimations of physical pleasure. Then,

praise of love is hardly considered in the critical studies on the Libro. One such consideration (J. A. Chapman, "A suggested interpretation of Stanzas 528 to 549a of the Libro de Buen Amor," RF, VI [1961], 29-39) is a distortion of the text: "both [love, wine] are a sin against God, and bring about man's damnation. Love 'sienpre fabla mentiroso' (161d)" p. 39. This comment is, however, qualified in context (162-165) with the fact that women are not always consistent; the term "mentiroso" has a secular not a religious meaning.

³³ See C. L. Lewis, The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition (Oxford, 1936) for an analysis of the tradition of the eulogy of love. Also Lecoy (*op. cit.*, p. 304): "Mais en réalité, c'est dans la lyrique provençale ou imitée de la provençale que Juan Ruiz a puisé, non seulement l'idée, mais le procédé, de développement par antithèses."

he closes his praise of love on a naturalistic note; love is so profitable that it even reaches out to base, ugly people who, because of love, seem more beautiful and noble than anybody else:

El que es enamorado, por muy feo que sea,
 otrosí su amiga maguer que sea muy fea,
 el uno E el otro non ha cosa que vea
 que tan bien le paresca nin que tanto desea.
 (159)

Juan Ruiz shifts the tone of eulogy to a world different from that of the clever courtly games. Nowhere does one find the idea that base and ugly people could love each other.³⁴ Juan Ruiz humanizes the erotica of the courtly poets by presenting love as it is, not as some think it ought to be. His artistic purpose is, of course, to present love not as something abstract or artificial but rather as a normality which is the property of all humans. The intricate elaboration of Aristotle, astrology, and Augustine establishes a perfect correlation between narrative and commentary, between the persona who praises love and the one who practices it. Whether love is so powerful an influence that man cannot overcome it, or, whether love is so naturally pleasant that one cannot resist it, what matters

³⁴The closest traditional counterpart is the Ovidian idea that love makes all creatures less uncouth ("Tum genus humanum solis errabit in agris / Idque merae vires et rude corpus erat" II, 473-474).

is that "por ende todo onbre / como un amor pierde luego otro cobre" (159c,d). The narrative and commentary are based on the assumption that, one way or another, physical love is not to be overcome.

Since Juan Ruiz treats ardent desire between man and woman not only as inevitable and natural, but also as good, pleasant, advantageous and, above all, as a motive of virtue (the ugly are loved), there is in the Libro what could be considered an earthly system of virtue in respect to physical love. Such an earthly system is antipodal to the religious system (see 182ff. where the destructive powers of worldly love are described) because buen amor views ardent sexual desire as a mortification of the soul. There are, therefore, in the commentary of the Libro two polar systems of virtues and sins in respect to the dichotomy of physical love. One derives its force from Christian authority; the other, the narrator tells us, from daily experience.

III

Buen Amor and Loco Amor

The two fundamental issues in the criticism of Juan Ruiz have been first, the question whether the Libro is merely a miscellany presented through the conventional device of

literary autobiography or an integrated work which might properly be said to have a theme; second, the question whether the theme of the Libro is religious or secular. As with all such questions, it is impossible to exclude entirely either possibility. However, the nature of the problem itself, the "either-or" possibility, points to a central fact about the Libro whether it reveals a theme or not. For in order to formulate a hypothesis about the theme or pervading spirit of the Libro, it is necessary to take into account both the narrator's enthusiasm about secular love and his inclusion of comments and stories decidedly Christian in spirit. Such hypotheses have hitherto been formulated by basing them on the phrases "didacticism" or "human condition" (in their medieval sense, of course). The result is to reduce a possible theme to a thesis. I should like to offer some suggestions concerning the theme or, rather, the pervading spirit of the Libro based entirely on the analysis of Juan Ruiz's art--the ironic tone of the moral commentary, the humorous and entertaining quality of the stories, the subtle elaboration of traditional ideas.

Although set in a didactic framework, the Libro is, nevertheless, an elaborate scrutiny of the conflict between realistic human values and the abstract code of divine love. Such scrutiny is evident in the manner with which buen amor is treated. Juan Ruiz submits the didactic convention of

buen amor to impossible strains. A convention, literary or ideological, is convincing if there are no intrusions of elements unacceptable to the convention. To use an analogy, the view of Arcadia changes considerably in the presence of a smell of sheep. Let insinuations about worldly love be interspersed with moral comments and a long-standing convention vanishes. The innocent-looking, offhand, humorous comments that Juan Ruiz introduces on the heels of his moral arguments have the same effect. They usually represent the everyday world of man where the strict religious attitude toward love is only one attitude among others--in fact, not the only important one. Under the pressures of this everyday world, the raison d'être of buen amor, at first seemingly unquestionable, begins to disintegrate. As far as definite decisions are concerned, buen amor ends at best in a draw with worldly love. For once the Archpriest moves outside the Christian commonplaces and the conventional literary attitudes into the real everyday world, the world of natural needs and pleasures, he encounters too many approaches to love. Love is too disruptive a force and depends too much on immediacies for him to be able to effect any definite, reasonable compromise. The one definite blow to the arguments viewing the Libro as a manual of buen amor and thus to the whole didactic structure comes when the Archpriest, given his choice as the narrative's commentator, chooses not to choose

definitely at all. However much Juan Ruiz finds buen amor a spiritual consolation, he remains hesitant to desert the idea of cupidity with all its pleasures and joys.

It is that wavering, that uncertainty, which defines Juan Ruiz's frame of mind. He does not make an out and out choice. As a priest or moralizer he should; but as an artist he does not. For Juan Ruiz to have the commentator make a choice of buen amor, as critics claim, implies that love is to some degree amenable to reason or to a higher theory of morality. And the point of the entire commentary is that love is not.³⁵ What amuses Juan Ruiz most about the didactic, conventional attitude toward love is the unrealistic

³⁵In an analysis of Christian and secular love in Chaucer, Donald E. Howard makes some very suggestive remarks concerning the critical attitudes toward great medieval writers: "To suppose that he [Chaucer] was 'ahead of his time' in his secular views, we must ignore the religious bias which we find elsewhere. To suppose on the other hand that he was imbued with the church's doctrines to such an extent that any secular tale is really only a dark allegory of the Fall and a lesson in charity, we must wrench the plain sense of secular tales. His thought is the more typical of his age because it reveals an interest in the secular held uneasily in check by Christian and ascetic strictures. And that conflict of secular interests with ascetic 'values' was the moral ambivalence with which Christianity had always struggled" "The Conclusion of the Marriage Group: Chaucer and the Human Condition," MPh, LVII (May 1960), p. 232. That is, we can examine a medieval writer's complexities without the necessity of treating him as "modern" or "medieval." Menendez Pidal warns about the danger in treating Juan Ruiz as a medieval writer without considering the changes and complexities of the Middle Ages: "Equiparar con la mente de un Pedro Alfonso, hombre del siglo XII, la mente de Juan Ruiz, hombre del siglo de Boccaccio, es cometer anacronismo" (Poesía juglaresca, op. cit., p. 208).

assumption that love can be contained within a set of rules. It is this amusing reaction to strict dogma that provides a source of humor in the commentary. If love is dynamic and unpredictable, then neither morality nor knowledge of religious behavior can constrain man to their ordered schemes. If, however, there is a pretense that love is disciplined by and subjected to charity, then charity itself is presented ironically.

The didactic form is made to contain unconventional attitudes in addition to the conventional one. This results in comedy and in a certain amusement at the expense of the original form and intention. The commentary clearly indicates this amusement. The warnings against sin pretend that the Libro is meant to teach a lesson. But the irony, the references to personal experience, and the many abrupt remarks on the inevitability of physical love give the game away. For example, the Archpriest ends a consideration of the futility of physical love with a surprising reaffirmation of love: "Aunque ome non goste la pera del peral, / En estar a la sonbra es plazer comunal" (154c,d). To resolve that being around love is pleasant even though one cannot partake of it, i.e., that even the minimum rewards of love (its shadow) are better than no love at all, is a contradiction of the supposed didactic aims. Or, he can confront

a strong religious argument concerning the evil of woman with a counter-argument:

Ssy dios, quando formo el ome, entendiera
que era mala cosa la muger, non la diera
al ome por conpañã nin del non la feziera;
ssy para bien non fuera, tan noble non saliera.
(109)

This is the same reasoning with which the Wife of Bath defends marriage and sensuality from attacks which emanated from the cult of purity and virginity. Both Juan Ruiz and Chaucer follow the counter-tradition of misogygy basing their argument on a reasonable, yet surprising, "If so--- why then?" formula.

The above two examples are typical of Juan Ruiz's technique in his comments on buen amor: throughout the Libro he offers a parallel between a false trail of morality and an unexpected turn of the idea; it consists of a playful, comic surprise, appropriately timed, which constantly reverses a serious meaning. The whole commentary, in fact, is a series of surprise situations. It is surprise, the failure of expectation, the occurrence of the unanticipated, that forms the pattern of the artistic structure of the commentary on love. This technical pattern creates a view of "expectation vs. unfulfillment" in buen amor. For example, Juan Ruiz makes an analogy between love and apples (163). Apples are never on the inside what they appear to be outside: "Mas ante pudren que otra." This is a Christian

commonplace on the ephemerality of the beauty of material things; it culminates in the Christian legend (utilized by Calderon) of man embracing a skeleton thinking it is a beautiful woman. The choice of apple which stands for passion and the choice of the strong image based on "decay" provide Juan Ruiz with a perfect image for a didactic argument that when love appears good or attractive, it is really decayed inside. But Juan Ruiz's reaction is the opposite of didacticism: "Mas ante pudren que otra: pero dan buen olor!" The pause and the abruptness of the shift is surely calculated; it is symptomatic of Juan Ruiz's deliberate technique of surprise. As in the case of Chaucer, what catches the attention of the modern reader in such situations is not so much the dichotomy of buen amor-loco amor but the ironic treatment of it. The dichotomy established in the analogy between apple and physical love is typical of ascetic thinking and the image of decay is meant to be a reminder of love's deceptiveness and of man's need for the more constant love of God. But the trail of didacticism is again false for, unexpectedly, the apple, despite the decay, at least smells good. Similarly, love, despite its failures, is very pleasant.

In the moralist's scheme of things, physical love is sternly condemned or severely limited in importance. In the Christian tradition, charity is offered as the only

authentic solution for man while on this earth. In the world of man, the real everyday world of experience, people are attracted by love and testify to its power and to its pleasures. Each attitude--the moralistic, the religious, and the realistic--exists, each often contradicts the others, and each claims to know the way of man's behavior. Taken alone, each attitude can make a convincing case for itself. But when they are placed side by side they are contradictory and often amusing. Each view of love is presented in the commentary with artistic care, so that each has its convincing moment. What is amusing is the seriousness with which each view is held, and often the denial and contradiction of other views. This irony of attitudes is, as we have seen, the aesthetic basis of the Libro. Over and above the irony of attitudes, however, rises the fact that natural, physical love is too powerful, complex, and unpredictable a force, to be completely contained by any one attitude or theory in the Libro. What emerges, finally, is a sense of love's inevitability. The seemingly conventional lines about the praises of love come to have an unsuspected literal truth by the time the Libro ends. In its own wonderfully comic way, the Libro recognizes man's inevitable indulgence, sacrificing, at least to a degree, the didactic form, the moral attitude which is too restrictive to do justice to the advantages of worldly love, and the theory of buen amor

which creates conflicting, inadequate attitudes toward love
by not recognizing man's basic realities.

CONCLUSION

There remains the question of the author's thoughts about physical love. The question is valid because he is the commentator. If the Libro's commentary is far from didactic in its theme and emphasis, it would be just as surprising if in these comments Juan Ruiz advocates the secular attitude toward life and love in a way resembling heresy. We know this: the commentary as a whole is not integrated one way or another. Incompleteness, on the one hand, makes an absolute judgment impossible; on the other hand, it betrays the character of Juan Ruiz's mode of thought: incompleteness almost always leads to humor or to irony. Thus any critical suggestions about the author, and mine are only meant to be suggestions, must consider Juan Ruiz in view of his humor and his irony.

Humor in the commentary results from the disparity between expectation and fulfillment of buen amor. If the content of effective questioning is, I suggest, a laughing questioning, a direct opinion upon the limitations of morality and didacticism would create an answerable argument, one that necessitates disagreement or defense; but humor, because it can drive out seriousness and contention, also deprives what is ridiculed (the limitations of didacticism) of any effective vindication. The reader is quickened to an awareness of the disproportion between the claims of

an authority and its accomplishments more by laughter than by solemn and direct opinions. In this sense, then, if humor aims to challenge the claims of buen amor by testing their viability, it also aims to excite the reader's interest by appealing to his own sense of common sense and experience regarding the limitations of strict morality. We may not know what Juan Ruiz thinks, but we do know that buen amor attempts to help man achieve a purity that may reward him with heaven; such achievement, however, is abstract and limited for it neglects the sense of human vitality which the experience of loco amor proclaims. But this is only suggested, it is never explicit. There is so much fun in the commentary of the Libro, and so little reproof, that it is not easy to find high seriousness in it. Yet it successfully questions the didactic claims of buen amor.

Through his ironic poses, Juan Ruiz achieves a high degree of artistic detachment. But what gives an explosive power to this irony is, I believe, the reader's suspicion that Juan Ruiz's detachment is also an artifice of a creative mind, controlling and channelling an intense personal involvement, at least personal in literary presentation, with the question of loco amor and alegría. His irony testifies repeatedly to the fact that he subjects any personal involvement to the discipline of his artistic form. But the author's feelings always lurk somewhere just below the

surface of his irony and, somehow, intensify the reader's own awareness of Juan Ruiz's real attachment to the topic he is handling. The reiteration of images concerning the loneliness which results if one is without a woman ("Que una ave sola nin bien canta, nin llora, / El mastel syn la vela non puede estar tod' ora") and the references to himself (as a narrator, of course) as lonesome without love (E yo, como estaba solo, syn compañía / Codiciaba tener lo que otro para sy tenia) strongly suggest attachment. Without the discipline of his artistic conscience which leads to detachment, Juan Ruiz's views on love, moral or secular, would appear as indignation; without any attachment whatsoever, his irony would be simply virtuosity or entertainment. Through his skill in dramatizing stories and comments as though they are personally felt, Juan Ruiz's humor and irony attain that aesthetic quality which, as in all great artists, derives from the union of theme and technique, from the marriage of personal involvement to artistic detachment. The intuition of Américo Castro concerning the happy temperament of Juan Ruiz in his literary expression is, I believe, a valid conclusion:

Esta "alegría" no es un convencionalismo, un marco temático, o un tópico arrastrado de otros textos. Aparte su frecuencia y su justificada aparición, está ya presente en el mismo enfoque de ciertos motivos religiosos, lo cual prueba que 'la alegría' es forma del mismo ánimo poético del autor" (La realidad, op. cit., p. 395).

We have examined the structure, the commentary, and the episodes of the Libro de buen amor. From an aesthetic point of view, we have discussed Juan Ruiz's achievement in irony, humor, and theme. But a study of his artistic devices can only suggest some levels of complexity in his writing; no technical analysis can "explain" the Libro de buen amor as a whole. The reader must learn to listen to the tone of the Archpriest's expression; this tone is a complex of notes which escape precise definition and description. One may read, for example, a comment about a poor man covering his poverty: "coge sus muchas lagrimas en su boca gerrada, / mas val que fazerse pobre, a quien non l'daran nada" (636c,d). The force of this observation--catching one's tears in his clenched teeth is better than showing poverty to those who won't give anything--cannot be pinpointed by the general term "realism." Or, the reader may come across the long series of epithets describing Trotaconventos and satirizing her profession. This tableau of the world of bawds is more than "rhetorical enumeration" or "picturesque details;" stylistically, it is a dynamic piling up, a swelling movement which gathers up everything in its rapidly increasing force. The chaotic lack of measure and the playful exaggeration which pierces the heart of the absurdity--something like Quevedo's famous descriptions--cannot be reduced simply to a "satirical

portrait." Or again, one reads a proverb ("Quien en el
 arenal sienbra, non trilla pegujares") commenting on a
 failure with a woman who lives by the bank of the river
 ("Por amor desta dueña ffiz trobas e cantares / ssenbre
 avena loca Ribera de Henares" 170a,b). The wit and humor
 of this remark--typical of his use of proverbs--cannot be
 confined within the narrow limits of such a description as
 the ironical device of "understatement." Neither can Ximio's
 recounting of ambiguous legal terms and his jargon of court
 procedures--a linguistic tour de force--be limited by the
 boundaries of "parody." There is in much of Juan Ruiz's
 expression a quality that transcends technical virtuosity.
 It is perhaps the awareness he shows both in sustaining his
 irony and his artistic intentions. This artistic awareness,
 combined with the temperament of alegría leads Juan Ruiz
 to exploit ironic techniques so diverse that he stands
 apart from all other satiric or moral writers of the Spanish
 Middle Ages. As one of Spain's major artists, he represents
 a triumph of the aims and techniques of medieval literary
 art. The exploitation of them to their fullest degree is
 the essence of the Art of the Libro de Buen Amor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS, EXTRACTS, AND TRANSLATIONS

Ruiz, Juan, Arcipreste de Hita. Libro de Buen Amor, ed. J. Cejador y Frauca. Edición y notas. 2 vols. Madrid: Clasicos Castellanos, 1946.

_____. Libro de Buen Amor. Paleographic edition, J. Ducamin. Bibliothèque Meridionale. Toulouse, 1901.

_____. Libro de Buen Amor, ed. Alfonso Reyes. Biblioteca Calleja. Madrid, 1917.

_____. Libro de Buen Amor, (Selección), ed. María Rosa Lida de Malkiel. Buenos Aires, 1941.

The Book of Good Love of Archpriest of Hita, Juan Ruiz, trans. by Elisha K. Kane. New York: William Edwin Rudge, 1933.

STUDIES IN THE LANGUAGES OF THE LIBRO

Aguado, J. M. Glosario sobre Juan Ruiz, poeta castellano del siglo XIV. Madrid, 1929.

Corominas, J. Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana. Berna, 1954.

Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. "Notas para la interpretación, influencia, fuentes y texto del Libro de Buen Amor," RFH (1940), pp. 105-150.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. El idioma español en sus primeros tiempos. Buenos Aires: Colección Austral, 1943.

Richardson, Henry B. An Etymological Vocabulary to the Libro de Buen Amor of Juan Ruiz Arcipreste de Hita. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Staaf, E. Etude sur l'ancien dialecte leonais. Upsala, 1907.

STUDIES ON THE LIBRO DE BUEN AMOR

- Alonzo, Dámaso. "La Bella de Juan Ruiz, toda problemas," Insula, No. 79 (July 1952).
- _____. "La cárcel del Arcipreste," CuH (Feb., 1957), pp. 165-177.
- Arnold, H. H. "The Octosyllabic 'cuaderna vía' of Juan Ruiz," HR, VIII (1940), 125-138.
- Babillot, F. "Le Libro de Buen Amor de l'archiprêtre de Hita," BH, XXXVI (1934), 500-502.
- Battaglia, Salvatore. "Il Libro de Buen Amor," La Cultura, IX (1930), 721-735.
- Bonilla y San Martín, A. "Antecedentes del tipo celestinesco en la literatura latina," RH, XV (1906), 372-386.
- Buceta, Erasmo. "La Política de Aristóteles, fuente de unos versos del Arcipreste de Hita," RFE, XIII (1925), 56-60.
- Castro, Américo. España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos. Buenos Aires, 1948. Revised, La realidad histórica de España, Mexico, 1954.
- _____. "El Libro de Buen Amor del Arcipreste de Hita," CL, IV (1952), 193-213.
- Chapman, J. A. "A Suggested Interpretation of Stanzas 528 to 549 of the Libro de Buen Amor," RF, VI (1961), 29-39.
- Cirot, G. "L'episode de doña Endrina dans le Libro de Buen Amor," BH, XLV (1943), 139-156.
- Clavería, C. "Libro de Buen Amor, 699c: '. . . estas viejas troyas,'" NRFH, II (1948), 268-272.
- Crawford, J. W. "El horóscopo del hijo del rey Alcaraz en el Libro de Buen Amor," RFE, XII (1925), 184-190.
- Gilman, Stephen. "The Juvenile Intuition of Juan Ruiz," Symposium, IV, No. 2 (November 1950), 290-303.
- Gybbon-Monypenny, G. B. "Autobiography in the Libro de buen amor in the light of some literary comparisons," BHS, 39 (1957), 63-78.

- _____. "Lo que buen amor dize con rrazon te lo pruebo," BHS, XXXVIII (January 1961), 13-25.
- Green, Otis. "On Juan Ruiz's Parody of the Canonical Hours," HR, XXI (1958), 12-34.
- Guisasola, Castro. "El horóscopo del hijo del rey Alcaraz en el Libro de buen amor," RFE, X (1923), 396-398.
- Hart, Thomas. La alegoría en el Libro de buen amor. Madrid, 1959.
- Kane, Elisha K. "The personal appearance of Juan Ruiz," MLN, XLV (1930), 103-108.
- Kellerman, W. "Zur Charakteristick des Libro del Arcipreste de Hita," ZRPh, 67 (1951), 225-254.
- Lapesa, Rafael. "Arcipreste de Hita," Diccionario de literatura española (Madrid, 1953), pp. 41-43.
- Lázaro, Fernando. "Los amores de Don Melón y Doña Endrina. Notas sobre el arte de Juan Ruiz," Arbor, No. 62 (1951), 210-236.
- Lecoy, Félix. Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita. Paris, 1938.
- Leo, Ulrich. Zur dichterischen originalität des Arzipreste de Hita. Analecta Romanica. VI. Frankfurt, 1958.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. Review of La alegoría en el Libro de buen amor, RPh, XIV, No. 4 (May 1961), 340-343.
- _____. Libro de Buen Amor. (Selección). Edición con estudio y notas. Buenos Aires, 1941, pp. 7-44.
- _____. "Nuevas notas para la interpretación del Libro de Buen Amor," NRFH, XIII (1959), 17-82.
- _____. Two Spanish Masterpieces: The Book of Good Love and The Celestina. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1961.
- _____. "Una interpretación más de Juan Ruiz," RPh, XIV (Feb. 1961), 228-237.
- Llorach, E. A. Review of Felix Lecoy, Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita, RFE, 27 (1943), 443-450.

- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. "Nota sobre una fábula de Don Juan Manuel y de Juan Ruiz," Poesía árabe y poesía europea (Buenos Aires, 1943), pp. 118-123.
- _____. "Título que el Arcipreste de Hita dió al libro de sus poesías," Poesía árabe y europea (Buenos Aires, 1943), pp. 109-114.
- Mettman, Walter. "Ancheta de caderas, Libro de buen amor, c. 432 ss," RF, LXXIII (1961), 141-47.
- Pérez de King, Ester. "El realismo en las 'cantigas de serrana' de Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita," Hispania, 21 (1938), 85-104.
- Puyol y Alonso, J. El Arcipreste de Hita. Estudio crítico. Madrid, 1906.
- Reckert, Stephen. "Auras duena garrida," RFE, 37 (1953), 227-237.
- Reyes, Alfonso. "El Arcipreste de Hita y su Libro de buen amor," Capítulos de literatura española, Primera serie (Mexico, 1939), pp. 1-14.
- _____. "Viaje del Arcipreste de Hita por la Sierra de Guadarrama," Capítulos de literatura española, Primera serie (Mexico, 1939), pp. 15-19.
- Sánchez-Albornóz y Menduina, Claudio. España: un enigma histórico. Buenos Aires, 1956.
- Schevill, R. Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1913, pp. 25-55.
- Schutz, A. H. "La tradición cortesana en dos coplas de Juan Ruiz," NRFH, VIII (1954), 63-71.
- Spitzer, Leo. "En torno al arte del Arcipreste de Hita," Linguística e historia literaria (Madrid, 1955), pp. 103-160.
- _____. Review of Felix Lecoy Recherches sur le Libro de Buen Amor de Juan Ruiz, Archiprete de Hita. Paris, 1938; RFH, 3 (1939), 266-274.
- _____. "Trouver," Romania, LXVI (1941), 1-11.
- Tacke, O. Die Fabeln des Erzpriesters von Hita. Breslau, 1911.

Weisser, F. "Sprachliche Kunstmittel des Erzpriesters von Hita," VKR, VII (1934), 164-243; 281-348. ⁴⁰⁴

GENERAL STUDIES PERTAINING TO THE LIBRO

Cirot, G. "Sur le 'mester de clerecia,'" B Hisp, XLIV (Jan-March 1942), 5.-16

Évesque, Eugène. "Notice," Pamphilus, in La "comédie" latine en France ou XIII^e siècle; textes établis et traduits, ed. G. Cohen, 2 vols. (Paris, 1931), pp. 169-192.

Gillet, Joseph E. Review of Américo Castro España en su historia, HR, XVIII (1950), 169-184.

Hurtado, J. and A. González Palencia, Historia de la literatura española. Madrid, 1943.

Ibn Hazm, Ali ibn Ahmad. El collar de la paloma: tratado sobre el amor y los amantes, trans. by E. García Gomez. Madrid, 1952.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. Poesía juglaresca y juglares. Buenos Aires: Colección Austral, 1942.

Rojas, Fernando de. La Celestina, ed. Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, con estudio crítico. Appended, Pamphilus de amore. Vigo: E. Knopf, 1899-1900.

Spitzer, Leo. "Note on the Poetic and the Empirical 'I' in Medieval Authors," Traditio, IV (1946), 414-422.

_____. "The Prologue to the Lais of Marie de France and Medieval Poetics," MPhil, XLI (November 1943), 96-102.

Willis, Raymond S. "Mester de Clerecía: A Definition of the Libro de Alixandre," RPh, X (1956-1957), 212-224.

LITERARY, PHILOSOPHICAL, AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Primary Texts and Translations

Alfonso X. Primera crónica general de España, ed. Menéndez Pidal. Madrid, 1906.

Bidpai. Calila y Dimna, fábulas: Antigua versión castellana, prólogo y vocabulario de A. Solalinde. Madrid, 1917.

El balardo del sabio Merlín, 1498, in Libros de Caballerías, NBAE, I (1907), 29-31.

- El libro del Cavallero Zifar (El libro del Cavallero de Dios),⁴⁰⁵
ed. Charles Philip Wagner. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1929.
- The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. F. N. Robinson. 2nd ed.
Boston, 1957.
- Dante Alighieri, Convivio, ed. Giorgio Rossi. Bologna, 1925.
- Fabliaux, selected and edited by R. C. Johnston and D. D. R.
Owey. Blackwell's French Texts. Oxford, 1957.
- Gonzalo de Berceo. Los Milagros de Nuestra Senora. Buenos
Aires: Espasa Calpe, 1947.
- Guerber, Helene A. Myths & Legends of the Middle Ages.
London, 1909.
- Guillaume de Lorries and Jean de Meun, Roman de la Rose, ed.
E. Langlois. Paris, 1914-24.
- Juan Manuel, Don. Obras, ed. J. Castro y Calco and Martin
de Riquer. Barcelona, 1955.
- _____. Crónica abreviada, ed. R. Grismer. Minneapolis,
1958.
- _____. Libro Infinito, ed. J. Blecua. Granada, 1952.
- Libro de Alixandre, ed. R. Willis. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton
University Press, 1934.
- Libro de la miseria de omne, ed. M. Artigas. BBMP. I. 1919.
- López de Ayala, Pedro. Rimado de Palacio. Poetas castellanos
anteriores al siglo XV, ed. Tomás Antonio Sanchez. BAAEE.
57 (Madrid, 1864), 425-476.
- Martínez de Toledo, Arcipreste de Talavera. Coruacho; o
Reprobación del amor mundano, ed. Prólogo y notas por
Martín de Riquer. Barcelona, 1949.
- Medieval Latin Poets, trans. Jack Lindsay. London, 1934.
- Ovid, The Art of Love (Ars Amatoria) and Other Poems, text with
English trans. by J. H. Mozely. Loeb Classical Library.
London & N.Y.: Heinemann, 1929.
- The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse, ed. F. J. E. Raby.
Oxford, 1959.
- Pamphilus de amore, in La "Comédie" Latine en France ou XII^e
siècle; textes établis et traduits, ed. G. Cohen. 2 vols.
Paris, 1931.

- Petrus Alfonsi. Disciplina Clericalis, ed. Angel González Palencia. Madrid, 1948.
- Santob, rabbi. Proverbios morales, ed. Ig. González Llubera, with introduction. Cambridge, 1947.
- Villon, François. The Complete Works, trans. by Anthony Bonner. New York: Bantam Classics, 1960.
- Wine, Women and Song: Medieval Latin Students' Songs, trans. by John A. Symonds. No. 30. London, 1884.
- Wright, Thomas. The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets of the Twelfth Century. Rolls Series. 2 vols. London: Longman, 1872.
- Zabara, Joseph Ben Meir. The Book of Delights, trans. by Moses Hadas. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1932.
- Studies
- Auerbach, Erich. Introduction to Romance Language and Literature. New York: Capricorn Books, 1961.
- Baldwin, Charles S. Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic. New York, 1928.
- Bédier, Joseph. Les Fabliaux. Études de littérature populaire et d'histoire littéraire du moyen âge. Paris, 1928.
- Bloomfield, Morton. "Distance and Predestination in Troilus and Criseyde," PMLA, LXXII (March 1957), 14-26.
- Bullitt, John M. Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire: A Study of Satiric Technique. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Carreras y Artau, Tomas and Joaquin Carreras y Artau. Historia de la filosofía española. 2 vols. Madrid, 1939.
- Castro, Américo. "Mozarabic poetry and Castille: A rejoinder to Mr. Leo Spitzer," CL, IV (1952), 188-189.
- Cazamian, Louis. The Development of English Humor. North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1952.
- Choinsard, P. Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'influence des astres. Paris, 1926.
- Clarke, Dorothy Clotelle. "On Juan del Encina's Una arte de poesía castellana," RPh, VI (1952-53), 254-259.

- Coghill, Neville. Geoffrey Chaucer. London: The Curwen Press, 1956.
- Craddock, Sister Clare Eileen. Style Theories as Found in Stylistic Studies of Romance Scholars (1900-1950). Washington: Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1952.
- Curtius, Ernst. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. New York, 1953.
- _____. "Theologische Poetik im italienischen Trecento," ZRPh, LX (1940), 1-16.
- De Bruyne, Edgar. L'Esthétique de Moyen Age. Louvain, 1947.
- Dempster, Germaine. Dramatic Irony in Chaucer. New York: The Humanities Press, 1959.
- Elliot, Robert. The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959.
- Empson, William. Seven Types of Ambiguity. London, 1930.
- Evans, E. C. "Roman Descriptions of Personal Appearance in History and Biography," Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XLVI (1935), 43-84.
- Faral, Edmund. Les arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècles. Paris, 1924.
- Flowers, Ruth Cave. Voltaire's Stylistic Transformation of Rabelaisian Satirical Devices. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1951.
- Gillet, Joseph. "The Autonomous Character in Spanish and European Literature," HR, XXIV (1956), 179-190.
- Gilman, Stephen. The Art of La Celestina. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1956.
- Gilson, E. The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy. New York, 1940.
- Gunn, Alan M. F. The Mirror of Love. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech Press, 1952.
- Hammer, J. "A Commentary on the Prophetia Merlini," Speculum, X (1935), 3-30.
- Haskins, C. H. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927.

- Hatzfeld, Helmut. "Esthetic criticism applied to Medieval Literature," RPh, I (1947-48), 305-327.
- _____. "Einige Stilwesenszüge der altfranzösischen religiösen Reimdichtung," ZFRPh, 52 (1932), 693-727.
- _____. "Recent Italian Stylistic Theory and Stylistic Criticism," Studia Philologica et Litteraria in Honorem L. Spitzer (Switzerland, 1958).
- Haury, Auguste. L'ironie et l'humour chez Ciceron. Leiden, 1955.
- Howard, Donald R. "The Conclusion of the Marriage Group: Chaucer and the Human Condition," MPh, LVII (May 1960), 223-232.
- Huizinga, J. The Waning of the Middle Ages. A Study of forms of life, thought and art in France and the Netherlands in the 14th and 15th Centuries. London: Arnold & Co., 1924.
- Jankélévitch, Vladimir. L'ironie ou la bonne conscience. Paris, 1950.
- Jeanroy, Alfred. La poesie lyrique des troubadours. Paris: Didier, 1934.
- Jourdain, A. Recherches Critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traditions latines d'Aristote. Paris, 1843.
- Lane, E. W. Arabian Society in the Middle Ages. London, 1883.
- Lenient, C. La Satire en France ou moyen âge. 4th ed. Paris: Hachette, 1893.
- Levin, Harry. "The Tradition of Tradition." Contexts of Criticism. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936, 1938.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. "La hipérbole sagrada en la poesía castellana del siglo XV," RPh, VIII (1946), 130.
- _____. "El romance de la misa de amor," RPh, III (1941), 24-42.
- Lipari, Angelo. "On Meaning in the Decameron," Italica, 22 (1945), 101-108.

- Lovejoy, Arthur O. The Great Chain of Being: The Study of the History of an Idea. (The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University, 1933.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1936.
- Mack, Maynard. "The Muse of Satire," The Yale Review, XLI (1951), 80-92.
- MacLennan, L. Jenaro. "Autocomentario en Dante y comentarismo latino," Vox Romania (Jan-June 1960), 81-123.
- Makarewicz, Sister Mary Reynelda. The Patristic Influence on Chaucer. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1953.
- McKeon, Richard. "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Speculum, vol. XVII (1942), 1-32.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. "La primitiva lírica española," in Estudios Literarios, Colección Austral (Buenos Aires, 1942), pp. 195-264.
- Misener, S. "Iconistic Portraits," CP, XIX (1924), 97-123.
- Nicholson, R. A. Studies in Islamic Poetry. Cambridge, 1921.
- Nykrog, Per. Les Fabliaux. Copenhagen, 1957.
- Panofsky, Erwin. Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism. New York, 1960.
- Paré, Gerard. Les idées et les lettres au XIII^e siècle. Bibliothèque de philosophie. Montreal, 1947.
- Poetow, L. J. The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric. Vol. III. Urbana, Champaign: Univ. of Illinois, 1910.
- Pratt, Robert A. and Karl Young. "The Literary Framework of the Canterbury Tales," in Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, ed. N. E. Bryan and G. C. Dempster. New York: Humanities Press, 1958, pp. 1-81.
- Praz, Mario. Review of H. H. Glunz, Die Literaturästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters (1937), in English Studies, XXI (1939), 166-169.
- Raby, F. J. E. A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.
- Robertson, Jr., D. W. "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens," Speculum, XXVI (1951), 24-49.
- _____. "Historical Criticism," English Institute Essays, ed. Alan S. Downer (New York, 1951), p. 14.

- Salinas, P. Jorge Manrique: o tradición y originalidad. Buenos Aires, 1947.
- Schiaffini, A. Traduzione e poesia nella prosa d'arte Italiana dalla latinità medievale a G. Boccaccio. Rome, 1943, pp. 98-99.
- Siciliano, I. François Villon et les thèmes poétiques de Moyen Age. Paris, 1934.
- Singleton, Charles. "On Meaning in the Decameron," Italica, 21 (1944), 117-124.
- Slaughter, Eugene E. Virtue According to Love in Chaucer. New York, 1957.
- Spitzer, Leo. "Le prétendu réalisme de Rabelais," MPh, XXXVII (1939-40), 139-150.
- Suskind, Norman. "Humor in the Chancons de Geste," Symposium, XV, No. 3 (Fall, 1961), 185-197.
- Tatlock, J.S.P. "Mediaeval Laughter," Speculum, XXI (1946), 289-294.
- Taylor, Henry Osborn. The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages. New York, 1925.
- _____. The Medieval Mind. London, 1927.
- _____. "Placing the Middle Ages," Speculum, XI (1936), 437-445.
- Ureña, P. Henríquez. La versificación irregular. Madrid, 1933.
- Van Steenberghen, Fernand. Aristotle in the West. Louvain, 1955.
- Waddell, Helen. The Wandering Scholars. London, 1949.
- Walsh, Gerald G. Medieval Humanism. New York, 1942.
- Ward, H. L. D. "Lailoken," Romania, XXII (1893), 504-526.
- Weber, Edwin S. "Comedy as Satire," HR, XXVI (1958), 1-11.
- Wellek, René. "The Pearl: An Interpretation of the Middle-English Poem," Studies in English, IV (Prague, 1933), 1-33.

Wittkower, Rudolf. "Individualism in Art and Artists: A Renaissance Problem," JHI, XXII (July-Sept. 1961), 291-303.

Wood, Mary Morton. The Spirit of Protest in Old French. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917.

Worcester, David. The Art of Satire. New York, 1960.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Anthony Nicholas Zahareas, was born in Chios, Greece, August 2, 1930. I received my secondary-school education in the third gymnasium of Athens, Greece, and my undergraduate training at Marietta, College and Ohio State University. I received the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1956. In 1958, I received the Master of Arts degree from Ohio State University. I was a graduate assistant for two years and an assistant instructor for two more. In September, 1959, I was appointed instructor at Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. In 1961-1962 I was instructor of Comparative Literature at Ohio State University while completing the dissertation for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

I have accepted a position as instructor in Spanish at Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.