THE ANXIOUS HERO: DISSECTING MASCULINITIES IN THIRTEENTH–CENTURY
MEDIEVAL IBERIAN LITERATURE

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Spanish

By

Anthony Javon Perry, M.S.

Washington, DC
November 7, 2018
THE ANXIOUS HERO: DISSECTING MASCULINITIES IN THIRTEENTH–CENTURY MEDIEVAL IBERIAN LITERATURE

Anthony Javon Perry, M.S.

Thesis Advisor: Emily C. Francomano, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

My dissertation examines the varying and converging constructions of gender and genre in four thirteenth–century medieval Iberian texts: Poema de mio Cid, Libro de Alexandre, Libro de Apolonio and Alfonso X’s Estoria de Espanna. By contextualizing the texts historically and using the perspectives of feminist theory, gender theory and cultural studies, I examine the constructions of masculinities within these texts and the role that these constructions play in the text’s genre. I contend that these texts bear witness to the anxious relationship between masculinity and power in the thirteenth century and aim to shape the reader’s/listener’s image of kingship/leadership and, in turn, hegemonic masculinity. They serve as a mirror for and of male leaders, a speculum principis for their thirteenth–century audience.

In each text, the male protagonist is a hero and, therefore, exemplary of what I term hegemonic masculinity. The self–fashioning of the hero’s masculinity, as manifest in the Fall/Redemption narrative structure, reveals itself to be anxious. I ground my argument in the medieval exegesis surrounding the Fall/Redemption trope and its ubiquity. In each chapter, I argue that this narrative structure serves as means of inculcating the ideals manifest in the anxious and exemplary hero. The heroes’ masculine bodies, manners and speech are culturally constructed entities coded by the discourse of these hero tales.

Their masculinities, as both culturally constructed and political tools, are part and parcel of the patriarchal structures of authority. The texts I examine are testimonies, specula, and each male author and character a witness, testis, to a process in which the conventions and protocols of
medieval masculinity are indoctrinated as normative behaviors. Additionally, they are a means by which masculine authority, domination and control are maintained and propagated.

In the bodies of work I have examined, I conclude that each hero, in the performance of his gendered self, reinforces the superiority of masculinity, in general, and the specific iteration of masculinity that he himself exemplifies. The male hero in each of the works, through his words and actions, constructs a version of masculinity tied to power and a version of masculinity that is superior and/or divinely sanctioned.
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INTRODUCTION

I am irked by the kings of Spain 
because they so prefer to fight among themselves, 
that they give warhorses and bays 
in tribute to the Moors, 

whose pride is doubled thereby; 
so they [the Christians] are defeated and conquered. 
It would be better, if it pleased them 
to maintain peace, loyalty, and faith among themselves 
Peire Vidal qtd. in O’Callaghan, Reconquest, 63

My dissertation examines the varying and converging constructions of gender and genre in 
four thirteenth–century texts: Poema de mio Cid (PMC), Libro de Alexandre (Alexandre), Libro 
de Apolonio (Apolonio) and Alfonso X’s Estoria de Espanna (Estoria). Using a combination 
of medieval studies, historiography, theology, feminist theory, gender theory and cultural 
studies, my research examines the construction, or rather, constructions of masculinities within 
these medieval Iberian texts as well as how these constructions play a role in the respective text’s 
genre. In each text, the main protagonist is male, a leader, and heroic. As such, I believe that the 
main protagonist, the text and the author shine a light on how both hegemonic masculinities, “the 
pattern of practice … that allowed men’s dominance over women to continue” (Connell 832), and 
power functioned in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula. These texts served as mirror 
for and of leaders, speculum principis, for their thirteenth–century audience.

As speculum principis, these texts dialogue between the text and the reader and/or listening 
audience. The dialogue between text and reader/listener has hegemonic masculinity as its 
foundation and theme. These texts and their proliferation bear witness to the relationship between

1 Peire Vidal was an Old Occitan troubadour who spent time in the courts of Alfonso II of Aragón, his son Pedro II, 
Alfonso VIII of Castile, and Alfonso IX of León (Fraser “Introduction: The World of Peire Vidal,” 2–3).
hegemonic masculinity and power in the thirteenth century with the aim of shaping the reader’s/listener’s image of a kingship/leadership.

THE CORPUS

I have chosen these texts because they reinforce the superiority of men. Their speech and their actions, those of the exemplary heroes, become naturalized and become thereby inherently and exemplarily masculine. Within the confines of the stories, the relationships between the masculine hero and other men are essential in the construction of their own masculinity.

The corpus of *PMC, Alexandre, Apolonio* and *Estoria* is a literal and figurative palimpsest. As Emily C. Francomano argues, in “Reversing the Tapestry: Prison of Love in Text, Image and Textile,” “[by] allowing sources and adaptations, new and old texts, to inhabit the same page, textual palimpsests simultaneously smooth over and reveal loose ends” (1100). Further, she submits that these textual palimpsests “[combine] the work of the readers and writers who transform, and are transformed by, their interpretive acts” (“Reversing the Tapestry” 1101). The materiality of the manuscripts and the content of the texts, as presented in the critical editions I use, reveal them to be hypertexts, or texts “derived from a previous text either through simple transformation … or through indirect transformation, … imitation” (Genette, *Palimpsests* 7).

As Alberto Montaner argues, the *PMC* “no es, en el aspecto temático, un texto aislado, sino que forma parte de un conjunto de obras que abordan y hacen cristalizar la materia cidiana durante el siglo XII” (293–94). The specific hypotexts are the *Carmen Campidocitoris*, “un panegírico latino en estrofas sáficas que enumera las principales batallas del héroe” (Montaner 294), the

---

¹ There is much debate about the date of composition of the *PMC*. That being said, “los diversos argumentos de los especialistas concuerdan para fechar el poema hacia 1200 o en el … año 1207, [el año que menciona el colofón de Per Abbat]: Russell (1952, 1978), Pattison (1967), Ubieto Arera (1957, 1972), Michael (1976)” (Colin Smith 43). For a detailed overview of the debate see Colin Smith’s introduction to his edition of *Poema de mio Cid* (pp. 38-48) and Alberto Montaner’s supplements to his edition of the *Cantar de mio Cid* (276–89; 293-302).
Historia Roderici, “una biografía compuesta en la zona oriental de la Península por un miembro séquito cidiano al poco de su muerte,” (Montaner 295), and the Crónica Najense, a Latin text about the youth of our protagonist, Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar (Montaner 296). There is one extant manuscript of the PMC and for this dissertation, I will cite from Montaner’s edition because Montaner’s edition “es la única edición en la que el códice único ha sido consultado de nuevo usando la tecnología más avanzada … lo que ha permitido ofrecer una nueva transcripción basada directamente en el manuscrito” (2; my emphasis). And, as he argues, this process along with an “análisis interno de la obra como testimonio indirecto representado por las crónicas alfonsíes, se ofrece un texto críticamente editado, de acuerdo con las pautas más exigentes de la ecdótica actual” (2).

The way in which an editor presents the text reveals the editor’s understanding of the text’s genre. The extant manuscript of PMC is missing the first page and arguably fifty lines of text (Montaner 3 fnA). In an effort to provide context to the first lines of conserved text, Montaner’s edition begins with a fragment from the Crónica de Castilla. This fragment serves as a paratext to the conserved text, “[surrounding] it and [extending] it, precisely in order to present it, as in the usual sense of the verb but also in the strongest sense: to make present, to ensure the text’s presence in the world, its ‘reception’ and consumption in the form … of the book” (Genette, Paratexts 1). This “Preliminar” presents the Cid as man to whom his “parientes e sus vasallos” (v. 2) are faithful.

1 For more detailed information, see Alberto Montaner’s “La materia cidiana en el siglo XII y las fuentes del “Cantar” (pp. 293–302) in his edition of the Cantar de mio Cid.
1 Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 6328
1 Though I cite from Montaner’s edition, I use both Colin Smith’s edition and the manuscript as references.
1 Colin Smith, in his edition, similarly explains that there are missing pages; however, he does not provide a fragment of the Crónica de Castilla. He extrapolates on what information could have been on those missing pages and in what form they could have been. He notes that “[el] poema pudo haber empezado con una alusión a la Jura de Santa Gadea,” or “pudo haber referido que, según la historia, el destierro del Cid se debió a que éste había organizado una incursión contra el reino moro de Toledo” (143). Smith concludes that Menéndez Pidal’s argument is the most reasonable: “el poema comenzaba describiendo la expedición del Cid a Sevilla” (143).
Montaner’s editorial decision to provide context foregrounds the Cid’s relationship with his vassals. The Cid’s relationship with his vassals will be further developed in this dissertation. Additionally, Montaner divides his edition into three cantares, though there is no such division in the manuscript. Dividing the text into cantares lends credence to critical assertions of a more learned authorship and/or dual authorship. A learned authorship speaks to a possible clerical author. Clerical authorship and its implications in the thirteenth century will be discussed in Chapter III, “The Figural Kings: The Reconstruction of Christian Masculinities in Libro De Alexandre and Libro De Apolonio.” The division of the cantares depends on lines 1085 (“Aquí’s conpieça la gesta de mio Cid el de Bivar.”) and 2276 (“Las coplas d’este cantar aquis’ van acabando”). Interestingly, line 1085 is “problematical as to both its interpretation and its position” (Pattison, “How Many Cantares” 337). In the manuscript, line 1085 follows 1084; however, in Montaner’s edition, 1086 follows 1084. Montaner seems to be following Ramón Menéndez Pidal’s lead who believed that line 1085 “came more naturally after line 1086 and lead into line 1087 with its new narrative matter” (Pattison, “How Many Cantares” 338). Some scholars do not use line 1085 to divide the poem into three cantares. Miguel Garci–Gómez, in his 1977 edition also uses line 2276 to point to dual authorship, arguing that after this line (“Las coplas d’este cantar aquis’ van acabando”), the second part is “de muy distinta urdimbre estilística y temática, que constituye llamarse Cantar de la Afrenta de Corpes” (156).

Similarly, Juan Casas Rigall, in his edition of Libro de Alexandre, argues that in the first few decades of the thirteenth century, “un clérigo hispano de sólida formación decide emular a los

---

1 Colin Smith has argued that Per Abbot is the author and therefore a more learned author. Smith argues that the author would know the deeds of the Cid through archival documents. The author would allegedly have been inspired by the French chanson de geste, Latin classical texts and medieval texts.

2 Colin Smith follows the manuscript and has line 1085 follow 1084. He notes that though others have placed line 1086 after 1084, “se puede dejar [después de 1085], conforme con el manuscrito, como una recapitulación parcial de los logros del Cid” (185 fn1086).
autores a quienes ha bebido para componer un ambicisoso poema narrativo sobre Alejandro de Macedonia” (“Presentación” ix) and the sources for Alexandre are “versiones latinas del Pseudo Calístenes” (Casas Rigall, “La composición” 546), Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni, the Roman d’Alexandre and French cleric Guatier de Châtillon’s Alexandreis (Casas Rigall, “La composición” 546–47). Casas Rigall notes that Historia de preliis and Roman d’Alexandre “son los principales complementos de la fuente básica” (“La composición” 547), the Alexandreis.

There are two extant manuscripts and various fragments that make up the Alexandre corpus. The two manuscripts are O and P. Casas Rigall’s edition, from which I will cite, is based on manuscript P, found subsequent to O, using manuscript O and the fragments as resources “cuando el testimonio principal está afectado por lagunas u otras deturpaciones obvias o plausibles” (Casas Rigall, “Presentación” 2).

Casas Rigall’s edition reflects, as Anthony P. Espósito argues, in “(Re)covering the Chiasmus: Restoring the Libro(s) de Alexandre,” “problems of contested authorship, scribal interference, textual primacy, and original language … as major controversies in the production of a critical text” (349). For example, as Espósito notes, “both manuscripts make overt but diverging

---

¹ For a discussion of the dating of Alexandre, see Z. David Zuwiyya (A Companion to Alexander Literature in the Middle Ages 234). According to C. Carroll Marden, the composition of Alexandre preceded Poema de Fernán González, circa 1250. However, María Eugenia Lacarra, in “El significado histórico del Poema de Fernán González,” proposes moving the date back to the time of Alfonso X. Ian Michael, in The Treatment of Classical Material in the Libro de Alexandre, argues that knowledge is praised in the text because the contemporary prince admired by the author was Fernando III or a young prince Alfonso. R.S. Willis, in “The Artistry and Enigmas of the Libro de Alexandre: A Review Article,” notes that the inclusion of Seville, conquered in 1248, as one of the best cities in Spain, means that a Christian author would not have said this before that date. Jesús Cañas notes that the composition is similar to those already existing at the time of Alfonso X.

² For more detailed information, see Juan Casas Rigall’s “El ‘Libro de Alexandre’ y sus fuentes” (pp. 546–51) in his edition of Libro de Alexandre.

³ For information on the fragments, see Casas Rigall’s “Transmisión textual: Manuscritos y fragmentos” (pp. 621–654).

⁴ Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, signatura Vit. 5-10
⁵ París, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, signatura Ms. Esp. 488
references to a possible author” (350). Though Casas Rigall based his edition in manuscript P, he cites stanza 2675 from both manuscripts.

Apolonio* exists only in one extant manuscript* together with Vida de Santa María Egipciaca and Libre dels tres Reys d’Orient. The primary sources of Apolonio are the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri (HART), La Gesta Apollonii Regis Tyri metrica, the Phanteon, the Gesta Romanorum, and the Carmina Burana.

Though I will be discussing Alfonso X’s Estoria, there is no Estoria in the same way that there is a PMC, Alexandre, and Apolonio (even with their lacunae). Specifically, I discuss the stories of Rodrigo and Pelayo as two separate yet interlocking stories within the larger estoria. The text that Ramón Menéndez Pidal published under the title, Primera Crónica General, whose edition I use in this dissertation, is “basado en dos manuscritos de la cámara regia (E. and E.)” (Brancaforte 20). However, as a history of Spain, the “Prólogo” delineates the hypotexts:

la cronica dell Arçobispo don Rodrigo, … la de Maestre Luchas, Obispo de Tuy, et de Paulo Orosio, et del Lucano, et de sant Esidro el mancebo, et de Idachio Obispo de Gallizia, … et de los otros escriptos de los Concilíos de Toledo et de don Jordan, … de de Claudio Tholomeo, … et de Dion que escriuio uerdadera la estoria de los godos, et de Pompeyo Trogo, et dotras estorias de Roma las que pudiemos auer que contassen algunas cosas del hecho dEspanna (vv. 311–44l)

Through the brief discussion of the materiality and the hypotext here I hope to have shown that upon hearing and/or listening to these works, it may not have been the first time a thirteenth–

---

* Marina Scordilis Brownlee notes that the extant manuscript was “copied in fourteenth–century hand, but dating originally—according to linguistic evidence—from the thirteenth century.” (“Pagan and Christian: The Bivalent Hero of El Libro de Alexandre”159)
* Biblioteca escurialense, ms. III-K-4
century audience would have heard of their male protagonists. Their intertexts reveal that, at least, partially, the hero’s identity was prediscursive.

Let us take, for example, Rodrigo Diaz de Vivar and the PMC. Any contemporary historiographical text about the history of Spain will undoubtedly reference and connect both the historical Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar and the PMC. Historian Simon Barton, in *A History of Spain*, writes that the PMC “[presents] a suitable role model for the warrior nobility of Castile to imitate” (52). Historian Peter Linehan, in *Spain 1157–1300: A Partible Inheritance*, suggests that the PMC “served as a sort of recruiting—poster for the Las Navas campaign” and “was designed to appeal to every social group capable of drawing inspiration from its hero’s achievements” (47), though Linehan does conclude that Alfonso VIII of Castile was not “much interested in recruiting—posters” (47). After all, the Cid is a national hero, “and the poem about him … is a cornerstone of Spanish literary culture” (Colin Smith, “Cantar de mio Cid” 196). Interestingly, these historians do not say that the historical Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar served as a “suitable role model” or a “recruiting poster;” but rather, they read the literary Rodrigo, the literary Cid as this role model.

**SCHOLARLY DISCOURSE**

When scholars discuss gender in the Middle Ages, it is regularly in reference to women, femininity, or marginal men or marginal masculinities. Few critics examine hegemonic masculinity together with its structural significance. My desire is to look at masculinity in these

---

texts, specifically masculinity as vested in heroes, heroes whom I deem exemplary men. Further, I see this as a way of examining emerging discourses of gender within literary genres in the thirteenth century. I ask the questions: what are these texts saying about exemplary men/masculinity in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula? What are they saying about masculine hegemony in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula? In asking these questions, I must also ask, what is masculinity and what is its relationship to power in the context of the medieval Iberian Peninsula? What is masculinity’s relationship to literary genre?

For me, there is no question of a relationship between masculinity and power, and through this textual interrogation, I hope to also point out the instability and fragility of masculinity in its medieval construction. Like masculinity, power must be reaffirmed and legitimized. In the thirteenth century, the kingdom of Castile was attempting to affirm and cement its power on the Iberian Peninsula (against and with other Christians, Muslims and Jews); it was attempting to affirm and cement its identity. Anyone reading these texts in the thirteenth century would have had that historical context as a means of understanding the text, a real–world hypotext, if you will; but also, the writers/authors would have had that same context in their construction of the text. My argument is that each text shows how integral its construction of masculinity, with its relationship to power, was to its particular horizons of expectation as well as to the interpellations of audience subjectivity.

Medieval literature and history are what Louis Althusser, in “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” refers to as Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA). That is to say, my texts allow

---

17 The interpellation process, according to Louis Althusser, is the process wherein individuals recognize themselves as subjects through ideology. This process illustrates how subjects can be complicit in their own subjugation. In recognizing/acknowledging that one is the recipient/the one addressed, the individual thus recognizes their subjecthood.
their authors to label and identify masculinity and power. Both the author and the reader are subjects (Althusser 171) and reading and writing are thereby a ritual of ideological recognition (Althusser 173). My approach in each chapter is that the Biblical Fall, as part of each text’s Fall/Redemption narrative structure, “interpellates” the reader/listener as a subject of the text’s ideology. This narrative structure is important in my articulation, later in this introduction, of genre. That being said, the Fall is not the only point when the reader is brought into the text. In all four texts, the narrators/authors invite the reader into the text, and into the inscribed ideology — sometimes even before the male protagonist has fallen. In PMC, the narrator says “Afévoslos la tienda // del Campeador contado” (v. 152). Here the narrator addresses the audience: “Afévoslos.” As Montaner contends, this is translated to mean: “Aquí los tenéis.” Here you have it/them, the you being the reader/listener. The narrator of Alexandre is more explicit and quicker to invite the reader/listener in:

Qui oírlo quisier’, a todo mio creer,
avrá de mí solaz, en cabo grant plazer,
aprenderá buenas gestas que sepa retraer,
averlo han por ello muchos a coñoçer.

Non vos quiero gran prólogo nin grandes nuevas fer,
luego a la materia me vos quiero acoger;
El Créador nos dexe bien apresos seer:
¡si en algo pecáremos, él nos deñe valer! (sts. 3-4)

The same is true for the narrator of Apolonio. He begins: “En el rey Antioco vos quiero comenzar” (v. 3a). Both these extradiegetic narrators break the so-called “fourth wall,” talking to the audience:
“Non vos quiero grant prólogo // nin grandes nuevas fer / luego a materia // me vos quiero acoger” (v. 4a-4b). The Estoria is similar and arguably more explicit. Alfonso’s prologue serves as the “threshold” for the reader’s engagement with the text’s ideology. It serves as the “zone between text and off-text, … a privileged place … of influence on the public, and influence that … is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it” (Genette, Paratexts 2; my emphasis). The authors of these texts tell the reader/listener that they, the authors, would like to bring the reader/listener to the subject at hand. That subject is a man and his relationship to power.

Masculinity is inextricably tied to power. The way that history has been written and told to us is through the “gesta” of heroic and/or powerful men — with, of course, the smattering of exceptional women. We, as a society, have taken these deeds of men as a stand–in for the progress of our societies and looked to understand it through their deeds. For example, to understand the Middle Ages, we, more often than not, find a man’s account (though, in fairness, there are historical reasons for this limitation) and take it as a seemingly unbiased and impartial reflection of societal norms. Alfonso does as much in his Estoria. In this dissertation, through my engagement with the above works, I hope to dissect the naturalness of the masculine metonymical approach.

In thinking about the horizons of expectations for the audiences of these texts, it is clear that the authors of these thirteenth-century text “address a community united by a masculine value system and the specularity of the relationship between the poet and implied audience” (Gaunt 42) reflects the relationship between the male protagonist and the other male (and arguably female) characters.
When we discuss gender, we often do so in contrast to femininity, reinforcing the seeming naturalness of masculinity. The end of the twelfth century and beginning of thirteenth century was a time in which our current iteration of Castile’s identity was being debated and fought amongst powerful men (Alfonso XIII of Castile, Alfonso IX of León, Sancho IV of Navarre, Pedro II of Aragón, etc.). Each of these powerful men attempted to lay claim to territory that would eventually become part of what we now call Spain. These men sought, through laws/curias, literature, marriages, conquests, histories, treaties, etc. to define their “imagined community.” I believe that the texts that I have chosen and their genres reflect said “imagined community.” The texts, in foregrounding the experience of a male hero, are mirrors of exemplary and hegemonic masculinity.

Given the various manuscripts and their origins, I could use these texts to extrapolate a specific understanding of Castilian, Leonese or Aragonese identity; however, I will simplify my argument to say that the texts reflect the dynamics of power as manifest in masculinity and/or the dynamics of masculinity as manifest in power on the Iberian Peninsula. The texts are windows into how hegemonic masculinity functioned in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula. Therefore, the texts are a window into how power functioned in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula.

What I want to add to this scholarly conversation is a closer look at the masculinity that is constructed in these texts – a closer look that I believe will and does reveal varying and converging ideals of masculinity that reach across the texts’ “traditionally” designated genre. I look at these texts as reflective of a functional genre, speculum principis. For example, though Apolonio and Alexandre are both written in “cuaderna vía,” are there differences in the construction of their male hero’s masculinity? And, if so, what does that mean for their genre? Does this have implications

---

*I borrow this from Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities as a way to avoid the seemingly anachronistic term “nation.”*
for if they can or cannot be read together? Though *PMC* is the Spanish epic, does the Cid’s construction of his masculine identity bear any similarities to that of Alexander? Does it bear any similarities to the historical construction of Pelayo in Alfonso X’s *Estoria*?

This, I believe, will lead us to think about a genre, similar to *speculum principis*, of *speculum masculini*, or “mirror of masculinity” — a genre that sought, through example, to teach powerful men how to be men in an age in which powerful men were attempting to define themselves and to define their “imagined community.” Dissimilar to *speculum principis*, I foreground the protagonist’s masculinity. I should first explain how I think about genre.

**FRAMING GENRE**

In this dissertation, I adopt Simon Gaunt’s methodology in *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature*. Gaunt argues that the *chansons de geste*, romance, the *canso*, hagiography and the *fabliaux*, as literary genres, cannot “be properly understood without taking its representations of gender into account” (17) and discusses three crucial terms for his methodology: genre, gender and ideology. Gaunt holds that there are two criteria for defining genre: *form* and *content*. Fredric Jameson, in *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, asserts that in the constitution of genre, both aspects are important, and that therefore genre is “that literary discourse which may be examined either in terms of a fixed form or in terms of a mode \[(content)\], but which *must* be susceptible of study from both of these perspectives optionally” (109; original emphasis).

As texts embody ideology, examining a text’s form and content, its genre, will lead one to understand a text’s ideology. Texts are symbolic acts “wherein contradictions, inequalities and injustices within societies are resolved and justified” (Gaunt 6) and a genre “represents one way of offering imaginary solutions” (Gaunt 6–7). Therefore, as Gaunt contends,
different moments in history different genres will arise in response to different tensions; synchronically, different genres may operate at the same historical moment to offer different solutions to the same set of tensions or to address different contradictions that are problematic in a society at a given moment (7) and therefore “[genres] are not stable structures, but mutate and evolve according to the historical moment (7; my emphasis). The mutability of Gaunt’s approach to genre is important in my conclusion, in that I do not find a text’s traditional generic designation and my designation mutually exclusive. Then, from this approach, it is critical to consider a text’s historical context in designating its genre. What are those different tensions that arose in the thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula and to what extent do these texts reflect those tensions?

Importantly, Simon Gaunt argues that in equating form and content, “it shows that all genres inscribe an ideology and, therefore, that the adoption of form in itself implies an engagement with ideology” (8). Therefore, writing about male heroes has implications for the text’s specific ideology. Additionally, writing in verse or in prose in the vernacular implies an engagement with a specific ideology. Julian Weiss dialogues with this in his discussion of “mester de clerecía,” arguing that though form does imply an engagement with a specific ideology (using cuaderna vía), engaging with that larger ideology can lead to a deeper understanding of the form. In his introduction to The ‘mester de clerecía’: Intellectuals and Ideologies in Thirteenth-Century Castile, Weiss asks “whether the mester is a unified school composed only of poems written in cuaderna vía [monorhymed alexandrine quatrains] or a broader and looser literary movement which also embraces clerical narratives in rhyming couplets, or pareados” (2). He concludes that “a social reading of cuaderna vía poems … acquires greater depth and meaning by setting them in

---

*That being said, Gaunt’s argument does not seem to allow for a genre that foregrounds content.*
the wider context of clerical narrative, and that the broad social and didactic impulses that drive
the poems in *pareados* … are the same as those that motivate the more formally sophisticated
poems” (2). Weiss here seems to be allowing for the susceptibility of study from both the
perspective of form and the perspective of content.

For Gaunt, if the literature or history is “determined by genre, so is the reader’s or listener’s
response” (Gaunt 9). As Hans Robert Jauss argues, in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, a reader
or listener approaches every text with a

horizon of expectations and ‘rules of the game’ familiar to him from earlier texts, which as
such can be varied, extended, corrected, but also transformed, crossed out, or simply
reproduced. Variation, extension, and correction determine the latitude of generic structure;
a break with the convention on the one hand and mere reproduction on the other determines
its boundaries (88)

Gaunt argues then that the author will be influenced “both by his or her audience’s actual response
and by the response he or she expects” and because of this “the evolution of genres is determined
by reception as well as by the writer’s conscious and unconscious engagement with the genre” (9).
A reader or listener uses his or her understanding of and experience with the genre to situate a text
and judge it (Gaunt 9).

In this dissertation, I argue that gender as manifest in the texts, specifically masculinity, is
part of the ideology that must be examined in order to understand a text’s genre. Because, as Gaunt
argues, “[if] genres … inscribe ideologies, the construction and representation of gender within
those ideologies is crucial to an understanding of how they function” (16). Like Gaunt, my
argument is not that “gender is the only factor which will allow an adequate understanding of the
differences between genres”; but rather, a genre “cannot be fully understood without a consideration of gender” (16; original emphasis).

I am particularly interested in masculinity because of what Pierre Bourdieu, in *Masculine Domination*, coins as the paradox of doxa. He argues that masculinity, like “[every] established order tends to produce … the naturalization of its own arbitrariness” (Bourdieu, *Outline* 164). Further, “[systems] of classification which reproduce … the objective classes … make their specific contribution to the reproduction of the power relations … by securing misrecognition … of the arbitrariness on which they are based.” That is to say, “the natural and social world appear as self-evident” (Bourdieu, *Outline* 164; my emphasis). This he defines as doxa. In *Masculine Domination*, Bourdieu examines masculinity as one such system of classification. As Bourdieu argues “[the] strength of the masculine order is seen in the fact that … the androcentric vision imposes itself as neutral and has no need to spell itself out in discourses aimed a legitimating it” (*Masculine Domination* 9). That is to say, “[both] in social perception and in language, the masculine gender appears as non–marked, … in opposition to the feminine, which is explicitly characterized” (9 fn6) and the “social order functions as an immense symbolic machine tending to ratify the masculine domination on which it is founded” (Bourdieu, *Masculine Domination* 9). Literature and history are cogs in this machine and the product they are producing is both themselves and masculine domination. As a “product of an incessant … labor of production, to which singular agents … and institutions … contribute,” literature is a “structure of domination” (Bourdieu, *Masculine Domination* 34) that ratifies masculine domination.

As my title suggests, I treat the eponymous characters as anxious heroes. I borrow the term “anxious” from Mark Breitenberg’s *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. In his book, Breitenberg, “[selects] a text or textual moment that displays an excessive response to a
specifically masculine anxiety” (17). He asserts that “[masculine] identity in patrilineal cultures largely derives from ‘resources’ men inherit, including his status, and what he is able to pass on to his offspring” (16). I would argue that those resources are wedded to a man’s power, and that that loss of power is also a specifically masculine anxiety. The loss of power was a specifically Castilian anxiety. It was a specifically thirteenth–century anxiety.

Breitenberg, then, “[searches] for the cultural tensions or contradictions that inform the response, then [considers] the function of the articulation within a specifically textual (or literary) context as well as in the general context of early modern patriarchy” (17). My assertion is that in the texts I have chosen, each hero experiences a moment, or moments, of masculine anxiety and that these moments precipitate a “self–fashioning,” to borrow from Stephen Greenblatt, of his masculine identity (Breitenberg 11).

Additionally, Breitenberg asserts that masculinity is fragile and that it is “inherently anxious.” Further, this masculine anxiety “reveals the fissures and contradictions of patriarchal systems and, at the same time, it … enables and drives the patriarchy’s reproduction and continuation of itself” (Breitenberg 2). Patriarchies, like palimpsests, “smooth over and reveal loose ends” (Francomano, “Reversing the Tapestry” 1100). Therefore, masculinity, intrinsic to this patriarchal system, must be constantly reproduced in order to retain its dominance. After all, as Breitenberg contends, “any social system whose premise is the unequal distribution of power and authority always and only sustains itself in constant defense of the privileges of some of its members and by the constraint of others” (3).

I argue that the self–fashioning of the hero’s masculinity is manifest in the Fall/Redemption narrative structure of the text and that this structure serves as means of inculcating the changing ideals of the thirteenth–century, specifically those that manifest in the anxious and exemplary hero,
in body, manner and speech. The masculine bodies, manners and speech, as represented in literature, are culturally constructed entities coded by discourse – the hero tales.

**HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

In the thirteenth century there were important historical shifts related to exemplary masculinity: infighting amongst the Christian kings with the dominance of the Castilian kings, the successes and failures of the “Reconquest,” the centralization of monarchical juridical power, the clericalization of monarchical power, the creation of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders in response to Cathar/Albigensian and Waldensian heresy, the expansion of papal authority, and the role of the chancery clerks; all of which, to some extent, played a part in the Iberian king’s desire to establish a legacy.

The thirteenth century on the Iberian Peninsula saw the reign of five kings of Castile: Alfonso VIII, Enrique I, Fernando III, Alfonso X and Sancho IV. For the purposes of my dissertation, the reigns of the first five are important. In texts which foreground kings, the “rules of the game” for approaching these texts undoubtedly involve the author’s and reader’s/listener’s experience with royal authority. As Amaia Arizaleta argues, in *Les clercs au palais*, “[pouvoir] des monarques et pouvoir de l’écrit allèrent de pair en Castille entre 1157 et 1230” (“Introduction,” 1).

Going into the thirteenth century, Alfonso VIII, king of Castile, and Alfonso IX, king of León, had an antagonistic relationship that involved their Christian neighbors. Alfonso VIII’s reign had started belligerently. As a result of his father’s death in 1158, a “power struggle broke

---

*a In 1214, when Alfonso VIII died, Enrique I was 10 years old and so his regency was assumed by his older sister, Berenguela of Castile, wife of Alfonso IX of León. In 1217, Enrique I died. Berenguela succeeded him; however, she renounced in favor of her son, Fernando III.*
out between rival Castilian aristocratic families — the Laras and Castros — to secure custody of the infant Alfonso VIII” (Barton, *A History* 65). The Laras won out.

As king, Alfonso VIII was perceived as domineering by his fellow Iberian kings. In 1190, Alfonso II of Aragón (r. 1162–96) joined Sancho VI of Navarre (r. 1150–94) in an anti–Castilian pact. In 1191, Alfonso II, Alfonso IX of León (r. 1188–1230) and Sancho I of Portugal (r. 1185–1211) made a pact against Alfonso VIII (O’Callaghan, *A History* 243). According to Muslim sources, Alfonso VIII “offered to pay tribute [to the Almohads] and to wage war against his coreligionists” (O’Callaghan, *Reconquest* 59). Religion was a uniting factor, at least at this point, in Alfonso VIII’s imagined Castilian community. This infighting was known in Rome, and after Pope Celestine’s election in 1191, he “demanded that the Christian kings make peace for ten years and take up arms against the Muslims” (O’Callaghan, *Reconquest* 60), sending his nephew, Cardinal Gregory of Sant’Angelo to Spain in 1192 (O’Callaghan, *Reconquest* 60). In 1193, Pope Celestine commanded Iberian prelates to compel their kings to end their truces with the Muslims, encouraging the Military Orders and the laity to attack Muslims, “whether the kings did so or not” (O’Callaghan, *Reconquest* 60), undermining royal authority. Because of this and the coming expiration of the truce with the Almohads, by 1194, the kings of Castile, León and Aragón had finally made peace (O’Callaghan, *Reconquest* 61).

The Archbishop Martín of Toledo and the knights of Calatrava attacked Muslim occupied territory in Guadalquivir. The caliph Abū Yūṣuf Ya’qūb, known as al-Mansūr, gave word to Alfonso VIII’s ambassador that he would not let this slight go unanswered. Alfonso VIII’s actions were supported by Celestine III; however, on July 19, 1195, al-Mansūr defeated Alfonso VIII at

---

21 The Almohads, in the twelfth century, challenged and defeated the Almoravids for domination in North Africa. With the collapse of the Almoravids, the Christians were able to capture Lisbon, Tortosa, and Almería. However, by the middle of the twelfth century, the Almohads had entered the Iberian Peninsula and had a strong hold on al–Andalus (O’Callaghan *A History*, 216)
Alarcos and captured Calatrava. Though Alfonso VIII requested aid from Alfonso IX and Sancho VII, he did not wait for those reinforcements (O’Callaghan, A History 243), and was summarily outmanned.

After Alfonso VIII’s defeat at Alarcos, he and Alfonso IX “quarreled bitterly” and in 1196, Alfonso IX and Sancho VII of Navarre (r. 1194–1234), fearing “the hegemonic pretensions of Alfonso VIII far more than the threat of Islamic expansionism” (Barton, A History 66), entered into an alliance with the Almohads against Castile. Despite Celestine III’s objections, the alliance between León, Navarre and the Almohads against Castile continued and all parties launched raids against Alfonso VIII. The Almohads attacked the Tagus valley west of Toledo. Alfonso IX attacked western Castile and Sancho VI attacked near Logroño.

The papacy felt the need to intervene and “launched a series of diplomatic initiatives designed to put an end to the infighting between the peninsular monarchs and to rekindle the flame of the crusade” (Barton, A History 66). However, Celestine III seemed to place the blame on Alfonso IX, and excommunicated him on October 31, 1196. This excommunication released Alfonso IX’s subjects from their oath of allegiance and Celestine III also offered indulgences to those who took up arms against him (O’Callaghan, A History 244). By April 1197, Celestine III “conceded to those who attacked the king of León the remission of sins” (O’Callaghan, Reconquest 62–3).

Alfonso VIII’s wife, Leonor, offered a solution to the discord on the Peninsula, and Alfonso VIII and Alfonso IX accepted. Alfonso IX would marry Berenguela, the daughter of Alfonso VIII and Leonor. (O’Callaghan, A History 245). However, Alfonso VIII and Alfonso IX were cousins. Their fathers had been brothers and, therefore, Alfonso IX and Berenguela were second cousins. In 1198, Pope Innocent III excommunicated Alfonso IX for consanguinity. He, additionally,
imposed an interdict on León. Upon the dissolution of the marriage between Berenguela and Alfonso IX, the enmity resumed between León and Castile. In 1206 the two crowns agreed that Fernando III, son of Alfonso IX, would be endowed with the lands and fortresses that his mother had received from her father and her husband (O’Callaghan, A History 245).

In 1209, Innocent III wrote to Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo, imploring him to “take up arms in a crusade against the infidels.” (O’Callaghan, A History 246). Various princes heeded the pope’s call and fighting resumed between the Christians and the Muslims. As a result, Muhammad al-Nasir, known as Miramamolín, in 1211, besieged the Castle of Salvatierra, the chief seat of the knights of Calatrava. As Salvatierra had been “a symbol of Castilian determination to undo the effects of Alarcos,” (O’Callaghan, A History 246), Alfonso VIII’s previously discussed defeat, this was a significant loss for Alfonso VIII. Another significant loss for Alfonso VIII that year was the death of his son and heir, Fernando.

Alfonso VIII, subsequently, asked the Pope to proclaim a crusade. Innocent III urged all Christians, both inside and outside of the Iberian Peninsula to support Alfonso VIII. Pedro II and Sancho VII pledged to support Castile; however, and not surprisingly, Alfonso IX made his support conditional. He would assist if a fortress held by Alfonso VIII was returned.

On July 13, 1212, Alfonso VIII, Pedro II, Diego López de Haro, and Sancho VII reached Las Navas de Tolosa. The battle began on July 16th and

Diego López de Haro commanded the center of the Christian army, with Sancho VII on his right and Pedro II on his left, while Alfonso VIII and the military Orders held the rear. In the ensuing combat the kings of Aragon and Navarre carried out a pincers movement, and Alfonso VIII rushed forward, breaking the enemy lines. Sancho VII drove forward through a circle of Negro slaves chained to one another to guard Miramamolín’s tent. The caliph
took flight and … [the] Christian triumph was complete. … Alfonso VIII sent Miramamolín’s standard and tent, with a detailed account of the crusade, to Innocent III (O’Callaghan, A History 248; my emphasis).

During this battle, Alfonso IX, not having been sufficiently satisfied with the terms of helping Alfonso VIII, encroached into Portugal, taking advantage of the death of Sancho I. After this battle, the kings of Castile, León, and Portugal agreed to peace at Coimbra. There they agreed to collaborate against the Muslims in the future. (O’Callaghan, A History 249).

CENTRALIZATION OF MONARCHICAL POWER

The last decade of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth century saw a renaissance of Roman law that “emphasized that the administration of justice was one of the essential reasons for the existence of the state, a function which the sovereign could not surrender to others” (O’Callaghan, A History 273-74). There has been historical work that put the centralization of monarchical power in the mid-thirteenth century with Alfonso X; however, as Ignacio Borge argues in his article, “La justicia del rey y el desarrollo del poder monárquico en el reinado de Alfonso VIII de Castilla (1158-1214),” Alfonso VIII had expanded monarchical power decades earlier (Borge 235). As Borge argues, “durante el reinado de Alfonso VIII se asiste a un considerable desarrollo institucional de los instrumentos para el ejercicio de la justicia del rey” (235–6). Focusing specifically on “los merinos mayores de Castilla y los alcaldes/jueces de la curia regia” (236), Borge also argues that there was a formalization of judicial processes through which written texts gained importance (236). Borge argues that the “alcaldes de la curia regia y los merinos mayores (y el cuerpo de merinos menores y otros oficiales de ellos dependientes) son los aparatos administrativos que hacen posible y efectivo el desarrollo de la justicia regia en el reinado
de Alfonso VIII” (245). Alfonso’s actions here as well as territorially speak both to his desire to mollify the tumultuous Iberian Peninsula as well as to imbue his crown with authority.

UNIFICATION AND EXPANSIONISM

When Fernando III, son of Alfonso IX of León, was proclaimed king of Castile, it seemed as if calamity had returned to Castile and León. Alfonso VIII had died some three years earlier and his 10-year old son, Enrique, had inherited the throne. Enrique’s older sister, and Fernando III’s mother, Berenguela, served as his guardian. Berenguela’s guardianship was challenged and, as a result,

she agreed to entrust him to Count Álvaro Núñez de Lara, as procurator, under the following conditions: that he not make war against any neighboring state, nor deprive anyone of his estates, nor grant property to anyone, nor impose any tribute, without her consent (O’Callaghan, A History 335). The historical recollection of Count Álvaro’s actions and intentions are in dispute. While, Joseph O’Callaghan argues that Count Álvaro’s conduct was “offensive,” and “brought the kingdom on the verge of civil war” (A History 335), Simon R. Doubleday, in The Lara Family: Crown and Nobility in Medieval Spain, argues that Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, in his history, “[downplays] any indication that the Laras enjoyed … widespread support” (53). While O’Callaghan presents Count Álvaro as a usurper, Doubleday argues that Count Álvaro had wide support and that his actions were “hardly extraordinary and [that] there are grounds for suspecting that the sins of the Laras have been exaggerated” (52). To some extent, Count Álvaro’s intentions do not matter. Enrique died in 1217. And as Doubleday puts it, Enrique’s death “brought an abrupt and total fall from
power for the Laras” (55). The next in line for the throne was Berenguela, who yielded the throne to her son, Fernando III, and not so surprisingly, the Laras opposed Fernando’s ascendency. Surprisingly, however, was that Fernando’s own father, Alfonso IX opposed him (Barton, A History 67–68). O’Callaghan contends that Count Álvaro encouraged Alfonso IX to unite León and Castile under his rule (A History 336). However, in 1218, Fernando III and Alfonso IX agreed to peace and a united front against the Muslims.

Upon his father’s death in 1230, Fernando reunited Castile and León (Barton A History, 65). As king of both Castile and León, Fernando oversaw great territorial expansion: capturing Córdoba in 1236, Jaén in 1246, and Sevilla in 1248 (Barton, A History 68).

Fernando III encouraged the use of the vernacular in Castile and Léon. In an effort to “impose uniformity upon the legal structure and to develop a common, royal, territorial law” (O’Callaghan A History, 450), Fernando ordered the Liber Judiciorum, a sophisticated and comprehensive codification of Visigothic laws, to be translated into Castilian as Fuero Juzgo. He had it given to Córdoba and other cities as municipal law (O’Callaghan, A History 65). Doing this, Fernando became the first peninsular ruler “to employ the vernacular generally in public documents and to encourage the translation of important texts” (O’Callaghan, A History 509). Additionally, Fernando III “fostered the Universities of Salamanca and Palencia and encouraged the use of Castilian, rather than Latin, as the official language of government and administration”

---

22 Though she did not sit on the throne, Fernando’s mother was essential to the strength of his government. As Amaia Arizaleta, in Les clerc au palais, argues: “Car tout au long des années pendant lesquelles Ferdinand régna uniquement sur la Castille, les hommes de sa chancellerie prirent soin d’indiquer que les actions de Ferdinand avaient lieu ex assensu et beneplacito dominae Berengariae reginae (formule qu’on trouve répétée, avec quelques variantes, dans tous les documents émis entre 1217 et 1230).” (Arizaleta Les clercs 142). « La présence constante des figures d’Alphonse et de Bérengère dans les actes martèle le lignage du souverain.” (142). “Ferdinand ne pouvait pas gouverner sans Bérengère, et tous les deux cherchaient la protection accordée par la figure d’Alphonse VIII.” (142)

23 For more detail about Ferdinand’s conquests, see O’Callaghan pages 343–57.
(O’Callaghan, *A History* 354). Though the University of Salamanca was brought into existence under his father, Alfonso IX, Fernando strengthened it and in 1255, Pope Alexander IV granted its graduates the right to teach anywhere in Christendom (O’Callaghan, *A History* 500).

Though at the outset contested, decades into Fernando III’s reign, Fernando had made great strides in the development of a less antagonistic “imagined community.” And by the end of his reign in 1252, Castile and León were united, allegiances had been formed amongst the Christian kings against the weakened Muslims, and clerics and scholasticism were united in providing a legitimate “national” identity. Alfonso X inherited this “imagined community” and attempted to expand it beyond Iberia’s physical borders.

Through the reigns of Alfonso VIII and Fernando III, we see that “the development of nationhood and the monarchical state were changing the nature of group identities.” (Hazbun 26). Their reigns, along with that of Alfonso X are the contexts for the literary and historical works I discuss; and, as such, provide evidence for why it is important to understand the role of these kings as centralizing patriarchal forces.

I will not spend much time in the introduction discussing Alfonso X in extreme detail. I will leave that to my fourth chapter on his *Estoria de Espanna*. However, what I will say here is that many argue that he was obsessed with becoming Holy Roman Emperor and that this desire shaped many of his actions as king. H. Salvador Martínez, in *Alfonso X, the Learned: A Biography*, would not characterize Alfonso X’s aspirations an obsession; rather, argues that his desire was perfectly normal and actions based in precedent (121-29). What is important for me here, and my dissertation, is Alfonso X’s desire to concretize a Spanish “national” identity (vested in powerful men) through vernacular writing “por que non cayessen en oluido et los sopiessen los que auien de uenir; et por que pudiessen otrosi conoscer el saber” (“Prólogo,” vv. 45l-2r).
HERESY

Heresy, disobedience to the authority of the church, was the result and cause of religious anxiety in the thirteenth century. In the thirteenth century, there was a move to define the Church and before the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, there was “unbridled experimentation in forms of religious life” (Madigan 214). Kevin Madigan, in *Medieval Christianity: A New History*, presents a compelling history of the rise of the Cathars and the Waldesians in the twelfth century, the result of which, he argues, was a movement to repress it. These heretics sought to alter the Christian identity. At the turn of the thirteenth century, Innocent III (r. 1198–1216) sat on the Holy Throne. Innocent III likened heresy to “treacherous behavior in the secular sphere and concluded that heresy should, like treason, be met with confiscation of the guilty party’s goods and punishment for his inheritors” (Madigan 198). As Madigan argues:

In the minds of popes and prelates, … heretics were wolves in sheep’s clothing, predicted in Scripture (Matthew 7:15), carriers and transmitters of a religious contagion; they endangered the eternal souls of men and women. As such, neither they nor the heresy they embraced and spread could be tolerated” (Madigan 178).

The Albigensian Crusades were a reaction to the rise in power of the Cathars. Madigan compares the spread of heresy and the Church’s response to it “rather like [how] the Center for Disease Control might regard a deadly worldwide flu spread rapidly by airline travel today” (203).

In addition to heresy, in the early thirteenth century, there arose a “new, urban, commercial population that had been largely despaired of, ignored and given to believe that it was, at best,

---

24 After discussing the Cathars and the Waldesians, Madigan concludes that, given how their heresy manifested, “[it] was, in the end, disobedience or stubborn defiance of ecclesiastical authority that made one a heretic in the Middle Ages” (Madigan 198).


demi–Christian” (Madigan 211). The Dominican and Franciscan mendicant orders arose in response to both crises and “became masters of the art of preaching, of confessing, of teaching, and of serving royalty and the papacy” (Madigan 211; O’Callaghan 494)

**A RESPONSE TO HERESY: THE MENDICANT ORDERS**

Saint Francis, then known only as Francis (“Francesco”), felt disillusioned with the state of faith in the thirteenth century. Reacting against the materialism of the bourgeoisie, Francis preached poverty (O’Callaghan 494). Francis, on a military expedition, fell ill and had a dream in which he heard the call of Christ, “who summoned him to renounce his commitment to vanities and undertake a life fighting for a different, divine cause” (Madigan 230). In 1208, Francis attended mass in Portiuncula, heard the gospel as if it were a message to him. Francis would go about “preaching penance” (Madigan 232). Francis’ preaching would not be the only influence that he would have on Catholicism. Francis’ revelations represented the “definitive ascendancy of the New Testament in western ecclesiastical history … and [his] own dedication to literal imitation in practice also marks the growing ascendancy of the literal over the allegorical reading of the Bible” (Madigan 232).

Dominic of Caleruega, born in Castile, “was educated in liberal and scriptural studies as a cleric in the schools of [Palencia]” (Madigan 212). Dominic had “zeal for orthodoxy” (212). After having been sent by Alfonso VIII on a diplomatic mission to Denmark, Dominic discovered the extent to which the Albigensian/Cathar heresy had spread throughout Languedoc and decided to devote himself to preaching there (O’Callaghan 495). In 1215, Dominic “organized a group of preachers designed to stamp out heresy and also to instruct people in faith and morals.” (Madigan 214). That same year, Dominic “sought from Innocent III papal confirmation of his order” (214). In 1217, Pope Honorius III (r. 1216–27) “approved the name of the new order, the ‘Order of Friars
Preachers’ and empowered the entire community with the right to preach—a novelty in the history of the church, as the privilege of preaching had traditionally depended on episcopal approval and authorization” (214-5). Madigan notes that after receiving approval to teach that Dominic broadened the scope of his initiatives and chose to send his friars to Paris and Bologna, “the sites of the two greatest universities in Europe” (215). Dominic believed that studying theology was a prerequisite for effective preaching (O’Callaghan 495). Madigan argues that Dominic’s “desire to target centers of university learning … had implications for the demographics of recruiting” (215), with most the friars preachers coming from “the sons of lesser nobility, the burgher class, and other sorts of professionals” (215). From the ranks of the Dominicans would arise Thomas Aquinas, who would be essential in fusing Aristotelian philosophy and Christianity. Aristotle plays a crucial role in the construction of Alexander’s identity.

STRUCTURE

In my first chapter, “Masculinities,” I frame gender theory, discussing both contemporary and medieval conceptions of gender, while foregrounding masculinity. For the purposes of my dissertation, I take the approach that the masculine and the masculine body, as represented in literature, are culturally constructed entities that are coded by discourse of the hero tales. For the purposes of my “dissection” of gender construction (specifically masculinities) within the confines of this dissertation, I will use gender to refer to the masculinity and femininity of men and women, while sex will refer to the anatomical body as male or female.

In my second chapter, “Engendering Speech Acts: Language and Performance in the Fall and Redemption of the ‘Buen Vassallo’ in the Poema de Mio Cid,” I, first, situate myself in

---

See Medieval Christianity: A New History (Madigan, 2015) pages 279-283 for more detail.
scholarly conversations about its generic designation. I date the PMC’s production in 1207\textsuperscript{a}, during the reign of Alfonso VIII of Castile. \textit{PMC} reflects a Castile in the middle of the Reconquest as well as one progressing toward the centralization of monarchical power. Its hegemonic masculinity, additionally, reflects the formalization of the judicial processes and territorial expansion that occurred under Alfonso VIII. Taking into consideration other’s criticism for and against designating the \textit{PMC} as an epic, using Gaunt’s methodology, I attempt answer the question of to what extent can a monologic construction of gender be said to be present throughout the text. This model, according to Gaunt is one “which has difficulty tolerating difference and which therefore engages in an obsessional, but ultimately unsuccessful attempt to repress and marginalize alterity” (23). My conclusion is that the text fails to produce a monologic constitution of masculinity in the way that Gaunt has argued for it. As many scholars have argued, there is something different about the first and second half of the text. I use their arguments and my dissection of the Cid’s masculinity to conclude that the construction of masculinity in the second half, though based in on his interaction with other men, is not the same as in the first half. While the field for the construction of his masculine identity is the battlefield in the first half, in the second it is the court. Overall; however, I still believe that the second half of the text, though dissimilar in \textit{form}, continues to be similar in \textit{content}, here viewing content as being the proliferation of the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and power.

In my third chapter, “The Figural Kings: The (Re)construction of Christian Masculinities in \textit{Libro de Alexandre} and \textit{Libro de Apolonio},” I look at two texts that are a part of “mester de clerecía.” The notions of “construction” and “reconstruction” are essential to my approach in this

\textsuperscript{a} I agree with Colin Smith in his introduction that “[aceptar] la fecha 1207 (o algunos años antes) como fecha de la compisición del poema puede parecer demasiado sencillo y hasta ingenuo, poer (hoy de acuerdo con muchos) lo creo perfectamente correcto” (43). See Smith (pp. 38-48) and Montaner (pp. 281-289).
chapter. These literary texts are conscious constructions and reconstructions by their respective clerical author (or authors). The tools used by the clerical author or authors to construct their texts were limited by and constructed through relations of power and normative constraints. Both *Alexandre* and *Apolonio* are reworkings of previous Latin and pagan sources. In this chapter, I look at mester de clerecía as “an excessive response to a specifically masculine anxiety”: the legacy of the/a king. I date *Alexandre*’s production during the reign of Alfonso VIII of Castile or during the beginning of Fernando III’s reign, while I date *Apolonio*’s production in 1250 under the reign of Fernando III of Castile. In my discussion, I place these texts in an era of clerical writing that made a “concerted effort to shape the … king’s image” (Pascual–Argente, “Nueva maestría” 188). Amaia Arizaleta, in *Les clercs au palais*, analyzes chancery document production from 1157 to 1230 and “traces the creation of propagandistic and quasi-literary image of Castilian monarchs” (Pascual–Argente, “Nueva maestría” 188). The kings are presented as “conquering and victorious leaders, preeminent among their Iberian peers” (Pascual–Argente, “Nueva maestría” 188). Given Alfonso VIII’s antagonistic relationship with Alfonso IX, this comes as no surprise.

In my discussion of “mester de clerecía,” I build on Julian Weiss’ *The mester*. Weiss’ broader understanding, focusing on the “poetics of clerisy, the nature of the message, and historical

---

* There is no precise date for Alexandre. For a discussion of the dating of *Alexandre*, see Z. David Zuwiyya (*A Companion to Alexander Literature in the Middle Ages* 234). According to C. Carroll Marden, the composition of *Alexandre* preceded *Poema de Fernán González*, circa 1250. However, María Eugenia Lacarra, in “El significado histórico del Poema de Fernán González,” proposes moving the date back to the time of Alfonso X. Ian Michael, in *The Treatment of Classical Material in the Libro de Alexandre*, argues that knowledge is praised in the text because the contemporary prince admired by the author was Fernando III or a young prince Alfonso. R.S. Willis, in “The Artistry and Enigmas of the Libro de Alexandre: A Review Article,” notes that the inclusion of Seville, conquered in 1248, as one of the best cities in Spain, means that a Christian author would not have said this before that date. Jesús Cañas notes that the composition is similar to those already existing at the time of Alfonso X. Julian Weiss, in *The ‘mester de clerecía’: Intellectuals and Ideologies in Thirteenth–Century Castile*, contends that *Alexandre* “could have been written towards the end of the reign of Alfonso VIII (1158–1214) or at the beginning of that of Fernando III (1217–52) … [as] [it] is shaped by concern for unity in diversity that is relevant to both monarchs” (24). Also see Juan Casas Rigall’s discussion in his edition of the *Libro de Alexandre* (p. 551-69). As I state above, I incline to date *Alexandre* during the reign of Alfonso VIII or the beginning of Fernando III’s reign, as most of the current proposals for dates place the production in the first third of the thirteenth century (Casas Rigall 568-69).
conditions,” (3) allows me the space to address how intrinsic the texts’ constructions of masculinity were to its particular horizons of expectation. My argument is that the “poetics of clerisy, the nature of the message, and [the] historical conditions” of Alexandre and Apolonio are tied up in masculinity.

For my approach to Alexandre, the language of the manuscripts plays an important role in extrapolating a historical context. As Juan Casas Rigall argues, “[el] dialecto original del Alexandre ha sido, sin duda, el principal debate en su estudio” (569). Further, Casas Rigall argues that:

el análisis lingüístico de los dos manuscritos y los fragmentos conservados induce a considerar tres formantes dialectales: el leonés, muy marcado en el manuscrito O, el aragonés, que aflora en la copia de P; y el castellano, alternativa de los fragmentos de Medinaceli, Bivar y El Victorial (569).

The principal modern editors of Alexandre have adopted divergent attitudes; however, all seemingly dismiss Leonese as the original language with the discovery of manuscript P, in 1188. (Casas Rigall 569). With this discovery, “se advirtió un evidente elemento aragonés en el nuevo testimonio” (Casas Rigall 575). And, therefore, Casas Rigall concludes that “los textos … conservados inducen a pensar que la lengua del poeta, aun constituyendo un artefacto literario, se funda sobre un dialecto ibérico centro–oriental” (581).

The construction of Alexandre is one that falls more in line with the epic genre, while that of Apolonio falls in line with the romance genre. As I discussed earlier Gaunt asserts that in the construction of the romance, where more importance is placed on his relationship to a female character and that that relationship is what defines his masculinity. I argue that this is true for Apolonio. Though Alan Deyermond in “¿Rei otro sobre mí’?: The Exile of the True King in
Thirteenth-Century Castilian Literature,” argues that “it is hard to relate its [Apolonio’s] themes to events in the last years of Fernando III or the first years Alfonso X,” he does allow for the space to read Apolonio, as I do, as *speculum principis*. In this chapter, I argue that there are similarities between *Apolonio* and its historical context. As H. Salvador Martínez notes in *Alfonso X, the Learned: A Biography*, “the first major family political and concern of Berenguela was to find him [Fernando] a wife” (35). Berenguela was concerned with the “spiritual and Christian life of her son,” and, additionally, at this time in Spain, “the situation of regarding the availability of marriageable women was such that practically all Spanish princesses … were related by blood” (35). Salvador Martínez argues that Berenguela thought of her own experience and looked for a bride that could not have possibly been related to Fernando. It also did not hurt that Fernando’s future bride, was “related to the two most prominent Christian dynasties of East and West” (36). With the youth of its protagonist at the start, the distance traveled for him to meet his bride, Luciana, the effort exerted for them to remain together and to have a male heir, for me, I could see Alfonso X seeing himself as the “fijo varón” that “conçibió Luçiana” (v. 626d).

In my fourth chapter, “The ‘Buen Cristiano’: The Construction of the Postfigurational Hero in Alfonso X’s *Estoria de Espanna,*” I focus on the stories of Rodrigo and Pelayo, the last Visigothic king of Spain. The sections I discuss date to between 1270 and 1274*. In dissecting the masculinity of Rodrigo and Pelayo, I attempt to gauge the extent to which the aforementioned methodology of masculine construction holds true with a text that is not literary, but that uses

---

* According to Aengus Ward, in *History and Chronicles in Late Medieval Iberia: Representations of Wamba in Late Medieval Narrative Histories*, the “versión primitiva (1270)” “is represented by 17 manuscripts split into two sub–groups, the ‘versión regia’ and the ‘versión vulgar.’” The latter incorporates the 1274 emendations. This is the El Escorial Y–I–2, “which for all of the pre–Pelayo sections represents the earliest stage of Alfonso’s chronicle” (Ward 35). Additionally, for the versión enmendada (1274), “[the] alterations were […] completed at a time of a political ferment. The plotting of the nobility, crystallised in the so–called *Conjuración de Lerma* of 1271, and the increasing resistance to the extension of royal power and influence was therefore another of many storm clouds on the horizon” (Ward 37).
literary devices to construct its *estoria*. Placing it in its historical context and using the text’s prologue, I argue that given that Alfonso X was not able to conquer the world like *Alexandre*, he attempts to do so through the texts he patroned. He represents and values a construction of masculinity present in epics, one predicated on the relationships between men. In doing so, Alfonso, as *auctor*, presents a mirror for and of leaders for his thirteenth–century audience.
CHAPTER I: MASCULINITIES

1.1: FRAMING GENDER

Gender has a foundational role in the formation of ideologies. As Gaunt argues, “[no] ideology], nor its inscription in text, can be disassociated from the sex/gender system of the culture in which it operates, even if superficially gender does not appear to be at issue” (16). To that end, it is important to frame my understanding and approach to gender.

Sarah Kay and Miri Rubin, in the introduction to Framing Medieval Bodies, opine that “[we] are born with bodies, but although they are thus native to us, and we innate to them, they are not thereby ‘natural.’” The “systematic coding of bodies means that they are as much the product, as the site, of experience” (1). Bodies can be spoken of as “natural” only because “the discourses of biology, anatomy and materialism exist within our culture, offering intellectual conceptualisations” (Kay and Rubin 1). That is to say, we acquire significance as gendered bodies through language and observable actions.

Similarly, Judith Butler, in her article, “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory,” develops her theories on the performativity of gender. Butler argues that gender is both performative as well as representation of an internalized notion of gender norms. She asserts that “the more mundane reproduction of gendered identity takes place through the various ways in which bodies are acted in relationship to the deeply entrenched and sedimented expectations of gendered existence” (“Performative,” 524; my emphasis). Butler does not argue that our performance of gender is an expression of some innate natural gender; but rather, that “there is sedimentation of gender norms that produces the peculiar phenomenon of a natural sex … and … this sedimentation … over time has produced a set of corporeal styles, which, in reified form, appear as the natural configuration of bodies into sexes
which exist in binary relation to one another” (“Performative” 524). Her argument, therefore, is that the performance of gender itself creates gender. This is what Butler means by gender being performative — “the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effect that it names” (Bodies that Matter 14). Butler borrows from speech act theory. In speech act theory, “a performative is that discursive practice that enacts or produces that which it names” (Bodies that Matter 13). Similarly, Jacques Derrida, in “Signature Event Context,” asks:

Could a performative utterance succeed if its formulation did not repeat a "coded" or iterable utterance, or in other words, if the formula I pronounce in order to open a meeting, launch a ship or a marriage were not identifiable as conforming with an iterable model, if it were not then identifiable in some way as a "citation"? ... In such a typology, the category of intention will not disappear; it will have its place, but from that place it will no longer be able to govern the entire scene and system of utterance [L’énonciation] (18)

In her discussion of gender performativity, Butler compares it to an actor’s performance in the theatre. She compares each individual to an actor performing his or her gender. Importantly, Butler observes a crucial difference between gender performance in reality and in theater performances: “Indeed, the sight of a transvestite onstage can compel pleasure and applause while the sight of the same transvestite on the seat next to us on the bus can compel fear, rage, even violence” (“Performative” 527). This leads to the assertion that gender performance is not an individual act, but rather, a collective act, with Butler arguing that “[gender] is a performance with clearly punitive consequences” and that “those who fail to do their gender right are regularly punished” (“Performative” 522). That is to say, that when someone goes to a play, we buy into the possibility and probability that the rules of iteration may change. Our buy in and, to some extent, the success of a play is based on the success of the actor’s ability to portray a role and our belief
in its veracity. Similarly, I would argue that within the construction of didactic works of literature, of which these four hero tales are a part — and that to some extent seek to mimaetically represent the world in which it is written —, display the “punitive consequences” of which Butler speaks in an effort to delimit socially sanctioned gender construction.

In *Gender Trouble*, Butler furthers her argument and asserts that the coherence of sex, gender and sexuality is culturally constructed through a repetition of stylized acts in time. Through this repetition, there is the establishment of a gendered self (which would include one’s sex and sexuality). Butler thereby argues that all of the abovementioned facets of the perceived ontological gender are performative social constructs. She locates these performances (which she argues are involuntary) within regulative discourses — discourses that delimit the possibilities of a natural gender/sex manifestation to that which is socially permissible.

### 1.2: MEDIEVAL GENDERS

Some medieval understandings of genders blur the lines defining the abovementioned gender and sex constructs. Let us take for example Isidore of Seville’s (c. 560-636) explanation of *vir* and *mulier* in his *Etymologiae*, wherein he uses the Latin word for sex to define the differences between what we now understand as gender. He writes about the difference between man (*vir*) and woman (*mulier*), and highlights the distinctions between *vir* and *mulier* regarding strength of force, behaviors of the human body (*sexed* attributes), and inclinations toward sexual appetite (*gendered* attributes):

17. El nombre de varón (*vir*) se explica porque en él hay mayor fuerza (*vis*) que la mujer; de aquí deriva también el nombre de “virtud”; o tal vez porque obliga a la mujer por la fuerza. 18. La mujer, *mulier*, deriva su denominación de *mollities*, dulzura, como si
dijéramos molier; suprimiendo o alterando letras resulta el nombre mulier. 19. La diferencia entre el hombre y la mujer radica en la fuerza y en la debilidad de su cuerpo. Es mayor en el varón y menor en la mujer la fuerza, para que la mujer pudiera soportarlo, y además, no fuera que, al verse rechazado por la mujer, el marido se viera empujado por concupiscencia a buscar otra cosa o deseara el placer homosexual. (43)

Isidore of Seville proffers here that gender, arguably indistinguishable from sex in the Middle Ages, is not solely based on a corporeal difference – the difference in the “fuerza” (and use thereof) of the respective genders/sexes. Isidore of Seville argues that man is called vir because within him resides more of something, vis, than in that of the woman. He asserts that the word woman (mulier) comes from sweetness (mollities), contending that this occurs after letters have been removed and the order changed. Isidore seemingly attributes a naturalness to gender construction. He is quite specific about the corporeal differences between vir and mulier, asserting that these two are differentiated by the respective strength and weakness of their bodies. That notwithstanding, the construction of the vir and mulier depends not only on this anatomical difference, but also a behavioral difference. Isidore asserts that because of the lesser strength of the woman, she will submit to the power of the man. However, from Isidore’s next assertion, this does not always appear to be the case. He contends that should the mulier decide not to submit to the man, lust would drive the man to seek satisfaction somewhere else, including with another man. It is quite important that Isidore’s definitions of man and woman include a reference to sexual desire (arguably a natural predisposition), since men who are rejected by women may begin to desire other men, not only countering the perceived naturalness of sexuality, but also of the construction of gender. Isidore asserts that women as women submit to men, but allows for that not to happen. Isidore asserts that men desire women, but allows for the possibility that men desire other men.
Though there is a preference inferred in his tone, the construction of the gender/sex category does not appear as fixed as one could assume would be the case in the Middle Ages. That is, gender, as defined in *Etymologiae*, depends upon behaviors, as well as what we now consider an understanding of sexual preference or desire (thinking in *Butlerian* terms), though in the Latin text, Isidore does not proffer a name for these men to be desired by other men. I would argue that they are feminine.

Isidore’s definitions of *mulier* and *vir* are not the only ways of understanding the construction of gender in the Middle Ages. In *Making Sex: Body and Gender from Greeks to Freud*, Thomas Laqueur extrapolates from medical and philosophical literature on the presence and prevalence of the one–sex/one–flesh model dating from Antiquity until the end of the seventeenth century (25). Laqueur contends that Aristotle and Galen’s influence on medical and scientific thought about the human body contributed to the belief in this one–sex/one–flesh model, a model that asserted that females differed from males in that female organs were male organs turned inward (25). He quotes Galen: “Think first; please of a man’s [external genitalia] turned in and extending inward between the rectum and the bladder. If this should happen, the scrotum would necessarily take the place of the uterus with the testes lying outside, next to it on either side. (25) Laqueur further argues that:

[These] views [those of Aristotle and Galen] do not constitute a modern account of two sexes. In the first place, there is no effort to ground social roles in nature; social categories themselves are natural and on the same explanatory level as what we would take to be physical or biological facts. … [Though] Aristotle … regarded male and female bodies as specifically adapted to their particular roles, he did see these adaptations as the signs of
sexual opposition. In the flesh, the sexes were more and less perfect versions of each other

(29)

In *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, a guide to written sources on the history of sexuality in the Middle Ages, authors Danielle Jacquart and Claude Thomasset refer also to Galen as a source for the construction of gender:

[The] Middle Ages, in so far as they inherited Galen’s ideas, did not only accept, with the opposition between left and right [testicle], a dividing up of space that was associated with various taboos, but also a scientific explanation of the human body with arguments and demonstrations that were to be questioned only by a thoroughgoing revision of the physiological system. (51)

Galen, using Hippocrates, with respect to gender differentiation, asserts that “woman” was “necessarily of a colder nature than man” (51). Jacquart and Thomasset observe that the question of gender differentiation was also raised in the *Conciliator* of Pietro d’Abano. The conclusion was similarly that the male is generally warmer and drier than the female (208 fn. 9). Therefore, heat was the major factor that contributed to the classification of human as *male*. Jean Dangler, in *Making Difference in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia*, also emphasizes heat as major masculine quality, rather than genitalia as a more dominant way of understanding gender distinction in the Middle Ages (84–5). However, returning to Jacquart and Thomasset in *Sexuality and Medicine*, they refer to Constantine the African’s *De Coitu*, which they assert is arguably the origin of Western tradition. Jacquart and Thomasset highlight Constantine the African’s contention that the position and functioning of male and female genitalia during intercourse can determine varying degrees of gender construction. Constantine’s arguments are similar to Galen’s: “Heat is the property of masculinity and cold the prerogative of femininity. The dominant presence of one or
other of these qualities in the testicles determines both the appearance of the individual, his or her endowment with hair and the sex of the future embryo, as well as the sexual abilities of the person who will develop out of it” (117). There is a seeming naturalness attributed to one’s gender. The authors continue:

The importance of the testicles in this ‘programming’ is considerable and the author [Constantine] comes back to the right–left division. The size of the right testicle show [sic] an aptitude to beget males, and the opposite is also true. All this is determined at the stage of puberty. One also has to take into account the localization of the sperm in the womb. Thus the combination of an emission coming from a strong right testicle, with a reception in the left part of the womb, produces the effeminate man. The origin of the masculine woman can be easily guessed. (117)

Furthermore, in the thirteenth century, Alfonso X, through the Siete Partidas (and arguably both the General Estoria and Estoria de Espanna), sought to establish the ideal criteria and norms regarding many facets (if not an attempt at all facets) of life, but specifically including marriage, sexuality and gender roles. Roberto J. González–Casanovas observes that “the Alfonsine jurists exercise polysemous and ambiguous interpretations of nature, society, and politics,” and “often confuse issues of sexuality and morality, gender and community, culture and reason” (“Gender” 46).

1.3: BODIES THAT MATTER: MASCULINITIES

The biological appearances and the very real effects that have been produced in bodies and minds by a long collective labour of socialization of the biological and biologicization of the social combine to reverse the relationship between causes and effects and to make a naturalized social construction (‘genders’ as sexually characterized habitus) appear as the grounding in nature of the arbitrary divisions which underlies both reality and the representation of reality and which sometimes imposes itself even on scientific research Pierre Bourdieu, Masculine Domination 3
As I will in this dissertation, medieval scholars tend to opt for a study of masculinities in plural, thus recognizing the variety of possible brands of masculine behavior, rather than “man” as a singular masculine gender always dominant. Medievalist scholars have argued that gender is not a “biological fact but a cultural production” and further that masculinity is a “culturally specific process of becoming” rather than a “universal category of being” (Cohen and Wheeler x-xi). Jeffrey Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler, in *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*, argue that the driving force for studying masculinity is the need to dismantle (and dissect) the notions that have naturalized men’s position as superior throughout history (x). Cohen and Wheeler’s assertion of the efforts (and need) to observe masculinity as a process of *becoming* rather than a universal category (xi) parallel efforts to address the idea of multiple masculinities, since as Clare A. Lees concludes, in the introduction to *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, there is “no single unified picture of masculinity in a seamless medieval world” (xx). In this same introduction, Lees asserts that “[there] is no “Man,” but rather “studies of men, explored from a diversity of viewpoints, cultures, and representations” (xx). Lees argues that such studies are crucial if ever we want “to understand the multifaceted dynamic of male experience without succumbing to the temptation to see all men as the Same against which all women, as ‘Other,’ are defined” (xx). Jacqueline Murray, in the introduction to *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, contends that medical, scientific, religious and secular discourses in the Middle Ages present multiple masculinities, and did not present “Man” as single category (xi). Murray contends that “[in] the Middle Ages, competing and contradictory messages about what it meant to be a man circulated, creating individual crises and social confusion among some men, and security and complacency among others.” (x–xi). Therefore, my exploration of *masculinities* rather than the study of “Man” is essential because there is not one brand of
masculinity within these texts, but rather, there are competing multiplicities and performances of masculine behavior and codes of conduct.

Some recent scholarship has sought to question our traditional understandings of masculinity in the medieval societies found represented in literature. Critical work specifically on masculinities in Iberian literature includes Louise Mirrer’s analysis of heroic ballads: “Representing ‘Other’ Men: Muslims, Jews, and Masculine Ideals in Medieval Castilian Epic and Ballads.” In this chapter, Mirrer specifically examines the portrayal in literature of Christian men as superior to the portrayals of Jewish and Muslim men (169-186). Additionally, Jill Ross, in chapter three of Figuring the Feminine, “Macho Words: Writing, Violence, and Gender in Poema de mio Cid,” examines gender construction in relation to speech and writing in the PMC, where for her, the feminine bodies of the Cid’s daughter’s become sites of inscription and violence, and the characterization of the cowardly yet villainous Carrión as “writers” contrasts with the Cid’s characterization as the potent masculine speaker (93). What I find pertinent about Ross’ argument, aside from her reading of the body as gendered, is her treatment of the patriarchy and the notion of hegemonic masculinity. Ross argues that “the wounding of female bodies in Poema de mio Cid are more tightly enmeshed in the patriarchal values of a warrior society that views women as pawns in a high–stakes game of politics and power” (81). This assertion falls in line with Gaunt’s conclusions about the chansons de geste genre. In her characterization of the Cid as the potent speaker, Ross asserts that “the Cid knows how to manipulate gesture and speech in order to call attention to his assertive virility” and that this “attests to the poet’s representation of him as the incarnation of masculine ideal” (97). This gendered characterization, wherein Ross associates the Carrión princes with the female gender because of their inability to use their words and their association with writing, is at odds with some assumed assertions about medieval men and women.
Women tended to be classified as those far more capable of using their words than men. The Archpriest of Talavera, in the fifteenth century, would commit much energy to warning men against the ability of women to use their words surreptitiously. Additionally, R. Howard Bloch, in *Medieval Misogyny* asserts that in the High Middle Ages, “we saw the reproach against wives synonymous with the varieties of verbal abuse – garrulity, argumentativeness, the spirit of contradiction, indiscretion, lying and seduction with words” (65). In “Epic Paradoxes: Vassalage, Lineage and Subjectivity in the *Poema de Mio Cid* and *Mocedades de Rodrigo*,” Thomas Caldin explores the roles of women and the construction of gender in both texts. Caldin argues that the role of women in *PMC* is not indicative of the often-argued genre in decadence or decline in the Peninsula, but rather a construction of characters who serve as a critique and a questioning of authority in the political systems founded upon vassalage. I hope that my dissertation contributes to this conversation.
Moreover, when men are subjected to one another in a peaceful order, the lowly position does as much good to the servant as the proud position does harm to the master. But by nature, as God first created us, no one is the slave either of man or of sin. This servitude is, however, penal, and is appointed by that law which enjoins the preservation of the natural order and forbids its disturbance; for if nothing had been done in violation of that law, there would have been nothing to restrain by penal servitude. And therefore the apostle admonishes slaves to be subject to their masters, and to serve them heartily and with good-will, so that, if they cannot be freed by their masters, they may themselves make their slavery in some sort free, by serving not in crafty fear, but in faithful love, until all unrighteousness pass away, and all principality and every human power be brought to nothing, and God be all in all. 
St. Augustine of Hippo, *The City of God* 19:15

“[Our] true good is free slavery” (St. Augustine of Hippo; *De civ. Dei* 14:15) – “slavery to God in the first place and in the second to his agent, the emperor”


As the Cid, the hero of the *Poema de mio Cid* (PMC), enters Burgos, women and men come out to see him and “de las sus bocas todos dizían una razón” (*Cantar de mio Cid* 2011: v. 19). All of the people of Burgos, and the text’s thirteenth–century audience, gaze upon the Cid, “Exiénlo ver // mugieres e varones, / burgeses e burgesas // por las finiestras son (vv. 16b-17; my emphasis),” and affirm, with the invocation of God, that the Cid would be a good vassal if he were to have a good lord. “Mio Cid Ruy Diaz,” based on the historical Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar (c. 1043

---

“Though in footnote, Alberto Montaner translates “burgeses e burgesas” to mean “todos los ciudadanos, he later questions whether this term refers to the inhabitants of Burgos or “vecino de una ciudad que no pertenece a la nobleza.” He asserts that “en este pasaje no se presenta a todos los habitantes de Burgos condoliéndose por el Cid, pues esto incluiría, por ejemplo, a Rachel y a Vidas. Por el contrario, se aprecia aquí un contraste entre los burgos o barrios comerciantes y artesanos, situados normalmente extramuros … y el castiello citado en el verso 98, es decir, la zona central de la ciudad, intramuros, donde residían las clases altas, aunque aquí designa específicamente la judería amurallada” (658).

Alberto Montaner problematizes the interpretation of the villagers’ statement: “Las propuestas de interpretación se reducen básicamente a dos, una condicional ¡Dios, qué buen vasallo sería el Cid, si tuviese un buen señor!, y otra optativa, ¡Dios, qué buen vasallo es el Cid! ¡Ojalá tenga un buen señor!” (7 fn 20). I agree with Montaner in that the first interpretation is preferable (7). He notes, “[teniendo] en cuenta la mentalidad feudal y los efectos jurídicos de la *ira regia*, la interpretación que parece más adecuada es [una en la cual] el exiliado dejaba de ser vasallo de su rey y, para subsistir, solía buscar a un nuevo señor al que prestar sus servicios (cf. *Partidas* IV, XXV, 8 y 11) (659). See Montaner pp. 658 – 660 for a more extensive discussion of the various interpretations.
– 1099), has incurred the wrath of his lord and king, Alfonso VI; has been dispossessed of his land and property; and finds himself, like his biblical predecessor, Adam, an *omne airado*. The Cid recounts to Martín Antolínez that, “el rey me á airado” (v. 90). By the third laisse, Mio Cid Ruy Diaz has entered Burgos seeking lodging for himself and his “sessaenta pendones” (v.16). And thus, begins our anxious hero’s necessary fall, “[echado] … de tierra” (v. 14).

This fall “interpellates” the reader as a subject of the text’s ideology, an ideology that upholds hegemonic masculinity through homosocial relations. As Colin Smith contends in the introduction to his edition of *PMC*, “[se] presupone que existe una comunión ideológica entre los personajes de la narración y el público a quien va dirigiendo el poema” (17). Though the importance of homosocial relations in the text’s ideology will be more apparent as the chapter continues, I will quickly discuss verse fourteen as a gateway to this conversation. In this line, the Cid, in response to the confluence of a good and bad omen (vv. 11-12), exclaims: “—¡Albricia, Álbar Fáñez, // ca echados somos de tierra!—” The Cid, with “echados somos,” acknowledges that this journey away from Castile will be a journey that he will take with his men. This lends credence to the text’s epic designation, as “[el] mundo épico es, por lo general, varonil y en él el caudillaje, el código militar y la total entereza frente a la adversidad son más importantes” (Smith 17), it is necessary to foreground this homosocial relationship.

Despite this foregrounding, for the audience, the Cid’s masculine identity is prediscursive. By the time of the production of the *PMC*, the historical Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, had been dead for over one hundred years. The Cid’s historical existence provides a common language for the poet and the audience; however, it, additionally, lays the groundwork for the poet’s constitution of the literary “buen vassallo” (v. 20). Similarly, the first intradiegetic audience to the Cid’s masculine identity, the people of Burgos, seemingly acknowledge that the Cid’s masculine identity is
prediscursive, or rather that there is the need to make it discursive: “—¡Dios, qué buen vassallo, //
si oviesse buen señor!—” (v. 20). The poet, in constructing his poema can be seen as the “buen
señor” that heeds the audience’s call. This interpretation relies on a conditional interpretation of
the line: “¡Dios, ¡qué buen vassallo sería el Cid, si tuviese un buen señor!” Here, it would be remiss
of me not to locate myself in the debate about whether the work is a poema or a cantar. There has
been much debate about the authorship of the PMC and as Irene Zaderenko acknowledges, in “The
Question of Authorship,” “[despite] the many studies that have been carried out since the poem
was discovered at the end of the 16th century, the ongoing debate over the work’s possible author
or authors is still far from a satisfactory conclusion” (90). Much effort has gone into whether the
PMC is the work of a juglar or juglares, and/or a literate poet or poets. Proof runs the gamut and
as Zaderenko says, “is still far from … satisfactory” (90). Roger Wright, in “Why was the Poema
de Mio Cid Written Down the Way It Was?”, posits a question that lends itself to my approach to
the text. Wright, rightfully, asks: “If the Poema was originally oral in inspiration and performance,
the first question that needs to be asked is this: why was it written down at all?” (120; my
emphasis). It is important for my approach that it was written down and that this is acknowledged
within the extant manuscript:

Quién escribió este libro       dél’ Dios paraíso, ¡amén!
Per Abbat le escribió           en el mes de mayo
                           en era de mil e dozientos   cuarenta e cinco años. (vv. 3731-3733)

That notwithstanding, though the text comes to me in written form, I would not be so bold to insist
that the audience was solely a literate one. Both Wright and Francisco J. Hernández provide a
plausible claim that “the initial written version … was produced for a reading, recitation, or
performance of the … Cortes [of Toledo],” (Wright 122).
In this chapter, I argue that the poet or poets of *PMC*, in their adaptation of the historical Cid’s life, attempt, and fail, to present a monologic construction of hegemonic masculinity. The poet or poets, through the exploration of the Cid’s masculine identity, reveal, in my estimation, a dialogic genre akin to a masculine romance. For this, I cede Clara Pascual–Argente’s conclusion in her article, “‘A guisa de varón: Masculinity and Genre in the *Poema de mio Cid*,” that “the *PMC* acknowledges courtly constructions of masculinity and responds to them by making clear the superior importance of the homosocial relationships at the root of such constructions” (541; my emphasis). In my analysis, I will, specifically, examine speech and performative acts in the text in an effort to discern the extent to which the text’s construction of masculinity adheres to that of the epic hero as laid out by both Simon Gaunt in *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature* and other scholars of Medieval Iberian literature, including, but not limited to, Pascual–Argente, Carlos Álvar, David Hook, Jeremy Lawrance, Ian Michael, Louis Mirrer, Alberto Montaner, David Pattison, Jill Ross, Colin Smith, and Irene Zaderenko.

In my examination of the constitution of the Cid as the “buen vassallo,” I hope to make space for the confluence of form and content in my approximation of the text’s genre. Specifically, the Fall serves as the structural framework that underlies the order and manner in which the narrative is presented to the reader and/or listener. Eric Jager, in *The Tempter’s Voice*, asserts that the fall had “countless interpretations,” “served numerous ideological ends” and “could be manipulated to benefit those having (or seeking) power, authority, or legitimacy” (1-2). My assertion is that poet’s adoption of the Fall narrative structure speaks to the didactic nature of the text. The question is: For whom is the poet’s lesson? The simple answer: Other powerful men. And for that reason, I will also look at the text’s genre in terms of function. Why present

---

" For more specific information about authorship, see Montaner pp. 276-281.
" As Simon Gaunt argues, in epics, a monologic construction of gender is constructed in which alterity is not tolerated.
masculinity in this form and with this content? In my estimation, given the turbulent thirteenth century, there arose the need to, through example, teach powerful men — here, vassals, to be men. *PMC is speculum principis.*

In my analysis, I will look at “those verbal assurances and promises which seem not only to refer to a speaking relationship, but to constitute a moral bond between speakers” (Butler “Performative Acts,” 519; my emphasis). The phenomenological theory of acts, the lens through which I examine gender, “seeks to explain the … way in which social agents constitute social reality through language, gesture and all manner of symbolic sign” (Butler “Performative Acts,” 519; my emphasis). Like Judith Butler, I argue that the “genealogy of gender [relies] on a phenomenological set of presuppositions, most important among them the … concept of act which is both socially shared and historically constituted, and which is performative” (“Performative Acts” 530; my emphasis). Performative “enacts or produces that which it names” (Butler, *Bodies* 44).

In this chapter, I focus on three moments that speak to the constitution of the literary Cid as the “buen vassallo” within the confines of thirteenth–century intelligibility and as a result of thirteenth–century anxiety and the exemplarity tied its constitution: 1. His fall in *ira regia* and subsequent interaction with the 9–year old–girl in Burgos, 2. His arrival in Cardeña and his family’s arrival in Valencia, and finally 3. His arrival to Alfonso VI’s court.

Firstly, I will continue to frame my discussion of the *PMC*’s genre. Subsequently, I will spend some time discussing the parallels between Man’s Biblical Fall and the concept of *ira regia* as I believe that the use of *ira regia* in the thirteenth–century exemplifies thirteenth–century intelligibility and thirteenth–century anxiety. My argument is that, within the *PMC*, the Cid falls out of favor with his lord and this leads him to seek redemption through his acts — both
performative and speech. Here, the notion of *act* is “both socially shared and historically constituted” and the matrix through which gender identity has become intelligible requires the sanction and uplift of some, while at the same time, the disapproval and prohibition of others. An epic dedicated to a specific iteration of masculinity could be seen as both sanction and uplift. Using Man’s Fall and the concept of *ira regia* as cultural and political laws “[regulating] the shape and meaning of [masculinity]” (Butler, *Gender Trouble* 24) in the thirteenth century, I look at the Cid’s fall as a “[failure] to conform the norms of cultural intelligibility” (Butler, *Gender Trouble* 24), to his gender within the confines of Alfonso VI’s Castile.

2.1: FRAMING THE POEMA DE MIO CID’S GENRE

I enter into a conversation about genre with no definite conclusion. There is much evidence, and much scholarly product, to designate the PMC as an epic; however, I believe that, produced during the Alfonso VIII (r. 1158 – 1214), a new epic masculinity, in dialogue with its romance counterpart, emerged. Many scholars agree that the PMC is preoccupied with honor and that, as an epic, male–male relations are important. That notwithstanding, the bulk of the discussion about exemplary male–male relations is on the battlefield. Simon Gaunt, in *Gender and Genre*, notes that “[the] battlefield is the space in which men are united, fight together, and die together” and that “the absence of women serves to underline the fact that the heroism of these men is heavily gendered” (26). Clara Pascual–Argente’s observations about the female gaze present in those masculine spaces complicates the PMC’s epic genre designation.

Traditionally, epic poems tend to follow certain guidelines for the development of the action. Carlos Álvar, in the introduction to *Épica medieval española*, notes that epic hero endures “[un] paso de pruebas peligrosas o encarnizados combates para restituir un orden primitivo, que
había quedado roto por la intervención del traidor o del enemigo” (Álvar 14) and that epics, of which he asserts the *PMC* is an exemplar”, “[tienen] como tema principal las hazañas realizadas por una colectividad (a veces representada por el héroe) que se siente agredida y que intenta volver a la situación inicial, anterior a la agresión” (15). This seemingly is true of the Cid and no different from my assertion thus far. He is outwardly somber about his situation when we, the reader, find him at the start of the conserved text: “De los sos ojos // tan fuertemientre Ilorando” (v.1), claiming some eight lines later: “¡Esto me an buelto // mis enemigos malos” (v.9). It would seem from his actions and words that the Cid feels insulted and, thus, the *PMC* is an epic. Nonetheless, in his seminal 1952 article, “Some Problems of Diplomatic in the *Cantar de mio Cid* and their Implications,” Peter Russell questions that the generic designation of the *PMC* an epic. Russell, providing historical context to the genre’s development on the Iberian Peninsula, argues that:

The poet of the *Cantar* was concerned with a theme about which the commonplace records of medieval administration provided a great deal of information and he probably thought he was acting exactly as the authors of French epic claimed to have acted if he used it. That, in fact, the position was entirely different and in consequence history took control of his narrative and of his imagination to such an extent that he produced the approximation to a poetic chronicle which the Cantar is, is surely as plausible an hypothesis as that which would seek to explain the absence of epic emotion in the *Cantar de Mio Cid* by concluding that, for some obscure reason, medieval Spanish epic was without those special

---

“Alberto Montaner in the “Presentación” to his edition of the *PMC* notes that “[la] épica consiste [...] en la representación de un héroe esforzado mediante una narración poética. Es difícil determinar la validez universal de las caracterizaciones genéricas [...], pero en el caso del *Cantar de Mio Cid* tal representación resulta perfectamente ajustada a su contenido y refleja lo que podría considerarse la línea maestra de su construcción interna” (IX). The use of the word “perfectamente” is cause for pause. Again, there is room to question the neat “epic” box in which we have come to place *PMC*.
characteristics which, as Émile Mireaux has reminded us, seem to be a regular feature of heroic poetry, even if composed outside of Europe. (348-9; my emphasis).

Building on Russell’s article, Jeremy Lawrance, in his article, “Chivalry in the Cantar de Mio Cid,” also finds himself interrogating the PMC’s designation as an epic. However, not wanting to move too far afield, he poses the question: “Does the shift toward the turn of the thirteenth century make the poem a late epic, or something more modern and already different from epic?” (37).

Unlike Russell, Lawrance ostensibly allows for the possible continued epic designation. In this same article, Lawrance contrasts Francisco Rico’s position with that of Russell’s. According to Lawrance, Rico refutes Russell’s argument that the PMC is a chronicle, and believes “that the ‘historicidad del juglar’ is ‘una técnica poética, un recurso, más al servicio de un nuevo modelo de epopeya’” (37; my emphasis). Like Lawrance, Rico allows for the possible continued epic designation, albeit “un nuevo modelo.” Lawrance acerbically alleges that critics, and to some extent, I would include Lawrance, “have grown comfortable with the idea that the poem belongs to a tradition whose every other exponent is written in a different language and metrical template” (37-38). He believes, and I concur, that a better approach would be to approach the genre question from the perspective of “narrative decorum and ethos” (38). This would allow for the confluence of form and content.

Lawrance’s description of two models for defining the heroic epic seemingly allow for the confluence of form and content. His two models are Aristotle’s and Maurice Bowra’s. Aristotle’s understanding of genre depends on the character of the protagonist as “‘better than us, or worse, or the same’” (38). With men as seemingly always the epic hero, this genre as defined, undoubtedly reinforces the superiority of masculinity. Carlos Álvar, in his introduction to Épica medieval española, expands on this:
Para Aristóteles, la epopeya [es una] imitación de hechos nobles, realizada con la palabra; utiliza un metro homogénico y es de carácter narrativo; además no tiene límites temporales. Cualquier poema épico debe ser dramático y de acción única, entera y completa, con comienzo, medio y fin. … La epopeya, al ser narrativa, puede presentar a la vez varios asuntos parciales que se desarrollan de forma simultánea al resto de la acción, con lo que las dimensiones de la epopeya pueden llegar a ser muy amplias. En cuanto al metro, … los versos más largos son más adecuados …, y no conviene mezclar metros (11-12)

Ian Michael, then, in “Epic to Romance to Novel: Problems of Genre Identification,” argues that the *PMC* is “clearly … not epic in the strict Aristotelian sense” because “instead of having a single action, it has two overlapping ones, different in nature from each other” (506-507). The deviating construction of the *PMC* leads Michael to “[raise] the question of genre overlap and genre merging” (508). Aristotle’s model adheres to narrative decorum.

Lawrance’s second model, however, is Maurice Bowra’s notion of heroic ethos. Bowra argues that “[what] distinguishes the heroic epic is the fact that it is about heroes in the technical sense of … warriors of superlative prowess whose driving motive in life is the quest for … the prize of honour through great deeds” (38; my emphasis). For Lawrance, this definition leads critics, and it would lead me as well, to class *PMC* squarely as an epic. The Cid “is a warrior whose life is dedicated to the winning of honour” (39; my emphasis). Lawrance continues, contending that “[such] a man’s qualities are realizable only in action, and above all in battle; there can be no heroic poetry which is not about fighting, and fighting of the specific kind where individual prowess counts” (39; my emphasis). Though *PMC* is brimming with action and battles, I would argue that a man’s qualities, specifically, the Cid’s qualities as a man are visible off the battlefield and because of this, challenge Bowra’s notion of heroic ethos. Heroism, as vested in the epic
according to Bowra, is seemingly a violent and physical endeavor. These models for the epic genre consider the content and construction of the identity of the protagonist as well as the character of the protagonist; however, they fall short of what I see as essential components of the story: 1. an overlapping plot, each different in nature from the other and 2. a notion of heroism off the battlefield.

I will, however, continue to rely on the notions of narrative decorum and heroic ethos. Honor is not only an important facet of the Cid’s ethos, but of that of the community of which he is a part. The Cid must regain his honor twice in the \textit{PMC}: first, after he has been banished in \textit{ira regia} and, second, after the Carrión princes have left his daughters for dead. For the first, the Cid engages in what Lawrance calls for in order to deem him the epic hero: “fighting of the specific kind where individual prowess counts”; however, in order to right the dishonor brought about by the Carrión princes, in the second part of the \textit{PMC}, the Cid, himself, does not resort to battle, but rather, the court system. Lawrance, in discussing this disparity in the plot, concedes that the second half “has a different kind of plot, one hard to imagine in \textit{any other epic}” (47; my emphasis). Similarly, Miguel Garcí–Gómez contends that the second part is “de muy distinta urdimbre estilística y temática” (156). Could this be because the \textit{PMC} is not squarely epic? Lawrance asserts that the outcome of the second half “implies that Rodrigo Díaz regards \textit{valor} as a matter of hierarchy, rather than prowess … and that he believes that \textit{derecho}, the law … is a higher thing than self–esteem, glory, or vengeance” (47). Given that during the reign of Alfonso VIII “se asiste a un considerable desarrollo institucional de los instrumentos para el ejercicio de la justicia del rey” (Borge 235-6) and my own reading of the text, Lawrance’s assertion does not surprise me. The thirteenth century saw an expansion of the court as a masculine space in which “batallas” similar to those on the field were taking and could take place. That being said, I argue that this
expansion and supremacy of the court is additionally present in the first half of the *PMC* and that the Cid’s response to it can be deemed heroic.

In Lawrance’s attempt to use Frye’s narrative modes to place the *PMC*, he asserts that to be able to distinguish between the hero of the heroic poem and the knight-errant of a romance of chivalry, a critic would have to ask themselves how they define the conception of manhood and valor that would distinguish one from the other (39). This echoes Gaunt’s assertion in *Gender and Genre in Medieval French Literature*, that genres cannot “be properly understood without taking its representations of gender into account” (17).

In discussing the potentially heroic ethos∗ of the *PMC*, Lawrance looks at the words used to define the Cid. He asserts “that societies in which heroism is a living ideal must have names for the men who embody it” (45): “El Cid,” “El Campeador.” For Lawrance, it is significant that the Cid does not stake his life for honor and, additionally, that he “subordinates his emotions to expediency and a rational calculation of the greater good” (46) — *mesura*. Lawrance concludes that the Cid is a new kind of hero — “one destined to die peacefully in his bed” (46). Clara Pascual–Argente, in “‘A guisa de varón’: Masculinity and Genre in the *Poema de mio Cid*,” continues in Lawrance’s direction, expanding and merging genres. Pascual–Argente contends that:

the PMC’s generic anomalies go well beyond the choice of subject for its second half …

The poem pays close attention to chivalric and courtly material culture. … More importantly, Rodrigo possesses the courtly virtue of *largueza* … and *mesura* … and his nobility stems from his deeds rather than his blood alone. Finally, in keeping with courtly culture, the *PMC* provides female characters with a heightened role in the construction of the hero’s identity … (540)

---

∗ I understand this “heroic ethos” to refer to those values which exalt the *valor* of an individual.
This is because, as Pascual–Argente convincingly argues, “the PMC acknowledges courtly constructions of masculinity and responds to them by making clear the superior importance of the homosocial relationships at the root of such constructions” (541; my emphasis). She maintains that in “[demonstrating] the relevance of the epic genre to respond to pressing questions posed by romance … [the PMC] develops a new epic masculinity constructed in dialogue with its romance counterpart” (541; my emphasis). She contends that the PMC “takes on some features and preoccupations that are typical of romance but instead of exploring them, as romance does, through the relationship of a male subject with a feminine other, it redirects them towards the male homosocial context characteristic of epic” (553). For Pascual–Argente, this is a “masculinization of romance.” I believe that the need to address “preoccupations that are typical of romance” stems from its context — one in which traditional understandings and institutions were being questioned. I will explore this later in my section on “Femininities.”

2.2: IN IRA REGIA: MAN’S FALL FROM GRACE

“[The] king ‘is not only incapable of doing wrong, but even of thinking wrong: he can never mean to do an improper thing: in him is no folly or weakness’”
William Blackstone qtd. in Kantorowicz, The Kings Two Bodies 4

Ira regia^, as an institution in the High Middle Ages, parallels Augustine’s interpretation of God’s banishment of Man in Genesis 3 and, additionally, serves as cultural and political law “[regulating] the shape and meaning of [masculinity]” (Butler, Gender Trouble 24) in the Middle Ages. In the thirteenth century, ira regia “was a characteristic aspect of [feudal relationships in León-Castile] … [that] enabled the king to punish his magnates for real or for supposed offenses by exile rather than by the harsher penalty of death” (O’Callaghan, Rev. of La ira regia en León y

^ For more on the development of ira regia see Hilda Grassotti (1965); María Eugenia Lacarra (1980:8 – 31; 1995); Isabel Alfonso (2002); Komé Koloto de Dikanda Madeleine [sic] (2004), Óscar Martín (2007); Alberto Montaner (2011: 3 – 4(D,E,O), 660)
Vassalage is gendered and the king could and would judge his vassals for “[failing] to do their gender right are regularly punished” (Butler, “Performative” 522).

In Chapter 2 of the Book of Genesis, after having “formed [Man] of the slime of the earth,” God placed him in Paradise among the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil (2:8 – 9). He commanded Man to not eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil because if he did, he would “die the death” (2:17). At the end of Genesis 2, God made a companion, Woman, for Man and they were both unashamedly naked. Genesis 3, the story of the Fall, begins with a reminder of this commandment issued to Man. The serpent, speaking with Eve, asks, “Why hath God commanded you, that you should not eat of every tree of paradise?” (3:1). Though in Genesis 2, it is not made explicit that Eve was told of God’s commandment, her response demonstrates her awareness, “Of the fruit of the trees that are in paradise we do eat: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of paradise, God hath commanded us that we should not eat; and that we should not touch it, lest perhaps we die.” (3:2–3) The serpent questions the validity of God’s commandment, convincing Eve to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, sharing it with Adam. The result is that Adam (Genesis 3:17–19), Eve (Genesis 3:16) and the serpent (Genesis 3:14) are all punished according to their nonconformity to God’s law. God sentences Adam to “labour and toil” the earth for sustenance, in essence, hard work. His Lord will no longer provide for him. He, along with his wife, Eve, are banished from paradise, in *ira regia*.

As Eric Jager, in *The Tempter’s Voice*, asserts, “[the] story of Adam, Eve and the serpent, is one of the oldest and most enduring myths of Western culture; has had “countless interpretations;” and has “[served] numerous ideological ends” (1). During the first four centuries and during ten medieval centuries, European civilizations used Genesis 3 to serve their various
ideological ends. Patristic authorities made Genesis 3 central to Christian theology (Jager 1) and the Fall functioned as “a fiction whose narrative and symbols could be manipulated to benefit those having (or seeking) power, authority, or legitimacy” (Roland Barthes qtd. in Jager 2). It is, therefore, not surprising to find that by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Augustine’s biblical exegesis of the Fall, that Adam’s original sin was disobedience, was ubiquitous. For Augustine, “[the] fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil is personal control over one’s own will” (qtd. in Pagels Adam, Eve, and the Serpent, 107). Augustine asserts that “obedience, not autonomy, should have been Adam’s true glory” (Pagels Adam, Eve, and the Serpent, 108). For me and my analysis of the PMC, Augustinian exegesis of the Fall provides a template for understanding vassalage and *ira regia*. Like Adam, a vassal could be exiled for disobedience.

By the early thirteenth century, “European monarchies were beginning to consolidate the ideological justifications for the separation of their secular power from the authority of the Church” (Weiss 112) and Augustine’s interpretation of the Fall was seen as a means of asserting and legitimizing authority. The thirteenth century saw the development of a fascination with centralized monarchical power (Weiss 123). This is particularly important for understanding the historical context of the production of the *PMC* under Alfonso VIII. The thirteenth century on the

---

* “By the time of Charlemagne (ca. 800), monastic poets in Anglo-Saxon England were adapting the Fall to the alliterative idiom of native heroic poems such as *Beowulf*, appropriating ‘pagan’ poetry for Christian use, replacing oral tradition with a scriptural one, and—in what was yet a missionary era in England—thereby warning about the dangers of false teaching, tales, and traditions. By the twelfth century, clerics were turning the Fall into liturgical drama for the spiritual instruction of the populace and also to treat important issues in domestic and feudal politics. By the thirteenth century, moral treatises written for laywomen in England and France were using the Fall as a cautionary tale about the rhetoric of seduction as well as to address various domestic and social problems centering on discourse between the sexes.” (Jager 5)

* For a more in–depth discussion of the causes of *ira regia*, see Ghislaine Fournés, Hilda Grassotti and Madeleine Komé Koloto de Dikanda.

* See Dante Alighieri’s *De monarchia*: “only a single monarch, or emperor, can establish the universal peace necessary for mankind to fulfill its divine function (I,v). Just as the excellence of the whole transcends the excellence of its constituent parts, only when the totality of mankind has been brought under the sway of a single ruling power can it achieve the earthly felicity assigned to it by God (I, vi–vii): ‘mankind is most like God when it is ruled by one ruler, and consequently is most in harmony with God’s intention’ (I, viii, 5; Dante 1995:19) (Weiss 109)
Iberian Peninsula was in a similar state as Augustine’s world in the fourth century; it “conformed to [a new situation] and interpreted the new arrangement of state, church, and believer in ways that … made religious sense of these astonishing new political realities” (Pagels, “The Politics of Paradise” 69). The second half of the twelfth–century into the beginning of the thirteenth–century saw a combined effort of Iberian kings and Catholics popes reconquer the Iberian Peninsula for the Christians.

Augustine, in the fourth century, placed “secular government at the center of human society, indispensable for the best as well as the worst among its members. For a Christian, civic obligations rank second … to one’s obligation to God (or, as this usually meant in practice, to the church)” (Pagels, “The Politics of Paradise” 91). The same can be said of those writing about the political situation in the High Middle Ages. Dante Alghieri, though writing later, early in the fourteenth–century in De monarchia, asserts that “[temporal] authority, then, which men call ‘empire,’ is a single sovereign authority set over all others in time” (I,ii,2; Dante 1995:5 qtd. in Weiss 109) and “mankind is most like God when it is ruled by one ruler, and consequently is most in harmony with God’s intention’ (I, viii, 5; Dante 1995: 19 qtd. in Weiss 109). Dante was part of an established debate over the authority of Church and State (Weiss 109) and the culmination of a century of evolution on the idea of universal monarchy (Weiss 123).

It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the claim made by some that Adam’s original sin was sexual; however, as Pagels argues

[Many Christians] rejected the claim made by radical Christians that the sin of Adam and Eve was sexual—that the forbidden ‘fruit of the tree of knowledge’ conveyed, above all, carnal knowledge. On the contrary, said Clement of Alexandria (c. 180 C.E.), conscious participation in procreation is ‘cooperation with God in the work of creation.’ Adam’s sin
was not sexual indulgence but disobedience; thus Clement agreed with most of his Jewish and Christian contemporaries that the real theme of the story of Adam and Eve is moral freedom and moral responsibility. Its point is to show that we are responsible for the choices we freely make—good or evil—just as Adam was (xxiii)

Though Christians regarded freedom as the primary message of Genesis 1 – 3, Pagels argues that Augustine’s interpretation went further — arguing for the necessity of government oversight. Pagels contributes this change to a change in the social and economic status of Christians during Augustine’s life. She argues that because Augustine did not live in a world in which Christianity was a dissident sect, Genesis 3 took on a different meaning. She notes that:

Christian bishops, once targets for arrest, torture, and execution, now received tax exemptions, gifts from the imperial treasury, prestige, and even influence at court; their churches gained new wealth, power, and prominence. … In a world in which Christians not only were free to follow their faith but were officially encouraged to do so, Augustine came to read the story of Adam and Eve very differently than had the majority of his Jewish and Christian predecessors. … Augustine [claimed that]: Adam’s sin not only caused our mortality but cost us our moral freedom, irreversibly corrupted our experience of sexuality …, and made us incapable of genuine political freedom (xxv-xxvi)

Augustine’s theory “persuaded many of his contemporaries that human beings universally [needed] external government” and this interpretation “became, for better and worse, the heritage of all subsequent generations of western Christians and the major influence on their psychological

---

and political thinking” (Pagels xxvi). As Pagels argues, original sin “involved nothing else than Adam’s prideful attempt to establish his own autonomous self-governance” (99).

2.3: THE “BUEN VASSALLO”

The Cid’s identity as the “buen vasallo” is prediscursive (here the discourse being the text), seemingly natural, and exemplary; that is, before he goes about constituting, or rather reconstituting an identity within the story he has already constituted an identity as the “buen vasallo” that is exemplary. As the Cid enters Burgos with the purpose of going “al lugar donde solía hospedarse en Burgos” (Montaner 8 fn31), women and men come out to see him and “de las sus bocas todos // dizían una razón” (v. 19) (“razón,” according to Smith in PMC, meaning statement or, according to Montaner in CMC, meaning “una misma cosa”). All the people of Burgos, like a Greek chorus, invoke God to affirm that the Cid would be a good vassal if he were to have a good Lord. Similar to the Cid’s assertive and expressive, this community speech act does not come unaccompanied nor without contextualization: “[mugieres e varones] plorando de los ojos, // tanto avién el dolor” (v. 18). The words themselves are not sufficient. They only convey what Searle calls the illocutionary point, “the point or purpose of a type of illocution” (3). The context provides the illocutionary force that determines “how that content is supposed relate to the world” (4). With respect to illocutionary force there are two directions: word-to-world direction of fit and world-to-word direction of fit (4), with the latter providing the illocutionary force to the community speech act. Though Montaner problematizes the interpretation of the villagers’ statement: “Las propuestas de interpretación se reducen básicamente a dos, una condicional ‘¡Dios, qué buen vasallo sería el Cid, si tuviese un buen señor!, y otra optativa, ‘Dios, qué buen vasallo es el Cid! ¡Ojalá tenga un buen señor!’” (7 fn 20), I believe them both to be legitimate. As the Cid will
come to represent exemplary Christian masculinity, the community speech act could be seen as implicit criticism of the king in the face of a potentially better lord. The words (and inaction to follow) of the community of Burgos represent the *world-to-word* illocutionary direction where the point is for the “world to match the words” (Searle 3).

A “buen vassallo” is honorable. A good man is honorable. As a result of Alfonso’s actions, the Cid loses his honor twice: 1. When he is exiled, in *ira regia*, and 2. when the Carrión princes, whom the Cid allows to marry his daughters (at Alfonso’s request), leave them for dead. The recovering of his honor, and thereby his constitution as a “buen vassallo” in the eyes of the text’s authority, Alfonso VI, comes in, broadly, two forms: conquering territory on the battlefield and through Alfonso VI’s court system. Both spaces are male–dominated. The result of the first is that the Cid, through arguably traditionally epic modes of masculinity, is, once again able to provide for his family and his vassals and is also able to recover his family. I will discuss the result of the second in the next section.

In this section, I focus my attention on the Cid’s fall, in *ira regia*, and subsequent interaction with the nine–year–old girl in Burgos. These moments speak to the process by which the Cid will come to be constituted, through naming, as the “buen vassallo” within the confines of thirteenth–century intelligibility and as a result of thirteenth–century anxiety and the exemplarity tied its constitution.

The Cid’s status *ira regia* at the start of the conserved text has him in a fallen state. This fallen state “interpellates” the reader as a subject of the text’s ideology, an ideology that upholds hegemonic masculinity through homosocial relations. Though others believe the Cid to be a “buen vassallo,” his fallen state points to his “failure to conform to the norms of cultural intelligibility” (Butler, *Gender Trouble* 24), to his failure to conform his gendered role as a vassal within the
confines of Alfonso VI’s Castile. Vassalage in *PMC* is a performative construction compelled by social sanctions and interdictions. It represents a constructed gendered identity where the social audience as well the actors, in the case of the *PMC*, the vassals themselves, “come to believe and to perform in the mode of belief” (Butler, “Performative Acts” 520). Failure to do one’s vassalage, and, in turn, one’s gender correctly, results in punishment. Banishment in *ira regia* could be and was one such punishment.

The king’s sanctions are an affront to the Cid’s identity as a vassal, lord and man; these sanctions are anxiety producing. His manhood is tied to his vassalage. It allows for him to provide for his family as well as his own vassals. It is the means by which the Cid fills, what I term, his “manhood account.” The first lines of the First Cantar entreat the reader and/or listener to sympathize with the Cid’s plight:

De los sos ojos tan fuertemientre llorando,

tornava la cabeza e estávalos catado.

Vio puertas abiertas e uços sin cañados,

alcándaras vazías, sin pielles e sin mantos,

e sin falcones e sin adtores mudados. (vv.1-4)

These lines reveal that the Cid has been dispossessed of his most valued property: his land[^42^], and can only take with him that which he is able to carry: his clothes and hunting birds. The first line displays his anxiety: “De los sos ojostan fuertemientre llorando.” As Adam left Eden with “garments of skin” (Genesis 3:21), so does the Cid leave with his “pielles”[^43^] (1).

[^42^]: Jacques Le Goff notes that “[el] señor, en contrapartida, debía a su vasallo protección y mantenimiento. Mantenimiento que [...] tomó la forma de otorgación de un feudo al vasallo, la mayoría de las veces este feudo consistía en una tierra, cosa que no tiene nada de sorprendente en donde la tierra era la fuente de todo: de la subsistencia, de la riqueza, de la consideración social y del poder” (59-60).

[^43^]: I interpret the above lines to mean that the hangers and perches (“alcándaras”) are empty because the Cid takes his clothes and birds with him.
The Cid’s depleting “manhood account” reflected its thirteenth century reality. Joseph F. O’Callaghan, in *A History of Medieval Spain*, maintains that “[the] bond [of vassalage] could be terminated at any moment by either party” (262). If the bond was terminated the vassal was “[obliged] to surrender […] whatever benefices he might have received from his lord [and] [a] royal vassal might go into exile to *seek a new lord*; if the king declared him *in ira regia*, […] the vassal was forced into exile but could take his men-at-arms (*mesnaderos*) or *vasallos de criazón*, who he had educated and maintained in his household” (O’Callaghan, *A History* 262). In line fourteen, addressing Álbar Fáñez, the reader learns that the dispossession affects more than just the Cid. The Cid says, “echados somos.” Like the Cid’s land, his wife and daughters will remain in Castile. That notwithstanding, the journey away from Castile will not be a journey that he will take alone. This reflects the text’s epic designation, as “[el] mundo épico es, por lo general, varonil y en él el caudillaje, el código militar y la total entereza frente a la adversidad son más importantes” (Smith 17). The Cid will be forced to reconstitute his identity like a true epic here, amongst men on the battlefield.

Restraint also is an essential quality of the Cid. Returning to the first *tirada*, the reader finds the Cid crying as a result of the loss he has suffered. Montaner notes that the first line indicates that the Cid was crying in silence: “La frase, que actualmente puede parecer redundante, implicaba en la Edad Media que el llanto se reducía a las lágrimas, sin el acompañamiento, entonces habitual, de sollozos, voces y gestos” (5 fn1). I would say that this type of crying is restrained. Additionally, given the “grandes cuidados” (6) he has experienced (and in spite of them) the Cid sighs and then speaks “bien e tan mesurado,” (7) reminding himself as well as the audience of his identity as a “buen vassallo.” The authorial intrusion supports the words and actions of the
Cid. Montaner asserts that “[esta] virtud [“tan mesurado”] es una de las principales cualidades del Cid en el Cantar y se manifiesta en casi todas las actuaciones del héroe” (5 fn7).

Here follow the first lines of speech of the conserved text and an additional aspect of his identity: his Christianity. The first line is an expressive (“—¡Grado a ti, Señor, // Padre que estás en alto!”) and the second (“¡Esto me an vuelto // mios enemigos malos!—” (vv. 8-9)) an assertive. Searle contends that the point of an expressive is to “express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content” (12), where truth is presupposed; whereas, the purpose of the assertive is to “commit the speaker to something’s being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition” (10). The Cid praises the “Señor” (Montaner ed.)/ “señor” (Colin Smith ed.) and asserts that his current condition is the result of the efforts of his enemies (though his enemies at this point are not specified): “¡Grado a ti, Señor, // Padre que estás en alto! / ¡Esto me an // vuelto mios enemigos malos!” (vv. 8-9). Searle argues that in the performance of the expressive, the truth of the proposition is presupposed (the Cid is genuinely thankful to his “señor”) and that the simple test of an assertive is its truth and falsity (Have the Cid’s enemies plotted against him?) (11). Montaner asserts that the “Señor” to whom the Cid directs his expressive is God, noting that “[en] esta tesitura, la acción de gracias del Cid es tanto un acto de resignación cristiana como una muestra de confianza en su futuro” (6 fn 8). Given that the part that follows “Señor” refers to the “Padre [...] en alto,” the biblical/religious “Señor” is more than reasonable. That notwithstanding, I proffer another possible interpretation of to whom the address is referring. The same line in the Colin Smith edition of Poema de Mio Cid, closer to the manuscript in its format, does not capitalize the “señor” as is found in the Montaner edition and this allows for the interpretation that the “señor” to whom the Cid refers is the Cid’s vassal.

*Given that capitalization rules were not fixed, I consulted a facsimile of the manuscript. The manuscript is not clear. It looks more like a capital S.*
lord, the king, to whom the Cid later refers as “mio señor natural” (v. 1273). That being said, the line in which the Cid thanks his “Señor” is strikingly similar to Job’s statement after he is also seemingly dispossessed by his Lord: “Naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: as it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done: blessed be the name of the Lord” (Job 1:21). The Cid, with Job-like restraint, cements his faith in His Lord. The Cid will repeat this over the course of the PMC.

The alleged reason for the Cid’s banishment mirrors Augustine’s exegesis of the Fall. Augustinian exegesis of the Fall lends itself to the interpretation that good and exemplary (Christian) men are those who serve their lord’s/Lord’s interests. Those that serve their own interests are prideful and subsequently banished. King Alfonso allegedly\(^a\) banished the Cid because the Cid attempted to serve his own interests. The Cid’s offense, if we are to accept “el burgalés conplido” Martín Antolínez’s explanation to Rachel and Vidas, the Jews whom the Cid tricks in order to finance his exile, is disobedience to his lord:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{El Campeador} & \text{ por las parias fue entrado,} \\
\text{grandes averes priso} & \text{ e muchos sobejanos;} \\
\text{retovo d’ellos} & \text{ cuanto que fue algo,} \\
\text{por én vino a aquesto} & \text{ por que fue acusado (vv. 109–112)}
\end{align*}
\]

The veracity of the accusations against the Cid can be called into question\(^b\). Joseph J. Duggan, in *The Cantar de mio Cid: Poetic Creation in its Economic and Social Contexts*, believes that “[for] the poet the accusation is untrue – otherwise he would have had the chests [given to Rachel and

---

\(a\) I repeat here “allegedly” because there is some question as to the veracity of the king’s allegations. The veracity will be discussed later in this section.

\(b\) Montaner in fn 110 notes, “Martín Antolínez emplea la falaz acusación hecha contra el Cid para dar verosimilitud al empeño de las arcas” (13; my emphasis). Colin Smith notes in fn 111, “Martín Antolínez alude aquí a esto como si se tratase de habladurías conocidas por todos, para convencer a los judíos de que el Cid, pobre en apariencia tenía una buena solvencia económica (284).
Vidas] contain genuine riches instead of sand – but in any case the sole motivation for the *ira regia* in the poem as we now have it is at base an economic one, that the Cid misappropriated wealth belonging by right to his lord” (17). That being said, the Cid is still an *omne airado*. There has been a perceived affront to the authority of his lord, the king, and this affront warrants the Cid’s exile. As Mark Breitenberg argues, in *Anxious Masculinity*, masculine identity derives from what men are able to pass on to their children (16). This, I would argue, extends to the Cid’s ability to pay his men, *his* vassals*. Though the Cid, himself, is without a lord, he arrives to Burgos “en su compaña // sessenta pendones” (v. 16). He is responsible to these men. In Burgos, the Cid is prohibited from purchasing anything: “Vedada l’an conpra // dentro en Burgos la casa” (v. 62), and Martín Antolínez provides for him: “Martín Antolínez, // el burgalés conplido, / a mio Cid e a los suyos // abástales de pan e de vino” (vv. 65-66) That notwithstanding, the Cid has no way to pay his men. In the subsequent conversation with Martín Antolínez, he says, “Espero é el oro // e toda la plata, / bien lo vedes // que yo non trayo nada, / e huevos me serié // por toda mi compaña” (vv. 81–83). The Cid’s “manhood account” is empty. This is undoubtedly cause for anxiety. As a lord, the Cid wants to continue to support his family as well as his vassals. This anxiety precipitates a “self-fashioning” of the Cid’s masculine identity. Within lines of this utterance, the Cid tells Martín Antolínez of his plan to defraud Rachel and Vidas:

> Ferlo he amidos, de grado non avrió nada:

---

^ This misappropriation of funds would seemingly fall well within the *Partidas*’ “reasons the king can expel his nobleman from the country”:

First, when they desire to take vengeance upon them, on account of some grudge they bear them. Second, on account of some evil deeds which they may have committed in the country. Third, because of some crime which may connected with treason or perfidy (Part. IV, Tit. XXV, Law X).

^ As Alberto Montaner notes, los soldados podían ser *de soldada* ..., o *de crianza* ... Los primeros, también llamados *asoldados*, eran los que prestaban sus servicios a un señor a cambio de un estipendio, y los segundos, los que había criado y educado el señor, por lo que tenían con él un vínculo mucho más estrecho. En el *Cantar* no se hace ninguna diferencia entre la lealtad y entrega de vasallos” (11 fn80).
con vuestro consejo      bastir quiero dos arcas,
inchámosla d’arena      ca bien serán pesadas,
cubiertas de guadalmecí e bien enclavadas,
los guadamecís bermejos e los clavos bien dorados.
Por Rachel e Vidas      vayádesme privado:
cuando en Burgos me vedaron conpra e el rey me á airado,
non puedo traer el aver ca mucho es pesado;
enpeñárgelo he por lo que fuere guisado,
de noche lo lieven,    que non lo vean cristianos.
Véalo el Criador        con todos los sos santos,
    yo más no puedo e amidos lo fago.— (vv. 84–95)

In these lines, I see a continuation of his anxiety as well as desperation and religiosity. The Cid does not see another means of providing for his men and family: “yo más no puedo // e amidos lo fago.” And before this line, he entreats God: “Véalo el Criado // con todos los sos santos.” The Cid is ostensibly swearing before God that he is out of options.

The reconstitution of the Cid’s identity within PMC for the reader and/or listening audience as the “buen vassallo” begins with its prohibition and sanction by the king through a letter:

---

* Vassalage in PMC is a performative construction compelled by social sanctions and interdictions. It represents a constructed identity wherein the social audience as well the actors, in the case of the PMC the vassals themselves, “come to believe and to perform in the mode of belief” (Butler, “Performativc Acts” 520). Jacques Le Goff, in *La Baja Edad Media*, asserts that with respect to “[el] feudalismo [...] ‘clásico’ [del siglo XI y del XII], el rasgo evolutivo más importante es el que ata estrechamente los lazos personales a los lazos reales, el vasallaje al feudo, y más aún hace que éste pase a un primer plano. El *contrato de vasallaje* liga reciprocamente a un señor y a un siervo” (59). In the Léon and Castile of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth century “the vassal ordinarily kissed his lord’s hand, saying, ‘Sir, I kiss your hand and I am your vassal.’ [...] If the vassal wished to break it [the bond], he was obliged to send one of his men to his lord to announce the end of the relationship saying, ‘Sir, I kiss your hand for him and from now on he is no longer your vassal.’” (O’Callaghan 262). Now that the vassal was no longer “siervo al señor,” he was “obliged to surrender horse and arms and whatever benefices he might have received from his lord” (O’Callaghan 262).
el rey don Alfonso tanto avió la grand saña.
Antes de la noche, en Burgos d’él entró su carta
con grand recabdo e fuertementre sellada (vv. 21-24)

The letter would have undoubtedly been read aloud; or rather, a thirteenth–century audience would have thought so. As Ignacio Álvarez Borge asserts, in his article, “Cambios y alianzas la política regia en la frontera del Ebro en el reinado de Alfonso VIII de Castilla (1158-1214),” Alfonso VIII, during the production of the *PMC*, formalized and bureaucratized the judicial process and through this process written documents became more important. As Álvarez Borge argues, letters were written so that they would be read aloud publicly. This would make the king’s law known as well as more effective (259). By the Cid’s arrival to Burgos, it is quite apparent that the king’s law was effective.

In Burgos, the nine-year-old girl, in her assertive, relates to the Cid that the people of the town have received a letter from the king and are not allowed to provide support to him. Though it is not stated explicitly that the letter was read aloud, the nine–year–old girl’s words lend credence to the possibility. She, additionally, provides the Cid with another epithet – the “Campeador,” an epithet argued by Jeremey Lawrance to be a necessary attribute of a hero. Both the letter and the naming set the boundary of the Cid’s masculinity for both the character himself and the listening/reading audience. The naming is the “repeated inculcation of a norm” (Butler, *Bodies That Matter* 20) and speaks to the truth of the Cid’s prowess on the battlefield as well as to the truthfulness of the narrator’s previous account that the Cid was in *ira regia*.

The Cid’s welcome by the city of Burgos in verses 16b through 20 contrasts greatly with his interaction with the nine-year-old girl. Whereas, the nine-year-old girl seems to exasperatedly

---

* Montaner notes of the title “Cid” that “este título honorífico de origen árabe que significa ‘señor’ es la forma más habitual que tiene el *Cantar* de referirse a su héroe (3 fn 3).
come out to warn the Cid, the people of Burgos, seem to be running to see him. The narrator recounts that the people would have provided the Cid with housing; however, “el rey don Alfonso // tanto avié la grand saña” (v. 22) that he sent a letter to Burgos stating:

que a mio Cid Ruy Díaz que nadi no l’diessen posad,
e aquel que ge la diesse sopiesse vera palabra,
que perderié los averes e más los ojos de la cara,
e aun demás los cuerpos e las almas (vv. 25-28)

The narrator’s account also provides the backing for the girl’s statement to the Cid. The repetition of the letter, and the Cid’s response to it, speaks to Álvarez Borge’s argument about the implication of royal letters. Though Jeremy Lawrance and Clara Pascual–Argente emphasize the role of Alfonso’s court in the second part of the PMC, this letter, for me, establishes the potential supremacy of Alfonso law and foreshadows the eventual reconstitution of the Cid’s through it — the law. Additionally, the nine–year old girl provides the Cid with the mindset of the community of Burgos of which the reading/listening audience is already aware. As Montaner notes:

“[la] inesperada aparición de la niña de nueve años tiene como misión esencial informar al Cid del contenido del mandado regio […], pero sirve también para detener la violencia que está a punto de sugerir [en los versos 35 a 39] [y] [se] produce […] un deliberado contraste entre los airados guerreros y la niña, cuya condición queda subrayada por la indicación de su edad” (666 fn 40).

I would argue, additionally, that the gender difference is also important. The nine-year-old girl’s gender is not revealed in the text of what she says to the Cid. She speaks always in the first-person plural: “Non vos osariemos;” “perderiémos los averes;” and “en nuestro mal.” However, her lack of naming, but rather, with emphasis on her age and gender contrasts with the repeated naming of
the Cid. The Cid does reply to her. He does not refute the information she has provided. He does not question it. He does not speak. As the readers/listeners, we are allowed to believe the truth of the accusations against the Cid. The omniscient narrator returns to tell the reader/listened that “Ya lo vee el Cid, // que del rey non avié gracia; / partiós de la puerta, // por Burgos aguijava” (vv. 50-51). He is resigned to his exile.

The fact that a nine–year–old girl has conveyed this information to the Cid speaks to the possible emasculation of the Cid and/or to the impetus for the construction of the Cid’s identity in male spaces. The nine–year-old girl alone would prove no physical threat to the Campeador as she has aptly described him. Her words, like the king’s letter, however hold symbolic and political weight. She and what she represents impede the Cid’s nature. He is unable to demonstrate his prowess. Before the interaction with the young girl, the narrators explains that the Cid has arrived to his “posada” and found the door locked noting that “si non la quebrantás por fuerça, // … non ge la abriese nadi” (v. 34). The situation requires the Cid to use force. The community has locked him out of “su posada” (v. 31; my emphasis). The narrator recounts that: “Aguíjó mio Cid, // a la puerta se llegava, / sacó el pie del estribera, // una ferida l’dava; / non se abre la puerta, // ca bien era cerrada” (vv. 37-39). The Cid must respect the authority of her words because they represent the authority of the law. His submission to the authority of her words also perpetuates his own domination. His submission to the king’s authority, as manifest in the nine-year-old girl, is an acceptance of the king’s definition of legitimate vassalage and legitimate masculinity. The Cid respects the illocutionary force, “how that content is supposed relate to the world,” of her words.

With the Cid’s recognition of the authority of the letter as manifest in the nine–year–old comes more anxiety. Before leaving Burgos, the Cid goes to “Santa María,” which is, according
to Montaner, “la catedral de Burgos,” funded by Alfonso VI. The Cid dismounts and prays, displaying that Christianity is a component of his identity as a man, after which:

salió por la puerta a Arlançón passava;
cabo essa villa en la glera posava,
fincava la tienda e luego descavalgava.
Mio Cid Ruy Diaz, el que en buen ora cinxo espada,
posó en la glera cuando nol’ coge nadi en casa,
derredor d’él una buena compaña;
assí posó mio Cid commo si fuesse en montaña (vv. 55-61)

The Cid, along with his “buena compaña,” is physically and metaphorically marginalized. He is sleeping on a “glera,” the rocky bank of a river.

He must go about regaining his honor and, in turn, reconstituting his masculinity. The king has made it impossible for the Cid to provide for his men:

Vedada l’an conpra dentro en Burgos la casa
de todas cosas cuantas son de vianda;
non le osarién vender al menos dinarada. (vv. 62-64).

Martín Antolínez, serving as a surrogate for the city of Burgos, provides for the Cid and his men, for some unstated reason, transgressing the king’s mandate to help the Cid. Antolínez understand the repercussions of his actions, noting that “acusado seré // por lo que vos he servido, / en ira del rey Alfonso // yo seré metido” (vv. 73-74).

---

As Montaner notes, “la catedral de Burgos, puesta bajo la advocación de Santa María, se comenzó a erigir a expensas de Alfonso VI en 1075 y estaba ya concluida en 1095. Inicialmente se erigió como iglesia anexa al palacio real de Fernando I, pero Alfonso VI donó el conjunto de edificios al obispo Jimeno de Burgos en 1081” (671-672 fn52).
The speech and performative acts in the opening scene and in the exchange with the “niña de neuf años” construct and establish the Cid’s sex/gender identity within the text as one that is complicated. The Cid’s heroic ethos can be said to be: 1. “mesurado,” 2. prediscursively sanctioned (epithets) and discursively emasculated (in *ira regia*), 3. prediscursively bellicose (epithets), 4. law-abiding, and 5. Christian. This iteration clearly establishes the Cid as an epic hero:

un hombre que se encuentra en una situación comprometida; quizás no un malhechor, pero sí temporal, o injustamente, proscrito de la sociedad y capacitado en su relativo aislamiento para mostrar su grandeza y llevar a cabo hazañas que le aseguren su retorno a la sociedad, a una sociedad que le aclamará y se beneficiará moralmente con su regreso, o con sus ejemplos, si es que el héroe ha perecido en su intento (Smith 17-18).

The Cid’s reconstitution as a “buen vasallo” by means of his “hazañas” is sanctioned by God and is, thereby, exemplary. After the Cid has succeeded in his plan of tricking Rachel and Vidas into financing his exile, he goes to the Benedictine monastery, San Pero de Cardeña, where he will reunite with his family. As he rides,

la cara del cavallo tornó a Santa María,  
alço su mano diestra, la cara se santigua:  
—¡A ti lo gradesco, Dios, que cielo e tierra guías;  
válanme tus vertudes, gloriosa Santa María!  
D’aquí quito Castiella, pues que el rey he en ira,  
non sé si entraré y más en todos los mis días.  
¡Vuestra vertud me vala, Gloriosa, en mi exida,  
e me ayude e me acorra de noch e de día!  
Si vós assí lo fiziéredes e la ventura me fuere conplida,
mando al vuestro altar  buenas donas e ricas;
esto é yo en debdo;  que faga y cantar mil missas.— (vv. 215-225)

In verse 217, the Cid here again uses an expressive. He seeks the protection of a new lord. The last three lines, commissives, display the vassal/Lord relationship that the Cid hopes to enter. The Cid offers to give money to church and to say a thousand masses. Given the Cid’s *mesura*, the presumption is that this commissive is sincere. Additionally, as the period of time allowed before the Cid must leave Castile expires, Ximena, the Cid’s wife, also offers a prayer to Mary (vv. 330-366), ending with “e ruego a San Peidro // que me ayude a rogar / por mio Cid el Campeador, // que Dios le curie de mal” (vv. 363-364). She makes this prayer in a church dedicated to Saint Peter (Montaner 26 fn366), traditionally understood to be the first bishop of Rome. On the Cid’s last night in Castile, he receives an answer from his new “buen señor” (v. 20). The angel Gabriel, whose name means “God is my strength,” comes to the Cid in a dream, saying simply:

—¡Cavalgad, Cid, el buen Campeador,
ca nunca en tan buen punto cavalgó varón!
Mientra que visquiéredes, bien se fará lo to.— (vv. 407-409)

Gabriel, standing in for God, speaks to the masculinity of the Cid: “ca nuncua en tan buen punto // cavalgó varón” (v. 408) and commits to protecting him. The Cid wakes up and does the sign of the cross and “a Dios se acomendó” (v. 411). He has a new Lord. The Cid’s “manhood account” has been replenished. As the narrator recounts: “Mucho era pagado [el Cid] // del sueño que soñado á” (v. 412). The Cid will go on to kill many moors, in the name of his new Señor and old señor. He will use the money he has earned to recover favor with his old Lord as well as to establish his own protectorate in Valencia.
2.4: FEMININITIES

The role of femininities in the *PMC* complicates the text’s genre and lends credence Pascual–Argente’s assertion that the *PMC* as a masculine romance. Gaunt argues that, in the epic, women “are excluded from the genre’s value system, unable to … participate in the privileged male bonds,” (62-63) and that “women are objects of exchange between men, symbolic of pacts or mediating aggression between men” (63); however, he additionally argues that women in epics can “supply a counter-narrative from which a critique of the disfunctional dominant masculine ideology, and therefore its construction of masculinity, is offered” (63). Further, he argues that “[for] many critics, [epics] in which women play an important role bear the mark of romance” (69). In this section, I will examine the feminine roles of Ximena, her daughters, Elvira and Sol, as well as the Carrión princes as they relate to the constitution of the Cid’s identity.

My argument is that Ximena, her daughters and the Carrión princes, in their femininities, though allowing for the female gaze, reinforce that the ethical system of the *PMC* is “exclusively masculine” (Gaunt 22). Each supports the text’s masculine ideology; however, counter to Gaunt’s argument that the female characters “supplement ineffectual or unworthy male characters, and … diagnose what is wrong with the male order” (23), each helps to reconstitute the Cid as the “buen vasallo.” Specifically, I will look at the Cid’s arrival to Cardeña, Ximena’s arrival with her daughter to Valencia, the encounter with the lion, and “La afrenta de Corpes.”

2.4.1: CARDEÑA

The family’s last interaction with the Cid in Cardeña before he heads out on his exile helps to constitute the Cid as a “buen vasallo.” As the “buen vassallo,” the Cid is loyal, has *mesura*, and is Christian. In the conversation with the abbot, the Cid’s wife and daughters are mere objects of exchange. At the start of the *PMC*, the Cid was seemingly unable to pay his debts and this caused
him anxiety. As a lord, the Cid had to continue to support his family. When he arrives to Cardeña, his conversation with the abbot demonstrates that God is the Cid’s new Lord, and that the new palace is now the Church/monastery and that he is working to ensure that he can pay:

—Gracias, don abbat, e só vuestro pagado,
yo adobaré conducho pora mí e pora mis vassallos;
mas, porque me vo de tierra, dóvos cincuenta marcos.
Si yo algún dia visquier, servos han doblados,
non quiero fazer en el monesterio un dinero de daño.
Evades aquí, por doña Ximena dóvos ciento marcos;
a ella, e a sus fíjas e a sus dueñas sirvádesla est año.
Dues fíjas dexo niñas, e prendetlas en los braços;
aquéllas vos acomiendo a vós, abbat don Sancho,
d’ellas e de mi mugier fagades todo recabdo.
Si essa despensa vos fallerciere o vos menguare algo,
bien las abastad, yo assí vos lo mando;
por un marco que despendades, al monesterio dare yo cuatro.— (vv. 248-260)

Here, we see that Ximena, Elvira and Sol are “are objects of exchange between men, symbolic of pacts” (Gaunt 63). As Luce Irigaray argues, in “Women on the Market,” “women’s role as fetish-objects … in exchanges … are the manifestation and circulation of the power of the Phallus” (183). Similarly, Gayle Rubin, in “The Traffic in Women,” argues that “if women are the gifts, then its men who are the exchange partners” and that it is men, as exchange partners, “upon whom reciprocal exchange confers its … power” (174). Ximena, Elvira and Sol’s circulation reproduces

“Montaner argues that in verse two, when the narrator says that the Cid “tornava la cabeça e estávalos catando,” the direct object pronoun, “los,” refers to “los versos citados en los versos anteriores” (5 fn2).
masculine hegemony. In verse 250, the Cid tells that abbot he is giving him “cincuenta marcos” to
the church. And then, in verse 253, the Cid tells the abbot, for his wife, Ximena, he is giving the
abbot “ciento marcos.” He is entrusting his family to the abbot: “Dues fijas dexo niñas … / aquellas
vos acomiendo // a vos, abbot don Sancho” (v. 255-256). He continues saying “d’ellas e de mi
mugier // fagades todo recabdo” (v.257), concluding that if the amount of money that he has given
the abbot is insufficient, that the abbot should provide for them because the Cid will be able to
send the money with interest: “por un marco que despendades, // al monesterio dare yo cuatro” (v.
260). As this conversation ends between the Cid and the abbot, the Cid’s family arrives to continue
his constitution as a “buen vasallo.” Ximena “llorova de los ojos, // quísol’ besar las manos” and
then praises the Cid. With these actions, she submits the authority of her husband. Her assertive
and directive evidence the Cid’s character and gender, specifically his role as a father and provider:

¡Merçed, Campeador, en ora buena fuestes nado!

Por malos mestureros de tierra sodes echado.

¡Merced, ya Çid, barba tan conplida!

Fem ante vos yo e vuestras fijas

-iffantes son e de dias chicas-

... ¡Da(n)d nos consejo por amor de Santa Maria! (vv. 266-269b; v. 273)

Here Ximena uses four epithets to describe her husband: “Campeador,” “en ora buena fuestes
nado,” “Çid,” and “barba tan conplida.” Both “Campeador” and “Çid” have been previously
discussed. Ximena asserts that the Cid was born at a fortunate hour (v. 266) as if to assert that his
disposition is dependent on his birth. Constantine the African contended that the position and
functioning of male and female genitalia during intercourse can determine varying degrees of
gender construction:

Heat is the property of masculinity and cold the prerogative of femininity. The dominant
presence of one or other of these qualities in the testicles determines both the appearance
of the individual, *his or her endowment with hair* and the sex of the future embryo, as well
as the sexual abilities of the person who will develop out of it (117; my emphasis)

After saying that the Cid had been born at a fortunate hour, two lines later, Ximena complements
the size of her husband’s beard: “barba tan conplida” (v. 268). We see from Constantine’s assertion
that there was much heat in the conception of the Cid, with his “barba tan conplida” — his beard
is an obvious display of masculinity.

This assertive is repeated throughout the poem as another type of epithet and at times the
expression is converted into an adjectival phrase replacing his name entirely: “Bien lo aguisa // el
que en buen ora nasco” (v. 808). This predilection for prophetic births of exemplary men, though
not “original” to the Bible, is necessary to mention in understanding the Cid as a hero that,
according to Frye’s generic designation, be in some way naturally superior. The Cid’s birth implies
his superiority as both hero and a man.

Additionally, Ximena notes that the Cid’s land has been taken unjustly from him and
through it reiterates the relationship between masculinity, the possession and acquisition of land,
and honor. Job, like the Cid, similarly was stripped of his masculinity. In the construction of Job’s
prowess as a “man great among all the people of the east” (Job 1:3), his property is listed as part
and parcel of this greatness. Satan proffers that his property be taken from him as a test of Job’s
loyalty to God. Ximena’s speech places importance on the Cid’s honorable role as a father and a
husband. She says, “Fem ante vos // yo e vuestras fijas” (v. 269). The final cited sentence is a
directive and speaks volumes. Ximena’s supplication for counsel for the love of Holy Mary, mother of Jesus, indicates the necessity of the man’s presence not only as a provider but also a source of guidance. This guidance is so necessary that she asks for it in the name of the Holy Mother (also a counselor of sorts).

Following Ximena’s reference to the Cid’s beard, it is noted that “[enclínó] las manos [el de] // la barba velida, / a las sus fijas // en braço’ las prendía” (vv. 274-275). The Cid’s actions connect two aspects of the gender constituted through Ximena’s words: his beard and his progeny, daughters. Butler argues that “gender is constituted through specific corporeal acts” (“Performative Acts” 521). Growing a beard is a way in which gender is constituted. This interaction between the Cid and his family supports the text’s masculinity ideology in which the Cid is constituted as the “buen vasallo.”

2.4.2: VALENCIA

The Cid’s interaction with his wife and daughters after he has recovered his honor seemingly contrasts with the previous interaction in Cardeña. When the Cid is reunited with his family in Valencia, the interaction with family, to an extent, embraces the feminine gaze. Pascual–Argente makes the argument that here the women’s roles are significantly important as to “bear the mark of romance.” (Gaunt 69). She argues that the female gaze “functions as a seal of approval on Rodrigo’s military and economic successes” (“‘A guisa de varón,’” 543). For Pascual–Argente, the PMC’s “focus on the female gaze as a means to validate Rodrigo’s identity as the lord and defender of Valencia appears in keeping with romance constructions of masculinity” (543). I agree with Pascual–Argente’s assertion that, within the particular Valencia scene, women are the intradiegetic audience to the Cid’s displays of masculinity; however, I question the extent of their power to define and direct hegemonic masculinity. That is to say, to what extent am I to believe
that the Cid defines his worthiness based on the response of his wife and daughters to his display of prowess? His actions, in agreement with Pascual–Argente, demonstrate that their, that of his wife and daughter, responses are important. Up to that point and throughout the poem, neither the Cid’s wife nor his daughters question the Cid’s masculinity. Both their actions and their words reinforce what the narrator tell us. In contrast, here, I am thinking about the extent to which Luciana and Tarsiana will affect Apollonius path in the *Libro de Apolonio*, to be discussed in the next chapter. Ximena and her daughters are audiences to the Cid’s display of exemplary masculinity and the daughters bear witness to the Carrión princes display of dishonorable masculinity; however, the responses of the feminine to these male-dominated spaces, for me, reinforce that these spaces are not for the feminine; whereas, in *Apolonio*, Luciana is invited into the male-dominated space to affect the construction of Apollonius’ identity, not merely just to gaze upon it. That being said, it is important to note that in both my approach and Pascual–Argente’s the female gaze supports the Cid’s constitution as the “buen vassallo.”

As previously discussed, Ximena and the Cid’s daughters remained in Castile upon his exile and in *tirada* 86, the Cid’s family reunites with him in Valencia, a city that he has conquered. The Cid welcomes his family with an exemplary display of masculinity:

A la Puerta de Valencia,       do fuesse en so salvo,
delante su mugier e de sus fijas     querié tener las armas.
…
El que en buen ora nasco    non lo detardava,
   vistiós’ él sobregonel,      luenga trae la barba;
   ensiéllanle a Bavieca,      cuberturas le echavan,
   mio Cid salio sobr’él     e armas de fuste tomava.
Por nombre el cavallo    Bavieca cavalga,

fizo una corrida,       ¡ésta fue tan estraña!

Cuando ovo corrido     todos se maravillavan

d‘es día se précion Bavieca     en cuant grant fue España.

En cabo del cosso      mio Cid descrivalgava,

adeliñó a su mugier     e a sus fijas amas; (vv. 1576-1578;1584-1593)

To his wife, daughters and “todos” that “se maravillavan” (v. 1590), the Cid displays his weapons skills, how much his beard has grown as well as his horse–riding abilities. After this display of masculinity, the Cid takes the women to the highest part of the alcazar: “[adeliñó] mio Cid // con ellas al alcácer, allá las subié // en el más alto logar” (vv. 1610–1611), where, according to Pascual–Argente, “they approvingly survey … Valencia … (“A guisa,” 542). For Pascual–Argente, this is the first instance of the female gaze.

A few verses later, “el rey de Marruecos,” with “cincuanta vezes mil de armas … entraron sobre mar” (v. 1626-1627). For the Cid, this is welcome news because he will be able to show his wife and daughters his valor:

Venido m’es delicio      de tierras d’allent mar,

entraré en las armas,     non lo podrá dexar;

mis fijas e mi mugier     verme an lidiar (vv. 1639-1641).

Again, he takes them to the alcazar: “Su mugier e sus fijas // subiólas al alcácer, / Alçavan los ojos, // tiendas vieron fincar” (vv. 1644-1645). Using verse 1655, where the Cid says to his wife “crécem’ el corazón  porque estades delant,” Pascual–Argente argues that the Cid’s emotional display and an “eagerness to interpet the battle … in a female centric way” are displays of courtliness (“A guisa,” 542). As she concludes, the Cid’s constitution as a “buen vassallo” “occurs
at the intersection of knightly prowess and romantic love.’ (Armstrong qtd. in Pascual–Argente, “A guisa,” 542). I agree that this display of emotion is important for the text’s reconstruction of the “buen vassallo” and I approach the scene from an additional angle.

My assertion is that the fear displayed by the women while watching the battlefield and/or participating in the battle reinforces a hegemonic masculinity based in homosocial relations. Women may watch; however, only men may participate and as a good vassal, the Cid is most impressive if and when he is successful in battle. For that reason, Ximena, his daughters and the Carrión princes, in speaking about the Cid, use epithets that reference this part of his identity. Returning to the notion of fear, before the battle, the Cid tells his wife not to be afraid twice: “non ayades pesar” (v. 1647) and “non ayades pavor” (v. 1653). When the Arabs arrive, the Cid is elated, as the battlefield is his wheelhouse: “Alegrávas’ mio Cid e dixo: // —¡Tan buen día es oy!—” (v. 1659). His words continue to match his actions. However, Ximena’s response and the response of her daughters, which follow this line, is quite the opposite:

Miedo á su mugier e quiérel’ quebrar el corazón,

assí fazié a las dueñas e a sus fijas amas a dos,

del día que nasquieran non vieran tal tremor (vv. 1660-1662)

The Cid grabs his beard and again tells the women not to be afraid, that his efforts will result in an increase in his “manhood account.” The fear displayed by the Cid’s wife and daughters to this male-dominated space demonstrates that these spaces are not for the feminine. As the narrator recounts, since the day of their births, Ximena and her daughters had not seen such trepidation.

The Carrion princes similarly display fear in male-dominated spaces and on the battlefield. Jill Ross, in chapter three of *Figuring the Feminine*, “Macho Words: Writing, Violence, and Gender in *Poema de mio Cid*,” examines gender construction in relation to speech and writing in
the *PMC*, and there she characterizes the Carrión princes as “writers” that contrast with the Cid’s characterization as the potent masculine speaker (93). As Ross argues, “[the] Infantes’ cowardly behavior when confronted by the loose lion, as well as their notable lack of courage on the battlefield, implies that their loss of honour is shot through with an *undcurrent of effeminacy* or sexual inadequacy” (85; my emphasis). I go further, and so does Ross, and designate the Carrión princes as feminine.

Let’s look specifically at the scene in which the Carrión princes fail to fight against Búcar. In this scene the feminine, as presented in the Carrión princes, is contrasted with the masculine, the Cid. The scene starts off by announcing that: “Alegávas el Cid // e todos sus varones, / que les crece la ganancia, // grado al Criador” (vv. 2315-2316). The narrator announces that, similarly to his feelings about the battle in Valencia, The Cid and all of his men are happy that through battle, they will be able to increase their “manhood account,” both literally and figuratively. This mirrors the Cid’s response to his wife when she expressed some trepidation about the battle in Valencia. He reminded her that his efforts on the battlefield would increase his “manhood account:” “Riqueza es que nos acrece // maravillosa e grand” (v. 1648).

The Carrion princes re not happy about the impending battle and the narrator notes that “mas, sabed, de cuer les pesa // a los ifantes de Carrión, / ca veyén tantas tiendas de moros // de que non avién sabor” (vv. 2317-2318). The Cid’s response to their fear contrasts with his response to his wife and daughters’ fear. Muño Gustioz, who was charged with supervising the Carrión princes, like objects, hears them express their fear, and, in secret, tells the Cid: “¡Evades qué pavor han vuestros yernos, // tan osados son, / por entrar en batalla // desear Carrión!” (vv. 2326-2327). The Cid, smiling, responds:

—¡Dios vos salve, yernos, ifantes de Carrión!
En braços tenedes mis fijas, tan blancas commo el sol.
Yo desseo lides e vós a Carrión;
en Valencia folgad a todo vuestro sabor,
ca d’aquello moros yo só sabidor,
arrancármelos trevo con la merced del Criador.— (vv. 2332-2337)

Montaner asserts that by mentioning the wedding, the author “parece estar relacionada con las dispociones forales que eximían a los recién casados de acudir al combate” (145 fn2333). I believe that these lines are a critique of the Carrión princes’ masculinity. As the Cid’s daughters are now part and parcel of the Carrión princes’ masculinity, I see the Cid’s comment as an insinuation to follow his model of masculinity. In the next line, he contrasts himself with the Carrión princes: “Yo desseo lides // e vós a Carrión.” Additionally, he tells them that they can return to Valencia. Arguably, they could go up the alcácer like their wives before them — to watch from afar, like the women they seemingly are.

This scene follows the important lion scene and adds to the Carrión princes’ humiliation. As Ross argues, the Carrión princes’ “shameful display of fear … and their notable lack of valour on the battlefield emphasize an absence of manliness. … [The] Infantes are feminized, passive objects of commodification” (97-98). When the Cid refers to the Carrión princes as “yernos,” not only is he referencing a familial relationship, he is also referencing this commodification. During the battle, the Cid tells Pero Vermúez, in place of Muño Gustioz who had been previously tasked with watching them, to take care of the Carrión princes: “Cúriesme a don Diego, // e cúriesme a don Fernando, / mios yernos amos a dos, // las cosas que mucho amo, / ca los moros, con Dios, // non fincarán en canpo” (vv. 2352-2354). The Cid, again, refers to them as his sons-in-law, but goes further and calls them “las cosas que mucho amo.” The princes “contribute their family
prestige to the Cid’s clan and enable to Cid to perpetuate his lineage, thereby resulting in the absorption of the Infantes into the Cid’s clan and the transformation of Elvira and Sol into ‘surrogate male heirs’” (Ross 98).

2.4.3: LA AFRENTA DE CORPES

The Carrión princes’ actions against their new wives and the Cid’s surrogate male heirs, Elvira and Sol demonstrate the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and power that is embedded in the *PMC*, and that is vested in the Cid, the “buen vassallo.” The “Afrenta de Corpes” foregrounds the body in the construction of gender. As Ross argues, “the wounding of the female bodies in the *Poema de mio Cid* is … tightly enmeshed in the patriarchal values of a warrior society that views women as pawns in a high–stakes game of politics and power” (81) and the Afrenta de Corpes is the Carrión princes’ “attempt to reinscribe the shameful stains of cowardice and effeminacy on the bodies of women so as to reassert control over their own virility” (85). The experiences of the Carrión princes in male–dominated spaces led them to a state of powerlessness, a state in which they need to add to their manhood account, and as Ross argues, “[powerlessness] in literary representation is akin to the attribution of female sexual status and identity” (Ross 97).

As men, the Carrión princes also understand that, as Feather and Thomas argue in “Introduction: Reclaiming Violent Masculinities,” the defense of the privilege of masculinity is predicated on the ability to “engage in violent action.” However, the Carrión princes are seemingly unable to defend the privilege of masculinity in male-dominated spaces. Their desire for vengeance against the Cid is because of his perceived affront against them as a result of the lion scene. To seek violence against the Cid, the Carrión princes exact violence on the Cid’s daughters, removing their clothes, leaving them for dead in their underwear, “una grave afrenta” for a “mujer honrada” (166 fn2720). Despite the Carrión princes’ actions, the daughters challenge their masculinity,
begging to be killed with their father’s swords: “al una Colada // e al otra Tizón, / cortandos las cabeças” (vv. 2727-2728). The Carrión princes try to control women, but by means not allowed to them under the law.

2.5: REDEMPTION

The Cid’s response to the affront/insult is not the response of an epic hero. According to epic tradition, “un ultraje de tal envergadura hubiera exigido una represalia sangrienta a título personal” (Montaner 170) Upon learning the news; however, the Cid “una grand ora // pensó e comidió.” (v. 2828). He raises his hand, taking his beard in his hand and says:

—¡Grado a Christus, que del mundo es señor,
Cuando tal ondra me an dada los infantes de Carrión!
¡Par aquesta barba que nadi non messó,
Non la lograrían los infantes de Carrión,
que a mis fijas bien las casaré yo!— (vv. 2830 – 2834)

Verses 2830–2831 mirror verses 8-9: “—Grado a ti, Señor, // Padre que estás en alto!/¡Esto me an buelto // mis enemigos malos!” These verses display “tanto un acto de resignación cristiana como una muestra de confianza en su futuro” (Montaner 6 fn 8). When the Cid references his unblemished beard, he references the honor that it brings him and the honor that he still has, the masculinity that it brings him and that he still has. The Cid continues saying that the Carrión princes will not benefit from their actions and that he will marry his daughters. As Montaner notes, “[este] propósito … indica que el matrimonio se consideraba anulado del cónyuge, que constituía un acto de repudio, como los mismos infantes han hecho constar desde que planearon la afrenta” (173 fn. 2834). The narrator notes that “[pesó] a mio Cid e toda su cort” (v. 2835).
The Cid attempts to have the princes condemned in public court\textsuperscript{53} for their actions and to regain his honor. The court session is a display (and ultimately a sanctioning) of his exemplary masculinity as well as a condemnation of that which does not fall within those definitions (namely the Carrion princes\textsuperscript{54}). All those men that support the Carrión princes are shamed. The court proceedings begin as count don García stands up to speak. Those men to speak after don García will repeat this action of standing before speaking. The theatrics of the court proceeding reflect Butler’s notion of gender performance as well as Searle’s notion of the illocutionary force. It is not just about the words that the men here in court use, it is also about the context as well as their intentionality. It is similar to the battlefield. The count starts the court proceedings by “admiring” the length of the Cid’s beard: “Vezós’ mio Cid // a llas cortes pregonadas. // Dexóla crecer // e luenga trae la barba” (vv. 3272-3273). Taken alone one could argue that the count is showing admiration for the Cid’s masculinity; however, given that the count is there to defend the Carrion princes, his “compliment” should be taken with a grain of salt. Additionally, the count follows his “admiration” with a note that “los unos le han miedo // e los otros espanta” (v. 3275). But he, being a man, does not. That is not to say that count views the Cid’s beard as a legitimate display of his masculinity, but rather, because of its presence it must be addressed. The Cid follows the count. The narrator mentions that the Cid touches his beard as he speaks as if to say that his beard gives him authority. He rebuffs the count and thanks God for the length of his beard and asks of the

\textsuperscript{53} “Sociologically, that is to say by reference to institutional criteria, a public sphere in the sense of a separate realm distinguished from the private sphere cannot be show to have existed in the feudal society of the High Middle Ages. Nevertheless, it was no accident that the attributes of lordship, such as the ducal seal, were called ‘public’; …—for lordship was something publicly represented. The \textit{publicness} (or \textit{publicity}) of representation was not constituted as a social realm, that is, as a public sphere; rather, it was something like a status attribute, if this term may be permitted. … [A lord] displayed himself, presented himself as an embodiment of some sort of ‘higher’ power. … representation can ‘occur only in public … there is no representation that would be a ‘private matter.’ For representation pretended to make something invisible visible through the public presence of the person of the lord.” (Habermas 7)

\textsuperscript{54} See Pascual–Argente’s article “‘A guisa de varón,’” for her discussion of the Carrion princes as an anti–model of masculinity.
count: “¿Qué avenes vós, conde, / por retraer la mi barba?” (v. 3283). He contends that “ca de
cuando nasco // a delicia fue criada, / ca non me priso a ella fijo // de mugier nada” (vv. 3285-
3286). The Cid speaks of his exemplary masculinity as manifest in the length of his beard. There
has been no one else to have a beard as the Cid has and during his fighting there was not a time
when either Moor or Christian tore his beard. He references a time in Cabra where he tore the
beard of the count as if to say that he is more of a man than the count. He continues noting that the
bald spot that resulted from him tearing his beard has yet to grow any hair back. He keeps the hair
that he took from the count’s beard as a token. This results in the count’s recusal.

2.6: CONCLUSION

From the onset of the PMC, the audience was presented with a male character, the Cid, that we were supposed view as exemplary. The information that we were able to garner about the Cid’s exemplarity came from the mouth of the Cid, the narrator, as well as the other characters around the Cid — specifically, the 9-year old girl. The 9-year old girl attempts to make the unintelligible intelligible for the Cid. The king has banished him, in *ira regia*. His presence is no longer intelligible in the Alfonso’s kingdom. This produces an anxiety in the Cid — as is seen in the first available lines of the poem — “De los sos ojos // tan fuertemientre llorando” (v. 1). The 9-year-old girl’s rearticulation of Alfonso’s law cements a scenario in which the Cid will have to leave behind his wife and daughters and construct a seemingly new identity — an identity that he will build through battling and killing other men. The way that this text is seemingly constructed, it is no surprise that it has been overwhelming deemed an epic. However, if we are to believe Pascual–Argente’s argument about the female gaze as well as to consider the Cid’s uncharacteristic response to the Carrion princes’ insult, one wonders to what extent we can designate the PMC
solely an epic. *Mesura* is an important component of the Cid’s identity and it has been argued by critics that this *mesura* played a part in his response to the affront. I would argue that the Cid’s *mesura* also played a part in his response to the 9-year-old girl. The Cid comes into Burgos and tries to use force to enter; however, as the narrator shares with us, force is not enough. The door does not bend to the will of the Cid. To some extent, the Cid must bend to the will of the door — or rather, the 9-year-old girl that comes through that door conveying a message from the crown.

Additionally, the Fall/Redemption narrative structure displays that the Cid’s articulation of masculinity is exemplary. The Cid, in contrast to the Carrion princes, has been allowed back into the system. As Pierre Bourdieu comments, “as a structured system, language (*langue*) is fundamentally treated as the condition of intelligibility of speech (*parole*), as the structured medium which has to be reconstructed in order to account for the constant relation between sound and meaning” (166). Speech and speech acts must be understood within the confines of the system to be acceptable. The words and actions of the vassal must be understood within the confines of the vassalage system. Speech and speech acts are also performative acts and therefore performative acts also must be understood within the confines of the system in order to be acceptable. Not adhering to that system (treachery of said system) equates to unintelligibility in language and a gender dsymorphia and/or an unnaturalness in actions. Punitive consequences result from both. The “juivizio de la cort” (vv. 3259b-3536) and the subsequent duel (vv. 3552-3671) are an effort to make the unintelligibility of the Carrion princes intelligible — the unmasculine, masculine. The Carrion princes continuously refer to the naturalness of their status; however, their words and actions are unbecoming of their alleged natural status. Their use of words too often does not coincide with their male gender. In the “juivizio de la cort,” the words and actions of the Carrion princes are to be explained and interpreted (made intelligible) by those men accepted as good
representatives of their gender and occupation. Each man (Pero Vermúez, Martín Antolínez, and Muño Gustioz) stands up and requests that the princes refrain from speaking as their words are only lies (“Mientes [...] de cuanto dicho has” (3313); “¡Calla, alevoso, boca sin verdad!” (3362); “Non dizes verdad // a amigo ni a señor, / falso a todos // e más al Criador” (3386-3387). The court scene reinforces that cowardliness and treachery unbecoming of a vassal and a man. The resulting duel maintains physical force as the ultimate display of manhood. Though the Carrion princes were given an opportunity to recover their honor, they were unable to do so. They befall a similar fate as befell the daughters of the Cid one *cantar* earlier. The Cid; however, has been accepted back into the fold and forgiven for his trespasses against his lord, Alfonso.

The *Poema de mio Cid* is a testimony, and its male authors and characters witnesses to a process in which the conventions and protocols of medieval masculinity, as vested in the Cid, are inculcated as normative behaviors.

The Cid, in the performance of his gendered self, reinforces the superiority of a specific type of masculinity that toes the line between epic and romance. Throughout, the constitution of the Cid’s gendered–self upholds hegemonic masculinity through homosocial relations, though there are moments of heterosocial relations than can be argued to “bear the mark of the romance.” This approach takes into consideration the text’s content in a generic designation. Additionally, the use of the fall/redemption narrative structure speaks to a generic designation that takes into consideration the text’s form. Medieval exegesis surrounding the fall/redemption trope and its ubiquity lends credence to a possible designation of the text as *speculum principis*. Given the thirteenth–century context, and the other texts to be examined in this dissertation, a broader, more inclusive generic designation as *speculum principis* addresses the similarities in form and content of this work with other works that have normally been designated as another genre.
CHAPTER III: THE FIGURAL KINGS: THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CHRISTIAN MASCULINITIES IN LIBRO DE ALEXANDRE AND LIBRO DE APOلونIO

Eric Auerbach, in Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, defines *figura* as “something real and historical which announces something else that is also real and historical. *The relation between the two events is revealed by an accord or similarity*” (29; my emphasis) For Auerbach, *figura* is different from allegory. Auerbach notes that it is precisely the figural interpretation of reality which … was the dominant view in the European Middle Ages: the idea that earthly life is thoroughly real, with the reality of the flesh into with the Logos entered, but that with all this reality is only *umbra* and *figura* of the authentic, future, ultimate truth, the real reality that will unveil and preserve the *figura*. In this way the individual early event is not regarded as a definitive self–sufficient reality, not as a link in a chain of development in which single events or combinations of events perpetually give rise to new events, *but viewed primarily in immediate vertical connection with a divine order which encompasses it.* (71–72; my emphasis)

*Libro de Alexandre (Alexandre)*55 and *Libro de Apolonio (Apolonio)*,56 composed in the thirteenth century, are two poems primarily based on Latin sources, Walter of Châtillon’s *Alexandres* in the case of Alexandre57 and *Historia Apolonii Regis Tyrii (HART)* in the case of Apolonio. Though

---

“There are two extant manuscripts: P and O. Manuscript P (1888) is in the Biblioteca Nacional de París (Cañas 16). Manuscript O is in Madrid. (Cañas 17).

55 There is one extant manuscript. It is conserved along with *Vida de Santa María Egipciaca* and *Libre dels tres Reys d’Orient* in the Escorial (Ms. III-K-4) (Corbella 12).

56 For an in–depth study of the source material and their relation to Alexandre see R.S. Willis (*The Relationship of the Spanish Libro de Alexandre to the Alexandres of Gautier de Châtillon; The Debt of the Spanish Libro de Alexandre to the French Roman d’Alexandre*), George Cary (*Medieval Alexander* 64–65, 179, 187, 207), Ian Michael (*Classical Treatment*), Isabel Uría Maqua ("El Libro de Alexandre y la Universidad de Palencia") and Amaia Arizaleta’s (*La translation d’Alexandre: recherches sur les structures et les significations du Libro de Alexandre* 51–80). It is quite evident that, as Arizaleta argues, the author of Alexandre “ne traduit pas un texte isolé, mais conçoit son entreprise autrement. Il transforme artistiquement un ensemble de trois œuvres différents, dont l’homogénéité résulte de leur thématique commune. […] L’auteur anonyme n’est pas intéressé par l’adaptation d’une unique source, mais par l’alternative d’une création artistique, seule rendue possible par la réunion de plusieurs sources” (79).
critics argue the extent to which, in both, the clerical poets emphasize the lessons about thirteenth-century Christian morality to be gained from their tales, each critic undoubtedly acquiesces to its presence.

Both *Alexandre* and *Apolonio* play out the regulatory social conventions of exemplary Christian kingship and, consequently, exemplary maleness. As Isabel Uría Maqua argues, “el contraste más significativo, en la consideración del *Apolonio* como contrapunto del *Alexandre*, reside en el comportamiento de sus protagonistas, en la manera cómo los conciben y tratan los respectivos autores de uno y otro poema” (“Contrapunto” 194). For Matthew V. Desing, *mester de juglaría*, of which the *PMC* is an arguable exemplar, and *mester de clerecía* “represent contrasting kinds of masculinity, a rude and unruly warrior masculinity on one side, and a refined and learned masculinity on the other” (“Gender, Authority and Discourse in *Mester de Clerecía Journeys*” 3). Though both *Alexandre* and *Apolonio*, given their form, are invariably read in the context of *mester de clerecía*, it would be remiss of me to say that both texts solely display, as Desing argues, “a refined and learned masculinity.”

---

“Willis notes that “the content and the atmosphere of the *Alexandre* are thoroughly Christian, although the poem contains a few features of classical paganism” (*Relationship* 68). He shows that the Spanish author excluded “most of the pagan elements of the *Alexandreis*” and inserts “his own Christian material” (*Michael Treatment* 88). Michael, in *Treatment*, studies the nature and extent of the Christian insertions. He concludes that [n]ot only did the Spanish poet introduce Christian comments and similes, he also undertook a considerable amount of Christianization of the direct discourse […] The Christianization is more deeply embedded in the fabric of his poem in the narration of events: the poet allows God and the devil a hand in the action and excludes the direct participation of pagan gods in the Alexander story. He converts the pagan goddess Natura into a medieval allegorical figure because she is essential to the denouement, but he first makes sure that the Christian God condemns the protagonist before Nature plots his death. Only in the story of Troy does he allow pagan gods into the actions, but even their discourse is Christianized and their paganism muted; God and the devil are allowed as much initiative in the Trojan war as elsewhere (141).

Joaquín Artiles, in *El ‘Libro de Apolonio’, poema español del siglo XIII*, notes that “El Libro de Apolonio no es ciertamente un poema *a lo divino*, pero sí una obra trascendida de religiosidad, inmersa en la ‘universal condición religiosa de la literatura medieval’ […] en que los autores […] explotan los atractivos de una obra pagana y la llenan de espíritu religioso, pensando en el bien de sus lectores” (131–132). Uría Maqua, in “El *Libro de Apolonio*, contrapunto del *Libro de Alexandre*,” argues for Apollonius’ conversion to Christianity over the course of the text.
Though Uría Maqua is not the first, and will undoubtedly not be the last, to discuss Alexandre and Apolonio in the same context, I find her reasoning for the comparison, in “El Libro de Apolonio, contrapunto del Libro de Alexandre,” to be thorough and beneficial to my argument in this chapter: 1. Both texts use cuaderna vía, 2. both are written in “romance de la Castilla del Norte de la primera mitad del siglo XIII” (193), 3. both deal with ancient Greece, 4. both have a king as the main protagonist that “destaca por su sabiduría y cultura libresca” (193) and, 5. finally: ambos poemas tienen una importante dimensión ejemplar y moralizante, pues los respectivos autores extraen de sus relatos una lección de moral cristiana, en la que la virtud es premiada y el pecado recibe su castigo. Incluso, el tema sobre el que se moraliza es … el mismo en ambos poemas, aunque visto de ángulos opuestos (193; my emphasis)

Pablo Ancos asserts that the authors of Alexandre and Apolonio write their texts “todo mediante la cristianización, medievalización y castellanización de las fuentes, así como a través del borrado de elementos de las mismas que no tendrían demasiado sentido en el contexto histórico compartido por autores y receptores” (Transmisión y recepción 290-291). Namely, that in the transmisión and recepción of Alexandre and Apolonio, there is to some extent an extant ideology in its construction — a Christian, medieval, and Castilian ideology that must be intelligible to its readers. Similarly, Ian Michael argues that “the reason for his imposition [that of the Alexandre author] of a Christian setting and context for Alexander’s actions is likely to be found … in a conscious effort to present the classical deeds in a form that could be easily grasped by his public” (Treatment 142). In “Modalidades de la escritura ficcional de la sacralidad monárquica,” Amaia Arizaleta, focuses on the clerical author and/or authors of Apolonio, arguing that Apolonio is a representation of the clericalization of royal power, “el reconocimiento de la autoridad de los clérigos en la definición y el ejercicio del oficio monárquico.” Arizaleta argues that it would be “posible postular que el
autor del Libro de Apolonio hubiera completado y corregido la representación del rey, para la instrucción de unos cortesanos laicos, y de unos eclesiásticos familiares del palacio, conocedores de la figura de un rey de victoria, necesitados del ejemplo de un monarca paciente y sufrido” (“Modalidades”). Arizaleta, in La translation d’Alexandre, makes a similar argument about the authors of Alexandre, concluding that “[car] si l’auteur de l’Alexandre s’est minutieusement appliqué a transformer les matériaux des sources, c’est parce qu’il voulait que son héros fût un monarque très chrétien” (La translation 256). I agree with Michael when he asserts that “[there] can be no doubt that the Alexandre poet had a strong didactic aim: he proclaims it in the exordium (3c) and shows himself throughout the poem ever ready to teach […] [There] is a considerable attempt […] to instil [sic] Christian morality in the reader” (Treatment 175).

In this chapter, I will argue that the authors of Alexandre and Apolonio adapt and reconstruct their Latin source texts in an effort to make their title characters intelligible for their thirteenth–century socio–political situation — a socio–political situation that saw Christian kings as centralizing figures. To that end, I analyze both Alexandre and Apolonio in the light of speculum principis, a literary genre significantly changed in the thirteenth century by the writings of Aristotle. Each author or authors holds up a mirror to their eponymous hero in an effort to demonstrate exemplary kingship and, in turn, exemplary masculinity. For each text, through the use of the Fall/Redemption narrative structure, the authors cement their respective Christian kings as centralizing figures.

I will examine speech acts and performative acts in the texts in an effort to discern the extent to which the texts can be read as a dialogic genre akin to a masculine romance. My argument

is that Alexander and Apollonius, in their respective texts, exhibit their masculinity in significantly dissimilar ways and that Alexander’s iteration of his masculinity, though from the onset intelligibly exemplary, closes without Redemption; whereas, Apollonius falls and is redeemed. In my discussion of Alexandre, I will focus on: 1. Alexander’s anxiety about his lineage, 2. Alexander’s pride, and 3. Alexander’s subordination of his mesura to fama. I have chosen these moments because they showcase Alexandre’s Fall/Redemption narrative construction, speak to Alexander’s identity as an anxious hero and finally, because, as a contrast to Apolonio, they shine light on the text’s generic designation. Important to my discussion of both is that in both texts, the audience learns that a good king must come into his authority legitimately, have a legitimate lineage, be forthright, be loyal, be humble, have mesura, and use violence in the name of the Christian God.

I follow up my discussion of Alexandre and focus on four moments that I see as essential to the development of Apollonius as anxious hero in Apolonio: 1. The incest riddle, 2. The shipwreck, 3. The loss of his wife, Luciana, and finally 4. The recovery of his daughter, Tarsiana. Similarly, I have chosen these moments because they showcase Apolonio’s Fall/Redemption narrative construction, speak to Apolonio’s identity as an anxious hero and exemplary Christian king and finally, because, as a contrast to and seemingly in conversation with Alexandre, they shine light on the text’s generic designation.

Before the above–mentioned analysis, in sections 3.1 and 3.2, I will frame my discussion of Alexandre and Apolonio as adaptations representative of mester de clercía. Subsequently, I will discuss mester de clercía and its relationship to the centralization of monarchical power in the thirteenth century.
3.1: MESTER DE CLEREÇIA

Alexandre and Apolonio were composed in cuaderna vía and are almost invariably read as prime examples of mester de clereçía. The term mester de clereçía is derived from the first verses in the second stanza of Alexandre: “Mester traigo fermoso, // non es de joglaría, / mester es sin pecado, // ca es de clerçía” (vv. 2a–2b). I agree with Ancos when he argues that “casi todos los poemas conservados [en el siglo XIII] comparten en líneas generales una misma forma primaria de composición y comunicación” (Transmisión 158) and for that reason “[t]al coincidencia podría, quizá, sumarse a los argumentos a favor de la consideración de la poesía en cuaderna vía del siglo XIII como un grupo homogéneo, de unidad indudable” (Transmisión 158). Similarly, Uría Maqua argues for a definition of mester de clereçía with an “alcance restringido” in which mester de clereçía is “caracterizada sobre todo por el uso sistemático de un modelo métrico–estrófico y prosódico rígido, que produce los poemas en cuaderna vía peninsulares del siglo XIII” (Uría Maqua qtd. in Ancos Transmisión 19). That is to say, Uría Maqua approaches genre from the position of form. Would this then entail a genre? If we approached it solely from the viewpoint of form, yes. Julian Weiss, in The ‘Mester de clereçía:’ Intellectuals and Ideologies in Thirteenth–Century Castile, offers us the term “literary mode” as a way of describing some “thirty vernacular poems over the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries” (1).

Weiss, in his discussion of the literary mode, expands the term mester de clereçía beyond the confines of cuaderna vía, beyond form, arguing that:

“For the intellectual progression of mester de clereçía, see: Manuel Milá y Fontanals (1865); José Amador de los Ríos (1863); Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (1911); Ramón Menéndez Pidal (1924; 1957); Joaquín Artiles (1964); Ian Michael (1961; 1970) Francisco Rico’s (1985); Isabel Uría Maqua (2000); Julian Weiss (2006) and Pablo Ancos (2012).

“Unless otherwise noted, I cite from Jesús Cañas’ 2007 edition of Libro de Alexandre.

“See also Uría Maqua (‘Sobre la unidad del ‘mester de clereçía’ del siglo XIII. Hacia un replanteamiento de la cuestión,’ “Una vez más sobre el sentido de la c. 2 del Alexandre,” and Panorama crítico del ‘mester de clereçía’).
a social reading of *cuaderna vía* poems … acquires *greater depth and meaning by setting them in the wider context of clerical narrative*, and that the broad social and didactic impulses that drive … poems … such as the *Vida de Santa María Egipciaca* and … *Elena María*, are the same as those that motivate the more formally sophisticated poems (2; my emphasis)

Weiss notes that in the thirteenth century, the recently formed University of Palencia “trained clerics to cater for the expanding administrative needs of Church and State” (1). Accordingly, these newly trained clerics were imbued with “an acute sense of their own worth and collective identity” and “adopted the role of intermediaries between the lay world of the unlettered and the secular wisdom and spiritual values which they had acquired as privilege of their literacy” (1). One such important socio–historical and political context is the “fascination with centralized monarchical power that was to evolve over the course of the thirteenth century” (Weiss 123). Similarly, Ignacio Borge argues in his article, “La justicia del rey y el desarrollo del poder monárquico en el reinado de Alfonso VIII de Castilla (1158-1214),” that Alfonso VIII expanded monarchical power at the turn of the thirteenth century (Borge 235).

In addition to the development of a fascination with centralized monarchical power*, the thirteenth century, and these clerics, saw a continuation of the Crusades*, and the beginnings of the Commercial Revolution — all brought about through territorial expansion. As Amaia Arizaleta, in *La translation de Alexandre*, argues:

---

“See Dante Alighieri (*De monarchia*). According to Auerbach, “Dante believed in a predetermined concordance between the Christian story of salvation and the Roman secular authority; thus, it is not surprising that he would apply the figural interpretation to a pagan Roman—in general he draws his symbols, allegories, and figures from both worlds without distinction” (67).

“See Arizaleta (*La translation*): “Le poète anonyme vit donc dans une contexte de croisade, où les idées d’autorité chrétienne commencent à se faire jour.” (258)
Lorsque notre auteur écrit son œuvre, les royaumes péninsulaires sont engagés dans un inexorable processus de conquête, dirigé par la monarchie castillane. Après la défaite d’Alarcos en 1195, le roi Alphonse VIII de Castille change l’orientation de sa politique pouvoir, afin d’obtenir ainsi un atout qui ferra démarrer, définitivement, la reconquête (257)

Territorial expansion would become essential to each author’s understanding of kingship and, in turn, masculinity. One’s ability to conquer territory was a display of one’s masculinity. In this patrilineal society, the king’s identity is derived from his resources (Breitenberg 16). Territorial expansion, in conjunction with the Reconquest, was not only important for a king’s identity as a man, but also for a king’s identity as a Christian man.

Thirteenth–century Iberia and the clerical authors “conformed to [a new situation] and interpreted the new arrangement of state, church, and believer in ways that […] made religious sense of these astonishing new political realities” (Pagels, “The Politics of Paradise” 69). Mester de clerecía, in both form and function, is a response to a masculine anxiety: “the profound social, religious, and political changes of twelfth– and thirteenth–century Europe” (Weiss 1). Through it, clerical authors attempted to craft the image of a good Christian king, to provide a speculum principis. In doing so, these writers reinforce an androcentric vision in which masculinity, as vested in these kings, is inseparable from power. And, as a “product of an incessant … labor of production, to which singular agents … and institutions … contribute,” mester de clerecia, is a “structure of domination” (Bourdieu, Masculine Domination 34) that ratifies masculine domination.
Looking at the representations of gender in both texts will shine light on a possible generic designation for the two texts. I believe that representations of gender, specifically of masculinity, explain and justify each text’s respective ideology. As Blye Frank asserts in “Hegemonic Heterosexual Masculinity,” “masculinity [is] not neutral nor […] biological.” It is a “social [accomplishment] of a political nature located within a larger set of political, economic, and social relations” (160-161). According to Frank, “patriarchal structures of heterosexist masculine authority, domination and control are diffused throughout society in its social, political, economic and ideological activities” (161). Literature, specifically that of the didactic *mester de clerecía*, is a social, political, economic and ideological activity by which heterosexist masculine authority, domination and control are maintained and propagated. Gary Kinsman, in *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power and Change*, argues that

In our society heterosexuality as an institutionalized norm has become an important means of social regulation, enforced by laws, police practices, family and social policies, school, and the mass media. In its historical development, heterosexuality is tied with the institution of masculinity, which gives social and cultural meaning to biological male anatomy, associating it with masculinity, aggressiveness, and an ‘active’ sexuality” (104)

The institutions, specifically kingship, represented in these texts “promote and disseminate … beliefs consistent with the interests of the dominant [male] … class” (Lumsden 193). The chancery, as the argued site for the writing of these works, also “[promoted] and [disseminated] … beliefs consistent with the interests of the dominant [male] … class” (193). As Arizaleta argues, in *Les clercs au palais*, the chancery within the palace was the place where “clerks fashioned a
written image of kingly power” (Pascual–Argente, “Nueva maestría” 187) and “[pouvoir] des monarques et pouvoir de l’écrit allèrent de pair en Castille entre 1157 et 1230” (Arizaleta, “Introduction” 1), arguably during and/or before the time of the creation of both Alexandre and Apolonio.

My assertion is that the author or authors of Alexandre, in their construction of their hero tale, to more of an extent than the PMC, fall more in line with the chansons de geste/epic genre, a genre predicated on, according to Gaunt, the argument that male characters are defined by their relationships with other male characters and that representative texts attempt a monologic construction of masculinity. However, the construction of the Apolonio falls in line with the romance genre°. For as Gaunt asserts, with respect to the construction of the romance, more importance, in the construction of the hero’s masculine identity, is placed on his relationship to a female character and that those relationships are what defines his masculinity. Apollonius, unlike Alexander, has to prove himself not only to the men around him, but, also, to the women around him. That being said, both constructions of maleness, in Alexandre and Apolonio, exalt the ever-important Christian morality.

° Though critics that have said that the text is a romance, Artiles (El ‘Libro de Apolonio’) defines it as a “novela bizantina versificada” (15) and Scordilis Brownlee believes that the text is part romance and part hagiography (“Writing and Scripture”).
3.3: **SPECULUM PRINCIPIS**: THE ANXIOUS PRINCE

»Sobre mí non querría
nin que con mi maestro
ca serí fiera onta
por el rey Alexandre

Sobre mí, no querría tan gran honta ver
nin que con mi maestro me sopiesse perder,
ca serié fiera onta e grant mal pareçer,
por el rey Alexandre omne obedecer.

*Libro de Alexandre* st. 26

There has been much written about the thematic function of the “rey noble, pagano” in *Alexandre*. María Rosa Lida, in *La idea de fama en la edad media castellana*, “considers the celebration of Alexander’s fame (a combination of pagan values and *ideales caballerescos*) to be the central theme of the work” (Brownlee 263); R.S. Willis, in “‘Mester,’” notes the “quasi–canonization of the miracle–working [Alexander],” a hero that was “moulded by the poet into an exemplar, not simply of traditional kingly virtues like justice and valor, but also of attainments of the scholar” (222, 224). Ian Michael, in *Treatment*, argues that in *Alexandre* there is “shift in approach as the poem progressed;” “Alexander, like the Iberian kings during the Reconquest, begins with the unobjectionable aim of freeing his people from foreign subjugation and offering them fame through fine chivalric deeds” (282); however, by “the end of the poem, Alexander is firmly established as the moral example, whose ‘bon presçio’ rests on deeds he performed before

---

“R.S. Willis is the first to argue that *Alexandre* is *speculum principis*. Willis notes that “it should not be overlooked that this scholar’s book could also be considered in a sense to be *speculum principis*” (“‘Mester’ 222). Though Willis proposes (answering his own question of “whom it is intended to reflect or instruct) deems *Alexandre* as “a monument to the saintly Fernando III, the re–conquero of Cordova and Seville, written towards or just after the end of his life,’ or “Alfonso el Sabio, descended from the Hohenstaufens through his mother, might, either as infante or new king, have been in the mind of the poet,” Francisco Rico, in “La clerecía del mester” argues that “si el autor hubiera tenido en mente un destinario regio, es inimaginable que no llegara a nombrarlo,” (11, note 30). Ian Michael, in *Treatment*, notes that “[t]he *Alexandre* may well have been intended as a *speculum principis*, as Willis suggested …; the poet appears to have exerted himself to explore all the aspects of kingship that he probably regarded as most important in a contemporary monarch” (28). Amaia Arizaleta, in *La translation d’Alexandre: Recherches sur les structures et les significations du Libro de Alexandre*, notes that “[o]n trouve dans l’*Alexandre* un « miroir des princes »” (240) and that “[l]’*Alexandre* castillan est globalement, tel que le poète le présente, un bon roi. Il met sans cesse en pratique les conseils sortis des lèvres d’Aristote” (243).

“Sin duda alguna, el texto de la España medieval más importante para la idea de la fama es el *Libro de Alexandre*, en parte porque su fuente principal, la *Alexandreis*, revive con impetuosa pasión el antiguo afán de gloria, en parte porque la figura del héroe se presenta de suyo a la elaboración caballeresca, como lo prueba la abundante floración de poemas que suscitó en diversas lenguas” (*La idea de la fama* 167).
he succumbed to pride” (284). Marina Scordilis Brownlee, in “Pagan and Christian: The Bivalent Hero of El Libro de Alexandre,” argues that Alexandre “offers a poetics which presents (and purposefully contrasts) these conflicting (partial) perspectives on Alexander, accommodating them in a coherent whole” (263). Brownlee, arguing for the “bivalence” of Alexander, notes that “the Alexandre-poet presents his protagonist both as a triumphant pagan and as a failed Christian … [because] these presentations of Alexander’s nature correspond to the two standard interpretations of his life during the Middle Ages” (263). Similarly, Arizaleta, in La translation, suggests that “la description d’Alexandre dans le poème anonyme convient au portrait d’une monarchie dont les objectifs premiers ont été d’étendre ses territoires aux dépens de ses ennemis et de faire percevoir sa subordination à la puissance divine” (244). As can be seen, critics may disagree as to the extent to which (and how) Alexander is exemplary, but few disagree that he is exemplary. Uría Maqua, for example, argues that “[l]a ejemplaridad del Alexandre es de advertencia contra el peligro del pecado de soberbia […] Por lo tanto, el valor ejemplar es de signo negativo: el poema nos presenta una conducta que no hay que imitar” (“Contrapunto” 194). In this section, I look at his exemplarity through the lens of the construction of his maleness, one in relation to other models of masculinity. In Alexandre, Alexander must prove himself to the men around him.

“George Cary, in The Medieval Alexander, notes that
[b]efore the twelfth century, writers on Alexander followed uniformly the historical portrait of him as the conqueror. But the intense library and intellectual activity of the twelfth century produced two clearly defined learned conceptions of Alexander, the moral and the theological. The first was founded upon the anecdotal material derived from Cicero, Seneca and Valerius Maximus, and reflected the Peripatetic approach to Alexander. The second was based upon the application of the attack directed by Orosius against Alexander’s pride to his Biblical role, and culminated in his appearance as a type of the Devil. This development of two independent learned conceptions of Alexander was accompanied by the growth of a secular tradition, which, while it was generally faithful to the legendary sources, was not based on any definite textual foundations but upon universal, though variable, canons of secular morality (273; my emphasis)

“Additionally, see Arizaleta, “Écritures de clergie. De la charte à la littérature (Castille, XII–XIII siècles)” and “Modalidades de la escritura ficcional de la sacralidad monárquica (Castilla–León, siglo XIII)”
Judith Butler, in *Gender Trouble* asserts that “[t]he rules that govern intelligible identity, i.e., that enable and restrict the intelligible assertion of an ‘I,’ rules that are partially structured along matrices of gender hierarchy and compulsory heterosexuality, operate through repetition” (198; original emphasis). There are several anxious moments that precipitate Alexander’s coronation as king, his coming into adult manhood. These moments construct a masculine identity that will permeate the text and that is sanctioned by the text. The audience comes to understand that to have legitimate authority, Alexander must have a legitimate lineage, be loyal and use violence.

The rumors about Alexander’s paternity casts doubt on Alexander as the rightful male heir to Phillip’s throne. After rumors surface about Alexander’s paternity (sts. 19–20), Alexander experiences repeated moments of masculine anxiety. The rumors are a public performance as “tod’el pueblo pecava” (vv.19d) in talking about the rumors. They, in addition to causing anxiety, bring about Alexander’s first display of violent masculinity (to be discussed later). With respect to the rumor that Nectánabo, Alexander’s tutor, is in fact Alexander’s biological father, we see that Alexander is not able to conceal or bear the rumor: “el infant el roído // nol pudo encobrir / pesól de coraçón, // non lo pudo sofrir” (vv. 20a–20b). Referencing the rumor as “roído” speaks to both the rumor’s pervasiveness and publicness. Subsequently, we are here privy to Alexander’s mental

---

71 “Seis son las etapas de la vida: infancia, niñez, adolescencia, juventud, madurez y senectud. La primera edad es la infancia, desde el momento que el niño nace, hasta que cumple los siete años. La segunda es la niñez (pueritia), o etapa «pura» y aún no apta para la procreación; abarca hasta los catorce años. La tercera es la adolescencia, «adulta» ya para engendrar, dura hasta los veinticinco años. La cuarta es la juventud, que es la más firme de todas y llega hasta los cincuenta” (Etimologías XI.2.1–5, 40–41).

72 I characterize the construction of his anxiety in the following ways: inability to cope (20a, 30b), reference to his heart (20b, 29d), illness (24b), silence (23d), no sleep (28d), thinking (21c, 23a, 28a), color change (23b–c, 31a, 34a, 35), body (30a), lethargic (31b), thoughts of violence (30c–d), losing weight (31b, 34b), and a disheveled appearance (34c–d).

73 See Arizaleta’s discussion of Alexander’s paternity in *La translation*. I agree with her assertion that Phillip (and God) explicitly legitimize(s) Alexander and therefore the truth of the rumors of his actual paternity is not important. The rumors as rumors, however, are important.
responses to his anxiety. The rumor causes him angst. Though Alexander responds with violence, throwing his rumored father out of a tower to his death and, for him, eliminating the cause of his anxiety, the death of his rumored father does not, however, quell his angst, but rather causes him more anxiety. The rumor, “el roído,” has opened a Pandora’s box of anxiety. After killing Nectánabo, Alexander begins to ruminate on his situation: “fue asmando las cosas // del siglo com’ andavan, / entendió sus avuelos // cual cueïta passavan” (vv. 21c-21d). Alexander has destroyed a threat to his identity; however, as Stephen Greenblatt argues, in Renaissance Self–Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare, “when one authority or alien is destroyed, another takes its place” (9). Alexander’s anxiety seemingly will never go away.

In an effort to relieve his anxiety and legitimize himself even further, Alexander decides that he must leave his home, a self-imposed Fall, and restore Greece to its former glory by defeating his vassal lord, Darius, king of Babylon — thereby finding other resources to add to his “manhood account” and repressing his anxiety. Mark Breitenberg argues that “[p]atrilineal inheritance is the primary means by which families and ranks maintain their class endogamy” and that “[p]aternal legitimacy was a powerful component of masculine identity for both fathers and sons” (Breitenberg 110). Alexander is distressed that the Greeks are vassals to Darius (and had been so since his grandparents). Alexander’s anxiety is a particularly masculine anxiety. Physical symptoms accompany Alexander’s anxiety in stanzas 23 and 24:

\[\text{As Cañas argues, there is no clear resolution to the rumor. Arguably line 20d ("\text{"Fijo\text{"} — dixo su padre—, \text{"Dios te dexe bevir\text{"}}") is spoken by Nectánabo and if so, Nectánabo is Alexander’s father. (Cañas 140). Arizaleta argues that because the source of the Nectánabo was Historia de Proeliiis, wherein it is made evident that Nectánabo is the father of Alexander, Arizaleta calls Alexander a \"bâtard divin\")}

\[\text{Weiss notes that "coita" “connotes the shame of being leaderless, landless, afraid, without food or shelter, and — less obviously perhaps— the betrayal of destiny and contamination of bloodlines” (144); “coita is suffering shorn of desire. The greatest lack is the will to power” (145).}

\[\text{As Breitenberg argues, “[m]asculine identity in patrilineal cultures largely derives from the ‘resources’ men inherit, including his status, and what he is able to pass on to his children” (16).}

\[\text{Arguably this relationship causes Alexander economic anxiety as well. See Simone Pinet (“Political Economy of the Libro de Alexandre”): “the initial presentation of Alexander’s main enemy, Darius, is situated in the context of debt}
El infant Alexandre, cuando lo fue asmando,
cambiósle la color, fues todo demudando;
maguer que era blanco, negro se fue tornado;
las tres partes del día bien estido callando.

Comiés todos los labros con la gran follonía,
semejava enfermo de fiera maletía;
dizía: «¡Ay, mesquino! ¿quándo veré el día
que pueda restaurar esta sobrançanía? (sts. 23-24)

As Alexander ruminates (again the poet uses “asmando”), he changes from white to black, reflecting his melancholic state. Breitenberg argues that “melancholy enables and sustains masculine subjectivity” and that “the discourse of melancholy plays its part in the cultural construction of the … (male) subject by providing a mutable category against which masculinity may then (anxiously) define and defend itself” (39). Alexander, in this moment of melancholy, defines himself (or, at least, attempts to do so). Alexander, “enfermo de fiera maletía,” offers his first words in the text, demonstrating his disquiet with Greece’s lack of political sovereignty and expressing his desire to restore it (through a Crusade–like acquisition of land), albeit in a rhetorical question at first: “¿quándo veré el día / que pueda restaurar // esta sobrançanía?” (vv. 24c–24d). Alexander’s question is asked of himself and/or to the reader/listener. A thirteenth-century king

[...] This debt becomes the central motivation and the initial strength (and worth; valer means both) of Alexandre” (54).

* See Juliana Schiesari (*The Gendering of Melancholia: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*): Melancholy is “a way for men to talk about their exile, about their losses, and about their desire for a union that cannot be had but that points to some kind of truth” (112).

* See Ancos (*Transmisión*): “En los dos capítulos anteriores se ha visto que la poesía del mester de clerecía se concibió para ser leída en voz alta a un grupo de oyentes. En su composición, sin embargo, tuvieron una función esencial la lectura ocular e individual de fuentes y la escritura” (287)
would ask himself the same question. The question is part and parcel of the performative expression of Alexander’s anxiousness as well as the construction of his identity as a future king, a future king consumed with the idea of sovereignty. Though there is no subject pronoun “yo” in the subordinate clause, I argue that Alexander is referring to himself when he says “que [yo] pueda restaurar sobrançanía” (v. 24d). The question and the words that follow are Alexander’s attempt to exert himself and, in turn, his masculinity in the face of anxiety. Alexander, “de los catorze años aún los dos le menguaban,” and, still a prince, comments:

»Si el mi buen maestro non me lo devedar,
dexaré Europa e passaré la mar,
iré conquérir Asia e con Dario lidiar,
averm’a, como cuedo, la mano a besar.

»Sobre mí non querría tan grant honta ver
nin que con mi maestro me sopiesse perder,
ca serié fiera onta e grant mal parecer,
por el rey Alexandre omne obedecer.

»Alcides de la cuna, com solemos leer,
afogó las serpientes que lo querién comer;
e yo ya bien devía en algo parecer,
que por fij de Nectánabo non m’ayan a tener.” (sts. 25-27)

In his first words, Alexander reaffirms that: 1. He is Christian, 2. The importance of valor, 3. The importance of honor, 4. The importance of ambition, 5. That he is educated and 6. His legitimacy.
I say reaffirms here because the narrator has already created this image of Alexander before Alexander even speaks these words. In Alexander’s soliloquy, Alexander notes that if his “buen maestro” allows him, he will leave Europe and cross the sea in order to conquer Asia and fight with Darius. This ambition contrasts with Rodrigo’s ambition, to be discussed in the next chapter. Later Alexander notes that “nin que con mi maestro me sopiesse perder.” Here I interpret the “maestro” to whom Alexander refers to be God. Here we see, as Arizaleta argues, that Alexander recognizes that “le pouvoir, royal ou impérial, ne peut provenir que de Dieu” (236). Alexander also displays the importance of valor in his words. He says that he will leave Europe, cross the sea to conquer Asia and fight with Darius. Additionally, Alexander makes a comparison between himself and Hercules (“e yo ya bien devía en algo parecer”). He compares Hercules being attacked by serpents sent by Hera to the rumors about Alexander’s parentage. Alexander’s valor has been thoroughly repeated up to the point of Alexander’s words. Specifically, Alexander has been compared to a lion and Hercules: “El infant, maguer niño, // avié grant coraçón, / yazié en cuerpo chico // braveza de león” (vv. 14a-14b). A few lines later, the narrator notes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A cab de pocos años} & \quad \text{el infant fue criado}, \\
\text{nunca omne non vio} & \quad \text{niño tan arrabado}; \\
\text{ya cobdiçiava armas} & \quad \text{e conquérir regnado}, \\
\text{semejava a Hércules,} & \quad \text{¡tant’ era esforçado! (st. 15)}
\end{align*}
\]

Alexander also makes it clear that honor is important when he says: “Sobre mí non querría // tan grant honta veer” (v. 26a) and “ca serié fiera onta // e grant mal pareçer” (26c). Earlier it is said that “El infant Alexandre, // luego en su niñez/ enpeçó a mostar // que serié de grant prez” (vv.

---

* Simone Pinet (“Toward a Political Economy of the *Libro de Alexandre*) argues that prez (like *preçio*, *valor*, *honor*, *pagar(se)*, *dar crédito*) “underline not the moral and economic ambivalence of [these] terms, […] but also the incorporation of a monetary economy within its ambivalence” (45). Pinet reads the use of these terms as clerics consciously engaged with the economic world and argues that *Alexandre* “is marked by an economy manifest […] as
7a-7b). Additionally, Alexander makes it clear that ambition is both important and essential to his construction as king. He wants to conquer Asia and Darius. He wants to make Darius his vassal (as Darius has made vassals of the Greeks: “Eran los reys de Greçia, // fasta essa sazón, / vassallos tributaries // del rey de Babilón” (vv. 22a-22b)). We see Alexander’s ambition in an earlier mentioned line when it is said that Alexander, “a cab de poco años,” “ya cobdiçiava armas // e conquerir regnado” (15a; 15c). Alexander also references his learnedness in his reference to the story of Hercules. Alexander, in recounting the basic plot says “com solemos leer” (27). We learned earlier that Alexander had been taught to read at the age of seven: “El padre, de siet’años, // metiólo a leer” (16a). And finally, the crux of Alexander’s identity and frustration is his legitimacy as heir to the throne. Alexander unequivocally denies Nectánabo as his father, ending his soliloquy with: “que por fij de Nectánabo // non m’ayan a tener” (27d). We have already read/heard that Alexander has killed Nectánabo in response to this rumor. Additionally, Alcides/Hercules (Hercules), like Alexander, had questionable parentage. He was the son of Zeus and Alceme, wife of Amphitryon. Zeus took the form of Amphitryon while Amphitryon was away. In the first two lines, Alexander references the story of Heracles in which Hera puts two serpents in his crib. Heracles grabs the snakes and strangles them. Amphitryon learns that night that he is not Heracles’ father (Cañas 142). The connection to Hercules will return again on Alexander’s tent.

Returning to after his soliloquy, we again see an anxious Alexander, pensive (28a), unable to cope (30b), not sleeping (28d), changing colors (31a, 34a, 35), lethargic (31b), thoughts of a sort of anxiety […] facing the exchange system” (47). Pinet argues that “[t]he anxiety […] is provoked by the simultaneous presence of two exchange systems, a gift economy and a profit economy, with conflicting political and moral consequences” (47–48) Pinet argues that because the poet structures the text as one of economic exchange, the initial presentation of Darius is situated in the context of debt (54). She reads honor in monetary units.

81 See Ancos (Transmisión) for a discussion of the implications of the use of oír versus leer.
violence (30cd), losing weight (31b, 34b) and with a disheveled appearance (34c–d). After an eight-stanza description of Alexander’s state, Aristotle asks Alexander to explain what “lo [fizo] pesar” (v. 36b). Alexander spends 10 stanzas explaining his anxiety to Aristotle. He explains that though he is an exemplary student, his anxiety causes this knowledge to be worth nothing. His manhood account lacks sufficient funds so to speak. As Simone Pinet argues in “Toward a Political Economy of Libro de Alexandre,” young Alexander questions the usefulness of knowledge in facing the moral and tributary debt his people are subjected to” (54): “mas todo lo olvido, // ¡tant’he fiera rencura!” (v. 40d); “mas todo lo olvido, // ¡tanto he grant pesar!” (v. 41d); “mas por esto lo he // todo a olvidar.” (42d); “mas todo non lo preçio // quant’un dinero val.” (43d); “mas no m puede todo’esto // un punto confortar” (44d); “nos me podría çelar // quanto val’ un acento” (45d). He reveals in stanzas 46 and 47 that Darius is the cause of his anger and anxiety: “mas bivré con recura, // morré con repençia, / si de premia de Dario // non saco yo a Greçia” (vv. 46c–46d).

Alexander asks Aristotle if he believes that going against Porus and Darius is “cosa aguisada” (v. 47c). Here he again talks about himself as king: “Non seriá pora rey // vida tan aontada” (v. 47a), affirming his lineage and manhood and tying his valor and his value. Alexander feels the need to prove himself in physical combat, on the battlefield, a male–dominated space. He believes this to be of more value, for as he says of his knowledge “non lo preçio // quant’un dinero val” “si de premia de Dario // non saco yo a Greçia” (vv. 43d; 46d). Battles will add to his manhood account.

Aristotle’s response is a microcosmic speculum principis. As Arizaleta notes, here “[o]n trouve … un «miroir de princes» … où Aristote prend la parole pour achever l’éducation du héros enfant” (240). In this bit of homosocial translatio, Aristotle makes “d’un home un roi” (La

---

“Apollonius will also question the usefulness of knowledge.

" See Pinet’s “Toward a Political Economy of the ‘Libro de Alexandre’.” Page 54 – 55: Pinet argues that Aristotle “sets out the possibility of a linguistic counterfeiting of something’s worth in order to obtain a conquest through the credit given to Alexander’s words as true and just appraisal” (55)
This microcosmic *speculum principis* connects *translatio studii* and *translatio imperii*, the transfer of power. The men in power needed to know how to rule.

I agree with Arizaleta when she argues that Alexander suffers because Darius has stolen power owed to Alexander (240). She argues that Aristotle’s speculative scholarship establishes the conditions by which Alexander will be judged as a good king. Interestingly, Pinet argues that one of the good qualities that Aristotle pushes for in a king is the ability to “counterfeit”:

This counterfeiting, or speculative use of information to falsify or diminish an opponent’s worth, which produces pleasure in Alexander’s men, results, one later witnesses, in the ‘esforçamiento de los corazones’—the strengthening of hearts—that is, in greater courage in battle that is inversely proportional to the devaluation of his enemy (55).

Alexander, with his words, has the ability to relieve masculine anxiety in others. As Pinet argues, “[t]he *Libro de Alexandre* works in fact as a ten–thousand–verse narration of the speculative success of the conqueror” (55):

El niño man’a mano tolióse la capiella,
posól cerca ’l maestro, a los pies de la siella,
dava grandes sospiros, ca tenié grant manziella,
parecióes la rencura del cier en la maxiella. (st. 50)

Alexander, at the foot of his tutor, receives the information that will make him into an exemplarily male king and hero. This text, *Alexandre*, is also “information that will make [its thirteenth-century reader] into an exemplary male king and hero.” Aristotle affirms Alexander’s value as a man: “si aquesto non fazes, // non valdrás un dinero” (v. 58d), “omne bueno” / “Fijo eres de rey, // tú has

---

“Though I do not discuss it in this dissertation, the transfer of power from king Phillip to Alexander mirrors the transfer of knowledge from Aristotle to Alexander. Both affirm Alexander’s legitimacy as male heir.”
grant clerezía” (v. 51c, v. 52a). Aristotle teaches Alexander how to be a leader of men°. As Ian Michael notes, “[t]he poet’s first attempt to define the virtues of a king can be deduced from Aristotle’s advice to Alexander in childhood” (1970, 31). Michael outlines Aristotle’s advice for being the perfect king:

1. Keep your affairs from base men (Alex 55 […]).
2. Judge well (Alex, 59ab […]).
3. Lead your men bravely (Alex, 65–79 […]).
4. Divide the booty fairly (Alex, 82 […]).
5. Avoid avarice, be generous (Alex, 62–64 […]).
6. Beware of the wiles of women (Alex, 53d–54 […]).
7. Shun strong drink (Alex, 58a […]).
8. Disregard flattery (Alex, 58c […]).
9. Treat your vassals well (Alex, 60 […]).
10. Fame° should be your aim (Alex, 70–71 […]). (31)

Aristotle affirms that both brains and brawn will be necessary for success: “en muchas grandes cueitas // te avrás a veer, / el seso e ’l esfuerço, // te avrá menester” (v. 65c–65d) and that Alexander should and will defeat Darius and Porus:

»Cambiar’ ha la ventura e mudaredes fado,

ganaredes el campo, Dario será rancado;

saldrá Grécia de premia, tu fincarás honrado,

° Importance of loyalty (st. 53, 57); Against ira regia (st. 60); Anti-women (st. 53, 54, 67); Importance of “prez”/premia/reward/legacy (st. 70, 71, 72)

° “La portée du thème de la Fama dans l’Alexandre est l’un des points les plus controversés dans l’analyse de cette œuvre. Alors que María Rosa Lida a défendu l’idée selon laquelle l’exaltation de la valeur de la Renommée constitue l’un des sens fondamentaux du poème, Ian Michael a refusé cette explication, à partir de l’analyse de la dernière partie de l’œuvre” (Arizaleta La translation 117)
Aristotle’s last words mimic Alexander’s first words, reinforcing Francomano’s notion of homosocial *translatio*: “Cambiars’ ha la ventura // e mudaredes fado” (v.85a)/ “Si el mi buen maestro // non me lo devedar” (v. 25a); “ganaredes el campo, // Dario será rancado” (v. 85b)/ “con Dario lidiar, /averm’a [...] la mano besar” (vv. 25c–25d); “saldrá Greçia de premia” (v. 85c)/ “restaurar esta sobrançía” (24d); “tu fincarás honrado/ e será el tu preçio // fasta la fin contado” (vv. 85c–85d)/”ca serie fiera onta // e grant mal pareçer, / por el rey Alexandre // omne obedecer” (vv. 26c–26d). The poet describes Alexander’s change in the young king’s disposition, seemingly relieved of his anxiety:

El infant fue alegre, tovos por consejado,
non olvidó un punto de quantol fue mandado,
perdió el mal taliento e tornó tan pagado
como si ya oviese tod’esto acabado (st. 86)

The poet notes that Alexander is happy, that he has lost his “mal taliento” and turned “tan pagado” as if all that had been spoken of was finished. The economic imagery (also present in Aristotle’s last words to Alexander) speaks to the value of Alexander’s “manhood account.” Jesús Cañas notes that in addition to meaning “voluntad” and “ganas,” “taliento” is also a “clase de moneda” (661). Additionally, “pagado” speaks to the what Pinet refers to as the “multiple linguistic registers that give away an economic meaning” (54). Alexander then starts to think about all of the possessions that he will gain after his conquest, what he will add to his “manhood account”:

Ya contava por suya torre de Babilón,
India e Egipto, la tierra de Sión,
África e Marruecos, quantos regnos y son,
The poet here references Babylon. Babylon (and Alexander’s possession of it) will play an important role in the course of the story. I agree with critics that argue for the importance of Babylon not just in the course of the story, but also in Alexander’s formation as king. Emily C. Francomano, in “The Senses of Empire and the Scents of Babylon in the *Libro de Alexandre*,” argues that Babylon is the *axis mundi*, “the axis upon which the *Alexandre*, along with Alexander’s ambitions, conquest, and eventual fall turns” (189). As Francomano argues, what we see in these lines above is Alexander’s desire to possess Babylon. Babylon, commonly read in *Alexandre* as “the place where the tower of Babel was built and destroyed” (Francomano “Senses of Empire,” 196), is significant in the Christian faith. I would argue that the conquest of Babylon, though not of the same level of import, mirrors the attempted conquests of Jerusalem in the Fourth (1202–1204) and Fifth Crusades (1213–1221). Babylon, like Jerusalem for the Crusaders of the thirteenth century, would be “the brightest jewel in Alexander’s crown” (Michael, *Treatment* 262). Subsequent to the Aristotle’s *speculum principis*, Alexander goes out on his first voyage, but not before the author spends *thirty–four* stanzas describing Alexander, his armor, his men and his horse. This is all part and parcel of displaying and affirming Alexander’s bellicose identity, one also tied to the value of these things and formed in male-dominated spaces. As Weiss argues, “[r]eal monarchical power, the poet seems to be saying at this point, comes from the prince’s military identity, his strength, and his warrior’s ability to kill” (Weiss 114).

### 3.3.1: THE PRINCE’S/KING’S BODY: UN “CUERPO TAN ACABADO”

| El rëy Alexandre, cuerpo tan acabado,  | mas eres enañrado; |
|   vas receber grant gloria,            |       |
|   tal era tu ventura e el tu prinçipado |       |
|   como la flor del lirio que se cae privado. |   |

*Libro de Alexandre* st. 2530
In this dissertation, I take the approach that the masculine body as represented in literature is a culturally constructed entity that is coded by the discourse of the hero tales. In that same vein, as Judith Butler argues, in *Gender Trouble*, “‘persons’ only become intelligible through becoming gendered in conformity with recognizable standards of gender intelligibility” (*Gender Trouble* 22) and that gender is not something that said person *is*, it is something said person *does*, an act, or rather, a sequence of acts. For Butler, it is “the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural being.” (*Gender Trouble* 45) Throughout Alexandre, Alexander does his gender in male–dominated spaces. Arguably, the *doing* (or the desire to *do*) of his gender is his impetus. There are many scenes that affirm Alexander’s maleness; however, I will discuss only three: his knighting, the description given of him to Darius and the tent that Alexander has constructed for himself. I believe these scenes are sufficient for a comprehensive accounting of Alexander’s maleness.

3.3.1.1: KNIGHTING

In the microcosmic *speculum principis*, Aristotle urges Alexander to *do* his gender:

[…]

*a buena edat sodes llegado*

de ser omne bueno,  *tú lo as aguisado,*

*si levarlo quisieredes*  *com lo as compeçado.* (vv. 51b–51d)

As we remember, an anxious Alexander has gone to talk to his tutor, Aristotle and expressed his frustration with Greece’s current situation, as vassals indebted to Darius, king of Babylon. Aristotle’s advice is filled with commands: “faz con tus vassalos,” “fabla con tus vassalos,” “te guarda mucho d’amar mugeres,” “va arriendo,” “no metas,” “echart,’ “non mostrar,” “nin seas.”
Subsequently, in “janero,” Alexander is knighted, a ceremonial doing of the male gender: “el infant venturado, // de don Mars compañero, / quiso çeñir espada // por seer cavallero” (vv. 89c–89). There are two things of note in the poet’s words: 1.) the quasi–epithet, “de don Mars compañero” and 2.) the action verb in the last line of the stanza. It is not happenstance that here the young prince is described as a friend of don Mars, the God of War in classical mythology. It is interesting to note that while Ares is Mars’ Greek counterpart, the stories of their parentages differ. While Ares is the son of Zeus (Jupiter) and Hera (Juno), Mars is the son of Juno (Hera) alone. Secondly, the last line of the stanza says that Alexander wanted (and did) gird his sword in order to become a knight. Similarly, the Cid “en buena ora [ciñó] espada.” What follows is an accounting of the value of Alexander’s newly donned maleness:

Allí fueron aduchos adobos de grant guisa:

bien valié tres mill marcos o demás la camisa,
el brial non serié bien comprado por Pisa,
non sé al manto dar preçio por nulla guisa. (st. 90)

This stanza is only the beginning of a thirty–four stanza description of Alexander, his armor, his men and his horse, Bucephalus, all wrought with economic imagery: vv. 91c–d, st. 92, v. 94a, vv.95a–b, v. 99d, v.100d, vv. 103c–d, and sts. 118. As Pinet has argued, the impetus for Alexander is the debt that Alexander owes to Darius. I do not believe that this debt is strictly monetary. I would argue that there is a connection between one’s financial accounts and manhood account. These stanzas where the poet speaks to the impressive value of Alexander’s clothing not only speak to Alexander’s prosperity in spite of his “indebtedness” to the king of Babylon, but also to his maleness at such a young age. Though the “cueïta” suffered by his grandparents causes him anxiety, it does not appear to have caused any financial burden as “[q]ualquier de los çapatos //
valió una cibdat” (v. 92a). The poet goes on to talk about the incomparable value of Alexander’s gloves, his sword (made by don Vulcán), his spurs, his shield, his shirts, his brial and his horse’s adornments. There are repeated references to how this dressing of his gender is viewed and its impact. Take for example stanza 101:

Fizo la otra fada terçera el brial;
quando lo ovo fecho, dióle muy grant señal;
quisiquier que lo vistesse fuesse siempre leal,
frío nin calentura nuncal fiziesse mal.

Alexander’s attire inspires loyalty. In other moments his attire rejuvenates (“tod’ omne quel vistiesse // non serié tan cansado” (v. 102c)), takes away fear (“Demás qui lo toviesse // perdrié toda pavor” (v. 103a)), and makes men happy (“siempre ’starié alegre, // en todo su sabor” (v. 103b)). All of this is to construct Alexander’s maleness. The Alexandre poet places his Alexander in the same category as Charlemagne, referencing the illustrious leader when the poet recounts the territories that Alexander “ya contava por suya”: “quanto que Carlos ovo // bien do el se pon” (v. 88d). These are big shoes to fill; however, the poet establishes the young prince Alexander as capable to fill them. With respect to Alexander’s conflict with Darius, the poet integrates this into one of the material displays of Alexander’s manhood during his knighting, his shield:

La obra del escudo vos sabré bien contar:
y era debuxada la tierra e la mar,
los regnos e las villas, las aguas de prestar,
cascuno con sus títulos por mejor devisar.

En medio de la tavla estaba un león
It comes as no surprise that Alexander’s shield is decorated with a lion. He has, and will be, constantly compared to a lion throughout the text. As Arizaleta argues, the shield is “une figura d’Alexandre ou, pour être plus précis, une figura de l’œuvre entière” (La translation 128). The images represented on the shield represent Alexander’s future conquests, things he will add to his manhood account. The lion, with all of Babylon in his paw, looking treacherously at Darius, is Alexander.

That notwithstanding, the lion is not the only important animal described in these stanzas. A knight is nothing without a horse. Alexander hears of Bucephalus, a “cavallo tan fiero” and decries:

Nol prendrá omne si yo non lo prisiero,
creo que será manso luego que yo l’oviero,
perdrá toda bravez quando en él subiero. (vv. 115b-115d)

Alexander tames Bucephalus. This is reminiscent of the Cid’s taming of the lion in PMC. What is important about this scene is not just that Alexander is able to tame the “untamable,” but that it happens in public. As the poet notes, when Bucephalus kneels, bows his head and lowers his eyes, “catáronse los omnes todos ojos a ojos” and “todos dizién: «Aqueste será emperador.»” (v. 117d; my emphasis). This is the beginning of the constitution of Alexander’s identity. This community directive is a repetition of what the poet has been pushing since the start of the text — that, like Charlemagne before him, Alexander deserves to be (and will become) emperor. The poet

---

*I will discuss this more when I discuss the squire’s description of Alexander to Darius.*
additionally cements that Alexander will be a Christian emperor. After taming Bucephalus and adorning him with similarly exemplary ornamentation, the poet tells us that “El infante con gozo // nol quiso calvagar / ante que fues’ armado // e besas’ el altar” (vv. 119a–b). In the next stanza, the poet repeats that Alexander, though he is ready to take up arms, “antes quiso a Dios // una oración fer” (v. 120c).

3.3.1.2: THE SQUIRE’S DESCRIPTION

Alexander is physically exemplary and, as I’ve previously stated, from the onset he is often compared to a lion: “El infante, maguer niño, // avié grant coraçón, / yazíé en cuerpo chico // braveza de león;” (vv. 14a–14b). One important description of Alexander is the one given to Darius. This happens in a male-dominated space. In stanza 148, after having received a letter from Alexander explaining that Alexander will no longer pay tribute to Darius (st. 143), Darius “[d]emandó del infant // qué fechuras avía, de qué sintido era // o qué mañas trayá” (vv.148a–148b). A squire provides a four-stanza description:

Non es grant caballero,     mas ha buenas fechuras,
los miembros ha bien fechos,    fieras las conjunturas,
los braços ha muy luengos,    las presas muy duras,
non vi a cavallero    tales cambas yo nuncas.

El un ojo un ha verde     e el otro vermejo,
semeja osso viejo     quando echa el çejo,
a un muy gran tablero     en el su pestorejo,

“Michael, in Treatment, uses the comparisons to a lion to discuss how the poet emphasizes Alexander’s courage. See v. 28b, v. 29, sts. 96–98, v. 151a and v. 1005c (47).
com fortigas majadas  atal es su pellejo.

Atales ha los pelos  como faz un león;
la voz como tronido,  quexoso ‘l coraçon;
sabe de clerezía  quantas artes y son,
de franquez e d’ esfuerço  más que otro varón.

Quando entra en fazienda  assí es adonado
que quien a él s’ allega  luego es delivrado;
e qui es una vez  de su mano colpado,
  sil pesa o sil plaze,  luego es aquedado (st. 149–152)

In addition to the description of Alexander’s lion hair, the squire also describes Alexander’s well–known green and red eyes and warrior body. Here we also see that his physical features, at least according to the squire, are incomparable to any man he has seen before: “non vi a cavallero // tales cambas yo nuncas.”; “sabe de clerezía quantas artes y son, / de franquez e d’ esfuerço // más que otro varón.” The squire does, however, find recourse in nature to describe Alexander’s exemplary physicality, noting that: “[Alexander] semeja osso viejo // quando echa el çejo” (v.

“Ian Michael – liberalism of his kingship: “In the exordium, the protagonist is described as ‘franc e ardit e de grant sabençia’ (6b; not in P). In his youth, ‘esforçio e franqueza fue luego decogiendo’ (12b)” (60) See pp. 60 - 63

“Alexander’s body is not just exemplary. He also knows how to use it, as can been seen in the last lines of the final stanza: “e qui es una vez  de su mano colpado, / sil pesa o sil plaze,  luego es aquedado” (152c – 152d). As the squire so rightfully said, Alexander “sabe […] d’ esfuerço  más que otro varón” (v. 151c – 151d). Specifically, there are two fights that display this — both are battles with “Philistines.” Aristómenes, referenced as the “filisteo” in spite of his Indian heritage (1350a), is characterizes as a big and strong man – like a giant. This brings to mind the story of David and Goliath – Goliath being a giant Philistine warrior defeated by the young David, future king of Israel (1 Samuel 17). Cañas notes that “[c]on ello la hazaña del protagonista [...] queda notablemente acrecentada” (373). Alexander, like the future Biblical King David does to Goliath, removes Aristómenes’ head: “cortóle la cabeza ant que fues levantado” (vv. 1355d). Some stanzas later, Alexander battles another “Philistine,” “fijo de padre negro e de una giganta”. Alexander defeats him and “fue todo fecho pieças,  en las lanças alçado” (vv. 1372c)
The beginning of Alexander’s physical development is significantly quite a few stanzas earlier. Alexander’s first campaign is against Nicolao, “un rey estrevudo, / que mandava grant regno” (vv. 129a–129b). When Alexander arrives, the “estrevudo” king asks Alexander who he is and Alexander responds:

… Yo so llamado por nombre Alexandre,

Philipo, rey de Greçia, aquel es el mi padre,

Olimpias, la reína, sepas que es mi madre

quien a mí con mal viene, de mí con mal se parte.

Andamos por las tierras los corpos delectando,

por yermos e poblados aventuras buscando,

a los unos parciendo, a los otros robando;

qui a nos trebejo busca, nos va dello gabando. (sts. 132-133)

As Alexander explains, he and his men are basically looking for a fight, to which Nicolao responds that Alexander is crazy. They agree to meet another day and fight, a fight in which Alexander displays not only his strength, but his skill:

el infant fue artero, sópolo bien estar,

ayudól su ventura e óvol’ a matar (vv. 140c-140d)

The reader, therefore, knows that when the squire provides this description of Alexander to Darius, that it is an accurate description. Alexander’s defeat of Nicolao is a notch in his belt, so to speak, that allows him the courage to respond as he does to Darius’ demand for a tribute — that when
Phillip had no son, the hen always laid golden eggs, but now that he has a son (Alexander), that hen has died.

The squire’s description notwithstanding, Darius has a portrait done of Alexander “por veer de quál cuerpo ixié // tal travessura” (v. 153b). However, Darius “fue muy quexoso // quando sopo la natura, / mas sosos’ encobrir // com’ omne de cordura” (vv. 153c-153d). Darius does not reveal this information, the truth of the squire’s description, to his men. Ironically, Aristotle has advised Alexander against this type of behavior in his *speculum principis*:

> Siempre faz con consejo quanto que fer hovieres,

> fabla con tus vassallos quanto fazer quisieres,

> sérante más leales si así lo fizieres; (vv. 53a-53d).

This decision to hide information, similarly, will prove detrimental to Rodrigo in *Estoria*. Darius subsequently sends letters to Alexander with threats and advice not to seek battle against him. Alexander dismisses Darius’ threats. The poet says “Non preçió Alexandre // todo esto un dinero” (v. 158a). After, Alexander continues to *perform* his gender, defending his father’s kingdom against Armenia. Phillip’s kingdom is in peril and Phillip is unsure of what to do. Alexander says that God is on their side (“sól que Dios de occasion // a mí solo defienda” (v. 162c). He goes to Armenia and makes a name for himself on the battlefield: “que a los nietos oy // se alçan los cabellos” (v. 166d). The result is that even the grandchildren yet to be born will hide their heads from Alexander. After this battle, Alexander is described as having “su barva much’ honrada” (vv. 168b). Some 147 stanzas earlier, after his first kill, the hairs of his beard were just appearing: “en

---

“13. Denominamos a los *puberes* así derivado el vocablo de *pubes*, es decir, de las partes pudendas del cuerpo, que entonces comienzan a cubrirse de vello” (41)
la barva los pelos // estonce l’assomavan” (vv. 21b), and now he has his beard “much’ honrada.”

He is coming into his manhood. As Cañas notes:

En la Edad Media la barba era considerada símbolo de la virilidad, representación ‘plástica’
de las cualidades positivas de un hombre en su faceta de guerrero […] Barba y honra están
íntimamente relacionadas. […] Los héroes épicos gustan de cuidar su barba con esmero,
de dejarla crecer, de jactarse de que nadie ha osado nunca poner su mano sobre ella”/ tirón
de barba símbolo de deshonor (165)

3.3.1.3: THE TENT DESCRIPTION

At the end of Alexandre, after Alexander’s flight into the air and after entering Babylon in
triumph for the last time, the poet inserts a description of Alexander’s tent (sts. 2538–2395).«

Though there is debate as to the author’s intention for placing the description of the tent where he
placed it, I agree with Ian Michael’s assertion that:

There is a strong functional reason for the location of this description at the point where all
Alexander’s conquests, including the sea and the air, are over, for it both firmly establishes
the grandeur of his worldly achievement and heightens the effect of the collapse of that
achievement in the poisoning scene that immediately follows (Treatment 267)

Similarly, for Cacho Blecua, in “La tienda,” the tent episode “sirve de cierre y, a la vez, de síntesis
y colofón glorificador de las hazañas heroicas” (113). I would argue that Alexander’s tent served
a similar purpose as his knightly garments. The tent, like his knightly garments, is extravagantly

---

« The description of the tent is based on the Roman d’Alexandre. There is debate as to whether or not it was the poet’s
original intent to place the description at this point. Others have argued that the description was originally intended to
be placed after Alexander’s marriage to Roxana. For more, see Willis (Debt 46); Michael (Treatment 266); Cacho

« The description of the tent follows the same economic terminology as the description of Alexander’s garments: “El
paño de la tienda // era rico sobejo, // era de seda fina, // de un xamit vermejo” (vv. 2541a-2541b).
decorated: “qualsequiere de todas // valié un grant tesoro” (vv. 2544b). As Arizaleta has argued, Alexander’s shield is a figura for Alexander and the text as a whole. I would argue that, similarly, the tent serves this purpose“. It is, in my reading, the embodiment of Alexander’s Christian masculinity, a Christian masculinity mixed with pagan iconography that permeates the text. The tent depicts a plethora of exemplary (both negatively and positively exemplary) male figures (and their hazañas): Lucifer, Adam, Noah, Hercules, Paris, Achilles and Alexander himself.

There are various opinions as to the function of the tent. I am apt to agree with Michael. The placement of the text, right before Alexander is poisoned, and those individuals referenced in the tent speak to the didactic purpose of the tent and the text. It is to show, as Uría Maqua has argued, that Alexander is the example of what not to do. All of the men, to a greater and lesser extent, have been referenced in the poem up to the point of their being placed in the tent. As I have argued, Hercules has been used as an example of manhood that rivals and mirrors Alexander’s. The story that is told in the tent reflects Alexander’s first words in the poem:

Niñuelo era Hércules, assaz poco moçuelo,
adur abrió los ojos, yazié en el breçuelo,
ettendiól la madrastra que serí fuert niñuelo,
querrí fer a la madre veer del fijo duelo.

Enbïava dos sierpres queriéno afogar,
perçibiól las el niño que lo querién matar,
ovo con sendas manos a ellas allegar,

“ As J. Guerrero Lovillo says, for “el caballero, la tienda tenía una significación casi análoga a la de sus armas. No podía deprenderse ni de una ni de otras” (qtd. in Cacho Blecua 113)
The tent is a summary account and testimony to Alexander’s manhood. It reminds the reader of the metaphors used to describe Alexander as well as Alexander’s heroic deeds. The description of Hercules’ life is not that dissimilar to what was told of Alexander’s life:

Desent iva criando, sintiése muy valiente,
vençió muchas batallas, conquirié mucha gente,
quitava a Anteon muy aviltadamente,
plantava sus mojones luego en occidente. (st. 2570)

What is noted above as an important facet of masculinity is the ability to expand territorially. This is an important aspect to consider when thinking about anxious masculinity. The amassing of territory through conquest not only speaks to a man’s virility, but it also serves as a resource that said man can pass on to his offspring — though Alexander does not have offspring. As Cacho Blecua argues, “[l]a superficie de la tienda equivale a [la] grandeza [de Alexandre] como conquistador” (132). Interestingly, Alexander’s reactions to the depiction of the mapa mundi in the tent, reveal that Alexander’s anxiety continues. When looking at the map, Alexander does not just take account of the territories that he has conquered, but he also takes note of those he has not. He is not content: “non se le podié tierra // alçar nin encobrir / que él non la supiesse // buscar e combatir” (vv. 2587c-2587d). The reader knows that this desire will bring about Alexander’s downfall. That notwithstanding, the tent, arguably something to be passed on, will continue to be a display of Alexander’s lineage and manhood. The tent, like the text, can serve as speculum principis.

From the onset of the text, we are told that lineage is important with respect to the construction of Alexander’s identity. Weiss tells us that “[l]ineage, then, which was increasingly
being exploited as an ideological tool by European monarchies and noble families, lends some of the authority to exercise power; but Alexander’s killing of his alleged father Nectanabo reveals lineage to be something that is not self-evident.” (115). Alexander, in his infancy, “nunca quiso mamar // lech de muger rafez, / si non fues de linage //o gran gentilez” (vv. 7c–7d). Alexander refused to drink milk from a lowborn woman.” Alexander’s own lineage appears some six stanzas later, following the augural pronouncement of ‘[I]os unos con los otros”:

Los unos con los otros fablavan entre dientes:

«Este niño conquerrá las indíanas gentes.»

Phelipo e Olimpias, que eran sus parientes,
avián grant alegría, metién en todo mientes. (st. 13)

In stanza thirteen, we learn that Alexander’s parents are Phillip and Olympias and that they are aware of Alexander’s foretold greatness. Here we also see the power dynamics of the patriarchal system. In the first speech act of the text, after a lengthy description of the miracles that accompany Alexander’s birth, it is rumored (“entre dientes”) that he will conquer, undoubtedly by military force, “las indíanas gentes.” This brings Alexander’s parents great happiness. His violent masculine identity is already being affirmed at the “constraint of others.” As the author tells us, before the story starts, Alexander is “de grant esfuerço” (vv. 5b) and “conquiso tod’el mundo, // metiólo so su mano” (vv. 5c). The foretellings of his bellicose masculinity are just and by the story’s end, they are reflected in the tent.

Alexander makes this situation analogous to the rumors that had been circulating that Nectánabo was Alexander’s father, validating his use of violence:

“See Michael (Treatment 64–65): “There is supporting historical evidence in thirteenth-century Spain for the noble weaning of kings’ sons: in his infancy San Fernando was suckled by his own mother, Doña Berengela, who would not allow wet-nurses to perform the task.”
His anxiousness begins with his first words and comes full circle by the end. As we can recall, Alexander is, after three days, able to articulate his feelings. The rumors about his parentage have called into question his right to the throne. Interestingly, his “father,” Phillip, also had a tumultuous rise to the throne. That being said, for Weiss, “[k]illing the father, whether real or reputed, is about identifying and establishing a relationship with the source of royal power: arms or letters” (Weiss 114). As Weiss argues, “[the] expanding feudal monarchies developed bureaucracies, offices, and legal systems as instruments to enforce their sovereignty and provide the ideological legitimacy for their centralizing aspirations” (114). I would argue that violence was another instrument for their centralizing aspirations. Further, I agree with Weiss when he argues that “[this] passage introduces the idea of knowledge as an instrument of power […] in order to maintain a hierarchical distinction between the monarch and the clerical apparatus that supported and empowered him. Real monarchical power, the poet seems to be saying at this point, comes from the prince’s military identity, his strength, and his warrior’s ability to kill” (114). This is reflected in the construction of the tent. As Feather and Thomas argue, the defense of the privilege of masculinity is predicated on the ability to “engage in violent action.” Alexander secures his identity as both a man and a future king. This is seen in stanza 27, when Alexander again disavows Nectánabo as his father and compares himself to Heracles/Hercules (Weiss 114). As Amaia Arizaleta notes, “Alexandre fonctionne en effet « comme l’icône d’une utilitas discrétionnaire gratia Dei que les princes de

---

* See Cañas 137–138.
l’époque auront volontiers pris comme exemple à imiter, puisque le pouvoir royal incarné par le Macédonien s’annonce comme synonyme de réussite »” (2007, 11) That is to say, Alexander’s masculine violence is to be imitated. This is reflected in the tent.

As Breitenberg argues, anxiety is “a restless, agitated, never–consummated search for something that may not exist, a state in which certainty is always suspended” (Breitenberg 4); it is a desire “‘to maintain its rights on a reality which it will yet not recognize as its own offspring or construction’” (Paul Smith qtd. in Breitenberg 4). Anxiety is the result of projecting one’s own mental constructions onto the world or onto another person and them mistaking them as objectively true (Breitenberg 4). Alexander questions his legitimacy and thereby his masculine identity. He, therefore, has sought to prove himself by conquering the world. Legitimacy is an important facet of masculinity. The rumors caused Alexander anxiety and he must prove he is worthy. He must prove his manhood through violence and domination of the known and unknown world. He goes out on a self–imposed exile to prove and display his manhood and to substantiate that he is the king’s legitimate son. He does all of this in male-dominated spaces. While on this peregrinatio vitae, there is another attack on his legitimacy. Alexander responds again with violence and so begins his trek to self–fashioning as king – as Pausona’s murder of Alexander’s father cements Alexander’s identity and coronation.

Like the Cid, in the PMC, Alexander performs his gender in male–dominated spaces. His identity is predicated on his relationships with men. Alexandre provides many scenes that affirm Alexander’s maleness as vested in his body. Through this, the audience learns that a good king can and does legitimate his authority through his body, decorating it, using it for violent purposes, what he puts in it, etc. His body is an extension of his authority. Given Isidore of Seville’s
definition of man (\textit{vir}), it comes as no surprise that the text naturalizes the relationship between a man’s body, force and power.

3.3.2: TREACHERY: THE KING’S TWO BODIES

Leyó en Daniël en una profecía, que tonarié un griego Asia en monarchia; plaziól’ a Alexandre, ovo gran alegria, dixo: “Yo sé esse, por la cabeça mía.”

\textit{Libro de Alexandre} st. 1145

Geraldine Coates, in \textit{Treacherous Foundations}, discusses the role of treachery, specifically “the role of individual treacherous acts in relation to the theme of political growth and decline as represented in foundation myths of Iberia” (2). She looks at the rise and fall of civilizations in 13\textsuperscript{th}, late 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century literature. Coates choses these centuries because they “saw decisive movements toward the development of absolutism, nationhood, and the state” (3). By studying treachery in this context, Coates discovers “its constructive role in the formation of collective identities” (2). Though Coates discusses the treacherous act as “a moment of collective crisis, a violent and perverse rejection of trust, which collapses the foundations of a given group,” (2) I think treacherous acts in \textit{Alexandre} are moments of crisis for Alexander’s identity. Treachery, as iterated in \textit{Alexandre}, is a particularly masculine anxiety.

While Alexander is away, Pausona has decided to kill the king and take Olympias for his wife and disinherit Alexander:

\begin{itemize}
\item Asmó que si pudiesse a Phelipo matar,
\item casarié con Olimpias a todo su pesar;
\item avríalo tod’el regno por señor a catar,
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{97} Coates admits that “collective identities” is a broad term and through her studies hopes to “demonstrate how it is variously inflected by gender, religion, class, and geographical affiliations” (37)
The author refers to Pausona as “el falso” and compares him to “Santanás.” Pausona is a pretender, a usurper to the throne. Alexander summarily defeats Pausona, “a guisa de varón” (vv. 183a), securing his legitimacy even further. Pausona’s sin and crime were not just killing Alexander’s father, but also attempting to marry (and possibly impregnate) Alexander’s mother and delegitimize Alexander. Catharine R. Stimpson, in “Shakespeare and the soil of Rape,” argues that “[b]ecause men rape what other men possess, rape becomes in part a disastrous element of male rivalry” (58). We can think of rape here as both Olympias’ avoidance of being seized as property by Pausona and also the possible (and probable) forced sexual intercourse. Phillip dies and Alexander becomes king, but not before Phillip legitimizes him in a bit of homosocial *translatio*, mirroring Alexandre’s conversation with Aristotle:

Dióle Dios man a mano ya quànta mejoría,
recobró la palavra con grant alegría,
dixol: «Yo, fijo, mucho còbdicié este día,
desaquí que yo muera una nuez non daría.

»Fierament vos ondrastes, en grant preçio soviestes,
quand Nicólao mataste, Armenia conquisiseste;
mas todas las bondades agora las cunpliesestes
quando a nos acá a acorrer viniestes.

»Guarlardón d’est servicio el Criador vos lo rienda;
fijo, Él vos reçiba en la su encomienda,
Él vos sea pagado, e guie vuestra fazienda;
de mano de traidores, fijo, Él vos defienda.

»Fijo, yo vos bendigo, ¡sí faga el Criador!
Él vos dé sobre Dario victoria e onor,
Él vos faga del mundo seer emperador,
en tanto me despido, vom’ a la cort mayor.» (sts. 190-194)

Phillip’s words honor Alexander. Phillip tells Alexander that he has been waiting his life for the day when he is able to pass on the kingdom to him. Additionally, he recounts that Alexander has already proven himself worthy in his eyes and in the eyes of God. Phillip’s last words mirror the last words spoken by the “father” when Alexander killed Nectánabo: “Long live the king!”

In his first pronouncement as king, Alexander reveals that his obsession is with leaving behind a legacy. Breitenberg, in thinking about masculinity, notes that “desire is coterminous with masculine subjectivity; it ‘inhabits’ subjectivity and in so doing, enables [and] motivates” (126). In the construction of Alexander’s legacy, Darius becomes the object of Alexander’s obsession/desire. As Breitenberg contends, the fundamental quality of masculine desire is “the perpetual deferral of satisfaction, the construction of new desired objects to maintain the subject in pursuit, the terror that desire should come to rest in consummation” (126). And because “the object of masculine desire must be published for it to accrue honor and value for its owner” (126), Darius is the topic of Alexander’s first speech as king. Given this, it is should come as no surprise that Darius later is included in Alexander’s tent. The tent is, after all, as Cacho Blecua contends, “un microcosmos del libro” (119). I agree with Cacho Blecua when he argues that Darius’ place
(along with Heracles’ place) in the tent is to draw attention to their death (and Alexander’s death) by “engaño.” (132).

Alexander’s obsession with leaving behind a legacy, a legacy constructed on the battlefield, in male-dominated spaces, resulted in the “perpetual deferral of satisfaction,” and the “construction of new desired objects.” As Ivy A. Corfis contends, in “Libro de Alexandre: Fantastic Didacticism, with each successful endeavor, Alexander is never satisfied and with “his exploration of the skies and the depths of the sea, his growing pride and cobdicia (not avarice but a general lack of restraint, a desire for forbidden things); and the tragedy of his death” (477). Pride arose out of the presumed natural relationship between masculinity and power and Alexander’s pride “[revealed] the fissures and contradictions of patriarchal systems and, at the same time, it … [enabled] and [drove] the patriarchy’s reproduction and continuation of itself” (2).

3.4: SOLOMONIC APOLLONIUS*

And the queen of Saba having heard of the fame of Solomon in the name of the Lord, came to try him with hard questions. And entering into Jerusalem with a great train, and riches, and camels that carried spices, and an immense quantity of gold, and precious stones, she came to king Solomon, and spoke to him all that she had in her heart. And Solomon informed her of all the things she proposed to him: there was not any word the king was ignorant of, and which he could not answer her.

1 Kings 10: 1 – 3

*There is little debate as to whether or not that the author of Apolonio Christianized the urtext, Historia Apoloni Regis Tyrrii (HART). See Marina Scordilis Brownlee (“Writing and Scripture in the Libro de Apolonio: The Conflation of Hagiography and Romance”) and Patricia E. Grieve (“Building Christian Narrative: The Rhetoric of Knowledge, Revelation, and Interpretation in Libro de Apolonio,”). Grieve argues against the view of a “secular text that has been imperfectly tinkered with” and rather suggests “that the work’s episodes serve as examples of the strategies for building books of Christian narrative […] , by addressing the kinds of issues that were of central debate during the early centuries of Christianity” (149). Additionally, Isabel Uría Maqua, in “El Libro de Apolonio, contrapunto del Libro de Alexandre,” concludes that “el poeta castellano, clérigo de la primera mitad del siglo XIII, implica este candente problema [la desconfianza en el método aristotélico para explicar los textos sagrados] en su recreación cristiana y moralizante del Apolonio” (209).
In this section, I hope to focus on both the medievalization and Christianization of the text and title character, Apollonius as contrasted to Alexander’s in *Alexandre*. Important to my discussion is Gaunt’s argument that “the masculine individual in romance is necessarily alienated. The feminine is the agent of his self–discovery, but also potentially the cause of his alienation” (Gaunt 109). Apollonius’s fall and redemption come at the hands of the feminine. The feminine, arguably, is both the “cause of his alienation” and “the agent of his self–discovery.”

Marina Scordilis Brownlee, in “Writing and Scripture in the *Libro de Apolonio*: The Conflation of Hagiography and Romance,” argues that investigations of *Apolonio* have been principally limited to

- aspects of linguistic function as part of the *mester de clerecía* corpus—in an attempt to define the semantic field of *clerecía* and the poetry to which it gave rise; and … its literary ‘reception’—the so called ‘process of medievalization’ whereby the subject matter of Greco–Roman antiquity was ‘adjusted’ to suit the cultural (i.e. religio–political) myths and realities of a thirteenth century Spanish audience (159–160).

There has been much written about the Christianization of the “buen rey” Apollonius in *Apolonio*. Matthew V. Desing argues that

[w]hile scholars are in general agreement that [*Apolonio*] is one of the most Christianized versions of the legend, there is no consensus about whether the Christian elements are merely a thin veneer imposed on a pagan tale or if the anonymous Castilian poet is carrying out a more complex Christian project in his reworking of the narrative (“‘De pan y de tresoro’: Sacrament in the *Libro de Apolonio* 93).

Brownlee, however, does not believe the Christian elements to be “merely a thin veneer imposed on a pagan tale.” For Brownlee, the *Apolonio* poet makes a conscious effort to remake Apollonius
into a Christian Everyman. She argues that the “change in identity” from the foreign traveler in the Latin text (*HART*) to the Christian pilgrim in the Castilian text happens in two ways: 1.) “the narrator is careful to link systematically Apolonio’s travels and obstacles (and those of man in general) to Divine guidance at numerous junctures in the work” (171) and 2.) “through his addresses to the audience and the resulting establishment of an extra-textual Christian community” (172), concluding that the poem is presented “in the manner of a saint’s life” (172). Similarly, Ronald Surtz, in “The *Libro de Apolonio* and Medieval Hagiography,” suggests that Apollonius’ story follows a pattern in many ways reminiscent of a saint’s life though in the end, Surtz argues, “the […] result is a model of secular piety” (341). Surtz, in “El héroe intelectual en el mester de clerecía” asserts that Apolonio is an erudite hero, placing the protagonist’s development in the context of thirteenth-century Cluniac and Cistercian monastic reform. For Surtz, “[e]s significativo que Apolonio aparezca por primera vez en el poema … realizando una tarea intelectual” (265). Patricia E. Grieve, however, goes further than Surtz, asserting that *Apolonio* is “not merely an intensification of Christian features but inherently an examination of issues of debate in early Christianity” (165 fn 3). Grieve, in “Building Christian Narrative: The Rhetoric of Knowledge, Revelation, and Interpretation in the *Libro de Apolonio*” titles Apollonius an “intellectual hero–king,” (150) whose function is to display the “centrality of revelation, and man’s role as God’s creation, intelligent yet needing spiritual guidance in order to become aware that

---

“Brownlee argues that “[t]he use of all three possible designations for a Christian pilgrim [as *peregrine*, *romero*, or *palmero*] in the *LA* to refer to Apolonio, then, transforms Apolonio from the status of a foreign traveller (his function in the Latin text) to that of a generalized Christian pilgrim who, while is not specifically *en route* to any of the three holy cities, implicitly (metaphorically) represents all those who are” (“Writing and Scripture” 170)

See similarities with Saint Eustace.

See Surtz (“El héroe intelectual” 270–271) and Vicente Cantarino (*Entre monjes y musulmantes. El conflicto que fue España*).

Surtz also notes that in the Latin source text, Apollonius is able to solve the riddle with God’s help whereas in *Apolonio* “el poeta castellano explícitamente atribuye la solución acertijo *sólo* a la sabiduría de su protagonista” (265; my emphasis). See also Brownlee (“Writing and Scripture in the *Libro de Apolonio*: The Conflation of Hagiography and Romance” 164–165) and Isabel Uría Maqua (“El *Libro de Apolonio*, contrapunto del *Libro de Alexandre* 196).
intelligence—knowledge—alone is insufficient in this life” (152). Desing, in reading Apolonio “as an allegory for participation in the Church’s sacraments as a means of turning from mundane to holy knowledge” (“De pan y de tresoro” 94), seems to return to Brownlee’s approach, seeing “sufficient evidence to be able to read a pagan king as a Christian Everyman” (117).

Additionally, there has been much written about the medievalization of the king and text. For Alan Deyermond, this text is *speculum principis* and reflects a “continuing medieval interest in the nature of monarchy” (“¿Rei otro sobre mí?” 13). It shows “the survival and success of a king who recognizes that there may be more than one kind of kingship, or the defeat of a king who is incapable of recognizing it” (“¿Rei otro sobre mí?” 13). Rosa María Lida, in *La idea de la fama en la Edad Media Castellana*, notes that the courtly gallantry that is present in *Apolonio* and absent in *HART* “confirma la conexión del Apolonio con el mundo profano y caballeresco” (164). Amaia Arizaleta, in “Modalidades de la escritura ficcional de la sacralidad monárquica,” focuses on the clerical authors of *Apolonio*, looking at Apollonius as a political apparatus, a “sinful monarch, that is ultimately redeemed.” Arizaleta sees Apollonius as a representation of the clericalization of royal power, that is to say “el reconocimiento de la autoridad de los clérigos en la definición y el ejercicio del oficio monárquico” and that “[s]ería … postular que el autor del *Libro de Apolonio* hubiera completado y corregido la representación del rey, para la instrucción de unos cortesanos laicos, y de unos eclesiásticos familiares del palacio, conocedores de la figura de un rey de victoria, necesitados del ejemplo de un monarca paciente y sufrido” (“Modalidades”). Weiss goes further, arguing that Apollonius’ courtliness, “which defines his identity

---

(individualizes him) as king, husband, and father, is deeply embedded in a web of social and economic relations” (200).

In my examination of the constitution of Apollonius as the “buen rey … de cortesia,” I hope to make space for the confluence of form and content in my approximation of the text’s genre. Specifically, the Fall serves as the structural framework that underlies the order and manner in which the narrative is presented to the reader and/or listener.

Uría Maqua in “El Libro de Apolonio, contrapunto del Libro de Alexandre,” argues that Apollonius over the course of the text converts to Christianity: “[e]sta evolución no se produce de una manera gradual y continua, sino que hay momentos en la vida del héroe que son fundamentales en el proceso de su conversión y su perfeccionamiento, moral y humano” (195). I use Uría Maqua’s argument as a starting point, but expand on her observations to argue that in these moments there is also anxiety present as it relates the construction of Apollonius’ masculinity in relation to the feminine. I will discuss: 1. The incest riddle, 2. The shipwreck and 3. Luciana’s perceived death, and 4. Apollonius’ reunion with Tarsiana. All of these moments are part and parcel of the construction of Apollonius’ identity as a man and king within the confines of thirteenth–century intelligibility and as a result of thirteenth–century anxieties.

3.4.1: INCEST RIDDLE

The late classical story of Apollonius of Tyre, which begins with the brutal rape of a princess by her father, elicited from several medieval writers the comment that just as one can find fold or jewel in a dungheap, according to proverbial wisdom, so such shocking story can have moral value for the Christian reader. But even without the Christian moralizing angle, the incest theme still could have considerable appeal, for […] ‘incest is like many other incorrect things a very poetical circumstance’ Elizabeth Archibald, Incest and the Medieval Imagination 7–8

The incest riddle, and incest’s continued presence in the text, is part of a historical construction of gender predicated on the role of women as objects for exchange. The riddle “makes
the role of the exchange of women in the formation of masculine hierarchies within feudal society a central theme” (Gaunt 74) and also highlights the beginning of the marginalization of the epic’s monologic construction of masculinity. Apollonius’ experience here also “interpellates” the reader as a subject of the text’s ideology, an ideology that upholds hegemonic masculinity through the hero’s relationship with the feminine. As the narrator tells us in the first and second stanzas, this is “hun romance de nueva maestría” about how Apollonius lost his daughter and wife and got them back “ca les fue muy leal” (v.2d).

The shadow of incest hangs over the story of Apolonio until the end. As Elizabeth Archibald notes, “[a]lmost every male authority figure in the narrative has a daughter …; indeed, father–daughter relations are a crucial indictor of moral character in both domestic and political spheres” (Incest 94). A similar construction of father–daughter relationships is not surprising in the Castilian author’s reworking of the Latin text, as the romance “consciously makes the role of the exchange of women in the formation of masculine hierarchies within feudal society a central theme.” (Gaunt 74) Apolonio, as a romance, “offers a … model of masculine identity, constructed in relation to the feminine” (Gaunt 74).

As Grieve argues, one of the central themes of Apolonio is social organization based on consensual marriage (157). In the twelfth century, the Church began its attempt to control the adjudication of marriage and to move away from a feudal idea of marriage. The three key features of the ‘feudal’ model of marriage were: “endogamy (allowing marriage within a kin–group), repudiation at will on the part of men, and family control of the choice of marriage partner. The key features of the Church’s model were: strict exogamy (forbidding the marriage of people who

---

**“Pope Alexander III’s decree of 1163 on the validity of marriage based on mutual consent of the partners altered ‘the bio–politics of lineage’ and displaced the ‘marriage decision away from those invested with the maintenance of genealogy […] which meant that the family could no longer constitute itself with the same minimal economy […] as a line” (Bloch, *Etymologies*, 162 – 165) (Grieve)**
were related, often to a high degree”), indissolubility, and the need for consent of both partners for the marriage to be valid” (Gaunt 74). Gaunt argues that “[i]n foregrounding the importance of consent on the part of both partners in marriage … the Church promoted the interest of the male individual against that of the group and raised the spectre of women’s choice” (75). In the literature beginning in the twelfth century, what is seen is “[a] society structured around feudal clans … displaced by a monarchy which acts as a cohesive symbol for a society of self-governing individuals” (84). Apolonio, whose production dates to 1250, at the end of the reign of Fernando III (r. 1217 – 1252), is that monarch that displaces Alexandre, whose production dates, at its earliest, during the reign of Alfonso VIII (r. 1158 – 1214); and at its latest, to the beginning of Fernando III’s reign. As Uría Maqua argues

es indudable que nuestro poeta conocía muy bien el Alexandre […] Por otra parte, si el anónimo poeta del Apolonio se hizo eco de los problemas que planteaba el método escolástico en el estudio de las letras sagradas, al presentarnos al rey de Tiro como un «clérigo entendido», como un estudioso «de letras profundado», confiado en sus saberes, tenía que evocar … el caso del Emperador macedonio, que, en el poema castellano, es castigado por Dios, a causa de su soberbia intelectual (209). Apollonius begins his story arguably “castigado por Dios a causa de su soberbia intellectual.” Apollonius is a learned unmarried king and decides to marry the daughter of a neighboring kingdom, Antioch. Though Apollonius has never met her, he loves her (“quería casar con ella, que mucho la amaua”). Apollonius, a “buen rey” possessing “cortesía,” is immediately placed in contrast to the king of Antioch. Antioch, like Apollonius, is defined with respect to women. The

---

106 For more on medieval incest laws see Elizabeth Archibald (Incest and the Medieval Imagination 9–52). For a discussion of incest between fathers and daughters also see Archibald (Incest 145–191).

107 See also Uría Maqua (“La soberbia de Alejandro en el poema castellano y sus implicaciones ideológicas”)
readers find out that Antioch is a widower with a beautiful unmarried daughter: “muriósele la muger con qui casado era, / dexóle huna fija genta de grant manera” (v. 4a–4b). Antioch is bequeathed, so to speak, a means by which he may enhance his resources, and in turn, his manhood. The author recounts that many suitors have come seeking the daughter’s hand in marriage; however, none “pudo en ella ninguno abenir” (v. 5b). We learn, however, that Antioch is sinfully in love with his daughter and rapes her:

El pecado, que nunca en paz suele seyer,
tanto pudo el malo boluer τ rebuter
que fiço ha Antiocho en ella entender,
tanto que se queria por su amor perder.

Bien ssé que tanto fue ell enemigo en el rey encarnado
que non auìa el poder de veyer el pecado;
mantenia mala vyda era de Dios ayrado,
ca non le façia servücio don’ fuese su pagado.

Por fincar con su fija, escusar casamiento,
que pudiesse con ella complir su mal taliento,
ouo ha ssosacar hun mal ssocamiento:
mostrórgelo el Diablo, vn bestión mascoriento. (sts. 6; 13–14)

The absence of a woman (more specifically, his wife) has caused Antioch angst. Though the response will be different, a similar anxiety arises when Apollonius believes that both his wife and

As Breitenberg says, “[m]asculine identity in patrilineal cultures largely derives from the ‘resources’ men inherit, including his status, and what he is able to pass on to his children” (16).
daughter have died. Here, however, we see that Antioch’s response is to engage in a sinful relationship with his own daughter. Antioch, to an arguable extent, seems to represent the old feudal system — a system in which endogamy is permitted (though obviously not to the extent of allowing the marriage of a father and daughter). As previously mentioned, the father–daughter motif is prevalent throughout the text. That being said, there is another important aspect to the “marriage”/relationship between father and daughter — consent. Antioch’s daughter does not willingly consent to this relationship with her father:

«Ama, dixo la duenya, jamás por mal pecado
non deue de mí padre seyer clamado.

Por llamarme él fija téngolo por pesado:
es el nombre derechero en amos enfogado

Mas quando ál non puedo desque só violada,
predré vuestro conseio, la mi nodriçia ondrada,
mas bien ueo que fuy de Dios desemparada,
a derechas m’en tengo de vos aconseiada» (sts. 11–12)

Apollonius, at this point unmarried, decides to ask for Antioch’s daughter’s hand in marriage (not knowing of the incestuous relationship between both). The riddle seems made especially for him, “[c]omo era Apolonio de letras profundado, /por soluer argumentos era bien dotrinado” (vv. 22a–22b). Here we see an irony which as Guant argues is

"Gayle Rubin has argued convincingly that the incest taboo produces certain kinds of discrete gendered identities and sexualities" (Butler 524). See Gayle Rubin, “The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ‘Political Economy’ of Sex”)

"The majority of medieval and traditional riddles about family relationships seem to suggest incest, but in reality point to acceptable blood and marital ties […] Incest riddles invert the logic of ‘innocent’ family riddles by affirming the incestuous relationship implied rather than denying it” (Francomano 2007, 7); Incest taboo “articulates the obligatory heterosexuality of patriarchal culture” (8)
“endemic in courtly culture” (93). This irony “represents the questioning of one construction of masculinity from the viewpoint of a different masculine subject position, the inscription of competing masculine discourses” (Gaunt 94). The interaction between Apollonius and Antioch model the two differing constructions of masculinity (the age difference not to be seen as fortuitous) – one model, that of the “buen rey … de cortesía,” is exemplary within the text (though not necessarily sanctioned at its start in Antioch’s court) and the other, representative of an old world, is not.

The audience of Apolonio would be aware of the Church’s policy regarding exogamous relationships. Ferdinand III was the result of an “incestuous” relationship. Leonor of Castile, in order to relieve the tension between Castile and León offered the idea that her daughter with Alfonso VIII, Berenguela, would marry Alfonso IX of León. In 1198, because Berenguela and Alfonso IX were too closely related, Pope Innocent III excommunicated them and imposed an interdict on León. The couple did not dissolve their marriage until 1204, after Ferdinand III was born.

The public court scene is a public performance and is important in the construction of Apollonius’ masculine identity. As in any romance, Apollonius must prove his worthiness to his future bride. Apollonius’ public failure is the anxious spur to the story. It is the impetus to his Fall. Like the text itself, Apollonius’ construction/representation will have as its audience “cortesanos laicos, … conocedores de la figura de un rey de victoria, necesitados de un monarca paciente y sufrido” (Arizaleta, “Modalidades”). As Butler’s asserts, performativity does not happen in a vacuum: “gender performances … are governed by … clearly punitive and regulatory social conventions” (527). Apollonius enters the court, addresses the king, addresses the court and

---

"See also Judith Halberstam’s Female Masculinity."
makes his demand for the princess’s hand. The narrator intrudes into the text noting that Apollonius is judged as young and naive: “todos ouieron duelo de la su juuentut. / Diçían que no se supo guardar de mal englut, / por mala de nigromançia perdió buena salut” (vv. 20b – 20d). That notwithstanding, as Apollonius speaks, the entire court listens (“toda la corte escuchaua”), similar to the Cid’s entrance into court, adding to the performative nature of the scene. Interestingly, though both men are “received” publicly by the members of the court and the king, the respect and admiration allotted to the respective men varies greatly. This respect is given to those who have displayed a penchant for violence – at least in Antioch’s “virtuous” court. For the Cid, the members of the court stand and the king goes so far as to offer the Cid his chair: “Venid acá ser, Campeador, / en aquesta escaño que m’diestes vos es don” (vv.3314 – 3115). Note that an epithet is used here that reflects the Cid’s exemplary use of violence. Though the reception is different, both scenes act as male–dominated public spaces in which the main characters gender performance is sanctioned and/or condemned by a king.

Apollonius, “de letras profundado,” unsurprisingly, figures out that the answer to the riddle is that the king is having an incestuous relationship with his daughter. Apollonius realizes the predicament in which has found himself. Apollonius “entendió la fallença τ el suçio pecado / como si lo ouiese por su ojo prouado” (vv. 22c–22d). Apollonius is anxious:

Auìa grant repintencıa porque era hí uenido,
entendió bien que era en fallença caydo,
mas, por tal que no fuese por baüieca tenido,
dio a la pregunta buen responso complido. (st. 23)

As Uría Maqua argues, “el joven príncipe se siente muy seguro de sí mismo, a causa de sus saberes, que él considera infalibles. … Confía tanto en sus saberes que no duda un momento en salir
triumfador de la prueba” (195–196). Apollonius proudly and confidently offers the correct answer to the riddle incriminating and at the same time reprimanding the king. Apollonius says:

… «Non deues, rey, tal cosa demanar,
que a todos aduze uergüenza e pesar:
esto si la uerdad non quisieres negar,
entre tu e tu fija de sse deue terminar.

Tú eres la rayz, tu fija el çimal;
tú pereces por ella, por pecado moral,
ca la fija ereda la depda carnal,
la qual tú τ su madre auiedes cominal» (sts. 24 – 25)

The king’s response, however, is to act as if he has been falsely accused (“aguisóle, en cabo, como fuese mal porfaçado” (26d)). He says that what Apollonius has said is false and that Apollonius has failed: “dixol’ Apollonius quel’ dixera falsedat, que no lo querrìa fer por nenguna eredat” (27c-d). In spite of this, “todos asmauan que dixerà verdat” (27d). Apollonius is to be sentenced to death, but he is given a 30–day stay of execution. Antioch responds with violence. He displays that he is more powerful that Apollonius. Antioch believes Apollonius’ response to be an affront to his manhood.

Distraught, Apollonius flees back to Tyre: “triste τ desmarrido pensó de naueyar, / fasta que fue en Tiro él non sse dio bagar” (29c–29d). Here we can see the physical manifestation of Apollonius’ anxiety. Like Alexander, Apollonius decides to be reclusive. He is welcomed home to great fanfare, but instead shuts himself in and ruminates:

Encérrase Apolonio en sus cámaras priuadas,
The system in which Apollonius found himself at Antioch’s court is a system that values force over logic or reason. Antioch feigns the use of logic; however, the only viable response to his riddle is violence. The answer itself is also violence against his own daughter. Apollonius, like Alexander, realizes that knowledge and his books are not enough. Unlike Alexander, however, he does not respond with violence, but like Alexander he realizes that “le falta experiencia, [que] no ha vivido aventuras” (Corbella 84 fn33a):

Pero mucho tenía que era mal fallido,

En non ganar la duenya τ ssallir tan escarnido;

quanto más comidia qué l’auía conteçido,

Tanto más se tenía por peyor confondido. (st. 33)

Apollonius continues to think about what his failure means. He was unable to secure a bride and also left ridiculed and the more he thinks about the situation (in an effort to understand it), the more confused he becomes. This anxiety brings about his self-fashioning:

---

112 See king Antioch’s conversation with Taliarco (sts. 38–40).
113 I am not the first to argue for the importance of this event as the catalyst for the story’s development. Brownlee says that Apollonius’ decision “to flee his homeland, mortified by the incest and fearful of Antíoco’s vengeance, initiates a series of harrowing adventures on land and sea” (“Hagiography and Romance” 165). Uría
Dixo que non podia la vergüenza durar,
Mas quería yr perdírse o la uentura mudar;
de pan τ de tresoro mandó mucho cargar,
metióse en auenturas por las ondas del mar. (st. 34)

As Uría Maqua argues, Apollonius’ anxiety is a conscious adage by the Castilian poet as stanza 34 was not present in HART (197). Apollonius is no longer able to bear the shame and leaves: “metióse en auenturas por las ondas del mar.” Remember that as Weiss notes, “the sea stands for the generalized and unpredictable disruption of social relations” (208). This first experience with the sea will eventually strip him of his identity, arguably, so that he may be reborn as a new man.

Apollonius’ interaction with Antioch puts him squarely in front of a male-dominated court that judges his kingship. Ostensibly, he fails. His understanding of kingship is not sufficient to be recognized and valued in front of this court. He falls. He needs to go out and have experience with the world. I also view this as Apollonius not being sufficiently Christian. We see that Alexander’s obsession with conquering all puts him at odds with God. As Uría Maqua has argued, presenting Apollonius as a “clérigo entendido,” confident in his own knowledge evokes Alexander, “castigado por Dios, a causa de su soberbia intelectual” (209). I see that Apollonius’ reliance solely on his own knowledge, as gained from books, is not enough. He needs to go on a journey that will both make him into an exemplary man as well as Christian man. As Brownlee has noted, the author of Apolonio adapts the foreign traveler present in HART to a Christian pilgrim by linking “Apolonio’s travels and obstacles … to Divine guidance” (171).

Maqua argues that “el sentimiento de humillación, la «onta», y la vergüenza por haber fracasado en sus planes de casarse con la princesa fue lo que empujó al rey de Tiro a salir de su país” (197). Desing argues that Apollonius’ uncovering of the riddle “set in motion the story of Apolonio’s fall and redemption” (2012, 97).

“for Uría Maqua,” “[e]s un primer paso hacia la conversión, hacia el verdadero cambio interior que se producirá con el naufragio, del que Apolonio saldrá un hombre nuevo” (197).
3.4.2: THE SHIPWRECK

Critics acknowledge the importance of Apollonius’ being shipwrecked in the construction of his identity, though differ in their interpretation of it. I see it as part of Apollonius’ Christian conversion. Uría Maqua sees the scene as crucial in Apollonius’ conversion to a perfect Christian (“Contrapunto” 198). Desing interprets the scene as a baptism, noting that all of “[t]he basic elements of baptism are present in the scene: submersion in water, prayer, stating the initiate’s name, clothing the initiate, and welcoming him into a new life” (“‘De pan y de tresoro’” 101). Brownlee makes an interesting observation about Apollonius’ reaction to being shipwrecked:

His reaction to this particular disaster … is of particular interest, for rather than blaming his bad luck on the machinations and iniquities of Fortune, he blames himself,—specifically, his pecados (165)

Apollonius is stripped of all of the previous things that defined him: his men and his clothing and is reshaped. He is given new clothes. This contrasts greatly with Alexander’s knightling.

Apollonius, after having left his home in Tyre, takes refuge in Tarsus; however, similar to the Cid in Burgos, he is asked to leave because king Antioch has become aware that Tarsus is protecting him. Similar to the nine–year–old girl in Burgos in PMC, the author of Apolonio has a member of the community convey this information to the protagonist. Elányco, “el cano,” says to Apollonius:

«Ay, rey Apolonio, digno de grant valor,
Si el tu mal supieses deuíés auer dolor!

Del rey Antioco eres desfiado,
in en çiudat ni en burgo non serás albergado,
He again takes to the sea, suffers a shipwreck, and arrives “desnudo τ lazrado” to the shores of Pentapolis. Clothing is an important part of man’s identity and the poet makes references to Apollonius’ lack of clothes: “mezquino de vestir τ calçar” (112c), “meguado de vestido” as well as his physical weak state: “lazrado” (112c), “todo desconortado” (113b), “mal traydo” (113d) before Apollonius’ soliloquy in which he expresses his anxiety, repeating the lack of clothes and physical depravity:

«¡Mesquino, dijo, que por mal fuy nascido!

Dexé muy buen reyno do biuía onrrado,

fuy buscar contienda, casamiento famado;

gané enamiztad, sallí dende aontado,

et torné sin la dueña, de muere enamiztado.

…

Mouióme el pecado, fízom’ ende sallir,

por fer de mí escarnio, su maleza cumplir;

diome en el mar salto, por más me desmentir,

ovo muchas ayudas por a mí destrouir. (sts. 114d–115; 118)

Here we see the importance of honor in the construction of Apollonius’ identity. Apollonius notes that he left a good kingdom where he lived “onrrado.” He notes that he left his kingdom in search of a “casamiento famado.” In pursuit of fame, Apollonius left dishonored. The inclusion of this aspect of Apollonius’ character is important for as Lida notes in La idea de fama, “[n]i una palabra
acerca de honra o de escarnio en el soliloquio correspondiente de la [HART]” (161). These are changes made the Castilian poet. Lida uses this as evidence of the text’s “ambiente cortesano y caballeresco” (161)\. From the onset, Apollonius is defined by his relationship with women: “cómmo perdió la fija τ la muger capdal, / cómmo las cobró amas.” The honor of one’s wife and daughter is part and parcel of a man’s resources. A woman’s chastity “functioned to secure and preserve actual economic interests (patrilineal inheritance and avoidance of bastardy), but […] also functioned symbolically as a more generalized guarantee of social order and cohesion” (Breitenberg 24). Therefore, the paradox of masculine identity predicated on female chastity caused a sizeable amount of anxiety. Apollonius hoped to achieve fame and honor in his marriage to what he believed to be a beautiful and virtuous woman; however, he leaves dishonored. Apollonius returns to this when he explains his situation to the fisherman in an extended interaction\\:\n
\begin{quote}
Fuy a Antiocha casamiento buscar;

non recabé la duenya, óueme de tornar.

Si con esso fincase quito en mio logar,

non auríe de mí fecho tal escarnio la mar. (st. 126)
\end{quote}

Apollonius repeats the poet’s description of himself: “pobre só τ mesquino” (123b), “desnudo τ lazdrado” (124a), “tal pobre qual tú veyes, abez só escapado.” (129d). Uría Maqua argues that Apollonius’ soliloquy reflects his newfound humility, a humility which he did not have when he went to seek Antioch’s daughter’s hand (199).\footnote{See Artiles (El “Libro de Apolonio”, poema español del siglo XIII 47–52) for more discussion of Apollonius as a “cortesano” (204).} That being said, I would argue that Apollonius’

\footnote{This is important as well. Not present in HART. See Desing.}

\footnote{It comes as no surprise that Uría Maqua, arguing that Apollonius’ develops into a Christian Everyman, draws connections between the biblical story of Job and Apollonius.}
continued anxiety about his possessions shows that he is not as humble as Uría Maqua would have
us believe. Apollonius’ recounts:

averes que traya, tesoros tan granados,
palafrés τ mulas, cauallos tran preciados,
todo lo he perdido por mis malos pecados (vv. 130b–130d)

However, taking into consideration Uría Maqua’s argument, these material possessions that
Apollonius has lost reflect an inappropriate version of masculinity. For, as Uría Maqua argues, the
shipwreck symbolizes “el despojo y desasimiento de los viejos hábitos, como un acto necesario y
previo a la conversión en el nuevo hombre” (199–200; my emphasis). This nuevo hombre will be
redressed. His identity here will not necessarily be tied to precious material possessions (very
unlike Alexander’s knighting ceremony):

Fendió su vestido luego con su espada,
dio al rey el medio τ leuólo a su posada;
diol’ qual cena pudo, non le ascondió nada,
aüia meior cenada en alguna vegada. (st. 139).

Though Uría Maqua reads the shipwreck as a test (similar to Job) and not as punishment, I would
have to agree with Surtz when he says:

el naufragio de Apolonio se interpreta en el poema castellano como un castigo por haber
salido en busca de aventuras, ya que la soberbia le había hecho fiarse demasiado en su
habilidad para solucionar el enigma del rey Antíoco (“El héroe intelectual” 271)

Though Uría Maqua refers to Job in her assertion that Apollonius is being tested, I would not argue
that Job was in any way proud, to the same extent that Uría Maqua admits of Apollonius (“el joven
príncipe se siente muy seguro de sí mismo (195), and deserving of punishment. Though Apollonius like Job accepts his punishment, Apollonius was far more deserving. That being said, what I do accept is her interpretation of the fisherman’s words: only after suffering setbacks does one become a man. That is to say, “las desgracias y los infortunios son buenos para el hombre, pues lo hacen maduro y experimentado, maestro de la vida” (202). As Blye Frank says,

Most males can be seen to undergo a process of transforming various meanings and messages to produce a constellation of behavior, which we can call hegemonic heterosexual masculinity. Men become the embodiment of that socially created classification. They externalize this masculinity through their speech, their dress, their physical appearance and presence, and their relations with others (166)

Though Uría Maqua sees this scene as a validation of “la experiencia de la vida,” I see it as part and parcel of constructing Apollonius as the exemplary Christian king, as the embodiment of hegemonic heterosexual masculinity. Anxiety and hegemony go hand in hand. As Julian Weiss notes, hegemony is

a lived process of domination which operates in a state of continuous flux, of renewal and modification and which is actively formed through its engagement with emerging and oppositional or alternative values and meanings (14).

---

118 Though Uría Maqua admits that Apollonius is very much sure of himself and his knowledge and admits that this brings about his conversion, Uría Maqua argues that because Apollonius quickly recognizes his error, what the anonymous poet offers to the reader is a humble king and not a proud king. (196–197). That being said, I would argue that Apollonius is humbled by his failure and not himself (at this point) humble. Even after he is further humbled by the storm, he never forgets that he is a king and that with his kingship, certain protocols are required.

“Desing seems (to some extent) to agree with Uría Maqua and reads Apollonius as the “blameless sinner […] expelled from paradise” (“De pan y tresoro” 98). For Desing, Apollonius “is tainted by the knowledge of the text’s original sin, albeit without any specific culpability on his part, and as a result is expelled from the allegorical Garden of Eden, his kingdom of Tyre” (“De pan y tresoro” 97). For Desing, the sea, “as a representation of the Church provides a space for the sinner Apolonio to encounter the sacraments as a means of progressing in knowledge and attaining salvation” (“De pan y tresoro” 98). That being said, “blameless” or not, a sinner is punished.
It is not coincidence that the fisherman explicitly tells Apollonius how he should proceed in being a man of the world. This *speculum principis* is reminiscent of Aristotle’s conversation with Alexander during his moment of anxiety:

El estado deste mundo siempre así andido,
   cada día se cambia, nunca quedo estido;
   en toller τ en dar es todo su sentido,
   vestir al despoiado τ despoiar al vestido
   ...

El que poder ouo de pobre te tornar,
   puédete, si quisiere, de pobreza sacar;
   non te querrían las fadas, rey, desmanparar,
   puedes en poca d’ora todo tu bien cobrar. (st. 143; st. 137)

After receiving lodging and food from the fisherman, Apollonius accompanies him to city walls where Apollonius (“posósse con vergüenza fuera a la carrera” (143d)) joins several noblemen in a ballgame where he demonstrates that despite his attire, he belongs to the social ranking of the men. Like the public court scene previously, this public display of athleticism is important in the construction of Apollonius’ masculinity. The poet notes that Apollonius “era en el depuerto sabidor τ liuiana: / entendríé quien se quiere que non era villano” (vv. 146c–146d). The author continues to comment on the other men’s reactions to Apollonius: “vio en la rota, que espessa andaua, / que toda la meioría el pobre la leuaua” (vv. 148c–148d); “toda su cosa leuaua con buen tiento;/semeiól’ omne bueno, de buen entendimiento;” (vv. 149b–149c); “El capdiello de Tiro, con

---

120 Metióse Apolonio, maguer mal adobado, con ellos al trebeio, su manto afiblado; abinié en el juego, fazié tan aguisado como si fuese de pequenyo hí criado. (st. 145)
Architrastres rewards this display of masculinity by inviting Apollonius to dine with him. However, Apollonius has anxiety before going to Architrastres’ court:

Apolonio de miedo de la corte enojar,
que non tenié vestido ni abodo de prestar,
non quiso de vergüenza al palacio entrar:
tornóse de la puerta, comenzó de llorar. (st. 154)

Though Uría Maqua argues that Apollonius has become a new man, I believe that Apollonius’ manhood continues to be tied up in his clothes and kingly decorum, that to some extent, Apollonius tries to construct his identity in male–dominated spaces, in spaces that value clothes and the kingly decorum present in Alexandre. The Apollonius entering Architrastres’ court is not the same self–assured Apollonius that entered Antioch’s court some 137 stanzas earlier. The arrival of Luciana, Archistrastes’ daughter to the court changes Apollonius’ focus. Luciana is charged with getting to know Apollonius and to her inquiry, Apollonius responds:

«Amiga cara, búscame grant pesar,
el nombre que hauía, perdílo en la mar,
el mio linaje en Tiro te lo sabrién contar» (vv. 172b–172d)

He, “de sospiros cargado,” then proceeds to recount what has happened to him up to that point.

---

121 “ca peligró en la mar, perdió quanto traya, / con menciua de vestido entrar non s’en trevia" (vv. 156c-156d)
122 Apollonius’ entrance into Architrastres’ court mirrors the Cid’s entrance into court. In both instances, weight import is placed on the accoutrement. Additionally, in both instances the author makes a point to discuss the arrangement of seating. The Cid, though offered the king’s seat takes a seat amongst his mesnada. Here, Apollonius when asked to choose his place as he would best know his place:

Apolonio, non quiso con ninguno posar,
mandóse, en su cabo, hun escanyo poner,
de derecho del rey non se quiso toller.
mandól’ luego el rey quel’ diessen a comer. (st. 159)
3.4.3: LOSING LUCIANA

As femininity is the source of a hero’s identity in a romance, and a relationship with a woman becomes a prerequisite of masculine individuation, losing Luciana is significant for Apollonius’ identity (Gaunt 95–96). After having married Luciana, Apollonius receives word that Antioch has died. Apollonius and a pregnant Luciana, therefore, travel to Antioch to take the throne. While traveling, Luciana goes into labor, giving birth to their daughter, Tarsiana. However, Luciana presumably dies in labor. Apollonius has a coffin made for his wife and she is set out to sea. The resulting loss of his wife causes him sadness and anxiety. The sadness is more so than we have seen up to this point. Apollonius has had several occasions to be sad; however, as Uría Maqua notes “[e]ste golpe [fue] mucho más duro que los anteriores” (204):

Desque la muger en las ondas fue echada,

siempre fue en tristiciá hi en vida lazrada,

siempre trayó de lágrimas la cara remojada,

non amaneçió día que non fuese llorada. (st. 326)

... 

Tanto era Apolonyo del duelo esmarrido,

non quiso escobrisse por seyer conocido;

fue para la posada del su huéspet querido,

Estrángilo, con que ouo la otra vez manido. (st. 328)

Apollonius is not the same: “los sus dichos corteses auíyalos ya oluidados, / fazianse desta cosa mucho marauyllados.” (vv. 330c–330d). Apollonius is without his men. The huéspada asks of Apollonius: “¿qué fue de tus conpanyas, mesnadas de prestar?” (v. 332c). Apollonius, here mirroring the Cid’s at the start of PMC, “Ilorando de los oios [...] / díxole la estoria τ tribulación,
/ cómo perdió en la mar toda su criazón” (vv. 334b–334d). This happens in the presence of “los huéspedes del rey” (v. 337a). Uría Maqua argues that different from the Apollonius on the beach in Pentápolis, this Apollonius “no solo acepta resignadamente la desgraciada muerte de Luciana, sino que está dispuesto a acatar la voluntad de Dios en todas cuantas desgracias le mande en el futuro” (205). The same is true of the Cid after is dispossessed of his land. He says, “¡Grado a ti, Señor, Padre que estás en alto!” (v. 8). The death of Apollonius’ wife has made him lose all interest in continuing his journey to Antioch and becoming king. Apollonius decides to travel to Egypt instead, giving up his daughter:

A cabo de diez anyos que la houo lexada,
recuíó Apolonyo con su barba trençada,
cuydó fallar la fija duenyagrant τ criada,
mas era la fazienda otramiente trastornada. (st. 434)

Uría Maqua argues that “la decisión de Apolonio de no ocupar el trono imperial de Antioquía y marchar a Egipto, se puede interpretar como un gesto de penitencia y humildad” (205). I would argue that Apollonius has lost part of his manhood and does not feel capable of being king. Additionally, I would argue that Apollonius, finding himself in a similar situation to Antioch with a dead wife and young daughter, does not want to repeat Antioch’s mistake. The end of Estrángilo’s speech rings this bell:

Si buena fue la madre, buena fija auemos,
en logar de la madre, la fija nos guardemos;
avn, quando de todo algo nos tenemos,
bien podemos contar que nada non perdemos. (st. 344)
As Dolores Corbella argues, “[d]estaca en toda esta estrofa la identificación entre Luciana y Tarsiana, tal como el autor había apuntado desde el nacimiento de ésta: “si la madre perdemos, buena fija auemos” (v. 279c)” Like the Cid in his exile in PMC, Apollonius will not return “fasta que casamiento bueno le pueda dar” (346d). Apollonius must replenish is manhood account. Uría Maqua argues that this is done through his peregrination through Europe; however, I would argue that it is not done until he has recovered all those things that make him a man — his kingdom, his wife and his daughter. Uría Maqua argues that when Apollonius returns to retrieve his daughter he is the perfect Christian. I disagree, however. He is neither the perfect man nor the perfect king. He does not have a wife and soon he will realize that he does not have a daughter. After all, as the poet has told us, this is not just a story about how Apollonius lost his wife and daughter, but also about “cómo las cobró amas” (v. 2d). Apollonius, in losing his kingdom and his wife, becomes both more Christian and humbler. Unlike Alexander, Apollonius’ adventures do not result in becoming more prideful. Arguably, this is because the results are different for each. With each adventure, Apollonius’ “manhood account” is depleted. His intellectual acumen was a display of his masculinity and that was not sufficient to win the hand of Antioch’s daughter. Apollonius’ clothes were part and parcel of his masculine identity; however, in the shipwreck, he was left without those trappings of hegemonic masculinity. What eventually would prove fruitful would be those qualities and characteristics that would prove him worthy to win Luciana’s hand. Further, I would say that the lessons for Apollonius and Alexander are different. As femininity is the source of a hero’s identity in a romance, and a relationship with a woman becomes a prerequisite of masculine identity, losing Luciana is significant for Apollonius.

See C.C. Phipps for a detailed discussion of the similarities between Luciana and Tarsiana (“El incesto, las adivinanzas y la música: diseños de la geminación en el Libro de Apolonio 813).
3.4.4: TARSIANA

Apollonius’ recovery of his daughter Tarsiana, still a virgin, is the means by which he achieves redemption. Apollonius is in a state of depression, “de ventura pesada” (v. 537b) at the loss of both his wife and his daughter. Upon meeting Tarsiana, and before knowing that she is his daughter, Apollonius recounts the bad things that have befallen him; however, he notes that “fasta agora quísome Dios guardar” (v. 493a). We note here Apollonius’ Christianity. However, through the conversation that he has with Tarsiana, Apollonius realizes that the woman with whom he is speaking is his daughter:

Reuisco Apolonyo, plógol’ de coraçón,

entendió las palabras que viniéén por razón,

tornóse contra ella, demandól si mintié o non,

preguntól por paraula de grado el uarón (st. 539).

This knowledge of the unknown relationship between a father and a daughter is in stark contrast to the knowledge that Apollonius has at the start of the libro. Apollonius, as is said, is without knowledge of aventuras, of the world when he answers the first question. His only knowledge stems from books and to some extent this is not valid. This knowledge brings about the prize that Apollonius sought at the beginning — the kingdom of Antioch and wife. Apolonio goes further, cementing that Apollonius will also have a legacy — through his son:

Plogo a Dios del çielo a su deuoción,

Conçibió Luçiana parió fijo varón.

El pueblo con el niño, que Dios les auié dado,

Andada mucho alegre mucho asseguardo (vv. 626c – 627b)
Recovering Tarsiana, as a virgin, continues Apollonius’ construction through heterosocial relationships. As can be seen thus far, Apollonius, in his interactions with the feminine, attempted to prove himself worthy.

3.5: CONCLUSION

Both Alexandre and Apolonio, in the construction of their anxious hero, demonstrate that an exemplary Christian king is: 1. Legitimate, 2. Christian, 3. Valiant, 4. Honorable, and 5. Educated. The construction of Alexander falls in line with the epic genre as the construction of his identity is predicated on his relationships with other male characters. Thinking about Alexandre as a speculum principis, it becomes evident that though the character Aristotle spends a significant amount of lines educating Alexander on how to be a good king, Alexander’s preoccupation with his lineage and the possible inadequacies that he felt as a result, resulted in him overcompensating with his physical prowess. As Julian Weiss contends, the “[r]eal monarchical power, the poet seems to be saying at this point, comes from the prince’s military identity, his strength, and his warrior’s ability to kill” (Weiss 114). Though Alexander seems to continually be able to eliminate his enemies, the result is that he will then seek something else with which to replace it. As Greenblatt argues, “when one authority or alien is destroyed, another takes its place” (9). This leads to Alexander’s downfall.

Apollonius contrasts greatly with Alexander. Though both adhere to the qualities above–mentioned, their engagement with them is significantly different. Both kings are presented with the opportunity to defeat/conquer an old enemy. Alexander works up to his chance to defeat Darius, to some extent relying on his physical prowess. However, when provided with the opportunity to conquer Antioch, Apollonius decides to go to Egypt instead, displaying the Cidian
trait of mesura lost on Alexander. Arguably, Apollonius realizes that, in returning to Antioch, as the father to a daughter of a dead mother, he would have been in a similar situation to what would have been his predecessor. Eventually, when it has been sanctioned by God (as Apollonius says to Tarsiana), things will come to fruition. Apollonius, unlike Alexander, respects and waits on the God’s sanction. Arguably this is because there is more of a Christianization in Apolonio than Alexandre. That being said, Apollonius is not truly exemplary until he has a son: “plogo a Dios del cielo τ a su devoción, / conçibió Luçiana τ parió fijo varón” (vv. 626c-626d).

Alexandre and Apolonio are clerical testimonies, and their male authors and characters witnesses to a process in which the conventions and protocols of medieval masculinity, as vested in the Alexander and Apollonius, are inculcated as normative behaviors.

Though both mester de clercia, Alexander, in the performance of his gendered self, reinforces the superiority of a specific type of masculinity that falls in line with an epic generic designation and Apollonius a romance. Throughout, the reconstruction of Alexander’s gendered self, he upholds hegemonic masculinity through homosocial relations, while Apollonius does so through both homosocial and heterosocial relations, though as a romance, his heterosexual relations are foregrounded. This approach takes into consideration the text’s content in a generic designation. Additionally, the use of the fall/redemption narrative structure speaks to a generic designation that takes into consideration the text’s form. Medieval exegesis surrounding the fall/redemption trope and its ubiquity lends credence to a designation of the text as speculum principis. Given the thirteenth–century context, and the other texts examined and to be examined in this dissertation, a broader, more inclusive generic designation as speculum principis addresses the similarities in form and content of this work with other works that have normally been designated as another genre.
CHAPTER IV: THE “BUEN CRISTIANO”: THE LITERARY CONSTRUCTION OF THE POSTFIGURATIONAL HERO IN ALFONSO X’S ESTORIA DE ESPANNA

“I am going the way of all flesh: take thou courage, and shew thyself a man.”
King David, 1 Kings 2:2

“Perhaps every word, every writing is born [...] as testimony.”
Giorgio Agamben; Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive

In the construction of his historical narrative, Estoria de Espanna (Estoria), Alfonso X, like the authors of Poema de mio Cid, Libro de Alexandre and Libro de Apolonio, uses a Fall/Redemption\textsuperscript{124} plot structure. Though a history, Alfonso uses literary techniques in the emplotment of his history. As Hayden White argues in “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact,” the way in which a history is read “depends upon the historian’s decision to configure [the history] according to the imperatives of one plot structure or mythos rather than another” (194). In this chapter, I argue that the Fall/Redemption narrative structure is a means by which Alfonso inculcates his understanding of kingship.

Writers from St. Augustine to the late medieval period used the Fall “to suit diverse historical conditions, cultural aims, languages, literary genres, and audiences\textsuperscript{125}.” (Jager 9). Eric Jager, in The Tempter’s Voice: Language and the Fall in Medieval Literature, notes specifically that the Fall was used by patristic authors “for the primal human transgression” (10n24). The use of this trope is no different in Estoria\textsuperscript{126}, though there are various interpretations of this trope. That

\textsuperscript{124} Patricia E. Grieve, in The Eve of Spain: Myths of Origins in the History of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Conflict, notes that “[the] histories of nations have often been recounted through the mythic pattern of falling and rising again, and more specifically as rehearsals of the Fall of humankind in the Garden of Eden. In stories about a reversal of a fall, the ruler whose tale is being told becomes a king of Christ figure, whose divinely ordained role on earth is to restore his Christian kingdom or to create a Christian empire” (35).

\textsuperscript{125} See chapters 3 – 7 of John M. Evan’s Paradise Lost and Genesis Tradition for a survey of the patristic and medieval literature of the Fall.

\textsuperscript{126} In a similar vein, Geraldine Coates, in Treacherous Foundations: Betrayal and Collective Identity in Early Spanish Epic, Chronicle and Drama, looks at the Estoria as growth and loss. She focuses on the accounts of the Roman Empire, the Visigoth Kingdom, and post-invasion Spain. She uses the terms “guardar,” “a state of possession and stability” and “minguar,” a state of “decline and loss” (79). Coates argues that Estoria “provides firm lexical markers” for the transition from stability to decline (79). Coates argues that “the presence of civil discord” and “the most extreme
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being said, the effort that a historian makes, in this case Alfonso X as *auctor*\(^{127}\), to configure the history is “essentially a literary, that is to say fiction–making, operation.” (White 195). This does not take away the “status of the historical narratives as providing a kind of knowledge;” but rather, the use of plot structures in this way “is one of the ways that a culture has a of making sense of events.” (White 195). As White argues, historians “seek to familiarize [readers] with events which have been forgotten” and do so “not only by providing more information about them, but also by showing how their developments conformed to one or another of the story types we conventionally invoke to make sense of our own life–stories” (197). The prologue mirrors White’s assertion, serving as a paratext for stories about Rodrigo and Pelayo. As paratext, Alfonso’s prologue surrounds the text and “[extends] it, precisely in order to present it, as in the usual sense of the verb but also in the strongest sense: to *make present*, to ensure the text’s presence in the world, its ‘reception’ and consumption in the form […] of the book” (Genette *Paratexts*, 1). Specifically, Alfonso’s prologue argues that the purpose of the *Estoria* is so that its readers could “saber tan bien contar lo que fuera en los tiempos dantes cuemo si fuesse en la su sazon” (*Prologo* vv. 37l–39l) and so that the knowledge provided therein “non cayessen en oluido et los sopiessen los que auien de uenir” (*Prologo* vv.45l–1r). For Alfonso, the *estoria* of the Iberian Peninsula and those men that inhabited it is the story of falling at the hands of outsiders, of heathens, of sinners, and being redeemed through blessed and true Christian men. In a recapulation of the highlights, the author or authors of the prologue note that one story of importance is “como por el desacuerdo que

---

127 Here I use *auctor* to describe Alfonso’s authoritative, as related to his authority, role in the creation of *Estoria* as his role in the *Estoria’s* creation said more about his authority than it did his authorial prowess. In the prologue, for example, it is stated that Alfonso had as many books as possible collected containing the histories of Spain and composed the *Estoria* “por que fuese sabudo el comienço de los espannoles” (*Prologo* vv. 47l–48l)
ouieron los godos con so sennor el rey Rodrigo et por la traycion que urdio el conde don Yllan et ell arçobispo Oppa, passaron los dAffrica et ganaron todo lo mas dEspanna; et como fueron los cristianos cobrando la tierra” (Prologo vv. 7–12).

The Fall/Redemption plot structure provides the reader with a lens through which to understand and interpret Alfonso’s history. Because the Fall trope was so pervasive amongst patristic and medieval writers, this is a lens with which many readers would have been familiar. Using this trope set up a horizon of expectations that “[addresses] a community united by a masculine value system and the specularity of the relationship between the poet and implied audience” (Gaunt 42).

The Fall was “the archetypal crisis of knowledge, authority, and hierarchy” (Jager 3). As Patricia E. Grieve argues in The Eve of Spain, “[the] histories of nations have often been recounted through the mythic pattern of falling and rising again, and more specifically as rehearsals of the Fall of humankind in the Garden of Eden.” (35). The Estoria is “part of a larger historical process, which exhibits characteristic patterns of medieval Christian historiography” (Deyermond 352). For Alfonso, history “begins with the Creation, moves rapidly to the disaster of the Fall, [and] has its central point in the Crucifixion and Resurrection” (Deyermond 352). With this model, the history of every human being, and the history of every nation, is formulated. When the sins of the ruler corrupt a kingdom, it will fall (Deyermond 352). It is not surprising then, that this would be done through an examination of male leaders — arguably redundant. Leadership had come to be synonymous with masculinity. Ruth Mazo Karras, in Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing unto

---

18 The medieval Christian interpretation of history formed in the early fifth century in response to two seminal works: St. Augustine’s De civitate Dei and Paul Orosius’ Historia adversus paganos. Of importance were the concepts of translatio imperii and flagellum Dei, “a heathen power that becomes the unwitting instrument of God’s will by overthrowing a kingdom that has fallen into sin […] shocking the survivors into penitence and a renewed effort to do God’s will” (Deyermond 353).
Others, emphasizes the importance of the phallus in the construction of the exemplary man. She argues that there were two types of medieval men — the penetrator and the penetrated, connecting the lack of a phallus with deviance (4-5). I argue that the phallus can and did take many forms, as will be elaborated in this chapter. In the Estoria, Rodrigo and Pelayo serve as allegories for the Christian Fall and Redemption respectively. Reading the text typologically, Rodrigo is the bad and dishonorable Christian king, a tyrant, and Pelayo is the good and exemplary Christian king, the Redeemer. In that Estoria is the story of the history of Spain, I look at Rodrigo, and his actions, as a stand-in for the the Fall. His actions bring about Spain’s condition of being in ira regia. I look at Pelayo as Spain’s redemption. Both kings have similar experiences; however, the difference in their responses for one brings about Spain’s Fall and for another begins Spain’s Redemption.

However, before delving into the text, I will spend time providing context for my analysis by: 1. Discussing history as a tool of masculine domination, 2. Alfonso as the “auctor,” and 3. The Estoria as both history and literature.

4.1: MASCULINE DOMINATION

History and its creation are arms of masculine domination. As Michel De Certeau argues in The Writing of History, “‘The making of history’ is buttressed by a political power which creates a space proper […] where a will can and must write […] a system” (6). He goes further, arguing that for this to happen, “power must be legitimized, it must attribute to its grounding force an authority which in turn makes this very power credible” (De Certeau 6 – 7). In the specific case of

---

Pierre Bourdieu, in Masculine Domination, argues that “[manliness], virility, in its ethical aspect, i.e. as the essence of the vir, virtus, the point of honor (nif), the principle of the conservation and increase of honour, remains indissociable, tacitly at least, from physical virility, in particular through the assertions of sexual potency – deflowering the bride, abundant male offspring, etc. – which are expected of a ‘real’ man. Hence the phallus, always metaphorically present but very rarely named, concentrates all the collective fantasies of fecundating potency” (12).
the *Estoria*, history is a masculine endeavor legitimated by the phallus — Alfonso, as king, extradiegetically, and by Rodrigo and Pelayo within the story.

Emily C. Francomano, in *Wisdom and Her Lovers in Medieval and Early Modern Hispanic Literature*, presents an appealing paratextual analysis for thinking about the medieval audience of *Estoria de Espanna*:

A miniature on the verso side of the first folio of one of the codices containing the *Estoria de Espanna* [...] depicts a scene of idealized *translatio studii*. Alfonso [...] appears [...] presiding over his court. Other crowned male figures are seated slightly below him, and below them are male courtiers. All of the men depicted are engaged in discussion, gesturing with their hands. Alfonso is turned toward his son Sancho IV and presents a book to him.

(28)

Francomano contends that the miniature “illustrates how wisdom passes from man to man in the sapiential tradition” (28), referring to this scene as homosocial *translatio*. I read this abovementioned transfer as both *translatio imperii* and *translatin studii*. The term *translatio imperii* refers to the transfer of power concentrated in a series of single rulers. The concept exemplifies the medieval notion that history was a linear succession of transfers of *imperium* — absolute power. During the medieval era, the notion was that *imperium* had been passed down from Greece to Rome and then from Rome to medieval Europe. Therefore, if one could establish his lineage dating back to Greece, one could and would legitimate himself and his kingdom. *Translatio studii* refers to the transfer of knowledge from one geographical place and time to another. Similar to *translatio imperii*, it was thought that Greece was the first seat of all knowledge, followed by Rome and then medieval Europe. *Estoria* exemplifies *translatio imperii* and *translatin studii*, treating history as *magistrae vitae*, or life’s teacher. As stated in the prologue:
In treating power and knowledge as a something held onto and passed through men, Alfonso like “[every] established order tends to produce … the naturalization of its own arbitrariness” (Outline of a Theory of Practice, 164). Thus, history written by men for other men, speculum principis, makes the connection among history, power and masculinity appear self-evident. As Bourdieu argues, in Masculine Domination, “[the] strength of the masculine order is seen in the fact that … the androcentric vision imposes itself as neutral and has no need to spell itself out in discourses aimed a legitimating it” (9). History, as written by Alfonso and his mesnada, “functions as an immense symbolic machine […] to ratify the masculine domination on which it is founded” (Bourdieu 9). Alfonso’s work, as a “product of an incessant … labor of production, to which singular agents … and institutions … contribute,” is a “structure of domination” (34) that ratifies masculine domination.

4.2: ALFONSO X, AUCTOR

Alfonso X (r. 1252 – 1284), known as el Sabio, the Wise or the Learned succeeded his father as king of León and Castile. (O’Callaghan 359). According to Joseph F. O’Callaghan in A History of Medieval Spain, “[Alfonso X’s] reign has exceptional significance because of the work that he and scholars associated with him accomplished in the fields of literature, history and law”.

For specific discussion of Alfonso’s education see chapter 2, “A Prince’s Education” of H. Salvador Martínez’ Alfonso X, the Learned: A Biography, pp. 45 – 87.
Alfonso was “greatly influenced by the principles of Roman law and utilized them in the preparation of the *Fuero Real*, a code of municipal law, which he granted to many towns, and the *Espéculo de las leyes*, the earliest redaction of the *Siete Partidas*” (O’Callaghan 372). As H. Salvador Martínez notes, in *Alfonso, the Learned: A Biography*, “a reading of [his] works … reveals a profound knowledge of the liberal arts …, not only of their theoretical aspects but also of their practical applications” (49). Martínez goes further, arguing that though “some of the execution of the works was left to collaborators, the literary spirit and unity behind them is uniquely Alfonso’s” (50). That being said, “the concept of royal power exemplified in these texts was often at variance with the older medieval notion of a delicately balanced relationship between the sovereign and his subjects. […] [The] nobles charged the king with upsetting the balance […]” (O’Callaghan 372) During his reign, Alfonso’s greatest “preoccupation was his desire to win the crown of the Holy Roman Empire.” And when the antiemperor died in 1256, Alfonso pressed his rights to the throne. He was the son of Beatrice of Swabia, a granddaughter of Frederick Barbarossa, and he belonged to the Hohenstaufen family (O’Callaghan 362). That being said, as Martínez argues, the validity of Alfonso’s claim to the throne did not only derive from genealogy, but from something altogether more essential, “an ideological conception of the monarchy as an integrating and absolutist institution, a notion that was relatively common in 13th-century Europe and the Iberian Peninsula before that” (121). Contrary to O’Callagan’s assertion, Martínez, taking into consideration this fact and the fact that “empire” as a concept “involved the view of a monarch’s rule over a number of territories” (121), argues that Alfonso’s aspirations to be emperor “were not at all obsessive, abnormal, or fantastic” (122). That notwithstanding, the *Estoria* was a means of substantiating his claim to the throne.
4.3: ESTORIA DE ESPANNA, MAGISTRAE VITAE

The *Estoria de Espanna* (*Estoria*) is a chronicle from the thirteenth century that attempts to “constitute the first national history in vernacular Spanish, spanning from the epoch of Noah to that of Alfonso himself” (Coates 77). As the prologue notes:

E por end Nos don Alfonsso, por la gracia de Dios rey […] mandamos ayuntar quantos libros pudimos auer de istorias en que alguna cosa contasen de los fechos dEspanna, et tomamos de la cronica dell Arçobispo don Rodrigo que fizo mandado del rey don Ffernando nuestro padre, et de la Maeste Luchas, Obispo de Tuy, et de Paulo Orosio, et del Lucano, et de sant Esidro el primero […] et dotras estorias de Roma las que pudiemos auer que contassen algunas cosas del fecho dEspanna, et compusiemos este libro de todos los fechos que fallar se pudieron Della, desde el tiempo de Noe fasta este nuestro” (49)

The prologue recounts the connection between Hercules and Spain, noting the battles of “Hercules de Grecia” against the Spaniards. The *Estoria* was partly intended to legitimize Alfonso’s claim to the title of Holy Roman Emperor. As Geraldine Coates argues, “[the] *Estoria* would allow Alfonso to assert his position as an heir to the former Leonese empire, and to include himself in the historic project of restoring the united Hispania of Roman and Visigothic tradition” (Coates 78). More important for this chapter, it founds “a national identity on the ideals of an [heroically masculine] past” (78) Alfonso founds his history on the idea of a redemption of the fallen Romano–Visigothic Spain, at the hands of a merciful God (Coates 79).

Coates makes an intriguing argument about Alfonso’s use of the vernacular. She argues that in an effort to unite the peoples of the Peninsula, and strengthen their loyalty to a single, royal

---

**Throughout, I will be citing from the Primera crónica general.**
leader, building on this idea of a mythic united Hispania, Alfonso compiled the *Estoria* in the vernacular (78).

*The Estoria* provides insight into the characteristics of the single, royal leader through an examination of the male leaders in the stories. Some serve as templates for kingly behaviour. As Aengus Ward, in his *History and Chronicles in Late Medieval Iberia: Representations of Wamba in Late Medieval Narrative Histories*, argues, “Alfonso patently regarded his history as serving the purposes of instruction.” (33). In the Prologue, Alfonso notes that “et por que pudiessen saber otrosi los que depues dellos uiniessen los fechos que ellos fizieran, *tan bien como* si ellos se acertassen en ello.” (*Prologo* 39l – 42l)) He concludes:

> et escriuiron otrossi las gestas de los príncipes, tan bien de los que fizieron mal cuemo de los que fizieron bien, por que los que despues uiniessen por los fechos de los buenos punnassen en fazer bien, et por los malos que se castigassen de fazer mal, et por esto fue endereçado el curso del mundo de cada una cosa en su orden. (3)

These “gestas de los principes” serve as *speculum principis*.

**4.4: THE LITERARY ESTORIA**

*Estoria de Espanna* is a historical narrative and, as such, is “plotted along casually connected lines toward a recognizable closure” (Richardson 160). Additionally, as a historical narrative, *Estoria* is literary. It is a “verbal fiction” with contents that are “as much *invented* as *found.*” (White “The Historical Text as Literary Artifact” 192). Like White, I do *not* presuppose a
“radical opposition of history to fiction” (192). Histories, through a process of “emplotment,”
“make stories out of mere chronicles.”

Alfonso X is both a historian and a storyteller. Historians, in order to make facts sensible,
use their “constructive imagination.” Alfonso X and his academic mesnada came to their
evidence “endowed with a sense of the possible forms that different recognizably human situations
can take” — here the history of Spain — and subsequently they “provide plausible explanations
for bodies of historical evidence when they succeed in discovering the story or complex of stories
implicitly contained within them” (194). As the compilers informed the readers in the prologue,
Alfonso charged them with bringing together as many books as possible about the history of Spain.
In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, chronicles were being used in the service of political and
cultural programs and Alfonso X’s was no different. Historiographically, two historians were
important: Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada

[in] response to the tensions between the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, Lucas de Tuy in
his Chronicon mundi promoted a Hispanic, Leonese context [while], Jiménez de Rada’s
support for the Toledan church underpins De rebus Hispaniae, in which he represents the
archbishops of Toledo as the ‘true successors and guardians of the Visigothic past’ and
champions unity under the primacy of a restored Toledo (Pick 2004:22). Both Lucas de
Tuy and Jiménez de Rada provided a new Christian–Classical interpretation of world, and
Iberian, history, seeking ‘to fix their king and country into a more inclusive background’
(Russell 1938: 232) (Coates 77)

“Emplotment” is “the encodation of the facts contained in the chronicle as components of specific kinds of plot
structures” (193)
To quote R.G. Collingwood
As “no set of casually recorded historical events can in itself constitute a story” (White 194), the author suppresses or subordinates certain events and highlights others to create his story. He does this through various means, including, but not limited to: characterization, repetition, tone variation, different points of view, etc. (White 194). My argument in this chapter is that the use of the Fall/Redemption narrative structure is a means by which Alonso constitutes his estoria.

The historian, Alfonso X, emplots his account as a story of a particular kind. Alfonso’s narratives are “not only a reproduction of the events reported, but also a complex of symbols which give us directions for finding an icon of the structure of events” (198). They “point in two directions simultaneously: toward the events [described] in the narrative and toward the story type or mythos which the historian has chosen to serve as the icon of the structure of the events. The narrative … [describes] events in the historical record in such a way as to inform the reader what to take as an icon of the events so as to render them ‘familiar’ to him.” (White 198)

The Estoria “[succeeds] in endowing [Spanish history] with meaning … by appealing to [and] … by exploiting metaphorical similarities between sets of real events and the conventional structures of our fictions” — The Fall/Redemption structure (202). In writing history this way, the historian “charges those events with the symbolic significance of a comprehensible plot structure” (202). This idea is not original to Alfonso. Jiménez de Rada used these mythoi. The story of the Fall was “an inherited story,” “a prior text that … shaped thought and society by exerting the power of the past over the perception of the present” (Jager 2; my emphasis).
4.5: RODRIGO, THE USURPER KING

“Because he is gone down today, and hath killed oxen, and fatlings, and many rams, and invited all the king’s sons, and the captains of the army, and Abiathar the priest: and they are eating and drinking before him, and saying: God save king Adonias.”
3 Kings 1: 25

In this section, I will look at Rodrigo, and his actions, as a stand–in for the Fall and how his actions bring about Spain’s condition of being in ira regia. Specifically, I will look at his rise to power, his breaking into the Toledo Palace and his rape of Count Julian’s daughter. I have chosen these moments because they showcase Alfonso’s recounting of the Fall of Spain through a Fall/Redemption narrative construction, speak to the construction of Rodrigo as the antithesis of the anxious hero, Pelayo, and, finally, because they problematize speak to the text as speculum principis. We learn by negative example that a good king must come into his authority legitimately, have a legitimate lineage, be forthright, be loyal, be humble, have mesura, and use violence in the name of the Christian God.

4.5.1: RISE TO POWER

In the third Book of Kings, as King David lies on his deathbed, his fourth son, Adonias, usurps the throne, “[exalting] himself, saying: I will be king.” (3 Kings 1:5). Though Adonias seemingly declares himself king, it proves to be nothing but a mere Searlean assertion, a statement that’s purpose is to “commit [Adonias] to something’s being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition” (Searle 10). His statement is an attempt to “[bring] a state of affairs into existence by declaring it into existence” (Searle 13). This is ultimately a failed declaration. As Searle argues, the “defining characteristic of [declarations is] that the successful performance of one of its

---

"In contrast to the Bible, Alfonso X’s Estoria does not provide performative utterances from the characters. The narrative voice is seemingly the only voice. History is, in Searlean rhetoric, representative —“The point and purpose of the members of the representative class is to commit the speaker […] to something’s being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition” (Searle 10)"
members brings about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality.” For Searle, a “[successful] performance guarantees that the propositional content corresponds to the world” (Searle 13). Adonias intends for his utterance to be successful. Adonias invites all of his “brethren” except for Solomon, promised the throne by King David, and Nathan, the prophet who supported Solomon, to his coronation. However, Adonias lacks power in the extra-linguistic institution. In order for a declaration to be successfully performed, “there must exist an extra-linguistic institution and the speaker and hearer must occupy special places within this institution” (Searle 14). Adonias mistakenly believes he has a special place within this extra-linguistic institution; however, King David’s words are stronger than the would-be King Adonias’: “[Set] my son Solomon upon my mule: and bring him to Gihon. And let Sadoc the priest, and Nathan the prophet, anoint him there king over Israel: and you shall sound the trumpet, and shall say: God save king Solomon.” (3 Kings 1: 33 – 34). Like Adonias, Rodrigo is a usurper to the throne.

_Siete Partidas_ (Partida II, title 1, Law IX) explains that in order for a man to “legitimately [be] called king”, he can “justly [obtain] the sovereignty of [the] kingdom” in four ways (274):

First, when the eldest son, by way of inheritance, inherits the kingdom, or when any of the others who are most nearly related to the king at the time of his death do so. Second, when anyone obtains it from all the people of the kingdom, who select him as lord, _where there is no relative who can inherit the sovereignty of the deceased king de jure_ (my emphasis). The third way is through marriage; and this happens when any one marries a woman who is the heiress of the kingdom, who, although he may not belong to the race of kings, can be styled king after he has married her. The fourth is by grant of the Pope or emperor, when either of them creates a king in those countries in which they have the right to do so (274)
Rodrigo meets none of those requirements when he ascended to the throne. He is a usurper, “a lord who has obtained possession of some kingdom, or country, by force, fraud, or treason” (Partida II, title 1, Law X, 274). In chapter 552, the narrator recounts that King Vitiza, having ascended the throne after his father’s death, has the previously banished Theodefredo’s eyes removed. Vitiza attempts to have Rodrigo’s, son of Theodefredo, eyes removed; however, the Roman senate, because of their love for Rodrigo’s grandfather, King Recesuindo, rebelled against King Vitiza. And “por el grand poder que tenie, ouol de uencer […] e sacol los oios” (552 vv. 43r – 45r). As I have argued in previous chapters, the defense of the privilege of masculinity is predicated on the ability to “engage in violent action” (Feather and Thomas 4) As Jennifer Feather and Catherine E. Thomas argue in “Introduction: Reclaiming Violent Masculinities,” “the structure of masculine privilege and the patriarchal institutions of government and family it supports are deeply implicated in the process of violence” (4) It is worth noting that the narrator relays to the reader that like Vitiza had done to his father, Rodrigo has Vitiza’s eyes removed. Rodrigo has rebelled against the legitimate King Vitiza, and ascends to the throne through the “election de los godos” (552 vv. 47r – 48r). Rodrigo has gained the kingdom by force, fraud and treason. In the next chapter, the narrator reminds the reader that the overthrown king is still alive, “Pues Vitiza seyendo aun uiuo et estando en Cordoua en desterramiento, començo a regnar el rey Rodrigo con ell ayuda et el poder que ouo de los romanos” (553 vv. 21l – 24l). Rodrigo, like Adonias before him, lays claim to the throne while the king is still alive. This rise to power is the beginning of Rodrigo’s Fall as well as Spain’s Fall, a Fall alluded to a chapter earlier: “por los pecados del rey Vitiza et de todas sus yentes que quiso Dios crebantar la *gloria et el poder de los godos de Espanna, e por

---

The Partida gives us insight into Rodrigo’s future endeavors: “Persons of this kind are of such a character to act for their own advantage, although it may result in injury to the country […] [Persons] of this kind always exert themselves to keep those under their dominion ignorant and timid” (274)

King Vitiza was “alçado rey despues de la muerte de su padre” (552 vv. 8r – 9r).
ende metioše Satanas en la paz querie Vitiza mostrar por enfinta” (552 vv. 37l – 42l). We see here that the narrator categorizes the beginnings of the fall of Spain, specifically here as vested in the fall of Vitiza as the desire of both God and Satan. As a result of the sins of a ruler, God saw fit to “crebrantar la *gloria et el poder de los godos de Espanna,” allowing for Satan to infiltrate the peace that had been established. The narrator then comments before recounting anything about Rodrigo’s reign that he will be the “postremero rey de los godos” (553 v. 25l).

From the onset, Alfonso attributes the downfall to treason

Under the last two Gothic leaders Vitiza and Rodrigo, “a long heritage of treachery, deposition, and unrest begins a fast descent into unmitigated vice” (Coates) The narrator recounts in chapter 559 that

de quales algunos fueron alçados reys por aleue, algunos por tracyion de muerte de sus hermanos o de sus parientes, non guardando la verdad nin el derecho que deuieren y guardar por quexa de ganar el sennorio mal et torticieramientre como non deuien, por ende los otros omnes que fuero otrossi en sus tiempos dellos formaron se con ellos et semeiaron les en los peccados; e por esta razón aiuiose la yra de Dios sobrelos, et desamparoles la tierra que les mantouiera et guardara fasta allí, et tollio dellos la su gracia (559 vv. 12r – 23r).

Here we see again that as a result of the sins of a ruler, God sees fit to “crebrantar la *gloria et el poder de los godos de Espanna,” here the narrator noting that God “tollio dellos la su gracia,” without which there could be no success. As the narrator recounts in the section on the Goths, “Los Godos,” the Goths are a bellicose warrior caste, noting that: “Mas tanto fueron los godos nobles de coraçon et sabidores et atreuudos en guerra, que numqua se les egualaron en batalla ni pudieron con ellos” (207 vv. 34r – 38r) and “la muerte desprecian los godos et alaban la ferida” (217 vv.50l

---

* For more discussion, see page 88 of Coates’ *Treacherous Foundations*. 
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With time, the Goths become less barbaric, “mas mansos et mas piadosos et mas sabios” (218 vv. 23l – 24l). The Visigoths, the Western branch of the Goths, valued loyalty. Coates notes that they “undertake a military campaign against the Romans owing to the disloyalty” (88). This is Rodrigo’s heritage, part and parcel of his approach to ruling. Judith Butler, in Gender Trouble asserts that “[t]he rules that govern intelligible identity, […] partially structured along matrices of gender hierarchy and compulsory heterosexuality, operate through repetition” (198; original emphasis). There is an anxious moment that precipitates Rodrigo’s usurpation of the throne — his coming into adult manhood.” This moment constructs a masculine identity that will permeate the text. Egica, the father of Vitiza, exiles Theodefredo, father of Rodrigo. (552 vv. 48l – 53l). As stated before, when Vitiza becomes king, he searches for Theodefredo and removes his eyes (552 vv. 8r – 12r). Vitiza wants to remove Rodrigo’s eyes; however, “mas por que ell era mucho amado del senado de Roma, por ell amor et la gracia que ouieran los romanos con Recesuindo su auuelo, alçosse contral rey Vitiza con poder de los romanos, et comenzol de guerrear descubiertamientre; e por el gran poder que tenie, ouol de uencer allí o se ayuntaron, et prisol e sacol los ojos” (552 vv. 38r – 45r). We see here that lineage and strength are important. The text will show that Rodrigo has neither.

4.5.2: BREAKING INTO THE TOLEDO PALACE

“And Solomon said: If he be a good man, there shall not so much as one hair on his head fall to the ground: but if evil be found in him, he shall die.”

3 Kings 1:52

---

“Seis son las etapas de la vida: infancia, niñez, adolescencia, juventud, madurez y senectud. La primera edad es la infancia, desde el momento que el niño nace, hasta que cumple los siete años. La segunda es la niñez (pueritia), o etapa «pura» y aún no apta para la procreación; abarca hasta los catorce años. La tercera es la adolescencia, «adulta» ya para engendrar, dura hasta los veinticinco años. La cuarta es la juventud, que es la más firme de todas y llega hasta los cincuenta” (Etimologías XI.2.1–5, 40–41).
Rodrigo’s breaking into the Toledo Palace displays his hubris and establishes his illegitimacy as a king. In chapter 553, the narrator provides the reader with a description of the now King Rodrigo. He is a “muy fuert omne en batalla et muy desembargado en las faziendas.” Additionally, with respect to his “mannas,” he is similar to Vitiza, the king from whom Rodrigo usurps his throne. The narrator has already recounted, in chapter 548, that Vitiza ascends the throne upon the death of his father, Egica. The narrator has described Vitiza as an enemy of God and the Church because he removed Sinderedo from his post as Archbishop of Toledo and replaced him with his own brother, Oppa, who was the Archbishop of Seville. Vitiza vainly believed that his own brother would be a better option. Vitiza has sinned “por adulterio carnal” and dirtied his brother by “adulterio espiritual.” Making matters worse, Vitiza did away with all of the privileges of the Church, returned the Jews to Spain, giving them privileges and “franquezas.” According to the narrator, the Jews became more honored and “cotados.” Similar to Vitiza, Rodrigo dishonors Vitiza’s two sons. He exiles them and they subsequently travel to Tangier to stay with Count Riccila, a friend of their father’s. The narrator let’s the reader know that Vitiza, the arguably still legitimate king, has relatives.

The narrator then begins to recount that in Toledo there is a palace that had always been closed and had many locks. We learn that Rodrigo asks that palace be opened because he believes there is a great treasure there. Here I read Rodrigo’s actions as vain ambition. It is something the

---

As told in the 15th century Crónica sarracina,

“One day […] against the counsel of his senior advisers, Rodrigo defied the injunction against entering an enchanted edifice, known as the House of Hercules (after the first ruler of the peninsula), to which each of the previous twenty-four Visigothic kings had added an iron lock, as custom dictated. Rather than add his lock, Rodrigo broke into the house—a sin of hubris and greed, because he thought there might be treasures within—and discovered an ark, containing a parchment with sketchings of men with beards and turbans as well as a prophecy, which stated that he who broke the covenant by entering the house would lose his kingdom to people who looked like the figures on the parchment. Rodrigo sealed the house and forbade his advisers to speak of it” (Grieve 21)
other kings before him have not been willing and/or able to do. However, he believes himself to have the strength and legitimacy to do. It is a temptation to increase his “manhood account.” Why does Rodrigo want to break into this palace when all kings before him did not? In Jager’s *The Tempter’s Voice*, he recounts St. Augustine’s “famous story of his youthful theft of pears, long recognized as a recapitulated Fall” (90). The last line of Jager’s recounting of Augustine’s story could provide us insight into *why* Rodrigo decides to break into the palace. As Jager notes, Augustine’s “real pleasure was simply in doing something that was not allowed” (Jager 90). Jager goes on to say that “[i]t is not the inherent qualities of the forbidden fruit that tempt Augustine but, as with Adam and Eve, what the fruit represents as a sign: for him, forbidden behavior; for them, forbidden knowledge” (Jager 90–91). This could be said of Rodrigo and his desire to do something that had not been done before. The described many locks on the palace provide fodder to the argument that Rodrigo’s desires were for something forbidden. Though not present in Alfonso’s description, the fifteenth-century retelling in the *Crónica sarracina* does provide more insight noting that it had been custom for the Visigothic kings to add a lock; however, Rodrigo broke into the house because he thought there would be treasures inside.

Arguably, Rodrigo believed that opening the palace will make him manlier. That the treasures inside would add to his “manhood account.” The prophecy that Rodrigo will be defeated is a commentary on masculinity and anxious masculinity. Receipt of the prophecy requires that Rodrigo do what other kings before him have not done, break tradition, – break into the Toledo Palace, “un palacio que estidiera siempre cerrado de tiempo ya de muchos reys” (553 vv.50l–51l). The narrator has thus far compared Rodrigo to Vitiza. Given the characterization of Vitiza, it is of note that even Vitiza did not have the hubris to break the locks and enter the palace.
Precedence is violated and Rodrigo’s desire to possess opened the floodgates of Spain’s destruction.

Upon entering the palace, Rodrigo only finds a locked chest and orders that the chest be opened. Inside there is no great treasure, but rather

un panno en que estauan escriptas letras ladinas que dizien assi: que quando aquellas cerraduras fuesen crebantadas et ell arca et el palacio fuessen abiertos et lo que y yazie fuesse visto, […] yentes de tal manera como en aquel panno estauan pintadas que entrarien en Espanna y la conqueririen et serien ende sennores (553 vv. 5r – 12r).

The men painted looked like Arabs. Rodrigo has the chest and the castle closed “assi como estauan de primero.” But it is too late. By this point, the metaphorical hymen is broken. As McGibbons notes, “Toledo, the capital of the Visigothic kingdom, was the heart, or more precisely the womb of Christian Spain.” (McGibbons 46). McGibbons goes further, arguing that “Rodrigo’s violation of the palace can be understood as the figura (or figurative vision) of his rape of a young woman […] [and] [his] ‘real’ and ‘historical’ violation of the palace and ark was what Eric Auerbach might call the ‘prophetic annunciation’ of the deflowering of Julian’s daughter and the ruin of Spain; the palace was a figure of Spain, the ark of Julian’s daughter, a Spanish virgin of Visigothic origins” (McGibbons 45) The fruit borne from the womb/ark in the Toledo Palace are Muslim. Rodrigo’s violation, of both the Toledo Palace and of Julian’s daughter will bear Muslim fruit. Upon hearing the prophecy, Rodrigo and his men are afraid. Rodrigo “sees the leaves and ignores the fruit.” (Jager 65)
4.5.3: THE RAPE OF JULIAN’S DAUGHTER

The narrator then recounts another story, “De la fuerça que fue fecha a la fija o a la muger del cuende Julian, et como se coniuro por ende con los moros.” The narrator recounts that the custom of the time had been to raise “los donzelles et las donzellas fijos de los altos omnes” in the king’s palace. Count Julian, a relative of the exiled king Vitiza, lives in the palace with his beautiful daughter. Rodrigo sends Count Julian to Africa and while Count Julian is away, Rodrigo takes Julian’s daughter by force. Custom would dictate that he marries her, but he does not. Catharine R. Stimpson argues that “because men rape what other men possess, rape becomes in part a disastrous element of male rivalry” (112) and as stated before, the defense of the privilege of masculinity is predicated on the ability to “engage in violent action.” Additionally, as James Brundage argues, in Law, Sex and Christian Society:

Every human society attempts to control sexual behavior, since sex represents a rich source of conflicts and can disrupt orderly social processes. Human sexuality is too powerful and explosive a force for any society to allow its members complete sexual freedom. … [Sexual] beliefs and practices exert power, not only over individual conduct, but also over the ways institutions themselves grow and develop. Marriage, adultery, fornication, prostitution, rape, sodomy, and celibacy—all have significant bearings upon property interests, household structure, and notions about morality (1)

Patricia Grieve argues that the rape has Arabic origins: “That Christianity could so easily accommodate the integration and expansion of the daughter’s role to an Eve figure is testimony only to the misogyny embraced by Christian mythmakers, not evidence of Christian origins in the legend.” (29) “El Toledano legitimized in 1243 the telling of the fall of Spain as a rape narrative. […] In addition, El Toledano, elaborated the legend of Pelayo, creating a narrative diptych that the fall of Spain began with the dishonor associated with a woman, and that the restoration began the same way. King Alfonso’s history […] contributed a tonal or attitudinal difference to the telling of the legend by focusing on the failure of kingship and the grave responsibility of kings—and by this inclusion of nationalist legends that highlighted the role of women.” (Grieve 49—50)

Some say that it was Julian’s wife and not her daughter.
Rodrigo’s actions demonstrate why he is not an exemplary king. As Patricia Grieve argues in *The Eve of Spain*, “control over one’s sexual appetite was commonly considered an outward measure of one’s strength in other arenas.” (24). Rodrigo’s rape of Count Julian’s daughter is the “very embodiment of why self–control and self–discipline. [*mesura*] […] were highly valued in a ruler.” (24).

Count Julian returns and learns of the king’s dishonor. As Count Julian is a sensible and conniving man, he pretended he had not become aware of the king’s dishonor, keeping up appearances. But after recounting the events of his voyage on behalf of the king, he took his wife and left without saying goodbye. With his wife, he goes to Çepta and talks to the Arabs. He comes back to ask for his daughter, claiming his wife is ill. Count Julian then takes his daughter as well. Count Julian wars against the Arabs:

> En aquel tiempo tenie el cuende Julian por tierra la Ysla uerde, a la que disen agora en arauigo Algeziratalhadra, e dalli fazie ell a los barbarous de Affrica grand Guerra et grand danno en guissa que auien del grand miedo. (555 vv. 23l – 27l; my emphasis)

Count Julian promises Muça, nicknamed Abenozayr, all of Spain. Rodrigo’s actions have led Count Julian to treachery. That being said, Count Julian’s response to this dishonor contrasts heavily with Pelayo’s response to a similar dishonor and betrayal at the hands of a king, to be discussed in a subsequent section. Muça believes Count Julian because of the battles that his people have fought against him. He respects his masculine prowess. Muça tells Vlit; however, Vlit distrusts the Count and sends only a few men. Muça sends Tarif with the Count. They go to Gibraltar. Rodrigo hears of this and sends his cousin. His cousin loses and dies. According to the narrator, the Goths had gone too long without fighting and were ill–prepared to defend themselves against the Arabs. They were now “flacos et couardes.” As a result of this battle, the Count proved
himself. And because Muça now trusted the Count, he sent the Count and Tarif into Spain with more men (for a third time). There is a description of Rodrigo’s clothing:

El rey Rodrigo andaua con su corona doro en la cabeza et uestido de pannos de peso et en un lecho de marfil que leuauan dos mulos, ca assi era estonces costumbre de andar los reys de los godos. (557 vv. 35r – 39r)

Rodrigo, through his clothing, attempts to legitimate his kingship. As the narrator says, Rodrigo is dressed as custom would have “los reys de los godos” dress. Obviously, dress alone is not sufficient to legitimize Rodrigo’s reign.

Vitiza’s two sons have joined with Count Julian, betraying Rodrigo. The narrator describes Rodrigo as brave, noting that he would rather be killed than flee. The sons believed that they would be able regain their father’s kingdom with Rodrigo’s death. There is continued description of the Christians as weak because they had not been fighting, tying back to the argument of the narrator that because of the sins of the kings God had abandoned them: “assi como dixiemos ya, aquella yente tan poderosa et tan onrrada fue essora toruada et crebantada por poder de los alaraues” (557 vv. 31l – 34l).

As Simon Barton argues in *Conquerors, Brides, and Concubines: Interfaith Relations and Social Power in Medieval Iberia*, “[a] Christian woman’s body was regarded as symbolic of God’s honor and authority [and] [it] followed that a nonbeliever who violated her besmirched not merely her honor, but God’s also, and that of the Christian community as a whole” (79). Though here Barton is discussing the violation of Teresa by an unnamed pagan king of Toledo, I would argue that the violation of the Christian woman’s body had the same import in the *Estoria*. Though the narrator has mentioned many kings, the Fall hinges on Rodrigo’s acts — *his* violation of Count Julian’s daughter. As Barton notes, “[the] Alfonsine account follows those of Lucas [de Tuy] and
[Archbishop] Rodrigo [Jiménez] fairly closely, but with a few differences of emphasis. In particular, the narrative accentuates the violence of the king’s sexual assault, in marked contrast to Pelayo’s somewhat tepid original account” (Conquers 81). Here, Alfonso’s changes highlight that a good king must have mesura, and only use violence in the name of a Christian God.

4.6: PELAYO, THE “BUEN CRISTIANO”

“The king swore and said: As the Lord liveth, who hath delivered my soul out of all distress, Even as I swore to thee by the Lord the God of Israel, saying: Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead, so will I do this day.”
I Kings 1: 29 – 30

In this section, I will look at Pelayo, and his actions, as a metaphor for Spain’s Redemption. Specifically, I will look at the rape of Pelayo’s sister as well as Pelayo’s confrontation with Muça. I have chosen these moments because they showcase Pelayo as the Christian Redeemer. Pelayo’s story also show as that a good king must come into his authority legitimately, have a legitimate lineage, be forthright, be loyal, be humble, have mesura, and use violence in the name of a Christian God.

That being said, Pelayo does experience a Fall himself, and I will start by discussing it. Pelayo’s actions, both during and subsequent to his fall, not only contrast him to Rodrigo, but also exemplify him as the “buen cristiano.”

The readers of the Estoria are introduced to Pelayo before his story begins:
este rey Vitiza, que luego en comiençó de su regnado començara de seer bueno et de darse a bien, començó luego de darse a mal et avoleza. e echó de la cibdad de Toledo en desterramiento all inffante don Pelayo, hijo del duc Ffáfila de Cantabria - e éste fue aquel don Pelayo el que después se alcó con los asturianos contra los moros en Asturias, assí
como adelante diremos en su logar - ca el rey Vitiza queriél mal por razón del padre a quien el matar con el palo (304a39-50;187)

Pelayo has found himself, like the Cid in *PMC*, in *ira regia*. Vitiza has become king after the death of his father, Egica, and looks to eliminate rivals. He finds Theodefredo, father of the previously discussed king Rodrigo, and removes his eyes. He would like to do the same to Pelayo, whose father Vitiza killed; however, as the text notes: “Otrossi quisiera fazer all infante Pelayo [...] mas ell infante Pelayo fuxol” (306b12-14). The reader learns later that when Pelayo escaped, seeking shelter in Cantabria, “era su escudero yl traye la espada” (564 vv. 4l-5l). These objects, like the Cid’s swords, Tizona and Colada, reflect a more bellicose masculinity. The Cid flees with his wife and his daughters. Similarly, Pelayo flees with his sister. Upon hearing that the Christians had been defeated, “tomo una hermana que auie, et fuesse con ella pora las Asturias que siquier entre las estrechuras de las montannas pudiesse guardar alguna lumbrera pora la *cristianidad* a que se acogiesse” (564 vv. 8l – 12l; my emphasis). It is not clear here if the light for Christianity is Pelayo, his sister or both; however, it is of import to mention that whoever was to serve as the light to which Christianity could find refuge, it was not the aforementioned Rodrigo. This idea is repeated some nine lines later, when the narrator shares that “E a estos quiso los Dios guardar por que la lumbre de la cristianidad et de los sus sieruos non se amatasse de tod en Espanna” (564 vv. 21l – 23l).

Reference to Pelayo’s *peregrinatio vitae* begins in chapter 549, “De las nemigas et las auolezas del rey Vitiza.” The chapter states that King Vitiza exiled the “inffante don Pelayo.” (549 vv. 43l -44l). The author lets the reader know that this is the same don Pelayo that will later defeat the Arabs. In chapter 552, the author notes that Vitiza wanted to remove don Pelayo’s eyes; however, don Pelayo escapes and finds shelter in Cantabria, “ca *Dios quiere* guardar en Espanna
donde se leuantasse acorro et libramiento a la tierra” (552 vv. 16r – 17r; my emphasis). Pelayo is protected by God. Similar to the Cid after his exile, Pelayo seemingly has God as his Lord.

Alan Deyermond, in the “The Death and Rebirth of Visigothic Spain in the Estoria de España,” asserts that:

Medieval writers inherited this figural scheme, and contributed two important innovations: the extension of prefiguration to secular events (thus, the translatio imperii is an aspect of figura); and something for which there is no technical term, but which may usefully be labeled postfiguration – that is to say, events in the lives of Christian men and women, and of Christian nations, which are shadowy, imperfect, yet unmistakable reflections of events in the life of Christ. [...] Such postfiguration, in which Christian [...] individuals are presented [...] as [...] retrotypes, was complemented by an awareness that the Old Testament prefigured [...] the New (356)

Pelayo is the Redeemer of Spain, and as such, he is one such Deyermondian retrottype. This is reflected in the repetition of Pelayo as the light of/beacon for Christians and its contrast to Rodrigo’s construction previously.

4.6.1: TREACHERY AND THE RAPE OF PELAYO’S SISTER

Pelayo displays the proper way to respond to dishonor. Chapter 565 recounts that in Gijon, Asturias, there was a mayor named Munuça and he was Christian, “mas pero auie yura fecha con los moros et era de su parte, et tenie aquella tierra et otros llogares que los moros ganaran en las montannas de su mano dellos” (565 vv.42l – 47l). Munuça fell in love with Pelayo’s beautiful sister. He started, “engannosamente,” a relationship with her. He pretended that he needed to send “su mandado a Tarif” and sent Pelayo. Munuça then married Pelayo’s sister. When Pelayo returned and found out that Munuça had taken his sister for his bride, he was upset. This is a clandestine
marriage, forbidden, according to the *Siete Partidas* by the Church: Marriage “should be contracted openly and not in secret, as it is well known that an evil intention influences men who contract marriages by stealth, without the knowledge of relatives of those whom they marry” (4.3.5). The narrator notes that because Pelayo was “omne atreuudo et buen cristiano” he did not want to suffer the evil and vile marriage. Defiantly, he took his sister, still nameless, to Asturias without saying anything to her new husband. The narrator notes that he did this “con gran corage pensado como podrie librar la cristiandad, ca fiaua en Dios que lo podrie aun fazer.” (565 vv. 16r – 18r). Though similar in offenses and actions in response, Pelayo’s reasoning and the extent of his actions contrast to Count Julian’s. Both, to some extent, clandestinely removed their female relatives from the reach of the king. However, while Count Julian counted on the Arabs for support, Pelayo counts on his Christian God. As the narrator says, “ca fiaua en Dios que lo podrie aun fazer” (565 vv. 17r – 18r). Pelayo, unlike Count Julian, also seems to adhere to the law that forbade the killing, wounding or the doing of any harm to the offender (*Siete Partidas* 4.3.5).

Munuça was upset by the fact that Pelayo took his bride from him. He took it as a great offense and dishonor. Here we see that masculine identity is constructed in relation to the feminine. Munuça sent word to Tarif to find Pelayo in the mountains. Tarif wrathfully sends 100 knights to capture Pelayo and to bring him to Cordoba in chains. As soon as the Moors arrived to Asturias they wanted to capture the traitor, as they called Pelayo, to capture him discreetly, but “sopolo el luego por un su amigo que ge lo fue dezir yl conseio que pues que non tenie armas nin poder con que se les pudiesse defender que se fuesse su uia.” (565 vv. 31 – 34). Pelayo is seemingly lacking the phallus. He has no men. He does not have sufficient weapons to defend himself. Pelayo was in a village called Breta and there he took refuge, fled by horse through the Pionia River to the other part and climbed the mountain. The Moors followed him but did not dare cross the river because
it was “grand et lleno.” Pelayo next came to the Cangas Valley and in this valley, he found many scared men that had fled because of the Moors. Pelayo’s interaction with the men prefaces his skills as a good leader and a good Christian. Pelayo, because of his fortitude and because of his boldness and audacity, encouraged and inspired the men, giving them the hope of God’s help, and telling them: “amigos, pero que Dios fiere et quebranta los sus fíjos por sus pecados, non quiere por eso oluidarlos por siempre de se non doler dellos” (565 vv. 48 – 50). The men “metieron mientes” in Pelayo’s good reasoning and in his “saintly” words and became less afraid. They became more courageous and loyal. They got behind him and went with him to the Auseua mountain. Pelayo then sent his messengers and his good “amonestamientos” to all of Asturias. He woke them up and took them out of the cowardice in which they found themselves as if they had been awoken from a “grieue suenno.” And from all parts of Asturias the people came running, as if he were, in the words of the narrator, “algún mandadero de Dios.” Pelayo, like the Cid, is a hero protected by God. This scene is similar to the Cid’s dream in which the Angel Gabriel comments that “nunca en tan buen punto cavalgó varón!” and that “[mientras] que visquiéredes, bien se fará lo to.” The Cid wakes up and does the sign of the cross and “a Dios se acomendó.” Pelayo is the redemption to the Rodrigo’s failure. As Geraldine Coates argues,

With the introduction of Pelayo, there is hope that the entire Visigothic heritage will be recreated from its humble remains, and herein lies what Colin Smith calls ‘a myth perhaps nobler, purer, more inspired and more directly useful than any other myth: the myth of the Goths, their continuity, their goodness and nobility’ (1982: 60)” (Coates 92).

Pelayo reinstitutes loyalty as a characteristic of a leader. Simon Barton, in discussing Pelayo notes that the story takes place in an age “when defense of family honor was considered essential” (Conquerors 20). He, therefore, argues and I tend to agree that Pelayo’s desire to avenge the
dishonor brought about by his sister’s marriage to Munuça is justifiable. I would, further, connect this justifiability to his display of Christian masculinity. Count Julian experiences something similar; however, the characterization of his avenging his daughter is seemingly negative. From the characterization, it appears that Count Julian has more in common with Munuça than with Pelayo.

4.6.2: THE LEGITIMATE CHRISTIAN KING

When Pelayo became king, he began to slaughter all of the Moors he could, wherever he found them. He went from cape to cape, “punno de meterlos en bollicio et en grand priessa […] a guisa de buen cabdiello.” Pelayo displayed a strength that was missing in Rodrigo’s men when they fought the Arabs. Tarif’s knights, that came to capture Pelayo, when they saw the strength of Pelayo, turned around to Cordoba and reported it to Tarif. When Tarif heard this, wrathfully, he sent a prince and an archbishop of Sevilla against Pelayo. The prince’s name was Alchaman and he went with a great cavalry. The archbishop was Oppa, the son of the king Egica, previously described as having been dirtied by “adulterio espiritual.” Tarif believed that by sending the archbishop, the archbishop could convince Pelayo to join the Arabs. Alchaman was sent so that if Pelayo was not convinced by the archbishop, he would be convinced by Alchaman: “si don Pelayo non quisiesse fazer lo quel conseiasse ell arçobispo, quel combatiesse mui de rezio yl tomasse por fuerça et despues que ge le leuase preso en cadena a Cordoua” (566 vv. 36 – 40). Again, we see the use of violence as a means by which men interact.

Pelayo, seemingly blessed with the Cid’s skill of augurio, again found out that that Alchaman and Oppa were after him and fled to a cave in a mountain. Pelayo took the best men to the cave and sent the other men to the top of the mountain. Alchaman and Oppa arrive to the mountain with their men, “fonderos et ballesteros et omnes a pie,” and did a lot of damage, getting
closer and closer to Pelayo. They then set up their tents and set up camp outside of the cave. The archbishop Oppa arrived one day to the cave on a mule to talk to Pelayo. His words were “falagueras pero engañosas.” Oppa spoke as if the fall of the Christians affected him. He said:

¡ay Pelayo!, bien sabes tu quan grand fue siempre el prez et el poder de los godos en Espanna, ca maguer que ouieron guerra con los romanos et los barbaros nunca fueron uençudos; mas agora sonlo ya por el iuyzio de Dios, et toda su fuerça crebantada et aterrada

(568 vv. 35r – 41r)

Oppa argues that it is the will of God and therefore asks Pelayo why he is even trying. He questions why Pelayo enclosed himself in the cave with only a few men. He questions why Pelayo believes he can defend himself when Rodrigo with all of his men could not defend himself against the Arabs. There is a difference between Rodrigo and Pelayo. One was an illegitimate tyrant, the other is a Christian Redeemer. The archbishop Oppa gives him a history lesson on the Goths. He warns him to take his things and save his own life by joining Tarif, a prince that he describes as “aquel princep tan onrrado que nunca fue uençudo” and argues, ironically, that Pelayo and his men will have honor if they admit defeat and join Tarif. They will be rich and honored all the rest of their life.

Pelayo’s response, a reinterpretation of history or rather a more correct interpretation of history, displays Pelayo’s intellectual acumen. Rodrigo was not able to correctly interpret the sign he was given when he opened the ark in the Toledo palace. However, here we see Pelayo’s ability to read and interpret correctly. Pelayo argues that Oppa does not know that God punishes sinners for some time. He does not abandon them or forget about them forever. As the narrator states, Pelayo knows well that Oppa and his brother Vitiza “killed” God badly with their sins that they committed with Count Julian, “sieruo de Satanas.” Pelayo explains that the church and Christianity
are broken and that this can last for only a little while. God does not want it to be forever, “ca aun la cristiandad se leuantara.” Pelayo believes in the mercy of God. He explains his faith, specifically in the Virgin Mary and says that he will be the vindication of the Goths. He will be the Redeemer. After having given his speech, he returns to the cave where his men were frightened of the large army that accompanied Oppa. They all prayed to the Virgin Mary, like the Cid had done for the Cid, for help. Oppa realized that Pelayo had a lot of faith in God and tells the Arabs that Pelayo is desperate and is fighting a losing battle. The only recourse is to battle him. Alchaman sent his men; however, according to Alfonso’s retelling, the power of God protected Pelayo’s men. Pelayo leaves the cave with his men and kills Alchaman and his men. The Arabs that remained fled to the top of the mountain where Pelayo’s other men were waiting and Pelayo’s men killed them. Oppa became a prisoner of Pelayo. From this story, we see that Pelayo’s mesura, faithfulness, and use of violence in the name of a Christian God. His mesura and faithfulness inspire and covert their men. If the goal of the Estoria was as the prologue purports, to teach princes how to be princes, it should come as no surprise that, in Alfonso X’s retelling of the story of Pelayo, he would emphasize Pelayo as a king that came into his authority legitimately, has a legitimate lineage, was forthright, was loyal, was humble, had mesura, and used violence in the name of a Christian God.
CONCLUSIONS

Giorgio Agamben, in Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive, contends that “[perhaps] every word, every writing is born [...] as testimony.” Agamben defines the term testimony as “[a] system of relations between the inside and outside of langue, between the sayable and the unsayable in every language [...], between a potentiality of speech and its existence, between a possibility and an impossibility of speech” (145). Testimony, etymologically, derives from the Latin word testis, a witness, which “signifies the person who, in a trial or a lawsuit between two rival parties, is in the position of the third party” (Agamben 17). Testis also, of course, means “testicle.”

Joshua Katz, in “Testimonia Ritus Italici: Male Genitalia, Solemn Declarations, and a New Latin Sound Law,” argues that testis meaning “witness” precedes that of testis meaning testicle and that “[no] one has ever seriously doubted [that] the divergence in sense arises from semantic split rather than phonological merger” (183). Nonetheless, Katz contends that “the cross-culturally common link between testicles and solemn oaths ... lies at the root of the Latin semantic root” (192). In Genesis, Abraham bids his servant to: “Put thy hand under my thigh, / That I may make thee swear by the Lord God of heaven and earth ...” (Genesis 24:2–3). The servant later “put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his lord, and swore to him upon this word” (Genesis 24:9). Here we have two men swearing an oath on Abraham’s testicles. As Katz argues, this “powerful symbol” had the implication that if one bore false witness it “[brought] a curse upon not only oneself, but one’s house and one’s future line” (193). But what of those individuals that lacked testicles? Were they able to make oaths? As Katz contends, “the testes or testiculi are literally the

---

“Additionally, Agamben cites superstes as another Latin derivation of the modern term witness. He notes that superstes “designates a person who has lived through something, who has experienced an event from the beginning to end and can therefore bear witness to it” (17).
witnesses, the objects without which the oath would not be binding or the ritual would not have the desired effect” (193. Therefore, only those with testicles could make oaths.

Bearing witness is not the only power afforded those with testicles. As I mentioned in the section on “Medieval Genders,” Galen contended that “[heat] is the property of masculinity and cold the prerogative of femininity” and “the dominant presence of one or other of these qualities in the testicles determines both the appearance of the individual, his or her endowment with hair and the sex of the future embryo, as well as the sexual abilities of the person who will develop out of it” (117). For Constantine the African, “[the] size of the right testicle show [sic] an aptitude to beget males” (117).

The Poema de mio Cid, the Libro de Alexandre, the Libro de Apolonio and the Estoria de Espanna are testimonies, speculum, and their male authors and characters witnesses — witnesses to a process in which the conventions and protocols of medieval masculinity are inculcated as normative behaviors. As Hans Robert Jauss insists in Toward an Aesthetic of Reception, “a literary work is not an object that stands by itself ... It is not a monument that monologically reveals its timeless essence.” (21) Literature is “dialogic.” It exists in the form of a dialogue between text and reader and/or listening audience. Literature is an event. As Jauss argues “[the] coherence of literature as event is primarily mediated in the horizon of expectations of the literary experience of contemporary and later readers, critics, and authors.” (22) This is similar to masculinity. Masculinity is not an object that stands by itself. It has a dialogical character — a character that I argue requires bearing witness.

In this “body of works” I have examined, I have argued that each hero, in the performance of his gendered self, reinforces the superiority of a specific type of masculinity that he himself exemplifies. That being said, I should acknowledge that the texts reinforce the superiority of men.
Their speech and their actions, those of the exemplary heroes, become naturalized and become thereby inherently and exemplarily masculine. Within the confines of the stories, the relationships between the masculine hero and other men were essential in the construction of their own masculinity. Though there are occasions, PMC and Apolonio, in which a hero defines his masculinity in relation to a woman, the supremacy of either homosocial relationships, in PMC, or homosocial *translatio*, in Apolonio is evident. Apollonius was not redeemed until he had a son. That notwithstanding, the end goal is to naturalize masculine hegemony. Literature written by men bearing witness to the experiences of men in order to teach other men how to be is a masturbatory iteration of narrative power. The male hero in each of the works, through his words and actions, constructs a version of masculinity tied to power and a version of masculinity that is superior and/or divinely sanctioned.
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