

Copyright
by
Delia Avila Atmaca
2011

**The Report Committee for Delia Avila Atmaca
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**The Paradoxical Exemplar:
The Image of Saladin in Don Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor***

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Michael Harney

Madeline Sutherland-Meier

**The Paradoxical Exemplar:
The Image of Saladin in Don Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor***

by

Delia Avila Atmaca, B.F.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2011

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my beloved parents, who by their sacrifice, perseverance, generous spirit and unconditional love, have been my greatest teachers in life.

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the inspiration, guidance and support of Dr. Michael Harney and Dr. Madeline Sutherland-Meier: thank you. I owe my gratitude to Dr. Elizabeth Richmond-Garza and Dr. César A. Salgado for turning the wheels to make my academic goal a reality. I extend a very special thanks to my mentor, Dr. Samer M. Ali, who ignited my love for medieval literature. Finally, I give thanks to Dr. Banafsheh Madaninejad, for being my tireless cheerleader and all-weather friend.

Abstract

The Paradoxical Exemplar: The Image of Saladin in Don Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor*

Delia Avila Atmaca, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Michael Harney

Don Juan Manuel's laudatory portrayal of Saladin, the Muslim Sultan of Babylon, in Exempla 25 and 50 of *El Conde Lucanor* presents an interesting paradox, particularly when considering that the fourteenth-century text was intended as moral instruction for a Christian audience. This report addresses this paradox by determining Saladin's placement within Juan Manuel's moral and spiritual philosophy through textual and comparative character analyses. The first section applies Victor Turner's social drama theory in a textual analysis of Exempla 25 and 50 to establish Juan Manuel's representation of Saladin as a triumphant figure, capable of meeting and overcoming challenges to his honor and virtue. The second section applies M. M. Bakhtin's concept of dialogism to engage in a closer examination of Saladin's "voice" in relation to other characters of Juan Manuel's exempla for the purpose of revealing the ambiguities and finer intricacies of Saladin's character. These analyses serve to raise and address paradoxical questions relating to Juan Manuel's presentation of Saladin as both a Muslim adversary and friend of Christendom.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Saladin Challenged and Vetted.....	5
Exemplum 25: Contest between Rivals.....	7
Exemplum 50: Contest of the Soul.....	23
Conclusion.....	35
Saladin: Such Stuff As Dreams Are Made On.....	37
It Is What It Is (Not): Saladin in Contrast.....	38
Friendship and Affiliation: Saladin and the Count of Provence.....	43
Saladin: The Greatest Man in the World.....	51
Conclusion.....	64
Bibliography.....	65

Introduction

El Conde Lucanor is one of the earliest literary works of prose written in Old Castilian Spanish, published in 1335 near the end of its author Don Juan Manuel's, life—a life spent at court and on the battlefield, leading the *Reconquista* at fronts that included northern Morocco and Murcia. Juan Manuel (who is author of an additional nine or eleven texts¹) intended *El Conde Lucanor* to serve as moral instruction for a Christian audience: “Este libro fizo don Johan, fijo del muy noble infante don Manuel, deseando que los omnes fiziessen en este mundo tales obras que les fuessen aprovechosas de las onras e de las faziendas e de sus estados, e fuessen más allegados a la carrera porque pudiessen salvar las almas.”² The text is typically organized into five sections: a preliminary section of fifty-one exempla, three sections of proverbs, and a fifth section presenting a brief, theological treatise. All sections are embedded in a larger frame story, featuring Count Lucanor, a nobleman fashioned in the image of Juan Manuel, and his wise counselor, Patronio. Each exemplum begins with Count Lucanor presenting a dilemma to Patronio, who responds with a moral tale. Juan Manuel's exempla thus contain a vast array of characters, including men and women, the rich and poor, clerics and nobles, and Muslims and Christians. Among these characters, however, there is one that presents a particular paradox in Juan Manuel's didactic text—the Muslim figure of Saladin (Salah al-Din Yusuf ibn Ayyub, c.1138-93 C.E.).

Juan Manuel features Saladin, the Sultan of Babylon, in Exempla 3, 25 and 50. In Exempla 3, Saladin's presence is implied as King Richard I's Muslim adversary, awaiting the Christian crusader armies on the shore of *Ultramar/Outremer*. The primary focus of

¹ Alfonso I. Sotelo, introduction to *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, by Don Juan Manuel, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 26.

² Don Juan Manuel, *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 71.

Exempla 3, however, is King Richard I's iconic leap into the sea to meet Saladin in battle—an action he commits in service to God. Exempla 3 thus portrays Saladin as an unequivocal enemy of Christendom, but Juan Manuel later presents Saladin prominently in Exempla 25 and 50 not as a nemesis but as a praise-worthy, chivalrous figure. In Exemplum 50, Juan Manuel even goes so far as to pronounce that Saladin is “the greatest man in the world.” How then does Juan Manuel reconcile such an esteemed portrayal of the great Muslim leader with his championing of the crusades and *Reconquista*, moreover, in a book intended as moral instruction for a Christian audience? Juan Manuel's venerable representation of Saladin in *El Conde Lucanor* is all the more puzzling because the text was composed at the height of the Iberian *Reconquista*. Indeed, Juan Manuel was intimately familiar with life on the battlefield; he had fought in wars against Muslims since the age of twelve.³ It should be noted, however, that *El Conde Lucanor* features several other Muslim characters besides Saladin, including, among others, the historical Alhaquem (Al-Hakam II, Caliph of Cordoba, 961-76 C.E.), an impoverished brother and sister who steal items from corpses as a means for survival, an esteemed Moroccan philosopher, a “fine young man” and his shrewish wife, the King of Granada,⁴ and a clever “buena dueña” (good lady). It is Saladin, however, who towers in stature above all other characters, Christian or Muslim, in Juan Manuel's exempla.

The paradox of Saladin points in part to another prominent aspect of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Iberian life: *convivencia*. Richard Fletcher states, however, that the experience of Iberian *convivencia* did not necessarily equate to utopian relations

³ H. Tracy Sturcken, *Don Juan Manuel*, Twayne's World Authors Series 303 (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974), 16.

⁴ Presumed to actually be the historical King Abenhuc of Éjica. (Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XXVIII: De cómo mató don Lorenço Çuáres Gallinato a un clérigo que se tornó moro en Granada,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 [Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003], 196-97.)

between Christians and Muslims: “One must not jump to the conclusion that *convivencia*, because long-lasting, was harmonious. The extent to which it was or was not remains a matter of enquiry. It must be said at once that attitudes expressed on both sides of the cultural divide between Christian and Muslim were hostile.”⁵ Fletcher points to derogatory statements expressed by King Sancho IV of Castile, Fernando IV, and Isa Yabir as evidence for his claim. It is probably wise to temper any inclination toward romantic idealism of Christian-Muslim relations in medieval Iberia, but *El Conde Lucanor* presents an interesting case—it is itself, as a text, representative of the tension between simple, everyday fellowship born of co-existence and aggression born of religious-political dogma. The image of the Muslim as integral to daily life in Iberia figures repeatedly in Juan Manuel’s exempla, but it is telling—and in light of Fletcher’s observation, perhaps remarkable—that Juan Manuel does not treat Muslim characters in his text in a manner that is any worse or better than Christian characters. Juan Manuel does frequently insert overt, scathing criticism in *El Conde Lucanor*, but it is reserved for corrupt, hypocritical Christians of every rank—including the Papacy. Thus, *convivencia* has its place in Juan Manuel’s text, but so too does the *Reconquista*. Exemplum 3 and 33 unequivocally champion the cause of warring against Muslims in service to God, in penance of sins, and in defense of Church and Christendom. Exemplum 3, in particular, features an iconic battle at *Ultramar/Outremer* between King Richard I and his Muslim adversary, Saladin. Exempla 3 and 33 stand in dramatic contrast to Exempla 25 and 50, which not only laud Saladin but also present an ambiguous confluence of identities within the Muslim adversary. The paradox of Saladin’s representation as a venerable figure is, therefore, further underscored when placed in context alongside Juan Manuel’s

⁵ Richard Fletcher, *Moorish Spain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 135.

criticism of the Church, his call for Christians to war against Muslims, and the greater, historical milieu of thirteenth-/fourteenth-century Iberia.

This report is devoted to addressing the question of how Juan Manuel reconciles his laudatory representation of Saladin with his championing of the *Reconquista* and the Christian didacticism in *El Conde Lucanor*. The report is divided into two separate sections. Section One is devoted to a close textual analysis of Exempla 25 and 50 using Victor Turner's "social drama" theory. Turner developed his social drama theory from Arnold van Gennep's anthropological model of a tripartite rite of passage, but he suggests that the individual moves successively through *four* phases of a transitional journey: 1) breach, 2) crisis, 3) redressive action, and 4) reintegration.⁶ Section One will therefore follow Saladin through these four phases to examine the manner in which he emerges from crises as a triumphant, virtuous figure worthy of praise and emulation. Section Two applies M. M. Bakhtin's concepts of monologism and dialogism to examine Saladin in relation to other characters in Juan Manuel's exempla, including his Christian counterpart, King Richard I. Such an analysis reveals subtler complexities of Juan Manuel's representation of Saladin, and it allows for a more definitive assessment of how the author reconciles his laudatory portrayal of Saladin with his championing of the *Reconquista* and devotion to Christian dogma.

⁶ Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, Symbol, Myth, and Ritual Series (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975), 38-41.

Saladin Challenged and Vetted

In this section I apply Victor Turner's "social drama" theory to analyses of Exempla 25 and 50 to demonstrate how Juan Manuel presents Saladin, the Sultan of Babylon, not as villainous or tragic, but as virtuous, chivalrous figure, deserving of respect and praise from Christians and Muslims alike. My purpose for applying Turner's social drama theory to a reading of Exempla 25 and 50 is to examine how Saladin moves through the four phases of breach, crisis, redress, and resolution to determine if and how Juan Manuel represents Saladin as a leader who can successfully overcome a challenge and affirm his virtue. Vetting Saladin's status in Juan Manuel's text as a chivalrous figure will allow for the second half of my examination in Section Two, which will address how Juan Manuel situates and perceives Saladin in relation to other voices in *El Conde Lucanor*.

Saladin appears most prominently in Exempla 25 and 50 of Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor*—two stories that present moral challenges to the Sultan's virtue and honor. Exemplum 25 represents Patronio's answer to Count Lucanor's moral question of what constitutes a "good man." The reader learns this lesson through the figure of Saladin, who stands here in relation to his captive, the Christian Count of Provence. The Count's captivity in Babylon⁷ and counsellorship with the Sultan pull Saladin into a state of crisis marked by liminality, in which power and authority in Provence and Babylon are inverted and the division between Saladin and the Count is blurred. Saladin is confronted with a moral challenge in Exemplum 25 that not only determines the stature of his intellect and honor but raises interesting questions about his identity that will be addressed in Section Two of this report. In keeping with the moral question of Exemplum

⁷ Juan Manuel's "Babylon" (*Babilonia*) refers to Salah al-Din's sultanate in Egypt and Syria (reigning 1174-93 C.E.), the seat of which was located in Cairo, Egypt.

25, Exemplum 50 represents Patronio's answer to Count Lucanor's question of what quality is most vital to a good man. Juan Manuel depicts an intimate battle between good and evil, or honor and dishonor, within Saladin's psyche. Saladin falls to temptation by the Devil when he lusts after his vassal's wife. He figuratively "loses his way," and he embarks on an arduous quest to find the answer to a moral question, symbolic of his misplaced virtue. His moral error and subsequent struggle to regain his disturbed psyche serve ultimately to make him stronger.

A brief introduction to the four phases of Turner's social drama is useful here. The first phase of the social drama, the *breach*, represents a violation of social norm. Turner states: "Breach of regular, norm-governed social relations occurs between persons or groups within the same system of social relations...Such a breach is signaled by the public, overt breach or deliberate nonfulfillment of some crucial norm regulating the intercourse of the parties."⁸ From the breach develops the *crisis*, the phase in the social drama where the initial violation of social norm broadens and escalates the rupture of social cohesion. Moreover, Turner states that the crisis phase contains an aspect of inherent liminality, in which persons "are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial."⁹ The third phase, *redressive action*, marks the process of resolution of the crisis, in which "certain adjustive and redressive 'mechanisms'...informal or formal, institutionalized or ad hoc, are swiftly brought into operation by leading or structurally representative members of the disturbed social system."¹⁰ This phase is a transitional process between crisis and reintegration, and therefore Turner suggests that the redressive

⁸ Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 38.

⁹ Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (1969; reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction, 2009), 95.

¹⁰ Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 39.

phase is also marked by a measure of liminality.¹¹ The final phase, *reintegration*, represents the conclusive resolution to the social drama, in which, in positive cases, the parties involved are brought back “into the fold,” are reintegrated socially and psychically into the social group. Turner notes, however, that the reintegration does not mean a return to the original state of being prior to the breach. Rather, the subject or parties involved are changed by the experience of the disruptive breach and crisis, and the subject may reemerge, for example, either diminished in status or aggrandized.¹²

EXEMPLUM 25: CONTEST BETWEEN RIVALS

Juan Manuel opens Exemplum 25 with the Christian Count of Provence embarking on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land for the glory of God and improvement of his soul: “Deseava mucho fazer en guisa porquel oviesse Dios merced al alma e ganasse la gloria del Paraíso, faziendo tales obras que fuesen a grand su onra e del su estado.”¹³ The Count departs on his journey with ample attendants and provision (“tomó muy grand gente consigo, e muy bien aguisada”¹⁴), leaving behind his family and dominion and placing all his trust in God. Ironically, it is God Himself who initiates the breach in the story, allowing for a turn of fate: “Nuestro Señor tiene por bien de tentar muchas vezes a los sus amigos, pero si aquella temptación saben sufrir, siempre Nuestro Señor guisa que torne el pleito a onra e a pro de aquel a quien tienta; e por esta razón tovo Nuestro Señor por bien de temptar al conde de Provençia, e consintió que fuesse preso en poder del

¹¹ Ibid., 41.

¹² Ibid., 42.

¹³ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XXV: De lo que contesçió al conde de Provençia, cómo fue librado de la prisión por el consejo que le dio Saladín,” in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 171.

¹⁴ Ibid.

soldán.”¹⁵ The Count’s resulting crisis therefore carries a moral and spiritual dimension; rather than arriving at his intended destination of the Holy Land, which would have bestowed honor upon the Count and his family, he finds himself disgraced, imprisoned at the hands of his rival, Saladin, in the Muslim dominion of Babylon.

Saladin’s Babylon does not simply lie geographically south of the Holy Land but is, rather, the symbolic nadir of the Count’s spiritual universe, the furthest distant point from “Paradise.” The Count’s journey is upended, and the wheel of fortune makes a downward turn for the worse, landing him in genteel captivity. Saladin treats the Count with all the respect and dignity that a nobleman of his title would command (“sabiendo Saladín la grand vondat del conde, fazíale mucho bien e mucha onra”¹⁶). In spite of their relationship as captor and captive, Saladin and the Count share a cordial friendship, and Saladin employs the Count as his entrusted counselor. The Count is so well respected that he enjoys the same stature in power and influence in Babylon as he had in his own dominion: “Commo quier que estaba preso, que tan grand logar e tan grand poder avía, e tanto fazían por él en toda la tierra de Saladín, commo farían en la suya misma.”¹⁷ Babylon is therefore a simulacrum of Provence, and it is this mirror-like aspect between the two dominions that affects the relationship between Saladin and the Count in the crisis phase of Exemplum 25.

The Count is held captive for a protracted time (“el conde estudo tan grand tiempo en la prisión”¹⁸). The Count’s governing counsel proves to be a great asset to Saladin in Babylon: “Todos los grandes fechos que avía [Saladín] de fazer todos los fazía por su

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., 171.

¹⁷ Ibid., 171-72.

¹⁸ Ibid., 172.

consejo.”¹⁹ Juan Manuel reiterates this fact when the Count tells Saladin, “E pues vos, señor, tenedes por bien que vos conseje yo en todas las cosas que vos acaesçen.”²⁰ Yet, while Babylon benefits, Provence is left vulnerable without its lord, and the Count’s absence from his dominion places the Count’s honor and the honor of his family at stake.

The Count’s good counsel is essentially a “gift” to Saladin, and Saladin pays his “debt” by giving luxurious material gifts to the Count. In this scenario, the Count’s currency lies in his wisdom and intelligence, while Saladin’s currency lies in his material wealth. According to Marcel Mauss, Saladin’s munificent gift-giving represents a symbolic display of power in relation to the Count: “He can only prove [his] good fortune by spending it and sharing it out, humiliating others by placing them ‘in the shadow of his name.’”²¹ In giving these gifts to the Count, Saladin reinforces his status as the possessor of enormous wealth—as one who is capable of giving such luxurious gifts with ease. Thus, with each exchange of wise counsel and material gift, the roles of the Count and Saladin as respective captive and captor become more deeply entrenched. Juan Manuel suggests, however, that Babylon grows in size and power primarily because Saladin follows the Count’s governing counsel. Therefore, from this perspective, the roles of captor and captive are actually blurred. If Babylon benefits directly from the Count, then who is in fact the real Sultan of Babylon? Though Saladin continues to function officially as the Sultan, in private he is increasingly the figurative captive to the Count’s counsel. Suddenly, Saladin’s gift-giving betrays a possible measure of anxiety: the more Saladin grows dependent on the Count’s governing counsel, the more Saladin may feel pressured to emphasize his power before the Count. According to Turner, this

¹⁹ Ibid., 171.

²⁰ Ibid., 172.

²¹ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. W. D. Halls (1950; reprint, New York: W.W Norton, 2000), 39.

figurative status reversal points to a state of liminality: “To my mind it is the analysis of culture into factors and their free or ‘ludic’ recombination in any and every possible pattern, however weird, that is of the essence of liminality, liminality *par excellence* [emphasis in original].”²²

States of liminality are a condition of the crisis phase in Turner’s social drama, and to the extent that Saladin and the Count are entwined in a relationship, the crisis in Exemplum 25 is actually dual in nature. The most evident aspect of this crisis is the Count’s captivity in Babylon, which displaces him from his governing post in Provence and serves to dishonor the Count and his family. The Count’s captivity is a serious blow to the political and economic stability of Provence, for we may assume that while Babylon grows in wealth and power thanks to the Count’s counsel, Provence languishes in his absence. Moreover, to the extent that the Count’s captivity in Babylon represents a geographic diversion from his intended destination of the Holy Land and a moral test by God (“tovo Nuestro Señor por bien de temptar al conde de Provençia, e consintió que fuesse preso en poder del soldán”²³), the Count’s benefit to the Muslim dominion of Babylon also symbolizes a spiritual turning away from God.

The Count’s captivity in Babylon places him in a state of liminality; Babylon may serve as a simulacrum that provides him with the same level of prestige and luxury as he enjoyed in Provence, but the fact remains that he is still a prisoner and is neither truly free or powerful in Babylon nor in active command of his dominion in Provence. Yet, the Count is not alone in this crisis, for his relationship with the Sultan serves to pull Saladin

²² Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play* (New York: PAJ Publications, 1982), 28.

²³ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 171.

into a state of liminality as well. This shared liminality between Saladin and the Count represents a state of *communitas*, of which Turner states:

In liminality, *communitas* tends to characterize relationships between those jointly undergoing ritual transition. The bonds of *communitas* are anti-structural in the sense that they are undifferentiated, equalitarian, direct, extant, nonrational, existential, I-Thou (in Feuerbach's and Buber's sense) relationships. ...*Communitas* differs from the camaraderie found often in everyday life, which though informal and egalitarian, still falls within the general domain of structure, which may include interaction rituals.²⁴

Thus, to the extent that Saladin grows increasingly dependent on the Count's governing counsel and the distinction between captor and captive is blurred, the Count's crisis is also Saladin's crisis.

Taking this dual crisis into account, the impending marriage of the Count's daughter represents a critical crossroads for both the Count and Saladin. It is also the point at which their shared liminality reaches its furthest extent—that is, the point at which the roles of the Sultan of Babylon and the Count of Provence are completely reversed. This occurs when the Count seeks Saladin's advice on selecting a proper spouse for his daughter:

“Señor, vos me fazedes a mí tanta merçed e tanta onra e fiades tanto de mí que me ternía por muy de buena ventura si vos lo pudiesse servir. E pues vos, señor, tenedes por bien que vos consejo yo en todas las cosas que vos acaesçen, atreviéndome a la vuestra merçed e fiando del vuestro entendimiento, píдовos por merçed que me consejedes en una cosa que a mí acaesçió.”...Entonçe le dixo el conde de los casamientos quel movían para aquella su fija e pidiol por merçed quel consejase con quién la casaría.²⁵

The fact that the Count cannot select a proper suitor points to his ineffectiveness as a lord in absentia and underscores the severity of the Count's crisis. Saladin agrees to advise the

²⁴ Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 274.

²⁵ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 172.

Count, and in so doing takes on the roles of father-figure to the Count's daughter and lord of Provence. The roles of the Count of Provence and Sultan of Babylon are now completely reversed, underscoring their shared liminality, or *communitas*.

It is this point of reversal, however, that also marks the beginning of redress, the moment in which the stage is set for the Count's rescue and restoration to his proper place in Provence. The redress occurs primarily because the Count's request for advice places Saladin on the spot. It is not by accident that the Count prefaces his request by discreetly reminding Saladin of the counsel he has provided the Sultan: "E pues vos, señor, tenedes por bien que vos consejo yo en todas las cosas que vos acaesçen, atreviéndome a la vuestra merçed e fiando del vuestro entendimiento, pídovos por merçed que me consejedes en una cosa que a mí acaesçió."²⁶ The Count gently reminds Saladin that his counsel is a bestowed gift, and for once, he humbly asks Saladin to reciprocate in kind with his own counsel. Mauss illuminates the underlying dynamic of this scenario: "Also, one gives because one is compelled to do so, because the recipient possesses some kind of right of property over anything that belongs to the donor."²⁷ Moreover, according to Mauss, the Count's gift of counsel places a burden upon Saladin; the Sultan must grant the Count his request or lose face:

A gift is received 'with a burden attached.' One does more than derive benefit from a thing or a festival: one has accepted a challenge, and has been able to do so because of being certain to be able to reciprocate, to prove one is not unequal. ...To refrain from giving, just as to refrain from accepting, is to lose rank—as is refraining from reciprocating.²⁸

Saladin implicitly understands his obligation for reciprocation, and he responds in due manner: "El soldán gradesçió esto mucho al conde, e díxol quel consejaría muy de grado;

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Mauss, 13.

²⁸ Ibid., 41.

e aún, quel aydaría muy de buenamente en quequiera quel cumpliesse.”²⁹ The Count’s gift of counsel places a burden on the Sultan, and Saladin must prove that he is indeed every measure the Sultan of Babylon, more than capable of reciprocating in kind. Saladin’s reputation is on the line—not simply in relation to his ability to reciprocate a gift, but also for his intellectual ability to provide good counsel. This burden effectively ensures that Saladin will give the Count the highest form of wise counsel he can offer—indeed, as we come to learn, his counsel results in the Count’s rescue from Babylon. In his essay, “Male Bonding as Cultural Construction in Alfonso X, Ramon Llull, and Juan Manuel,” Roberto J. González-Casanovas supports the argument that Saladin’s noble reputation is embodied in his counsel: “The proofs of loyalty and nobility take the forms, not of heroic companionship in military or political action, but of trustworthy service by means of good counsels in noble domestic affairs and matters of conscience.”³⁰

Thus, Saladin graciously fulfills the Count’s request, advising him to marry his daughter to an *omne* [man].³¹ This concise response is loaded with meaning, and the Sultan’s choice of *omne* for the Count’s daughter reflects Juan Manuel’s scheme of what defines a respectable man:

E falló que un fijo de un rico omne que non era de muy grand poder, que segund lo que paresçia dél en aquel escripto, que era el mejor omne e el más complido, e más sin ninguna mala tacha de que él nunca oyera fablar. E desque esto oyó el soldán, consejo al conde que casase su fija con aquel omne, ca entendió que, commoquier que aquellos otros eran mas onrados e más fijos dalgo, que mejor casamiento era quel e mejor casava el conde su fija con aquél que con ninguno de los otros en que oviesse una mala tacha, quanto más si oviesse muchas; e tovo que

²⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 172.

³⁰ Roberto J. González-Casanovas, “Male Bonding as Cultural Construction in Alfonso X, Ramon Llull, and Juan Manuel: Homosocial Friendship in Medieval Iberia,” in *Queer Iberia: Sexualities, Cultures, and Crossings from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance*, ed. Josiah Blackmore and Gregory S. Hutcheson (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999), 182.

³¹ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 173.

más de preçiar era el omne por las sus obras que non por su riqueza, nin por nobleza de su linage.³²

Saladin's selection of an *omne* as a proper suitor marks the beginning of redressive action, setting the stage for the Count's rescue. Saladin's redressive action is beneficial to all parties, restoring persons to their proper place in the world: Saladin as the undisputed Sultan of Babylon and the Count as head of his family and lord of Provence. The question remains, however, whether Saladin's restoration of the Count's honor is born at least partially from a genuine concern for the Count as his esteemed friend. Likewise, there remains the paradox of Saladin instrumentality in God's plan for the Count. That is, to the extent that God tests the Count's faith by allowing him to be taken captive ("Nuestro Señor tiene por bien de tentar muchas vezes a los sus amigos...e por esta razón tovo Nuestro Señor por bien de temptar al conde de Provençia, e consintió que fuesse preso en poder del soldán"³³), Saladin plays a central role in God's overarching plan. From this perspective, Saladin's religious affiliation is beside the point because God uses him both to test the Count's faith as well as to initiate his rescue from captivity. This paradox leads to a question of Juan Manuel's perception of Saladin's identity. These questions are further addressed in Section Two of this report.

The key to Saladin's redress lies in the foundational quality of a proper *omne*—i.e., that he be a man of good actions (deeds and works), or "omne por las sus obras."³⁴ Saladin's choice for a suitor serves, therefore, as an implicit call to action. Saladin understands that such an *omne* would not suffer dishonor to himself or his family and would take immediate measures to defend and restore it; thus it is only a matter of time

³² Ibid., 173-74.

³³ Ibid., 171.

³⁴ Ibid., 174.

before the Count is rescued from Babylon. We may assume that Saladin is confident in the strength of his power and mind to meet the forthcoming contest with the suitor.

Indeed, before he even consummates his new marriage, the suitor (now, the new son-in-law) announces that he is leaving Provence to rescue the Count and take back the family's honor, answering Saladin's call to action:

Llamó a la condessa e a sus parientes e díxoles en grant poridat que bien sabien que el conde le escogiera entre otros muy mejores que él, e que lo fiziera porque el soldán le consejara que casasse su fija con omne, e pues el soldán e el conde tanta onra le fizieran e lo escogieran por omne, que ternía él que non era omne si non fiziesse en esto lo que pertenesçia; e que se quería ir e que les dexava aquella doncella con qui él avía de casar, e el condado: que él fiava por Dios que él le endereçaría porque entendiesen las gentes que fazía fecho de omne.³⁵

The son-in-law is fully aware that a standard has been set for him, and that his own honor lies in the balance until he meets that standard by rescuing the Count. Thus, he too finds himself at this moment in a state of liminality. The unconsummated marriage underscores his liminal state, keeping him from fully entering into a legal and moral contract with the Count's family. With the marriage in limbo, the honor of all involved parties (the son-in-law, his family, the Count, and the Count's family) also remains in limbo.³⁶ The son-in-law embarks upon a journey of his own, echoing the Count's journey to the Holy Land. The transportive aspect of his journey is itself inherently liminal. The son-in-law's journey, however, is a deliberate "hunt" for Saladin, and he not only places his trust in God but also takes every precaution to ensure success, traveling to Armenia to learn Saladin's language and culture and acquiring knowledge of Saladin's love for hunting.³⁷

³⁵ Ibid., 175.

³⁶ Note also that an unconsummated marriage provides the son-in-law with a legal "escape hatch," by which he may extricate himself from any commitment to the Count's family in the event of failure in his rescue plan. This evinces pragmatism and political acumen in his character.

³⁷ Ibid., 175.

Significantly, when the son-in-law arrives in Babylon (anonymously and unannounced) he refuses all gifts from Saladin: “E desde que él llegó al soldán, fue muy bien recebido, pero non le besó la mano nin le fizó ninguna reverençia de las que omne deve fazer a su señor. E Saladín mandol dar todo lo que ovo mester, e él gradesçiógelo mucho, mas non quiso tomar dél ninguna cosa e dixo que non viniera por tomar nada dél.”³⁸ Mauss states that the breaking of the obligatory gift-exchange ritual is “tantamount to declaring war; it is to reject the bond of alliance and commonality.”³⁹ In not accepting gifts, the son-in-law thus performs an inherently aggressive action, but this action serves to maintain his autonomy, allowing him to sidestep any obligation to Saladin. On the contrary, it is the son-in-law who offers Saladin the “gift” of selecting fowl and canines from his own possession for a hunt, and it is here that the son-in-law begins to jockey for power over Saladin: “E porque sabía que el soldán era muy caçador, que él traía muchas aves e muy buenas, e muchos canes, e si la su merçed fuesse, que tomasse ende lo que quisiesse, e con lo quel fincaría a él, que andaría con él a caça, e le faría quanto servicio pudiesse en aquello e en ál.”⁴⁰ Consequently, when the son-in-law finally corners and captures Saladin, he is free to respond righteously to the Sultan’s cry of treason: “E el yerno del conde le dixo que non mandasse Dios, que bien sabía él que nunca él le tomara por señor, nin quisiera tomar nada de lo suyo, nin tomar dél ningún encargo porque oviesse razón de lo guardar, mas que sopiesse que Saladín avía fecho todo aquello.”⁴¹ Because the son-in-law avoided entering into a ritual gift exchange with Saladin, his deception against him remains honorable. Note also how the son-in-law

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Mauss, 13.

⁴⁰ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 175.

⁴¹ Ibid., 176.

relies on these reciprocal obligations incumbent in the gift-exchange ritual in his speech to Saladin:

Contol cómo él era el yerno del conde, e que era aquél que él escogiera, entre otros mejores que sí, por omne; e pues é por omne lo escogiera, que bien entendía que non fuera él omne si esto non fiziera; e quel pidípor merçed quel diesse su suegro, *porque entendiesse que el consejo que él le diera que era bueno e verdadero, e que se fallava bien dél* [emphasis mine].⁴²

It is on this point that the son-in-law truly traps Saladin, moreover, without need for physical force or weapons. The son-in-law corners Saladin by using the code of ritual of gift-exchange. That is, in choosing him to be the best suitor to the Count's daughter, Saladin made an implicit (and public) pronouncement that he, the suitor, meets all the qualities necessary, according to Saladin, of a good *omne*. This pronouncement leaves Saladin vulnerable because any unfulfillment of these qualities on the part of the new son-in-law would debase Saladin's intellect and judgment. The son-in-law's plan for capturing Saladin and rescuing his father-in-law rests entirely on this crucial point, and he only needs to remind Saladin of this fact to compel him to release the Count.

The capture of Saladin serves as the climax of Exemplum 25—the fulfillment of the redressive action and the beginning of the reintegration phase, according to Turner's social drama. Surely, the mighty Sultan of Babylon is not so gullible as to not notice the warning signs of imminent danger by the visiting stranger/son-in-law, especially when considering Saladin's conscious choice of a proper *omne* for a suitor and his awareness of the potential (if not certain) implications of that choice. From this perspective, Saladin's cry of treason may be just a show, for when the son-in-law finally reveals his true identity and intent to rescue his father-in-law, Saladin's reaction indicates that he is not bitter or humiliated by his "defeat" but joyful and even grateful: "Quando Saladín esto oyó,

⁴² Ibid., 176-77.

gradesçió mucho a Dios, *e plógol más porque açerto en 'l su consejo*, que sil oviera acaesçido otra pro o otra onra por grande que fuesse. E dixo al yerno del conde que gelo daría muy de *buena mente* [emphasis mine].⁴³ Saladin's wisdom and intellect in providing good counsel are validated, and he compliments the son-in-law for having a "good mind" (*buena mente*), a phrase he previously used in his promise to the Count: "díxol...quel ayudaría muy de *buena mente* en quequiera quel cumpliesse [emphasis mine]."⁴⁴ Hence, the phrase "buena mente" is a clue pointing to Saladin's awareness that his choice for a suitor would inevitably result in the rescue of the Count from Babylon.

Saladin's attendants arrive to find him elated: "E quando las gentes ý llegaron, fallaron a Saladín mucho alegre."⁴⁵ Moreover, Saladin's protection of the son-in-law's true identity and intent points to the Sultan's co-conspiracy in his own capture and, by extension, the Count's rescue: "Y nunca dixo a omne del mundo nada de quanto le avía contesçido."⁴⁶ In private exchange with the Count, Saladin's ebullient praise for the son-in-law also points to this co-conspiracy:

E desde que vio al conde, començol a dezir con muy grand alegría: "—Conde, mucho gradesco a Dios por la merced que me fizo en acertar tan bien commo acerté en 'l consejo que vos di en 'l casamiento de vuestra fíja. Evad aquí vuestro yerno, que vos a sacado de prisión." Entonce le contó todo lo que su yerno avía fecho, la lealdat e el grand esfuerço que fiziera en la prender e en fiar luego en él. E el soldán e el conde e quantos esto sopieron, loaron mucho el entendimiento e el esfuerço e la lealdad del yerno del conde. Otrosí, loaron muncho las vondades de Saladín e del conde, e gradesçieron mucho a Dios porque quiso guisar de lo traer a tan buen acabamiento.⁴⁷

⁴³ Ibid., 177.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 172.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 177.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

The scene is an all-around praise fest. The rescue of the Count from Babylon is a perfect win-win situation for all concerned parties. The Count retains the glory of his influence in Babylon while being restored to his proper place in Provence, the son-in-law earns his title and glory, and Saladin's authority, wisdom, and power are vetted.

Yet, according to Turner's reintegration phase in the social drama, a person does not merely return to his original place in society; rather, in his response to the crisis, a person typically undergoes a change that may ultimately serve to improve and elevate his position. Such is the case for the Count of Provence, son-in-law, and Sultan of Babylon. An examination of the Count's improvement begins with Juan Manuel's suggestion that the Count understands the full meaning and implications of Saladin's recommendation to marry his daughter to an honorable man:

Conde, yo sé que tal es el vuestro entendimiento, que en pocas palabras que vos omne diga entendredes todo el fecho. E por ende vos quiero aconsejar en este pleito segund lo yo entiendo. Yo non conosco todos estos que demandan vuestra fija, qué linage o qué poder an, o quáles son en los sus cuerpos o cuánta vezindat an convusco, o qué mejoría an los unos de los otros, e por ende que non vos puedo en esto aconsejar çiertamente; mas el mio consejo es éste: que casedes vuestra fija con omne. El conde gelo tovo en merçed, *e entendió muy bien* lo que aquello quería decir [emphasis mine].⁴⁸

At this stage, the Count remains physically and ritually trapped in genteel captivity in Babylon, but his comprehension and implementation of Saladin's advice suggest that the Count himself participates, albeit passively, in his own rescue. The moment in which the Count and Saladin reverse roles is also, paradoxically, the moment that marks the beginning of the Count's return to his proper place in Provence. The Count's honor is restored, but he also gains a worthy son-in-law who will ensure the future prosperity of his family and dominion. His material wealth is increased by Saladin, who bestows

⁴⁸ Ibid., 172-73.

substantial parting gifts: “Entonçe dio el soldán muchos dones e muy ricos al conde e a su yerno; e por el enojo que el conde tomara en la prisión, diol dobladas todas las rentas que el conde pudiera levar de su tierra en quanto estudo en la prisión, e enviol muy rico e muy bien andante para su tierra.”⁴⁹

The son-in-law also increases in stature. By rescuing the Count, he meets the implicit standard set by Saladin and proves his mettle, intellect, and honor. Like the Count, the son-in-law benefits materially, receiving many rich gifts from the Sultan. Furthermore, it is understood that he will finally consummate his marriage with the Count’s daughter, as a natural extension of the symbolic “consummation” of his honor. This will complete his contract with the Count’s family and with God (inasmuch as a sanctioned, matrimonial union represents a binding spiritual contract with God), thereby ending his liminal state and reintegrating him into an honorable place in society.

Saladin, like the Count, is also restored to his proper place in the world, and to the extent that he and the Count shared a state of *communitas*, the Count’s restoration serves to pull Saladin out of a state of liminality and back to his proper place as the unequivocal Sultan of Babylon. Juan Manuel suggests that it is Saladin who mobilizes the redress of the Count’s crisis. Though the son-in-law is praised as a hero for journeying to rescue the Count of Provence, it is really Saladin who instigates the rescue from Babylon, and it is he who does it in a benevolent manner that benefits everyone. Juan Manuel’s title for *Exemplum 25* points directly to this fact: “De lo que contesçió al Conde de Provençia, cómo fue librado de la prisión por el consejo que le dio Saladín.” Saladin’s counsel proves to be good and true. Just as his selection for a suitor places a burden upon the new son-in-law to meet Saladin’s implicit standard, so too does the Count’s request for advice

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 177.

place a burden on Saladin to meet, if not exceed, the Count's standard for good counsel. González-Casanovas observes that Exemplum 25 "illustrate[s] the need to correspond fully to the highest expectations that friends and others have of one's virtues,"⁵⁰ and Saladin succeeds in proving his virtue. Indeed, not only does his counsel ensure the prosperity and stability of the Count's family in Provence, but it also serves to rescue the Count from Babylon.

By extension, Saladin's bountiful parting gifts serve not only as tokens of his esteem for the Count and son-in-law, but also as a final, grand display of the Sultan's exceeding power. Of this display, Mauss writes:

He can only preserve his authority over his tribe and village, and even over his family, he can only maintain his rank among the chiefs—both nationally and internationally—if he can prove he is haunted and favoured both by the spirits and by good fortune, that he is possessed, and also possesses it. And he can only prove this good fortune by spending it and sharing it out, humiliating others by placing them "in the shadow of his name."⁵¹

Juan Manuel suggests that Saladin has the Count to thank for much of his prosperity ("todos los grandes fechos que avía de fazer todos los fazía por su consejo"⁵²), but the Count's counsel improves Saladin morally as well. To understand Saladin's moral benefit, we must examine how Juan Manuel repeatedly presents the figure of the subordinate or captive advisor in *El Conde Lucanor*. Exemplum 1, for example, features a similar relationship between a captor and his captive philosopher: "Este privado avía en su casa un su cativo que era muy sabio omne e muy grant philósopho. E todas las cosas que aquel privado del rey avía de fazer, e los consejos qué l avía a dar, todo lo fazía por

⁵⁰ González-Casanovas, in *Queer Iberia*, 184.

⁵¹ Mauss, 39.

⁵² Manuel, "Exemplo XXV," 171.

consejo de aquel su cativo que tenía en casa.”⁵³ Here, the king’s minion is saved from deceit and physical harm thanks to the captive philosopher’s wise counsel: “Oviera a seer aquel privado engañado por mala cobradicia, e quísol Dios guardar, e fue guardado por consejo del sabio que tenía cativo en su casa.”⁵⁴ Exemplum 21 features an orphaned, fledgling king saved from his errant ways and led into proper governance by his adroit foster parent, the court philosopher: “E desque el filósopho vio el pesar e el cuidar que el rey moço tomava, e que había sabor de cuidar en su fazienda, diol muchos buenos consejos en guisa que en poco tiempo fue su fazienda toda endereçada, tan bien de su cuerpo, como de su regno.”⁵⁵ Finally, of even greater significance is the relationship between Count Lucanor and Patronio in the frame story. Count Lucanor outranks Patronio, but his prosperity and prudent leadership are due largely to Patronio’s guidance, and we may assume that with each succeeding exemplum, Count Lucanor grows in acumen. We may likewise assume that Saladin benefits morally from the Count’s counsel—that is, that the counsel augments Saladin’s wisdom and expertise over the course of his relationship with the captive Count.

In the frame story, Patronio suggests that there comes a time when an advisor should no longer dispense advice, implying that he must step aside so the advisee can flourish on his own by using the lessons he has learned:

“Agora, señor conde Lucanor, vos he respondido a esta pregunta que me feziestes e con esta respuesta vos he respondido a çinquenta preguntas que me avedes fecho. E avedes estado en ello tanto tiempo . . . E por ende, vos digo que lo uno por esto, e lo ál por el trabajo que he tomado en las otras respuestas que vos di,

⁵³ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo I: De lo que contesçió a un rey con su privado,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 81.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁵⁵ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XXI: De lo que contesçió a un rey moço con un muy grant filósopho a qui lo acomendara su padre,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 157.

que vos non quiero más responder a otras preguntas que vos fagades, que en este enxiemplo e en otro que se sigue adelante deste vos quiero fazer fin a este libro.”⁵⁶

Thus we may also read the Count’s rescue from Babylon as a natural conclusion to the advisor/advisee relationship between the Count and the Sultan. In summary, the Count’s request for advice compels Saladin to reciprocate while also challenging his moral judgment; in the process, Saladin must release the Count from captivity but with this virtue and intellect intact. Saladin’s position is in fact elevated because the experience only serves to augment Saladin’s wise and beneficent reputation at home and abroad.

EXEMPLUM 50: CONTEST OF THE SOUL

In Exemplum 50, Juan Manuel presents an intimate contest for power—a battle between good and evil, or honor and dishonor—within Saladin’s own psyche. Patronio/Juan Manuel answers the moral question of what constitutes a good man in Exemplum 25 as he who is a man of good *works*, or *actions*, rather than wealth or title (“era el omne por las sus obras que non por su riqueza, nin por nobleza de su linage”⁵⁷). In Exemplum 50 Count Lucanor asks Patronio to tell him the single-most important quality necessary for a good man. Patronio responds with a story about Saladin and his vassal’s wife, which serves not only to answer Count Lucanor’s moral question but also illuminate the qualities of good governance and present Juan Manuel’s criticism of hypocrisy at all levels of the Church and ruling class. Saladin commits a violation of trust

⁵⁶ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo L: De lo que contesció a Saladín con una dueña, muger de un su vasallo,” in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 288.

⁵⁷ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 174.

and faces a serious challenge to his honor, but his struggle to reclaim his virtue ultimately serves to make him wiser and stronger than ever before.

In Exemplum 25 God “tempts,” or tests, the Count of Provence by allowing him to be taken captive by Saladin. In Exemplum 50, however, it is Saladin who falls captive to temptation by the Devil: “E el Diablo, que siempre se trabaja en que faga el omne lo más desaguisado, puso en el talante de Saladín que olvidasse todo lo que devía guardar e que amasse aquella dueña non commo devía.”⁵⁸ While traveling with his retinue, Saladin is compelled to spend the night at the home of one of his vassals. There, the Devil tempts Saladin with lustful desire for the vassal’s beautiful wife. Saladin seeks advice from an immoral counselor on how to acquire the woman, and giving in to his desire, implements his counselor’s advice—separating the wife from her husband by dispatching him to the forefront of some distant land. Aside from breaching religious prohibitions against coveting another man’s wife, Saladin violates his vassal’s trust.

For one, Saladin breaks the code of hospitality. While traveling with his retinue, Saladin is compelled to seek accommodation at a vassal’s home: “traía [Saladín] consigo sienpre muy grand gente; e un día, porque todos non podían posar con él, fue posar a casa de un cavallero.”⁵⁹ His vassal’s accommodations are relatively humble, but the man and his wife do everything possible to care for their esteemed guest: “E quando el cavallero vio a su señor, que era tan onrado, en su casa, fizole quanto serviçio e quanto plazer pudo, e él e su muger e sus fijos e sus fijas servíanle quanto podían.”⁶⁰ As a guest in his vassal’s home, Saladin’s lust for the vassal’s wife represents a grave form of treachery—violating the implicit trust between a lord and vassal as well as the respect for his gracious host. To

⁵⁸ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 281.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

the extent that a lord and vassal enter into a contract, in which the lord promises protection in exchange for the vassal's fealty, Saladin's treachery is a violation of the fundamental ritual of gift-exchange.

Indeed, Saladin's separation of the couple recalls the evil woman of Exemplum 42, who accomplishes that which not even the Devil can: break up a happily married couple. It is telling that Patronio introduces Exemplum 42 in response to Count Lucanor's question of "que cuál era la manera que un omne malo podría aver para fazer a todas las otras gentes cosa porque más mal les veniesse."⁶¹ Like the evil woman, Saladin uses deceit to separate the vassal from his wife. Moreover, the evil woman appears on the surface to be a devout Catholic pilgrim, suggesting that not all is as it appears; likewise, Saladin, though appearing on the surface to be the same munificent Sultan of Babylon, is in reality no longer the virtuous leader that he was prior to his treachery. Saladin thus finds himself in notorious company, and to the extent that he seeks to destroy a sanctioned, holy union, Saladin places himself in direct opposition to God.

Following Turner's social drama, the crisis in Exemplum 50 develops when Saladin implements his plan to acquire the vassal's wife. Shortly after the husband is sent away, Saladin abuses the woman's hospitality to proposition her inside her home. The woman faces the danger of having her reputation ruined by the sexual assault, as she tries to explain to the Sultan:

Señor, como quier que yo só assaz muger de pequeña guisa, pero vien sé que el amor non es en poder del omne ante es el omne en poder del amor. E bien sé yo que si vos tan grand amor me avedes commo dezides, que podría ser verdat esto que me vos dezides, pero assí commo esto sé bien, assí sé otra cosa: que quando los omnes, e señaladamente los señores, vos pagades de alguna mujer, dades a

⁶¹ Manuel, "Exemplo XLII: De lo que contesçió a una falsa veguina," in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 240.

entender que faredes quanto ella quisiere, e desque ella finca mal andante e escarnida, preçiádesla poco, e commo es derecho, fina del todo mal. E yo, señor, reçelo que conteçerá assí a mí.⁶²

The grave injury that sexual assault would cause to her body and reputation represents a serious crisis in itself, and with it Saladin again violates the implicit promise by a lord to protect his vassals from harm. In turn, Saladin's sexual assault of his vassal's wife would cause him the permanent loss of his legitimacy as a ruler. By implementing his scheme to possess the woman, he has already figuratively abandoned his role as a proper leader, leaving his dominion vulnerable to the seed of corruption. The dangers caused by a ruler abandoning his obligations to his dominion are grave, as Patronio relates in Exemplum 1:

Faría muy grant deserviçio a Dios en dexar tantas gentes commo avía en 'l su regno que tenía él bien mantenidas en paz e en justiçia, e que era çierto que luego que él dende se partiese, que avría entrellos muy grant bolliçio e muy grandes contiendas, de que tomaría Dios muy grant deserviçio e la tierra muy grant dapño.⁶³

Saladin's violation against the vassal's wife therefore represents a corruption and moral decay of his rulership, and as Juan Manuel suggests in the "Tercera parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio" such an error only begets more errors: "El yerro es yerro; del yerro nasce yerro; del pequeño yerro nasce grand yerro; por un yerro viene otro yerro; si bien viene del yerro, siempre torna en yerro; nunca del yerro puede venir non yerro."⁶⁴ By extension, we may state that proper governance builds a strong, functional society, while improper governance leads to social corruption and demoralization. The satisfaction of Saladin's carnal desires would thus come at a very high cost, leading to the loss of his legitimacy, vulnerability of his people, and deterioration of his dominion.

⁶² Manuel, "Exemplo L," 282.

⁶³ Manuel, "Exemplo I," 80.

⁶⁴ Don Juan Manuel, "Tercera parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio: Escusación de Patronio al conde Lucanor," in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 313.

The woman uses her intellect and cunning to protect herself. With remarkable finesse and foresight, she plots her rescue: “Respondiol la buena dueña que si él le prometiesse de conplir lo que ella le pidría, ante quel fiziesse fuerça nin escarnio, que ella le prometía que, luego que gelo oviesse conplido, faría ella todo lo que él mandasse.”⁶⁵ Saladin agrees to the deal, and with that, she bids: “díxole que lo que dél quería era quel dixiesse cuál era la mejor cosa que omne podía aver en sí, e que era madre e cabeça de todas las vondades.”⁶⁶ Her request sets the gears in motion for her eventual rescue. Saladin immediately embarks on a quest to find the answer to the moral question, and it is in fact to his credit that he does so, for in seeking the truth, Saladin exhibits a gleam of his former self—the person who at one time had made every effort to live and treat others with respect. Misguided by temptation, Saladin has lost his way, and his quest is really a search for his “true” self, that kernel of truth that once guided his actions.

No one among Saladin’s retinue and counselors is able to answer his moral question. He therefore embarks upon a journey (a common trope of liminality suggesting that he is neither here nor there) across land and sea. Further underscoring his liminal status at this juncture in the story, Saladin disguises himself as a humble juggler in order to maintain anonymity while traveling with a troupe of itinerant jugglers.⁶⁷ The privacy afforded by Saladin’s disguise also underscores the personal nature of his quest—that Saladin’s journey is really a search for truth within himself. The disguise serves the practical purpose of protecting his privacy and ensuring his safety during travel, but it also radically inverts Saladin’s identity: the great Sultan of Babylon effectively reverses

⁶⁵ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 283.

⁶⁶ Ibid. Note how the woman’s request for the chief quality a man can possess contrasts with Count Lucanor’s request for the worst quality a man can possess in Exemplum 42, the story of which echoes Saladin’s break-up of his vassal’s marriage.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

roles to become a lowly entertainer. Saladin's humble guise will carry significant implications as he progresses on his journey to seek the answer to his moral question among the clergy and kings of Europe.

On this liminal journey nothing is quite what it seems, as we come to learn when Saladin beseeches the holy dignitaries of the Papal Court and noble kings of Christendom to answer his question: "E desconoçidamente passó la mar, e fue a la corte del Papa, do se ayuntan todos los christianos. E preguntando por aquella razón, nunca falló quien le diesse recabdo. Dende, fue a casa del rey de Françia, e a todos los reyes e nunca falló recabdo."⁶⁸ That neither the Church, which is presumably the steward of men's souls, nor any of the kings of Europe, who represent the pinnacle of political power, are capable of providing a true answer to Saladin's moral question points to a scathing criticism against moral hypocrisy. Turner notes that liminal states provide a space for social criticism: "Liminality is both more creative and destructive than the structural norm. In either case it raises basic problems for social structural man, invites him to speculation and criticism."⁶⁹ Here, Juan Manuel reiterates a statement that he repeats throughout *El Conde Lucanor*: that the quality of man is not reflected by his wealth or title—no matter how great—but by his understanding of the truth and his good deeds in service to God ("era el omne por las sus obras que non por su riqueza, nin por nobleza de su linage"⁷⁰). On the other hand, what is equally revealing about this situation is the fact that Saladin is able to recognize the error of their responses. How can Saladin judge the veracity of people's answers if he himself does not know the truth? On this point Juan Manuel implies that Saladin *does* in fact know the true answer to the moral question; the truth

⁶⁸ Ibid., 284.

⁶⁹ Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre*, 47.

⁷⁰ Manuel, "Exemplo XXV," 173-74.

simply lies buried within his psyche, which has been clouded by temptation. This is especially significant when we recall that Saladin is at this moment disguised as a humble itinerant juggler. Juan Manuel thus suggests that Saladin, even at his lowest point, possesses more intellect and virtue than any among the Papal Court or kings of Europe. Saladin's quest represents an internal, spiritual battle between truth and falsehood, and his commitment to staying on his mission until he finds, or rather rediscovers, the true answer to his moral dilemma is further evidence of his inherent virtue:

E ya por la dueña non fiziera tanto; *mas, porque él era tan buen omne*, tenía quel era mengua si dexasse de saber aquello que avía començado; ca, sin dubda, el grant omne grant mengua faze si dexa lo que una vez comiença, solamente que el fecho non sea malo o pecado; mas, si por miedo o trabajo lo dexa, non se podría de mengua escusar. E por ende, Saladín non quería dexar de saber aquello porque salliera de su tierra [emphasis mine].⁷¹

Indeed, Juan Manuel will repeat the implication that Saladin is superior in intellect and virtue to the holy dignitaries of the Papal Court (assuming the Pope included) and the kings of Christendom at the conclusion of Exemplum 50.

Just as Saladin and his troupe near their breaking point (“que non pudieron fallar della recabdo e que se querían tornar”⁷²), he encounters a young squire:

E acaesció que un día, andando por su camino con sus jubglares, que toparon con un escudero que vinía de corer monte e avía muerto un ciervo. E el escudero casara poco tiempo avía, e abía un padre muy viejo que fuera el mejor cavallero que oviera en toda aquella tierra. E por la grant vejez, non veía e non podía salir de su casa, pero avía el entendimiento tan bueno e tan complido, que non le menguava ninguna cosa por la vejez.⁷³

Juan Manuel inserts clues in this scene that point to a very curious scenario. For one, he depicts the young squire as having just returned from a successful hunt. Thus, the

⁷¹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 284.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

metaphor of the hunt once again reemerges in Exemplum 50. Throughout *El Conde Lucanor* the art of the hunt signifies the art of chivalry, and Juan Manuel very often employs it in reference to an underlying moral or spiritual pursuit. Here, in Exemplum 50 we are confronted with the image of its successful outcome: the young squire has captured his prey. In this sense, the young squire's hunt reflects Saladin's own quest, and we may therefore read this scene as a foreshadowing of the imminent capture of Saladin's prize—a truthful answer to his moral question. The squire's father is also an auspicious figure. The old man (in keeping with Juan Manuel's concept that nothing is quite as it appears), though physically blind, possesses a powerful, penetrating insight. Through the power of his wisdom and insight the old man "sees" not the illusory falsehood of the surface/material world but the truth beneath it.⁷⁴ This ability to discern the actual, hidden truth of things reflects Juan Manuel's definition of a virtuous man, and in this sense, this humble old, blind man towers over the lofty but ignorant papal dignitaries and kings of Europe. Indeed, the young squire asserts that if his father cannot answer Saladin's moral question, then *no one* can: "dixoles que si su padre non les diesse consejo a esto, que non gelo daría omne del mundo."⁷⁵

Yet another hospitality scene occurs in Exemplum 50 when Saladin, still disguised as an itinerant juggler, is invited to the home of the young squire and his father. Saladin's moral crisis had its origin during a stay at his vassal's house, when he was first tempted by the Devil. Finally, after an arduous journey across land and sea, Saladin comes full circle, arriving at the truth as a guest in someone's home. The old man gives Saladin his answer:

⁷⁴ Juan Manuel's Exempla 26 depicts the allegory of the tree of Truth and Falsehood, in which Truth, as the tree roots, lie unseen, beneath the surface of the branches of Falsehood.

⁷⁵ Manuel, "Exemplo L," 284.

Vos digo que la mejor cosa que omne puede aver en sí, e que es madre e cabeça de todas las vondades, dígovos que ésta es la vergüença; e por vergüença suffre omne la muerte, que es la más grave cosa que puede ser, e por vergüença dexa omne de fazer todas las cosas que non le paresçen bien, por grand volundtat que aya de las fazer. E así, en la vergüença an comienço e cabo todas las vondades, e la vergüença, es partimiento de todos los malos fechos.⁷⁶

In an instant, Saladin recognizes this to be the answer he had been searching for (“entendió verdaderamente que era assí commo el cavallero le dizía”⁷⁷), further proving that the truth had been buried within his subconscious all along. It was his sense of honor (or shame) that Saladin misplaced when he fell to temptation, and because it is “madre e cabeça de todas las vondades,” losing it caused Saladin to violate both his vassals’ trust and God’s law.

At last, Saladin possesses the true answer to the woman’s moral question, but he remains in the grips of temptation as he returns to Babylon with the intention of finally possessing the vassal’s wife. That is, Saladin still only knows half the truth. As Juan Manuel states in the “Segunda parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio,” it is not

⁷⁶ Ibid., 286. In English, “vergüença” translates literally as “shame,” but its full meaning in the context of Juan Manuel’s Exemplus 50 may be better understood as “honor.” Thus, I have chosen to use the word “honor” in reference to this quotation.

In his essay, “La vergüenza como constante social y narrativa en Don Juan Manuel,” Antonio Carreño states: “Esta [vergüenza] se asocia en *El Conde Lucanor* con el sentimiento de honra, estado social, pro, estimación y fama. . . . Como vemos, en el estado del caballero el tener vergüenza es primordial. Y como una manera de ser, el sentir vergüenza se antepone aquí al ser honrado; es más, de una se deriva la otra: del tener vergüenza emana el tener honradez. . . . Establece don Juan Manuel un código normativo de comportamiento social: ‘Ca por buenas maneras que aya, si vergüenza non oviere, tal cosa podrá facer algún día, que en los días que biva siempre será engannado; e si vergüenza oviere, nunca fará cosa por que la aya,’ confiriéndole un carácter ritual y religioso. ‘Et pues digo,’ continúa, ‘que antes sufrirá la muerte que fazer cosa vergonrosa,’ y concluye: ‘Et por ende la madre et la cabeza de todas las vondades es la vergüenza.’ El caer en vergüenza o el ‘facer cosa vergonrosa’ se mueve, en este texto, en el mismo campo semántico y social que el caer en deshonor o hacer cosa deshonorosa. Ambos términos se entrecruzan y complementan. Y el que ‘vergüenza oviere,’ sugiere don Juan Manuel, mantendrá su honra, dignidad, gracia divina; tendrá buen seso (también prudencia) en su compartamiento social y dentro de su *estamento* [emphasis in original].” (Antonio Carreño, “La vergüenza como constante social y narrativa en Don Juan Manuel: El ‘Ejemplo L’ de *El Conde Lucanor*,” *Thesaurus* XXXII, no. 1 [1977]: 32. Carreño quotes from Don Juan Manuel, *Libro del cavallero et del escudero*, in *Obras de don Juan Manuel*, vol. I, ed. J. M. Castro y Calvo and Martín de Riquer [Barcelona, 1955], 17-18.)

⁷⁷ Ibid.

enough for a man to *know* or *speak* the truth—he must put that truth into *action*: “La escalera del galardón es el pensamiento, e los escalones son las obras.”⁷⁸ The resolution of Saladin’s moral crisis pivots on this crucial point. In order to fully reclaim his honor and virtue, he must support his knowledge with good actions.

When Saladin presents his answer—that a sense of honor is the most important virtue a man can possess—the vassal’s wife responds with glee (“Quando la buena dueña esta respuesta oyó, fue muy alegre”⁷⁹), for Saladin’s pronouncement of this truth offers her the means for her rescue. She replies with yet another question:

Señor, agora conosco que dezides verdat, e que me avedes cumplido quanto me prometiestes. E pídovos por merçed que me digades, así commo rey debe decir verdat, si cuidades que ha en ’l mundo mejor omne que vos.⁸⁰

The question seems straightforward and simple, but it serves to place Saladin at the final threshold of self-realization. The vassal’s wife presents Saladin with an implicit choice: is Saladin the greatest man in the world, or is he not? To deny it would be a humiliation and a debasement of his high rank as the Sultan of Babylon. Moreover, to deny it would also be a rejection of the enlightening experience of his recent quest. That is, Saladin sought and found the answer to his question after an extensive journey across land and sea. He did in fact journey across the known world, beyond his dominion to the highest courts in Christian lands. He found no person—not even among the highest dignitaries of the Papal Court or kings of Christendom—who could correctly answer his moral question, implying that Saladin instinctively knew that all responses were false until he recognized the true answer as told by the old man. Furthermore, recall that the old man, in turn,

⁷⁸ Don Juan Manuel, “Segunda parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio: Razonamiento que face don Juan por amor de don Jaime, señor de Xérica,” in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 306.

⁷⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 287.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

recognized Saladin's true identity as the Sultan of Babylon by the sound of his voice ("conosçió en la palabra que aquél era Saladín"⁸¹). That is to say, he was blind to Saladin's outward guise as a lowly juggler, a guise that reflected his moral downturn. The old man, who himself had been a former guest at the Sultan's court, gave private deference and praise to Saladin for his graciousness and generosity. The old man's deference to the Sultan is all the more striking when considering that he did what no papal dignitary or king could do—answer Saladin's moral question. These facts therefore point to Saladin truly being the greatest man in the world, and he agrees to the title:

E Saladín le dixo que, commo quier que se le fazia vergüença de dezir, pero pues avía a dezir verdat commo rey, quel dizia que más cuidava que era él mejor que los otros, que non que avía otro mejor que él.⁸²

What remains now is for Saladin to apply his knowledge of the truth (and his self-realization as "the greatest man in the world") into action.

In a scene reminiscent of the confrontation between the son-in-law and Saladin in Exemplum 25, the woman reaffirms the veracity of Saladin's declaration that he is the greatest man in the world—and uses it to pin him to his word:

Vos avedes aquí dicho muy grandes dos verdades: la una, que *sodes vos el mejor omne del mundo*; la otra, que la vergüença es la mejor cosa que el omne puede aver en sí. E señor, pues vos esto conosçedes, e sodes el mejor omne del mundo, pídivos por merçed que querades en vos la mejor cosa del mundo, que es la vergüença, e que ayades vergüença de lo que me dezides [emphasis mine].⁸³

With these words she jolts Saladin back to full consciousness. She restores him to his proper place—not simply in the world, acknowledging his supreme rank among men—

⁸¹ Ibid., 285.

⁸² Ibid., 287.

⁸³ Ibid.

but within his psyche, reminding him of the moral obligations incumbent upon his rank. She thereby secures her rescue: desist, she tells Saladin, or risk losing legitimacy.

The woman's cunning plan works. From this moment onward, there is nothing ambiguous or liminal about Saladin's identity; he stands resolute in the understanding of who he is and what he is obliged to do. Awakened to the reality of his situation, he reponds: "Quando Saladín todas estas buenas razones oyó e entendió cómo aquella buena dueña, con la su vondat e con el su buen entendimiento, sopiera aguisar que fuesse él guardado de tan grand yerro, gradesçiólo mucho a Dios."⁸⁴ The woman saves Saladin's honor; furthermore, in saving his legitimacy as a ruler, she also saves the dominion of Babylon ("e todo este bien acaesçió por la vondat daquela buena dueña"⁸⁵). In gratitude, Saladin reunites the woman with her husband and showers them with magnificent gifts,⁸⁶ thereby restoring and improving the status of the vassal and his wife.

Saladin is not only restored to his former self, he is edified. He overcomes temptation, and his love for the vassal's wife is transformed: "Commoquier que la él amava ante de otro amor, amóla muy más dallí adellante de amor leal e verdadero, qual deve aver el buen señor e leal a todas sus gentes."⁸⁷ Saladin is grateful to the woman for saving him from disgrace. He loves her all the more for rescuing him from committing a grave error, but now, with a love that is loyal and true, such as expected of a lord for his vassals. Saladin's moral triumph is impressive: the great Sultan of Babylon falls from his high stature to the lowest possible point (inasmuch as his immoral action likened him to the false pilgrim of Exemplum 42, who possesses the "worst" human quality) only to

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

reemerge as the “greatest man in the world.” This pronouncement must therefore be placed in context of Patronio’s counsel on what determines the true quality of a man:

Mas, para que vos e todos los omnes podades cognosçer cuál es bueno a Dios e al mundo, e cuál es de buena palabra e cuál es de buena entendimiento e cuál es de buena palabra e cuál es de buena entención, para lo escoger verdaderamente, conviene que non judguedes a ninguno sinon por las obras que fiziere luengamente, e non poco tiempo, e por commo viéredes que mejora o que peora su fazienda, ca en estas dos cosas se paresçe todo lo que desuso es dicho.⁸⁸

Saladin is led astray by temptation, but over time, he proves to be a faithful, honorable man; indeed, Saladin is all the more triumphant *because* of his fall and arduous return to grace. Applying Turner’s social drama to Exemplum 50 therefore reveals that Juan Manuel presents Saladin as an unequivocally honorable figure—no less, in fact, than “el mejor omne del mundo.”

CONCLUSION

Applying Victor Turner’s social drama theory to a textual analysis of Exempla 25 and 50 determines that Juan Manuel portrays Saladin as an honorable man who triumphs against challenges to his virtue. In Exemplum 25 Juan Manuel uses Saladin to answer the moral question of what constitutes a good man, placing him in relation to his Christian counterpart, the Count of Provence. Saladin proves his virtue and intellect through his good counsel, which serves not only to ensure the prosperity and stability of the Count’s family but also to restore the Count to his dominion of Provence. Saladin is capable of selecting a proper suitor because he possesses the knowledge of what constitutes a good man, implying that he is such a man himself. In Exemplum 50 Saladin battles for his very

⁸⁸ Ibid., 281.

soul after he is led astray by the Devil. Saladin figuratively “loses himself,” and he embarks on a quest to find the answer (symbolic of his misplaced virtue) to his moral question. Here again, Juan Manuel implies that Saladin is only capable of discerning the true answer because he already knows the answer himself, and to the extent that no papal dignitary or king is able to provide a correct answer to his moral question, Juan Manuel implies that Saladin is more knowledgeable and more honorable than they. Saladin ultimately triumphs (with help from the vassal’s wife) over temptation, reemerging from his personal crisis not simply with his honor intact but elevated as “the greatest man in the world.” Thus, in both exempla Saladin overcomes challenges to his honor, and he emerges from these crises not simply restored to his former glory but improved. Thus, it is clear that Juan Manuel does not portray Saladin—the Muslim adversary of Exemplum 3—as villainous or tragic but as an honorable and chivalrous figure worthy of praise and emulation by his Christian audience.

Saladin: Such Stuff As Dreams Are Made On

Applying Victor Turner's social drama toward a textual analysis of Exempla 25 and 50 served to establish that Juan Manuel represents Saladin as a man of action who can triumph over moral challenges and as the epitome of chivalry ("el mejor omne del mundo"). With Saladin's venerable representation established, it is now possible to examine the finer subtleties of his character in *El Conde Lucanor*. It is significant that Saladin appears in two of the lengthiest plot-driven exempla of *El Conde Lucanor*. Saladin is a virtuous figure, but he is also arguably the most complex character, fictional or historical, of Patronio's stories. Saladin's character resonates not simply within Exempla 25 and 50 but throughout the text of Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor*, and his subtle complexities speak of Juan Manuel's own philosophy as informed by his experience with *convivencia* and the *Reconquista* in thirteenth-/fourteenth-century Iberia.

A closer examination of Saladin's character is therefore worthwhile to fully understand his placement in *El Conde Lucanor*. To that end, analyzing Saladin's "voice" (to borrow a term from M. M. Bakhtin) in relation to the voices of other characters in the exempla serves to reveal the finer, sometimes paradoxical, elements of his character. My character analysis of Saladin is divided into three parts, each illuminating different aspects of how Juan Manuel situates Saladin within his moral and spiritual philosophy. Part One examines the real underlying character of Saladin according to Juan Manuel's concept of deceptive appearances—that surface is mere illusion and truth often lies hidden beneath a guise. Part Two is an examination of the relationship between the Sultan of Babylon and the Count of Provence from Exemplum 25, a relationship that brings into question Saladin's political and religious affiliations and offers an insight into Juan Manuel's view of Christian and Muslim interrelations in medieval Iberia. Finally,

Part Three analyzes Saladin in relation to his historical Christian counterpart, King Richard I of England, who is the subject of Exemplum 3 and is referenced in Exemplum 33 of *El Conde Lucanor*. Examining the connection between these two historical figures as represented in *El Conde Lucanor* serves to more definitively situate Saladin within Juan Manuel's philosophy, or even psyche. Part Three also addresses how the relation between Saladin and King Richard I points to a tension between Juan Manuel's dialogic and monologic approaches in *El Conde Lucanor*—a tension between the author's endorsement of worldly pragmatism and his devotion to religious dogma.

IT IS WHAT IT IS (NOT): SALADIN IN CONTRAST

The recurring concept in *El Conde Lucanor* of truth lying hidden beneath the surface reveals aspects of Juan Manuel's placement of Saladin within the author's philosophy. In the "Segunda parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio" Juan Manuel includes the following proverb: "Todas las cosas paresçen bien e son buenas, e paresçen mal e son malas, e paresçen bien e son malas, e paresçen malas e son buenas."⁸⁹ Moreover, Juan Manuel presents an allegory about Truth and Falsehood in Exemplum 26, in which Truth plants a tree with Falsehood.⁹⁰ Falsehood convinces Truth to apportion to his care the part of the tree that is above ground and keep for her care the remainder that is below the surface. Falsehood thus spreads his lies with the extending branches of the tree throughout the nearby village. Truth eventually recognizes Falsehood's ruse and thus

⁸⁹ Manuel, "Segunda parte," 304.

⁹⁰ Don Juan Manuel, "Exemplo XXVI: De lo que contesçió al árbol de la Mentira," in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 179-83.

kills the roots, destroying the tree of Falsehood. Juan Manuel indicates that Truth lies hidden beneath the surface—that appearance is mere illusion, and that Truth will always prevail over Falsehood. Moreover, in the frame story to Exemplum 50 Patronio states:

E bien cred que non a cosa en 'l mundo en que omne tanto nin tan de ligero se engañe como en cognoscer los omnes quáles so en sí quál entendimiento an. E estas son dos cosas: la una, quál es el omne en sí; la otra, qué entendimiento ha. E para saber quál es en sí, asse de mostrar en las obras que fazen a Dios e al mundo; *ca muchos parescen que fazen buenas obras, e non son buenas*: que todo el su bien es para este mundo. E creet que esta vondat quel costará muy cara, ca por este bien que dura un día, sufrirá mucho mal sin fin. *E otros fazen buenas obras para serviq̃io de Dios e non cuidan en lo del mundo*; e commo quier que éstos escogen la mejor parte e la que nunca les será tirada nin la perderán; pero los unon nin los otros non guardan entreamas las carreras, que son lo de Dios e del mundo...pero, ayundándole Dios, e ayudándose el omne, todo se puede fazer; *ca ya fueron muchos buenos reys e otros homnes sanctos; pues éstos buenos fueron a Dios e al mundo* [emphases mine].⁹¹

It is telling that Juan Manuel exemplifies this central moral of *El Conde Lucanor*—that the best path in life for noblemen is to commit good deeds in service to God while also caring for the important things of the world, namely the people dependent on their care and their estates—via the Muslim protagonist Saladin. Juan Manuel even proclaims Saladin to be the “*greatest* man in the world.” To fully comprehend the magnitude of his praise, it is useful to examine whom and what Juan Manuel identifies as the *worst* in the world. What follows then is a discussion on the author’s use of the concept of deceptive appearances for his criticism of moral corruption and hypocrisy among men of title.

In Exemplum 11 Patronio relates the story of the Dean of Santiago’s interest in the art of necromancy. The Dean consults with the Grand Master of black arts, Don Yllán, who escorts him below ground, where he keeps his secret library (“e entraron entramos por una escalera de piedra muy bien labrada e fueron descendiendo por ella

⁹¹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 280.

muy grand pieça, en guisa que paresçia que estavan tan vaxos que passaba el río de Tajo çima dellos”⁹²). Here again, Juan Manuel indicates that the true nature of Don Yllán lies *beneath* the surface. The Dean promises to grant a position to Don Yllán’s son in exchange for teaching him the black arts. In what turns out to be a masterful trick, the Dean rises up the ecclesiastical ranks but never fulfills his promise to Don Yllán, offering different excuses with each advancement. He is ultimately elected Pope in Rome, but rather than fulfill his promise, he threatens Don Yllán with imprisonment as a heretic and sorcerer: “Se quexó mucho el Papa e començol a maltraer [a Don Yllán] diziéndol que si más le affincasse, quel faría echar en una cárçel, que era ereje e encantador, que bien sabía que non avía otra vida nin otro offiçio en Toledo, do él moraba, sinon vivir por aquella arte de nigromançia.”⁹³ Thus, the Dean reveals his true nature as a liar and hypocrite, and at this moment he suddenly finds himself back in Don Yllán’s cavern, only to discover that his advancement had been nothing more than an elaborate illusion devised by Don Yllán to determine his true, hidden nature. Juan Manuel thus alludes to moral corruption within the Church by suggesting that ecclesiastical dignitaries are not always the upright, moral men that they purport to be.

In Exemplum 40 Patronio relates the story of a powerful seneschal who, falling mortally ill, calls for the Prior of the Dominican Friars and Guardian of the Franciscans to order that his wealth be dispensed to them upon his death for the salvation of his soul. After his death the friars comply with his wishes, but concerned for his fate, they consult with a woman who, possessed by the Devil, divines that the seneschal’s soul resides not in Paradise but in Hell. Patronio states, “Ella díxoles que sin dubda la fe e la ley de los

⁹² Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XI: De lo que contesçió a un deán de Sacntiago con don Yllán, el grand maestro de Toledo,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 119.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 122.

christianos toda era verdadera, e si él muriera e fiziera lo que deve fazer el que es verdadero christiano, que salva fuera la su alma; mas él non fizo commo verdadero nin buen christiano...E este bien fazer es en la entençión, e porque la entençión del senescal non fue buena, ca fue quando non debía seer fecha, por ende non ovo della buen galardón.”⁹⁴ Juan Manuel thus suggests that it is not enough to will good deeds after death, but that one must perform them while one is still alive and with the intention of doing so in service to God.⁹⁵ The seneschal’s posthumous charity only serves to reveal his greedy nature for hoarding his wealth while still living.

In Exemplum 42, Count Lucanor seeks to know the worst evil a wicked person can commit (“yo e otras muchas gentes estábamos fablando e preguntávamos que quál era la manera que un omne malo podría aver para fazer a todas las otras gentes cosa porque más mal les veniesse”⁹⁶), and Patronio uses as example a seemingly devout pilgrim who is capable of committing the crime which not even the Devil is capable:

E un día, viniendo el diablo de aquel logar do fazían vida aquel omne e aquella muger, muy triste porque non podía poner y ningún mal, topó con una veguina. *E desde se conocieron*, preguntol que por qué vinía triste. E él díxole que vinía de aquella villa do fazían vida aquel omne e aquella muger e que avía muy grand tiempo que andava por poner mal entrellos e nunca pudiera...E ella díxol que se marabillava, pues tanto sabía, cómo non lo podía fazer, mas que si fiziese lo que ella quería, *que ella le pornía recabdo en esto* [emphasis mine].⁹⁷

Juan Manuel states that the worst criminal is the hypocritical person who spreads lies and commits evil behind the guise of a devout and noble persona. This moral is clearly stated in Patronio’s concluding words in Exemplum 42:

⁹⁴ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XL: De las razones porque perdió el alma un Siniscal de Carcassona,” in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 233.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Manuel, “Exemplo XLII,” 240.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 240-41.

Si queredes saber cuál es *el pior omne del mundo* e de que más mal puede venir a las gentes, sabet que es el que se muestra por buen christiano e por omne bueno e leal, e la su entençión es falsa, e anda asacando falsedades e mentiras por meter mal entre llas gentes. E conséjovos yo que siempre vos guardades de los que vierdes que se fazen gatos religiosos que los más dellos siempre andan con mal e con engaño, e para que los podades conosçer, tomad el consejo del Evangelio que dize: “A fructibus eorum coñosçetis eos” que quiere decir “que por las sus obras los cognosçeredes [emphasis mine].”⁹⁸

Likewise, in Exemplum 50 Juan Manuel indicates that no holy dignitary at the Papal Court (assuming the Pope included), nor any king in Christendom possesses the moral wisdom to provide the correct answer to Saladin’s moral question.⁹⁹ Juan Manuel thus underscores his prescription that one must judge a person by his actual deeds rather than his title or wealth.

These examples of deception in *El Conde Lucanor* help the reader to better appreciate Juan Manuel’s pronouncement of Saladin as “el mejor omne del mundo.”¹⁰⁰ We may thus understand that as such, Saladin is free of deceit, hypocrisy, and malicious intent. Unlike the Dean of Santiago, the Sultan of Babylon is a true man of his word who keeps his promises. Unlike the greedy seneschal, the Sultan is munificent, bestowing his guests, vassals, and even his captives, with bountiful gifts and honors. Unlike the dignitaries of the Papal Court and kings of Christendom in Exemplum 50, the Sultan is wise and perceptive, capable of discerning the true answer to the moral question of the singular quality that makes a man truly great. He is a man of good deeds who carefully guards his honor and benevolently governs his people and dominion. Inasmuch as he functions in God’s divine plan as both temptor and restorer to the Count of Provence, the Sultan is also a man in service to God. Finally, more than any other character in Juan

⁹⁸ Ibid., 244.

⁹⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 284.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 287.

Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor* Saladin, the Sultan of Babylon, suffers the most dramatic fall from grace, falling so low as to commit the very same crime as that committed by the false pilgrim in Exemplum 42 (the type of person that Patronio labels as "*el pior omne del mundo*") only to ultimately conquer his temptation after arduous struggle and rise even higher than before—as "*el mejor omne del mundo*."

FRIENDSHIP AND AFFILIATION: SALADIN AND THE COUNT OF PROVENCE

In my textual analysis of Exemplum 25, I primarily addressed the relationship between Saladin and the Count of Provence as captor and captive. Here, I discuss another significant aspect to their relationship—their bond of genuine friendship, and the implications of this friendship on the political and religious affiliations of Saladin.

The first clue to the goodwill between the Sultan of Babylon and the Count of Provence occurs in the frame story, when Count Lucanor requests Patronio's advice on how to advise a vassal who wishes to marry off one of his relations:

Patronio, un mio vasallo me dixo el otro día que quería casar una su parienta, e así como él era tenuto de me aconsejar lo mejor que él pudiesse, que me pidía por merced quel consejasse en esta lo que entendía que era más su pro, e díxome todos los casamientos quel traían. E porque *éste es omne que yo querría que lo acertase muy bien*, e yo sé que vos sabedes mucho de tales cosas, ruégovos que me digades lo que entendedes en esto, porquel yo pueda dar tal consejo *que se falle él bien dello* [emphasis mine].¹⁰¹

Count Lucanor wishes to see his vassal rise up in the world, and because the Count of Provence requests the same advice from the Sultan, we may transfer Count Lucanor's sentiment to Saladin. Indeed, Saladin expresses the same care and concern himself, even

¹⁰¹ Manuel, "Exemplo XXV," 171.

before learning the details of the Count's request: "El soldán gradesçió esto mucho al conde, e díxol quel consejaría muy de grado; e aún, quel ayudaría muy de buena mente en quequiera quel cumpliesse."¹⁰² From this perspective, Saladin has the Count's best interests at heart.

Juan Manuel suggests that an implicit sense of trust has developed between the Count and Saladin over the years of the Count's captivity. The Count's petition points to his trust that Saladin will counsel him rightly: "Señor, vos me fazedes a mí tanta merçed e tanta onra e fiades tanto de mí que me ternía por muy de buena ventura si vos lo pudiesse server."¹⁰³ Saladin advises the Count to marry his daughter to a good *omne*, but the Count's trust does not end with a mere request for advice. After acquiring details of the eligible suitors from the Countess in Provence, he actually allows Saladin to choose the best suitor for his daughter, freely sharing intimate details of his family's affairs and liaisons in Provence. After acquiring a detailed list of the positive and negative qualities of each suitor, he shares the list with Saladin ("e desde el conde vio este escripto, mostrólo al soldán"¹⁰⁴). Saladin chooses whom he believes to be the best man from among the list, and the Count orders the Countess to follow through with Saladin's decision: "El conde envió mandar a la condessa e a sus parientes que casassen su fija con aquel que Saladín les mandara."¹⁰⁵

Juan Manuel provides hints that others view the situation between the Count and Saladin to be strange and unusual. When the Count requests the list of qualifications for each suitor according to Saladin's specifications, the reaction from the Countess and his family is one of astonishment: "La condessa e los parientes del conde se marabillaron

¹⁰² Ibid., 172.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 173.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 174.

desto mucho, pero fazieron lo quel conde les envió mandar.”¹⁰⁶ Again, the Count’s order to obey Saladin’s choice provokes a similar reaction: “E commo quier que se marabillaron mucho ende, enviaron por aquel fijo de aquel rico omne.”¹⁰⁷ Juan Manuel seems to be stating that this is no small thing. By relying on Saladin (who is still technically the Count’s adversary and captor) to select the best suitor for his daughter’s hand in marriage, the Count effectively places the future prosperity of his family and, by extension, his dominion in the hands of his (nominal) enemy. It is a risk, but the Count does not indicate any measure of anxiety or apprehension toward Saladin.

The political and religious affiliations of the two become blurred. After spending years in genteel captivity in Saladin’s Babylon—during which time the Count advised Saladin in all great, important matters (“todos los grandes fechos que [Saladín] avía de fazer todos los fazía por su consejo”¹⁰⁸)—the Count consigns to Saladin the one governing request made to him by his family in Provence. This points to the Count’s immense level of trust in Saladin, but it also points to the Count’s inability to meet his obligations as patriarch of his family and lord of his estates in Provence. Though it may be through no fault of his own, the Count effectively abandons his rulership in Provence.

Juan Manuel repeatedly addresses the matter of a nobleman shirking his duties as a patriarch and lord in *El Conde Lucanor*. Note what the king’s favorite says in Exemplum 1 to his king, who ostensibly wishes to transfer his title and duties to him:

Díxol que si esto fiziese, que faría muy grant deservicio a Dios en dexar tantas gentes commo avía en ’l su regno que tenía él vien mantenidas en paz e en justiçia, e que era çerto que luego que él dende se partiese, que avría entrellos muy grant bolliçio e muy grandes contiendas, de que tomaría Dios muy grant deservicio e la tierra muy grant dapño, e quando por todo esto non lo dexase, que

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 173.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 174.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 171.

lo debía dexar por la reina, su muger, e por un fijo muy pequeñuelo que dexava: que era cierto que serían en muy grant aventura, también de los cuerpos, commo de las faziendas.¹⁰⁹

Furthermore, in Exemplum 16 Patronio tells Count Lucanor, who expresses his wish to retire from his duties as a nobleman to spend his life in leisure: “E vos, señor conde, pues sabedes que avedes a morir, por el mi consejo, nunca por viçio nin por folgura dexaredes de fazer tales cosas, porque, aun desque vos murierdes, siempre viva la fama de los vuestros fechos.”¹¹⁰ In Exemplo 23 Count Lucanor tells Patronio that friends are urging him to retire and simply enjoy his wealth, to which Patronio responds:

Bien deveades cuidar que non es buena razón para ningún omne, e mayormente para los que an de mantener grand estado e gobernar a muchos, en querer sienpre comer de lo ganado; ca cierto sed que por grant aver que sea, onde sacan cada día e non ponen ý nada, que non puede durar mucho, e demás paresçe muy grand amortiguamiento e grand mengua de coraçón.¹¹¹

In the “Segunda parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio” Patronio states: “El rey rey, reina; el rey non rey, non reina, mas es reinado.”¹¹² Lastly, in the “Quinta parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio” Patronio states that the path for a king or nobleman to enter Paradise is to fulfill the obligations incumbent upon their rank, protecting their estates and people under their care, in dedication to God:

Otrosí, los que passan en el mundo cobdiçiando fazer porque salven las almas, pero non se pueden partir de guardar sus onras e sus estados, estos tales pueden errar e pueden açertar en lo mejor; ca si guardaren todas estas cosas que ellos quieren guardar, guardando todo lo que cumple para salvamiento de las almas, açiertan en lo mejor e puédenlo muy bien fazer; ca çierto es que muchos reys e

¹⁰⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo I,” 80.

¹¹⁰ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XVI: De la respuesta que dio el conde Ferrant Gonsáles a Muño Láinez su pariente,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 139.

¹¹¹ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XXIII: De lo que facen las formigas para se mantener,” in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 164.

¹¹² Manuel, “Segunda parte,” 306.

grandes omnes e otros de muchos estados guardaron sus onras e mantuvieron sus estados, e faziéndolo todo, sopieron obrar en guisa que salvaron las almas e aun fueron sanctos, e tales commo éstos non pudo engañar el mundo, nin les ovo a dar el galardón que el mundo suele dar a los que non ponen su esperança en ál sinon en él, e éstos guardan las dos vidas que dizen activa e contemplativa.¹¹³

By all indications, the Count stands in grave moral danger for his virtual abandonment of his obligations to his family and dominion in Provence. Rather than augmenting his own family and estates, the Count increases the power and wealth of his nominal adversary, the Sultan of Babylon. In so doing, not only is the welfare of the Count's family and dominion at risk, but even the salvation of his very soul.

What, however, does the Count's moral dilemma say about the relationship between the Sultan of Babylon and Count of Provence, and what does it reveal about Saladin, specifically? Note that the Count and Saladin effectively switch roles, and in so doing, Juan Manuel suggests that Saladin is by proxy the Count of Provence, and the Count, for all his governing counsel, is the Sultan of Babylon. At this moment the relationship between Saladin and the Count transcends the relationship of captor/captive, or even advisor/advisee, into that of a genuine friendship. The hierarchical relationship between the two men is leveled, and thus Juan Manuel suggests that Saladin and the Count are, at this moment, *equals*. This leveling of status between Saladin and the Count is a perfect example of Turner's definition of *communitas* ("The bonds of *communitas* are anti-structural in the sense that they are undifferentiated, equalitarian, direct, extant, nonrational, existential, I-Thou...relationships."¹¹⁴).

A hint of this aspect of *communitas* occurs earlier in Patronio's story when the Count is first captured: "E commo quier que estava preso, sabiendo Saladín la grand

¹¹³ Don Juan Manuel, "Quinta parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio," in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 339.

¹¹⁴ Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 274.

vondat del conde, faziale mucho bien e mucha onra...e tanto fazian por él en toda la tierra de Saladín, commo farían en la suya misma.”¹¹⁵ The Count resides in Babylon in genteel captivity, and to the extent that Babylon profits from the Count’s governing counsel and Saladin bestows honors on the Count in accordance to his title, the figures of the Count and Saladin are really one and the same (“commo...*la suya misma*”). Moreover, if the Count and Saladin are equal, then by switching roles Juan Manuel implies that a Christian ruler governs the Muslim dominion of Babylon, and a Muslim ruler governs the Christian dominion of Provence.

Another clue to the aspect of Saladin lies in the very success of the Sultan’s choice for a man to wed the Count’s daughter. The new son-in-law proves to be the salvation of the Count, journeying to Babylon to rescue him from captivity, and indeed, as discussed in Section One of this report, it appears it was Saladin’s implicit intention for that rescue to occur in the first place. Saladin’s counsel serves not only to rescue the Count from Babylon, but also to ensure the stability and prosperity of the Count’s family and, by extension, his dominion in Provence for succeeding generations (“E todo este bien vino al conde por el buen consejo que el soldán le dio que casasse su fija con omne”¹¹⁶). What is more, Saladin also rectifies the Count’s moral violation of not augmenting his family’s wealth during his captivity in Babylon by giving him as a parting gift *double* all the rents he would have earned in Provence otherwise: “E por el enojo que el conde tomara en la prisión, diol dobladas todas las rentas que el conde pudiera levar de su tierra en quanto estudo en la prisión, e enviol muy rico e muy bien andante para su tierra.”¹¹⁷ According to Juan Manuel, such actions directly relate to the

¹¹⁵ Manuel, “Quinta parte,” 171-72.

¹¹⁶ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 178.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 177.

nature of the man committing those actions; in this case, the Sultan of Babylon reveals his true, good nature as he improves the Count's family and dominion in Provence: "E devedes saber que el omne con vondad acreçenta la onra e alça su linage e acreçenta las riquezas."¹¹⁸

Finally, recall that the origin of the Count's temptation is God Himself ("tovo Nuestro Señor por bien de temptar al conde de Provençia, e consintió que fuesse preso en poder del soldán"¹¹⁹). The Count's entire time spent in captivity is, therefore, a moral test from God that reveals the Sultan to be an instrument in God's plan for the Count's spiritual improvement. That is to say that God uses Saladin for His own purposes. Saladin initiates the rescue of the Count from Babylon, which transforms the Sultan from being the Count's captor to his savior. This plus the fact that Saladin operates (we may assume, unwittingly) within God's overarching plan for the Count of Provence only serves to make Saladin's political and religious affiliation even more ambiguous. The paradoxical implication is that Juan Manuel's representation of Saladin is *dual* in nature—that Saladin is *both* friend and foe and, furthermore, both Muslim and Christian, particularly within the context of Saladin's and the Count's shared state of *communitas*. This duality stands in contrast to Saladin's unequivocal identity as the leading Muslim adversary on the battlefield, as in Exemplum 3, where it is understood that Saladin awaits the arrival of King Richard I and Christian crusader armies. Saladin's dual nature emerges from his interpersonal relations with his Christian counterparts, and it points to the fluid dynamics between Christians and Muslims in an atmosphere of medieval *convivencia*. Indeed, the very inclusion of Saladin as a venerable figure in Juan Manuel's Christian didactic text

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 178.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 171.

reflects the everyday experience of co-existence in medieval Iberia. González-Casanovas states:

Discussion about the good friend and companion involves multiple, and at times contradictory, layers of reference to heroic archetypes, biblical exemplars, ethical prototypes, social contracts, political networks, and ecclesiastical prescriptions. Ultimately, such constructions of male bonding must deal with the fundamental cultural frontier that operates in late-medieval and Renaissance Europe: a secular humanism privileges *philia* as an “ascetic” formation (critical, esthetic, ethical) for good subjects or knights in this world (as in Juan Manuel’s *El conde Lucanor*).¹²⁰

On the interpersonal level, Saladin’s identity becomes indeterminate (or rather, dual), and within the context of his relationship with the Count, the very same may also be said of the Count of Provence.

Although the Count is eventually restored to Provence by the end of Patronio’s story, his hand in the improvement of the dominion of Babylon is indelible. Likewise, the Sultan’s influence in the future stability and prosperity of the Count’s family and dominion in Provence will continue to have its effect via the new son-in-law. The point to be taken here is that although the two men can claim their own separate realms, Saladin as a Muslim remains as much an *integral* part of Christendom as the Christian Count of Provence remains an integral part of the Muslim world, and to that end, the dual nature of their characters points to a complex, brotherly bond marked by genuine affection and friendship as well as rivalry and competition.

¹²⁰ González-Casanovas, in *Queer Iberia*, 187.

SALADIN: THE GREATEST MAN IN THE WORLD

In this section I demonstrate Saladin's placement within Juan Manuel's universe by examining the Muslim protagonist in relation to his historical Christian counterpart, King Richard I of England, who is the subject of Exemplum 3 in *El Conde Lucanor*. In Exemplum 3 a battle-weary Count Lucanor confides with Patronio that he has spent his life continually at war and requests advice on how to make amends for sins he may have committed on the battlefield so that he might enter Paradise. Patronio responds with the story of a hermit who suffered so many hardships in spiritual devotion that God sends an angel to inform him that he is promised entry into Paradise. The hermit begs to know who will be his companion there, and the angel responds that it will be King Richard I of England. The news astonishes the hermit because King Richard I is a man of the world who killed many in battle, while he, the hermit, renounced the world to devote himself entirely to a life of the spirit:

Desta razón non plogo mucho al hermitaño, ca él conosçía muy bien al rey e sabía que era omne muy guerrero e que avía muertos e robados e deseredados muchas gentes, e siempre le viera fazer vida muy contralla de la suya e aun, que paresçía muy alongado de la carrera de salvación.¹²¹

The angel retorts that in fact King Richard I deserves to enter Paradise even more than the hermit because of his fateful "leap" in service to God ("ca çierto fuesse que más serviçio fiziera a Dios e más meresçiera el rey Richalte en un salto que saltara, que el hermitaño en quantas buenas obras fiziera en su vida"¹²²).

Exemplum 50 presents Juan Manuel's central moral in *El Conde Lucanor*—that a nobleman should not follow a path either wholly dedicated to the world or to the spirit,

¹²¹ Don Juan Manuel, "Exemplo III: Del salto que fizo el rey Richalte de Inglaterra en la mar contra los moros," in *Libro de los enxemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 93.

¹²² Ibid.

but rather the middle path of performing good deeds and fulfilling the worldly obligations of caring for one's family, vassals, and estates in dedication to God. In Exemplus 3 Juan Manuel speaks more specifically to those noblemen (such as the fictional Count Lucanor) who are called, indeed obligated, to serve God on the battlefield, defending Christendom against the Moors. Such is the "leap" that Juan Manuel ascribes to King Richard I:

E el angel le dixo que sopiese que el rey de Françia e el rey de Inglaterra e el rey de Navarra pasaron a Ultramar. E el día que llagaron al puerto, yendo todos armados para tomar tierra, vieron en la ribera tanta muchedumbre de moros, que tomaron dubda si podrían salir a tierra.... E...acomendó [el rey de Inglaterra] el cuerpo e el alma a Dios e pidiol merçed quel acorriesse, e signóse del signo de la sancta Cruz e mandó a los suyos quel ayudasen. E luego dio de las espaldas al cavallo e saltó en la mar contra la ribera do estavan los moros.¹²³

Note how the scene recalls the leap of faith by the Count of Provence at the beginning of Patronio's story in Exemplus 25:

Un conde ovo en Provençia que fue muy buen omne e deseaba mucho fazer en guisa porquel oviesse Dios merced al alma e ganasse la gloria del Paraíso, faziendo tales obras que fuesen a grand su onra e del su estado. E para que esto pudiesse cumplir, tomó muy grand gente consigo, e muy bien aguisada, e fuese para la Tierra Sancta de Ultramar, poniendo en su coraçón que, por quequier quel pudiesse acaesçer, que siempre sería omne de buena ventura, pues le vinía estando él derechamente en serviçio de Dios.¹²⁴

The key difference between Exempla 3 and 25, however, lies in Juan Manuel's approach to the relation between Christians and Muslims. Exemplus 25 presents a virtual role reversal between the Christian Count of Provence and Muslim Sultan of Babylon, underscoring the ambiguity inherent in their dual relationship as rivals and friends. Exemplus 3 presents no such uncertainty. Rather, Juan Manuel effectively states that in God's overall scheme of Earth and Paradise, Christians and Muslims are mortal enemies,

¹²³ Ibid., 93-94.

¹²⁴ Manuel, "Exemplo XXV," 171.

and the proper path for an able nobleman to amend his sins and reach Paradise is to battle the Moors at any opportunity in service to God and in defense of Christendom. Patronio advises Count Lucanor:

Mas, pues Dios vos pobló en tierra quel podades servir contra los moros, tan bien por mar commo por tierra, fazet vuestro poder porque seades seguro de lo que dexades en vuestra tierra...E faziendo esto, tengo que ésta es la mejor manera que vos podedes tomar para salvar la alma, guardando vuestro estado e vuestra onra. E devedes crer que por estar en serviçio de Dios non morredes ante, nin bivredes más por estar en vuestra tierra. E si muriédes en serviçio de Dios, biviendo en la manera que vos yo he dicho, seredes mártir e muy bien aventurado, e aunque non murades por armas, la buena voluntat e las buenas obras vos farían mártir, e aun los que mal quisieren dezir, non podrían; ca ya todos veien que non dexades nada de lo que devedes fazer de cavallería, mas queredes seer cavallero de Dios e dexades de ser cavallero del diablo e de la ufana del mundo, que es falleçedera.¹²⁵

Juan Manuel makes clear that it is incumbent upon a nobleman to serve God by fighting against the Moors, a venture that would bring honor to his name and good fortune to his soul. In a manner that recalls the moral in Exemplum 26 that Truth always prevails over Falsehood, the idea in Exemplum 3 is that Christians are always triumphant over Muslims, whether by victory or martyrdom. Likewise, Juan Manuel suggests that Christian bravery trumps Muslim mettle on the battlefield, and the killing of Muslims is glorious to God and cause for celebration:

E desde los [moros] vieron venir contra sí, e vieron que non dubdavan la muerte e que vinían contra ellos tan bravamente, non les osaron asperar, e dexáronles el puerto de la mar e començaron a fuir. E desde los cristianos llegaron al puerto, mataron muchos de los que pudieron alcançar e fueron muy bien andantes, e fizieron dese camino mucho servicio a Dios.¹²⁶

Juan Manuel repeats the message of Exemplum 3 in Exemplum 33, in which Count Lucanor, who finds himself continually pestered by petty disputes with fellow

¹²⁵ Manuel, "Exemplo III," 95-96.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 94.

noblemen, seeks advice from Patronio on whether he should pursue peace or continue these disputes and, furthermore, whether or not he should commence war against the Moors. Patronio responds with an allegory about a cunning falcon that belonged to the Infante Don Manuel.¹²⁷ The falcon tries to hunt a heron, but is himself hunted by an eagle. After several thwarted attempts to strike at the heron, the falcon devises a strategy to injure the eagle, allowing him to kill the heron without impediment (“tornó el falcón a la garça e matóla”¹²⁸). Patronio advises Count Lucanor to do the same—to end his petty quarrels so he may pursue that which is most essential to his life as a nobleman:

E sabedes que en cosa del mundo, segund el vuestro estado que vos tenedes, non le podedes tanto servir commo en aver guerra con los moros por ençalçar la sancta e verdadera fe católica, conséjovos yo que luego que podades seer seguro de las otras partes, que ayades guerra con los moros.¹²⁹

Just a few lines down, Patronio reiterates the obligation of Christian noblemen to fight against the Moors in service to God and in penance for their sins, referencing King Richard I as inspiration:

E pues a los señores vos es bueno e provechoso aver algund mester, çierto es que de los mesteres *non podedes aver ninguno tan bueno e tan onrado e tan a pro del alma e del cuerpo, e tan sin daño, commo la guerra de los moros*. E si quier, parat mientes al enxiemplo terçero que vos dixen en este libro, del salto que fizo el rey Richalte de Inglaterra, e cuánto ganó por él [emphasis mine].¹³⁰

There is no measure of equivocation in Exempla 3 or 33 of Juan Manuel’s stance on Christian noblemen’s obligation to defend Christendom against the Moors.

¹²⁷ The Infante Don Manuel was the father of the author, Don Juan Manuel.

¹²⁸ Don Juan Manuel, “Exemplo XXXIII: De lo que contesçió a un falcón sacre del infante don Manuel con un águila e con una garça,” in *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*, ed. Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53 (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003), 214.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

How then does Juan Manuel reconcile his championing of the *Reconquista* with his portrayal of Saladin as the incomparably chivalrous Sultan of Babylon? A clue to the answer to this question lies in the respective locations of Saladin and King Richard I in *El Conde Lucanor*. That is, Juan Manuel describes Saladin in Exemplum 50 as “el mejor omne del mundo” while portraying King Richard I in Exemplum 3 as being in Paradise. In other words, the highest rank that the Muslim protagonist can achieve, or rather, the highest rank that Juan Manuel is personally capable of assigning to Saladin, is that of “the greatest man in the *world*.” Juan Manuel stops short of elevating Saladin’s stature any further because, according to his faith, Paradise is reserved only for good Catholics. He states such in the “Quinta parte del libro del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio”:

Pero devedes saber que para ganar la gloria del Paraíso...A la primera, que aya omne fee e biva en ley de salvaçión: a ésta vos digo que, segund verdat, la ley de salvaçión es la sancta fe cathólica segund la tiene e la cree la sancta madre Ecclesia de Roma.¹³¹

With that, it would seem that the matter regarding Saladin’s placement in *El Conde Lucanor* is settled. Saladin, the great Sultan of Babylon, being Muslim, cannot enter Paradise and is therefore relegated to the realm of the mortal World—and yet, there are simply too many ambiguities surrounding his character, whether intentional or not, to definitively conclude that Saladin, in Juan Manuel’s cosmos, is a mere “infidel.” What is more, Juan Manuel’s Saladin is too complex a character, especially in comparison to King Richard I, to be written off so easily.

Aside from an initial moment of doubt upon seeing the vast number of awaiting Muslim warriors on shore (“vieron en la ribera tanta muchedumbre de moros, que tomaron dubda si podrían salir a tierra”¹³²), King Richard I is an emotionally flat

¹³¹ Manuel, “Quinta parte,” 322.

¹³² Manuel, “Exemplo III,” 93.

character. He is, more accurately, an icon of Christian bravery; Juan Manuel uses him to rally able, Christian noblemen to the cause of the *Reconquista*. As such, the purpose of King Richard I is not to demonstrate qualities of interpersonal skill or good counsel and governance. The only intimate exchange we observe is that between King Richard I and a messenger, in response to a call by the King of France for a strategy meeting:

E el rey de Inglaterra, que estava en su cavallo, quando esto oyó, dixo al mandadero del rey de Françia quel dixiese de su parte que bien sabía que él avía fecho a Dios muchos enojos e muchos pesares en este mundo e que sienpre le pidiera merçed quel traxiese a tiempo quel fiziese emienda por el su cuerpo, e que loado a Dios, que veía el día que él deseava mucho; ca si allí muriese, pues avía fecho la emienda que pudiera ante que de su tierra se partiese, e estava en verdadera penitencia, que era çierto quel avría Dios merced al alma, e que si los moros fuessen vençidos, que tomaría Dios mucho serviçio, e serían todos muy de buena ventura.¹³³

Immediately after this speech, King Richard I performs his iconic leap into into the sea. By any standard, his leap is a bold, aggressive, and independent move. He wastes no time in committing to action, nor does he concern himself with the actions or fates of the other kings or men. The only concern King Richard I has at this moment is for his own soul—saving his soul by committing to battle in dedication to God. From this perspective, Juan Manuel’s story of King Richard I is monologic. King Richard I acts only in relation to God, or rather, his Christian faith. Juan Manuel’s representation of King Richard I, in turn, only serves to uphold the dogma that champions war against Muslims as service to God. Nor is there any measure of ambiguity or contradiction to King Richard I in Exemplum 3. Indeed, Juan Manuel’s/Patronio’s story of the leap of King Richard I fits well with Bakhtin’s description of Christian hagiography:

¹³³ Ibid.

In early Christian *crisis hagiographies*...we have as a rule only two images of an individual, images that are separated and reunited through crisis and rebirth: the image of the sinner (before rebirth) and the image of the holy man or saint (after crisis and rebirth)... It depicts only the *exceptional*, utterly *unusual* moments of a man's life...But these moments *shape the definitive image of the man, his essence, as well as the nature of his entire subsequent life* [emphasis in original].¹³⁴

The image of King Richard I—and the quality of his character as a man—is embodied in his singular, iconic leap, just as Juan Manuel states that the quality of man may be deciphered by his actions: “E para saber cuál es [el omne] en sí, asse de mostrar en las obras que faze a Dios e al mundo.”¹³⁵ King Richard I's leap is so iconic that a mere reference to it by Juan Manuel is enough to relate its intended meaning to his audience (“e si quier, parat mientes al enxiemplo terçero que vos dixie en este libro, del salto que fizo el rey Richalte de Inglaterra, e cuánto ganó por él”¹³⁶). From this perspective, any description by Juan Manuel of King Richard I's interpersonal relations would simply be superfluous.

Juan Manuel's story of King Richard I is therefore distinct from the author's pragmatic approach to everyday, interpersonal affairs between Christians and Muslims, and it is on this point that King Richard I stands in contrast to the figure of Saladin in *El Conde Lucanor*. Juan Manuel's representation of Saladin in Exempla 25 and 50 is dialogic; the Sultan of Babylon operates in relation to other characters: the Count of Provence, son-in-law, vassal's wife, old man, and young squire. We as readers do not learn about Saladin's character by way of his performance on the battlefield (though it is understood that it is he and his men who await the Christian crusaders on the shore of

¹³⁴ M. M. Bakhtin, “Forms of Time and Chronotype in the Novel,” in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 116-17.

¹³⁵ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 280.

¹³⁶ Manuel, “Exemplo XXXIII,” 214.

Ultramar/Outremer in Exemplum 3), but through his private, interpersonal relations with other characters. What is more, we do not so much observe Saladin in relation to characters that are in league with him, either religiously or politically, as we do in relation to characters that are in one way or another his *opposite*: the Count of Provence, the (Christian) son-in-law, the seemingly humble *wife* of his vassal, Papal dignitaries, kings of Christendom, and the old (Christian) man and young squire.

Moreover, whereas Juan Manuel depicts King Richard I in Paradise, distant and detached from humanity, Saladin is a man of the world, subject to temptation. We learn nothing of the particulars of King Richard I's sins in Exemplum 3, but in Exemplum 50 we witness Saladin's dramatic fall and arduous return to grace. Juan Manuel does not feature Saladin on the battlefield as he does King Richard I, although Saladin's valorous reputation does precede him (e.g., he takes the Count of Provence captive at/en route to the Holy Land). Juan Manuel instead presents a more intimate, private Saladin. In Exemplum 25 we observe Saladin's relations with his captive, counselor, and friend, the Count of Provence and his private confrontation with the son-in-law. In Exemplum 50 we are privy to the private details of Saladin's moral crisis and soul-searching journey. If Juan Manuel's representation of King Richard I is iconic (inasmuch as King Richard I is depicted alongside a saintly hermit in Paradise), then his representation of Saladin is intimate and wordly; Saladin is utterly human, subject to moral failure but also capable of great triumph. It is Juan Manuel's dialogic representation of Saladin—a display of his interpersonal intimacy and multifaceted, even paradoxical, character—that points to a profound fascination on the part of the author with the Muslim protagonist.

Juan Manuel implies in Exemplum 25 that Saladin is an ambiguous, dual character. There is, however, another dual aspect to Saladin that helps to explain Juan Manuel's fascination with him and better understand his representation in *El Conde*

Lucanor—Saladin as the *hunter* and the *hunted*. For Juan Manuel, mastering the art of the hunt is integral to *cavallerismo*, signifying nobility, and as such, “the hunt” is a recurring theme throughout *El Conde Lucanor*.¹³⁷ In Exemplum 25 we learn via the son-in-law that Saladin is himself a hunter: “E sopo cómo Saladín era muy caçador.”¹³⁸ In Exemplum 50 Saladin is portrayed as a figurative hunter in quest for a truthful answer to his moral question. Juan Manuel underscores Saladin’s quest as a metaphorical hunt through the figure of the young squire, shown returning home after having just captured his prey—a moment that implies Saladin’s capture of the truth: “E acaesçió que un día, andando por su camino con sus jubglares, que toparon con un escudero que vinía de correr monte e avía muerto un ciervo. E el escudero casara poco tiempo avía...”¹³⁹

The image of Saladin as the one who is *hunted* occurs in Exemplum 25, when the son-in-law ventures out to “capture” Saladin in order to rescue his father-in-law, the Count of Provence, from Babylon. The son-in-law carefully prepares for his personal hunt for Saladin, mastering all the skills necessary for a successful outcome:

E luego...cavalgó e fuesse en buena ventura. E endereçó al regno de Armenia, e moró ý tanto tiempo fasta que sopo muy bien el lenguaje e todas las maneras de la tierra. E sopo cómo Saladín era muy caçador. E él tomó muchas buenas aves e muchos buenos canes, e fuesse para Saladín.¹⁴⁰

The hunting scene in Exemplum 25 between the falcons and cranes, in which the son-in-law tricks and corners Saladin, recalls the allegorical hunting imagery of Exemplum 33: “alançaron los falcones a unas grúas. E fueron matar la una de llas grúas a un puerto de la mar...”¹⁴¹ To the extent that Patronio’s allegory in Exemplum 33 champions the

¹³⁷ Sotelo, Introduction, 33.

¹³⁸ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 175.

¹³⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 284.

¹⁴⁰ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 175.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 176.

Reconquista (“conséjovos yo...que ayades guerra con los moros”¹⁴²), this scene in Exemplum 25 between the son-in-law and Saladin also carries overtones of the mortal battle between Christians and Muslims. That is, the son-in-law journeys to Babylon to capture and defeat Saladin for the purpose of rescuing and restoring the Christian Count of Provence to his proper dominion in Christendom. From this perspective, it would seem that Juan Manuel suggests that Christians and Muslims belong to two distinct realms, and that the mission to restore the Christian Count to his place in Christendom is the only purpose for the son-in-law’s hunt for Saladin. Yet, there remains another, underlying motive for the son-in-law’s capture of Saladin that illuminates the paradox of Juan Manuel’s appeal for the Muslim protagonist.

Note the suitor’s reaction to the news that Saladin chose him to marry the daughter of the Count of Provence:

Desde él esto oyó, entendió que fablavan verdaderamente en el casamiento e tovo que, pues Saladín lo escogiera por omne, e le fiziera allegar a tan grand onra, que non sería él omne si non fiziesse en este fecho lo que pertenesçía.¹⁴³

He implicitly recognizes the standard that has been set for him in receiving this honor to marry the Count’s daughter, all the more so because it was Saladin, the Sultan of Babylon, who selected him. Immediately after being granted this honor (and even prior to the marriage ceremony), the new son-in-law takes over the Count’s estates: “E dixo luego a lla condessa e a los parientes del conde que si ellos querían que creyesse él que gelo dizían verdaderamente, quel apoderasen luego de todo el condado e de todas las rendas.”¹⁴⁴ For all intents and purposes, the son-in-law is at this point the new Count of Provence, but there is still one thing left remaining for him to accomplish before his title

¹⁴² Manuel, “Exemplo XXXIII,” 214.

¹⁴³ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 174.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

is truly consummated: pursue and defeat Saladin. Though the son-in-law arms a galley in preparation for his hunt (“armó pieça de galeas”¹⁴⁵), it is telling that he does not ultimately use physical force to “capture” Saladin. Rather, the son-in-law uses his intellect, for it is according to his intellect and wise actions rather than brute force by which Saladin judges the man. Having cornered Saladin and boarded him onto his galley, the son-in-law reveals to him privately:

Contol cómo él era el yerno del conde, e que *era aquél que él escogiera*, entre otros mejores que sí, por omne; e pues él por omne lo escogiera, *que bien entendía que non fuera él omne si esto non fiziera*; e quel pidía por merçed quel diesse su suegro, porque entendiesse *que el consejo que él le diera que era bueno e verdadero*, e que se fallava bien dél [emphasis mine].¹⁴⁶

The stakes for the son-in-law to prove himself are in fact very high (“Quanto es mayor el subimiento, tanto es peor la caída”¹⁴⁷). To understand these stakes, recall that in Exemplum 50, Saladin is capable of discerning the veracity of the responses to his moral question because he implicitly knows the answer himself. Likewise, in Exemplum 25, Saladin is capable of discerning who among the list of potential suitors is a worthy man (*omne*) because he is himself such a man—and no average man at that:

E falló [Saladín] que un fijo de un rico omne que non era de muy grand poder, que segund lo que paresçia dél en aquel escripto, *que era el mejor omne e el más complido, e más sin ninguna mala tacha de que él nunca oyera fablar* [emphasis mine].¹⁴⁸

Note how this description of the son-in-law echoes Saladin’s admission of his own title in Exemplum 50: “E Saladín le dixo que...era él mejor que los otros, *que non que avía otro mejor que él* [emphasis mine].”¹⁴⁹ The son-in-law is, therefore, by implication the very

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 176-77.

¹⁴⁷ Manuel, “Segunda parte,” 305.

¹⁴⁸ Manuel, “Exemplo XXV,” 173.

¹⁴⁹ Manuel, “Exemplo L,” 287.

image of Saladin, and it is according to this supreme standard of intellect and competence that the son-in-law must prove himself. Having already assumed control of the Count's estates and financial accounts, there is no practical reason why the son-in-law must pursue Saladin and rescue the Count from Babylon (where the Count leads a posh life in genteel captivity)—except to prove himself *directly to* Saladin and, by extension, the World that he is indeed the man Saladin judged him to be.

Juan Manuel thus implies that the level of honor a man receives is equal in measure to the honor possessed by the person who bestows it. Saladin, being the “greatest man in the world” thus bestows a supremely immense honor upon the son-in-law. In this case, however, the son-in-law must defeat the very man who bestows this honor upon him because he remains the nominal adversary of the Count of Provence and of Christendom. The son-in-law's capture of Saladin, therefore, fulfills the honor granted to him. This point is central to Juan Manuel's fascination with Saladin. The Muslim figure of Saladin—the Sultan of Babylon, the “greatest man in the world”—represents, for crusading Christian noblemen such as Juan Manuel, the ultimate *prize*. Saladin's chivalrous reputation—his valor, benevolence, and consummate strategic skill and intellect—serve to make Saladin both an esteemed friend of Christendom and a powerful, worthy adversary. To the extent that Saladin represents everything that the chivalrous, crusading Christian nobleman desires for himself, he is thus desired as the ultimate prize for conquest. His “defeat,” even figuratively in literature, transfers his honor to the conqueror. The son-in-law effectively conquers Saladin by cornering him to release the Count from captivity, but Saladin lives on, reigning supreme as the Sultan of Babylon. And so he must, or the fantasy of Saladin would cease to exist in the minds of Christians. Saladin thus functions much like a beloved object of desire, and in this lust for one's venerated opponent there emerges a gripping fascination and a fantasized joining of the

Self with the Other—in this case, leading to the paradoxical image of Saladin existing simultaneously friend and foe, Muslim and Christian.

Conclusion

Juan Manuel's *El Conde Lucanor* consists of five sections; a first section of moral tales, or exempla (the section most prominently associated with *El Conde Lucanor*), followed by three sections of proverbs, and a fifth section devoted to a theological treatise. The exempla present an array of characters, embedded within the frame story of Count Lucanor and Patronio. Among the many characters represented, the figure of Saladin as a preeminent figure in Exempla 25 and 50 points to an interesting paradox in Juan Manuel's text, and this report devotes itself to addressing the question of how the author reconciles his inclusion of the Muslim figure within a text intended as moral instruction for a Christian audience. The first section of this report applies Victor Turner's social drama theory toward a textual analysis of Exempla 25 and 50, examining Juan Manuel's representation of Saladin as a praise-worthy figure, capable of triumphing over crises, rather than as a villain, anti-hero, or hero manqué. The second section applies M. M. Bakhtin's concept of dialogism toward a character analysis of Saladin in relation to other characters in the text, including the "voice" represented by Juan Manuel's proverbs and theological treatise. Analyzing the figure of Saladin in relation to other characters' voices reveals more intriguing aspects of Juan Manuel's treatment of the Muslim protagonist in the text. Ultimately, we learn that Juan Manuel does indeed present Saladin in an undeniably positive light, and that this representation points to a deep fascination with the Muslim protagonist as a virtual object of desire—a venerated rival whose conquest serves to bestow honor on his conqueror. We learn as well that the author's fascination with Saladin leads to a complex and enigmatic representation of the Sultan's identity, with allusions to a dual nature: the great Saladin as both friend and foe, Muslim and Christian.

Bibliography

- Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Carreño, Antonio. “La vergüenza como constante social y narrativa en Don Juan Manuel: El ‘Ejemplo L’ de *El Conde Lucanor*.” *Thesaurus* XXXII, no. 1 (1977): 54-74.
- Fletcher, Richard. *Moorish Spain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- González-Casanovas, Roberto J. “Male Bonding as Cultural Construction in Alfonso X, Ramon Llull, and Juan Manuel: Homosocial Friendship in Medieval Iberia.” In *Queer Iberia: Sexualities, Cultures, and Crossings from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance*, edited by Josiah Blackmore and Gregory S. Hutcheson, 157-92. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999.
- Manuel, Don Juan. *Libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor e de Patronio*. Edited by Alfonso I. Sotelo, 22nd ed., Letras Hispánicas 53. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W. D. Halls. 1950. Reprint, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2000.
- Sturcken, H. Tracy. *Don Juan Manuel*. Twayne’s World Authors Series 303. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974.
- Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Symbol, Myth, and Ritual Series. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- . *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: PAJ Publications, 1982.
- . *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. 1969. Reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Aldine Transaction, 2009.