

FEDERICO J. ASSIS-GONZÁLEZ  
Universidad Nacional de San Juan  
Facultad de Filosofía Humanidades y Artes  
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas  
ORCID: 0000-0003-1427-0872

## Friends of Power. The Problems of Friendship in Don Juan Manuel's Thought (14<sup>th</sup> c.)

**Keywords:** friendship, Don Juan Manuel, power, king, nobility, Castile, woman

The bond with the other defines us. Not only does an occasional encounter with someone evidence hierarchies and socio-economic positions, but the people who are known and the nature of the relationship established with them is part of the social capital<sup>1</sup> of every person.

Encountering the other puts into play a series of mechanisms in which the equality or superiority of the parties is evident. According to some classical authors — like Aristotle or Cicero<sup>2</sup> — friendship was an equal and reciprocal bond par excellence between men, but for Don Juan it was difficult to imagine friendship between *hidalgos* that did not include inequality as a central element, even if this was a problem within the concept itself.<sup>3</sup> Don Juan Manuel lived in one of the most turbulent periods in the history of the Kingdoms of Castile and Leon, marked by regencies and uprisings of the aristocracy, participating in some of them, which undermined the royal power. As regent of the kingdom, Don Juan accumulated quasi-royal

---

<sup>1</sup> The social capital, according to Pierre Bourdieu, could be defined as the “conjunto de recursos actuales o potenciales que están ligados a la posesión de una red duradera de relaciones más o menos institucionalizadas de interconocimiento y de inter-reconocimiento; o, en otros términos, a la pertenencia a un grupo, como conjunto de agentes que no están solamente dotados de propiedades comunes (susceptibles de ser percibidas por el observador, por los otros o por ellos mismos) sino que están también unidos por lazos permanentes y útiles.” BOURDIEU 1980, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ideal friendship implied equality, but already in Aristotelian writings the existence of unequal friendships was recognized as based on a hierarchical difference and unequal exchange of elements, while both extremes of the relationship differed by virtue, function and cause. The *Nicomachean Ethics* contained several examples of unequal friendship: between adults and youth, men and women as well as rulers and their subjects. But in that last case, a virtuous man being required by his superiors would only befriend him, if he outdid him in virtue, for there would be no proportional equality between the parties otherwise. Consequently, for the Stagirite, there existed only a first and principal friendship, that of two good men, and the rest would approach it by likeness.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ASSIS-GONZÁLEZ 2019b.

power and, after Alfonso XI's coming of age, he did not cease to confront the king to defend his orbit of power and influence. He fought on the battlefield as well as in his writings, which made him famous among the authors in the Spanish language. Famous among the literati for his mature works — *Libro de los estados* and *Libro del conde Lucanor*, in which various fictional characters allow him to transmit his doctrine — over the years he began to tackle the historiographical genre — in works like *Tratado de las Armas* or *Libro de las tres razones* — setting out his interpretation of the events which had occurred in Castile since his father, Don Manuel, founded the lineage in the mid-13th century. Don Juan's life was defined by his relationships<sup>4</sup> and by a presumption of superiority that led him to confess to his son, Fernando, that talking to him about friendship would be difficult because “yo en Espanna non uos fallo amigo en egual grado.”<sup>5</sup>

Among the *ricoshombres* no one had greater lineage or wealth<sup>6</sup> than a member of the Manuel family. No infante “nin otro omne en el sennorio de Castiella [...] es amigo en egual grado.”<sup>7</sup> This inferiority of the rest is a fact that Don Juan always advised to keep in mind, since friendly affability among the nobles should not overshadow hierarchy. In principle, he considered that the best way to uphold honour was through “los que fueren sus eguales o en mayor estado que el”, taking advantage of the power and prestige of those and taking care of “que se onre mas dellos que ellos del.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Don Juan, born in Escalona (1282), was the son of the Infante Don Manuel and the Countess Beatrix of Savoy. He was Fernando III's grandson, Alfonso X's nephew, Sancho IV's cousin and godson, and nearly became Alfonso XI's father-in-law. He spent his life, fighting for power; he eventually became regent of the kingdom, a position he had to relinquish after Alfonso XI's coming of age in 1325. Finally, after submitting to Alfonso XI, he dedicated his last years to managing his estates and producing some of the most radicalized writings in defence of his lineage, to which he gave an aura of holiness in contrast to the cursed lineage of Alfonso X. The date of his death is uncertain, but the year 1348 is considered to be the most likely date.

<sup>5</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 162.

<sup>6</sup> Much has been said about the high esteem in which Don Juan Manuel placed his lineage, embodied in the almost heroic figure of his father, Don Manuel, and of his grandfather, Don Fernando III, but it is worth clarifying here that the importance of possessions, of wealth for this magnate was not translated into profit or gain but concrete military power, linked to the warlike function of the higher nobility. For this reason, in the *Libro enfenido*, he affirmed that his inheritance allowed him to keep “cerca de mil caballeros, sin bien fecho del rey”, which contrasts with the *ricoshombres* described by Thomas Aquinas. In *De regimine principum* the Dominican characterized them as mercenaries dependent on the king's money to maintain his honour. Unlike them, Don Juan had such vast estates that they allowed him to move “del reyno de Nauarra fasta el reyno de Granada” without sleeping in another noble's villa or castle, and riches so vast that they maintained the high status of the members of his family even in the most adverse times so that “nunca se falla que infante, nin su fijo, nin su nieto tal estado mantouiesen commo nos tenemos mantenido.” MANUEL 1983c, pp. 162, 163.

<sup>7</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 162.

<sup>8</sup> MANUEL 1983d, p. 315.

As he understood it, the status of the Manuels differed from that of *ricahombria* and was similar to that of the royal family, because they received nothing from anyone and were able to maintain a great number of men. These characteristics, typical of kings, guided Sancho IV when he advised his heir to manage his estate in such a way that his friends “ayan menester a ti e tú non a ellos.”<sup>9</sup> According to Don Juan Manuel, the Manuel lineage was superior to every Castilian lineage, except the king’s, by divine will and that condition had to be maintained by his descendants. That is why Don Juan warns Fernando Manuel that “non vos faga ninguno creyente que auedes a mantener estado de rico omne, nin tener esa manera” since “mas se allega a la manera de los reys, que a la manera de los ricos omnes.”<sup>10</sup>

The giver of goods and honours par excellence was the king, while the act of giving was part of the form of love upon which were based the political-economic obligations of the kingdom, the *debdo*. Don Juan knew this and always sought to emulate kings in their more refined and more symbolic as well as pragmatic political manifestations. In this sense Carlos Mota has said, when analysing the *Libro enfenido*, that Don Juan Manuel never spoke of a purely affective love, unlike Alfonso X (Part. IV, XXVII, IV), because “incorpora a la noción de amor un componente de transacción política, más que de reciprocidad: hay un debdo político y económico (por ejemplo, entre señor y vasallo), pero también lo hay familiar, ‘de linage’.”<sup>11</sup>

### THE POLITICS OF FRIENDSHIP

In this context Don Juan Manuel defined various forms of love, a term that designates a series of strong bonds — with God, with parents and children, with the spouse and with other men. Love between men was called friendship, but there were various ways in which this bond was expressed.

The *complida*<sup>12</sup> was the most perfect form of friendship conceived by Don Juan and, for this very reason, it was presented as an impossible bond. The reciproc-

<sup>9</sup> BIZZARRI 2001, p. 257.

<sup>10</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 163.

<sup>11</sup> MOTA 2014, p. 111.

<sup>12</sup> Among the four forms of love listed by Don Juan Manuel, the *amor complido* was the most complete. The second and third forms of love, love of the *linaje* and love of the *debdo*, were shown as incomplete forms regarding the fourth one, called *amor verdadero*. The friendship of a true friend was superior to that of the *linaje* and the *debdo* friendship because it had the component of proof in time. The other two forms were the love of one’s relatives and vassals, key figures in the upholding of stately power, although of doubtful loyalty.

Ian Macpherson has defined the *complida* friendship, from Don Juan Manuel’s *Maneras de amor* and the *Libro del conde Lucanor*, as well as Pedro Alfonso’s *Disciplina clericalis* as a friendship that “has been put to the test, and survived the test.” MACPHERSON 1971, p. 180. However, such an understanding would not be appropriate. In fact, if we stick to the Manueline text, the *verdadera* friendship was born “por debdo señalado o por buen talante” and whose love “lo a prouado en grandes fe-

ity and equality which such a bond demanded made it non-existent among men, given as they were to betrayal and pettiness. However, friendship was not perfect and it blended in the political struggles which marked the Castilian Middle Ages. Understanding how ties of friendship worked was key to properly exercising lordship and for that reason Don Juan could not avoid reflecting on it. As Aristotle pointed out in the *Eudemean Ethics*, the very work of the politics, the actual political act, was to create as many bonds of friendship as possible.

Power and friendship went hand in hand, especially in the Castilian society, sustained by personal ties. For this reason, Don Juan Manuel assigned an important place to friendship among the aspects in which a lord who wished to be “bueno et muy onrado et poderoso” should be instructed. The physical body was the first instrument that the lord had to care for to govern others, but there was another body that should not be neglected, the political one. We are talking about the stately body, composed of good vassals, castles and fortresses, which to be maintained required “muchos amigos, et que aya mucho que les dar.”<sup>13</sup>

The act of giving seems to be a proper act of noble friendship with strong Pauline foundations that emphasize the superiority of the giver. Both Aristotle and the Learned King agreed on this point. The powerful more than anyone needed friends on whom to act, because the activity of the giver, like that of the lover, always prevailed over the passivity of the receiver, of the beloved. The *Partidas* argued that the more honest, powerful and wealthy a man was, the more he would need friends. They constituted the *raison d'être* of the *prouecho delas riquezas*, they were to be used to *fazer el bien* to friends, opposing the logic of bourgeois profit. But behind the idea of goodness was hidden the logic of debt. Donation was intended to strengthen the ties of vassalage and courtesy in order to take care and increase wealth and honour because “sin amigos non podrian durar, por que quanto mas honrrado, e mas poderoso es el ome, peor golpe rescibe, sil fallece ayuda de los amigos” (Part. IV, XXVII, II).

---

chos et peligros.” The complida friendship, by contrast, would consist of a friendship based on perfect equality of the parties and a reciprocity in excessive actions, to the point of harming oneself in pursuit of the good of the friend. This was a type of friendship which Don Juan claims never to have seen in his life. MANUEL 1983c, p. 185.

<sup>13</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 173. The idea of a geminated body politic crosses the Middle Ages from its Pauline origins. Ernst Kantorowicz's classic work, *The King's Two Bodies* [1st ed. 1957] is an obligatory reference in this regard. His work reflected on the historical importance of mythical fictions in politics. Starting from the political theorists of the Tudor period, he went back to the Middle Ages to answer a problem that did not focus on “the complex presence of power, but its absence”. LAYSER 2016, p. xxi. The mortal physical body and the eternal political body were the two poles of a theoretical construction which made it possible to provide political continuity to kingdoms held in the figure of the king. Since his appearance in Michel Foucault's *Surveiller et punir* [1st ed. 1975], his reflections have not ceased to influence historians dedicated to not only the history of the body or culture, but also the various aspects presented by the new political history, crossed by the concepts of discourse, mediation and representation.

Both Alfonso X and his nephew, Don Juan Manuel, knew that “obediencia de amor que la obediencia de temor”,<sup>14</sup> without forgetting that these two ways of obtaining the subjugation of the men and women of the kingdom were to be applied according to the condition in question.<sup>15</sup> If friendship, as a political bond, was characteristic of the *hidalgos*, the friendly and fearsome treatment of the king should be distributed with that condition in mind as well. That is why the author of the *Libro de los cien capítulos* says that “los buenos con amor e los viles con temor” are to be taken, meaning being good to the nobility and vile to the common people.<sup>16</sup>

In fact, following this logic, it is possible to differentiate the bond that the sovereign established with one another through two actions. On the one hand the king was to “aver por manera de amar los omnes buenos e que entiendan en él verdat e amor.” On the other he had to “guiar los omnes de la tierra de manera que l’amen e que l’teman, e debe guiar al pueblo de manera que l’ayan miedo.” In this sapiential text we see that those *omnes buenos* who were to understand that they were loved with truth and love are the same *ricos omnes* from whom loyalty and understanding were demanded. In the same way the *omnes de la tierra* correspond to the common people, since love and fear were expected of both. This discursive nuance is significant given that, although it was demanded of all the people, including the nobility, love and fear of their king, not for that reason, the *ricoshombres* were not recognized as ones being treated differently.<sup>17</sup>

It should be remembered that the idea of love and fear linked to the monarchy was a translation by means of the similarity of the link which theologians considered to be established with divinity. Such conceptualization was collected in the *Partidas* when the author explains that love “es cosa por que el ome ama a Dios”, giving this link the name of charity (II, XII, VI). Through the Creator’s love man was able to love “otrosi a su vezino” (II, XII, VI). In the same way fear had its origin in God’s love because it was “assi como guarda e portero del amor” (II, XII, VIII).

As Augustine of Hippo said, “el temor de Dios es espanto, que cae enel coraçon del ome spiritualmente, con miedo de perder su alma, e su amor” (Part. II, XII, VIII) and, like love, by emulation extends to the secular bonds of man, starting with political-theological relationship with the sovereign. According to this code, love and fear are two feelings that cannot be separated: no one “puede amar si non teme” (II, XIII,

<sup>14</sup> HARO CORTÉS 1998, p. 87.

<sup>15</sup> According to Patrick Boucheron, the political character of fear is expressed in the ambivalence of the English verb “to awe” that it is the root both to describe the awful and that which inspires respect — awesome. That nature “no es el *Timor Dei* de los teólogos, sino el temor latino, vereor, que podría traducirse tanto por temor como por reverencia”. BOUCHERON 2018, p. 121.

<sup>16</sup> HARO CORTÉS 1998, p. 87. Speaking of the good ones is to do it of the condition of *ricahombria* as evidenced in the following passage from *Libro de los cien capítulos*: “E el rey á mester de su pueblo amor sin atrevimiento e temor sin miedo, e á mester de sus ricos omnes lealtad sin engaño, e seso e entendimiento.” HARO CORTÉS 1998, pp. 85–86.

<sup>17</sup> HARO CORTÉS 1998, p. 87.

XV). What you love is accompanied by the fear of losing it, but fear and love should not be confused. Dread was born from different causes. While fear originated in love, “el miedo nasce de espanto de premia, e es como desamparamiento” (II, XIII, XV).

It is worth mentioning that the author of the *Partidas* seems to imply that the love that shaped fear was a hierarchical love, an unequal friendship exemplified by that between parents and children. The father was naturally feared for “el linaje que con el ha: e por el Señorío que ha sobre el, segund derecho, por que es su fechura.” From this hierarchical relationship, the idea of donation re-emerged. Reason to fear the father was “por non perder el bien fecho que ha, o espera ver del.” This paternalistic model of the creator and the creation, donor and receiver was proposed by the Alfonsian text to understand the bond with the king. From such fear “nascen dos cosas, verguença, e obedescimiento, lo que conuiene mucho que aya el pueblo al Rey” (Part. II, XIII, XV).<sup>18</sup>

It is love, not strength, that is the best tool for the sovereign. While the strong king “obedécenle los cuerpos de su pueblo por fuerça”, the *Libro de los cien capítulos* says, to the good king their hearts will obey, thus controlling their wills.<sup>19</sup> Don Juan Manuel read with this logic the loving relationships that articulated the kingdom when he said that “De los viles se sirue omne por premia; de los buenos et onrados, con amor et buenas obras.”<sup>20</sup> This approach is not new, but what it is subversive is to consider that none of the friendly ties that Manuel could establish during his life would be in conditions of equality. They were superior to all, except to the king who

<sup>18</sup> About the king’s paternal bond with his people and the role that fear and love played in him, the *Segunda Partida* gives us an explanation. In this text, the three terms are put into action to indicate in what form they were articulated: “E el otro miedo que viene del espanto, e dela premia, es atal, como el que han los sieruos a los señores, temiendo que por la seruidumbre, en que ellos son, toda cosa que los señores fagan contra ellos que lo pueden fazer con derecho. Onde segund estas dos razones, deue el pueblo temer al rey, assi como fijos a padres, por la naturaleza que han con el, e por el señorío que ha sobre ellos : e por non perder su amor, nin el bien que les faze, o que esperan auer del. Otrrosi le deuen temer como vassallos, a señor, auiendo miedo de fazer tal yerro, porque ayan a perder su amor, e caer en pena, que es en manera, como de seruidumbre” (II, XIII, XV).

<sup>19</sup> HARO CORTÉS 1998, p. 87. According to the *Partidas*, the obedience was commanded by God in the ancient Law, when he chose Saul as king of Israel ordering his people to submit to him with these words: “el Rey será sobre vos, e sed leales e obedientes, e ayudar vos ha, e será vuestro defendedor” (II, XIII, XV). But the Alfonsian text also draws on the New Testament, which tells how the apostles Peter and Paul commanded Christians to obey the temporal authorities. Peter commanded this by telling the people that “fuesen a mandamiento, e obediencia de su Rey, con todo temor”, while Paul considered that every man should submit to the kings “porque ellos son puestos por mano de Dios, e el poderío que han, dello reciben. E quien los quisiere contrastar, faze contra el mandamiento de Dios, e gana para si perdimiento de alma para siempre jamas” (II, XIII, XV). This link between respect for the Scriptures and obedience to the king is not a minor aspect because, in this political theology, the failure to fulfil a political duty to the king had a transcendent consequence equivalent to a mortal sin, condemnation.

<sup>20</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 447.

was superior just because of his stately condition. This makes of themselves kings without a crown, because their bonds resembled those which could be made with God, the Emperor or the King, whom they love on a rational basis, as Macpherson has pointed out. They love the sovereign for the good works he has done, as one loves God for all that he has given and will give to man.<sup>21</sup>

Consequently, the lord's duties were to be to other men, his friends. That is, members of the aristocracy. He had to worry about fraternizing with them. But this fraternal bond, not rooted in a community model based on agreement like most friendships, meant the existence of a parental friendship that served as a basis. As Aristotle points out, it is on the basis of the love between parents and children that arises the love that the brothers feel each other, "pues la identidad con relación a éstos produce identidad entre ellos mismos" (Et. nic. VIII, 12, 1161b, 32–33). The same is true of relatives, united by the same progenitor, all of them would be, in a certain way, "lo mismo, si bien en individuos separados" (Et. nic. VIII, 12, 1161b, 33–34).

The problem of political instability at the end of the 13th and in the 14th century in Castile exposed the very instability of this fraternal system of nobility with the king. The feudal system demanded for its operation that "la desigualdad humana se limitase a los confines sociales."<sup>22</sup> If it were exacerbated within the nobility, only suspicion and insecurity would be fed. That is why Don Juan Manuel advised, in several examples of the *Libro del conde Lucanor*, to close ranks against the enemies of this fraternity. The great lords were to act corporately in the protection of their power.

This is clearly seen in *ejemplo 22* when two false advisers, the fox and the ram, broke the brotherhood on which two lords, the lion and the bull, held their power. These false counsellors, who, seeking their profit, broke the loyalty owed to their lords, deceived them "fasta que el amor que solia seer entre el león et el toro torno en muy grand desamor."<sup>23</sup> Such a rupture made them end up facing and

commo quier que el león fizo mas danno et mas mal al toro et abaxo mucho el su poder et la su onra, pero sienpre el leon finco tan desapoderado dalli adelante que nunca pudo ensennorear las otras vestias nin apoderar se dellas commo solia, tambien de las del su linage commo de las otras.<sup>24</sup>

The mighty lion, the king, in his capacity as lord of lords, by his inherent strength caused more damage to the bull, but this victory was pyrrhic, it brought about its demise. This happened, Don Juan says, because "el leon et el toro non entendieron que por el amor et la ayuda que el vno tomava del otro, eran ellos onrados et apoderados de todas las otras animalias."<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. MACPHERSON 1971.

<sup>22</sup> BLANCO-AGUINAGA, RODRÍGUEZ-PUERTOLAS, ZAVALA 2000, p. 121.

<sup>23</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 169.

<sup>24</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 169.

<sup>25</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 169.

Breaking the friendly alliance that supported their power was the fruit of not knowing how to take care of bad counsellors. This happened especially to the great lords during the *mançebia* [youth] since “los mas de los que con·ellos biuen non catan si non por adobar su pro con·ellos; et por auer mas su talante, loanles et consejan les todo aquello en que pueden auer | mayor plazer.” According to Don Juan, the counsellor who only told his master what he wanted to hear was a very dangerous deceiver “por que·la voluntad de los omnes, et sennalada mente de·los moços, es sienpre mas aparejada a·conplir [su voluntad] que a catar por su pro et su onra”, as they follow these disloyal sycophants and not *los que leal mente aman su pro*. The reference to his relationship with Alfonso XI is evident. However, like any friendship based on usefulness, when bad times arrived, these counsellors abandoned their lords in the greatest need because “non les amauan por amor verdadero nin leal, si non en quanto fazian de su pro con·ellos.”<sup>26</sup>

To surround oneself with bad advisers spoke ill of the lord, who manifested his disloyalty and disaffection with those who had professed true friendship with him. In this sense the words with which Jofré de Loaysa criticized Fernando IV coincide perfectly with the Manueline description. According to the chronicler, the Infante Don Juan and don Juan Núñez astutely and with flattery won the will of the sixteen-year-old king, displacing his mother, María de Molina, the Infante Don Enrique and his officers “et omnes alios qui sibi in tribulacionibus et pressuris constantes et fideles extiterant alienavit a se et quasi exosos habuit.”<sup>27</sup>

Contrary to the teachings of the sages, the king had broken the friendships that had been proven in contrariety and over time to rely on the advice of friends who sought their own advantage. Moreover, the very condition of those counsellors was unworthy by their origin, “oficiales, familiares, secretarios [...] et dilectos”,<sup>28</sup> increasing the disdain for any lord and much more for a king in what, as Aristotle asserted, a powerful man must know how to differentiate his useful friends from those who are pleasant. Those “que aspiran al plazer buscan, a unos, graciosos y a otros, hábiles para ejecutar sus órdenes, y estas condiciones no se encuentran con frecuencia en la misma persona” (Et. nic. VIII, 6, 1158a, 27–33).

This lack of judgment evidenced by the young king broke with the alliance that supported his power and that of the other lords, as it happened with the lion and the bull. Strengthening each other, corporately defending the privileges of their blood through unequal ties of friendship, Don Juan believed that social climbers and low-status men would be prevented from facing the lords against each other in order to fall weakened before those who led them into confrontation. Friendship and politics were strongly intertwined in Manueline thought, like the love and fear of the subjects in the monarchical discourse.

<sup>26</sup> MANUEL 1983a, pp. 75–76.

<sup>27</sup> LOAYSA 1982, p. 206.

<sup>28</sup> LOAYSA 1982, p. 206.



However, this relationship of love and fear is not observed in the thought of Don Juan Manuel, who in referring to the treatment that his son should have with the sovereign, places the king in an ambiguous position. We say this because, although he must recognize him as his lord and, therefore, recognize his higher authority, he did not miss the opportunity to highlight his own superiority. In fact, Don Juan considered that, by divine mercy, “non a omne en Espanna de mayor grado que vos.”<sup>29</sup> Thus, the ambiguity is manifested in a relation of superiority-equality that resulted in a split in the treatment that Don Juan and Don Fernando Manuel could establish with the monarch. The divine improvement of the king was to be recognized in *de palabra* honour, while the Manuel family, in their pseudo-royal condition, were enabled in their works to “pasar con ellos commo con vezinos.”<sup>30</sup>

Whoever knows the thought of this noble will know that the distinction between the word and the work is not a minor aspect. For Don Juan, the works were those that revealed the true nature of the human will, while the words, in their lightness, possessed less consideration in bringing with them the stain of deceit, of lying in the making. It is the deeds that prove words and friendship.<sup>31</sup> This is why the *amor de palabra* is found in the Manueline taxonomy close to that of *ventura* and that of *tiempo*; in all of them fidelity is withdrawn in adversity and words are diluted in vain promises. But not all love based on the word was reviled by Don Juan Manuel. On the contrary, he recognized a higher form of *amor de palabra* which he calls *amor de corte*. Higher in so far as, through your formalities, it strengthened the fraternity of the chivalrous nobility thanks to the palatial setting where the hierarchies seemed to dissipate to give rise to a frank and gener-

<sup>29</sup> MANUEL 1983b, pp. 161–162.

<sup>30</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 162. This treatment of the Manuel family with the kings is explained by the great wealth of the family. In a study which Lope Pascual Martínez dedicated to the chancellorship of the lordship of Don Juan Manuel the author highlights the property of Cuenca and Murcia of the magnate for constituting their stately centres of greater extension and wealth from which conformed “una pequeña corte, similar a la de los reyes de Aragón y de Castilla, con los que se trata de igual a igual [...] Una corte prerrenacentista, al estilo de las italianas de la época, donde trovadores, juglares, literatos y artistas encuentran la mejor acogida.” MARTINEZ 1982, p. 260.

<sup>31</sup> As has been pointed out in a recent study (Cf. ASISS GONZALEZ 2019a), God-given Wisdom to the king and the other great lords with which to discern the lie of Truth is key to the exercise of power. Without this gift of understanding the lord would be at the mercy of the deception of his senses, of the limitation of his human understanding, incapable of fully understanding the divine motives, and of the words of the lawyers who ensnare his judgment. In contrast to the word, which deceives and blinds, Don Juan emphasizes the value of silence, because in the absence of volitional sonority of a word that expresses its will, the lord can listen to its double meaning to try to know the thought of the other, but also to listen to the inner sounds of a living being. Silence is needed to be able to hear God, but also to the subjects because the word of the lord by his power will silence, even without intending to, anyone who thinks differently. For this reason, to govern is, for Don Juan, to know how to hear, to distinguish Truth from falsehood, and to choose words and silences to act with knowledge and justice, being wary of the sweet words of false friends and of deceitful counsellors.

ous environment in which the king more than superior of the warrior aristocracy was the provider of all the pleasures on land, abundantly.

Likewise, Don Juan describes the *amigo de corte* as one who shows himself through “buenas palabras et acontentpradas” at the banquets where the nobles gave themselves “sus donas”. Courtly love is a common territory for words and deeds in which they contribute to create an appearance that translates into concrete effects of power, into deeds. The court itself was a collection of samples about power for the high nobility, so when the king possessed “maneras de buen rey”, they could not excuse themselves from being present at his court *quanto pudiere*.<sup>32</sup>

In that framework of thought, “dar et conbidar, et fazer mucho plazer al rey et a los de su corte”, with beautiful words and acts of generosity, finally sought to prevent “non paresca en el et en sus fechos ninguna mengua.” Coining a higher form of love allows the author to contrast it more with its degraded forms. Following this logic, he also distinguishes between useful friendships — *de prouecho*, *de mester* and *de varata* — a higher form, the *amor de varata*. In this, “un omne ama a otro et le ayuda porque el otro [amo] antes a el et le ayudo, et falla que esto es buen varato.”<sup>33</sup> In other words, the loves of *varata* and *corte* were superior because they were reciprocal while in their degraded forms the restitution of what is given is not guaranteed and the troubles of life could extinguish them leaving the former friend in need.

But Don Juan’s thought does not end in the literality of his statements. What words do not say directly can be inferred from the structuring of the themes in the *Libro enfenido* in chapters V to VII. In them, Don Juan Manuel analyses the relations and the treatment that his son could establish with his superiors, equal and inferior. This, in principle, reconfirms us that the Manueline friendship was not exempt from the hierarchies with which it interpreted all its social reality, but if we look more closely we can deepen this first perception.

As it has already been said, only the king was considered superior to Don Fernando Manuel for his divine mark, but immediately afterwards he was reduced to a *vezino* in the treatment and works. For his part, in the sixth chapter, when dealing with those of equal rank, Don Juan found this to be a major problem, as he believed that there was no one to exceed them in lineage or inheritance. The words he chose in this chapter reflect his self-perception of the son of a despoiled king, an idea he developed in the *Libro de las tres razones*. Don Juan not only explicitly said that his ways, those of his father before him and those of his son, were more typical of kings than of *ricoshombres*. He also indirectly recognized in his son the status of infante, and in himself of a king, when he stated: “otro infante, nin otro omne en el sennorio de Castiella non es amigo en egual grado que uso.” If there are other infantes, this was because Don Fernando was one of them.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 188.

<sup>33</sup> MANUEL 1983c, pp. 160, 186.

<sup>34</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 162.

This self-recognized position caused the most voluminous and nuanced section to constitute the seventh, versed in dealing with friends of a lesser degree than don Fernando. These relations were crucial, since they formed, together with the fortresses, the *grant poder* of the lord in front of the king. Although Don Juan distinguished in the first instance between vassals, relatives and friends, the first two categories were actually subsumed in the third. The kinship was the love or friendship of lineage and the vassalage was understood in the love of *debdo* that was born in the man when receiving from another a good-upbringing, marriage, inheritance or help by which “a de pagar et deue amar por este debdo.”<sup>35</sup>

Consequently, all the friends that Don Fernando could find would be of lower status, but even in inferiority it was possible to distinguish its various levels.<sup>36</sup> In effect, the highest of the lower friends are designated as *lindos de linaje* and their relative superiority was to be reflected in the treatment that the son of Don Juan was to provide for him. But more important than the deal was the friendly position which this magnate was assigned in relation to the rest of the nobility and the king. It is worth remembering that all the *grandes* had to pay attention to the latter — *parar mientes* — to identify their condition. If he was a good king he should be loved and served faithfully and obediently, but if he was a tyrant the service that would be rendered to him would be the bare minimum, avoiding provoking his anger.

In other words, the great lords of the kingdom had to “estar apercebidos et ojo abierto”, judging the sovereign.<sup>37</sup> Who in theory could only be evaluated with time by God, in the Manuline proposal was subjected to nobility. But, more importantly, this same theorizing led to putting the rest of the nobility under the protection of Manuel. Pre-eminence over the rest of the Castilian *ricoshombres* expressed in a vassal relationship in which Don Juan Manuel was lord and protector of his “friends”.

As he understood, such a well-managed advantageous position would guarantee his son to be lord of all the aristocracy, because “pocos ricos omnes avra en Castiella que si ovieredes que lis dar, que non sean vuestros vasallos.”<sup>38</sup> The result of such a bond was the protective attitude that Manuel had to assume as good lords towards their brothers of estate and against a tyrannical king. This ended up exacerbating one of the features that most clearly differentiated the *ricoshombres* from the rest of the noble knights, the absence of personal dependency ties. Through them

<sup>35</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 184.

<sup>36</sup> According to Don Juan Manuel: “Todos los amigos que vos avedes de aver non son todos eguales, et por esto non avedes de pasar con todos egual mente.” MANUEL 1983c, p. 163.

<sup>37</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 161.

<sup>38</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 163. Don Juan is aware of the importance of rents for the maintenance of lordly power, but not for a lucrative purpose but as an instrument, as a means to show power and superiority in the hierarchical scale. So he tells his son that “las rentas se acrescentan los averes, et por el aver se mantienen los sennores et las fortalezas et los amigos et los vasallos. Ca ninguna destas cosas non se pueden mantener luenga mente sin ellas.” MANUEL 1983c, p. 174.

the knights subordinated themselves to the magnates, remarking “el alto grado de ‘libertad’, que caracterizaba a la primera nobleza.”<sup>39</sup>

The nobility, free from such obligations, except with regard to the king, could profit from the personal ties to which it subjected the lower-ranking nobles. Considering the cultivation of these bonds, Don Juan advised his son that the highest lineages of the kingdom, those of royal lineage — the Cameros and the Castro — or of highest lineages — Vizcaya and Lara — should be given to understand “que los tenedes por parientes et por amigos, et que avedes a fazer por ellos tanto commo por vos mismo, et que los avedes a defender de los reys, si quisieren ser contra ellos a tuerto [et] sin razon.” In this way he was showing “la auantaja et el poder et la mejoría que vos Dios dio.”<sup>40</sup>

But it is not for this reason that Don Juan set aside the treatment of the bonds of friendship that he and his son necessarily had to establish with those nobles who, without being superior, were part of his own estate, united by blood and courtesy, and with the king, who was his superior only in his capacity as lord of lords. On this point Leonardo Funes considered that the virtues of the ideal king, described in the second chapter of the *Libro del cauallero et del escudero*,<sup>41</sup> actually sought to evoke an environment of perfect harmony between the king and the nobility crossed by the ideology of courtly love, projection of the feudal and chivalrous imaginary. The harmony between the king and the aristocracy is seen by Don Juan as the fruit of state friendship based on fraternity.

As Jacques Derrida explained in *The Politics of Friendship*, fraternal ties are a political and androcentric bond.<sup>42</sup> From this alleged brotherhood, noblemen were considered members of a community, of a group. United by the friendly bonds of courtesy, they treated themselves as “brothers” in a bond strengthened by joining the cavalry. For this reason women were absent from the problem of friendship. The only feasible friendly relationship was the male one. Women served only

<sup>39</sup> MOXÓ 1969, p. 10.

<sup>40</sup> MANUEL 1983c, pp. 163, 164.

<sup>41</sup> FUNES 2005–2006. According to don Juan Manuel, with a good king “sus naturales eran seguros de auer del buen galardón del seruiçio quel fazian, avn mas que non mereçian. Et non reçelauan que por ningun mezclador les ve[r]nia ningun danpno sin grant su mereçimiento.” MANUEL 1983a, p. 42.

<sup>42</sup> The philosopher’s reflection on friendship in this work is as original as it is relevant. The title of the work links two aspects that, in appearance, would work on different planes, politics and friendship. Politics, as administration of public life, had nothing to do with a personal, intimate bond between two people, such as friendship. However, as the feminist movements of the 1960s showed, the personal is also political. In conceiving personal and affective ties as products of power, DERRIDA 1998 highlights the paradoxical character of friendship, which since Aristotle has been conceived on the pillars of reciprocity and similarity. In dialogue with this and other thinkers, the Algerian writer reveals the threads of power that define what we mean by friendship and conceal its contradictions to this day. His proposal serves as a starting point for the reflection of this article to (re)politicize the ties of friendship theorized by Don Juan Manuel.

as a nexus that enabled, guaranteed, favoured and renewed male fraternity through the marriage of uterine cousins.<sup>43</sup>

In fact, friendship, both in the time of Aristotle and Don Juan Manuel, was masculine and therefore rational, with men, to the detriment of women, were the most complete representatives of the species. For Aristotle, women represented a lack and, for medieval thought, sin. In his words Don Juan showed that the bond that a man had to make with a woman differed enormously from that which it was possible to have with a couple because with her the reproductive aspect had to prevail. She was treated in the same section as children. Reproduction was the act that legitimized the man's contact with the woman, authorizing surrender to desire. But it was not for this reason that she was warned of the dangers of bowing to her by the tricks that snatched her will.

A man in love was imprisoned by desire. Therefore, the *buena duenna* said to Saladin in the example 50: I know well that “el amor non es en poder del omne, ante es el omne en poder del amor.” Love as *passio innata* born of an *cogitation inmoderata*, of excessive, obsessive reflection, captured the lover, who from that moment on cared only about finding the means to realize his desire. According to Andreas Capellanus, the etymology of the word love consecrates its captivating nature as “significat capere vel capi.”<sup>44</sup> This is what for don Juan distinguishes friendship from love. While the former helps man to fulfil his state obligations, the latter focuses all his attention on concupiscent thoughts.<sup>45</sup>

This interpretation coincides with the etymology proposed by Isidore of Seville. Although both friends and lovers held on to a strong bond, Isidore explained that *amicus ab hamo* (Etim. X, A, 5) or, in other words, friend, derives from *-hamus-*, a reminder of the *catena caritatis* that united men. Friendship in Thomistic thought was based on charity, on love for other men, thanks to which one professes for divinity. In contrast, the love of lovers, unlike friendship, subjected man's will to suffering by worldly desire. For this reason Isidore defines those who gave themselves to these passions as *amator turpidinis*, a lover of the base, “quia amore torquetur libidinis” (Etim. X, A, 5). Such a passive position of the tormented was also reproduced in *De amore*, a much more benevolent text towards the satisfaction of carnal desire than

<sup>43</sup> Cf. RUIZ-DOMÈNEZ 2017.

<sup>44</sup> The same idea was later continued by Dante Alighieri in his *Divina Commedia*. In the second circle of hell the poet meets the spirits of two adulterous lovers, Paolo and Francesca. Asking to speak with them, Francesca tells him that “Amor, ch'a nullo amato amar perdo./ mi prese del costui piacer sí forte./ che, come vedi, ancor non m'abbandona.” ALIGHIERI 1993, vv. 103–105. These verses respond to the fatalistic thesis elaborated by Andreas Capellanus in *De amore*, according to which love must inevitably correspond with love. Likewise, a Castilian contemporary of Don Juan Manuel, Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita, says in the *Libro de buen amor*: “vuestro amor e deseo, que me afınca e me aquexa./ no-s me tira, no-s me parte, non me suelta, non me dexa./ tanto más me da la muerte quanto más se me alexa.” RUIZ 2001, v. 662.

<sup>45</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 416; CAPELLANUS 1985, p. 62.

the Isidorian one. For Andreas Capellanus “qui amat captus est cupidinis vinculis aliumque desiderat suo capere hamo.”<sup>46</sup>

On the other hand for Don Juan this attitude towards earthly passions was a serious mistake, as it prevented the lord from fulfilling the obligations that God had caused to fall on him or, in other words, condemned him to hell. As the Castilian writer tells us “los mas de los omnes yerran en la manera que deuen traer con sus mujeres.” They submit to his command and will, which, unfaithfully, would bring him harm “para las faziendas et para los cuerpos et para las famas.”<sup>47</sup> Submitting to the woman was always a wrong decision regardless of the reason. Anyone who thought that they should do *por fuerça* what their wives wanted to do because they were very good and loved their husbands was as wrong as anyone who bows to a wife “tan fuertes et tan brauas et tan porfiosas” that it frightens him.<sup>48</sup>

The figure of indomitable, strong and even mannish women obviously could not have been Don Juan’s invention. Warnings relating to them can be found in other texts as well. Horrific women are the embodiment of evil,<sup>49</sup> but the beauty of women was also a grave danger since they could bend the will of men. The Melusinian tradition<sup>50</sup> present in *De nugis curialium* is a good example of this. Perhaps the most telling case in this regard is not the one linked to Henno *cum dentibus* (Dist. IV, c. 9), who gets rid of the dragon-woman through the distrust of his pious mother, but those

<sup>46</sup> CAPELLANUS 1985, p. 62.

<sup>47</sup> MANUEL 1983c, p. 165. The fear of the rebellious woman is also present in the warning given by Walter Map in *De nugis curialium*: “Amice, contumelia uiri es uxor/ inobediens; caue tibi” (Dist. IV, c. 3). This idea is then supported by various mythological, biblical and historical examples. Among them, we highlight the case of Jupiter, who is seen as a very powerful king who ended up reduced to mooring among the beasts due to his attraction to Europe — “Iupiter [...] post Europam mugire coactus est” (Dist. IV, c. 3). His figure serves the cleric to assert that if a king of unmatched grandeur fell so low, the more attentive the rest of the men must be to avoid submitting to a woman. For Map the *optima femina*, rarer than the phoenix, “non potest sine amaritudine metus et sollicitudinis et frequentis infortunii” (Dist. IV, c. 3). A woman, even a good one, always brings misfortune to a man and, for that reason, must always be feared.

<sup>48</sup> According to Georges Duby, in the Carolingian world the woman, now a wife, was still an adversary: “Los hombres vivían la conyugalidad como un combate arduo, que requería vigilancia asidua.” DUBY 2013, p. 54. The man feared that his wife would be more ardent than he, an insatiable “devourer”. In no way did priestly and warrior morality come closer than in an attitude toward women mixed with distrust and contempt for a being as dangerous as they are fragile.

<sup>49</sup> The *Libro de buen amor* of the Archpriest of Hita brings together the topics of horrendous women, of huge strength and greedy sexual desire in the monstrous character of the *serranas*, which Walter Carrizo links to the giant shepherd of the *roman courtois*. Cf. CARRIZO 2018.

<sup>50</sup> Claude Lecouteux states that the Middle Ages saw the resurgence of Melusinian stories, common to all Indo-Europeans, based on the belief in a woman/spirit, protector of the shaman, interwoven with the mythical theme of the supernatural wife, Nymph or demigoddess, who is at the same time also the educator of the hero, to the point of making it impossible to separate the elements of that union. For more on this tradition about the nuances between fairies and witches, see LECOUTEUX 2005.

of Wastinum Wastiniauc (Dist. II, c. 11) and Edricus Wilde (Dist. II, c. 11).<sup>51</sup> In both cases anonymous women of captivating beauty and grace capture the hearts and bend the will of those who have looked at them.<sup>52</sup>

These fairies differ from the Morganian model of the *roman courtois*, helpers of the knights, as they are not fantastical. In Map's view, fairies have sexual and reproductive female bodies. According to Fabrizio De Falco, this aspect makes them catalyst demons of a series of fears and counter-values.<sup>53</sup> For the mediaevalist, the pact and the dire consequences of a hypergamous marriage served Map to criticize any kind of upward social mobility. Without denying this, we also understand that such an agreement represented a submission of the man to the will of the woman, whom he could not completely dominate. The agreement deprives him of his wife's full disposition.

In the story of Wastinum Wastiniauc the fairy warns him that it will serve him with devout obedience "usque in diem illum quo prosilire uolens ad clamores ultra Leuem

---

<sup>51</sup> The Melusinian scheme of both stories is repeated: 1) the knight meets a beautiful and lonely woman-fairy; 2) he kidnaps her and then rapes her; 3) there is a pact between the knight and the woman-fairy, which submits to conditions in exchange for various benefits; 4) the pact is broken by the man; and 5) there are consequences to this act for him. Fabrizio De Falco points out that the women in the stories of Walter Map, unlike the genre of *pastorelas*, are of superior condition to the gentleman. A superiority that is not static or material but ontological, belongs to a supranatural world, which manifests itself in its unparalleled beauty and in the richness of its clothing. The gentleman does not ignore this condition, he knows it and prefers to take the risk. DE FALCO 2017.

<sup>52</sup> The idea that love enters through the eyes and traps the will, enunciated in Andreas Capellanus' *De amore*, was present in Castilian lands when Don Juan Manuel composed his works. His contemporary, Juan Ruíz, Archpriest of Hita, shows this when he says: "¡Ay, Dios, e cuán hermosa viene Doña Endrina por la plaça! [...] Con saetas de amor fiere quando los sus ojos alça." RUIZ 2001, vv. 653a, 653d. The topic of the love wound can also be identified in the story of Wilde Edricus: "Hac uisa, miles [Edricus] accipit uulnus in cor, arcuque Cupidinis impressos uix sustinet ignes; totis accenditur, totus abit in flammis, et a feruore pulcherrime pestis aureique discriminis animosus effecitur" (Dist. II, c. 12). The result is always the capture of the will, the submission to the woman. The Archpriest confesses that "en un tienpo una dueña me priso [capturó]/ de su amor non fui en ese tienpo repriso [arrepentido]." RUIZ 2001, v. 77, while the narrator tells us that Edricus "ipsa rapit a qua rapitur." (Dist. II, c. 12). He who thinks himself an active subject of what is happening is actually a hunted hunter who is passively driven by his desire. The game of looks, passivity and activity in loving relationships are topics present on the Iberian Peninsula in the 14th century. As Rachel Peled Cuartas notes, both the *Libro del buen amor* and the Hebrew work *Melitsat Efer ve Dinah*, written in Zaragoza, make use of traditional motifs such as the game of looks and metaphors of aggressive virility, but also that of the slayer woman. In both texts there is "la imagen de flechas disparadas de los ojos de la fémima dirigidas a herir al varón que las mira [...] La mujer, que constituye un objeto de deseo, tiene también una auténtica virilidad guerrera." PELED CUARTAS 2012.

<sup>53</sup> "Classical deities, along with most other supernatural beings, were routinely interpreted as devils in orthodox Christian theology of the Middle Ages, and at various points in his text Map does indeed align fairies and other supernaturals with the demonic (iv.6, iv.11). But Map's own perspective on supernatural phenomena is more complex [...] and in section ii.11–15 [...] he repeatedly interrupts his narratives to note with wonder that human interaction with such beings occasionally produces a positive result." SCHWIETERMAN 2010, p. 24.

me freno tuo percusseris” (Dist. II, c. 11). For his part, the fairy assured Edricus prosperity in body and estate, “donec inproperaueris michi aut soreres a quibus rapta sum, aut locum aut lucum unde, aut aliquid circiter illud” (Dist. II, c. 12). From the moment he broke the pact, happiness would elude him and he would not cease to fall until he died. In one case, the husband cannot physically punish the woman and in another, he cannot reproach her, even in words, for not having been attentive to his orders.

These stories combine the two reasons, given by Don Juan, why a man could submit to a woman: force and love. Fairies are infinitely more powerful than their husbands, whose lives they improve thanks to this superiority, but this force does not fully manifest itself until the breaking of the covenant, at which point they not only free themselves from marriage by their own decision, but they also punish their spouses with multiple misfortunes. Love, on the other hand, is the most evident engine of submission. The knights, enamoured of the superhuman beauty of the anonymous girls, do not stop to think about the dangers which an approach to the supernatural carried for their body and, above all, for their soul.

Don Juan Manuel, more reflective than the young people in these stories, considers, in the *exemplo* 27, both paths to be equally harmful to the lord. The brave woman acting against her husband’s will is represented by Emperor Fadrique’s wife. This lady lived to contradict her husband, so the emperor, after failing in his attempt to change his wife’s attitude, sought divorce from the pope. The pontiff’s refusal led him to think of a plan to manipulate his wife’s character and drive her to suicide. Thus he took a poisonous ointment to hunt deer and told her not to put it anywhere where she had a wound because she would die. He then took another medicine and let his wife see him using it. He told her to use that medicine and not the other when needed. When he went hunting, “començo ella a ensannar se et a enbraueçer”, she said:

¡Veed el falso del emperador, lo que me fue dezir! Por que el sabe que la sarna que yo he non es de tal manera commo la suya, dixo me que me vntasse con aquel vngüento que se el vnto, por que sabe que non podria guaresçer con el, mas de aquel otro vngüento bueno con que el sabe que guareseria, dixo que non tomasse del en guisa ninguna; mas por le fazer pesar, yo me vntare con el, et quando el viniere, fallar me ha sana. Et so çierta que en ninguna cosa non le podria fazer mayor pesar, et por esto lo fare.<sup>54</sup>

The pleas and cries of his courtiers were of no avail, “tomo la yerua et vnto con ella las llagas” and “murió por la manera que avia porfiosa e a su danno”, ending a stormy marriage. The death of the wife was the only way to get rid of such a woman, so Don Juan advised in *exemplo* 35 to reflect very well before deciding to marry.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>54</sup> MANUEL 1983b, pp. 221–222.

<sup>55</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 222. A few years ago, Yoshinori Ogawa, starting from the John Keller and Francisco Márquez Villanueva’s research, concluded that in this example Don Juan Manuel “conscientemente ha producido un texto erótico y estableció una relación innegable entre el amor físico y



In this example, particularly, Don Juan presents us with a Moorish woman who became a “devil” because of her bravery and *malas et reuesadas* ways. Although her father was very rich, no one wanted to ask for her hand until a young man, with more ambitions than money, resolved that she would be his wife. When the day came, the young woman’s father warned him that until that moment “non avia omne que·la conosçiesse que, por pobre que fuese, quisiese casar con ella.” Then, he told the young man’s father, who was his friend, that if his son persisted in his intention he feared that “seria muerto o le valdría mas la muerte que·la vida.” Neither the warnings, nor the father’s fear of his daughter made a dent in the will of the young Moor and, after getting married, the newlyweds were left alone in the house as the tradition commanded, not without the fear that the next day would end the “nouio muerto o muy maltrecho.”<sup>56</sup>

But the young man knew the advice that Don Juan gave in exemplo 27: “del primer dia que el omne casa, deue dar a entender a su muger que·el es sennor e que le faga entender la uida que ha de pasar.” Consequently, he worked out a way to prove to his wife what life would await her beside him. Thus, sitting at the table, he looked around, seeing a dog, said to it: “¡Perro, da nos agua a·las manos!” Before the lack of response of the animal, he repeated more bravely the order and then “leuantose muy sanudo de·la mesa et metio mano a·la espada et [...] cortol la cabeça et las pier-nas et los braços, et fizo lo todo pedaços.”<sup>57</sup>

After this, he did the same with a cat and a horse. The woman, seeing that her husband killed the horse, stopped thinking that it was a game and, believing that her husband was crazy, feared for her life.<sup>58</sup> At that moment, her bloodied husband

---

la violencia.” OGAWA 2017, p. 244. According to his studies, he understands that the “blood flood” seen in history speaks directly of deflowering. After the whole sequence of intimidation, the sexual act of the spouses is succinctly enshrined in the text by saying that “ovieron dormido vna pieça.” MANUEL 1983b, p. 288. While we do not misjudge the opinion of Keller and Ogawa, we do understand the symbolic reductionism by which the bloodied sword becomes a post-deflowering phallus. For our part, we understand that there was undoubtedly a message of violence towards the woman who, in contravention of her husband, harms her honour. Such a message can be clearly found in at least three *examplos*. In fact, the woman threatened with death is saved here by submitting to the will of her husband, but in *exemplo 27* she ends up dead by opposing her and in *exemplo 42* the husband, believing that his unfaithful wife planned his death, ends up killing her by manipulating the false *beguina*. Thus, although in the text a brief euphemistic mention is made of the sexual act in sleeping together, we understand that the conscious intention of the author was not to narrate an erotic story but to instruct the man on the means by which to subdue an insubordinate woman. KELLER 1975; MÁRQUEZ VILANUEVA 1995.

<sup>56</sup> MANUEL 1983b, pp. 286–287.

<sup>57</sup> MANUEL 1983b, pp. 229, 287.

<sup>58</sup> The sequence of deaths chosen by the author, according to John Keller, is not accidental, but demonstrates Don Juan’s knowledge of Moorish culture. According to the American researcher, the first death is that of a dog because Islam manifests a clear contempt for dogs. This rejection, present in the Quran and the Old Testament, does not cause the young woman to be too affected and allows

returned to the table swearing that he would kill anyone who did not comply with his orders, and, sitting down,

cato a cada parte, teniendo la espada sangrienta en el regaço; et desque cato a vna parte et a otra et non vio cosa viua, boluio los oios contra su muger muy braua mente et dixol con grand sanna, teniendo la espada en la mano: —Leuantad vos et dat me agua a las manos.<sup>59</sup>

The fearful woman did everything her husband commanded. When his wife's family heard what had happened, "fueron marabillados; et desque sopieron commo pasaron en vno, presçiaron mucho el mancebo por que assi sopiere fazer lo quel cunplia et castigar tan bien su casa." The link to the advice from *exemplo 27* is confirmed when the young man's father-in-law, clearly subdued by fear of women, wanted to use the same method to subdue his wife. Thus, he took a rooster and beheaded it in front of her. She said: "A la fe, don fulan, tarde vos acordaste, ca ya non vos valdría nada si matassedes çient cauallos: que ante lo ovierades a començar, ca ya bien nos conosco." <sup>60</sup>

The message is clear, women had to bow to the will of men at the risk of losing their lives. The empress who did not submit ended up dead, while the young Moor survived in submission. However, where it is most clearly revealed that Don Juan was thinking of male and rational friendship, cut down on the shadow of the female and irrational, is in *exemplo 27*, in the case of Don Alvar Hannez and Doña Vasçuñana. The risk of relating to a woman was always the same, to be subjected by her character, as in the case of brave women, or by love for them, which meant renouncing the rationality of masculinity to be dragged by emotion and caprice.

In one way or another, the risk was to fail to fulfil the obligations to God arising from the position held in the order of Creation. If we understand that for Don Juan reason and power are attributes of the masculine, we will see that behind the word friendship there is a synthesis of these two terms in a position that today we would call phallogocentric.<sup>61</sup> From this position, in which the centrality of power and the possession of logos are associated with the phallus, Don Alvar's nephew spoke when

---

the narrative to deepen in two successive steps the gravity of the deaths. The second is more serious according to Islamic beliefs. Muhammad had a special affection for cats and the peoples who lived from Persia to Cordoba had the same attitude. In the cat's death, Keller sees an act of breaking with tradition. The young man is saying he will not respect his father-in-law's warnings. But the most serious death, for the symbolic value that for Moors and Christians this animal had in the civil and military life, was that of the horse. Only after this death did panic take hold of the woman, who went on to fear for her life and gave in. KELLER 1975.

<sup>59</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 288

<sup>60</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 289.

<sup>61</sup> This neologism coined by Jacques Derrida in "Plato's Pharmacy" (1968), composed of the Greek words *phallós* and *logos*, refers to the privilege of the male in the construction of meaning, while the possessor of male genitality and rational capacity is male.

criticizing his uncle that “...fazia mucho por su muger et la apoderaua mucho en toda su fazienda.”<sup>62</sup>

The criticism gave way to the reply of the old uncle, who described to us the only woman who was not harmful to the lord, with whom there was nothing like friendship. Don Alvar through various absurd situations, in which he deliberately confuses cows with mares and vice versa, shows that his wife was absolutely subject to her husband’s understanding. The lady endorsed the absurdity without hesitation, although her own judgment marked the misunderstanding. This was the expectation of a wife for Don Juan, since this guaranteed that doing much and delegating much to her would not be harmful to her honour. For Don Alvar, his wife was nothing more than a possession, like the dog, the cat and the horse from *exemplo* 35. He sees her only as part of the servants who express the power of the lord. That is why, speaking with his nephew, he highlighted as something very valuable that “del dia que conmigo caso, que nunca vn dia le bi fazer nin dezir cosa en que yo pudiesse entender que quería nin tomava plazer sinon en aquello que yo quis; nin le vi tomar enojo de ninguna cosa que yo fiziesse.”<sup>63</sup>

Consequently, Don Juan’s model woman was a being without criteria “sienpre tiene verdadera mente en su talante que qual quier cosa que yo faga, que aquello es lo major” and instrumentalized as a means to the ends and interests of the lord “ lo que ella a de fazer de suyo o le yo ecomiendo que faga [...] sienpre lo faze guardando todavia mi onra et mi pro et queriendo que entiendan las gentes que yo so el sennor, et que la mi voluntad et la mi onra se cumple en todo.” Only in this way would Don Alvar’s attitude not be a *tacha*, because

si el omne, por aver grand amor a su muger, quiere estar con ella tanto por que dexa de yr a los lugares o a los lugares o a los fechos en que puede fazer su pro et su onra, faze muy grand yerro; nin si por le fazer plazer nin conplir su talante dexa nada de lo que pertenesçe a su estado, nin a su onra, faze muy desaguisado; mas guardando estas cosas, todo buen talante et toda fiança que el marido pueda mostrar a su muger, todo le es fazedero et todo lo deue fazer et le pertenesçe muy bien que lo faga.<sup>64</sup>

It is always about lordship, power and state. For Don Juan, there is nothing that could interest a nobleman outside these limits. Friendship, lineage, love, conjugality only operate in this unequal and asymmetric logic in which the power of the lord acts as a miniature god.

<sup>62</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 224.

<sup>63</sup> MANUEL 1983b, p. 228.

<sup>64</sup> MANUEL 1983b, pp. 228–229.

SOURCES, STUDIES, MONOGRAPHS AND OTHER MATERIALS USED  
IN THE TEXT

- ALFONSO X 1974 = Alfonso X, *Las Siete Partidas [facsimil]*, glos. lic. Gregorio López, Madrid 1974
- ALIGHIERI 1993 = Dante Alighieri, *Divina Commedia*, in: *Tutte le opere*, Roma 1993
- ARISTÓTELES 2014 = Aristóteles, *Ética nicómaquea*, in: *Aristóteles*, Madrid 2014<sup>3</sup>, pp. 9–242
- ASSISS GONZÁLEZ 2019a = Federico Asiss-Gonzalez, *La sonoridad en la representación del noble castellano. Un estudio de las obras de don Juan Manuel (siglo XIV)*, in: Gerardo Rodríguez, Gisela Coronado-Schwindt, Éric Palazzo, *Paisajes sonoros medievales*, Mar del Plata 2019, pp. 413–429
- ASSISS GONZÁLEZ 2019b = Federico Asiss-González, *La amistad, un problema político. Construcción manuelina del vínculo aristocrático*, “Mirabilia”, XXIX, pp. 282–301, <https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Mirabilia/article/view/360931> (10-01-2021)
- BIZZARRI 2001 = *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, ed. Hugo Bizzarri, Madrid 2001
- BLANCO AGUINAGA, RODRÍGUEZ-PUERTOLAS, ZAVALA 2000 = Carlos Blanco-Aguinaga, Julio Rodríguez-Puértolas, Iris Zavala, *Historia social de la literatura española (en lengua castellana)*, Madrid 2000
- BOUCHERON 2018 = Patrick Boucheron, *Conjurar el miedo. Ensayo sobre la fuerza política de las imágenes. Siena, 1338*, Buenos Aires 2018
- BOURDIEU 1980 = Pierre Bourdieu, *Le capital social. Notes provisoires*, “Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales”, XXXI, 1980, pp. 2–3
- CAPELLANUS 1985 = Andreas Capellanus, *De amore. Tratado sobre el amor*, Barcelona 1985
- CARRIZO 2018 = Walter Carrizo, *Figuraciones de lo monstruoso en el Libro de buen amor: las «serranas», versiones femeninas del «gigante-pastor» transpirenaico*, “Lemir”, XXII, 2018, pp. 103–116
- CICERÓN 2019 = Cicerón, *De amicitia*, in: *The Latin Library*, <https://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/> (16-09-2019)
- DE FALCO 2017 = Fabrizio De Falco, *I capitoli melusiniani del De nugis curialium: ribaltamento dell’ideologia cavalleresca e uso politico*, “Studi medievali. Serie terza”, LVIII, 1, pp. 45–92
- DERRIDA 1998 = Jacques Derrida, *Políticas de la amistad, seguido de El oído de Heidegger*, Madrid 1998
- DUBY 2013 = Georges Duby, *El caballero, la mujer y el cura. El matrimonio en la Francia feudal*, Buenos Aires 2013
- FUNES 2005–2006 = Leonardo Funes, *Ruptura e integración en la escritura didáctico-narrativa de don Juan Manuel*, “Letras: revista de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina Santa María de los Buenos Aires”, LII–LIII, 2005, pp. 180–188
- HARO CORTÉS 1998 = *Libro de los cien capítulos (Dichos de sabios en palabras breves e complidas)*, ed. Marta Haro Cortés, Madrid 1998
- JAMES 1983 = Walter Map. *De Nugis Curialium. Courtiers’ Trifles*, ed. M.R. James, Oxford 1983

- KANTOROWICZ 2016 = Ernest Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton 2016
- KELLER 1975 = John Keller, *A re-examination of Don Juan Manuel's narrative techniques: la mujer brava*, "Hispania", LVIII, 1975, 1, pp. 45–51
- LECOUTEUX 2005 = Claude Lecouteux, *Hadas, brujas y hombres lobos en la Edad Media. Historia del Doble*, Barcelona 2005
- LEYSER 2016 = Conrad Leyser, *Introduction to the Princeton Classical Edition*, in: Ernest Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton 2016, pp. ix–xxiii
- LOAYSA 1982 = Jofré de Loaysa, *Crónica de los Reyes de Castilla Fernando III, Alfonso X, Sancho IV y Fernando IV (1248–1305)*, ed. Antonio G. Martínez, Murcia 1982
- MACPHERSON 1971 = Ian Macpherson, *Amor and Don Juan Manuel*, "Hispanic Review", XXXIX, 1971, 2, pp. 167–182
- MANUEL 1983a = Juan Manuel, *Libro del cauallero et del escudero*, in: *Don Juan Manuel. Obras completas*, ed. José M. Blecua, vol. I, Madrid 1983, pp. 35–116
- MANUEL 1983b = Juan Manuel, *Conde Lucanor*, in: *Don Juan Manuel. Obras completas*, ed. José M. Blecua, vol. II, Madrid 1983, pp. 7–506
- MANUEL 1983c = Juan Manuel, *Libro enfenido*, in: *Don Juan Manuel. Obras completas*, ed. José M. Blecua, vol. I, Madrid 1983, pp. 141–190
- MANUEL 1983d = Juan Manuel, *Libro de los estados*, in: *Don Juan Manuel. Obras completas*, ed. José M. Blecua, vol. I, Madrid 1983, pp. 191–502
- MÁRQUEZ-VILLANUEVA 1995 = Francisco Márquez-Villanueva, *Sangre y matrimonio: el mancebo que casó con muger muy fuerte et muy brava*, in: Luce López-Baralt, Francisco Márquez-Villanueva, *Erotismo en las letras hispánicas: aspectos, modos y fronteras*, México 1995, pp. 315–334
- MARTÍNEZ 1982 = Lope Pascual Martínez, *Los oficios y la cancillería en el señorío de don Juan Manuel*, in: *Don Juan Manuel. VII centenario*, Murcia 1982, pp. 259–286
- MOTA 2014 = Carlos Mota, *Libro infinido*, in: M<sup>a</sup> Jesús Lacarra, *Don Juan Manuel y su producción literaria*, Valencia 2014, pp. 87–112
- MOXÓ 1969 = Salvador de Moxó, *De la nobleza vieja a la nobleza nueva. La transformación nobiliaria castellana en la baja Edad Media*, Madrid 1969
- OGAWA 2017 = Yoshinori Ogawa, *Amores sangrantes: sexo y violencia en El Conde Lucanor*, in: Francisco Toro-Ceballos, *Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, y el Libro del Buen Amor. Dueñas, cortesanas y alcahuetas: Libro de Buen Amor; La Celestina y La Lozana Andaluza. Homenaje a Joseph T. Snow*, Alcalá la Real 2017, pp. 241–248
- PELED CUARTAS 2012 = Rachel Peled Cuartas, *La mujer sometida y la mujer subversiva: dese y carnaval en Juan Ruiz y Don Vidal Benbenist*, in: *Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, y el 'Libro de buen amor'. III Congreso Internacional del Ayuntamiento de Alcalá la Real, el Centro para la Edición de los Clásicos Españoles y el Instituto de Estudios Giennenses, celebrado en Alcalá la Real del 7 al 29 de mayo del año 2011. Congreso homenaje a Jacques Joset* [en línea], coords. Francisco Toro Ceballos, Laurette Godinas, Madrid 2012, [https://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/arcipreste\\_hita/03/peled.htm#np1](https://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/arcipreste_hita/03/peled.htm#np1) (12-01-2021)
- RUIZ 2001 = Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor*, ed. José M. Blecua, Barcelona 2001
- RUIZ-DOMÈNEC 2017 = José Ruiz-Domènec, *La memoria de los feudales. Edición renovada*, Barcelona 2017

SCHWIETERMAN 2010 = Patrick Schwieterman, *Fairies, Kingship, and British Past in Walter Map's De Nugis Curialium and Sir Orfeo* [en línea], tesis doctoral, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8zh4b6x4> (11-01-2020)

SEVILLA 2004 = Isidoro de Sevilla, *Etimologías*, eds. José Oroz Reta, Manuel Marcos Casquero, Madrid 2004

### Summary

Friendship is one of the ways for people to bond with each other and as such it is a political bond. In the Middle Ages it was a key element of a political system based on personal relationships. Classical authors, such as Aristotle, had defined it in terms of equality and reciprocity. But both notions were problematic for medieval thought, sustained in hierarchical links. Don Juan Manuel stands out among authors of that era, as his lineage placed him in such a high social position that he could have equal treatment with the king. The author of the present article analyses, from a political perspective, the forms of friendship described by Don Juan Manuel to understand how it is articulated with his theory about stately government of the kingdom.