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The tale of Don Yllán and the dean of Santiago’s encounter in Toledo is the eleventh exemplum in Juan Manuel’s fourteenth-century Conde Lucanor (CL). This collection, which contains fifty such short, self-consciously didactic narratives, is often characterized as being the first work of Castilian prose and holds pride of place in the canon of medieval Spanish literature. Marcelo Menéndez Pelayo, John Keller, and David Wacks credit the work’s author, Juan Manuel, with introducing narrative fiction into the Castilian cum Spanish tradition (Menéndez Pelayo 1:144, Keller 45, “Don Yllán” 413–14). Lida de Malkiel and several critics since have proclaimed the eleventh exemplum (“Exenplo XI”) as the jewel of the collection, and Wacks characterizes it as “one of the best-known, most frequently anthologized and university class-friendly tales in Don Juan Manuel’s work” (Lida de Malkiel 158; Lacarra 167; Valbuena Prat 171; Wacks “Don Yllán,” 413).

“Exenplo XI” begins with a member of the Church’s middle management—the dean—seeking out the necromancer, Don Yllán, at his home in Toledo and requesting that the latter teach him his “sciencia” (53). Don Yllán first makes the dean promise that, even if he achieves great success, he will not forget Don Yllán’s help: “el deán le prometió et le aseguró que de cualquier bien que él oviess, que nunca ál faría sinon lo que él mandasse” (54) (But the dean promised and assured him that all his resources would be at his disposal). But as the story, Don Yllán’s illusion, plays out, we find, on the contrary, that the dean in fact never grants Yllán’s requests. Each time he is promoted up the Church hierarchy, Don Yllán asks the dean to grant his son the position the dean would be vacating, but to no avail. Once the dean finds himself named pope and has established himself in Avignon, seat of the papacy during the schism of 1309 to 1377 (all still part of Don Yllán’s illusion), he feels confident enough not only to rebuff Don Yllán’s petition for a position for his son, but to further threaten to expose him for being a necromancer and heretic, “diziéndol que si mas le
affincasse, quel faría echar en una cárcel, que era ereje et encantador, que bien sabía que non avía otra vida nin officio en Toledo, do él morava, sinon vivir por aquella arte de nigromancia’’ (57) (The pope objected to this complaint and began to abuse him, saying that if he persisted he would put him in a prison as a heretic and a necromancer, for he well knew that he had no other life nor trade in Toledo where he lived than to exercise the art of magic [70]). After this final rebuff, Don Yllán and the author Don Juan Manuel break the spell and reveal to both the Dean and the reader that it has all been an illusion. Juan Manuel, the author, continues to refer to the dean as pope as he brings us (the reader) back to Don Yllán’s living room and to the first evening of their encounter—underscoring simultaneously the former’s success and ingratitude:

Estonce don Yllán dixo al Papa que pues ál non tenía de comer, que se avría de tornar a las perdizes que mandara assar aquella noche, et llamó a la muger et díxol que assasse las perdizes. Cuando esto dixo don Yllán, fallóse el Papa en Toledo, deán de Sanctiago, commo lo era cuando y vino; e tan grand fue la vergüença que ovo, que non sopo quel dezir. (57)

(At this, Don Yllán told the pope that since he had nothing to eat, he would have to return to the partridges which he had ordered roasted that night, and he called the servant woman and told her to roast them. Now when Don Yllán said this, the pope found himself back in Toledo and dean of Santiago, as he was when he came, and so great was his shame that he did not know what to say. [71])

This is an exemplum in which Andalusi knowledge (Yllán’s science) confronts clerical ambition (the dean’s greed) with the goal of instructing authority; the uneasy but exciting contact of different traditions and bodies of knowledge is at the heart of “Exenplo XI.” By using his sorcery, Don Yllán exposes the cleric’s self-interest and unwillingness to recompense him for his training. The Christian cleric is the morally corrupt character, while the necromancer, although an expert in the “occult sciences” (“el arte de negromancia . . . aquella sciencia” [53] [the art of necromancy . . . that science]) reveals himself to be both shrewd and courteous. In this story not only does the narrator require that his Castilian-speaking audience put themselves in the shoes of a necromancer and antagonist of an ecclesiastical rising star, who manages to become, apparently, nothing less than pope, ruler of the Christian West, but, in so doing, the narrator (and by extension the author, Juan Manuel himself) asks us to consider a world in which churchmen are driven by the most selfish and evil of desires and sorcerers are capable of being models of moral behavior. The dean hails from the center of Iberian Christianity, Santiago, which by the fourteenth century was
a centuries-old center of pilgrimage respected across Europe, and the symbolic home to the spiritual inspiration for Christian Iberian attempts to conquer Andalusi lands (Reilly 734–35). Don Yllán, on the other hand, hails from the iconic city of Iberian multi-faith coexistence, Toledo, the melting pot for Christians, Jews, and Muslims (Gerli 789). Both men are emblematic not only of the cultural climate of their native cities, but are also iconic of two versions of medieval Spain—one the spiritual heart of the Christian Reconquest recognizable to and part of the medieval Christian West, the other the center where Andalusi/Eastern knowledge was translated and consulted by Western scholars—and of their respective bodies or systems of thought.

Many critics have read the CL as part of the Latin ecclesiastical exempla tradition that, while seemingly adapting some content from the Arab traditions of the Peninsula, nevertheless derives its ethos primarily from Western Christian didactic literature. Others, such as María Rosa Menocal, however, think that the CL is part of a larger, primarily vernacular frame tale tradition. “The Conde Lucanor is itself but one version, one rendering, one storytelling session, within the vast framed narrative tradition of medieval Spain and Europe” (Menocal 473). In this essay I look at how “Exenplo XI” is both product and reflection of the various traditions and cultures of medieval Iberia and how Juan Manuel forges a new version of this story from these inherited traditions in order to showcase problems of concern to his fourteenth-century audience, namely, the tension between ecclesiastical and Andalusi systems of thought and their representatives, and how the author’s manipulation of the frame and the power of fiction itself echoes Don Yllán’s manipulation of magic to test the dean’s mettle. The lessons of “Exenplo XI” regarding the transmission of knowledge and who controls it, as well as the function of speculative fiction and its ability to explore alternative realities and potential futures, obtains for both a fictional audience (Conde Lucanor) and contemporary twenty-first-century readers. In our current era in which a liberal arts education may seem superfluous, this lesson is important not just for our students, but also, arguably, for us, the educators who design and shape that education and determine what it hopes to achieve. Chris Hedges has recently attacked the academy for its complacency in the modern era, describing American universities as complicit in what he describes as “moral nihilism”:

We live in an age of moral nihilism. We have trashed our universities, turning them into vocational factories that produce corporate drones and chase after defense-related grants and funding. The humanities, the discipline that forces us to stand back and ask the broad moral questions of meaning and purpose, that challenges the validity of structures, that trains us to be self-reflective and critical of all cultural assumptions, have withered.
Hedges makes a compelling argument that it is precisely the type of thinking that characterizes the humanities, which not coincidently is that encouraged by Juan Manuel in “Exemplum XI,” that is required to mitigate this process, brought about in his opinion by those bureaucracies and systems of power that may be no longer the Church and the nobility, but any one of several contemporary entities that wield power and influence globally. For Hedges, as for the contemporary thinkers he cites, including Theodor Adorno and Immanuel Kant, such patterns of thinking—of asking the deeper questions regarding institutions of power, bodies of knowledge, and the elites who control them—are the moral prerogative of everyone: “Moral autonomy, as Immanuel Kant wrote, is possible only through reflection, self-determination and the courage not to cooperate.” Hedges laments, however, how few of us are exercising or encouraging others to exercise such moral autonomy. Juan Manuel’s tale of the rogue necromancer who has the foresight and wisdom to question the figure of institutional authority who comes to his door making false promises allows us not only to offer our students a model of such behavior, but to put them, however briefly, in the uncomfortable position (via the reading process) of questioning cultural assumptions and forcing them to ask these broader questions.

Telling Traditions

The *exemplum* form was by the first half of the fourteenth century in its clear heyday in Western Europe. Its rise in popularity can be attributed to various forms of contact with the Muslim world in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and to the creation of the lay clergy. For Joan Young Gregg the *exemplum* were a genre of tales used by the clergy to illustrate the points made in their sermons and as such they functioned to inculcate “the largely unlettered medieval populace with the societal norms of European Christianity” (3). The Dominicans, to whom our author Juan Manuel had deep and well-documented ties, were foremost among the clergy in their use of *exempla* (Lida de Malkiel 158–63; Deyermond 17–24; Ferreiro Alemparte). The fact that Juan Manuel encourages readers to consult originals of the *CL* that he safeguarded in the Dominican monastery of Peñafiel underscores Juan Manuel’s desire to control his work despite his own liberal use of previously existing material. Several scholars have noted similarities between “Exemplum XI” and Latin *exempla* about magicians and their students included in medieval European collections (Devoto, Deyermond, Lida de Malkiel). However, the focus of these tales in the Latin tradition is to stress the dangers of studying the science of necromancy and the tales are populated by demons and evil spirits, and not hospitable
and patient necromancers like Don Yllán. In the Latin tradition, necromancy and the black arts were often associated with Arab learning, and in this tradition Spain features prominently as a site for the study of astrology and magic (Ferreiro Alemparte 207–208). Among the examples of tales of clerics going to Spain to seek instruction in the art of Arabized magic are those of Gerberto, tutor of Hugh Capet the Elder’s son, around whom a legend arose that as a monk he fled to Toledo and Seville to learn the Sarracen arts, including divination and magic (207). Legends also abounded regarding Pope Gregory VII, who was publically declared a necromancer by some 30 bishops in June of 1080—this presumably because he studied said art in Toledo (208).

The dean of the “Exemplo XI,” like real fourteenth-century Christian clerics and noblemen, did not need to cross the Mediterranean to learn the sciences of the East. The translation projects of the Iberian Peninsula made such learning, and the experts in it, much like Don Yllán, available on Western European soil. In “Exemplo XI” we have a Church figure, much like Gerberto and Pope Gregory VII, except that Juan Manuel makes him an Iberian, specifying he is from Santiago, which, as mentioned, was a center not only for Iberian Christians, but also for Northern Europeans who were familiar with it as a center of religious pilgrimage (Ferreiro Alemparte 208–9). The selection of Toledo in “Exemplo XI” may, in fact, point to a particular instance in which Juan Manuel adapts the Latin ecclesiastical story tradition concerning students and necromancers to his vernacular version of an earlier Judeo-Arabic tale.

While the rise of exempla in Western Europe is often read almost exclusively in the context of Christian ecclesiastical culture, in Iberia exempla were a popular form not only among the clergy, but also among learned nobles such as Juan Manuel (Lida de Malkiel 155–63; Deyermond 22–24). Maria Menocal points out that the intellectual milieu of Juan Manuel’s class, and even within his family, privileged the Arab and Hebrew traditions of the Iberian Peninsula (481–87). His uncles, Alfonso X and Don Fadrique, as well as his cousin Sancho IV, oversaw the production of exempla collections designed to instruct their readers on ethics and politics—and several of these collections were adapted from the Andalusi and Jewish traditions. Alfonso X (“El Sabio”) is perhaps the best-known medieval Spanish consumer and recycler of Arab literature. Not only did he commission the translation of one of the best-known and oldest collections of frame tales or exempla, Calila wa Dimna, his oversight of the creation of histories, law codes, and original poetry that adopted generously from works he had translated from the Arabo-Iberian traditions is well documented (Márquez Villanueva). Many of the Alfonsine translators were Arabic-speaking Jews. Juan Manuel would have been familiar with Alfonso’s exempla collections and with that of Alfonso’s brother, Fadrique. Menocal discusses in detail the CL’s relationship with the Sendebar, one of the Arab
frame tale collections translated for Fadrique. Like his uncles, Juan Manuel seems to have looked to the Arab tradition in Iberia, in both written and oral form, as a valid source for his own work. Not only does he include Arabic phrases in three of the *exempla* in the *CL*, several of the *exempla* adapted from the Arab tradition are clearly marked in the text, with Patronio stating that they occurred in a particular place in the Arab world or featured a particular Arab historic figure (Hoyos Hoyos; Deyermond 28–29; Lida de Malkiel 158). In fact, “Exenplo XI” is not the only *exemplum* in the collection in which Andalusi cultural models are held up as examples over and against Christian Spanish models. Ermanno Caldera points out that in “Exenplo XXIV” an Andalusi monarch (“rey moro”) is represented as a paradigm of wise conduct, while Christian kings are consistently criticized in the *CL* (38). Additionally, in “Exenplo XLVI” valuable advice on luck is put in the mouth of “un muy grant filósofo que vivia en Marruecos” (in Caldera 39) (a very great philosopher who lived in Morocco). Several other *exempla* allude to real Andalusi monarchs such as al-Mu’tamid (Abenabet) (“Exenplo XXX”) and al-Hakim (“Exenplo XLI”), the latter in an *exemplum* which is a Castilian adaptation of an Arab legend. These *exempla* in which the protagonist, model of wisdom and moral character, is Muslim ground Don Juan Manuel’s work in the Andalusi cultural milieu, as critics such as Caldera, Hoyos Hoyos, and Deyermond have long noted. Andalusi culture was not exclusively Muslim, though, and also included the Arabized cultural production of Iberian Jews. Despite Juan Manuel’s documented knowledge of, access to, and respect for the Arabo-Andalusi tradition and despite assertions by critics such as Menéndez Pelayo and subsequently Ángel González Palencia that “Exenplo XI” derives from a tale from the *1001 Nights* tradition, Lida de Malkiel, Daniel Devoto, and David Wacks point out that there is little similarity between the tale suggested and “Exenplo XI” (Menéndez Pelayo 1:148; Lida de Malkiel 158; Devoto 383; Wacks “Don Yllán” 417 n18). As Lida de Malkiel points out, the tale of the *1001 Nights* that tells of Naker el-Chamy, Abd ar-Rahmen’s cousin, shares few points of comparison with “Exenplo XI” (186 n7). As mentioned above, other critics such as Reinaldo Ayerbé-Chaux and Ferreiro Alemparte look instead to the Latin *exempla* tradition, offering several examples of stories in which clerics that have come to Spain to study magic are taken away by demons. However, Wacks shows convincingly that, despite Ayerbé-Chaux, and others’ assertion that the source of “Exenplo XI” can be found in the Latin tradition or Menéndez Pelayo’s that it can be found in the Arabic, the closest analogue is to be found in the Judeo-Iberian tradition, in a Hebrew *exemplum* included in Ibn Sahula’s thirteenth-century work, the *Meshal Haqadmoni* (“Don Yllán” 418–32). In Latin *exempla* that depict the conflict between students and teachers of magic, the focus is on the evils that arise from studying necromancy, the necromancer being, along with evil spirits and/or the devil, simply an agent of those evils (Ferreiro Alemparte
209–211). Yet, as Wacks points out, in both the Hebrew version and in Juan Manuel’s, the issue is the insolence of the would-be student and his (in all versions the student is male and a member of homosocial scholarly groups such as the clergy) suitability for learning; Wacks 420–22, 429–30). In the Hebrew version, the would-be student does not respect the necromancer’s intelligence (Wacks 419–20). Similarly, in “Exenplo XI,” as discussed above, the dean reveals that he too does not respect Don Yllán, but is willing to betray him rather than compensate him for his trouble. The moral of Juan Manuel’s version is similar to that of Ibn Sahula, but the setting is different. In Ibn Sahula’s tale, the student leaves Jerusalem to study in Egypt. While Egypt, the setting for Ibn Sahula’s tale, was a place associated with magic in both the Latin ecclesiastical and Jewish traditions, Don Juan Manuel’s choice to set the tale in Toledo offers us a perfectly natural progression of the tale, as it, like the Sephardic Jews, passed westward within the Arabic world into the Iberian Peninsula.

Jerusalem and Egypt (like Toledo and Santiago in the CL) are locales that would have popular associations with longstanding traditions of learning for the work’s intended audience. Both places are also associated with foreignness—faraway exotic locales and bodies of knowledge. While both Egypt and Jerusalem would be distant locales for Iberian Jews reading Ibn Sahula’s version, the latter would be identified as the geographical and the symbolic, spiritual homeland of all Jews, just as, arguably, Santiago would be identified as both physical and spiritual center for Iberian Christian readers of the CL. Toledo, though, is much more problematic. While clearly identified with non-Christian and foreign/exotic wisdom by European (non-Castilian) clerics, from 1085 CE it was also a center of Christian Iberian intellectual and royal authority. The choice of Toledo, though it marks Juan Manuel’s version as a specific vernacular development in the not-insubstantial story tradition of the magician and his ungrateful students, also points to the ambiguities of medieval Iberian society and culture. Toledo is not a (wholly) foreign, exoticized space, like Egypt, for example, but rather is at the intellectual heart of Juan Manuel’s vernacular culture; it reveals not a black-white dichotomy between good and evil, but a murky place where such categories are dismantled. In Juan Manuel’s version of the tale, Toledo and Santiago, like the professions of the main figures, necromancer and cleric, and like the words of the story itself, are signposts that ultimately misdirect. “Truth” is not to be had from the cleric, even if he hails from Santiago, but rather seemingly resides in the difficult gray areas found where different peoples and systems of belief come into contact.

Lessons and Frames
As noted above, the stated lesson of Juan Manuel’s version of this tale differs from those of the Latin tradition warning against necromancers, and reflects a moral more in line with Ibn Sahula’s lesson about teachers and students. According to Patronio, the lesson of “Exenplo XI” is that if the person you have helped does not help you in kind, you should stop assisting him: “pues vede que tanto fazedes por aquel omne que vos demanda ayuda et non vos da ende mejores gracias, tengo que non avedes por qué trabajar nin aventurarvos mucho por llegarlo a logar que vos dé tal galardón como el déan dio a don Yllán” (57) (And you, Sir Count Lucanor, since you see how much you are doing for the man who asks you to help, and yet gives you little thanks for it, I do not think that you should do very much or take any risks only to come to the point of being rewarded as was Don Yllán by the dean [71]). However, according to Don Juan Manuel in the final rhyming couplet, the lesson is that your friends, once they achieve success, will not help you should you need it: “Al que mucho ayudares et non te lo conosciere, / menos ayuda avrás del desque en grand onra subiere” (59) (If one you help is thankless now, / He’ll later keep no solemn vow [71]). Neither Patronio’s summary nor these pithy rhymed couplets, though, fail to do justice to the complex work done by the prose narrative. This slippage between the stated lesson and the larger ambiguities of the narrative characterizes the entire collection and seems to be symptomatic of frame tale collections as a whole. Menocal, in reference to the Disciplina Clericalis, points out that the moral stated in the frame tale collection is almost always undone by the frame tale structure itself—which, for Menocal, is the true lesson:

From the very beginning our notion of didacticism is tested, and, in the end, debunked... Interpretation, and thus the potential variability in meaning, is just as strongly brought to the fore: when we see and hear the listeners of stories and their interpretations, we are pushed to meditate directly on the many contingencies of meaning—and the implied infinity of frames implicated by interpolation makes ever more obvious and radical such orality and its relativism. (479)

Laurence De Looze points out that the ambiguity of language is at the heart of the CL, as it was for many fourteenth-century works in the wake of Ockham’s discussion of nominalism and reality (118–19). De Looze succinctly underscores the ambiguity at the heart of the Don Juan Manuel’s work:

Manueline didacticism does not call for a lack of ambiguity, the potential duplicity of human signification becomes one of the elements about which the didactic work must teach. The uncertainty inherent in all human signification may create moments of aporia in the Conde
Lucanor, but this is hardly a defect, and only a post-Enlightenment association of instruction with logical clarity would be embarrassed to find that this is the case. The need to hone one’s powers of interpretation—the very need, if you will, of a Lucanor to have a Patronio—is because signs (whether language or actions) may or may not truly represent intentions. How to distinguish the rhetorical manipulation of signs from the genuine reflection of one’s inner feelings and character through signs? [. . .] The lie, as such, is an abuse of rhetoric. But might it not also be conceivable that one could exploit duplicitous signs for entirely moral reasons? (119)

“Exenplo XI” is a perfect example of the above expression of Don Manuel’s ethos. For De Looze the “problematic nature of human signification” (i.e., slippages of meaning), either because of different positions of utterance or because of willful misrepresentation (engaño), characterize the overwhelming majority of exempla in the first part of the CL. This is, in fact, the case for “Exenplo XI,” in which the reader (like Don Yllán) is faced with looking beyond and/or manipulating the circumstances of language and the production of signs to discern the dean’s “real” intentions. Don Yllán’s creation of an illusory world in order to discern the dean’s intentions reflects not only the inherent ambiguity of signification that De Looze explores, but also how the particular context of this ambiguity—the details of Iberian realities that Don Juan Manuel includes, such as the geographic specificity of the setting and the respective professional expertise of the characters—functions as a mode of signification for the reader, both fourteenth-century and contemporary.

And while many critics think the specific details of fourteenth-century Iberia found throughout the CL—the concern for honor, social position, Church hierarchy, and the cultural realities of Castile—alienate this text from contemporary students, it is precisely those details that underscore Juan Manuel’s mistrust of signs and meanings. And even these concerns for wealth, prestige, and religion resonate with our students. Ian Macpherson finds the CL to be something of a “period-piece,” claiming that the “social and geographical limitations of CL are severe,” as it is geared mostly toward fourteenth-century Spanish noblemen, and that the overriding lesson that the CL “strives to show [is] that self-interest and worldly success are not incompatible with the salvation of the soul” (37). I would argue, however, that such a lesson—even if only the most superficial—is not lost on our own students, who are familiar with contemporary popular leaders and beliefs that similarly link religious belief and worldly success.

The details of the story that Macpherson finds alienating and that he thinks alienate contemporary readers, details such as the locales (Toledo and Santiago) and the men’s professions (cleric and necromancer), while not necessary for understanding the story’s central engaño (deception), do create
a subtext that brings additional meaning to the tale and rewards the students who read deeper. Each man can be read as representative not just of a place, but of a system of belief, of a way of making sense of the world—of interpreting signs. The dean is driven by desire for worldly success and self-interest, and yet he is the antagonist—the dupe. Don Yllán, who minds his own business and proves the more intelligent of the men, comes out the better role model in this exemplum. The status of neither man’s soul is discussed, but the ambiguity of presenting a protagonist whose field of specialty is the black arts seems to fly in the face of Macpherson’s reading. By all indications, the lesson for the reader is to follow Don Yllán’s method and not to trust outward signs—not to trust in the dean’s moral character despite his ecclesiastical office—even (or especially) once he achieves success in the Church and becomes pope.

It is the frame that allows the author to seduce the reader into this deeper reading. The author manipulates the power of fiction much as the character Don Yllán manipulates his science, magic. Guillermo Serés points out that in this exemplum Juan Manuel echoes Yllán’s trick of illusion in the way he narrates the story:

La citada maestría del autor se aprecia especialmente en la disposición de la historia de don Illán, con su ilusionismo sutil que engaña al deán (y al lector), con su narración sabiamente demorada, con la evocación miniaturista de la cámara del nigromante. Ello es así porque el autor dispone el relato de tal forma, que, análogamente a cómo el nigromante don Illán juega con el deán para demostrar su ingratitude, don Juan Manuel lo hace con el lector, pues no le advierte en ningún momento de que también le ha integrado en el tiempo ilusorio del deán; de igual modo juega Patronio con el Conde Lucanor. (note in Manuel 1994, 52–53)

(The abovementioned mastery of the author can especially be appreciated in the nature of Don Yllán’s story, with its subtle spell that tricks the dean [and the reader], with the knowingly disrupted narration and the extremely detailed evocation of the necromancer’s chamber. The author unfolds the story in this way such that, analogous to the way in which the necromancer Don Yllán plays with the dean to expose his ingratitude, Juan Manuel plays with the reader, for he never alerts him to the fact that he has included him in the illusory time of the necromancer’s spell; this is also how Patronio plays with Count Lucanor.)

While we, the readers, like the dean, are victims of Don Yllán’s illusion, we are then asked to identify with Don Yllán in the moraleja that follows, in which Juan Manuel (Johán) tells the reader that if someone you help is not
grateful at the time, he will be less so if he attains a better social position. This shift in the character with whom the reader is asked to identify is, in fact, part of the aesthetic experience of the story—this final surprise that causes us to rethink all that has gone before.

Patronio is purposefully ambiguous in the opening of the story, asking Lucanor to listen to what happened to the dean of Santiago when he encountered Don Yllán, the master of Toledo: “mucho querría que sopiécedes lo que contesció a un deán de Sanctiago con don Yllán, el grand maestro que morava en Toledo” (53) (I should like you to hear about what happened to a dean of Santiago with Don Yllán, the great sage of Toledo [68]). The fact that Patronio tells the count to listen to the story of the dean in order to help him with his situation implicitly suggests that the parallel will be between dean and count, i.e., that these two will have a similar problem with an ungrateful acquaintance. The dean is privileged by the grammatical construction; it is the dean’s story (“lo que contesció a un déan”) and Yllán is subordinated, being the object of the preposition linking him to the dean (not the possessor of the story) and relegated to the position of supporting character—“with” Yllán (“con don Yllán”). Thus, the reader naturally identifies first with the dean, the student, who gets to realize his dream of attaining worldly power and material success. But in fact, as we only discover once the illusion is revealed (or perhaps as we progress in the story and realize who is asking favors of whom), it is Don Yllán with whom the count (and the reader) ultimately identifies, once we see how the dean reacts when given the chance to fulfill his dreams.

The Future of Fiction

Both the versions of this tale of betrayal—that of Ibn Sahula and Juan Manuel’s “Expenlo XI”—anticipate the genre of speculative fiction known as “science fiction.” The protagonist, Don Yllán, uses his knowledge of what was considered at the time the most cutting-edge science to manipulate the laws of the natural world—to change what today, post Star Trek and Einstein, we would call the “space-time continuum.” Loren Ghiglione has recently proposed that speculative fiction is a better vehicle than scientific or academic studies for predicting the future, for it offers “a way of examining what is neither impossible nor verifiably possible—a way of considering present possibilities by working out their consequences” (2). This is exactly what Yllán does in this tale. Like the author of speculative fiction (Juan Manuel in this case)—Yllán allows the dean and the reader to explore and experience one possible future. Technology is key to contemporary speculative fiction but, as the science fiction writer Arthur C. Clarke points out, “any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic”
(413). As discussed above, Yllán’s science (necromancy or black magic) was part of the Judeo-Arabic cultural milieu of Iberia, which was the center of technological advancement for fourteenth-century Europe. Toledo was famous as an intellectual center where Western Europeans could access the knowledge of the East via the Arabic tradition, including the then cutting-edge fields of mathematics, philosophy, astronomy, astrology, and, of course, Don Yllán’s field, magic. Given this confluence of factors, it is easy to see how this tale may be read in this same vein of speculative fiction, and shows that writers have long used fiction to explore the future and its possibilities for the present and its inhabitants. In Juan Manuel’s fiction, as in Ibn Sahula’s, access to the potential technology of the future is possible via a foreign system of knowledge.

Reading this tale in the Judeo-Iberian and medieval Castilian versions discussed above forces the modern reader to think about contemporary culture’s debt to the past and about the very process of cultural transmission—not just from one culture to another, but from one language to another and from one generation to another. The ways in which these ideas resonate with contemporary debates concerning intellectual property rights, including (but certainly not limited to) the issue of plagiarism in literature, as well as the issue of authorial identity and of the role of originality in fiction, are too numerous to list. Don Juan Manuel and Don Yllán both ask us to consider these topics via fiction—the realm in which we the reader, like the characters of the story, can explore alternatives in order to learn something about ourselves as interpreters, arbiters of meaning, and about our interpretation, that creation of meaning, as a reflection of our moral makeup. This tale about humans and the institutions they live and work in, the knowledge they seek and its possible applications, and the possibilities of fiction allows our students to think not only about their role in the world and in the institutions in which they function, but also about what they are learning and why—precisely the manner of thinking encouraged by the humanities education that is increasingly under threat in American universities. Most important, perhaps, is that this story will also allow our students to imagine other possibilities, which, in the end, is the unique gift that fiction offers, and which allows this medieval work of fiction to continue to speak to us today.

Notes

1. Mercelino Menéndez Pelayo claims the CL is “la obra maestra de la prosa castellana del siglo XIV, a la que comparte con el Decamerón la gloria de haber creado la prosa novelesca en Europa” (1:144) (the finest work of Castilian prose of the fourteenth century, which shares with the Decameron the glory of having created European novelistic prose); María Jesús Lacarra claims that some of Juan Manuel’s
exempla are among the best stories of all time (167). Maria Rosa Menocal discusses how the CL reinforces the ideals of Castilian hegemony so favored by nineteenth-century philology (475–76). The work as conceived of by Juan Manuel, and as it exists in the manuscript tradition, consisted of several different sections, of which the 50 to 51 exempla now known as the CL comprise the first. The subsequent sections include proverbs and illustrations and are not found in modern editions. See Laurence De Looze’s discussion of the origins of such divisions in the CL in both the manuscript and modern traditions (1–90).

2. All translations of “Exemplum XI” are from Keller and Keating’s 1977 translation.

3. For James Murphy the exempla are both product and vehicle of the “homilectic revolution” that began in the thirteenth century (Rhetoric 310). See also Burgoyne 27. For Menocal, “The Conde Lucanor, the Decameron, and the Canterbury Tales constitute the trilogy of fourteenth-century framed narratives which all explicitly reflect back on a vast tradition, their own histories, which can only be sketched out here but which must be understood as a vital part of the texts themselves” (478).

4. For Joan Young Gregg, a scholar of medieval English literature, this contact with the Muslim world is both military (Crusading) and cultural (the translation of Indian and other Eastern works into Arabic and then Latin). David Wacks offers a case study of the latter in the case of Moses Sefardi (Petrus Alfonsí) a representative example of how al-Andalus served as the essential cultural matrix for the production of frame tales in Western Europe. On the exempla and the Franciscans and Dominicans, see Gregg 8.

5. Gregg stresses that the clergy accepted entertaining exempla because they were “regarded as a legitimate means of making profound and complex theological doctrines more accessible to the untutored” (11). Gregg points out that while the exempla were made realistic by offering specific recognizable local details, homilists admonished against depicting negative characterizations of religious figures or recognizable contemporary political figures (12). Don Juan Manuel’s use of real Andalusí rulers and negative portrayals of clerics, such as the Dean of Santiago in this exemplum, show his collection does not conform to Gregg’s description of the Western European exempla tradition.

6. See Burgoyne 27 and Lida de Malkiel 156. Dominicans such as Etienne de Bourbon (d. 1261) (Liber de septem donis), Humbert de Romans (d. 1277) (Liber de dono timoris), and Arnold de Liège (Alphabetum narrationum) all produced anthologies of exempla in Latin.

7. “Don Johán dio et sabe que en los libros contese muchos yerros en los transladar, porque las letra se semejan unas a otras . . . Ét porque don Johán se receló desto, ruega a los que leeran cualquier libro que fuera trasladado del que él compuso . . . que si fallaren alguna palabra mal puesta, que non pongan la culpa a él fasta que vean el libro mismo que don Johán fizo” (8) (Don Juan has seen and knows that in books many errors are introduced when they are translated, because the letters look alike . . . And because Don Juan did not want that to happen, he begged anyone who would translate one of his books . . . that if they find any word out of place, that they should not blame him, but instead consult the copy made by his own hand).

8. The modern Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges further exploits this tale’s potential for misrepresentation and for relocating the reader vis-à-vis not only characters, but also author. He presents this material without any indication that it is not his own—he simply confirms and continues the storytelling tradition. Unlike Juan Manuel and Don Yllán, however, he does not include a final revelation scene—an acknowledgement of the illusion and of his own role as its creator. If the reader does not know Don Juan Manuel’s version of the story, he/she will forever be under the
spell of Borges, assuming that he is the author and that this story is a modern creation. In so doing, Borges arguably introduces the story, which was not created by Juan Manuel, who himself mined the many traditions of story collections with which he was familiar for material, to a modern audience. In so doing, Borges simultaneously insults and pays homage to Juan Manuel, and copies Juan Manuel himself, who adapted the story either from an earlier Hebrew version or, as Wacks maintains, from a medieval vernacular Iberian oral tradition.

9. These examples lead Ferreiro Alemparte to state, “A comienzos del siglo XIII la ciudad de Toledo aparece ya como asiento de la ciencia diabólica” (208) (At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the city of Toledo appears as a center of the diabolic science).

10. Deyermond, in fact, suggests that Juan Manuel derived his ethos from the Dominicans: “Los dominicos enseñaron a Juan Manuel que no hay necesariamente un conflicto entre las dos finalidades de la salvación del alma y el mantenimiento—y hasta el aumento—del estado y de la honra” (23) (The Dominicans taught Juan Manuel that there is not necessarily a conflict between the salvation of the soul and the maintenance—and even increase—of one’s social position and honor).


12. Colloquial Arabic is included in tales XXX, XLI, and XLVII. Alan Deyermond points out that in the Libro de los estados, the narrator claims that don Johán conversed with wise Moors: “ya obiera él departiemiento con algunos moros muy sabios” (28) (he had already had dealings with some very wise Moors). Deyermond also points out that Juan Manuel was close friends with Nasir, Muslim king of Granada and subsequently Gaudix.

13. “In Don Juan Manuel’s case, his use of Arabic language and Andalusi narrative material invokes the cultural authority of the Andalusi Caliphate (and later Taifa kingdoms) populated by the protagonists of his exempla” (Wacks, Framing 149).

14. For an English translation of the work, see Scheindlin, “The Sorcerer.” Wacks argues that the existence of this tale in a thirteenth-century Judeo-Iberian collection and a fourteenth-century Castilian version points to a “common vernacular culture” (433).

15. Ayerbé-Chaux gives three medieval Latin examples of the ingratitude of students, including an exemplum in the collection of Etienne de Bourbon (238–39). He also offers as analogue a tale from the Tabula Exemplorum in which a magician tests his student’s claims that he will give him riches (241–2).

16. Seidenspinner-Núñez notes (applying Iser’s reader-response theory to the work) that even though Juan Manuel gives us a possible solution to the conflict presented in the text, he requires us, the readers, to “adopt an attitude toward the one offered” (262). Seidenspinner-Núñez continues, “the acceptance or rejection of the solution(s) offered in the Conde Lucanor depends directly on the degree of the reader’s identification with the work’s repertoire and with the fictitious reader in the text” (262). He maintains that since Juan Manuel was a socially respected nobleman, his authority as author (and fictitious interpreter) would cause the audience to “readily assimilate the moral teachings of his book” (263).

17. This ethos echoes the so-called “prosperity theology” of many contemporary American evangelicals (Van Biema and Chu).

18. On the recent cut of five humanities programs at SUNY, Albany, see Caroline Foster Segal and Margot Adler.
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