

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE IBERIAN IMAGINATION: 1400-1650

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

BY

DAVID M. REHER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2020

Copyright 2020 by David M. Reher

Contents

List of Figures.....	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
<i>Thesis</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Turcica in the Spanish Golden Age.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Orientalism and the Ottomans</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Critical framework.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Orientalism</i>	<i>19</i>
Part 1: Constantinople as Heterotopia.....	24
Chapter 1: Heterotopia of the Fallen City	27
<i>Thesis</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Andanzas y viajes de un caballero español (1454).....</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Tirant lo Blanc (1511)</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Viaje de Turquía (1557).....</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>La Santa Liga (1621)</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>94</i>
Chapter 2: Heterotopia of the Founded city.....	102
<i>Place and Non-Place</i>	<i>102</i>
<i>Embajada a Tamorlán (1406).....</i>	<i>108</i>
<i>La Destruccion de Constantinopla (1587).....</i>	<i>150</i>
Part 2: Heterotopias in Constantinople	172
Chapter 3: Female Homosocial Heterotopia	174
<i>The last Visigoth King.....</i>	<i>181</i>
<i>Tirant lo Blanc (1511)</i>	<i>187</i>
<i>Viaje de Turquía (1557).....</i>	<i>200</i>
<i>El amante liberal (1613).....</i>	<i>211</i>
<i>La gran sultana (1615)</i>	<i>220</i>
<i>El Conde Partinuplés (1653)</i>	<i>233</i>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>248</i>
Chapter 4: The Male Homosocial Heterotopia	251
<i>The last Visigoth King.....</i>	<i>259</i>

<i>Tirant lo Blanc (1511)</i>	266
<i>Viaje de Turquía (1557)</i>	280
<i>El amante liberal (1613)</i>	290
<i>La gran sultana (1615)</i>	303
<i>El conde Partinuplés (1653)</i>	317
<i>Conclusion</i>	324
Epilogue	328
Works Cited	333

List of Figures

Figure 1: Titian. La Religión socorrida por España. 1572-5. Courtesy of ARTstor.	87
---	----

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my dissertation committee for supporting me throughout the highs and lows of this project: to Steven Hutchinson, who, after an all-to-brief meeting, agreed to be part of my committee, and whose expertise has been invaluable in helping my dissertation to reach its full potential; to Miguel Martínez, whose attention to pedagogy and active learning has been an inspiration, and who has always pushed me to excel; to Fred de Armas, without whose advocacy I simply could not have not made it this far—I am forever indebted to your patience, understanding, and belief in my ability to do this.

I am grateful also to the University of Chicago, the Department of Romance Languages, the Fulbright committee, the CLS, the Delmas Foundation, the Newberry Library and others for their financial contributions in making my project possible.

I would also be remiss in not recognizing my unofficial mentors, who were kind enough to take a shy newcomer under their wings: Felipe, for nudging me to become social secretary and into our trips throughout Scandinavia; Katrina, for countless lunches and your friendship; and Jaime, for giving me the push I needed for my first conference paper, and for your willingness to give share your thoughts with countless writing projects. My experience at U-Chicago was greatly enriched by all of you, and I'm overwhelmed by your generosity.

Thank you also to Cristina—we met when I first started this project, and it feels right that our relationship is also starting a new stage as we finish this. Gracias de verdad por todo tu amor, por no dejar de creer en mí, y por ser la única persona que ha leído mi tesis sin tener la obligación. Una vida contigo se me hace corta.

And, finally, profound thanks to my parents, who have always encouraged my love for reading, and my curiosity about the world. Thank you for your love, patience and understanding—I could not have asked for better parents.

Abstract

Research on the Ottomans during the Renaissance and early modern periods has primarily fallen into a dichotomy of fear and fascination—that is, either in scholarship that centers on the prejudice with which the Spanish viewed the East Mediterranean Orient, or, less often, criticism that uncovers surprising moments of tolerance and appreciation. While such an approach has been valuable, it proves limiting in considering how places such as Constantinople also provided a screen on which to discuss issues that preoccupied Spanish society such as race, gender and collective identity. I suggest an alternative framework that better encompasses the flexibility and diversity with which Spanish authors imagined the opposite end of the Mediterranean: Foucault’s heterotopia. Heterotopias are places where multiple utopian visions for a space overlap, often juxtaposing different times and places into a single, imagined site, chivalric novels, novelas, and treatises. I frame my project as a heterotopia in two ways: Constantinople as heterotopia, a city that evokes other historical cities; and Constantinople made of heterotopias, how places like the Harem and Turkish bagnios constitute the imagined city.

First, I consider how Constantinople serves as an archetypal fallen city in evoking Troy in works like Pero Tafur’s *Andanzas y viajes* (1451), and Lope de Vega’s *La Santa Liga* (1621). At first, Troy plays a role in framing the Orient in a dichotomy of Trojan/Ottoman and Greek/European; later it comes to symbolize larger Spanish claims to the whole of Classical history. My second chapter looks at Constantinople as a heterotopia of foundational cities in *Embajada a Tamorlán* (1406) and Lasso de la Vega’s *La Destruycion de Constantinopla* (1587). Here, ancient cities like Enoch and Lavinium are defined by an envy that is projected onto a wealthy Orient. Simultaneously, this maneuver also serves to mask criticisms of Spanish Imperialism. In my final two chapters, I then analyze heterotopias within Constantinople across several different texts, such as Marotrell’s *Tirant lo blanc* (1511), the anonymous *Viaje de*

Turquía (1557), Cervantes' *El amante liberal* and his play *La Gran Sultana* (1615), and Ana Caro's *El Conde Partinuplés* (1637 / 1653). I start with the Harem, which authors use to discuss anxieties over Spain's gradual transition from a predominately homosocial to a heterosexual society, as women gained more agency in public life. In my final chapter, I delve into the parallel male-homosocial space. Authors use this space to interrogate the increasing pressure to marry that the Spanish state brought to bear: in some cases, authors use Constantinople as a place to champion celibacy, while others use it to promote marriage.

This project is an initial venture into this topic, seeking to encourage further research on how the East Mediterranean Orient offered a discursive space where Spanish authors tested and contested notions of collective self.

Introduction

Estando en estas y otras muchas razones, llegó un moro corriendo, y dijo, a grandes voces, que por las bardas o paredes del jardín habían saltado cuatro turcos, y andaban cogiendo la fruta, aunque no estaba madura. Sobresaltóse el viejo, y lo mesmo hizo Zoraida, porque es común y casi natural el miedo que los moros a los turcos tienen, especialmente a los soldados, los cuales son tan insolentes y tienen tanto imperio sobre los moros que a ellos están sujetos, que los tratan peor que si fuesen esclavos suyos (I, 41, 545).

In the first half of *Don Quijote*, the knight errant has fought the giants-turned-wineskins in the enchanted inn when an unknown rider and a mysterious woman enter, both dressed *a la morisca*. The rider narrates the tale of his captivity in Algiers, where he was imprisoned in the bagnios. One day, the daughter of a wealthy Moor lowers some gold coins and a note with a string and reed, professing her love for him. The captive makes plans to escape with her, and tricks his way into her father's garden under the pretense of gathering herbs. The two are only able to secure a moment alone when their father runs off in pursuit of the Ottomans¹ above. The scene casts the Ottomans in a contradictory way. On the one hand, it creates a curious alignment, where the narrator empathizes with the Moors and their subjugation under the Ottomans—in a brief moment, despite the recent expulsion of the Moriscos, and the 1492 expulsion of Nazari Muslims, the narrator is united with Christian Spain's primary antagonists against the relatively newer threat of the Ottomans. Yet, at the same time, the captive is only able to finally have an intimate scene with Zoraida because of the Ottomans. The scene is fascinating in that it defies the totalizing tendency that defines Enlightenment Orientalism by casting the Ottomans separately from the North Africans.

This contrasts with the totalizing tendencies seen in other parts of Europe. The Ottomans were crucial in forming French and English Enlightenment Orientalism, being at the heart of

¹ I prefer the term 'Ottomans' over 'Turks' here, the latter referring to an ethnic group that made up a minority of the Ottoman Empire, and that by no means monopolized political positions in the diverse empire.

Northern Europe's first serious engagement with Islam. However, this was certainly not the case with Spain, which had seriously grappled with defining itself against a Muslim other since the 711 Umayyad conquest. The scene thus broaches two questions: Where can we locate the Ottomans within Spanish discourse, and how can we frame an Early Modern Spanish Orientalism that encompasses the empires at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean?

My dissertation answers this question and resolves the underlying tension of the scene above in this way: the Ottomans (and even their Byzantine predecessors) provided a crucial, imaginary pole opposite to Spain. This polarity created in Constantinople a space in which, beyond dichotomies of fear and fascination, Spanish authors found a degree of utility as they imagined the East Mediterranean Orient.

To frame this, I will first give an overview of the pervasiveness, nature, and evolution of writings on the Ottomans. Next, I explain how prior criticism on the Ottomans in the Spanish imagination has been limited, classifying treatments of the Ottomans as more or less tolerant. To nuance this, I suggest a framework of heterotopia—that is, Foucault's notion of a space beyond official discourse that invites different visions of society—, which challenges this dichotomy of admiration/animosity while offering a flexibility that better accommodates the different visions of Spain that we find reflected in Constantinople. Through the heterotopic lens, Constantinople at times both shores up a positional superiority championing Spanish hegemony and just as often undermines it, as it accommodates the contradictions and overlaps that are sparked by competing visions of Spain. Constantinople thus shows how the Ottoman Orient (at least within these texts, and in contrast to closer Orients in North Africa and Spain itself) offers a space to extend dominant Spanish ideology, yet, paradoxically, is also a shelter from it, in a way that is not anticipated by Said's framework.

Thesis

I argue that Constantinople acts as a heterotopia, offering a more complicated and nuanced view of Spanish Orientalism as Spain looked toward the East Mediterranean empires while simultaneously looking inward at its own shifting notion of self. Building on the work of critics like Barbara Fuchs, Edward Said, and Javier Irigoyen-Garcia, my project endeavors to underscore the importance that the Ottoman Empire (and also, to a lesser extent, the Byzantine Empire) had in driving Spanish cultural production. My dissertation divides into two parts, first considering Constantinople as a heterotopia, and second considering it as a space containing heterotopias, united both by topography and the discourses that they interrogate, and all bearing strata made up of differing visions of Spain. I am interested in establishing the diversity of these visions—even among the more ‘Orientalist’ ones that place Spain in a position of superiority, as well as the more speculative visions that do not depend on this dynamic.

Drawing on critics like Nancy Bisaha and Antonio Urquizar-Herrera, my first chapter considers how Troy is projected onto Constantinople, as the Trojan War begins as a prototype that helped Spanish authors understand the Ottomans from a position of military superiority in texts like Pero Tafur’s *Andanzas y Viajes* (1454) and Joanot Martorell’s *Tirant lo blanc* (1511). While this starts with a fascination with the ruins of Troy, it gradually comes to encompass the whole of classical intellectual heritage, as humanist authors argue for the superiority of Spanish modes of learning over those that it projects onto the Ottomans. This highlights Spain’s growing ambitions from a nation that could rival the Ottoman expansion to an empire that deserved exclusive claim to the whole of classical history, as we see in *Viaje de Turquía* (1557) and Lope de Vega’s *La Santa Liga* (1621).

My second chapter considers alternative ‘sister cities,’ namely Enoch and Lavinium, that are placed into juxtaposition to Constantinople. My analysis explores how these cities are

connected through themes of architectural devastation as well as through Gerald Maclean's framework of 'imperial envy.' In Ruy Gonzalez Clavijo's *Embajada a Tamorlan* (1406), we see how Christian envy of the might of the Timurid empire is projected onto Timur, whose endless envy drives him to conquest that is ultimately transitory. In contrast, Christianity, though divided by petty jealousies, is assured final victory through humble symbols that point to its timelessness. Lasso de Vega's *La Destruycion de Constantinopla* (1587) at first seems to follow this same motif, as the conqueror Mehmet is driven by ambition and envy against divided Byzantine Christians. Yet when placed among the playwright's other siege-oriented works, we are able to trace a criticism of imperial ambitions that ultimately dooms the Spanish Habsburg empire to Constantinople's fate.

My third chapter explores a heterotopia inside of Constantinople, the harem. Considering the critical contributions of Mulvey, Lefebvre and Foucault, I argue that the harem becomes a place to interrogate sexual anxieties as the homosociality at the center of medieval culture is replaced by heterosexuality as the dominant paradigm in the Early Modern. This is met with resistance in earlier texts, drawing on the collective trauma of Spain's founding myth, where its last Visigoth king rapes a young noblewoman, whose father then engineers the Umayyad invasion of 711 for revenge. Voyeuring the harem thus begins as a warning against the corrupting influence of the East Mediterranean Orient (and, with it, of unrestricted heterosexual desire) as in *Tirant lo Blanc*, as well as an opportunity to invert Spanish anxieties about enclosed women into a tool in which Spain can achieve a metonymic superiority over the Ottomans as in *Viaje de Turquía*. However, these visions of Spain are soon overwritten, as authors rather advocate for marriage and heterosexuality as they imagine the harem in *El amante liberal* (1613), *La gran sultana* (1615), and *El conde Partinuplés* (1653).

In my final chapter, I consider another heterotopia in Constantinople, an equivalent male homosocial space. Applying Eve Sedgwick Kosofsky's framework, I consider how this space provides an escape from the 'compulsory heterosexuality' that made marriage an essential component of masculine identity. We see this as a vision of a Spain of male harmony in *Tirant lo Blanc* and also as a vision of a Spain that respects individual desire in the case of *El amante liberal*, which deploys the space as a refuge for a woman beset by pressure to marry unappealing suitors. We see this also in *Viaje de Turquía*, as well as a growing sympathy for the Catamites that contests the increasing prosecution of sodomy in Spain. Our final two texts adopt more orthodox visions of Spain, as *La gran sultana* uses the space to criticize anti-Judaism, and *El conde Partinuplés* presents a vision that affirms marriage while, subtly, also criticizing misogyny.

My dissertation will change the field of Spanish literature by offering a more flexible structure with which to understand how Spanish authors employed the East Mediterranean Orient. It also gives further attention to Spanish literature on the Ottomans, which has remained understudied, while underscoring the importance of these and similar works in uncovering unorthodox visions of Spain that may not have been possible elsewhere. More globally, Spanish portrayals of Constantinople provide a more complete picture of Early Modern Orientalism, as well as of how the Mediterranean was experienced through the lens of captivity, sense of wonder over architectural marvels and sexual desire. This underscores the Mediterranean as both an interconnected place, yet also a shared experience that united its various religions and nations.

Turcica in the Spanish Golden Age

As Bunes Ibarra notes, "La España del Siglo de Oro mantenía una guerra contra los musulmanes, en especial los otomanos y los magrebíes, tanto en el frente bélico como en el campo de batalla de la publicística sobre papel" ("La visión" 72). Indeed, in the second volume of *Erasmus y*

España, Georges Bataillon notes that, during the Spanish Golden Age, “sin tomar en cuenta los folletos—que ofrecen una desproporción mucho mayor—hay dos veces más libros sobre los turcos que sobre América” (444). This naturally had profound ramifications on all levels of Spanish society, as Jeremy Lawrance notes:

All genres of *Turcica* were also represented by native productions. The popular market was fed by a *literatura de cordel* of broadsides and sensationalist journalism. The more educated layman could read entertaining or edifying autobiographical testimonies by adventurers and travelers, including captivity narratives, though more often he chose pilgrim-books on the Holy Land. Cultured Renaissance hidalgos were expected to spice their polite conversation with informed views on the Ottomans (19).

The Ottomans were as important intellectually as they were for literary production: as Nancy Bisaha notes, “humanist reactions to the Ottomans are a legacy of the Renaissance no less important than the dignity of man, republican thought, and three-point perspective in painting” (11).

Previous criticism has primarily focused on plays as well as *turcica*, referring to informative descriptions of the Ottomans. For the latter category, while many sources were translated from other French, German, or Italian, Spanish treatises on the Ottomans were not printed. Perhaps the most significant Spanish treatise is the anonymous *Viaje de Turquía* (a text we will consider in greater detail below).

Literary works like plays focused primarily on the defeats and victories of recent history. Mehmet Sait Şener elaborates on these works a good deal in his 2017 doctoral dissertation “El tema turco en el teatro español de los siglos XVI-XVII.” He proposes as a sub-genre “obras turquescas,” arguing that they should no longer be included as part of the ‘obras moriscas,’ a contrast with Albert Mas and Ricardo García Cárcel. While he concedes that both genres share a number of overlapping characteristics, he suggests that “obras turquescas” focus on specific conflicts between Christians and Ottomans, and that their Ottoman characters are held at a

greater distance in the Spanish imagination, seldom converting to Christianity (Şener 23). He divides plays into three categories: captivity plays that center on conflicts between the Spanish and Ottoman Empires, and others that consider the conflict between the Ottomans and other Christian nations (Şener 3). He sub-divides the captivity genre into those focusing on the plight of Christian captives,² and those in which Christians rise to power in the Ottoman court.

Evolution

Critics have also agreed that Spanish attitudes toward the Ottomans alternated between more fear and less interest, depending on the current conflicts between Spain and the Ottoman Empire. Spain's medieval fascination with Muslims of Al-Andalus and the Maghreb served as a point of departure for its perspective on the Ottomans. During much of the Spanish Middle Ages, Al-Andalus were seen as a land of refinement and intellectual achievement in the humanities and sciences.

This changed in the 15th century, when a period of aggressive Spanish and Ottoman expansion in the Mediterranean triggered a sort of rediscovery of the religious Other.³ The cities of Granada (1492) and Constantinople (1453) fell within 50 years of each other, fundamentally re-aligning centuries-old religious boundaries, though the full consequences of these conquests were not immediately sensed. Paloma Díaz Mas notes that the conquest of Constantinople (as was the case with Jerusalem) had a relatively limited affect in Castile due to the death of Juan II as well as Castile's campaigns in Al-Andalus (325). There are scant mentions of it in chronicles

² “No se trata sólo de un peligro de muerte tras el cautiverio, sino del riesgo de perder la vida y el alma en un mundo de apariciones, engaños, tentaciones y vicios” (Şener 25).

³ “Citaré exclusivamente un ejemplo para ilustrar esta afirmación: la pintura veneciana anterior a Carpaccio, incluidas las obras de Gentile Bellini, presenta a los musulmanes con unas características no agresivas; son simples personajes que aparecen en las obras de arte para representar paisajes orientales, tanto turcos como mamelucos o norteafricanos. Sin embargo, en torno a 1490, los cuadros comienzan a escenificar personajes musulmanes con caracteres violentos, mostrando su maldad y aviesas intenciones, lo que trae implícita una intencionalidad claramente manifiesta. [...] Los musulmanes a los que han sometido en la conquista del reino de Granada se van transformando paulatinamente en otomanos” (Bunes Ybarra, “Cristianos y musulmanes” 308).

and, surprisingly, no references to the theme in romances and very few in cancioneros (328, 335). Pero Tafur was likely pushed to create his travel account of Constantinople (which we examine below) on the eve of its conquest (Díaz Mas 326), yet this is a unique case. During the 16th and 17th centuries, portrayals of Constantinople grew more popular. They were centered on chivalric and crusader exploits in Byzantine Constantinople, as well as romances set in Ottoman Constantinople that focused on recent conflicts or on Christian captives. She concludes that:

en los libros de caballerías de finales del siglo XV y la primera mitad del XVI -y, por tanto, en los romances que retoman esas historias-, Constantinopla es un reino cristiano exótico y lejano, marco de aventuras fabulosas. La Constantinopla en manos de los turcos parece irrumpir en el romancero castellano en época tardía y por otras circunstancias: a partir de mediados del siglo XVI (Díaz Mas 334).

References in Catalan, however, are a good deal more frequent owing to Aragon's Mediterranean commercial interests. Several poems on the city's conquest have been preserved, and it also inspired chivalric texts, such as *Tirant lo Blanc* (another text that we examine), which was translated into Castilian shortly after its publication in 1490.

A second factor driving a renewed interest in Muslims was the indoctrination of the Moriscos. This led Spanish intellectuals to return to medieval texts on Muslims, reworking the frontier literary tradition by adding new stereotypes. The continuity between Ottoman and North African Muslims is particularly evident in an example that Ricardo García Cárcel provides: during Cisneros's first regency, the cardinal tried to form a Holy League against the Ottomans while organizing campaigns in North African cities like Orán and Bujia.

During this early time (1530-1569), captivity accounts that related "el sufrimiento como galeotes forzados o como presos en largos y penosos cautiverios" were popular (García 19). Ottoman figures on stage would come more slowly, despite an initial appearance in 1519. This was accompanied by a lull in conflicts from 1540-1560, as Spain was distracted by its American

holdings and wars on other fronts; during this time, Ottoman influence grew through the Mediterranean's southern coast in "el rapto de África" (García 17).

The next period was defined by "el miedo general," and "la obsesión epidemiológica, la creencia firme en la conjura musulmana entre moriscos, berberiscos y trucos" (García 17), which were stoked by the Morisco rebellion in 1568 as well as the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus in 1570. In literature, this manifested as a hostility toward the Ottomans and a focus on Christian triumphs over the Ottomans. This mirrored Islamophobia at home, as Ottoman victories led to harsher treatment of the Moriscos, as happened with the fall of la Goleta in 1574, and the Inquisition produced confessions from Moriscos awaiting Ottoman saviors. The formation of the Holy League with its resounding victory in 1571 led to a surge in Turkish plays centered on important historical conflicts between the Ottomans and Christians. The first play centering on the Ottomans was published in 1587, Lasso de Vega's play *Destrucción de Constantinopla* (which we will consider in depth below).

Driven by further preoccupations with the American colonies, Felipe II expelled the Moriscos in 1609. This marks a decline in printing materials on the Ottomans. Despite a rise in Mediterranean corsairing, Spain's involvement with the Ottomans and with Africa would remain limited until the conquest of Orán in 1732. Paralleling this was a decline in references to Muslims that reflects a disinterest among readers. As conflicts between the Ottomans and the Spanish dwindled, captivity accounts gave way to the "intento de justificar la expulsión mediante la demonización intelectual de turcos y moriscos" (García 25). After 1610, playwrights seek out new themes, such as the Ottoman-Safavid wars, and figures who fought against the Ottomans, like Timur.

Orientalism and the Ottomans

Critics have also considered establishing a framework through which the Spanish understood the Ottomans. This has been accompanied by the essential work of highlighting the stereotypes with which the Spanish defined the Ottomans. Mehmet Sait Şener enumerates various traits that defined the stereotypical Turk, portrayed as incapable, cruel, divided, lustful, effeminate, cowardly, arrogant, and hypocritical—the antithesis of how European Christians preferred to think of themselves. Bunes Ibarra similarly observes that Christian Spain saw the Ottomans as more Muslim than Turkish, viewing them monolithically, with no attention paid to their internal divisions. The Ottomans are seen as unlearned, in contrast to the Muslims of the Western Mediterranean.⁴ Other stereotypes are more positive, such as their exemplary hygiene and exquisite foods as well as their loyalty to their superiors, though this was also cast as blindly following orders. Portrayals of Muslims sometimes serve to criticize the Spanish. While necessary to understanding the whole picture of Spanish Pre-Enlightenment Orientalism, these stereotypes imply a degree of fixedness that undermines the more fascinating, dynamic framework that better encompasses the shifts in and diverse uses of that Spanish authors found in the Ottomans and their capital city.

More relevant to my present project are the moments where critics have endeavored to frame the underlying rules that give rise to the stereotypes. Ricardo García Cárcel does this in suggesting a ‘turcofobia’ that shaped perceptions of the Ottomans, and was characterized by three traits: “un proceso de animalización despectiva” (25), comparing the Ottomans to bears,

⁴ “Los descendientes de reyes y sultanes no son educados en el ejercicio del poder como ocurre en el mundo cristiano, por lo que se crían sin ningún tipo de formación política. Sólo los andalusíes y moriscos, antiguos habitantes de España, suelen cuidar que sus hijos aprendan a leer y escribir, lo que no realizan los sultanes otomanos con sus descendientes” (Bunes Ibarra, “La visión” 70).

dragons, crocodiles; “inversión sexual,” in particular sodomy and the decadence of the harem (25); and finally, “la repulsión, la prefabricación del asco en todos los sentidos” (27).

Bunes Ibarra offers a more complete framework. He first rejects the terms ‘Orientalism’, and traces several contrasts between Said’s framework and the reality of the Mediterranean.⁵ Orientalism was not an academic discipline that fed readily into state and economic policy. A natural history for the Muslim world was never produced, in contrast to the many written for the Americas. Additionally, literature and art that evoked the Muslim world were sold alongside that which did not, in contrast to the emergence of Oriental markets in the Enlightenment.

Rather, Bunes Ibarra suggests a ‘preorientalismo,’ that contrasts, for instance, the figure of the Oriental tyrant with a theory of oriental despotism of the 19th century. Developing in the 16th and 17th century before ultimately dying out, ‘pre-orientalismo’ centered on a growing sense of eurocentrism that emphasized differences between Europe and the rest of the world, and where Europe’s past acts as a guarantee of its future success. Europe identified itself through the shared heritage of Rome, as well as its shared religion. The world outside of Europe was understood as a continuation of the Orient as the ancient world described it, marked by cycles of empires rising and falling to other nascent empires.⁶ Despite the frequent contact between both sides of the Mediterranean, stereotypes predominated, forming a series of dichotomies that left no room for simple curiosity: Christian v Muslim, sedentary v. nomad, rural v. urban, Europe v. Asia.⁷

⁵ “El redescubrimiento del islam y de los musulmanes en la Edad Moderna no está movido por ideas románticas de la huida de la sociedad que encorseta al individuo, sino que su aproximación es una consecuencia directa del intento de dominio de este espacio” (Bunes Ibarra, “El orientalismo” 41).

⁶ “A lo largo de los siglos, en especial en el Mundo Oriental, se han ido sucediendo civilizaciones, entes políticos y estructuras de poder que después de unos principios difíciles han logrado dominar, gracias al genio político y militar de uno de sus príncipes, amplias extensiones territoriales, pero que han desaparecido por la aparición en su entorno de una nueva generación de hombres que les someten” (Bunes Ibarra, “La conquista” 91).

⁷ “El hombre del XVI y del XVII no se aproxima a lo diferente con la curiosidad de conocerlo y valorarlo” (Bunes Ibarra, “El orientalismo” 45)

In his framing of “preorientalismo, place is essential. Bunes Ibarra notes that, while Islam was, in general, cast as backwards during the Early Modern period, Spanish authors are more tolerant of some Muslims than others. Place is particularly important within this paradigm, as proximity to Europe seemed to convey civilization. North African Muslims are less cultured than those of Al-Andalus, who maintained classical architecture while making Andalusia more arable.⁸ The Muslims of the Barbary coast were more learned and organized than those that dwelled in mountainous regions, and the desert nomads were the least civilized. Within this hierarchy, the Ottomans were the most salient, and they were seen as the greatest threat in both literary and historical texts.

At the same time, place was also submitted to a negative vision of their inhabitants, and similarities were projected onto lands that the Spanish hoped to conquer.⁹ Urban spaces served as a particular focal point, communicating degrees of culture and civilization.¹⁰ The usurpation of lands that belonged to classical cultures, like the Greek, Romans and Byzantines, prompted anxieties that the vestiges of a glorious past would disappear under Muslim rule and justified plans to reconquer the city. The importance of place is particularly clear in the case of Constantinople, where the Ottomans now raised their inferior buildings.¹¹

⁸ “Al mismo tiempo, los musulmanes del Norte de Africa [*sic*], en comparación con los que vivían en Al-Ándalus, poseen un grado de cultura menor al haber dejado arruinar el legado romano por no cuidar los edificios antiguos, no conservar los recintos amurallados y no transformar sus alfoques en vergeles agrícolas.” (Bunes Ibarra, “El paisaje” 25)

⁹ For instance, “las calles empedradas de Estambul recuerdan a las de Barcelona, los palacios de los sultanes son pequeñas Alhambras” (Bunes Ibarra, “La visión” 66).

¹⁰ “Los pueblos que son capaces de construir urbes, o de presentar las existentes, demuestran su grado de desarrollo político, social e intelectual” (Bunes Ibarra, “El paisaje” 25).

¹¹ “La ciudad, que debía ser una de las maravillas del mundo, ha sido arruinada por los conquistadores y entre sus murallas ahora crece la floresta en medio de los solares y muros .de los arruinados palacios. Ha perdido parte de la nobleza y magnificiencia [*sic*] que la caracterizaba, para ser habitada por hombres que levantan edificios efímeros contruidos con materiales pobres y perecederos. Se contraponen la grandiosidad, belleza y lujo del pasado como las pobres obras del presente, diferenciando la categoría y la calidad de sus pobladores por este extremo” (Bunes Ibarra, “El paisaje” 26).

Drawing particular interest among various Muslim cities, Istanbul deserves special consideration as the confluence between Spain's fear of the Ottomans and fascination with the classical world. For the Spanish, Constantinople is indelibly associated with the Ottomans.¹² The Ottomans emerged from a sort of cultural void, absent in classical sources,¹³ only becoming truly significant for the Spanish when they conquered the city. Constantinople was seen as a second Rome, though its inhabitants were often identified as 'griegos,' which closed the historical gap between the Byzantines and the Ancient Greeks¹⁴ and established Constantinople's proximity to the classical world. Few Spanish chroniclers knew of Constantinople firsthand, unless they were captives. Being on the opposite end of the Mediterranean, Christian Spain depended on other countries for news of the Byzantines, modifying them slightly as they saw fit, but seldom writing an original account.¹⁵

As Spain's interests began to conflict with the Ottomans in the Mediterranean, the city and its conquest garnered more attention. The fall of Constantinople contrasted with the end of the *reconquista*, yet, for Spanish authors, it also echoed the 711 conquest of Spain. Because of these uncomfortable parallels, Spanish authors were driven to explain why Constantinople fell, rather than how. This prompts a negative reading of the Byzantines that attributes the fall of the capital city to their weakness.¹⁶ One such moment of weakness was when the Byzantines failed

¹² "Constantinopla es para ellos la representación del poder y la grandeza de los turcos, además de un símbolo y un lugar deseado" (Bunes Ibarra, "Constantinopla en la literatura" 263).

¹³ "Los turcos son considerados como un nuevo grupo humano, no descrito por las fuentes clásicas, del que interesa más sus formas de vida, calidades morales y civiles, y su técnica militar que su localización en el espacio" (Bunes Ibarra, "La visión" 67).

¹⁴ "Esta consideración, que en principio no posee una importancia excesiva, llena de arcaísmo la descripción de las formas del ejercicio del poder y la organización del Imperio Bizantino" (Bunes Ibarra, "La conquista" 91).

¹⁵ "Su característica más importante es, por lo tanto, la de compilar las crónicas históricas del resto del continente, a las que añaden sus juicios de valor y las opiniones que consideran más acordes para ejemplificar la decadencia del reino cristiano de Oriente" (Bunes Ibarra, "La conquista" 89).

¹⁶ The fall of the city is attributed to "Las disensiones internas en Oriente," as well as "Su falta de celo y su excesivo egoísmo" rather than Ottoman military might (Bunes Ibarra, "La conquista" 92).

to defeat Mohammad early on. Accordingly, the Ottomans were a *flagellum dei* for the schismatic Orthodox, and Constantinople's conquest was secondary to the larger narrative of the expansion of the Muslims in Europe.¹⁷

While the Ottomans were tireless builders, their architecture and urban planning generates comparatively little interest for the Spanish. The implication is that the Ottomans have only occupied and reused it and similar ancient cities, incapable of creating cultural sites.¹⁸ They underscores a perceived contrast between the solid, enduring Roman buildings, and the Ottoman buildings made of cheap, inferior materials. Ottoman architecture paled alongside classical, which, though run down, still inspired awe.

Between turcophobia and turcophilia

As is evident above, previous research on the Ottomans and on Constantinople have divided works on the Ottomans into two primary categories: animosity, where the Ottomans are demonized; and admiration, where they are used as a foil to criticize Spain when it strays from the culturally-dominant model for being.

As we have seen above, Miguel Ángel de Bunes Ibarra often writes on these topics, evidenced in works like “Cristianos y musulmanes ante el espejo en la Edad Moderna los caracteres de hostilidad y de admiración”; “La visión de los musulmanes en el Siglo de Oro: las bases de una hostilidad”; and *La imagen de los musulmanes y del norte de Africa en la España de los Siglos XVI Y XVII: los caracteres de una hostilidad*. Ricardo García Cárcel argues for a “turcofobia hispánica” in his article on “Turkish psychosis” (19). Şener finds a similar pattern in

¹⁷ “La historia bizantina se articula siempre a la islámica, ocupando un papel secundario y de simple marco de referencia” (Bunes Ibarra, “La conquista” 90).

¹⁸ “Los turcos lo único que han hecho ha sido habitarlas, reutilizando todo lo que encontraron cuando las conquistaron. Como son un pueblo sin cultura, y la única que tienen es la de la fuerza de armas, han ido empobreciendo las urbes edificadas por los antiguos” (Bunes Ibarra, *La imagen* 48).

his analysis of Turkish-centered drama, writing “por más que haya algunas piezas excepcionales, las obras turquescas sirven como mecanismos de antítesis que actúan como una especie de balancín, con el turco en un lado y el cristiano en el otro” (5), though acknowledging that “la imagen del Gran Turco no siempre estaba fundada en una dicotomía entre cristianos buenos y turcos malos y que abundaban las excepciones” (273).

Other critics take a more positive view, as does Jessica Boll. Her dissertation on Constantinople demonstrates how “unexpected empathy reaches across cultural, religious and political divides, and the Ottoman capital serves as a literal and figurative bridge between opposing ideologies” (21), where select texts “ultimately reject traditional representations of the so-called ‘Orient’” (11).

Critical framework

While critically useful, categorizing texts about the Ottomans exclusively as more or less tolerant undermines their richness. I suggest that the best way to map out these interpretations is through considering Constantinople as a heterotopia, as well as by studying recurring sites, which act as liminal entries, or hinges, and that help map Constantinople as a space. Heterotopicality is a useful framing mechanism. Lisa Lowe argues for seeing Orientalism as “a tradition of representation that is crossed, intersected, and engaged by other representations” (IX). This offers an alternative to reading Orientalism as “a consistent, univocal discourse that dominates, manages, and produces cultural differences” or as “a totalizing framework that would grant such authority to orientalism, and that would understand all forms of resistance to be contained by that

single determining tradition” (Lowe X).¹⁹ Her framework of heterotopicality helps us to better encompass the importance of Constantinople as a discursive field.

Heterotopia and Heterotopicality

To understand this, we must briefly review Foucault’s sense of heterotopia, “the sense in which discursive terrains are spatial and are composed of a variety of differently inscribed and imagined locations” (Lowe 15). Foucault defines heterotopia in the article, “Of Other Spaces.” Published in 1984 after Foucault’s death, it is based on the lecture notes for a presentation that Foucault gave in 1967. As it was never reviewed by Foucault, it remains ambiguous, and thus we will benefit from surveying how both Foucault and other critics have explained it.

Foucault explains that heterotopias are sites that combine numerous locations, being “capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible” (“Of Other Spaces” 6). Heterotopias change constantly: “a society, as its history unfolds, can make an existing heterotopia function in a very different fashion” (5). Additionally, heterotopias “are most often linked to slices in time-which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time” (“Of Other Spaces” 6).

Useful here is the juxtaposition between physical and literary space. Kelvin Knight argues that heterotopia was intended as a literary concept, referring “not to real places, but rather to fictional representations of those sites, and of their simultaneously mythic and real

¹⁹ Javier Espejo Surós seems to echo this in calling for a new direction for studies on the Ottomans: “Para avanzar en la formulación de una interpretación crítica ambiciosa, habrá que apoyarse, desde sus variados enfoques, en los estudios sobre mentalidades y sistemas de representación,” adding that the field should be broadened to include the “contexto europeo de construcción de identidades nacionales y sus mecanismos propagandísticos y de creación de un estado de opinión” (ii). While by this he means an extension of seeing the Ottomans within the context of “moriscos, moros, corsarios berberiscos, musulmanes en general y turcos,” the same is also true for Spanish society itself, I argue.

dimensions” (147). Foucault viewed these sites as “the repositories of myth and fantasy for a given society at a particular historical moment” (Knight 147). These layers of myths and fantasies make heterotopias a space of contestation which “involves the simultaneous presence of incompatible descriptions of space, to the point where no logical resolution is possible, and they negate each other, completely effacing the possibility of the space that is ostensibly described” (Knight 154).

Heterotopias are subversive. Foucault contrasts heterotopia with utopia (“Of Other Places” 4). Utopias “present society itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down, but in any case these utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces” (“Of Other Places” 3). Peter Johnson clarifies that utopia refers to a “utopian framework or impulse” (84). Mark G. Kelly helpfully observes that, “from a Foucauldian point of view what is important about such utopias is not the thing they aim for, but what practices they actually produce in the here and now” (110). Utopia serves as an end to justify political means (Kelly 109); hegemonic visions for how society *should* be displace alternative views on how society *could* be. Utopias fail because “no vision of an alternative society is ever a complete description, since it is impossible entirely to describe a social totality at all, still less in advance of its existence” (Kelly 110). This dooms utopian ideas to exclude parts of society.

The oppressive quality of utopias derives from their being places that allow for ‘discourse,’ or the organization of knowledge that enables power over a subject (Knight 142).²⁰

Heterotopias prevent discourse by eschewing “any promise, any hope or any primary form of

²⁰ “Unlike utopias, which Foucault asserts ‘permit fables and discourse’, which ‘run with the very grain of language and are part of the fundamental dimension of the fabula’, heterotopias ‘dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences’. They ‘destroy “syntax” in advance’, he says, ‘and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to ‘hold together”’ (Knight 142).

resistance or liberation,” recalling the contestation discussed above (Johnson 84). Heterotopias provide places for particular utopian impulses to overlap without being able to assume supremacy, relating to utopias “but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect” (Lowe 24). Heterotopias thus contest authority (Knight 155) with their heterodox visions of utopia, allowing Kevin Hetherington to read them as “spaces of alternate ordering” that “organize a bit of the social world in a way different to that which surrounds them” (vii). This is particularly apt for our primary sources below, where Constantinople hosts various overlapping heterotopias, which become spaces to resist Ottoman authority, yet also Spanish authority, as authors fantasize about alternatives to their own social order.

Lowe argues for applying heterotopia to Orientalism in order to move beyond the dichotomy of “Europe and the rest.” Heterotopicality escapes the binaries (East/West, Center/Margins, etc.) upon which domination is often inscribed, and that can at times close off readings into the diverse ways that identity is negotiated:

the desire to classify unevenness, incongruity, and non-correspondence in terms of binary models of difference is based on a logic inscribed by discourses of domination, and that to conform to binary difference is inevitably to corroborate the logic of domination, to underdevelop the spaces in discourse that destabilize the hegemony of dominant formations. (Lowe 24)

Instead of the binary opposition of fear/fascination that shaped previous frameworks for the East Mediterranean Orient, heterotopicality advocates “another notion of difference that takes seriously the conditions of heterogeneity, multiplicity, and nonequivalence” (Lowe 24). This allows us to take into account the “articulations and rearticulations [that] emerge from a variety of positions and sites, as well as from other sets of representational relations, including those that figure class, race, nation, gender, and sexuality” (Lowe 15). Heterotopicality affirms that

discourse of the Orient was inevitably and inextricably caught up in other discourses of identity, encompassing “this sense of multiplicity and interpenetration—the continual yet uneven overlappings, intersections, and collusions of discursive articulations” (Lowe 15).

Orientalism

Critics have highlighted a variety of reasons for which Said’s framework does not apply as easily to both the case of Spain and Europe prior to the Enlightenment. In his defense, Edward Said acknowledged in his 2002 introduction to the Spanish translation of *Orientalism*, “España es una notable excepción en el contexto del modelo general europeo cuyas líneas generales se describen en *Orientalismo*” (*Orientalismo* 9), though it is still helpful for us to review his framework as a point of departure.

Above all, critics have noted the imbalance of power, in which Constantinople stood out as a superior (or even later on, equal) to Spain in every sense. This contrasts with the military superiority that allowed European nations to project imperial might across the Muslim world in Africa and Asia. Kim M. Phillips notes as much: “Europeans were conscious of the much greater military might, economic force, and social organization found in various eastern contexts. Even when writing of places with simpler and poorer societies, such as parts of southeast Asia, it was not with a colonial or imperial eye” (59), and Suzanne Conklin Akbari reiterates this (9). Phillips argues that Said is limited by “a very narrow and one-dimensional view of modern views on Asia,” which overlooks positive as well as nuanced portrayals of Asia in both contemporary as well as pre-Enlightenment scholarship. Additionally, the Iberian Peninsula resists Said’s division of Orient and Occident, which Akbari calls “particularly troubling to the medievalist” (12). Barbara Fuchs adds that, even during Early Modernity, Spain was Orientalized by the rest of Europe at the same time that “Spain’s hybridity makes Moorishness a habitual presence in

Iberian culture, so that Andalusí elements are intimately known and experienced” (*Exotic Nations* 3).

Since Bunes Ibarra’s argued that Orientalism does not exist as an academic discipline to Early Modernity, scholars in the US have sought ways to adapt Said’s framework to the Medieval and Early Modern eras by focusing on it as a ‘style of thought.’ In *Idols in the East* (2009), Suzanne Akbari Conklin considers Orientalism as a ‘style of thought’ rather than an academic discipline (6). For the sake of our study, we will add to this ‘style of thought’ a particularly useful concept that we will adapt from Said: ‘positional superiority,’ defined as a strategy “which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (7). While not the only mode that we shall see at play in our analysis, it is nonetheless the more common, as Spain tries to assert primacy over the East Mediterranean Orient.

Akbari draws a distinction between the near—“near and familiar,” where Europe defined itself as much as the Other—and far Orient, “in which fantasies of the Islamic East serve as much to define the self as to define the other” (10). The Islamic East depended on two separate yet interdependent discourses: one of “bodily, ethnic Oriental difference,” based on the geographic impact of the four corporeal humors, and one of “the discourse of Islamic religious difference” (Akbari 11-12). With the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, however, these discourses began to merge, as a preoccupation with recovering Jerusalem gave way to a fear of, and defense against, the expanding Ottoman Empire. In the rise of an Early Modern Orientalism, ‘Saracen’ (evoking both religious and bodily difference) was replaced by the terms ‘Turk’ and ‘Moor,’ which focused exclusively on bodily difference (Akbari 19). This changes in terms reflects a diversification, where one all-encompassing term gave way to various ones that

reflected a difference between how Europe viewed its relationship with North Africa and with the Ottomans (Akbari 19), as we saw in our opening anecdote. For this reason, I have opted to speak of an East Mediterranean Orient—leaving open contrasts with an Indian Ocean Orient, a North African Orient, and so forth.

Also considering the climate and its effect on humors in “a quadripartite cosmology” (19), Kim M. Phillips’ *Before Orientalism* (2013) focuses on Asia beyond the Islamic Orient, focusing on diverse topics like food, femininity and civility. She argues that, after the Mongol conquests of the 13th century, the Medieval European view of Asia was not homogenous as Said argues, but rather encompassed a broad range of perspectives that “ranged from the pragmatic through the stigmatizing to the wondering and in some instances awestruck” (Phillips 199). Here, positive views mattered as much as the negative ones, which were often derived from Greco-Roman sources and correspond to the 18th century and beyond where, “stereotyping, homogenizing, and demonizing became regular” (Phillips 26). Phillips argues, above all, that such portrayals were “never inevitable” (26). Both studies are useful in recognizing that post-Renaissance Enlightenment (especially as Said conceives of it) had already closed off a wealth of visions of the Orient that we can recover with a more flexible framework. Additionally, we can see how space begins to link to discourse, creating an inviting heterotopia for authors.

Marcus Keller and Javier Irigoyen-García’s *The Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe* (2017) suggest a framework for Early Modern Orientalism that shares with Said’s “the premise that it is essentially Eurocentric and therefore conditioned by a unidirectional perspective, looking from the West to the East and from a center to the periphery” (6). They adopt “an interdisciplinary and transnational approach to show parallels between Orientalist traditions in several European vernaculars while also revealing particularities of each of those

traditions” (Irigoyen-García & Keller 7). Applying Hegel’s framework, they espouse analyzing contradictions that are composed of thesis and antithesis to ultimately yield a synthesis. For instance, a text’s dichotomy of Orient and Occident offers insight into how it imagines Europe. This uncovers the ‘openness’ of Early Modern Orientalism, as well as the instability and fluidity of categories like East and West, showing how Orientalism shapes other subjects that seem unrelated.²¹

This helps clarify the implications for my analysis in the following chapters, which includes themes that preoccupied the Spanish at home as well as when imagining Constantinople, such as enclosing women and Muslim architecture. Their approach proves to be useful, and my analysis at times echoes theirs, mining portrayals of Constantinople to understand how Spanish authors saw their society reflected in it. However, I argue that this does not completely accommodate other uses of the Orient. At times, as we shall see, Constantinople provided a place of alternative visions of Spain that undermine the hegemonic ones.

Towards a new understanding of Orientalism

Heterotopicality as a frame work better encompasses the range of contradicting instrumentality with which Spanish authors used Constantinople. Some readings were, on the one hand, dominant visions of the city that upheld Spanish superiority. Others, though, used the Oriental space as a shelter for more radical ideas that destabilized the culturally hegemonic version of Spain. Constantinople thus offers a space to both manifest a hegemonic Spain, as well as also a counter-hegemonic one.

²¹ “Rather than reading representations of the East as the allegorical treatment of another, entirely different problem—the question of justice for instance—the case studies demonstrate that the treatment of such a question cannot be separated from the reflection about the East and the West, and that all three are affected by virtue of playing a part in the dialectical process that is early modern Orientalism” (Irigoyen-García & Keller 6).

As my exploration here seeks to make evident, understanding Constantinople through heterotopias reveals the complexity of the role that the East Mediterranean Orient served in the Spanish imagination. As we have seen, heterotopias allow the overlap of distinct incompatible spaces, like the Orient and Spain. This is clear in the case of Constantinople, whose historical and social complexity presented endless challenges to the authors who sought to represent it. To epistemologically encompass the city, authors thus depended on metaphor, comparing the city to others like Troy or Samarqand, as well as through metonymy, using familiar topoi, such as the harem, or the bagnios.

Our heterotopias, at times, present a vision of Spain that reinforces the dominant utopia, even surpassing it in perfection, and, at other times, presents other visions that undermine the official version of Spain. Heterotopias act disruptively in two ways: destabilizing the concept of Space (and the ways that predominant thinking prescribes its use) and establishing a new sort of utopia outside of the hegemonic one, rivaling it.²² Even at their most orthodox, these utopian visions of Spain collapse the necessary difference between Spain and its East Mediterranean Other,²³ which, even when cast as a colonizable space, threatens to surpass Spain in its Spanishness, reminiscent of the American colonies that Foucault includes in his list of

²² Foucault writes: “The last trait of heterotopias is that they have a function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles. Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory (perhaps that is the role that was played by those famous brothels of which we are now deprived). Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled” (“Of Other Spaces” 8). A scholar of Foucault will likely note that here, as well as elsewhere, my framing and application of Foucault’s term is at times selective. In the quote above, for instance, I do not defend how heterotopias relate to ‘all’ space. I justify this for two reasons. First, I am using heterotopicality here as an analytical tool, which, if imperfect, remains what I have found the most useful, even if this usage breaks down. Second, as mentioned above, Foucault did not have the opportunity to finalize his work on ‘heterotopia,’ and perhaps might have refined it further.

²³ This runs the risk of Christina Lee’s ‘anxiety of sameness,’ “a cultural phenomenon that stems from the insecurity and distress generated when boundaries that differentiated and separated the dominant and the marginal of society could be breached, diminished, or even forgotten, sometimes to the point of changing the very identity and meaning of belonging to the dominant group” (4).

heterotopias. Other, less orthodox visions of Spain present stable alternatives to the dominant vision of Spain, undermining its exclusivity.

Constantinople thus acts as a shifting mirror of Spain,²⁴ as well as the “the greatest reserve of the imagination” (“Of Other Spaces” 9) as authors continuously develop new versions of Spain. These topoi offer means of collapsing the border between Spain and Constantinople, acting as hinges between them where the familiar and unfamiliar mix. They act as liminal entry points where different visions of Spain, whether hegemonic or otherwise, can exist. These shifting visions reflect how heterotopias also change constantly to meet society’s needs, for instance, the Harem can reflect anxieties over women, yet also their liberation.

Additionally, heterotopias allow for the overlap of times, blurring of history, the present, and the future, where the past can foretell Spanish victory. Constantinople is itself a palimpsest of Byzantine and Ottoman culture (underscoring the surprising continuity between how both Empires were understood), a mix of the ancient and the contemporary. Itself a heterotopia containing heterotopias, Constantinople allows Spanish authors to find parallels between Spain and its place in Europe. Whether rooted in the Book of Genesis, the Trojan War or the myth of the Visigoth King Rodrigo, these foundational points allow for a re-creation of Spain, as well as a re-writing of its future.

Part 1: Constantinople as Heterotopia

²⁴ This mirroring role is crucial: “I believe that between utopias and these quite other sites, these heterotopias, there might be a sort of mixed, joint experience, which would be the mirror. The mirror is, after all, a utopia, since it is a placeless place. In the mirror, I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent: such is the utopia of the mirror” (“Of Other Spaces” 24).

We will first consider how Constantinople acts as a heterotopia through metaphor, where Spanish authors project other, ancient cities onto it in order to interrogate discourses of nation and empire, juxtaposing different times and places. These ‘sister cities’ provide a means for authors to propose different models that create diverse visions of Spain in an ever-changing positional superiority over the East Mediterranean Orient. These multifaceted models overlap, and even contradict, as we shall see in the case of our final text, which directs these mechanisms back against Spain in a critical reading.

Our chapters explore two different aspects of Constantinople’s deployment as a heterotopia, each concerning the threat of the Central Asian conquerors, including mainly the Ottomans, but also the Timurids, in a similar discourse. They work, rather broadly, on two contradictory assumptions about the origins of the peoples who threatened Christian Constantinople and Europe: either they came from some place, or they did not. Michael Heath recognizes a similar dichotomy, arguing that, for Renaissance scholars, “the Scythians gradually replaced the Trojans as the supposed forebears of those modern barbarians, the Turks” (454). This is not precisely the case in our texts: later Spanish texts seem to depend on a prior understanding that the Ottomans descended from the Trojans in order to later challenge this view and assert that all classical heritage belonged to Spain. Additionally, our works do not dwell at length on the Scythians as possible ancestors. However, we do find a theme of nomadism that encompasses both the Scythians,²⁵ as well as the Timurids and Ottomans, as I explore in the second chapter.

²⁵ We see this in Vasco Diaz Tanco’s *Palinodia, de la nephanda y fiera nación de los Turcos* (1547). The Scythians were a violent, disordered people: “eran tan acostumbrados a rebueltas entresi: ytan escanda losos [*sic*]: que jamas obedescieron capitan y ni tovieron governador ni reconocieron especial señor que los toviessi en justicia y les governasse” (27). After being converted to Islam, the Scythians leave their inhospitable land, “E ansi saliendo gran gente dellos desus casas y tierra que ya tenian por propria y natural: llegaron al gran reyno de natholia onde discurriendo” (28). The Scythians are framed as being out of the appropriate place, while also being unable to make their own lands hospitable and civilized.

These two facets also cover opposing views of cities: first, Troy as the fallen city, and secondly, Lavinium and Enoch as the founded cities. This establishes both Spain's place in Europe and its sense of self and history, while doing the same for the East Mediterranean Orient (both Byzantine and Ottoman) in Europe.

Chapter 1: Heterotopia of the Fallen City

In Romance 585, entitled “De cómo el rey Don Rodrigo se enamoró de viendola lavar sus cabellos á la vera de una fuente,” Rodrigo ends the poem with a plaint:

“¡Ay Dios, quién fuese Troya,
O París de tal Elena,
Aunque en España no quedase joya
Qu’el fuego no abrasase como á Troy” (401)

This illustrates that, just as Spain saw parallels between itself and Constantinople (as we shall see later), Spain also saw itself and Constantinople reflected in Troy. We shall start by considering how Troy acts as a heterotopia configuring the basis for Spain’s understanding of the Ottoman Orient, while also providing space for rival visions of Spain.

My first chapter looks at how Spanish authors superimpose Troy onto Constantinople, casting the imperial capital as a heterotopia in which they can explore discourses on issues such as classical heritage, the Orient, and learnedness. In contrast to our next chapter, where Troy presents a means to criticize the West, we begin by considering how Troy was used as a flexible symbol that continually worked to help Iberian authors interpret the Ottoman Empire within discourses that maintained Spanish superiority. Troy served as an archetypal fallen city, open to pillage and possession (prizes which do not always take physical form, but at times more abstract ones, such historical legacy), that melds readily with Ottoman Constantinople. It offers a means to legitimacy, serving as the fodder for justifying projects of empire.

Troy’s connection to Constantinople was due, in part, to its geographic proximity—present-day Çanakkale is located in the mouth of the Marmara Sea, assuring that all sea-faring travelers to Constantinople passed what Europeans reckoned were the city’s ruins. Yet this proximity was also increasingly cultural, as the Europeans understood the Ottomans to be long-

lost descendants of the Trojans. This also had far reaching effects on how the Greek capital was understood during its decline and aftermath.

Thesis

The first way in which Constantinople acts as a heterotopia is in its overlap with Troy, as Spanish authors project the ancient city onto Constantinople. While we see Troy employed here for mostly Orientalist ends that uphold Spanish superiority, the nature of that superiority changes dramatically, as Constantinople is overlaid with the different discourses that draw on Troy across various texts. This allows authors to interrogate many issues, such as architecture, classical intellectual materials, and imperialism.

For instance, Spanish authors superimpose the Trojan War onto Europe's present conflicts with the Ottomans, presenting a vision of a Spain that can defeat a stronger, larger Ottoman Empire and that the latter can indeed be defeated as in our first two texts, *Andanzas y viajes* (1454) and *Tirant lo Blanc* (1511). At the same time, Troy is used to justify missions to possess the Orient, playing part in a discourse that seeks to extend the reconquest to Constantinople.

In later texts, the discourse evolves as Troy grows to represent the classical stakes in the conflict between the Occident and Orient, where antiquity at once promised imperial greatness even as it threatened to decay or disappear completely under Ottoman rule. Here, Troy contributes to a discourse on classical learning and Humanism, where Europe asserts exclusive possession of the classical past as its heritage. In *Viaje de Turquía* (1557), Troy symbolizes how the subjects of Constantinople neglect the ancient past, where we find a vision of an intellectually superior Spain. *Santa Liga* (1621), written decades after the Battle of Lepanto,

reflects a more confident approach that undermines the association between the Ottomans and Troy, presenting a vision of Spain as sole rightful heir to the whole of classical heritage.

To conclude, I explore two aspects of pre-Enlightenment Orientalism that the flexibility of a framework of heterotopia allows us to see: Spain's increasing investment into the classical world as part of its identity via Humanism paralleled a growing complication of Orientalism that lead to richer forms of maintaining Spain's positional superiority over the Orient. I then highlight some of the differences and similarities between how classicism informed Orientalism in Spain and in Italy, and return to Said's framework.

Troy in Europe

In addition to its geographic proximity to the Ottoman Capital, Troy has a persistent association with the Ottomans that originate in Ancient times within broader Europe. Harper notes that in Ancient Rome "easternness was a defining factor in the depiction of the Trojans, and Roman artists often showed them wearing the Phrygian cap, a generic signifier of "the Orient" (154). This is perhaps due to the overlaps in geography¹ and names², as Spencer suggests. Harper notes that, according to the 7th-century pseudo-Jerome "the Turks were descended from an eponymous Trojan named Torquatus. Having fled their destroyed city, they took refuge in the Asian interior, where they lived in obscurity for millennia, finally reemerging to take back what was rightfully theirs" (156)³. Harper observes that in the 1300's, the Trojans are increasingly given Turkish garb as Europe becomes more concerned about the Ottomans

¹ "First, the Trojans had been a powerful nation in Asia Minor; and the Turks had been ruling in that part of the world for a long time" (Harper 331).

² "Furthermore, the name for the Trojans which had been made widely familiar by Virgil (although not found in Homer) was Teuceri; to associate this with Turci (Latin) or Turchi (Italian) was easy" (Harper 331).

³ Thomas J. Macmaster observes it even earlier in the Merovingian Chronicle of Fredegar (660) where the Turks are depicted as an additional descendant of the Trojans, alongside the Franks, Latins, and Macedonians. Macmaster suggests that The Franks, alongside the Britons and Swedes, needed migratory myths to better align themselves with both the Biblical Israelites and ancient Romans, which they found in the myth of Troy.

(170) and reaches a climax⁴ in the 15th century before declining in the 16th century. The fall of Constantinople thus became a “vengeance for the calamities of Ilion” (Spencer 331), which we see reflected in Tafur’s account.

Spencer also cites illuminations from the *Crónica Troyana* (1490) as the earliest example, noting the Morisco’s garb and mudéjar design of the buildings in Troy (158). While Spencer takes this to represent “the dual assumption that the Turks should share appearance, costume, and architectural style with both their putative ancestors and their Iberian co-religionists” (158), Rodríguez Porto notes several Moorish features, including the *juego de bohordos* (19) and horseshoe-arch entries for the city walls.

Troy in Spain

As Troy proves an axis around which different discourses on classical culture are organized, it is beneficial to understand how Troy was understood as Oriental in Medieval and Early Modern Spain. By analyzing chronicles and accounts of Troy, we see that it symbolizes conflict between Asia and Europe, serving as a doorway into the Orient. As a paragon of cities, Troy is a symbol of wealth, learning and luxury, coming to represent the classical world. This establishes Asia as a place of riches and cultural achievement, much as was Constantinople, both under Byzantine and Ottoman rule. This encourages a discourse of possession that parallels the imperial aims with which Spanish authors often discuss Constantinople.

Troy is first an Oriental city. Alfonso X’s *General Estoria* reflects Troy’s liminality between Europe and Asia. After Troy is sacked and its royal family killed by the Greeks over an affront to their honor by the Trojan King Laomedon, Priam returns and rebuilds the city, drawing

⁴ “The visual imagery of the fifteenth century, a period that saw the apex and subsequently the partial suppression of a trend among European artists to dress the ancient Trojans in the costume of contemporary Ottoman Turks” (Harper 151).

on both East and West: “E fizo luego mayores e mas altos e mejores los muros de Troya. E enbio luego otrosi por Asia e por Europa buscar maestros muchos que sopiesen labrar de fuste e de piedra” (112).

The *Crónica troyana*—a 1350 translation of the French *Roman de Troie* commissioned by Alfonso XI and finished by his son Pedro I 1155-1160—by Nicolás González also elaborates on how Troy is a meeting point between Europe and Asia. When debating the manner of vengeance to take against the Greeks, Ector identifies himself as Asian (“Pero nos somos de asya esto sey eu moy ben” (González 124)) in contrast with the European Greeks, who are better warriors and better united: “Demays sabemos ben que son moy fortes gentes et moy esforçados et an toda aterra de eyropa que ten aterça parte do mundo. Et dizeruos ey por qual rrazon. elles [sic] son señores da hũa parte. Et todos los outros que moran ãna outra parte uerran ãna sua ajuda et en esta gisa an toda europa” (González 123). After reiterating that “os de europa son amellor cauallaria do mundo nen que mayns saben de gerra,” the Trojan prince concedes that the Greeks “an senorio en asya” (González 123-24).

This association continues in other texts. In the *General Estoria*, Achilles identifies himself as a European, lamenting the “Gran mal e ontra era para ser toda Greçia e toda Europa ayuntados alli por vna muger” (144). The *Historia Troyana Polimétrica* (a 14th-century Castilian translation of the *Roman de Troie*) similarly divides Asia and Europe, explaining that “Elena en toda tierra de Europa nunca podieron fallar par de fermosura; e Poliçena otrosí nunca le podieron dar par en toda tierra de Asia fasta que viono y Elena” (215). Troy thus occupies a role reminiscent of Constantinople, as a point of connection between East and West. Long before the Ottomans emerged as a threat in Spanish consciousness, Troy was already established as a

paradigm for the Ottomans—this made it a natural choice when, later on, Spanish authors tried to make sense of the Ottomans.

Troy is also established as an object of marvel. Troy’s urban and architectural wonders place it on the level of contemporary cities like Constantinople, Rome or Samarqand: “Et quea faria tan forte que non temeria anehūa cousa nen orgullo de ueziño nen de eemjgo que ouesse nen dos gregos” (*Crónica troyana* 108). González describes the city in hyperbolic terms, “Et eu acho ēnos antecessores que esta foý amaýor çidade nen maýs rrica nen maýs saborosa nen maýs uiçosa nen mellor de todaslas outras que ēno mundo foron” (109).⁵

In particular, Troy itself is an architectural achievement, underscoring its status as a site of learning and wealth. The Galician chronicle expands on the importance of Troy’s walls. They show Priam’s learnedness, as “elReý metia todo seu saber cōmo ofaria mellor” (109). Moreover, the author marvels at their size, “omuro moýto ancho feýto de pedra marmor. Et era tan alto quanto hun arco poderia deýtar assaeta. et fezolle moýtas grandes torres enderredor.” Their wealth also points to Priam’s erudition: “Et quanta pedra ý auja fo ý marmol et uermella et negra et cardea et uis et india. Et destas pedras ataes mandou el Rey pōer en seu muro et outras moýtas de estrayas colores” (109). As we shall see, Troy’s architectural legacy persists in its ruins that fascinated travelers and authors alike.

These themes of Orientalism and architecture come together in the description spanning several chapters of Hector’s luxurious bed chamber, found in the incomplete *Historia Polimétrica* (as well as the *Crónica Troyana*). The *Historia Troyana Polimétrica* explains that the chamber boasts four pillars, the first of which offers a magical mirror: “qualquier que entrase en la cámara, tanto que catase contra el espejo, luego veríe toda quanta desapostura en el su

⁵ He returns to this theme at the end of description: “tal çidade non foý ante nen depoýs cōmo aquela,” and “Pero finalmente uos digo que nunca home ueu tal vila nen oýo falar de tan boa” (González 111)

cuerpo oviese, quier en vestir, quier en catar, quier en andar” (216). A second pillar has an enchanted woman who moves constantly. This gives way to a scene with “por muy gran encantamiento muchas bestias de muchas guisas, las unas a semejanças de leones, las otras semejavan toros, las otras grifos” (217). The ensuing list of marvelous creatures lasts nearly a page, and emphasizes Troy’s position between the human and known, and the unknown and monstrous—in sum, between Europe and the Orient.

Erudition and paganism also emerge as a theme here. This establishes Troy as a site of ancient knowledge, on the one hand, alongside sites like Athens. Alternatively, this suggests Troy (and its descendants, the Ottoman Turks) as a rival to Greek and Christian knowledge. The third pillar produces the world’s most beautiful music, while the fourth evokes paganism as “un ídolo... que era todo fecho de oro muy fermoso a gan [*sic*] maravilla, e tenía en la cabeça una corona de oro muy apuesta con muchas piedras preçiosas” (Larrea Velasco 220). The idol answers every question, “bien como fazían los otros ídolos de los tenplos en que yazían los diablos ençerrados,” drawing on the theme of demonic magic and knowledge. This view of Troy as a cultured city also offers to cast the Ottomans not as barbarians (as we shall see is a rival trend in our next chapter, and which was common in the rest of Europe), but rather as rivals for classical heritage with their own epistemologies; such an attitude would have been easier as Spain reflected on the intellectual of its Muslim past while contending with the Ottomans.

It is easy to see a reflection of this Troy in Constantinople at the Byzantine height as a commercial and cultural power in the Mediterranean, as well as the later seat of Ottoman power. This view of Troy was destined to give way to rivalry, however, as humanism’s spread in Europe complicated the intersection between the Orient and the classical world, and raised the stakes of

who could claim access to the classical past.⁶ Moreover, the Habsburg's increasingly identified themselves with Aeneas. This is particularly so during the reign of Carlos V (1500-1558) who, in his claim to be universal emperor, brought to bear extensive artistic propaganda that aligned him with the Trojan prince, as Mary Tanner details⁷. However, aspects of the medieval tropes persist, as we see in Juan Luis Vives's 1526 treatise *Sobre las disensiones de Europa y la Guerra contra los Turcos*. The humanist intellectual cites "aquella guerra famosísima de los griegos con Príamo," (57) as proof that "[n]unca el Asia se derramó sobre la Europa, sin que fuese expulsada con algún desastre histórico" (56). This conflates the Greek/Troy dichotomy with that of Europe/Asia, as we've seen above. Moreover, there is a desire (or envy, recalling our previous chapter for "las opulencias del Asia, fabulosas, increíbles" (Vives 55). This is accompanied in the lines above by praise of Athen's Asian colonies, "ciudades insignes, las primeras de Asia sin duda, bien por su densa población, bien por su riqueza y su pujanza" (Vives 57)⁸. Undergirding this desire to occupy Asia, Vives asserts the colonies were the greatest cities in Asia, implying that Europeans are better exploiters of Asian wealth. We shall see this theme return in our analysis of *Tirant lo Blanc*.

Published in 1547, Vasco Diaz Tanco's *Libro intitulado palinodia de la nephanda y fiera nación de los Turcos* recognizes that some historians claim that the Ottomans "proceden de Troylo hijo del rey Priamo de Troya y hermano de Hector y de Paris, y ansi se tienen por verdaderos troyanos" (27). Others attribute their lineage to the less civilized Scythians, evoking a

⁶ Nancy Bisaha describes the shift as "the rise of new intellectual currents in the early Renaissance, namely a return to classical texts, rhetoric, and ideas," and argues that, as a result, "humanists revolutionized Western views of Islam, transforming an old enemy of the faith into a political and cultural threat to their growing sense of 'Europe'" (5).

⁷ *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (1993).

⁸ Marcia Colish echoes this, concluding, "Perhaps the most striking feature of Vives on the Turks is his recognition that European Christendom, in his day, had moved into the colonial phase of its history, and that he can capitalize on this fact" (8).

discourse of nomadism, urban space, and civilization that we will explore in our next chapter. This Trojan genealogy is accompanied by Ottoman claims to empire, as Tanco observes that Solimano “dize que le toca de razon el ymperio de Roma por ser succedor como el dize que es de la real sangre de los troyanos los quales señorearon los reynos de poniente y” (149). Spanish authors were conscious that their claims to Rome’s legacy were rivaled by the Ottomans, prompting anxiety. This wasn’t confined solely to Christians: Troy as a motif of non-Europeaness extended into the Americas,⁹ and was also appropriated by Moors as a means of resistance.¹⁰ As we explore below, authors dealt with anxiety over classical heritage through a variety of overlapping discourses and visions of Spain that were projected onto Constantinople as a heterotopia, shoring up their claims to the classical past as we see in the following texts.

Architecture and the Religious Other

A vital part of Spain’s view of the East Mediterranean Orient and its classical legacy centers on buildings and their remains. In our next chapter, we will explore this, as well as the part it plays

⁹ These associations crossed into the new world as well, as Jean-Pierre Tardieu notes, quoting an account by Miguel Acosta Saignes: “Los «negros del Mariscal Castellanos» en la Guajira resistieron más, según parece. Denunciados los excesos que cometían desde 1562, duraron hasta 1586, año en que el gobernador de Venezuela, Luis de Rojas, mandó para aniquilarlos a una tropa de cincuenta hombres, capitaneados por Juan Esteban: «...halló doblados y hecho un pueblo muy fuerte, cercado todo de maderos muy gruesos y en ella siete fuertes desde donde pelearon, a la cual población y fuertes, los soldados pusieron ‘la nueva Troya’»” (17).

¹⁰ This is particularly evident in Francisco Ynduráin’s investigation of a Morisco performance of Francisco de Arellano’s *Destrucción de Troya* to celebrate the Ottoman conquest of La Galeota in Tunis 1574. The resulting Inquisitorial proceedings “se a bisto largamente por aber echo una comedia de la destrucción de Troya en la qual contenía ciertas palabras las quales ban señaladas en el mesmo acto de la presentación que ba con esto” (162-63). This was accompanied by dragging a straw effigy of Juan de Austria in Almonazid. This recalls the play where a large part of the action centers on the recovery of Hector’s body after Achilles drags the slain Hector’s body around Troy several times and refuses to return it to the Trojans for a proper burial.

Although Ynduráin does not draw the connection, the play was likely selected also since it recalls the unfortunate fate of Marco Antonio Bragadin (1523-1571), the Venetian officer who was flayed alive and, after his skin was stuffed with straw, paraded through the streets of Famagosta after the fall of Cyprus in 1571. Priam’s declaration that “no es justo ser mal tratado, / sino ser su cuerpo onrado / sin dudar” (58) would have given a sense of vindication for the oppressed Moriscos. This is especially the case if they saw themselves as allied with descendants of the Trojans who are now avenged and victorious under the Ottoman banner.

in the architectural facet of urban landscapes, in places like Constantinople; here, we will consider how Spain's view of its own architectural past shaped its perspective on ancient ruins. Antonio Urquizar-Herrera's book *Admiration and Awe* (2017) demonstrates how crucial architecture was to establishing Spanish collective identity. For instance, the critic relates that one version of the account of the last Visigoth king, Rodrigo,—Spain's founding myth—involved Rodrigo entering a forbidden tower which held no treasure, but rather his doom. Spain's original buildings were thought to be destroyed as a result the subsequent conquest: "Roderick's punishment acquired a symbolic architectural projection in the historiographical narratives of the destruction of Visigothic Christian cities and buildings by the incoming Muslims" (Urquizar-Herrera 30). This theme of architectural devastation "was endlessly repeated in later treatises on the subject" (Urquizar-Herrera 33).

Of course, despite this image of architectural destruction, post-Reconquest Spanish cities were often defined by a *mudéjar* architectural legacy: "In some Spanish cities, the Islamic royal palaces and the massive main or Aljama mosques with their towering minarets were the most prominent monumental structures in the urban landscape" (Urquizar-Herrera 7). This underscores the contradictory tensions with which Muslim architecture was viewed as admirable, on the one hand, yet also as a symbol of a menace to Christendom.

During the Middle Ages, architectural admiration for the religious Other was dealt with by casting such buildings as "architectural wonders and exotic trophies" (Urquizar-Herrera 8). Later, as Spain began to position itself as both exclusively European and culturally superior, its intellectuals sought to undermine Muslim architectural contributions, such that "early modern local and national histories expressly aimed to turn medieval Islamic architecture into ancient remains imbued with stories about the Roman and Christian origins of Spain" (Urquizar-Herrera

19). This helped to create a “genealogical link [that] demonstrated the temporary nature of the Muslim presence, and guaranteed the religious purity of the space with the return of the Christian order” (152). Muslim architecture was thus reduced to a palimpsest, something that was built on top of a Western foundation.

The critic observes a similar tension between admiration and anxiety in Ottoman Constantinople’s architecture. On the one hand, “descriptions of the powerful Turkish Empire highlighted its magnificent buildings and exotic customs” (Urquizar-Herrera 72). At the same time, however, Ottoman Constantinople also evoked a parallel revulsion as focus shifted from the physical city (*urbs*) to the social city (*civitas*). As “an urban metaphor for the loss of order and classic regulation that had once characterized the Roman Empire” (115), it was “the quintessence of political and moral chaos” (115). This was contrary to reality, where “[t]he reaction of the Ottomans to the sacred monuments of Christendom they inherited was competition, not destruction, as exemplified by Mehmed II’s construction of his own mosque in Istanbul to vie with the Orthodox Christian basilica of Hagia Sophia” (Finkel 149).

We shall see how treatment of classical architecture points to treatment of classical intellectual heritage in our last two texts.

Andanzas y viajes de un caballero español (1454)

Historical context

The first text that we will consider in analyzing how Troy and Constantinople work together as a heterotopia is a travel account written by the Castilian knight Pero Tafur. He relates his voyages through the Mediterranean and Northern Europe (1436-1439) prior to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, although it was written, or at least revised, after the fall of the city; it was edited for the first time in 1874.

Pero Tafur (1410-1484) was born in Córdoba. According to Vasiliev, he probably fought under Luís de Guzmán on the frontier of Jaén around 1431, before departing on his voyage in 1435 (“Pero Tafur” 78). Leaving from Venice, Tafur embarks on four different voyages: first to Rome; then through the Eastern Mediterranean including the Levant, Egypt, and the Byzantine empire under John VIII Palaiologos; third, through Central Europe, including Poland, the German Empire, and Northern Italy; and, lastly, the return voyage through the Adriatic and Mediterranean sea (Martínez García 266). After returning in 1439, he married Doña Juana de Horozco and had a son and three daughters, eventually attaining the role of alderman of Córdoba before his death in 1484 (Vasiliev, “Pero Tafur” 78).

Historically, the text is particularly important for its portrayal of Constantinople in the eve of its fall and was written shortly afterwards. This event resonates profoundly throughout Europe. Molina Molina observes that “[e]n realidad, pocas metrópolis han desarrollado una imagen más prestigiosa y controvertida que Constantinopla. Como heredera de la Roma imperial, fue objeto de una reverencia equivalente durante mucho tiempo” (“Viaje de Pero Tafur” 90), and its fall had a profound impact on Castilian humanist contemporaries of Tafur.¹¹ The text is also crucial thanks to Tafur’s insight on the Council of Florence in 1438, where Byzantine Ambassadors met with Pope Eugene IV to bridge the Great Schism, without result.

¹¹ Tafur “con muchas probabilidades, hubo de tener trato con el secretario pontificio Poggio Bracciolini, que de 1434 a 1443 sigue a Eugenio IV y al concilio. Allí hubo de encontrarse también con su muy conocido y familiar cordobés Nuño de Guzmán, que volvería a España unos meses después que él. Y por supuesto, hubo de encontrarse con otros humanistas españoles, como Alonso de Cartagena y su familiar Fernando de la Torre, o Juan de Cervantes y su criado Juan Rodríguez del Padrón. La espléndida Florencia de hacia 1439-1440 fue una magnífica encrucijada literaria, donde curiosamente se cruzaron las inquietudes humanísticas de un notable grupo de escritores españoles” (Pérez Priego, “Encuentro del Viajero” 141).

Tafur explicitly references *Embajada a Tamorlán*, and likely read it,¹² though, as Molina notes¹³, his reasons for travel were more personal than Clavijo's. Legassie observes that, during Tafur's time, nobles in Castile were wrestling with questions of identity.¹⁴ This would especially be the case for Tafur, who "belonged to the upper level of the growing and influential merchant class, with its claim to be part of the lesser nobility" (Lebargé 239).

This reflects the rise of urban culture during Tafur's lifetime, as both Seville and Córdoba experience commercial booms. Villalba Ruiz notes that Tafur is conscious of the end of the Reconquista's chivalric era,¹⁵ which, while 40 years from ending, must have been a surety in Tafur's mind. This permeates through the text, as Tafur mentions the Crusades in the Levant and in Iberia, while, as we shall see, laying the epistemological groundwork to extend a discourse of Reconquest into Constantinople.

Previous criticism

Castro Hernández provides a thorough review of secondary literature, dividing it into three categories: "la figura de Pero Tafur y la elaboración de su escrito; las intenciones y motivos de viaje (las aventuras caballerescas, relaciones comerciales y encuentros intelectuales); y el relato de viajes, el mundo contemplado y los mirabilia" ("Un estado de la cuestión" 27-28). My

¹²"La Embajada a Tamorlán de Ruy González de Clavijo, proporciona a Tafur un planteamiento totalmente distinto, más enfocado hacia la descripción de las tierras y pueblos visitados, haciendo especial hincapié en sus tradiciones y forma de organización" (Villalba Ruiz de Toledo, "El viaje de Don Pero Tafur" 538).

¹³"A diferencia de otros textos conocidos como el itinerario de Münzer o la Embajada a Tamorlán de González Clavijo, este viaje no tiene ninguna intención política o diplomática. El motivo del mismo tampoco es la peregrinación" (Molina Molina, "Viaje de Pero Tafur" 856).

¹⁴"Historians have traced these developments back to the Jewish pogroms that convulsed the peninsula in 1391. The century that followed this calamity witnessed the Castilian nobility's fraught attempt to define themselves as a group. The number of families claiming noble ancestry increased dramatically; textual theorizations of what it meant to be noble proliferated; texts related to heraldry and family history were produced in ever greater numbers; and controversies raged over the conferral of noble status on conversos, Jewish converts to Christianity" (Legassie 221).

¹⁵"Todos los valores encerrados en un código de la caballería que se ha ido nutriendo de valores y principios a través de los siglos, están dando paso a una visión más eficiente de las relaciones sociales y políticas" (Villalba Ruiz de Toledo, "El viaje de Pero Tafur" 548).

analysis fits best into the last category, as Tafur's contemplation of the world is fed by his preoccupation with the Reconquista.

Only three works address Constantinople within the text, and they are written primarily from a historical perspective. Antonio Bravo García explores Tafur's account along with two others in order to "conocer los prejuicios que, con frecuencia, tiñen relatos de este tipo" ("Viaje y perjuicio" 627). He notes that Tafur's "opinión ante una sociedad victoriosa en lo militar, como había sido la de los musulmanes turcos, resulte bastante positiva," (652), and that Tafur is more critical of the Greeks. In another article, Bravo García includes Tafur's account along with Clavijo's and Benjamín de Tudela's to explore the Jewish community in Galata, the obelisk in the Hippodrome, and the artefacts that Latins brought back with them from Constantinople along historical lines ("La imagen de Bizancio"). Finally, José A. Ochoa Anadón examines the genealogical connection to the Byzantine emperor that Tafur claims, noting that, while some parts of his reasoning are flawed "su invención no es absoluta, pues hay demasiadas coincidencias y no sólo en la fecha histórica de nuestro Don Pedro" ("Pero Tafur" 292).

My contribution is to explore Constantinople as a new object of reconquest, established through the importance of Troy in Tafur's epistemology. The role of Troy has been neglected by critics until now, apart from passing references. However, Troy plays an important role in the author's experience of Constantinople. This is most clear as a knight laments, "¡Bien an fecho la venganza de Troya los turcos! que áun ante que yo viniese é Constantinopla fuese tomada, tan subiectos estavan como agora" (94). This direct comparison sheds light on a series of references to Troy that work together to project a discourse of reconquest onto Constantinople that contests the pessimism that accompanied the Ottoman advance through Eastern Europe. While it is fascinating to wonder whether Tafur had a personal interest in leading a campaign to retake the

Byzantine capital, my interest here is to consider how Tafur establishes Constantinople as the focal point of several overlapping discourses, thus putting the Ottoman capital in a relationship of positional superiority that casts it as potential fodder for Spanish conquest.

I explore how this vision of Constantinople is woven from three threads, such that we can speak of 1) a hereditary Troy, as Tafur links himself genealogically to the Byzantine royalty to show his legitimacy as heir; 2) an architectural Troy, where Tafur evokes themes of architectural destruction to criticize Christians while undermining the Ottomans; and finally an 3) epic Troy, which intermingles references to the Crusades with others to the *materia troyana*, as Tafur folds the fallen city into a more familiar framework in order to imagine its conquest.

Hereditary Troy

Genealogies serve as one way to draw Constantinople into a more comprehensible epistemology that can assert ownership. To better understand the far-reaching implications of Tafur's declaration of "la venganza de Troya" (94), we must first dive into who, exactly, are the Greeks in Tafur's metaphor. Tafur devotes particular attention to Santa Helena, the foremother of Greek Constantinople, eventually asserting his heritage and implying a persistent claim to the city. This, in turn, is bolstered as Tafur demonstrates that virtue is inherited.

The link between Santa Helena and Constantinople sheds light on the intertwining of two epic struggles that permeate the text: the Trojan War and the Crusades. Tafur's travels recollect both wars, superimposing them as he draws nearer to Constantinople. This overlap of the two wars transforms the Trojan War into an extension of the war on Islam, thus framing an epistemological justification to extend the Reconquest to the far side of the Mediterranean.

Apart from a few scant examples,¹⁶ almost all classical references center on the Trojan War as well as its aftermath. From early on, the *materia troyana* intermingles with the contemporary conflict between the Byzantines and the Ottomans. Most often, buildings and cities emerge as key symbols. Tafur underscores Genoa for his reader: “[la cual] dizen que la pobló Iánu, príncipe de Troya” (21). Sicily is home to Mt. Trápana, “donde está el cuerpo de Anchises, padre de Eneas” (157), and Padua was founded by “Antenor, después de la destruyçion de Troya” (151). Rhodes was founded by Achilles (73), and is home to “la torre del Vituperio, donde dizen que Archiles fué fallado con Patroclo” (80). This attention to architecture foregrounds the architectural stakes in recovering Constantinople. One early reference is to the isle of Crete, “do fué rey Agamenón, príncipe de los griegos contra los troyanos”, which highlights the comparison between ancient and contemporary Greeks. A few sentences later, we read about “la ysla de Citarea... aquella donde París robó é Elena é la levó á Troya” (37). This allusion to Helen of Troy calls to mind the text’s other Elena, the mother of Emperor Constantine, who emerges as a central person in the text. This is especially significant as, just as the rape of Helen sets off the Trojan war, now the rape of Saint Elena’s city begs for European retaliation.

It is worthwhile to map how the text sets up Helena’s importance, further bridging the gap between her and Helen of Troy as Troy is imposed onto Constantinople. Through the various cities (namely Jerusalem, Rome, Venice and Constantinople) that serve as loci of experiences, Tafur references the founders of Constantinople, Emperor Constantine the Great (272-337), but, more often, his mother Santa Helena. The Byzantine capital acts as a nucleus to which these

¹⁶ Such as a reference to “el castillo del Curco, que antiguamente se llamava Cólcos, donde fué Medea, é la ysla donde andava el camero dorado” (Tafur 46) in Armenia and “ansí poetas como oradores é estoriadores, desta Meçina fablaron mucho, espeçalmente en el primero bello Púnico” (Tafur 156). We will also consider the numerous crusade examples in our final section.

references point. The city is both the ultimate trajectory of its two founders, but also, in a sense, it is also a final destination for Tafur. Only in Constantinople can he finally get to the bottom of his lineage, as he verifies that he is, in fact, a descendent, and, implicitly, potential heir, of the Byzantine Emperor. This adds legitimacy as Tafur alludes to the reconquest of the Byzantine capital and carefully records the various relics and places that point back to Santa Helena.

After a single reference to Constantine,¹⁷ Tafur is surprisingly far more interested in the deeds of the Emperor's mother. In the Roman chapel "Santo Santorum," Tafur comments that "hay muchas reliquias que Santa Elena y madre del emperador Constantino, embió quando fué á Ultramar" (29). In Jerusalem, we read of "donde Santa Elena falló la cruz de Iesucristo" (41) and Tafur climbs up the mountain where Christ fasted to a chapel "lo qual todo fizo Santa Elena por onrrar aquel lugar santo" (44). Venice houses her body along with other relics from the 1204 Venetian conquest (114), a point that Tafur mentions earlier as well¹⁸.

This continues in Constantinople: the Hagia Sophia houses, "otras muchas reliquias que Santa Elena, quando fué á Ierusalem, las tomó é traxo allí" (Tafur 97). The Valayerna church is "la qual fizo Santa Elena, é quiso mucho mostrar allí su poder" (98). These frequent references to Santa Helena links her to the city via a permanent, architectural legacy, linking her to the loss of the city, and to the loss of Helen of Troy. As we shall see, connecting Helena to Troy provides a counternarrative to the vengeance of Troy—just as the Greeks recovered Helen, so too can the Castilians (under their Greek-descended Pero) recover Helena's city.

¹⁷ In Rome, Tafur highlights "la yglesia primera que se dize, fué entre los latinos, es San Juan de Letran, donde los Padres Santos an su advocaçion é de allí se llaman obispos," which features the Tarpeian gate, which leads to a reference to "El emperador Constantino, quando se convirtió á la fe católica é dio el Patrimonio del Imperio á la Yglesia é la dotó" (28).

¹⁸ "de allí truxeron muchas reliquias santas que oy están en Veneza: el cuerpo de Santa Elena" (Tafur 84).

Tafur's lineage

A central purpose to Tafur's visit to Constantinople is to figure out the origins of his lineage, "que se dizíe aver salido de allí é de la sangre imperial suya." He asks to know "la verdat de todo" (81), and the emperor explains how Tafur's supposed ancestor Don Pedro ("primogénito de Constantinopla") arrived to Castile during the conquest of Toledo in 1085 under King Alfonso VI:¹⁹ Don Pedro's father demanded that nobles pay tribute, and forced them to serve "yualmente con los villanos" (82). The disaffected nobles petition the Emperor's first-born to reason with his father, but it goes poorly—Don Pedro retreats to Adrianopolis ("que oy es la estança é corte del Grant Turco") and, rather than fight his father, goes to Spain where he is named count, while Greek knights hail Pedro's brother as the new infante (83).

The infante dethrones his father and retracts his father's laws and gives the nobles even greater privileges, such that "é por eso se dize oy, que non ay tanta libertad en parte del mundo en los fidalgos como en la Greçia, nin tanta subjeçion en los villanos, que paresçe que son esclavos de los fidalgos." This leads to a lament on the current state of the Empire, where "oy los unos é los otros padesçen grant servidumbre, pues que así están señoreados de los enemigos de la fé, que son los turcos, por pecado de los xprianos" (83). As we shall see later on, evoking the precarious state of Christians elsewhere justifies Tafur's chivalric duty to protect Christian subjects from marauding infidels.

Don Pedro, however, stays in Castile and marries the king's sister and leaves him in control of the kingdom while the king is fighting the Moors, during which time "era muy noble cavallero, esforzado, franco, muy cuerdo." Tafur closes the account by explaining his line of

¹⁹ This date coincides with rule of the Byzantine Empress Zoë Porphyrogenita, the last ruler of the Macedonian dynasty—a whole five dynasties before the Emperor who greets Tafur, John VIII Palaiologos. In as much as Tafur commits this particular error, and makes no mention of Byzantine dynasties, Tafur seeing himself as a descendent of Santa Helena is quite likely.

descent from Pedro: “é yo así mesmo aquellas armas traygo é de aquel mesmo linaje vengo,” (84). Tafur reinforces his credibility and conveys the illustrious nature of his line by adding that he is also descendent of hero of the reconquista, “aquel Don Pero Ruyz Tafur, que fué principal en ganar á Córdoba [en 1236], [quien] era nieto del conde Don Estevan Yllan, fijo ó nieto de aquel Don Peryllan príncipe que ya dixé” (84).

The emperor treats Tafur as a relative, which further proves Tafur’s case as a potential heir for restored Byzantine throne: “É de aquella ora en adelante me acatava con mucho amor é como á persona de su sangre, é quesiera mucho que yo me quedara en su tierra é me casara é asentara” (86). Tafur takes the offer seriously, writing “é bien creo que lo fazíe, allende de las cosas sobredichas, porque la çibdat es mal poblada é an mengua de buenas gentes darmas, é non me maravillo, que con tal gente é tan poderosa contienden” (86). This possibility is reinforced by an earlier anecdote, where Mosen Suarez, the Castilian admiral of Cyprus, after fighting for the king and securing his ransom from the Ottoman Emperor, is made heir to the throne and marries him to an illegitimate daughter (49).

This presages a similar device in *Tirant lo blanc*, where a European knight (Tirant, or as we shall see in the next section, Espercius) is granted the hand of an Oriental princess after defending the realm. When Tafur later rescues a few Christian captives (discussed below), Tafur is inserting himself into a similar tradition, where the defender of Christians merits positions of chivalric privilege. Tafur’s hereditary ties to Constantinople are thus reinforced by his virtuous acts as a knight.

The story of Pero’s ancestor conveys a theme of moral superiority through noble lineage—the Byzantine Emperor is dethroned for treating nobles as commoners. This allows Pero to prove his lineage through his noble deeds, as he later does when rescuing captives, which

we discuss below. The theme of hereditary worth returns as Tafur pauses in his descriptions of Rome to explain two statues that deal with a question between the commoners and nobles, as the former asks why, if all men were sons of the same father Adam, should nobles take precedence? (32). This question as well as the answer are carved onto the statues: “DEGENERANT OMNES VICJIS, FIUNTQUE MINORES, EXALTAT VIRTUS, NOBILITANTQUE MORES.” Tafur writes that, as a result, the hidalgos gained great privileges, including eligibility for the consulate, echoing Tafur’s own role as alderman in Córdoba (32). This highlights Tafur’s bourgeois origins, as Castro Hernández observes²⁰ (39). More importantly, Tafur establishes the criteria of virtuous acts as proof of his imperial descent.

Architectural evidence strengthens Tafur’s hereditary right to reclaim the city. When Tafur asks why his family’s crest²¹ is no longer used in Constantinople, the Emperor refers to the sack of the city in 1204 during the 4th Crusades, when Venice sent an armada, claiming to be “en favor del emperador de Constantinopla contra los turcos” (84). They are initially supported by the Byzantines as the Emperor retreats to Morea and the Venetians “de allí truxeron muchas reliquias santas que oy están en Veneza” (84). This pillage also included architectural wonders.²² After 75 years, a grandson of the deposed emperor organizes a rebellion, killing and capturing all the Venetians and ascending to the throne.

²⁰ “la legitimación a su estado de noble y caballero se encuentra en plena concordancia con el hecho de que manifieste en Constantinopla que descende de la sangre imperial” (Castro Hernández 39).

²¹ Ochoa Anadón’s article “Pero Tafur: un hidalgo castellano emparentado con el emperador bizantino” explains the history of the seal:

Las armas son pues las descritas por Tafur, pero con sus esmaltes y metales correspondientes: cuatro fajas de gules sobre jaqueles (ajedrezado) de azul y plata. En la misma enciclopedia heráldica (tomo 43, p. 75-77) se trata el origen no claro del apellido Illán (o Illanes) que para algunos debía estar en Toledo -aunque no se aducen pruebas serias para ninguna hipótesis, y puede compararse con el topónimo Illán de Vacas en el partido de Talavera de la Reina” (Ochoa Anadón 285).

²² “Ansímesmo truxeron cosas magníficas de edifiçios, truxeron dos colupnas muy grandes que est’an puestas á la ribera del mar en la playa desta mar, con su Patron dellos, tan altas como torres, cosa bien dura de creer que tal se podiese traer; é están ençima de la puerta de Sant Marco quatro cavallos muy grandes de alaton dorado de oro muy fino é grueso, é muchas losas de jaspes é mármoles ansímesmo, é otros cosas muy muchas que truxeron de Constantinopla en aquel tiempo que la señoreavan” (84).

However, he refuses to take up his ancestor's arms, instead arguing to keep his own, "que con aquellas suyas avía ganado el imperio é que non las dezaría en ningunt caso" (85). Yet during Tafur's visit, the knight observes that the old arms "están por los muros é torres é posadas antiguas é yglesias de la çibdat, é aún, quando algunos edifiçios faze el pueblo por sí aquellas armas antiguas pone"²³ (85). His seal acts then as an architectural mark that further asserts possession of Constantinople.

Tafur tries to make a case for returning to the old arms, arguing that they were imperial, and that the empire had more authority than the sole person who restored it, all the more so if the empire was what had set him back on the throne (85). By making the case that empire is more than its restorer and its emperor, Tafur converts the domain into a transferable territory, fodder for the Reconquest on par with the Moorish cities that Tafur encounters at the start of his trip. We analyze this further below.

The presence of seals is also important in detailing the final resting place of Don Pedro, providing concrete, architectural evidence of Tafur's account: he is buried in a chapel in Toledo, "é en lo alto del cielo está pintado en un cavallo é su vandra é sus paramentos de sus armas, las quales son aquellas que oy trae el muy virtuoso é generoso señor Don Fernánt Alvarez de Toledo" (84). This also creates an architectural bridge as the same seal is present at two ends of the Mediterranean, bringing Constantinople closer to Castile while closing the distance between Tafur's forebearer and Tafur himself, inviting the reader to find a familiarizing extension of Castile in Constantinople.

²³ This strategy recalls the Armenian crosses in *Embajada a Tamorlán*. These architectural markers symbolize the original Christian owners, despite the Turkish rule in the region, and similarly point to Tafur's hereditary hold on the city.

Architectural Troy

While the *materia troyana* primarily serves a similar campaign against the Ottomans, Trojan architecture serves a double purpose that we will see repeated in our next chapter. On the one hand, the ruins underscore a Christian disinterest for the past, showing how architecture is an index for Christian immorality, as indifference and sins are punished by the loss of buildings, culminating with the destruction of Constantinople. On the other hand, the ruins play a part in an architectural discourse that casts the Ottomans as nomads, lacking architectural permanence as we shall see again with Timur in our next chapter.

Tafur first notes the ports of the ancient city, descreying both Fojavieja (78) and the Dardanelles (80). Tafur asks the captain to see the remains of Troy. Tafur arrives in Ilyon (Élion) and the port of Ténedon—at least, so he judges from “grandes pedaços de edifiçios é mármoles é losas, é aquella ribera, é aquel puerto del Ténedon enfrente, é un muy grande otero como que cayda de grande edificio lo oviese fecho” (79). Tafur adds that “an los turcos por reliquias los edifiçios antiguos é non desfarían ninguno dellos” (79). As we shall see, this contrasts with the Christians, who are tied to the destruction of similar ‘edifiçios antiguos.’

Tafur is repeatedly disappointed by the local Christian ignorance of the ruins, leaving Troy after “non fallando persona que supiese dar raçon ninguna,” and then leaving the castle of Tenedón after “desto non pude más saber” (79). Likely, Tafur hopes for an experience similar to his visit of Jerusalem, which provides a geographic catalogue that reconstructs biblical events.²⁴ This ignorance highlights a disconnect between Europe’s illustrious past and its decadent present as well as its accompanying under-appreciation for classical heritage—a rising concern for

²⁴ A characteristic passage is as follows: “Entramos por cerca la puerta Áurea, que es junto con el templo de Salomon, é pasamos por la pesçina donde el ángel arrebolvíe el agua de que sanava los enfermos; é de aí fuemos á la casa de Pilátos, é de Cayfas, é en aquel lugar donde Iesuxpto fue judgado” (42).

Humanists like Tafur. As Tafur further develops the theme of architectural destruction, this neglect of the past builds on, as we shall see, the neglect of the Crusades.

Christians also are tied to needless architectural destruction. Tafur places importance on the Castle of Tenedon, and the fact that “éste turó muy grant tiempo la guerra entre veneçianos, é ginoveses, tanto que por sentençia del Papa se determinó que lo derribasen é non fuese de ninguno” (79). Accordingly, Tafur is critical of this decision: “é sin duda fue mal consejo que éste es un puerto de los principales del mundo” (79). It is now an Ottoman raiding post, from which they “matan muchos de los xprianos” (79). Christian division (both political and chronological; that is, Christendom’s disconnect from its more hegemonic past), is symbolized in how Trojan architecture now works to the Ottomans’ advantage. Tenedón, a battleground between the Greeks and Trojans, now plays the same role for the Christians and Ottomans.

Christian ignorance about Troy shows a similar disdain for classical heritage that is echoed in the past that appears as urban decay, where the sister cities of Rome and Constantinople are shadows of their former selves.²⁵ Constantinople “es muy mal poblada... la gente non bien vestidos, mas triste é pobre, mostrando el mal que tienen, aunque non tanto quanto devían, por ser gente muy viçiosa é embuelta en pecados” (Tafur 101). Rome²⁶ is similarly, “es mal poblada segunt su grandeza” (28) despite how “solíe ser cabeça del mundo é agora es cola” (32). Part of this is due to foreign invasions, but Tafur also highlights Christian responsibility. Pope Gregory I (540-604),²⁷ being concerned that “la magnificencia de los

²⁵ Other cities lacking the same classical importance are an exception to this, with the highly praised Venice particularly standing out.

²⁶ Curiously, Tafur repeats the description of “lavrado e enfiesto, que parece que hoy sale de la mano del maestro” both in reference to Troy, and also Rome, connecting the two cities.

²⁷ “el papa Sant Gregorio, veyendo que los fieles xpianos que del universo allí concurrían, por procurar salvacion de sus ánimas, viendo la magnificencia de los edificios, en tal manera espedían en los visitar, que empachavan el santo propósito con que vinieran, por tanto mandó desatar todas ó las más de las magnificas obras, que avían quedado de los antiguos tiempos” (26).

edificios” distracted Christian pilgrims, “mandó todos ó la mayor parte dellos derribar, por que dexasen aquella visitación é siguiesen los santuarios” (31). Crucially, however, the pope was unable to completely destroy these wonders, affirming their architectural permanence: “pero non se pudo tanto derribar, que las más cosas é parte dellas non parescan aquello que fueron” (31), and the ruins continue to attract people more than the sanctuaries.

Moreover, buildings are miraculously destroyed in connection to sins. In Rome, Pope Gregory discovers the cause of a plague affecting the city. A church “Santa Ágata de la Suburra,” formerly housed an idol, and some Christians continued to secretly worship it (26). When they arrived at the church, the pope’s procession “emparejaron con la ymágen del ídolo, dió un grant tronido, é partióse en pedacos” (27). In Constantinople, we have already read of the “yglesia [que] llamavan la Valayerna” built by Santa Elena. This church is similarly destroyed due to sin: “allí muchas veces se fallaron en el pecado de la sodomía; é una vez cayó un rayo del çielo é quemó toda la yglesia” such that “está oy quemada que non se podría reparar” (98).

Elsewhere, in Constantinople, Tafur describes “una estatua enmedio de la plaça de onbre así mesmo de alaton.” Legend has it that, if merchants disagreed about the value of a trade, the statue (“el Justo”) would close its hand when fair price was placed in it, leaving both merchants committed to the trade (99). This works until a man wishes to sell his horse for 300 ducats to a local lord. Unable to agree on a price, they go to the statue, where the buyer places a single ducat in the statue’s hand, and the statue closes it, showing that the horse was worth no more. The seller “tanto se enojó, que tiró de una semitarra é cortó la mano á la estatua, é de allí jamás nunca judgó” (99). The horse dies as soon as the buyer reaches his home. Just as sodomites provoke the destruction of the church, the unjust lord’s mutilation of the statue evokes a moral depravity that further justifies loss of the city by feeding into perceptions of Byzantine immorality. This

contrasts later with Tafur's generosity, whether in giving money to a mother and her hungry children (135) or to a band of poor nobles (147-48). In underscoring various Christian sins and failures, Tafur sets up architecture as a grounds for demonstrating that Constantinople's conquest has been "por pecado de los cristianos" (83).

Yet, even though Christians have proven their unworthiness for both Troy and Constantinople, the text undermines Ottoman possession of Constantinople, suggesting that, despite their sins, Christians are still more worthy. Troy also works evokes an architectural discourse which casts the Ottomans as inferior due to their nomadism. As we saw in our introduction, Spanish authors viewed Ottomans as inadequate owners for Constantinople's marvelous urbs. Bunes Ibarra writes that the Spanish thought of the Ottomans, "[c]omo son un pueblo sin cultura, y la única que tienen es la de la fuerza de armas, han ido empobreciendo las urbes edificadas por los antiguos" (*La imagen* 48). While Ottomans treat the Trojan ruins with a reverence lacking among Christians, they are unable to restore the city to the architectural and economics greatness that would legitimize their possession of the ancient city, in the way that he envisions doing so with Málaga and Ceuta.²⁸ This points to, as well, the tendency to reuse classical ruins in the Middle Ages as *spolia*; living among the ruins without putting them to use casts the Ottomans as alien to an urban-centered European mode of thought.

Tafur gives more detail to the Port of Tenedon, which "paresçe tan nuevo como que oy saliese de la mano del maestro, é el molle está fecho de muy grandes losas é colupnas en que se amarran los navíos, é muy buen suelo para surgir" (79). The port's durable qualities are at the

²⁸ Of Málaga, he writes "si fuese nuestra mejor sería, lo que non faría ningunt lugar de los moros, porque entrarían muchas cosas de nuestra tierra" (20). Regarding Ceuta, he says: "sin duda si el rey de Castilla la señorease é se presçiase de nobleçella, segunt el sitio donde está, sería una de las nobles cosas del mundo" (19). The potential to improve the cities commercially justifies his interest in conquering them.

forefront, as it seems not to have aged a day—it is thus a symbol of permanence that contrasts with the Ottomans, whose architecture Tafur is curiously silent on.

As numerous critics notes, Tafur’s view of the Ottomans is positive: “Los turcos es noble gente en quien se falla mucha verdat,” so much so that “quando de virtud se fabla, non se dize de otros que de los turcos” (89). Yet, Tafur also observes, “non ay peón en toda la tierra, é todos andan á cavallo... Su persona é gentes están siempre á campo, invierno é verano, en tiendas, puesto que estava çerca de la çibdat, é jamás entra en poblado sinon es quando va al baño con sus dueñas” (88). In contrast to, for instance, the extensive description of the Hagia Sophia,²⁹ Tafur offers no description of either of these tents, nor of the architecture within the Ottoman Empire. When Tafur later visits Bursa, he comments that “después quel Turco la posee ase mucho ennoblesçido” (103), yet fails to elaborate. Tafur passes over, for instance, the relatively recent construction of mosques: the Yeşil Cami completed in 1419-1420 and the Ulu Cami finished around 1399. In so doing, Tafur glosses over symbols of Ottoman permanence, and depicts the Ottomans as nomads. Despite Tafur’s praise (among the highest in the work), the Ottomans are still unassimilable into Tafur’s epistemology; as neither builders nor restorers, they are, in his eyes, inappropriate possessors of Constantinople.

Epic Troy: Avenging the vengeance of Troy

Troy is evoked in a final sense as Tafur returns to Troy and rescues Christian captives while portraying himself as a latter-day Achilles. When he returns to Troy, through the canal by

²⁹ “...la yglesia, la qual es tan grande, que dizen que, quando Constantinopla prosperaba, avie en ella seys mil clérigos. É este circuyto lo más está mal parado, pero la yglesia en tal manera está, que oy paresçe que se acaba de faxer, á la manera griega, de muchas capillas altas todas cubiertas de plomo y é de dentro, de lavor musayca fasta una lanza del suelo, é tan sutil, lo musayco, que aun el pincel non se atrevería á lo fazer mejor; é de allí abaxo tan delgadas losas entremezcladas con marmoles pórfidos é jaspes muy ricamente labrados, é el suelo de losas muy grandes por magnificencia asserradas muy delgadas; entre estas capillas é enmedio dellas está aquella principal, que dixere que páresela de tan lexos, la altura de la qual non se podría creer que çimiento tal sostuvieve” (96).

the Dardanelles “que fué puerta de Troya” (103), some Christian captives wave from the coast. While the captain is reluctant, Pero begs to take a skiff to rescue them, “que si otra cosa fuese non serie maravilla que Dios nos diese la mala ventura,” evoking the theme of divine punishment for neglect of the Crusade. The captain relents and Pero and four others take a boat to shore, but the Ottomans pursue the captives, obligating the captain to send a second boat with 20 armed men. His boat returns “á salvo con nuestros xpianos” (103).

In addition to highlighting how this adventure occurs near Troy, Tafur crucially receives an injury in the leg: “allí fui ferido en el pié de una frecha, pero bien se fizo, pues non perdimos nada é servimos á Dios,” which Legassie calls “a shamelessly Homeric injury,” (208), echoing the fatal wound that Achilles bore. Tafur invites a connection of his rescue of the captives to the Greek hero’s part in the rescue of Helen. The Crusades and the Trojan War once again overlap.

Legassie observes that the scene also evokes the Reconquista and its “long Iberian tradition of exploiting the plight of the captive in order to rationalize the privileges of the nobility. The landowning elite positioned themselves as the defenders of unarmed Christians, who might otherwise be forced to convert to Islam” (209). Troy (and with it, Constantinople) become potential grounds for extending the Reconquest, one of several references to the Crusades in the text, alongside the opening adventure against the Moors in Gibraltar and references to Godfrey of Boullion and the Crusades in the Levant.

The *materia troyana*—as we have seen, a symbol of the Occident’s frontier with the Orient, and the ancestors of the Ottomans—permeates the work, paralleling the attention that Tafur gives to another conflict of epic proportions: the Crusades. The Trojan War is, in essence, a paradigm for understanding the war against the infidel.

As Molina Molina observes, Tafur makes little distinction between fighting Muslims at home and abroad: “Tafur aparece en su libro como el prototipo del ideal de caballero cristiano, del hidalgo castellano en lucha contra el Islam; joven que está dispuesto a tomar las armas contra los infieles, no sólo en suelo hispano sino también en cualquier reino cristiano” (642). Liberating Christians from Muslim power is a central preoccupation in the text.

This offers another connection between the Byzantine capital and Castile. While discussing the Tatar Kahnate, Tafur breaks into a lament for the fall of Constantinople, contrasting it with Spain’s own state: “todas las naçiones de xpianois que están por el mundo repartidos están entre los moros, siervos como acá los mudéjar es, é agora del todo están perdidos é sujetos é esparcidos por el mundo” (94). Constantinople is portrayed along the same lines of Muslim Spain, where, as a knight committed to the Reconquest, Tafur locates himself within a similar liberating mission.

As he does with sites that are crucial to the Trojan War, Tafur also highlights sites tied to the Crusades, placing Constantinople at the center of a discourse of crusade that potentiates a reconquest of Constantinople. For instance, Corfu provokes a reference of King Lançalango’s plan to use Naples as a staging ground to retake Jerusalem (36). In Jerusalem, Tafur points out “una posada, que fizo el duque Godofre de Bullón [1060-1100], quando ganó la Casa santa” (40) and recounts the epitaph on the crusader’s tomb “TOTAM ISTAM TERRAM ACQVISIVIT CULTVI CHRISTIANO” (42). Much like Troy’s ruins and Tafur’s seals, here again does architecture serve as an assertion of Christian ownership of the land. Crusade is mentioned again later when a cardinal’s ship is attacked by Pisans, and the enraged Pope Eugene IV “dio cruzada sobrellos, é fiziéronlos muy grant dapño” (154) until rulers dissuade him, “con condición que

para que ellos fuesen asueltos, que ganasen la Casa Santa de Ierusalem” (154), suggesting that another Crusade was at hand.

Tafur establishes his eagerness to place himself within the discourse of crusade at the very start of the text. He joins the Conde de Niebla’s invasion of Gibraltar, where he is told that fewer than ten men guard the fortress (17). An initial skirmish to test the fortress’s defenses goes horribly, as 15-20 Castilians were killed immediately. Meanwhile, the tide had risen, and, the Count is killed as Moors advance on the retreating forces. Despite this loss, though, Tafur cannot help but to envision the conquest of Ceuta pages later: “me paresció mucho bien, é muestra aver seydo grant pueblo; é sin duda si el rey de Castilla la señorease é se presçiasse de nobleçella, segunt el sitio donde está, sería una de las nobles cosas del mundo” (19). Tafur repeats this sentiment when touring Málaga, “si fuese nuestra mejor sería, lo que non faría ningunt lugar de los moros, porque entrarían muchas cosas de nuestra tierra” (20). Tafur is eager to acquire new territory for his kingdom.

The Reconquista also compels Tafur to return to Castile. In Brussels, the Duke of Milan asks Tafur about his travels, hinting at a conquering mission to Jerusalem (133). When the Duke asks about Tafur’s future plans, he replies that, after Paris, “luego me bolvería en Castilla, porque sabía de çierto quel Rey, mi Señor, quería fazer la guerra en persona á los moros” (133). In Bratislava, Tafur asks the Holy Roman Emperor for license “que me quería venir en Castilla, porque dizien quel Rey, mi Señor, vinie en persona á la guerra de los moros” (147).

This echoes the earlier allegation of divine justice for failing in the war against Muslims, as does Tafur’s criticism of the Latin Kingdom’s part in the ‘vengança de Troya.’ The Ottomans would have taken Constantinople sooner if not for “miedo de non ensañar los xprianos del Poniente... e bien paresçe, por la negligencia que, despues de Constantinopla perdida, an

mostrado los príncipes é pueblos cristianos, que en vano era su reçelo” (95). The failure to defend or recover the city is portrayed as a failure of their obligations as Christians. Tafur portrays himself as a foil to larger Christendom, both in his commitment to the Reconquista, and, as we shall see, in his own defense of Christians.

Tafur suggests his countrymen as a remedy to the failure of the Latin and Byzantine kingdoms. This network of Castilians culminates as Tafur conveys his utter confidence of Westerners (and Castilians in particular) against the Ottomans: “bien creo si con la gente del Poniente se fallasen, non avrie en ellos resistençia, non porque de la persona non son buenos, mas fallésçeles mucho de lo nesçesario á la guerra” (102). A few sentences later, he singles out his nation: “¡Pluguiera á Dios que á la gente de nuestra tierra nos cayera por veçino, pues que allá non ay amparo nin fusta nin fortaleza, salvo bien pelear!” (102).

As Wade Labarge notes, “Tafur appears so anxious to exploit his contacts wherever he landed, [even though] many of them were relatively unimportant people and fellow-countrymen, whom he used as stepping-stones” (241). Pero Tafur’s encounters with his countrymen is a persistent theme. In Bologna, for instance, Tafur writes that “resecví grant honor de los castellanos que allí” (23); later in Asisi “fallé allí un criado del cardenal nuestro de Castilla” (33). In Cyprus, Tafur meets Mosen Suarez, Admiral of Cyprus, “un cavallero natural de Segovia” (48). Later in Paphos (“Bafa”), he lodges with “Diego Thenorio, escudero castellano” (49). Tafur’s interest in his countrymen crosses religious lines. He is charged with delivering tribute to “un trujamán mayor del Soldán, natural de Castilla, judío de Sevilla que se renegó en

Babylonia” (49). Arriving in Venice, Tafur seeks out fellow Castilian pilgrims³⁰. In Bruges³¹, Gant³², Antwerp³³, Basel³⁴, Nuremberg³⁵ and Krakow³⁶, Tafur also encounters Castilians. Why this attention on Castilians? This network adds credibility to his account, but more importantly, it also maps out the various Mediterranean destinations of his travels as familiar, weaving his compatriots into the fabric of the Mediterranean. They also may act as welcoming steppingstones to Constantinople.

Alternatively, the text may simply rely on chivalric romances as a model to organize Tafur’s journey. In either case, the text establishes Constantinople as the center of a network of fellow Castilians and Iberians, where he (and any other Castilians on the same itinerary) can count on the support of their countrymen. This brings the city closer to Castile, making it easier to imagine and less alien, as the wide distance between the two ends of the Mediterranean closes, and puts the Byzantine capital within Spanish reach, epistemologically, if not militarily.

As with the *materia troyana*, Constantinople proves to be an exceptional center with “muchos castellanos... a sueldo del Emperador” (86), an entire community of his countrymen working to protect Constantinople from Ottoman invasion. After lodging with Juan de Caro “natural de Sevilla,” (80), he is visited the next day by “los castellanos que estaban en

³⁰ “Pregunté si venían allí algunos castellanos, é respondiome uno que ai estava, que estaban allí Gutier Quixada é Pero Barva dé Campos, que yvan á Ierusalem” (107).

³¹ Tafur is invited to dine with an abbess who “dixo como avie venido en romería á Santiago, é avie rescebido tanta onor de castellanos, que non sabia en qué lo satisfacer” (133). Bruges also is home to “muchos castellanos é de otras naçiones que conosco” (136).

³² Tafur writes of the death of “miçer Jaques de la Ben, que fizo armas en Castilla” (137).

³³ In Antwerp, he notes the number of boats “de España, tanto é más que ningunos la finchen, mayormente los de Castilla,” (137) and also meets “Juan de Morillo, criado del rey Don Juan” (138).

³⁴ In Basel, Switzerland, he meets “la embaxada de nuestro Señor el rey de Castilla, segunt la avía dexado” (140).

³⁵ In Nuremberg Tafur meets the Castilian embassy for the Council of Florence, including “un fijo de un Conde que yo vi en Castilla, estando en la guerra de los moros en la frontera de Jahen” (142).

³⁶ In Krakow, “el obispo de Burgos fizo conmigo tantas alegrías quantas pudo, porque ansí avía respondido; é aun después en Castilla delante de mí al rey Don Juan lo notificó” (146).

Constantinopla é los que allí estavan en Pera... entre los quales vi Alfon de Mata, escudero de cavallo del rey Don Juan, nuestro Señor” (81).

Constantinople is also significant as the work’s only site for praise of Castilian culture. Pero sends the Emperor John VIII Palaiologos (himself a ‘trujamán’) “un trujamán del Emperador, que llamavan Juan de Sevilla, castellano por naçion... porque le cantava romances castellanos en un laúd” (81). Later, a knight from the Emperor’s household invites Tafur to eat, and, after the meal, invites him to his chamber where the host dons “un collar de oro descama de la devisa del Rey nuestro señor, ‘e salió á mí é fabló en nuestra lengua castellana” (86). He explains that, while he is ashamed of doing so in public, for the love he has for Tafur and his nation, he would speak Castilian to him whenever they were alone (86).³⁷

The network of Castilians that he lays out negates, in part, this question of distance that he laments. While distance is an issue, Castilians have a number of allies in ports throughout the Mediterranean, thus bringing an extension of the Castilian Reconquista into the realm of possibility, even as Tafur laments the inaction of the Latin kingdoms.

Conclusion

In order to broach a possible reconquest of Constantinople, Tafur superimposes the Trojan War onto the current war against Muslims. This provides an opportunity to establish both the legitimacy of recovering the Ottoman capital, as well as the means to do so. To this end, Tafur portrays himself as an epic hero both in the style of the Trojan War and the Reconquista. This entails projecting Castilian hegemony throughout the Mediterranean, as well as onto

³⁷ The host later brings one of his sisters, “muy fermosa muger, diziendo, que aquella, tanto que en la tierra estoviese, la sirviese por amiga, é á ella le encomendó á mí; bien creo que quisiera contratar casamiento” (86). This recalls a common plot device in *Tirant* and other chivalric works, where a foreign knight marries into a local kingdom, eventually ruling it. While Tafur was married at the time of writing, his use of the trope places the reconquest of Constantinople within the realm of the chivalric imaginary.

Constantinople. As we shall see in our next work, Troy remains a paradigm for understanding the Ottoman expansion beyond the Orient; yet parallel to this run Iberian dreams of expanding into the Eastern Mediterranean, where potential colonies await them with open arms.

Tirant lo Blanc (1511)

Tirant lo Blanc was written mostly by Joanot Martorell (1413-1468) with some interventions by his friend Martí Joan de Galba, who finished the text after his death. Martorell was a knight who traveled and dueled extensively throughout England, Spain, and Portugal, and fought under Alfonso el Magnánimo in Naples. His work was first published in 1490 in Valencia, and, in 1511, the first Castilian version was published by Diego de Gumiel in Valladolid under the title *Los cinco libros del esforzado e invencible caballero Tirante el Blanco de Rocasalada, caballero de la garrotera*. Despite the Castilian version's rarity, it was read by Cervantes (Piera and Shearns, 101). The text narrates the adventures of the English knight Tirant the White as he earns prestige in tournaments in England before fighting Moors in Sicily and Rhodes. He heads to Constantinople, where he defends the Byzantine Empire against the invasion of combined forces of Persians, Moors and Ottomans. During this time, he falls in love with the princess Carmesina, and, after he is convinced that she is cheating on him, he flees, shipwrecking in Barbary, which he then conquers. Returning home, he reconciles with the princess, roots out the Muslim invaders, falls sick and dies.

In *Tirant lo Blanc*, Troy's role echoes its role seen in our previous text. It casts an epic light onto Tirant's campaign against the invading Muslims, who are aligned with the Ottomans, recalling the 'Trojan revenge.' Yet alongside these epic references, the physical locale of Troy also appears, a stopping point before Tirant's triumphant return to Constantinople. This is preceded by a short interpolation, highlighting the exploits of the knight Espercius on the island

of Kos. I suggest that the episode acts as a preface for the second appearance of Troy. The anecdote—bookended by references to Troy—places the island, Troy, and Constantinople in a discourse on classical history, arguing that it must be colonized by Europeans in order to be protected from invading Orientals.

The Trojan Revenge

Relatively little attention has been given to Troy in the work. Rafael Alemany Ferrer observes that “...resonancias del no menos prestigioso topos clásico de la guerra de Troya [...] se reflejan en la novela cual en un espejo más o menos nítido” (224). The critic notes that Martorell was likely a devotee of Conesa’s Catalan translation of Guido delle Colonne’s *Historia destructionis Troiae*, from which he draws numerous rhetorical devices (222). These, along with similarities in the love-struck knights and the complaints during Tirant’s and Carmesina’s funerals, prompt him to conclude that “La Constantinopla de Martorell, atacada y asediada por los turcos, adquiere la condición de una suerte de revival de la Troya atacada y asediada por los griegos” (221). We can connect this heterotopian superimposition of Troy onto Constantinople to the “venganza de los troyanos” that we saw in *Andanças e viages*.

The Trojan revenge is developed throughout the book long before Tirant arrives physically in Troy. Here, Troy functions in two different ways. First, Troy serves as a milestone of chivalry, against which Tirant’s exploits are compared. Additionally, as we have seen in *Andanças*, Martorell continues to use the Trojan War as means of interpreting the present conflict between the Ottomans and the Byzantines.

The narrator ranks the Greeks and Trojans as memorable knights repeatedly, elevating his subject matter. Martorell begins his prologue by affirming the need to remember “las hazanas y historias antiguas de los hombres fuertes y virtuosos: para que sean espejos y muy claros

enxemplos y virtuosa doctina de nuestra vida,” among whom he includes “aquel egregio poeta Homero ha contado las batallas de los griego y troyanos y de las amazonas” (2r). Later, when the hermit explains the origin of knighthood to Tirant, the “singulares cavalleros griegos y troyanos” are listed among those of great virtue (19v). The war also serves as a backdrop while the emperor relates the history of Pera and Constantinople, saying that Pera’s conversion to Christianity was “despues de gran tiempo dela destruycion de troya” (82r), while Constantinople was established shortly thereafter when Pera’s population outgrew the city. Finally, the Trojans are associated with wealth, as Tirant’s army captures spoils and “No se lee en las ystorias romanas ni troyanas que tan rico campo como este fuesse vencido en tan poco tiempo” (90r-90v).

Additionally, Martorell’s insistence on the historical importance of the Trojan War invites the readers to superimpose the epic conflict onto Tirant’s own feats, as Marotell links the Christians to the Greeks and the Ottomans to the Trojans. Early on, in chapter XLVIII, Tirant identifies himself with Achilles. When the King of England is reluctant to let Tirant fight in the tournaments, Tirant replies, “si vuestra alteza no quiere que vea los peligros de las armas mande me vuestra alteza que me vista como muger y este entre las donzellas de la reyna mi señora: alli como hizo aquel invencible cavallero Archiles entre las hijas del rey Priamo de Troya” (26r). This both foreshadows a later moment when Tirant, to his own ridicule, does just this by wearing Carmesina’s nightgown into battle (which we explore in a future chapter), and more immediately it casts him as the descendent of the near-invincible Greek champion.

Likewise, when in Sicily and Rhodes, (chapter IX in book two), the Genovese and Ottomans prepare a fleet to attack Greece, with the Genovese flying a red banner with the chalice and host, while the Ottomans’ was “de terce nel verde con letras de oro que dezian vengadores de la sangre de aquel cavallero bienaventurado don hetor troyano” (61r). The Ottomans, then, are

the Hector to Tirant's Aquilles. This is strengthened in the battle of Pelis (chapter CXXXIII) when the Grand Turk warns the Sultan of Egypt not to underestimate his foe, "...assi como hizo el rey de troya que por su culpa se perdieron el y los suyos, por hazer poca cuenta delas cosas y no las tener en algo" (89r). The Grand Turk's knowledge is rooted in the Trojans, showing an epistemological genealogy.

In the same sense, the Byzantines are also rooted in their knowledge of the Greeks. When Tirant asked to act as an imperial judge (chapter IX of the third book), Montsalvat ("un cavallero mal xristiano") objects on the grounds that Tirant must first "yr en romeria y hazer grandes ofrendas a los dioses en la ysla donde paris llevo a la reyna elena: y por esto ovieron antiguamente los griegos vitoria de los troyanos" (79r). The island serves as a symbol of Greek victory over the Trojans, which in turn underpins the entirety of Byzantine chivalry.

These allusions culminate in a final reference, where Tirant demands that the Ottomans leave the Byzantine Empire after they request a truce. He cautions them, foregrounding the importance of the Trojan War in chivalry: "la antigua gloria de los griegos es olvidada por vosotros: mas la grandeza de su nombre no podra jamas preterir tanto como durara a la memoria de Troya" (94r). Just as the Grand Turk recalls Trojan history, Tirant now recalls Greek history, as both are anchored in their respective sides of the Trojan War. Moreover, Tirant establishes the ancient Greeks as the predecessor to the present Byzantine Emperor, who "sucede en virtud y bondad de cavalleria a aquellos gloriosos antiguos cavalleros griegos" (94r). The Greek victory against the Trojans now serves as portent of the Byzantine victory over the Ottomans. This assurance is especially impactful given the work's post-1453 publication. By evoking the Trojan War, Martorell points forward to a possible reconquest of Constantinople.

Physical Troy

Despite preparing its readers for Trojan revenge, *Tirant* is, after all, an alternative history. This becomes clear when the physical site of Troy appears briefly. No description is offered, and, in a brief chapter, Troy is mentioned twice. Yet, despite its seeming insignificance, Troy marks the final stop before Tirant's illustrious return to Constantinople from North Africa and the culminating campaign against the Muslims, as he sweeps over them in short order. To better understand this placement of Troy before Constantinople, we must look at what precedes Tirant's stay in Troy: Espercius's adventures on the Isle of Kos. The episode highlights the classical stakes of both knights' victories.

In Chapter X of book 5, the reader's attention shifts from the English knight to the frustrating missteps of Espercius who, up until now, has been a minor character. He is sent by Tirant as an emissary to request the King of Sicily's support. On his way back to Constantinople, however, he misses Tirant's fleet bound in the opposite direction to Palermo. When Espercius arrives back in Palermo, he discovers again that Tirant has again already departed and, even worse, when Espercius returns to Constantinople, he misses Tirant for a third time (251r). After heading up the canal of Romania, a storm takes his vessel. All perish, except for Espercius and ten others, who wash ashore on the desolate island Lango, present-day Kos (at the time, Hospitaller stronghold). The group heads inland, where they come across a man guarding a small herd. He explains that apart from a few houses belonging to exiles from Rhodes, "no avia poblacion" and "bevia aqui en mucha miseria: por quanto esta isla es encantada: y ninguna cosa en ella puede aprovechar" (251r). After Espercius begs, the shepherd gives them some food. He then recounts the story of Hypocras who "antiguamente era principe y señor de aquesta isla de Lango y de Cretes" (251r). This ruler had a beautiful daughter who had been transformed into a dragon that was 18 feet long, entitled the Lady of the Islands. She lives among ruins: "tiene su

abitacion en las bovedas y cuevas de un castillo antiguo,” showing herself a couple of times a year.

The enchantment (placed on her by the Goddess Diana) can only be broken by a knight brave enough to kiss her in her horrifying dragon form. Two men have tried previously, and both have died. Espercius, seeing his desperate situation, decides to try his luck in early morning so that his companions can't stop him. He stops before the cave, and says a prayer before the dragon comes running. Seeing him resolute, she kisses Espercius as he continues imploring God's help. The knight faints as the dragon transforms into the beautiful princess. She rubs his temples, kisses him until the knight awakens and confesses his love for her. He is richly awarded: “mostro le gran quantia de tesoro: lo qual le presento juntamente con su persona” (254v). The two rule happily ever after, as new subjects flock to the desolate island, building the city Espertina la Venturosa as well as “...otras muchas villas y castillos y otros pueblos” (254v). The couple, with their descendants, rule with “...mucho paz y prosperidad” (255r).

As Alemany Ferrer observes, the episode is copied (nearly word for word) from the 4th chapter of *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (*Artus i Espèrcius* 247), excepting the arrival and success of the third knight, Espercius. Perujo delineates a series of parallels between Espercius's exploits and Tirant's feats in Africa, suggesting that Kos is a microcosm for the whole North Africa thread. Azorín argues that the scene is part of Marotrell's endeavor to promote a new kind of chivalry that is better able to adapt to Fortune, in contrast to Tirant.

Critics have not tied this scene to Troy in the chapter that follows it, despite good reason to do so. However, in addition to being back-to-back, the island was formerly ruled by Hippocrates, until Diana intervenes, making it a locus of antiquity on par with Troy in the

following chapter; indeed, these are the text's only two classical loci, barring Constantinople.³⁸ Both are occupied by foreign Christian knights, who, in so doing, restore them back to Europe. Moreover, the episode anticipates Tirant's own nuptials and victory, awaiting him when he leaves Troy. This juxtaposition of Lango and Troy is not mere coincidence, but an intentional gesture.

Espercus's conquest of the island casts him as a savior for the classical legacy that it represents. The island was formerly ruled by Hippocrates, a towering classical figure as the father of medicine. The pagan enchantment of Diana, goddess of the moon, as well as the hunt, points to the text's Muslims.³⁹ In breaking the curse, Espercus restores Hippocrates's legacy to Europe by saving his daughter and healing the infertile isle of Lango, symbolically wresting the classical figure from a Muslim threat. Though it is the dragon that kisses him after he wavers, he nonetheless manages to cure a curse that the father of medicine seemingly could not. This, accompanied by the prosperity of Espercus's rule evokes "the idea of regenerating a fundamentally lifeless Asia" that Said associates with Romantic Orientalism (154).

The restoration of Lango turns the Greco-Roman heritage into fodder for imperial expansion by bringing it into a discourse of proper architectural and economic usage. As Rodríguez observes, "puentes, acueductos, baños y calderas se reconocen como símbolos de su capacidad para adaptar y domesticar el medio ambiente en beneficio propio" (42). 'Adapting and domesticating' points to a sense of both owning and establishing proper use of the lands. In Laura Carbó's analysis of the earlier text (*Embajada a Tamorlán*), she observes, "un interés

³⁸ The Byzantine Emperor explains that Constantinople was named for his ancestor, who "fue elegido por emperador de roma y era señor de toda la grecia y de muchas otras provincias," linking the city to the Roman Empire (82r).

³⁹ Tirant's North Africa adventure begins after he is discovered by a hunting party and as he stumbles while leaving the cave. The moon above casts his shadow into a cross, which he interprets for all present as a prophecy of his victory over Islam.

especial por la transformación de la naturaleza en función de la producción de alimentos y la comercialización de los mismos, así como el tratamiento eficiente de los recursos naturales que facilitan el traslado y la habitabilidad” (1). In Lango, the abandoned buildings and ruins invite European occupation, evoking the Reconquista victories and repopulation of cities like Gibraltar and Archidona (1462) during Martorell’s lifetime.⁴⁰ By repopulating and causing the island to prosper, Espercius’s legitimacy is assured. The classical ruins serve as a foundation for European expansion, just as the abandoned buildings and under-populated cities would in Spain’s Reconquest. The colonization of the Eastern Mediterranean now becomes a colonization of Europe’s past, as Espercius comes to a nearly abandoned island that submits to him as though it had been waiting for him.

Just as Espercius breaks Diana’s curse, and reverses its sterility in prosperity, Tirant reverses Troy as a symbol of Trojan revenge and Turkish victory back to a symbol of Greek and European victory. Espercius’s victory in Lango reclaims the classical heritage it represents as European. With the Lango episode as a prelude, Tirant does the same with the ancient city, reclaiming it epistemologically, by using Troy as a staging point for his return to and victory in Constantinople. In so doing, Tirant restores Troy back to its classical sense, where it serves as a

⁴⁰ There is a strong architectural and urban focus in this passage. In winning the princess Espercius wins her castle as well, and the kingdom prospers after the royal couple “edificaron alli una noble ciudad que fue llamada Espertina la venturosa y despues otras muchas villas y castillos u otros pueblos (252v). The “muchas iglesias y monesterios” included act as a definitive seal of ownership that recalls the Reconquest.

The construction and control of monuments here echoes a concern elsewhere in Tirant. In Chapter 44, Book III, the Turks lament that Tirant has come, saying that, otherwise, “ya estuvieramos dentro delos palacios de Cosntantinopla y de su iglesia tan fermosa overiamos hecho mezclita” (109v). In chapter 53, Book III “A king promises to kill Tirant and “una ymagen toda de oro y como oviessen tomado la cibdad de costantinopla la haria poner sobre la puerta dela dicha cibdad” (118v). When Tirant takes a city in chapter 46 of Book V, the culminating act is storming a minaret, “vna grna torre que era mezclita la qual estava junta con la cerca de la ciudad” (226v). In Chapter 53 of Book V, Tirant orders a Bishop “que tornase a consagrar la yglia [sic] mayor de la ciudad por que los moros la avian hecho mezclita y que pusiessen pilas para batizar” (272v).

This added detail of churches becoming mosques and reverting back to churches reaffirms how the project of Reconquest very much frames how Martorell envisions the warfare, even on the opposite side of the Mediterranean, extending the Reconquest into lands threatened by Turks. Sacred buildings here too serve as public symbols of conquest.

symbol of Europe's triumphant heritage. This restoration foreshadows how Tirant saves the ancient capital Constantinople and its Greek heritage. In undoing the revenge of the Trojans, Tirant also regenerates the Byzantine Empire, repossessing classical heritage for Europe.

This echoes the chivalric dynamic that we've seen earlier, in Tafur's *Andanzas*, where noble privilege was justified as protecting commoners from Muslims. Despite being a foreigner from North Africa, Espercius's claim to the island is justified by its loss to Diana's curse. This is mirrored in Tirant's victory and imperial throne—by protecting the Greek citizens, and their heritage, the Christian knights earn the right to rule. Martorell thus turns his eyes to the Mediterranean, extending the Reconquest into lands threatened by the Ottomans (even though, historically, the isle of Kos would not fall until 1523).

Conclusion

Troy thus serves two purposes: on the one hand, it acts as a model for Tirant's conflict with the Ottomans; on the other, it is part of a classical discourse that justifies European possession of sites it considered integral to its heritage. Curiously, Martorell is unconcerned with race in this particular scene. We first encounter Espercius in Tremicen (Book 4, chapter 90) during the North African episode. Unconcerned with questions of *limpieza de sangre*, Espercius is an adequate vessel for restoring Greek heritage to Christendom because he is a convert.

Viaje de Turquía (1557)

While praising it as the best example of an original Spanish informative text on the Ottomans, Bunes Ibarra suggests that the text was unpublishable during the 16th century due to

its occasional praise of the Ottomans.⁴¹ Though not published for the first time until 1905 by Manuel Serrano y Sanz, the dedication of the manuscripts clarifies that it was written in 1557, during the Council of Trent and 15 years before the Battle of Lepanto, as well as during the resurgence of the myth of the last Visigoth king. The work is recounted in dialogue form between three friends: Pedro Urdemalas, a former captive who has escaped from Constantinople and is now performing penance on the Camino de Santiago, and two inn-keepers, Matalascallando and Juan de Voto a Dios. The work is divided into two parts, as Pedro narrates his captivity and escape from the city, and then answers his companions' questions.

Florencio Sevilla and Ana Vian trace the existence of six different manuscripts, including an unpublished one of Byzantine emperors. The research on the text has focused a good deal on the question of authorship, refuting Serrano y Sanz's argument for Cristóbal de Villalón, Marcel Bataillon makes a case for the humanist physician Andrés Laguna ("Andrés Laguna"). Fernando García Salinero has proposed Juan Ulloa de Pereira. Antonio García Jiménez has suggested Benardo de Quiros, Felipe II's personal physician, a theory supported by Jesús Fernando Cáceda Teresa. Alfredo Rodríguez López-Vázquez provides linguistic evidence supporting Serrano y Sanz's original case.

Numerous critics have engaged with the work's unique structure. The first to argue for dialogue is Alan S. Trueblood. Thomas R. Hart writes in favor of the text as dialogue.⁴²

Florencio Sevilla Arroyo elaborates on this, showing how dialogue mixes with novelistic

⁴¹ "De otra parte, la visión de los turcos que rezuma en sus páginas resultaba completamente inapropiada en un momento en que la monarquía hispánica estaba fijando un ideario político que vinculaba el poder del emperador o el rey con la defensa de la religión católica contra los enemigos interiores y exteriores. El acercamiento al adversario político y religioso, reconociéndole virtudes morales y políticas que eran negadas por sistema en el mundo europeo del momento, hacía de estas páginas un peligro evidente para la creación de un pensamiento oficial sobre los sucesos que estaban acaeciendo en el Mediterráneo" ("El orientalismo español" 47-48).

⁴² "The best model for understanding Laguna's work is not autobiography or narrative fiction, which trace the development of a character as a result of his or her experiences but the Renaissance dialogue" (107).

elements, giving the flexibility needed for the text's mix of satire and moralism.⁴³ Marie-Sol Ortolá explores the picaresque qualities of the text, particularly Pedro's trajectory to spiritual awakening, writing that that the author (as well as the author of *Lazarillo*) reacts to Protestantism, showing "sympathies to it through the creation of these two novels ("Significance" 88), and also discusses the text's theatrical qualities ("Modos"). Juan José Mosquera traces the use of popular folklore characters in the work's three speakers, showing how this gives the work a great degree of veracity.

Other critics consider the work's contents. Miguel Ángel Bunes de Ibarra and Mirjana Polić Bobić explore the text's sources of information for Ottoman culture. Goyita Núñez Esteban maps out the panorama of the physical Constantinople and writes that the text's accuracy points to its larger fidelity to reality. Ángel Delgado Gómez contends that the work's travel is tied to a fascination for gathering medical knowledge rather than humanism. Elvezio Canonica argues that the text's multilingualism is another reflection of its humanist influence.⁴⁴

The presence of Troy in the text has not garnered critical attention. The deployment of Troy in *Viaje de Turquía* marks a shift in the discourse on classical heritage, where the fears that lead to dreams of rivaling the Ottoman Empire as a modern-day Greece shift to an intellectual colonization of Constantinople and the classical heritage it represents. Here, Troy no longer frames a discourse that places the Christians on the sides of the Greeks and the Ottomans on the side of the Trojans, allowing a smaller Spain to envision itself as a rival to the Ottomans. Rather, Troy and Greece both play a part in a discourse of the classical intellectual heritage, of which the

⁴³ This mix creates "una nueva fórmula, de cuño inconfundiblemente humanístico, si no erasmista, preocupada tanto de lo estético como de lo satírico-moral; encaminada a satisfacer simultáneamente necesidades creativas y satíricas, y, en suma, atenta a lograr un cabal equilibrio entre el compromiso histórico y el literario" (84).

⁴⁴ el plurilingüismo en el *Viaje de Turquía* es un instrumento para llevar a cabo y ganar la querela pacis erasmiana, al tiempo que es una afirmación de las lenguas vernáculas, incluso in partibus infidelium" (31).

narrator is exclusively worthy. This changes the nature in which Spain maintains its positional superiority over the Ottoman Empire. Spain, now itself a rival empire, begins to envision itself as a worthy rival to the classical heritage on which the Ottoman Empire is built. Pedro affirms that, as a European, he is better able to fully appreciate the classical past on which the Ottoman Empire is built. To prove this, Pedro uses medicine and architecture as points of departure to criticize local stewardship of classical legacy in Constantinople.

Pedro, Ulysses, and Galen

To fully understand Troy's importance in the work, we must recall that Pedro compares himself, in the opening of the work, to Odysseus, whose clever ruse (suggested by Athena) leads to the final defeat of Troy before his circuitous journey home. Pedro, before securing his freedom and escaping, must similarly score a victory through his superior intellect by thriving in Constantinople. This 'conquest' is centered on Troy as both a general symbol of Antiquity, although Troy persists as a significant site of for re-enacting the victory over the Orient symbolized in the fall of Troy.

The author presents Ulysses as "por perfecto dechado de virtud y sabiduría," due to his experience as "un varón que vio muchas tierras y diversas costumbres de hombres" (87). This image returns later as Matalascallando praises Pedro's intellect, "No creo haber habido en el mundo otro Dédalo ni Ulises sino vos, pues no pudo la prosperidad cegaros a que no mirásedes adelante" (252-53). Both mythical heroes follow similar westbound routes although, Daedalus receives no further mention. Similarly, Pedro's own westward return marks his own cleverness, which he demonstrates with his grasp of classical knowledge.

This connection of Pedro's learnedness to classical knowledge is repeated throughout the *Viaje de Turquía*. Medicine is one prime example of this link. This fascination with Troy guides Pedro's understanding and hegemonic use of medicine. Pedro frequently references Galen, "que fue troyano," citing him far more often than other figures such as Hippocrates, Demosthenes, or Homer. Pedro masters the Trojan intellectual's domain due to his own innate intelligence, as we shall explore below. This mastery becomes a re-enactment of Odysseus's conquest of Troy—Pedro's expertise on Galen ultimately entitles him to Galen's birthplace.

Pedro identifies himself with Galen at numerous points. One such reference is when Sinán Bajá punishes Pedro for refusing to convert by placing him on a construction crew. Here, the Bajá mocks him: "Di, cristiano, aquella filosofia de Aristótil y Platón, y la medicina del Galeno y elocuencia de Ciceron y Demóstenes qué te han aprovechado?" (188). Here, Galen works as a synecdoche for all medical knowledge. Later, when in a debate over whether camel's milk was helping or hurting his master, Pedro shows this favoritism again, "acotando del Galeno autoridades y llevándoles libros alli e intérpretes turcos que fuesen jueces" (213).

This emerges as part of a larger discourse where Pedro lays claim to Constantinople through his knowledge of Galen and Greek. Troy is no longer antithetical to Greece, as in our previous texts; rather they are both neighbors on the continuum of the classical past. This tie between Galen and Greece becomes clear when Pedro is denigrated by the Jewish doctors. Pedro recounts how the doctors argue that "aunque en mi tierra yo sea buen médico acá no es posible ni puedo alcanzar como ellos las complexiones." Pedro answers to the contrary. The medicine he knows is from Constantinople's vicinity, including Hippócrates as well as Galen "de Pérgamo que no es más de treinta o quarenta leguas de aquí" (210). The Jews, in contrast, know medicine from Moorish authorities from Spain, "ansí que la mía es propia para acá, y la suya para allá"

(210). On one hand, this subversively recognizes the contribution of Jewish doctors to Spanish medicine.⁴⁵ Yet, more importantly, Pedro's mastery of classical knowledge acts as a claim to Constantinople. This contrasts with the Jews (and Ottomans) who are unable to decipher the learning it represents, and thus are not the appropriate doctors for the city.

Later, when discussing Troy, Pedro mentions Galen again. In addition to reinforcing the ties between Galen, Pedro and Troy, Pedro establishes the importance of classical Greek in practicing medicine, reinforcing his merit as an heir to the city. In response to Matalascallando's question about the differences of modern and ancient Greek, ("griego y gramática griega"), Pedro explains "En el tiempo de Demóstenes y Eschines, Homero y Galeno y Platón y los demás, en Grecia se hablaba el buen griego, y después vino a barbarizarse y corrompióse de tal manera que no la saben la gramática" (318). Pedro portrays the modern Greek speakers as the corrupt, barbaric descendants of ancient luminaries. While Pedro concedes that any Greek student of 'gramática' can learn more in a year than a Spanish student could in 20, Pedro still insists "estad satisfecho que hay pocos en Grecia que hablen más elegante y coresanamente su propia lengua que yo, ni aun mejor pronunciada" (319). Pedro's superior Greek makes him a fitting heir to the Eastern Mediterranean's classical legacy, in contrast to Constantinople's current residents, whether contemporary Greeks, Ottomans or Jews.

Additionally, Pedro discounts non-Greek forms of learning, creating a divide between East and West. Pedro qualifies Averroes as one of "[los] bárbaros que no alcanzaron filosofía" (323). Moreover, he is critical of his peer's knowledge of Arabic, saying "tampoco entienden mucho" (171). Of Hebrew intellectualism, he says "en hebraico ningún autor hay que valga un cuarto" (171). Instead, the best doctors are those who had studied in Spain prior to the expulsion.

⁴⁵ Similar to this, Pedro elsewhere observes that the expulsion resulted in the Jews sharing the technology of gunpowder with the Turks.

Pedro chastises the use of translations, decrying apprenticeships where “unos con otros se andan enseñando, y cuasi va por herencia, que el padre deja la barreta y un libro que dice en romance: ‘para curar tal enfermedad, tal y tal remedio,’” sin poner la causa de donde puede venir” (170). This inadequate bookishness contrasts with Pedro, who, after claiming falsely to be a *médico*, reads a single book, acquiring expertise of the entire field thanks to “aquella poca de lógica que había estudiado” (134). This points to a second contrast that Pedro marks between himself as a Christian and the intellectual traditions he encounters in Constantinople. In addition to consider *what* is learned (Greek medicine or non-Greek, that is), Pedro also places weight on *how* it is learned. Pedro argues for a thorough learning, rather than a superficial ad hoc form of studying. When arguing against the apprenticeships described above, Pedro insists that one should memorize texts rather than use them as references: “yo reniego del médico que ha de estudiar cada cosa cuando es menester, que mucho mejor sería tomarlo en la cabeza y traerlo dentro” (171). Keeping in mind that memory was tied to humanist understanding of intellect (Merino 32), this is on the one hand another nod at Pedro’s learnedness, and the accompanying lack thereof among his fellow doctors. It also represents two different attitudes toward classical history. While the Jewish doctors use it as a reference, Pedro both commits it to memory, demonstrating a more intimate connection with classicism, and also applies classical learning (“lógica”) to learn even more. The Orient, in contrast, is bound to wrong modes of learning and decoding classical knowledge, a theme which persists in *Santa Liga*, our next work.

In order to lay claim to classical knowledge based on his merit, however, Pedro must disrupt genealogical claims. For this reason, Pedro argues that medicine should not be an inheritable profession. While curing Sinan Bajá, Pedro asks a Jewish doctor whether he became a licenciado through letters or inheritance. The doctor replies that his father studied in Salamanca,

and, for that reason, so was the doctor and his children, who were “licenciaditos” (224), prompting Pedro to laugh.⁴⁶ As we have seen, this is accompanied by his disdain for the Greeks, who he reduces to “la jente más bárbara” (317). For Pedro, claims to intellectual tradition are not genetic, but rather based on merit.⁴⁷ In recognizing its true value, Pedro asserts a stronger claim to antiquity that contrasts with both Greeks and Jews.

Pedro’s knowledge of Greek and the latest learning strategies thus casts humanism as a chance to assert Christian intellectual hegemony over the two other Abrahamic religions that long provoked anxiety in Europe. The conquest of Troy and subsequent journey back to the West thus serve as a symbol for the larger battlefield of classical learning, as Europe wrestles this away from religious others.

Architecture

This dispute over control of classical learning also has an architectural element. While we’ve dealt with architectural terms of envy in the previous chapter, here architecture also indicates the conditions of the culture around it as an index of learning. When describing the state of education in Troy, we have seen how Pedro focuses on the physical structure of schools, saying “Ni en Athenas ni en toda Greçia hay escuela ni rastro de haber habido letras entre los griegos” (317). The state of Greece’s education is inscribed onto the state of its buildings. Just as it is with learning, Troy is also a battleground for claims to classical architecture.

Nowhere is this more apparent than when Pedro narrates his experience of Troy, which is largely in ruins: “pedaços de edifiçios antiguos hay muchos” and in other cases, “ni donde

⁴⁶ It is worth noting the subversive nature of Pedro’s argument. If it is absurd for knowledge to be passed down, then isn’t whole proposition of *limpieza de sangre* equally so? This contrasts with Pedro’s obvious anti-Judaism elsewhere.

⁴⁷ Although he does recognize the benefits of osmosis thanks to family, assenting when Matalascallando alleges that his herbological knowledge is thanks to “siendo hijo de partera, primo de barbero y sobrino de boticario” (177).

parezca rastro de lo pasado” (316)⁴⁸. Pedro notes that Troy has declined, being “no como solía, sino como Pérgamo.” The majority of the remaining buildings are “labradas no a la antigua, sino pobremente, como a la morisca” (317). This contrast between poor, Moorish and enduring classical constructions is explained earlier: “No quieren los turcos hazer perpetuos edificios, sino para su vida, y así las paredes de la casa son de buena piedra y lodo, y por la una y la otra parte argamasa, que no es mal edificio” (185-86). As Bunés Ibarra comments: “existe una contraposición entre el mundo romano, representado por edificios sólidos y grandiosos, con una arquitectura perdurable, y el otomano, que construye sus habitaciones con materiales baratos y pobres, con unas características eminentemente funcionales” (*La imagen* 49).

The accompanying claims of Western hegemony rest on top of a contrast between the permanence of Western architecture, and the ephemerality of Oriental architecture. Troy remains as a permanent, concrete symbol of the classical world’s legacy that contrasts with the ephemeral attitude that Pedro attributes to the Ottomans.

In contrast to *Andanzas y viajes*, where the Ottomans live reverentially among the ruins, Pedro implies that the destruction of ancient ruins is due to the Ottoman construction in Constantinople, “para los edificios que el Gran Turco haze en Constantinopla lleban toda quanta piedra hallan en estas antiguallas” (316). As a consequence, when he describes Troy’s cities, it is as a realm of disappearing ruins. The text highlights Muslim interference in interpreting the ancient ruins.

This parallels a similar perception in Spain, where, as Antonio Urquizar-Herrera notes, Spain’s mudéjar wonders were often thought to have been built upon (or with) Roman ruins.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ As we’ve mentioned, Pedro points out for a second time that Pérgamo is “de donde fue natural el Galeno” (316).

⁴⁹ “Reclaiming Islamic monuments as antiquities implied the existence of a thread that connected them anachronically to the classical period, a thread that was frequently spun out of arguments around the reuse of ancient

Reading Spain's classical past was thus blocked by the intervening mudéjar architecture. This opposes Antiquity to the Ottoman present. Seeing the process repeated would have given a sense of urgency and another reason to intervene and save Europe's antiquity, as the Ottomans demolish ancient ruins to make their own. At the same time, it diminishes the importance of Ottoman architecture, suggesting that it is merely built on and from Western ingenuity.

Within this apparent Orthodox reading, however, we can find another, more heterodox one, as Pedro champions humanist learning while criticizing Ottoman and Spanish pedagogy.⁵⁰ This is a risky move. Goyita Núñez Esteban argues that the author of *Viaje* chose to remain anonymous since "La literatura erasmista estaba entrando de manera clandestina en nuestro país y hacía muy poco (1556) que se había descubierto un foco protestante en Valladolid con el que había acabado inmediatamente la Inquisición" (335). Constantinople thus provides a space in which Pedro can practice and argue for humanism, even as he encodes it in a discourse of Spanish superiority, imagining, in himself, a vision of a humanist Spain.

Conclusion

Pedro uses his medical and linguistic knowledge to cast himself as a worthy heir and claimant of antiquity, in contrast to the Ottoman Empire's neglect of it, symbolized by superficial knowledge of the past and destruction of its ruins. This acts as a larger move to colonize the past and to establish it as irrevocably Western and European, despite its current location in the Orient. In contrast to our two older texts, which depend on an association between

spoils. According to antiquarian texts, Córdoba's central mosque was a repository for Roman marbles, the foundations of the Giralda lay on Roman ruins, and the monarchs of the Alhambra had Latin inscriptions on display" (76).

⁵⁰ Pedro is cuttingly derisive of Spain's lack of intellectual curiosity, saying "pero tienen una buena cosa los maestros de España: que no quieren que los discípulos sean menos asnos que ellos, y los discípulos también tienen otra: que se contentan con saber tanto como sus maestros y no ser mayores asnos que ellos; y con esto se conjierta muy bien la música barbaresca" (321).

Troy and the Ottoman Empire, *Viaje de Turquía* uses Troy to present a new discourse where the author lays claim to the whole of the classical world. As we have seen, this is driven in part by Humanism, which cast Oriental difference in approaches to knowledge as weakness. This persists in our next work as well.

La Santa Liga (1621)

Lope de Vega's dramatic version of the Battle of Lepanto, *La Santa Liga* (published in 1621 as *Parte XV* of his comedies, and likely written in the last decade between 1595 and 1603, according to Antonucci (n.p.)) shows an evolution of how the discourse of Troy's classical world informs the conflict between Christians and Ottomans. Rather than being as central as it had been in previous texts, it now forms part of a network of classical references. Moreover, Troy is no longer tied exclusively to the Orient; rather, Lope de Vega keeps the best elements of the classical past for Europe, while projecting classical failures onto the Orient. This bolsters a larger strategy where Lope casts the Ottomans as poor students of the classical past, doomed to repeat it without learning from it. In contrast, the Europeans are able to understand the principal behind classical examples to beneficially apply them to their present circumstances. This emerges from a shift from a medieval dogmatism to a philological humanism, which affirms Europe as the rightful heir to the classical past, symbolized in Constantinople.

The work centers on fall of Cyprus (1570) and the Battle of Lepanto (1571). In the opening scene, the sultan Selín leaves the bath, hopelessly in love with Rosa Sultana. However, after being visited by his father in a dream, he decides to resume the work against the Christians by first re-conquering Cyprus. He sends his Bajá Mustafá to negotiate the island's return with the Venetians. On his way, Mustafá agrees to return the Christian captive Constancia and her son back to Cyprus. The Venetians refuse to cede Cyprus, and, after Mustafá leaves, Titian presents

the senate with a second painting of Rosa Sultana, a copy of the first that he made at Selín's request.

When Mustafá returns in the second act, he finds that Selín has now taken up with a second woman, Fátima, and that Alí, a second general, called him a coward in front of the Sultan; in reality, Alí is trying to take Constancia. To deal with the rivalry between the two generals, at the suggestion of both women, Selín appoints Alí as the commander of the fleet, and Mustafá as commander of the land. At the siege of Nicosia, the renegade Uchalí ends the argument by urging them to return Constancia to her husband Leonardo, hoping that he will betray the city.

In the third act, the parties of Santa Liga have finally agreed on terms as the Ottomans conquer Famagusta. The two sides meet in Lepanto, where the allegorical figures of Roma, Venecia and España narrate the Battle of Lepanto, where the Spanish are victorious.

Previous research

Criticism of the play has been rather limited, due in part to Menéndez Pelayo's harsh judgement. Scholars have primarily looked at the drama comparatively, or explored the role of Muslims in it. Taking the comparative route, Juan Udaondo Alegre explores Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*'s influence in the work, while Guillen Usandizaga does the same with Ercilla's *La Araucana*. Fausta Antonucci compares *La Santa Liga* to a play we looked at in our next chapter, Gabriel Lobo Lasso de la Vega's *Destruycion de Constantinopla*.

Elizabeth R. Wright explores how the play draws on various historiographical representations of the play to meet the needs of a diverse audience ("Enredos") and looks at how resolves the play's disjunct tones by tying them to underlying epic qualities ("Epic Temptation"). More relevant to our current theme, both Miguel Renuncio Roba and Mehmet Sait Sener connect

the play to its contemporary historical reality, as well as analyzing how Lope characterizes the Ottomans.

Fredrick de Armas has looked at the role of ecphrasis in the work. The critic explores the importance of several of Titian's works in contributing to the text's orientalism ("Allure"). In a second article, he notes how Titian's mission to the Ottoman court uses painting to underscore Europe's greater cultural achievement ("Sultanas, reinas, damas y villanas").

The last three critics have noted several aspects of Orientalism in the text, such as Selín's feminization, lasciviousness, and cruelty. My present exploration considers how classical heritage provides a means for the text to establish a positional superiority that casts the Ottomans as anti-intellectual.

As we consider various references below, we see how, in its final state, Troy no longer plays a central role in establishing the West as a superior military power; rather, Troy now is present as a single point in a constellation of classical references (a culmination of the discourses that we saw in our previous text) that establish Spain as culturally superior. Lope de Vega draws on a broad range of past conflicts to reinforce the inevitable victory of the Christians and, more importantly, the superiority with which Spain understands classical intellectual heritage. This revolves around two legal traditions that Lope de Vega evokes early on in the work—the *mos italicus* and the *mos gallicus*. They highlight two different forms of understanding the classical past, which, I suggest, Lope uses to frame the contrast between Ottoman and Christian uses of antiquity across three themes: Cleopatra's Egypt, Socrates' dialogue with Phaedrus, and the gigantomachy.

Asia

The conflict between the Ottoman forces and the Holy League is portrayed in terms of Orient and Occident. Both Selín and Rosa come to represent the entirety of Asia or the Orient, echoing the metonymic role that we've seen with Troy and the Orient in the Middle Ages.

Mustafá calls him

¡Oh, gallardo descendiente
de la gran casa otomana,
por tantos siglos dichosa
en la sujeción del Asia! (176-79)

Rosa Solimana is “la hermosura del Asia,” (142-44) and refers to him as ruler of “más que por el Asia toda, / por merecer mi favor” (629-30). Selín loves Rosa enough such that he'd consider himself fortunate even “Cuando perdiera en Oriente / lo que tiene conquistado” (38-40). This essentialization of the Orient as Ottoman is marked by religious division, as we see in Juan's prayer “¡Vivís Vos, que apenas quede / en toda el Asia cabeza!” (2027-28). Similarly, Mustafá praises Ali as a second Alexander, an inversion of the Greek king's lengthy march eastward. This recalls the Asia/Europe dichotomy that, as we've seen, defines the present conflict.

Troy

Missing among the above references to Asia is the elision with Troy that we've seen in our introduction. Frédéric Serralta provides an initial study of references to Troy in Lope's corpus, observing that the playwright employs such allusions broadly, at times as simple rhetorical devices, and at others as meaningful allusions. Understandably, the critic does not include *La Santa Liga*, which admittedly has only passing references to Troy. While the *materia troyana* does play a role in casting the conflict between East and West, the Ottomans are no longer clearly associated with the Trojans as we have seen in our first two works. Rather, both sides of the Trojan war are subsumed as Christian. This represents, I suggest, a final step in

Spain's growing confidence (due to the Battle of Lepanto and perceived decline of the Ottoman Empire) in its worthiness as an heir of classical intellectual inheritance, as Spain now claims the entirety of classical history.

Though we shall further delve into the nature of this representation, it is enough here to consider what of the *materia troyana* Lope permits the Ottomans, and what part he does not. While the playwright uses the figure of Helen to criticize their erotic decadence, he reserves the epic heroes for the Christians.⁵¹ In Act III, Juan compares himself and Andrea to figures from the *Illiad*: “Yo seré español Aquiles; / sed vos Héctor genovés” (2037-38), echoing the *Viaje de Turquía* in reserving both Greek *and* Trojan heroism for the West. Lope separates the legacy of erotic failure from heroic achievement (a move echoed in his treatment of Marco Antonio/Mark Antony), going so far as to project the Trojan Hector into Christendom. Marking a contrast with the Medieval dichotomy of Troy/Turkey and Greece/Europe that we've seen in our previous texts, Lope reapportions classical heritage, rewarding epic heroism to the Westerners and branding the Orientals with the failures within that heroism.

Troy is referenced for the Turks, though with an important caveat. As Mustafá and Alí both fight over Constanca, prompting the latter to declare that she “ni es Elena, ni la Cava.” Constanca, on the one hand, evokes Constancy in her dogged loyalty to her husband and willingness to fight the Turks. However, it inevitably evokes Constantinople as well, “Que vamos a buscar al enemigo / hasta Constantinopla” (2533-34). Just as Constanca's fate is tied to Constantinople's, Helen's is to Troy's—the women come to represent the city, showing how Troy lends itself as a device for predicting the Ottoman defeat. This appropriation of Troy as a Western symbol is one element of Lope's larger deployment of the classical world's legacy as a

⁵¹ This calls to mind Said's quote, “What is really left to the Arab after all is said and done is an undifferentiated sexual drive” (311).

discourse of positional superiority that places Spain above the Ottomans by casting the latter as poor readers of Greco-Roman history.

Mos italicus v. mos gallicus

Lope portrays two different approaches to the classical past: while the Ottomans take the classical references as literal models that they must dogmatically imitate, the work's Christians are allowed a more nuanced application of the classical past. This is particularly clear as Lope references to jurists that reflect two rival legal traditions.

Lope depicts his Ottomans in a decidedly non-literate light. Mustafá disputes the hereditary claim from the last Cypriot king Luis Saboya (1426-1482) by arguing

mas los Baldos y Jasones,
que escribe Italia y España
con tinta, con sangre pura
los escribimos en Asia. (886-889)

I suggest that these references serve two purposes here. On the one hand, Mustafá is rejecting two important European jurists, Baldus de Ubaldis (1327-1400) and Giasone del Maino (1435-1519), underscoring the drama's lack of corresponding Muslim jurisprudence. For Lope's popular audience, this would have been tantamount to rejecting all erudition, Faustino Martínez notes.⁵² Mustafá later adds to this a direct opposition of letters to arms:

No penséis que allá tenemos
letrados de ropas largas,
ni se han de revolver libros,
sino en la mar las armadas.
No se han de mojar las plumas,
sino los remos en agua,
en pólvora los cañones
y en los pechos las espadas. (894-901)

⁵² "Eso hizo que con suma facilidad el pueblo, el lenguaje popular, asumiesen su nombre como modelo de inteligencia, sabiduría, erudición, formación jurídica, y, al mismo tiempo, como se ha visto en el capítulo anterior, como representante del confucionismo y la complejidad a la que se había llegado en el mundo del derecho" (Martínez Martínez 133).

In opposing *letrados*,⁵³ pens, and books, the Ottomans are presented as anti-intellectual and unlearned. This, as we shall see, later undermines their claims to the classical heritage on which their empire is built.

At the same time, it is important that both were disciplines of the Bártolo de Sassoferrato, the greatest champion of the *mos italicus*, a legal approach that dogmatically held Roman law as inviolable.⁵⁴ Opposing it was the humanist jurisprudence (*mos gallicus*) that emerged in the early 1500's and, rather, sought to understand the principles behind Roman law using historical context and philology. The *mos italicus* saw Roman law as the pinnacle of jurisprudence, while humanism was more willing to comment and criticize Justinian law, seeing it as appropriate for Rome, but not necessarily timeless (Carpintero 109-10).

By Lope's time, the *mos italicus* would have seemed dated, painting Mustafá as behind the latest intellectual currents. The reference also contains a comment on the Ottoman character's view of ancient history. As we shall see elsewhere, there is a frequent gap between Ottoman knowledge of the ancient world and the ability to profit from its examples by considering the universal principals that classical knowledge offers. In contrast, the play's Christians are able to adapt classical references to their war against the Ottoman empire.⁵⁵

⁵³ We must note that Mustafá goes a step further than does another famous defender of arms, Don Quixote. While the knight advocates for the superiority of *armas* as an enforcement of the law that *letrados* write, Mustafá discredits letters all together.

⁵⁴ Faustino Martínez Martínez argues that these historical figures are evoked as part of the expanding role of common law in Lope's Spain, interpreting the above passage as demonstrating how "el Derecho Común está dominando la argumentación jurídica" (136). The critic does not push his argument any further, however, and glosses over the transition from *mos italicus* to *mos gallicus*, likely because "Lope no tenía conocimientos jurídicos" (132). I would argue, however, that given Lope's extensive education, including several years at a Jesuit institute, that the playwright likely would have been sufficiently informed to recognize both jurists as at odds with Spanish Humanism.

⁵⁵ This association between the play's Christians and humanism is evident as well in Udaondo's analysis. He observes in the text a division between *Venus vulgaris* and *Venus caelestis*, following Plato's *Banquet* and its division between divine and earthly love. The latter represents "símbolo cristianizado de las ideas," and "la cristianización de ideas neoplatónicas" as most embodied in Juan de Austria's prayer in the third act (704). Selín is, in contrast, "un auténtico esclavo de la Venus vulgaris," (707).

This becomes evident from the opening of the text, where Selín misinterprets the Roman custom of bathing, asking,

¿qué nación,
de cuantas han sido y son,
tuvo en la guerra las manos
que los antiguos romanos? (26-29)

Selín associates bathing as a martial trait, even though the servant whom he addresses points out that this was only during times of peace. Selín's imitation of Roman customs is foregrounded as unthinking, and rather dogmatic. He imitates the customs of Rome, without discerning the moral lessons therein, that is, without seeking the principal behind them. Underscoring this irony, Lope seems to be playing off of rumors that Selim II fatally split his head after chasing a concubine and slipping in the bath (Finkel 162).

We see this motif repeated in Lope de Vega's diverse employments of classical Greek and Roman techniques. Echoing Selín's dogmatic interpretations of bathes and empires, Lope implies that the Ottomans are only able to use mythical references as models for immorality, without considering the principals behind classical examples. Christians, in contrast, use them to perfect their spirituality and service to the state. The majority of the mythical allusions are on the part of the Ottoman characters, and, above all, they serve to critique Selín and the dangers of unrestricted sexual temptation. The most obvious, of course, is the repeated reference to Mars in the arms of Venus that is first mentioned by the Christian slaves in the initial scene, and later again by Bajá Pialí in the following scene, where he tries to warn Selím of the dangers of his decadent life. Despite these warnings, Selím insists in dividing his loyalties, never fully turning his back on Venus to embrace Mars.

Cleopatra

The battle of Actium is an additional classical reference that shows this dogmatic imitation of immorality. Fatima scolds Selím for pursuing two women by “¡Por tu vida, que metías / dos áspides en el pecho!” (1142-43). This reference to Cleopatra is particularly meaningful in light of the Marco Antonio Colonna (1535-1584), an Italian Duke who captained the papal ship *Capitana* during the Battle of Lepanto.

Evoking Cleopatra both feminizes Selím, but also links him to Egypt, echoing another theme in the text, where the Ottoman Empire, “hasta el abrasado Egipto” (50), is repeatedly tied to Egypt. That the Empire stretches to Egypt factors directly into the conquest of Cyprus, locating it geographically,⁵⁶ and also justifying it politically: “Selín, de Selín abuelo, / ganó a Egipto y, así, gana / a Chipre por bienes suyos” (878-80). In linking him to Egypt as a preface to the naval Battle in the third act, Lope de Vega evokes Mark Antony’s defeat at the Battle of Actium, a definitive loss of Ptolemaic Egypt to Rome. Despite the clear warnings from his love interest, Selím repeats the destructive eroticism of the Roman General by insisting that he can love both Rossa and Fatima and still lead the Empire to victory. This echoes, as well, his inability to choose between the two generals, Mustafá and Alí, as they fall into rivalry. Selín is unable to understand the principal behind the historical account to connect erotic dissipation to loss of empire.

This casts Marco Antonio Colonna as a reversal and undoing of his namesake’s loss by fighting alongside Cleopatra against Rome. This connection becomes more patent as the text

⁵⁶ Chipre, al mar Mediterráneo,
puesta entre provincias varias,
la que tiene al mediodía
a Egipto en igual distancia (842-47).

brings into play other women for whom kingdoms have fallen as Alí says of Constanca, “ni es Elena, ni la Cava” (1443).

To harden the borders between good and bad elements of classicism, Lope carefully subordinates his allusions to Greek mythology to state and religion. In our examples above (“Yo seré español Aquiles; / sed vos Héctor genovés” (2037-38)), Juan clarifies that both his and Andrea’s epic quality are in service to their respective states. Similarly, the mythological references are carefully subordinated to the Christian mission. This is echoed again, when Andrea compares Juan to the Roman god of war, he is careful to qualify him as “un cristiano Marte” (2786). The submission to state and religion is reaffirmed by biblical references that come alongside the allusions to Greek Myth, as is the case of Pope Pius, for instance, “No vencía Josué / mientras que Moisés no oraba” (1994-95). Another example is when Don Juan exclaims “Seré rayo de tu sol, / nuevo David español” (2039-2040). Later, Felipe II (1527-1598) is compared to the Biblical King Solomon (1979-80).

How Classical history is understood foregrounds the different ways that both Christians and the Ottomans appropriate ancient heritage, returning to our division of the dogmatic Bartolismo clashing with the more broad-minded humanism. While the Ottomans are confined to imitating decadent practices like bathing and the fatal attractions for Venus, Cleopatra, Helen, and the Cava, the Catholics are able to profit from and avoid repeating these examples, embracing instead the best, heroic qualities. While the Ottomans are indiscriminate in their imitation, the Christians are able to choose what to imitate as they consider the principals behind classical examples.

Faedro

This inability to profit from classical example becomes even more apparent as we consider how the work evokes Plato’s *Phaedrus* in the allegory of the chariot. Here, Plato

compares the human soul, divided into natural passions and the rational, moral side to carriage drawn by two horses.⁵⁷



Figure 1: Titian. *La Religión socorrida por España*. 1572-5. Image courtesy of ARTstor.

⁵⁷ “So when the charioteer sees the light of his beloved’s eyes, his whole soul is suffused with a sensation of heat and he is filled with the tingling and pricking of desire. The horse that is obedient to the charioteer restrains itself from leaping on its beloved, because as always it is held back by a sense of shame. The other horse, however, stops paying any attention to the charioteer’s goad and whip; it prances and lunges forward violently, making life extremely difficult for its team-mate and for the charioteer, and compelling them to head towards the beloved and bring up the subject of the pleasures of sex” (38).

To understand how this is referenced in the play, we must look at how Lope draws ekphrastically on of the final paintings of Titian who, we recall, is featured as a character in the first act. As Frederick de Armas notes, “several aspects of the *Allegory of Religion* enter into the composition of Lope’s third act” (“Allure” 201). In considering how the painting evokes the allegory above, we are will be able to understand how, in comparing Selín to Constancia, Lope shows the Ottoman ruler’s failure to reflect classical ideals of balance, while Leonisa is able to. The Ottoman leader is doomed to imitate the platonic divide, yet, in contrast to his Christian enemies, is unable to overcome it.

It is helpful to briefly analyze the painting: *La Religión socorrida por España* was first composed as a sketch of Virtue triumphing over Vice for Alfonso d’Este in 1534 that Vasari describes. The current version was sent by Guzmán de Silva to Charles V in 1575, alongside other religious paintings. The painting is oil on linen, centering on the figure of Spain bearing a breastplate and victory standard, and the figure of Religion who appears partly naked, lying under a tree with various serpents representing heresy threaten her from behind. Behind the figure of Spain, we see another figure, who probably represents Justice, and a man who is likely Juan de Austria, the illegitimate son of Carlos V, half-brother to Felipe II and commander of the Christian fleet at Lepanto. In the background, we see the allegorical figure of Neptune in a chariot pulled by two horses over the sea.

While we will later consider other parts of the painting, I wish to focus briefly on two aspects of it. First, the horses of the chariot describe Selín’s inability to dominate his passions; this forms a contrast with Constancia’s single-minded devotion. In a work dominated by love, this tension between two forms of loving is evident in Selín, who is likewise divided in two. Shortly after declaring his love for Fátima, she tells him

no podrás tener
dos mujeres en un pecho;
que es más llano que la palma
que, cuando celos les dieren,
reñirán y, si riñeren,
te han de alborotar el alma (1061-66).

Some hundred lines later, precisely this happens. This indecision is echoed later, when Alí slanders Mustafá, claiming that Mustafá cowered before the Venetian senate. Selín is on the verge of impaling both, when Fátima urges him instead to honor them (1320).

In addition to splitting his heart between two women and two generals, Selín is also torn between his erotic desire and his desire to fulfill his father's legacy, as Roba notes (210).⁵⁸ This is echoed in the painting, where we can see one horse with its head turned toward the galleys ready for war, and the other toward the naked woman beneath the tree.

This provides a further contrast between Constanca and Selín. She similarly feels torn between two loves during the Battle of Cyprus, where her child and husband are captured anew, as she laments:

Cuando acometer
quise a defender mi esposo
y, con esfuerzo animoso,
con él la vida perder,
por otra parte me asalta
el alma, sin quien ya vivo,
ver mi Marcelo cautivo,
del alma prenda tan alta.
¡Ay, dulce hijo! ¡Ay, esposo! (1820-28)

However, in contrast to Selín, these two loves are nobler, both symbols of procreation and family. In recognizing that she may not have both, she accepts this, ("Pues que dos vidas no

⁵⁸ "Selín se nos presenta al principio de la obra como un mal gobernante que, en lugar de ejercer su cargo con diligencia y responsabilidad, ha abandonado los asuntos de estado para dedicarse a los placeres sensuales que le ofrece la corte de Constantinopla: los baños, la música, el baile, las trescientas mujeres que componen su harén y, sobre todo, un ciego y loco amor hacia su bella esposa, Rosa Solimana" (210).

tengo, / el uno ha de perdonarme” (1838-40)). After she has the chance to save both, she affirms her constancy after Leonardo calls her by name, “--¡Constancia! --Seré este día / la misma virtud, ¡por Dios!” (1846-47). This highlights Selín’s inconstancy, as he refuses to sacrifice one passion for another throughout the play.

The painting’s horses not only represent Selín’s indecision between Venus and Mars, but also point to a larger division in the Ottoman Empire. Just as one horse looks at the sea while the other toward the land, the Ottomans divide their forces between land and sea, under two different generals. This contrasts with the unity and lack of discord among the Christians, where (despite initial tensions) Don Juan is the sole commander. As Juan Andrea Doria, the Genoan in charge of the vanguard states,

Un cuerpo lleno de humores
presto se corrompe y gasta;
allí es sola una nación
y sólo un señor la manda. (2399-402)

The Christians are of one mind, as is reflected in the painting where the figure of Spain and Justice look at the figure of Religion harmoniously. This forms a fascinating contrast with Selín’s own use of painting, done “contra los ritos de su infame seta” (v. 801). As Frederick de Armas comments, the original painting that was likely referred to in the play was a portrait of Rossa Sultana holding a weasel, a symbol of lust (“Allure” 199). This suggests that the decadent Sultan commissioned the painting with the purpose of titillation, rather than the edificatory use that Lope rewards his audience for as they trace the connections between *La Religión socorrida* and the play. The playwright thus adds another facet to his exploration of proper and improper readings, casting the Ottomans as poor viewers of art.

Gigantomachy

Considering the painting in light of the play also gives us insight into how Constantinople works within Lope's Orientalizing framework for classicism. By drawing on mythology, Lope de Vega portrays the struggle between religions as the struggle between gods.

To establish this, we will focus on another element of the painting, the two central national figures and the deities that they evoke. The prominently-figured turbaned Neptune is aligned with the Ottomans. The armed woman representing Spain in the forefront, however, is initially unclear. Helpfully, Panofsky notes that in previous drafts the figure of Spain was Minerva (88-89).

This juxtaposition of Neptune alongside Minerva calls to mind a mythical competition between the two deities. Both offered gifts to become the patron deity of Athens, which, in that time, had no name. Neptune offers a horse, or, in another version, the sea, but, as it was salty and undrinkable, the citizens did not accept it. Minerva, however, offers the olive tree, winning the contest. Neptune, enraged, floods the city.

In addition to the two gods, the myth is also evoked in thematic objects: the sea, horses, and tree. There are several moments in the plays where Lope seems to be drawing on both the painting and the myth. Lope casts the Ottomans as Neptune. After the Ottoman victory in Turkey, Uchalí and Alí sit on the shore, reflecting on how, in their victory, "Neptuno a sus arenas se retira, / los peces tiemblan del fatal estrago" (2194-95). The juxtaposition of the seated Ottomans alongside a reclining Neptune reinforces the connection between the two that we see in the portrait. Moreover, Marcelo, Constancia's son, similarly evokes the portrait's image of Neptune transported by his seahorses. When the mother explains that they cannot walk across the sea back home, the child declares "Pues, madre, en un carro iremos" (749). Perhaps the clearest

moment is in the first act. Upon finding news that Selín is building an armada, a Christian captive laments “Constantinopla se hunde” (735), recalling Neptune’s divine punishment.

Lope’s reading of the painting within the play thus projects the disputed Athens on to Constantinople, whose possession is left in doubt as the army contemplates a move toward the Ottoman capital. Both cities are the point of contestation between two different gods. This is foreshadowed in previously discussed references to the Trojan war, as much a conflict between the gods as it is between men. We find an additional reference to the gigantomachy in the first act. Selín marvels at Alí’s invented stories of Mustafá’s cowardice before the Venetian senate, wondering how this could be so for

un hombre arrogante,
soberbio y loco en exceso,
que tendrá este monte en peso,
como en Sicilia el gigante (1184-87).

The giant in question is Enceladus, who was buried under the island of Sicily by Athena during the war between the Titans and the gods. In comparing Alí to the giant, Lope also casts the Ottoman Empire as a sort of monstrosity, recalling Juan Doría’s observation that, due to its distinct nations, the Empire was like a corrupt body (2399).

In the play, the conflicts between Athena and Neptune and Athena and Enceladus are echoed in the conflict between the Christian *Dios* and *Alá*, warring over possession of the whole world, yet also over a single city. This points back to the Cypriot mother Constanca, for whom both Christian and Ottomans fight while she remains loyal to the true God. She is a symbol for Constantinople, the center of a mythical conflict between two different gods, competing both for them and for the classical heritage they represent. Spain’s superimposition on the figure of Athena predicts the ultimately victory of Spain while alluding to the accompanying recovery of the city for Christendom.

Moreover, the Christians are associated with Athena, the goddess of wisdom, in contrast to the brutish Neptune or Enceladus, whom she manages to overpower or outwit. This returns us to our initial observation—as patrons of Athena, the Christians are able to draw lessons from the past, rather than dogmatically imitating it as do the Ottomans. Neptune is also an important figure—he represents, here, the navel nature of the battle, but also contrasts with Athena (for whom a city is named) as a sort of nomadic, un-landed figure. His glance toward the vulnerable allegorical figure of faith is also an envious glance toward land.

These references to Roman gods have implications for the work’s location among genres. As Wright notes, the play was written during a time of greater interest in the epic, both nationally, and, in Lope’s case, personally, as he sought to become a royal chronicler⁵⁹ (“Epic Temptation” 322). The critic goes on to ask “Why give the Battle of Lepanto—an epic event if ever imperial Spain engendered one—such varied, comic treatment?” This is in reference to the epic quality of the third act that contrasts with the more comedic nature of the first two. Wright suggests that this mixture adjusts the epic genre to a popular theater setting. As an additional consideration, I would note that the play shows a shift in its epic protagonism, alongside an increase in epic elements. While the first act starts with the epic resonance of the visit from Selín’s father, the third act boldly claims epic as its own genre, such as the description of the battle in 2700-12, which Wright ties to the Canto 24 in *La Araucana*, while at the same time now bestowing on the Christians the bold titles of second Hector and Achilles. This is a triumphalist move, as the classic genre is wrested away from the Ottomans and given in full to the work’s Christians, while at the same time representing the Christian triumph as a sort of epic. In addition to the political, imperial implications (echoed in the references to gigantomachy, where the

⁵⁹ Moreover, as Juan Udaondo notes, the work coincides with the start of Lope’s epic production (695).

Spanish take the place of the Ottomans as supreme rulers), this also has intellectual and literary significance. In laying exclusive claim, Lope asserts that the epic genre as well as its classical past belong to Europe.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Lope draws on classical knowledge in two ways: first, to assert European intellectual superiority as the proper heirs to ancient Greece and Rome, and also to show the inevitability of Christian victory through divine contests like the gigantomachy. Notably, Troy's role in this has shifted. It is less central than in our previous texts, now forming a part of a constellation of classical allusions.

Conclusion

Classicism and the Ottomans

These texts offer numerous points of juncture and disjuncture with how the classics and Ottomans explained one another outside of Spain. Here, Nancy Bisaha's study proves useful. On the one hand, we can trace a continuity between humanists in and out of Spain. For instance, as happens with Italian humanists, Spanish authors also found that "ancient texts provided a cultural context and a discursive field in which humanists placed not only themselves but also the Ottoman Turks" (Bisaha 44). Additionally, some humanists drew equally on the Crusades and the Classical world, as we have seen Pero Tafur do (26). For Bisaha, Italian humanists generally fall somewhere between "two opposite approaches: Eurocentrism and, conversely, cultural tolerance" (9).

As Natalio Ohanna notes, this was no less the case among Spanish humanists⁶⁰ who show a similar “polarization of Spanish humanism into two irreconcilable trends with regard to the perception of Muslims” (111). However, this naturally draws on “the tensions within the borders of the Iberian Peninsula, where the capacity to absorb, adapt or obliterate its own Islamic heritage was being negotiated as a matter of national identity” (111). In contrast, however, “one cannot even find a distinction between the legacy of the ideals of crusade and the predominantly secular image used to exploit classical rhetoric, transforming the Turks into new barbarians” (110), a distinction that Bisaha is able to draw against Italian humanists.

Our texts above suggest additional differences between Spanish and Italian epistemologies regarding the Ottomans. I suggest three points of contrast: Spanish authors’ use of the term ‘barbarian,’ their dependence on Reconquista narratives, and their use of Troy. The texts we’ve considered show a reluctance to cast the Ottomans as barbarians. Bisaha’s Italian humanists shift from associating the Ottomans with the Trojans to portraying them more as barbarians.⁶¹ Bisaha writes that “From a purely academic standpoint, the Turks alarmed humanists... for the threat they posed to learning” (60). ‘Barbarian’ was later extended to refer to non-Turk Muslims, accompanied by “the giant leap of portraying all Muslims as backward dullards” (170).⁶²

⁶⁰ The critic analyzes two different humanist texts: Juan Luis Vives’s *De Europae dissidiis et bello Turcico* (1526) in which “the distinctly Renaissance spirit of his pacifism is reinforced by a recognition of the Muslim as belonging to a common humanity and, therefore, as a neighbor who must be approached in conformity with the Christian doctrine, through preaching and the example of impeccable works” (110-11); and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda’s *Cohortatio ad Carolum V* (1529) which “legitimizes the need for a military campaign against the Ottomans in terms of a mobilization of Christianity for its very existence” (104).

⁶¹ “Deceptively simple and seemingly redundant of classical tropes, the Turks as barbarians invited a complex set of cultural, historical, and psychological tools with which humanists envisioned and sought to control them intellectually. It comforted humanists to feel that even as Europeans were losing ground to the Turks they were somehow “better” than their foes and would certainly rise again” (78).

⁶² Bisaha goes on to add, “It seems peculiar that Muslim culture could become the object of humanist intellectual attacks when it produced some of the greatest philosophers of the Middle Ages. And yet some humanists, for example, Petrarch, completely dismissed Arab learning as valueless and even harmful to Western readers” (170).

This is not as clearly the case in our texts, perhaps because such an attitude would have been much harder to take seriously in Spain, even as it sought to rewrite its own Muslim history⁶³. Texts like *Andanzas e Viages* and *Viaje de Turquía* are, if anything, harsher on Christian ignorance than on the Ottomans. The term *barbaro* is used both to describe decadent Christians as well as the invading Ottomans in *Viaje de Turquía* and *Destruccion de Constantinopla* (although less often so in the case of latter). Only the triumphalist *Santa Liga* uses it exclusively to describe Muslims. Moreover, our texts do not make a strong effort to portray Ottomans as enemies of learning—Lope’s *turcos* spare no references to mythology, and in *Viaje de Turquía*,⁶⁴ Pedro is much harsher on his Greek co-religionaries than the Ottomans,⁶⁵ as is Pero Tafur. Rather, intellectual history, classical mythology, and architectural remains are often shown as contention prizes to be won.

Italian humanists also, at times, saw the Ottomans as *flagellum dei* (161). However, in Spain’s case, this was central, evoking (as we’ve seen) repeated parallels to the fall of Visigoth Spain, while Bisaha’s humanists compare the conquest of Constantinople to the fall of Rome. This reflects the difficulty in tracing a clear distinction between the Crusades and the humanist views of the Turks in Spanish humanism (Ohanna, *Invention* 110). This difference is crucial: while the fall of Rome marks the beginning of ‘dark ages’ for humanists, the fall of Visigoth

⁶³ Though this was not the case for Sepúlveda, who resembles the Italian humanists more:

Sepúlveda makes an important inference about the fate of Christians in Islamic lands by observing the form of intellectual slavery to which even those who share their faith and nation with the sultan are subjected. To remove all possibility of real freedom, Turks are prevented from the study of letters and are forbidden the knowledge of the liberal arts, which is most often that which moves the souls of mortals to freedom and true religion. (Ohanna 108)

⁶⁴ “[Vives] adopts the term ‘Turkish’ as a synonym for cruelty to condemn the Inquisition and the counterproductive effects of its use of coercion” (Ohanna 150).

⁶⁵ When Juan asks whether there are schools in Constantinople, Pedro replies, “Infinitas. Los señores, y primeramente el emperador, las tienen en sus casas para los pajes; tienen maestros salariables que van cada día a leerles su «Alcoram», que es en arábigo, y el «Musaf»; de manera que, como a nosotros el latín, les es a ellos el arábigo. Léenles también filosofía, astrología y poesía; verdad es que los que enseñan saben poco de esto y los discípulos no curan mucho de ello; pero, en fin, todavía saben más que los griegos cristianos y armenos, que son todos bestias” (397).

Spain, rather, marks the birth of the notion of modern Spain, and its subsequent expansion outward, through both the Americas and the Mediterranean.

This points to a further difference between how Spain and Italy viewed the Ottomans. As Bisaha notes, viewing the Ottomans as Barbarians fed into colonizing discourses in the Americas, where the goal of “colonizers from several countries was the quest to bring civilization, in the classical sense, to those lacking it” (182). Moreover, Bisaha conceives of colonialism as a “key component in the formation of the West-East discourse,” adding that, “the bulk of humanist rhetoric on the Ottomans and Islam shows a highly developed sense of Europe as the cultural superior to the East—precisely at a time when Europe was fighting for its survival” (6). It is, of course, important not to conflate the southward expansion of Iberian Christians during the Middle Ages with colonization. However, as our texts have shown, Christian Spain’s persistent interest in capturing and possessing Constantinople stemmed from similar conquests prior to 1453.

These differences are reflected in how Spanish authors deploy Troy. Initially, Troy played an overlapping role of importance in both Italy and Spain, providing one lens into how Europe understood its history—in essence a type that helped explain the Ottomans. Bisaha notes a gradual shift to casting the Ottomans as barbarians that parallels their emergence as an existential threat. In Spain’s case, however, particularly in our last texts, we find an increasing confidence that asserts that both Troy and Greece belong to Spain and its dreams of an extended Reconquest.

Said and Classicism

I will offer some observations on how the Spanish view of the Orient compares and contrasts to Said's. Said observes that the Orient was divided between the previously known or conquered places that evoked Herodotus and Alexander, and the unknown realms, such that "The Orient therefore alternated in the mind's geography between being an Old World to which one returned, as to Eden or Paradise, there to set up a new version of the old, and being a wholly new place to which one came as Columbus came to America, in order to set up a New World" (58). The former perception, the restoration of an 'Old World', emerges as themes both in *Andanzas e Viages* and *Tirant lo blanc*, as both characters seek to reconquer Constantinople and Kos.

Said also observes they are an object of European fascination: "the Orient of memories, suggestive ruins, forgotten secrets, hidden correspondences, and an almost virtuosic style of being" (170). As we will see in our next chapter, ruins similarly attracted Spanish interest. However, rather than evoking mystery (although Pero Tafur is eager to decode the ruins of Troy), these ruins serve as a means to criticize local, Christian and Jewish culture, as is the case in *Viaje de Turquía*. In the case of *Tirant*, they serve as a point of departure to renew the Orient, recalling European interest "in remaking himself and the Orient (dead and dry-a mental mummy)" (Said 193).

Said compares the post-Enlightenment public's fascination with enlightenment Orientalism to "a similar enthusiasm in Europe for Greek and Latin antiquity during the High Renaissance" (51). While Said does not dive further into this parallel, we have seen how, in fact, humanism has run apace with Orientalism, giving it types with which to understand the Ottoman.

Interest in antiquity is intertwined with the Orient, and justified a need to possess and colonize classical history. This need was strengthened all the more by anxieties over its location

in Ottoman-controlled lands. Said acknowledges that Europe viewed Islam's entanglement with classical and Biblical lands as problematic. For Said's Orientalists, the Greek tradition is antithetical to the Muslims who now inhabit its geography. Hellenists like Carl Becker showed their "love of Greece curiously by displaying a positive dislike of the Orient" (Said 209). Similarly, travelers like Chateaubriand noted the contrast between classical Greece and its current inhabitants "how can this degenerate stupid mob of 'Musulmans' have come to inhabit the same land whose vastly different owners so impressed Herodotus and Diodorus?" (Said 175) This tension stems from sense of faulty stewardship, where Muslims are an imperfect heir to Greco-Roman identity: "Islam'... inherited the Hellenic tradition, it could neither grasp nor employ the Greek, humanistic tradition" (Said 103). This echoes the 'barbarism' that Bisaha finds among Italian humanists.

Our Spanish authors nuance this, and show that, for them, the Ottomans can employ the Greek tradition, but imperfectly, and in a way that is inferior to Europe. Spain's unique history leads to distinct epistemological strategies for explaining and containing the Ottoman Orient, based on intimate lived experience. Our texts recognize that the Muslim world was too complex to essentialize, in contrast to Said's "Arab Oriental... staring vacantly out at a modern landscape he can neither understand nor cope with" (312). Spain's understanding of the diverse and changing nature of Dar-al-Islam made it impossible to deny Muslim dynamism; moreover, to have done so would have undercut the merit of the 711 conquest as well as Spain's lengthy Reconquest.

To deal with this stronger sense of Muslim agency, Spanish authors thus needed a discursive flexibility to frame and contain the East Mediterranean Orient. It found this in understanding Constantinople as a heterotopia, of which Troy's role is one aspect, where the fall

of the ancient city allows authors to interpret the fall of the Byzantine capital in readings of positional superiority.

Yet, it is also because of this awareness of Muslim contributions that Spanish authors show an increasing interest in encroaching epistemologically, as well as politically, on what was previously imagined to be the domain of the Ottomans, Troy. Spain readily folded the Ottomans into the structures of reconquest of the Iberian Moors as it saw its own founding myth reflected in the conquest of Troy, and in Constantinople.

Another contrast with Said's framework is in Spain's complication of its notion of collective self as it delves into its past and mapping out its sense of empire. In asserting legitimacy over ancient sites that were of interest to all Europeans, our texts also assert Spanish merit over that of other states, as Constantinople and Troy help to locate Spain within Europe in a superior, exclusive role. The East Mediterranean Orient provides space for discourse on the Orient, yet also for discourse on Spain relative to the rest of the West.

The flexibility of heterotopia also enables the shift we have seen in our analysis above. At first, it reflects Spain's initial strategies to 'make due,' dealing with the threat of the Ottoman Empire by using Troy to promise victory against it, as we see in *Andanzas* and *Tirant lo Blanc*. This gives way to a growing confidence in asserting ownership of the ancient heritage that Troy comes to represent as we can see in *Viaje de Turquía* and *La Santa Liga*. Pero Tafur limits himself to evoking the Trojans as a type to understand the Turks. Martorell, however, draws on Hippocrates, while the author of *Viaje de Turquía* draws on an even greater range of classical figures, comparing himself to Galen, Daedalus and Odysseus. Lope goes further, drawing on a wider range of classical symbols to wrest Greco-Roman heritage from the Ottoman Empire (and, implicitly, the rest of Europe) and to bestow this legacy on Spain. Yet these maneuvers depend

on affirming Ottoman erudition, even as Spain places it on a tier below Europe—the Ottomans are capable of learning, just not as well as the Spanish.

The East Mediterranean Orient was repeatedly dominated in the Spanish imagination, as various forms of positional superiority exerted claims over Constantinople, the fallen city. Drawing the Ottomans into Western epistemology provided a means to subordinate them, as description give way to circumscription. This assured the ultimate victory for Spain, as well as its entitlement to the fruits of this victory.

Chapter 2: Heterotopia of the Founded city

We now direct our attention to the founded city. A heterotopia of empire, the founded city points (paradoxically) to the fleeting, frail nature of empire, as the foundation of one capital is tempered by the decay or fall of another, as we see in both of our texts below. This frames the project of empire as temporal. At the center of this heterotopia is the nomadic potentate, who enviously seeks to found a city—what, in the Spanish urban-centric mind, grants historical legitimacy and permanence. This suggests that, with figures such as Attila the Hun, Genghis Khan, Timur, and Mehmet the Conqueror, Medieval Spanish intellectuals sought to find patterns between these conquerors who emerged from relatively unknown lands beyond the Mediterranean.

As with our previous texts, Constantinople works as a heterotopia, blurring together different times and places in a way that permits overlapping discourses. Here, we see a vision of Spain that is both hegemonic in *Embajada a Tamorlán*, yet also another that resists this dominant vision, as *Destrucción de Constantinopla* affirms Spanish superiority, while at other times challenging visions of a superior Spain. Both visions revolve around an understanding of the urban-centered aspect of Spanish (indeed, Western) identity, which is where we will begin.

Place and Non-Place

As Karen Daly observes, in the Middle Ages, travel was understood as a movement from point to point, rather than through space: “for the medieval mind space is one-dimensional and synonymous with distance rather than area, in particular the distance separating two places, or two points of reference” (*Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros* 20). Being nomadic meant, then, belonging to no place at all, and thus existing outside of the framework that being in a fixed place (in a city) provided. As Richard L. Kagan has observed, the pre-Enlightenment understanding of the city echoed Thucydides’s division of *civitas* (the lived, human space) and

urbs (the physical, constructed city) in *History of the Peloponnesian Wars* (9). This provides a helpful paradigm to probe what nomadic interstitiality meant for Spanish authors.

Cities formed a central notion in how individuals understood their identity as well as in how political power manifested. Covarrubias attributes ‘*ciudad*’ to *civitas*, defining it as a place of laws and governance.¹ Just, orderly civil life would thus be unimaginable for a nomadic people. Cities were crucial to how Spanish subjects configured their identity, such that “the rise of the Spanish national political identity, strongly connected to that of the Crown of Castile and its monarchy, was closely related with the cities and towns in the kingdom that played a central role in strengthening the identity of the kingdom” (Asenjo 296). In particular, belonging to a city also meant belonging to a historical narrative, such that having a city also meant having “a glorious past bestowed ‘honour’. This included historical memory, as, “from the 15th century onwards, cities set down their own chronicles to preserve and recreate the memory of their past glories and values” (Asenjo 297). This frames nomadic people as existing outside of both history and the discourses that define the knowable, leaving them placeless in epistemological interstices.

The architectural side of cities, the *urbs*, was an index of control over nature. Architecture was a symbol of the local city-dwellers’ ability to make proper use of the land,² as ‘adapting and domesticating’ convey a sense of both owning and establishing proper use of the land. Coming from the virgin spaces, which lacked such usage cast, were nomads on the

¹ Covarrubias refers to *civitas* in his definition of *ciudad*, explaining that “De manera que ciudad es multitud de hombres ciudadanos, que se ha congregado a vivir en un mesmo lugar, debaxo de unas leyes y un gobierno” (288).

² Jimena Rodríguez observes in her analysis of *Embajada a Tamorlán*: “El viajero registra un espacio urbano, construido, modificado por el hombre, donde puentes, acueductos, baños y calderas se reconocen como símbolos de su capacidad para adaptar y domesticar el medio ambiente en beneficio propio” (42). Similarly, Carbó finds in the same text “un interés especial por la transformación de la naturaleza en función de la producción de alimentos y la comercialización de los mismos, así como el tratamiento eficiente de los recursos naturales que facilitan el traslado y la habitabilidad” (1).

peripheries of technology and civilization. Envy (itself a contradictory notion, as we shall see) emerges as a paradigm for navigating how the *urbs* are deployed against the East Mediterranean Orient.

Medieval Envy

The Medieval and Early Modern ontological dependence on urban life lead to the projection of envy onto both Timurids and Ottomans in the two works that we consider in this chapter. To understand Envy and the contradictions that allow it to encompass Spanish views of Muslim architecture and cities, we must first note that, during the Spanish Middle Ages and into the Renaissance, envy was understood as existing in two forms, a good envy (a notion of ambition) and a bad envy (envy as jealousy), as becomes clear in Spanish wisdom texts. Sancho IV defines good envy as “quando vn omne vee fazer bien a otro, toma ende envidia queriendole semejar en fazer bien e en ser tal commo el, o mejor sy pudiese” (Bizzarri 339), reflecting a desire to outdo positive examples.

The latter envy was divisive, dividing families. *Castigos e documentos del rey don Sancho IV* notes that envy “mete desamor entre el padre e el fijo, e vn hermano con otro, e vn amigo con otro su amigo” (Bizzarri 339). Bad envy was also self-destructive. *Bocados de oro* echoes this: “Assi como el orin come el fierro, de aqui ado lo desgasta, asi la envidia destruye al enbidiador, e el enbidiado non enpeesce” (Bizzarri 340). Balint reinforces this in observing that the early church fathers “seem less concerned about the damage the envier might do than about the spiritual health of the envious person” (44). Da Conta and Dos Santos find the theme as well in late medieval art, noting that “those condemned due to the cardinal sin of envy are often represented as gnawing their own guts” (176). The two critics also analyze the representation shown here of Envy painted by Giotto di Bondone (c. 1266-1337) in the Scrovegni Chapel in

Padua. Out of the envious' mouth comes a serpent, "turning back toward the envious and biting their head, such that the envious is his own victim" (171). This dichotomy of good and bad envy, as well as its divisive nature is analyzed in our two texts below.

During the Renaissance, envy became a common literary trope where authors portrayed themselves as the objects of envious critics. As Javier Portús Pérez notes, during the Siglo de Oro, fame, envy and literary success were intertwined concepts (139), the critic observes that one of envy's most common uses was "como motivo de afirmación personal y prueba de la propia importancia" (145), which took the form of translating "los ataques invariablemente en términos de envidia ajena, y consideraba ésta una expresión de la fama personal y una carga que inevitablemente acompaña al mérito y al esfuerzo" (139). Being envied was thus a marker for individual merit.

Imperial envy

These multiple valences of envy made it a useful tool for securing positional superiority against triumphant Muslim conquerors. Envy played a fundamental part in how the Spanish understood Oriental political power, whether the Timurids or later the Ottoman Turks. This abounds in numerous references, such as Juan Luis Vives's *De Europae dissidiis et bello turcico* (1526), where the humanist warns that, even if the Spanish were to retreat into the New World, "ni aún allí les dejarán vivir tranquilos esos hombres, picados por el delirio de la codicia y de la ambición" (85-86).

To better understand how envy was deployed as a tool of positional superiority to uphold Spanish hegemony, we can consider Gerald Maclean's notion of 'imperial envy', detailed in his book *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800*. Acknowledging the weakness of England relative to the Ottoman Empire (a theme that fits Medieval Christian Spain

just as well),³ Maclean describes imperial envy as a contradictory feeling, that at once admired and resented the Ottomans, that is, draws on “identification as well as differentiation, of sameness as well as otherness, of desire and attraction as well as revulsion” (22). As we shall see with our second work, the outward gaze is simultaneously inward. Charting imperial envy is “a useful strategy for understanding the growth of imperial fantasies and ambitions that would help to energize and transform an insular people into an imperial nation,” in particular how “the dominance of imperial envy started to give way to an emergent imperiousness” (21).

The overlap between Maclean’s framework and that of our Spanish authors is borne out in the numerous parallels we can note between English and Spanish works. We can also observe parallels with *Viaje de Turquía*, where Pedro de Urdemalas rises from captive to imperial physician, similar to an English captivity account, *The Adventures of (Mr T. S.) An English Merchant* (1670). T.S. similarly works himself up from captive to chief advisor which, Maclean argues, “displaces imperial envy with a personal take over” (112).

Yet most relevant is the projection of envy where “those afflicted by envy feel that those they envy should also envy them back,” which Maclean observes in a 1663 report from Henry Marsh with a “fantasy that the Ottomans wished they were English” (208-09). Of particular interest in this chapter is the “remarkable fantasies of Anglo-Ottoman filiation” (55) he finds in the ballad “The Honour of an Apprentice of London” (1658–1664), where “the sultan is suddenly overcome by repentance and envious admiration for all things English” (211). This evokes a similar filiation that we shall see in Cervantes’s *La gran sultana*, where the titular

“Between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, then, whenever the English looked east to the Ottoman Empire, what they regularly saw was a strategic ally against the Spanish, a model of social and political governance that often put their own to shame, a grand and functioning empire that seemed effortlessly to control vast lands and seas, a model of culture and civilization, and a source of luxury goods that had increasingly become essential to everyday life” (61).

character becomes mother of a line of Ottoman-Spanish sultans. This marriage is accompanied by displays of Spanish culture in the form of dress, music and dance—a sudden performance of all things Spanish. *Embajada a Tamorlán* in particular explores how Spanish envy toward Oriental wealth was sublimated and projected onto an Oriental potentate.

However, among these similitudes, we should also note some important differences. First, the critic comments, “the notion of imperial envy better suits the pre-colonial period” (22), since “with the realization of those ambitions during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, envy gives way to an amicable indifference born from a presumed superiority that had, perhaps, always been present” (23). While, as we shall see, imperial envy does provide self-assurance for a remote, backwater Castile in the 1400s, many of the strategies and parallels that we have cited above persist into the height of Spain’s imperial power, as in our second text, *Destruycion de Constantinopla*. I suggest that, in contrast to England’s confidence, Spain, even as a world power, never fully escaped the anxiety and insecurity that followed the 711 Umayyad conquest and its Morisco legacy, and how both were reflected in Spanish views of the Ottoman Empire.

As a second difference, the English follow a trajectory toward characterizing the Ottomans “less as distant and barbaric partners in trade and increasingly as potential allies in the great game of international intrigue and empire building” (189), all the while continuing to express their contempt. This was not the case with Spain, who saw them as antagonists even long after the Battle of Lepanto. Additionally, Maclean also concludes that the Ottomans were “models by which the English learned to frame their own self-representations while seeking and building an empire of their own” (55). While also true for the Spanish, this role was more occupied by Muslims and Jews, as Spain saw itself as an empire before engaging with the

Ottomans. Despite these differences, we shall see that, as Maclean observes, envy is indeed a central paradigm for portraying the Ottoman Other, as Spanish authors consider questions of empire and political might as represented by architecture and urban space.

Embajada a Tamorlán (1406)

To commence our exploration of Constantinople as a heterotopia, we begin with Ruy González de Clavijo's account of Enrique III's embassy to the Turco-Mongol ruler, Timur. Here, Constantinople is overlain with different cities, such as Augustine's city of God, yet also, presented as its inverse, the Timurid capital Samarqand and the Biblical city of Enoch. Envy provides a connective theme between this constellation of cities, offering a double-edged criticism, reproaching the infighting between Christians, while also reproving Timur's ambition by asserting its vanity. Here, a focus on architecture establishes a positional superiority, where the ephemerality of Oriental opulence contrasts to the transcendent-if-humble Christian architectural traces.

After summarizing the work and its historical context, and then offering a brief overview of its secondary literature, I will explore how the text's recurrent mention of ruined buildings and devastated cities map out a theme of envious infighting. I argue that this is set up by an unexpected maneuver, where Troy (often a symbol for Oriental vengeance, as we explore in our next chapter) is used to preface the Orient yet, unexpectedly, it is not the Orientals, but rather the Europeans who are responsible for its destruction. As indicated by his capital city Samarqand and various buildings that he has commissioned, Timur, in contrast, is presented as a protector and constructor of buildings.

Yet, while this may seem to initially present a positive view of Timur, the potentate is in fact a figure of endless ambition. This casts him as another Oriental city founder, Cain. After recalling Cain's complex identity as a figure of envy, nomadism and urbanism, I establish

parallels between his capital city Samarqand and the Byzantine capital Constantinople. This enables us to understand an underlying motif in the travel account: a criticism of Timur's architecture that serves as the basis for an Augustinian contrast between a wealthy, terrestrial city founded by Samarqand, and the eternal, humbler City of God (referring to the community of believers). This portrays the ultimate vanity of Timur's project while assuring the eventual future victory of Christendom. I conclude with several observations on how Clavijo forms an ad hoc framework to accommodate the surprising rise of Timur while maintaining Christian hegemony in the text.

Historical context

Embajada a Tamorlán shows Byzantine Constantinople as a decadent city threatened by a far stronger Orient. The Battle of Kosovo in 1389 had reduced the Byzantine empire to all but Constantinople's immediate surroundings. Sultan Bayezid I laid siege to Constantinople in 1394, and soundly defeated a crusading force sent to end the siege in 1396 at the Battle of Nicopolis. This strengthened Ottoman control in the Balkans, as well as its presence as a definite threat to Constantinople and Eastern Europe. The siege lasted until 1402, when Timur defeated and captured Bayezid at Ankara;⁴ the Ottoman ruler's four sons waged a long civil war that delayed the fall of Constantinople for 50 years, until 1453.

Present at the crucial battle of Ankara were two Castilian emissaries (Payo de Sotomayor and Hernán Sánchez de Palazuelos) who had arrived to establish commercial relations with Timur. They were both treated well, and returned to Spain with the Timur's own emissary, Muhammad Al-Kazi.⁵ *Embajada a Tamorlán* recounts a second envoy sent (in 1403) to

⁴ Bayezid had violated a treaty with Timur in 1398 by conquering the Djanik emirate. Timur declared war the following year.

⁵ "Mahomat Alcagi" in the text.

“acrescentar en el amorío que le mostrava” (79), accompanied by King Enrique III’s “letras y cierto presente” (79). The travel account relates their journey across the Mediterranean and Central Europe before ultimately arriving in Timur’s capital city, Samarqand, in present-day Uzbekistan. Unfortunately, Clavijo’s company is sent back before anything is signed as Timur falls ill and later departs on a campaign against the Ming dynasty. The mission takes three years as the company tries to find the nomadic ruler, while dealing with the aftermath of the fourth Venetian-Genoese War, shipwrecks, harsh climates, and robbery.

Previous criticism

Criticism of the text has looked primarily at several themes. Among the most popular is the work’s historicity. Francisco López Estrada’s series of articles examine each stop on Clavijo’s itinerary. F. Javier Villalba Ruiz de Toledo looks at the challenges of travel during the 15th century, and José Ochoa writes on the Hospitalers. Antonio Pedro Bravo García uses the work to reconstruct the politics of the Byzantine Mediterranean; Courtney K Lanz explores the economic and political motives for sending the embassy. The question of authorship has fostered research by Patricia E. Mason and López Estrada, while Sofía M. Carrizo Rueda looks at the works’ objectivity. The text has perhaps had a greater impact outside of Spanish letters, where it has helped critics like Bernard O’Kane and David J. Roxburgh reconstruct Timur’s court.

Other critics have researched *Embajada*’s legacy in Spanish letters—Rafael González Cañal in Renaissance comedies⁶—and López Estrada looks at the work’s influence in the 15th

⁶ Rafael González Cañal writes on the three extant Spanish comedies on Timur: one by Luis Vélez de Guevara (though attributed to Lope de Vega) published in 1642; another by Rojas Zorrilla in collaboration with two other playwrights; and another by Matos Fragoso, Juan Bautista Diamante and Andrés Gil Enríquez published in 1671. The critic considers the similarities and differences in the three works. The first, *La famosa comedia de la nueva ira de Dios, el Gran Tamorlán de Persia*, offers fascinating parallels with our analysis here, where the eponymous character is a nomadic Hercules who is both bestial, raised by two serpents, fighting with a club, and wearing a lion skin, while he also points to one of Spain’s foundational figures, whose pillars were featured prominently on the Habsburg seal.

century, while María Jesús Lacarra, Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego, and Rafael Beltrán Llavador have written on the work's place in the genre of travel literature. Others have looked at the work's similitudes with new-world travel: Jimena Rodríguez compares the encounter with Timur to that of Moctezuma; A. Martínez Crespo compares the work to the first Chronicles of the Indies.

The text has invited theoretical approaches as well. For instance, the text's portrayal of cities and space has been explored by Karen M. Daly, who looks at the question of space and travel, and by R. Eberenz, who writes about the text's urban spaces. Victoria Béguelin-Argimón explores Clavijo's sense of wonder. Jeffrey M. Evatt analyzes the work's national sentiment.

Of more interest to my current project, Benjamin Liu⁷ encourages reading the text with a “re-orienting’ of the literary history of European and Spanish travel literature along global lines, as part of world economic systems of trade routes and cultural relations centered around Asia, rather than Europe or America” (27). This trade was defined by “a marked commercial deficit that favored Asia at the expense of Europe” (27), and exhausted Mediterranean precious metals (19). In Spain's case, this would have naturally run parallel to the sense of cultural inferiority, as Christians studied Arabic, bought al-Andalusi silks, and brought Mudéjar architects northward. Such a climate would naturally foster a broader sense of envy over Oriental wealth and knowledge, which, as we shall see, pervades our text.

Laura Carbó analyzes how “la alteridad se percibe en relación a la propia experiencia cultural, y es así como las descripciones de los individuos, las comunidades y el entorno natural se piensan y se traducen en relación con las representaciones del sujeto itinerante” (2). As we shall see, the landscapes that Clavijo observes certainly do map onto his own anxiety and

⁷ Liu draws on the work of André Gunder Frank.

admiration. Carbó relates the extensive description of parties to Castilian etiquette norms and tying places like gardens and tents to literary tropes, contending that “existe la posibilidad de abrir un nuevo marco de análisis con énfasis en intensificación de las ceremonias, las comilonas masivas, la elaboración de los alimentos y las bebidas, el consumo conspicuo” (7). In this section, I adopt such a framework to understand why Clavijo places such emphasis on architecture and urbanism.

I also build off of the work of critics like Pérez Priego,⁸ Bravo García,⁹ Eberenz¹⁰ and their focus on both cities and buildings. In dealing with the subject of envy as well, I adopt an intertextual approach that contrasts with the historical approach of the critics above. In exploring the literary symbols and cultural signifiers that resonated in uniquely Castilian ways, we are better able to understand the subtexts that mark how the medieval Spanish understood the Orient.

Samarqand and Constantinople

We must first establish both the importance of Samarqand and Constantinople, and how Clavijo places juxtaposes the two through a variety of elements. This shows that Samarqand is essential to understanding Clavijo’s construction of Constantinople, and the themes of infighting and architectural decadence that he brings to a head in his description of the Byzantine capital.

While apparently only just a longer stop on the embassy’s itinerary (the party is forced to spend the winter in Constantinople due to shipwrecking during a storm), Clavijo establishes Constantinople as a counterweight to the Timurid capital of Samarqand. The descriptions of the

⁸ “En el libro de viajes, en efecto, la ciudad se convierte en el índice de referencia esencial a través del cual progresa la descripción del itinerario. De esa manera, las ciudades se van constituyendo en los verdaderos núcleos narrativos en torno a los que se organiza el resto del relato, la relación del viaje” (*Estudio literario* 226).

⁹ “los dos viajeros españoles muestran a lo largo de sus relatos un interés muy grande por todo lo que tiene relación con las iglesias, monasterios, cultos y, en especial, con las reliquias” (“La Constantinopla que vieron” 47).

¹⁰ Rolf Eberenz’s article, “Ruy González de Clavijo et Pero Tafur, l’image de la ville.”

cities are the longest in the texts; Carrizo Rueda observes that the number of pages devoted to Samarqand is only comparable to those dedicated to Constantinople (85). Both cities are nexuses of marvel and beauty in the text. They are both (barring one other, brief exception) the only points at which Clavijo describes structures' interiors, using the same descriptive techniques to recreate the role of the viewer in both.

Yet both are also antithetical—while Constantinople is a city in decline due to enervating infighting between Christians, Samarqand is a developing city whose powerful if brutal ruler works to '*ennoblecer*' it. Parallel to this, Constantinople is a city of stone buildings, a center in the web of important loci of both Western Thought (e.g. Virgil, or Avicenna) and permanent, lingering traces of Christianity, even as it gradually falls into ruin. In contrast, Clavijo focuses primarily on temporary cloth structures in his description of tents and pavilions in Samarqand, portraying it as a transitory, earthly city.

Invidious division and Architectural destruction

Demonstrating the 'bad' envy that fractures both the self, as well as collective unity, Christians and more familiar Muslims¹¹ fall to infighting that leaves traces of architectural and urban devastation throughout the embassy's journey. Timur emerges as a foil against such divisions, righting those wronged by the invidious while preserving architectural wonders.

¹¹ The Ottomans were understood to be descendants of the Trojan Torquatus (as I discuss in the previous chapter), while the Persians are mentioned in the Bible.

Troy

As we have seen in the later *Andanzas y Viajes*, Troy was portrayed during the Middle Ages as a liminal site that marked the line between Europe and Asia.¹² At first glance, Troy seems to play a similar role here as it acts as prelude for Constantinople. Shortly after the party passes Troy, we find the first mentions of Asia and the Ottomans. However, this nucleus of *materia troyana* serves as a prologue for the destructive envy (primarily but not exclusively among Christians), as the covetous rape of Helen is linked to the destruction of a temple and the loss of Troy.¹³ We will see later how this develops as thematic link of infighting and architectural devastation continue, laying the ground work for a comparison between the *urbs* of Constantinople and of Samarqand.

Clavijo speeds through the Western Mediterranean traveling from Sanlúcar to Rome in four pages, only slowing down to describe the Roman city of Gaeta. Shortly afterwards, the party

¹² As an example of Troy's liminality, here is a key passage from Nicolás González's *Crónica troyana* (1350). As the trojans debate going to war against Greece to recover Priam's sister Hesiona, Hector casts the possible conflict as a war between Europe and Asia. He calls himself Asia, saying "Pero nos somos de asya esto sey eu moy ben" (124); while describing the Greeks as Europeans, "moy fortes gentes et moy esforçados et an toda aterra de eyropa que ten aterça parte do mundo" (123). Moreover, medieval chroniclers often argued that the Trojan prince Teucris was a logical forefather for the Ottomans.

¹³ Clavijo describes towers that he attributes to Roland (86). After passing the Tower of Carellano, he also pauses to narrate an anecdote centered on its owner Ladislaus the Magnanimous (1377-1414), who divorces his wife and forces a subject to marry her. This violation of marriage perhaps recalls Paris and Helen, and calls to mind the division among co-religionaries and countrymen that runs through the rest of the text. However, in neither case do we find the allusion to architectural destruction that dominates the work starting from this first reference to Troy, barring one exception. Within four pages of the journey's start, the party passes by Ibiza, "la torre de Abicena," where Avicenna was supposedly born. Here, they find the remains of siege weapons "E en la cerca e torres d'ella están pedradas de ingenios que'l rey don Pedro fizo lançar quando la tovo cercada" (84). According to Francisco López Estrada, this refers to problems between "Pedro IV el Ceremonioso (reinó de 1336 a 1387) con sus parientes, los Jaimes II al IV señores de Mallorca, a los que acabó por dominar" (84).

This transpired in 1341, 60 years before Clavijo's embassy. I suggest a more plausible reading is the siege of Pedro I of Castile (el Cruel), who also laid siege to Ibiza in 1359 before Pedro IV el Ceremonioso of Aragon's sends a fleet. According to Book IX, Chapter XXIV of Jerónimo Zurita *Anales de Aragon* (1562-1580), Pedro I and his troops leaves in such a haste that "dejaron las máquinas y trabucos que habían sacado para el combate." He fortifies himself on the largest galley, "temiendo la armada del rey de Aragón." This suggests a failure to capitalize on an advantage due to cowardice, which Donald Kagay echoes in discussing this and other battles, "many Iberian observers, including the sixteenth-century Aragonese chronicler, Jeronimo Zurita, concluded that 'there could be no possible excuse' given by the Castilian king to explain his cowardly shirking of battle" (31).

This reading makes more sense when considering that Pedro I lost the throne to his half-brother Enrique II (El Fratricida), the grandfather of Clavijo's king, Enrique III. Clavijo's observation points to Pedro's cowardice, and thus implicitly justifies Enrique II's betrayal, a necessary gesture amidst so many similar fratricidal conflicts, as we shall see.

passes the island of Cetril (present-day Cythera, Greece) where there is “un gran pedaço de muro e torres derrocado, e dixeron que allí fuera el templo que derrocara Paris cuando rovara a Elena e quebrantara el ídolo, al tiempo qu'el rey Príamo, su padre, lo enviara fazer guerra en Grecia” (94). The section that follows serves as a prologue to the party’s arrival in Constantinople.

As we’ve seen in *Andanzas y Viajes*, liminality between East and West emerges here as a theme. Within three pages of the first mention of Troy, Clavijo opens up a series of references intertwined with mentions of the Ottomans. The proximity to Turkey represents a threat that evokes a sense of fear toward Asia. The Anatolian mainland is first mentioned, while passing the island of Lango “E a la mano izquierda pasaron a raíz de una tierra firme de la Turquía.” This is accompanied by a sense of danger, as “tan juntas son estas islas e la tierra de la Turquía, que no osaron pasar con la dicha carraca entre ellas de noche” (96). The text conveys a sense of foreboding—“este camino d'este Rodes a Xio es peligroso, por quanto la tierra de la Turquía, que está a la mano derecha, an de ir junto con ella” (101). This foreboding deepens as Clavijo repeats that party must pass Lango slowly “por la tierra de la Turquía ser cerca” (102). Later, Clavijo observes the Ottomans and Greeks living intermingled: “otra isla que es llamada Catanis e es poblada de griegos; e fueron otrosi a par de otra isla grande que es llamada Xamo, e es poblada de turcos” (103). The centrality of this frontier between Asia and Europe continues as a theme throughout the section: “en este derecho pareció la tierra de la Turquía, sierras e montañas altas, e la tierra de Grescia, llana e tierra de labranças de pan” (113). Greece is a domesticated, controlled territory that contrasts with the uninhabitable Turkey, an image of the proper and improper use of land that defined urban space in Europe, recalling the clash of nomadism and architecture in *Andanzas y Viaes*.

In addition to serving as a connection between East and West, Troy also links the events of the Trojan War to the current war against the Ottomans. Clavijo describes the Cabo de los Armenios as the beachhead for the Greek invasion of Troy: “cuando los griegos pasaron de Grecia para destruir a Troya, aquí en este castillo tovieron su real,” including the moat that the Greeks dug to protect themselves from Trojan retaliation (112). The cape is juxtaposed against the castle of Gallipoli, the Turkish beachhead: “el primer lugar que los turcos ovieron en tierra de Grecia” a victory not attributed to them; rather “ovieronlo por ocasión de Genovese” (113). Here, the two invasions are linked, as the Ottomans and Trojans move in separate directions. Gallipoli is also a metonymic symbol of the Turkish control over the region: “E por ocasión d’este castillo ganaron los turcos los lugares e tierra que han ganado de Grecia; e si este lugar perdiesen, perderían quanto en Grecia han ganado” (113).

This reading at first seems quite similar to *Andanzas y Viajes*, as this liminality sets up a conflict between Ottomans and Greeks, East and West, infidel and Christian. However, while Tafur underscores a variety of sins among the Christians, and speaks positively of the Ottomans, Clavijo instead redirects the reader’s attention to the conflicts between family and co-religionaries among Muslims and Christians alike. We will return briefly to the first direct reference to Troy, which establishes the motif of architectural destruction and infighting. In referencing the ruins of the temple, Clavijo underscores the rape of Helen as an act that combines the two themes for the first time. It is also only the text’s second mention of infighting, barring a reference to Ladislaus of Anjou (1377-1414)—Clavijo foregrounds both themes before going forward, casting them as both a problem among Christians, yet also among the Ottomans’ ancestors.

The abduction violates Paris's original mandate from his father, to recover his sister Hesione, who was taken as a concubine by Hercules after an earlier sack of Troy. Clavijo focuses particularly on the divisions between family, underscoring that Paris deviates from the task given by his father. The betrayal of father by son, sister by brother, as well as host (Menelaus) by guest serves as a prologue for the numerous divisions and inter-family conflicts that we shall see in Constantinople and other *urbs*.

Troy is one such city: the destruction of the temple that accompanies Helen's rape is a metonymic allusion for the destruction of Troy that it provokes. This is reflected in *Crónica Troyana*, where González laments Helen's abduction: "Aý quanta maa uentura naceu depoys daquel tenplo que estonce alý quebraron" (Vol I, 136), and blames it for Troy's fall in fortunes: "Et pagousse tanto que maýs non poderia da gran gaaça que auja feýta et da desonrra que del aujan tomado et dos presos que leuauan. Maýs agora me semella que começaron gran loucura" (138).¹⁴ Architecture serves as an index of collective unity, ruptured by invidious betrayal.

The destruction of the temple in Cetril is the first in a series of ruined buildings that are interwoven with the references to Troy. For instance, in addition to the ruins of Troy, we come across "isla del Vejo." Most significant is Metelin¹⁵, where ruined palaces prompt Clavijo to discuss imperial infighting. Metelin is ruled by the Genoese Johan de Catalus, who has taken the side of John VII, a rebellious nephew of the current Byzantine Emperor, and left with a fleet to take Salonika from the elder emperor (106). Manuel II discovered that John VII had promised

¹⁴ Antonio Urquizar-Herrera notes that the 13th-century Archbishop Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada tells a unique version of King Rodrigo's fate: the Visigoth monarch dooms Spain by entering a locked tower that "became an irresistible temptation for King Roderick who, instead of treasure, found nothing but misfortune, loss of innocence, and exile. The tower revealed that the monarch's sinful actions would lead to retribution, and that his punishment would be the 'disastrous forfeit' of Spain" (30). Also a commonly told anecdote, this shows parallels to the destruction of the Temple that ultimately dooms Troy.

¹⁵ The island of Metelin has "unos grandes palacios caídos. E en medio dellos estaban fasta quarenta mármoles blancos enfiestos, puestos como cuadra, e dezían que encima de aquellos mármoles solía estar una cuadra en que fazían concejo los de aquella ciudad" (105).

Constantinople to Bayacet I (son of the Ottoman Emperor) if he were to defeat Timur. When the older Greek ruler found out, he became enraged and exiled his son to Escalime, taking Salonika from him (107). As a result, the prince now moves to take the city by force (107). The infighting between the two Christian rulers is thus set as the greatest threat to the Byzantine Empire, as Clavijo frames the account with mention of ruined palaces. This recalls as well the tie between political control and architectural destruction that we saw in *Andanzas y Viajes*, which Clavijo here links exclusively to infighting.

Clavijo has no qualms about placing the fighting between his fellow Catholics, the Genoese and the Venetians,¹⁶ on the same plane as the pagan Trojans and Orthodox Byzantines.¹⁷ On the island of Tenio, which was settled by Priam, Clavijo observes the Castle Tenedor: “[Príamo] fiziera en ella un grand castillo, que es llamado Tenedor para defendimiento de los nabíos que a la ciudat viniesen” (109). The castle, however, had been destroyed due to “discordia entre venecianos e genueses, a tanto que los unos e los otros ovieron de fazer grand armada de galeas e de naos, e destruyeron lo más d’la isla: e ovo grandes muertes entre los unos e los otros” (110), after the Byzantine Emperor promises the island to the Genoese in exchange for naval support, but then sells it to the Venetians. Peace only comes at the price of the castle and villa, and the island is abandoned while the grudge continues.¹⁸ Christian infighting repeats the

¹⁶ The Venetian–Genoese Wars lasted from 1256 to 1381, concluding with the fourth and final conflict, the War of Chioggia (1377–1381). The Venetians bought Tenedos in 1376 from the Byzantine Empire. Seeing their access to the Black Sea threatened, the Genoese responded by supporting Andronikus IV’s campaign to usurp his father John V. After the Genoese seized position of the Venetian port of Chioggia, and their fleet was blocked in, Amadeus VI of Savoy negotiated a peace that included the evacuation of Tenedon. However, piracy continued on both sides and the two republics would clash again in 1403 at the battle of Modon.

¹⁷ Clavijo’s attitude toward Byzantines is ambiguous—while writing that “ha en ellos muchos yerros en la fee,” he nonetheless calls them “gente muy devota” (165) and “gente muy devota e de gran oraçón” (167).

¹⁸ “fizieron paz con tal condición que’l castillo e la villa fuese derrocada e despoblasen la dicha isla, e que los unos ni lo otros no la oviesen ni poblasen. E d’esta manera fue despoblada. E esta fue una de las cosas por que hoy en día a desabenencia entre venecianos e genoeses” (110).

destruction of Troy as Clavijo connects the destruction of the castle to the Trojan War. While the Ottoman advance due to this is worrying, Clavijo casts this infighting as more destructive.

In addition to foregrounding this theme of destructive infighting, Troy also frames the embassy's entry into the Byzantine capital, juxtaposing one city's destruction with the decadence of another, both marked by envy. Shortly after (within two pages) of Troy's final mention, the party then arrives in the Byzantine court. Troy does not re-appear until much later, in a passing reference to the Amazons. Just prior to their arrival, though, Clavijo foregrounds Constantinople's architectural importance as the party encounters "una isla poblada que ha nombre el Marmora. E d'esta isla fueron sacados los jaspes é mármoles é losas que en Constantinopla ha" (113). The mention of different kinds of stone from the island creates the expectation of marvelous buildings as the party arrives to the city, and establishes the *urbs* of Constantinople as an architectural pinnacle in the narrative. As Laura Carbó notes, Clavijo's interest in architecture and urban space continues in the Byzantine capital: "la ciudad, más que el encuentro con los líderes bizantinos, parece ser el centro de interés para el autor." However, beneath this impressive facade, architecture also persists in representing divisive envy.

Constantinople

Constantinople is, unsurprisingly, one of the text's architectural nuclei, with Clavijo devoting considerable detail to describe eight different churches as well as other buildings like a cistern, castle and tourney grounds. However, of greater interest at the present is the text's attention to devastated architecture. Clavijo is fascinated by Constantinople's ruins¹⁹. Clavijo links this deterioration to both conflicts among the Catholic Genoans and Venetians, yet also

¹⁹ By ruins (an anachronistic term that does not appear in the text), I refer to decayed buildings, which are referred to in the text as "derrocado," and "caído," and are often found in abandoned spaces which are "despoblado" or "mal poblado."

does not hesitate to include the orthodox Byzantine ruler and his son, and even the Ottomans, in this same discourse of divisive envy. Even among all his praise for the Church of the Hagia Sofia, the city's greatest wonder, he cannot help but observe that, "otrosí junto a esta Iglesia hay muchos edificios caídos, puertas que entravan a la iglesia cerradas e caídas" (132). Clavijo links this devastation to fighting between Christians, hearkening back to the desolation of Troy due to the conflicts of the Venetian-Genoese Wars. This occurs at three points in his description of Constantinople's *urbs*: the tomb of Romanos Argyros III (968-1034), the castle next to church of Sancta Maria de la Cherne, and the castle of Gallipoli.

The author describes the tomb of a Roman Empire: "é dezían que aquella sepultura solía ser cubierta de oro, é en ella engastonadas muchas piedras preciosas, é dezían que cuando los latinos ganaron aquella ciudad, podía aver nobenta años que rovaran aquella sepultura" (121). This refers to the three-day Sack of Constantinople in 1204. During the 4th Crusade, the Latins agreed to restore Isaac II Angelos to the Imperial throne and, when Isaac was instead made co-emperor, the Latins pillaged and took control of the empire until 1261, when it was recaptured by Michael VIII Palaiologos. The wanton destruction of 1204 enraged Pope Innocent III, whose condemnation resounded throughout Europe, and chroniclers lamented that the mission to wrest Jerusalem from the control of the Egyptian Ayyubid Sultanate never materialized.²⁰ The stripped tomb thus points to a thwarted ambition to advance Christianity against Islam, derailed by infighting and (at least from the Byzantine perspective) betrayal.

²⁰ Michael Angold notes that "Papal condemnation cast a shadow over the moral standing of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. There were those in the West who had an interest in disparaging the Latin Empire" (114). Angold also cites the circa-13th-century historical compilation *Heracles*, commenting that, "but more revealing is the compiler's dismay at the departure of so many from the Holy Land to seek their fortune in Constantinople" (114-15).

Later, Clavijo's list of the architectural wonders of Constantinople (by far the most substantial part of his account of the city) is interrupted by infighting: "Otro día, miércoles, los dichos embaxadores no pudieron pasar en Costantinopla como tenían acordado" (134). The city has been thrown into chaos upon news that Venetian galleys have left to attack a Genoese armada. The toll is high, with many dying, and Chatil Morate (the French governor of Genoa) is captured. The episode interrupts Clavijo's descriptions of the city's wonderful buildings, and the delay it provokes is a "gran desmán a los dichos Embajadores" (134).

The fighting between Christians serves as a preface to further elaborate on the Byzantine Imperial infighting, as the next day the Castilians visit a chapel ("Sancta Maria de la Cherne"), "a par de un castillo que estava derrocado, que solía ser posada donde los emperadores. El cual castillo derrocó un emperador porque lo prendió en él un su fijo" (135). Recalling the destroyed temple of Venus on Cytharea and the devastation of Tenedos, the toppled castle again connects to infighting and destruction.

When the party tours the church of María de Setria, Clavijo comments that it is where the younger emperor's father is buried (140). This leads to an elaboration on the imperial internecine conflict. John VII conspires with Bayacet I's son Morato to overthrow both his and the Turk's father.²¹ When both are captured by their fathers, John VII's father razes the castle in Gallipoli. Although both fathers agreed that, if they caught their children, they would gouge out their eyes, John VII's father instead orders that he be imprisoned, and blinded "con bacines calientes"

²¹ Clavijo has confused key details here: John VII is in fact the son of Manuel II's usurping brother, Andronikos IV Palaiologos, while Morate refers to Şehzade Savcı Bey, both of whom rebelled against their fathers in the 1370's. "E el turco Morate, padre d'este qu'el Tamurbeque venció, ovo otrosí otro fijo en aquel tiempo que le fue desobediente. E el fijo del turco e del Emperador, fiziéronse a una parte para deponer a sus padres e tomarles el señorío; e el Morate e el Emperador de Costantinopla feziéronse eso mismo en uno contra los fijos" (141).

(141).²² The castle of Gallipoli thus demonstrates the destruction from inter-family and internecine struggles.

The invidious infighting is best demonstrated with a final example on the divide between Christians. In Pera, Clavijo details two lawsuits centered on artifacts that were taken from Constantinople during the 4th Crusade. One is a dispute over the missing little finger of St. Agnes's hand, which the Genoese allege that the Byzantine emperor cut off to place with his own relics. Additionally, referring to relics from Saint John, Saint Dionís and other saints, “dezían que ovieron cuando Costantinopla entraron los latinos, e después ge las demandaron el

²² The reason for which John VII is ultimately pardoned also offers a rich commentary on parricide and urban decadence. The son remains imprisoned until one day redeeming himself when he heroically kills “una grand culuebra” (141). The Byzantine emperor frees his son, but this act of mercy is misplaced, as John VII “a cava de tiempo tornó al su mal propósito, e prendió a su padre, el Emperador, é tóvolo preso un tiempo” (141). The snake's appearance highlights Constantinople's urban decay: Clavijo earlier describes a statue of three intertwined snakes, erected when “dezían que en la ciudat solía aver muchas culuebras e otras animalias malas que matalos omne e que los emponçoñavan.” (127) The emperor of the time “las fizo encantar en aquellas figuras de culuebras. E que de allí adelante, nunca fizieron mal a ninguna persona en la ciudat” (127). Seemingly, snakes once again threaten the city, underscoring its decadence as nature pushes back against human domestication.

The decision to pardon John VII for killing a snake may reference an exemplum that appears in the second part of the María del Mar Gutiérrez Martínez's edition of *El Libro de los exemplos por A.B.C.* Here, monks are amazed to see “que el abat Sant Pablo tomava en las manos las serpientes cornudas que son las más empoçoñadas que todas las otras, que llaman en latín cerastes, e escorpiones e cortávalos por medio” (122). When asked how, the monk replies, “Qualquier que fuere limpio e sin pecado como fue Adán en el paraíso ante que pecasse, todas cosas les eran subjugadas e les obedecían,” confirming the moral epigram, “Las animalias se deven someter al ombre justo; esto beves bien creer.” (Sánchez, *Libro de exemplos parte II*, 122).

Yet John VII's veneration of saintliness becomes transparent when he tries to usurp his father again, proving that he, rather, is the serpent as the text evokes another popular exemplum from, fittingly, Saint Augustine's *Libro de la Cibdat de Dios*. Here, a man raises a ‘culuebra’ at home, which one day bites and kills his son. The serpent hides in a tree until one day, the man wishes to reconcile. The snake refuses, explaining, “ca quando pienso e me viene a memoria la ofensa que te fue que maté a tu fijo nunca puedo confiar de ti, nin tú debes fiar de mí, ca quando veo que me cortaste la cola que era mí honor y mi fennosura nunca te perdonaré.” Quoting King Solomon, the Snake concludes “Del enemigo viejo nunca confies ca si podiere vengar de ti non se fartará de tu sangre” (Sánchez, *Libro de exemplos parte I*, 100). This is precisely the mistake that the Byzantine Empire makes with his rebellious son. Recalling the image of a snake in the envious person in our introduction, it is interesting to note as well that the *Physiologus* describes the viper as a parricidal figure: “Our Savior, therefore, likened the Pharisees to the viper; just as the viper's brood kills its father and mother, so this people which is without God kills its father, Jesus Christ, and its earthly mother, Jerusalem. ‘Yet how will they flee from the wrath to come?’” (Curley 16). Isidoro de Sevilla writes, “Vision in snakes generally is feeble,” (258) echoing the Byzantine prince's blindness while in prison.

patriarca de los griegos e que andudieron en pleito sobre ello” (149). Clavijo here makes an allusion to Saint Paul’s admonition against lawsuits among Christians in 1 Corinthians 6:4-6.²³

These divided families are described against the backdrop of the two religious Schisms (the Great Schism, as well as the Western Schism,²⁴ where a pope in Rome and a second, anti-pope in Avignon split Europe from 1378 to 1417) which “loom large in the narratives of Clavijo” (Daly, *Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes* 94). At the heart of sundry divisions between Christians (along with infighting between family, as co-religionaries), there always lies a desired, envied object,²⁵ whether a throne, wealth, or relics. However, envy continues as a theme beyond Constantinople as the text places more familiar Muslims within the same discourse as the text’s Christians.

Between Constantinople and Samarqand

Outside of Constantinople and all the way into Samarqand, Clavijo continues to draw attention to conflicts between co-religionaries, whether as family or nation, where it prompts the loss of realms, and even endangers the party personally. In the space between the two capital cities, architecture plays a diminishing role, which casts greater emphasis on Constantinople and later the Timurid capital Samarqand as nuclei of construction. At the same time, within this space, Clavijo sets Timur up as a foil to the other peoples in the text.

After leaving Constantinople, the party is again hindered by the Venetian-Genoese War, where fear of being robbed by the Ottomans is on par with fear of Genovese pirates: after a storm

²³ “So if you have such cases, why do you lay them before those who have no standing in the church? I say this to your shame. Can it be that there is no one among you wise enough to settle a dispute between the brothers, but brother goes to law against brother, and that before unbelievers” (ESV).

²⁴ Enrique II was active in trying to end the divide, going so far as to ally with France to encourage the Avignon Benedict XIII (the Aragonese Pedro Martínez de Luna y Pérez de Gotor (1328–1423)) to resign.

²⁵ Recalling that covetousness and envy continue to be often confused and elided.

that destroys their ship, the party is able to recover most of their lost cargo while receiving assistance from the Turkish locals by claiming to be Genovese: “en no ser robados de turcos ni de los marineros, que lo fizieran más aína, salvo por es estar en la tierra de los turcos” (155). The Ottomans, until recently a threat to Constantinople, are placed on the same level of the Genovese, as the scene recalls how the internecine conflict previously interrupted Clavijo’s tour of the relics in Constantinople.

Continuing on, in Trebizond, the Byzantine splinter kingdom, Clavijo meets the Emperor Chorma and his son, Quelex. While the envoy is resting, they are greeted by the treasurer and Urco, one of the emperor’s pages (164). This Urco is “muy privado del Emperador e no se hazia en el Imperio, salvo quanto él quería; e dezían que era de baxo linaje e que era fijo de un fornero, pero avía buen cuerpo” Curiously, this lone mention of same-sex attraction takes place in a Christian realm, a contrast with the tendency of later texts to displace homoeroticism into the Muslim world, as we shall see. This, however, provokes discord between father and son, such that the son lays siege to the city for three months until the principal men of the empire intervene. While the son and Urco are eventually reconciled, Clavijo comments “después se siguió asaz desonra e daño al dicho Emperador por tener consigo a este cavallero” (164).

The problems of strife between Christian brothers also leads to what is perhaps the party’s most significant challenge (at least in terms of the attention that Clavijo devotes to it). The embassy is extorted by fellow Christians under the Greek Quilileo Cavasica when near the castle of Ardaça, “el cual castillo acostumbran siempre estar ladrones malos onmes, e el Señor es otro tal” (170). This is Clavijo’s harshest condemnation in the text, here directed to Christians. Cavasica’s men demand a tribute, and Clavijo’s party ultimately gives in, offering a piece of scarlet and a silver plate (171). However, Cavasica’s men demand more, forcing the party to buy

a camblet, and Cavasica “estonces fue contento, e no bien” (172). Even afterwards, however, they are further accosted when the men return and demand more. The incident echoes the internecine conflicts between the Genovese and Venetians, as well as the division of Christian royal families. The incident contrasts the hospitality that immediately follows from one of Timur’s tributaries, the Señor of Arzinga, “el cual resevió muy bien a los dichos embaxadores e les dio buenas posadas e viandas e lo que ovieron menester” (173). This casts Timur as a foil to the petty Christians and Ottomans, as we shall soon see.²⁶

Armenia is an additional example: “E es de saber que perdieron los cristianos a Armenia la Mayor por desacuerdo de tres hermanos” (349). After the death of their father, the land is divided among three brothers. Again, the oldest brother goes to war with the others, they resort to hiring Turkmen and Turkish mercenaries (350). When the two younger siblings march against the elder, the Turkish mercenaries talk to the Turkish, and agree to take the city for themselves, killing the brothers. As a result, the Armenian kingdoms “fueron metidas en poder de los moros, e se apoderaron de toda Armenia. E quando esta gente se apoderaron d’esta ciudal e la destruxeron. mataron cuantos cristianos armenios fallaron, e nunca más en ella habitaron” (350).

The Emperor of Catay who “solía ser gentil e fue convertido a la fee de los cristianos” is another case of royal fratricide: The emperor of Catay dies, and divides his realm between his three sons, but the oldest wants to take the lands of the younger two, killing the youngest. The middle child, however, wins against his brother, who, “con el desesperamiento que le iva todavía mal, fizo poner fuego a su real, e quemóse él e mucha de su gente. E el mediano quedó Señor”

²⁶ Perhaps the most damning betrayal of the Christians is when the Byzantines and Genovese break their promise to pay Timur and to drive the Ottoman forces from Greece into Turkey so that Timur could defeat them finally (184). However, “en lugar de guardar lo que con el Tamurbec avían puesto, dexaron pasar los turcos de la Grecia en Turquía. E desde fue vencido el turco, pasavan ellos mesmos a los turcos de la Turquía con sus fustas a Grescia, los que venían fuyendo” (185). This results in the rancor that Timur holds against Christians in his realms: “con esta ocasión tenía mala votad el Tamurbeque a los cristianos, de que se fallaron los de su tierra,” (185) justifying, in part, his subsequent destruction of Georgian and Armenian churches.

(315). The eldest brother's devastation of his own realm aptly symbolizes the self-destructive envy that we've seen among various siblings and co-religionaries thus far.

Destructive infighting is not limited to Christians, however. While at Chios, Clavijo relates that "embaxadores ovieron nuebas en como al fijo mayor del turco que venció el Taburlán, que era finado el que avía de heredar la Turquía, e que otros sus hermanos avían guerra en uno sobre el señorío de la tierra" (104). Envy divides father and son, Christian brothers, and royal siblings throughout the text, such that nearly no realm of the various that Clavijo encounters is left unaffected. However, there is a crucial exception to this pervasive theme.

TIMUR, BENEFACTOR OF ENVY

In the intervening space between the text's two principal cities, Clavijo establishes two patterns that link Timur to the envy that elsewhere divides the text: Timur is both benefactor of envy and preserver of architecture. Timur stands as a stark contrast against Christians as well as the similar conflicts among non-Christians that Clavijo also mentions.

Timur gains allies from the envious destruction of families, making him a foil to their infighting. The party meets "un cavallero moro que llaman Espandiar" (160), ruler of a tremendous realm. Espandiar becomes Timur's vassal after the Turkish Vasica kills his father and exiles him, regaining his realm when Timur kills Vasic. Another example is Tratan, lord of Arzinga (Modern day Erzincan, in East Central Turkey). His father dies without leaving a legitimate heir, and Tratan rules in his stead. However, he is soon contested: "no lo quisieron resevir por señor, e alçóse con la tierra un cavallero, fijo de una hermana de Tratan, que avía nombre Ibolabis," who is the legitimate grandson of the deceased king (177). Timur intervenes, seizing the Ibolabis and two supporters and restoring Tratan's natural son, "el que dixo Tratan

que era su fiyo” (177). Clavijo thus portrays Timur as a defender against envious fratricide, which casts a negative light on the text’s other Muslims and Christians alike.

Timur also expands his realm thanks to infighting, excluding him from the same destructive category in which the text’s other Muslims and Christians are placed. In addition to taking advantage of the division between the rival princes in the Persian Horazania (Khorasan, in modern-day Iran (251)), in the Castle of Quebeli, Timur is able to conquer the neighboring realm of Chorasmia (Khwarezm, also in Iran) thanks to a rift between brothers: “E después de aquí, conquirió el imperio de Orçania por discordia que avía entre dos hermanos. señores que eran de aquel imperio, e con maneras que traxo con los de la tierra” (251). This recalls how the Ottomans similarly benefitted from the Genoese/Venetian conflict over Tenedos, moving onto the abandoned island to make it into a base of piracy before falling to infighting themselves.

Both Horazania and Chorasmia are Muslim kingdoms, showing that Clavijo does not limit the theme of destructive infighting to his co-religionaries. Rather, he extends it to include more familiar Muslims, such as the Ottomans (who were thought to have descended from Trojans or Scythians) or to the Persians (who are central in the Bible), alongside Christian Byzantines, Italians, Trebizondians and Armenians. That Timur is left outside of these paradigms reflects his sudden rise into renown, which surely caught Clavijo and his contemporaries off-guard. While the text’s other Muslims and its Christians are able to reconcile easily into his epistemology, Timur exists outside of it, unmoored in the history that grounds his view of more familiar peoples. Timur is thus Orientalized a step further than both Ottomans and Persians, portrayed as the availing outsider even among his co-religionaries. Clavijo’s Orientalism is more geographic than religious—that is, he is more comfortable with the Muslims he knows than he is with their conqueror Timur and his sudden emergence from the further reaches of Asia.

This sheds light on the ambiguity with which Timur is portrayed in the text—on the one hand, he has saved Constantinople from Ottoman conquest, yet he also persecutes Christians, who at times prey on the embassy. Clavijo seems unclear on whether to portray him as a potential ally (in keeping with his mission) or as an extension of the Ottomans who wait to pounce on Christian division. This parallels the imperial envy that we are tracing through the work—Clavijo is divided between a true sense of wonder and a need to undermine it, just as he hedges his bets in establishing the mechanisms to cast Timur as a potential foe.

TIMUR, PRESERVER OF ARCHITECTURE

Amidst so much architectural destruction, Timur protects buildings even as Christians destroy them. This culminates when the party arrives in Samarqand, where Timur is engaged in numerous construction projects that serve as a foil to decadent Constantinople and the architectural decadence that pervades the rest of the text.

For instance, Timur takes “action to protect Tabriz’s houses, mosques and other buildings coupled with the description of the city’s infrastructure, trade and public services [which] highlight the emperor’s role in the development and protection of the city” (Lanz 100). This comes after Timur’s oldest son, Miraxan Miraza, destroys numerous buildings in Tabriz so that people would say “Miraxan Miraza no fizo obra ninguna, mas mandó desíazer las mejores obras del mundo” (209). Among these is a particular house where the body of a great knight was entombed. Miraxan Miraza “mandóle otrosí derrocar, e al cavallero que jazía dentro, mandólo echar fuera” (209). This recalls the previous tomb of the Roman emperor that was destroyed by crusaders in Constantinople (121), casting a negative light on the Christians as they contrast with Timur’s conscientious construction of tombs for his family.

However, couched within this act of architectural salvation, we find the first of many subtexts that undermine Timur's considerable accomplishments as driven by the same envy that divides the rest of the world. Timur's son serves as a clear allusion to Herostratus, who burned down the temple of Artemis in Ephesus for the same reason (and, as our next text shows, was a symbol of ambition). Such wanton destruction would have been particularly appalling to Clavijo's audience, whose "strong tradition of political pragmatism" extensively recycled Islamic structures as the Christians moved south (Borrás Gualis 330) as, at least in the case of Castile, they were valued as "the monuments captured as spoils of war" (Urquizar-Herrera 17). Karen Daly suggests another connection between Tabriz and Castile, noting that the brightly colored tiles may be "a familiar point of contact with the Iberian cultural reality [...] in a sea of unfamiliarity" (*Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes* 128); the demolition then would have stood as a particularly marked contrast to Castilian appreciation and recycling of mudéjar structures. This points to the tension in Timur's portrayal as beneficiary of envious Christian infighting and defender of buildings.

While not immediately evident, Timur himself is envious, even as he benefits from the envy of others. As we've commented earlier, medieval *envidias* also included a good envy, an ambition to outdo the feats of other people. Yet, as Clavijo makes clear, there can be too much of a good thing: this ambition drives Timur to continue his conquest,²⁷ rather than consolidate and protect his empire as he nears death.

²⁷ Following Alexander the Great, "el mayor conquistador del mundo que en menos tiempo mas tierra ganasse" (Bizzarri 374), according to *La historia de la Doncella Teodor*, Timur is similarly driven to spend his whole life in conquest. The comparison of the two figures is evoked in Clavijo's two passing references to Alexander, both referring to battlegrounds, against Darius (204) and Poro, lord of India (240).

This ambition becomes clear in Clavijo's later reference to Troy, previously the introduction to the divisive envy and architectural destruction among Christians and more familiar Muslims. Near the end of the party's stay in Samarqand, Clavijo mentions the Amazons, connecting them to Troy: "E estas fueron del linaje de las amazonas que se acaescieron en Troya cuando la destruxieron los griegos" (318). Recalling our earlier theme of Troy as the threshold between Europe and Asia, the Amazons are in a marginal zone between Samarqand and Catay, where Timur was headed to attack the Ming dynasty before his death. Politically, "estas mujeres son del señorío del Tamurbeque, e solían ser del señorío del Catay" (318); geographically, they are "onze jornadas d'esta ciudat de Samaricante, fazia la tierra del Catay" (317); and, textually, they appear after Clavijo's description of Catay's inhabitants. This recalls the liminality that we have seen in Troy when tied to Constantinople: Troy is both entry into the Muslim Orient, but also egress out of it, into the Far Orient of Christian Cathay and the Orient that lies beyond Clavijo's experience.

More importantly, however, Troy also emerges as a symbol of the endless ambition that ultimately undermines Timur's admirable traits. This reference to Troy falls at a crucial moment in Timur's life—despite his advanced age, Timur opts for a final campaign to Catay rather than consolidating empire, assuring a successor, or finishing his numerous urban projects. This is to disastrous effect: he dies en route, and his empire falls into civil war. The second reference to Troy thus symbolizes Timur's endless ambition. This is presaged in *El libro de Alexandre*,²⁸ where, as Casas Rigall underscores, the interwoven account of Troy offers a double moral:

²⁸ Certainly, Clavijo had Alexander in mind, alluding to the conqueror twice, making him the most referenced historical figure in the text. Sanga is the city from where "fue señor Darío, e esta era la mayor ciudat de su señorío e de que más se preciava, onde más fazía su morada. E d'esta ciudat salió con su hueste e poderío cuando peleó con Alixandre" (204). The river Biamo is where "en una llanura ovo su batalla Alixandre con Poro, señor de la India, cuando lo desvarató" (240).

“Troya pasa de ser un lícito espejo de la fama a constituirse en potencial imagen de la ambición” (40)—while Timur’s envy is laudable, it becomes dangerously immoderate. Following Alexander, Timur prepares to push East before dying while in a state of incomplete conquest.

Prior to this, however, good envy is evoked in our current scene, where the wealthy buildings that Miraxan Miraza destroys were made by “omnes grandes e ricos e a fama de si unos an envidia de otros, por ver cuál faría más maravillosa obra” (200). Driven but unable to surpass his father, Miraxan Miraza foreshadows the endless ambition that ultimately undermines Timur’s legacy. In benefitting from the envy of others while being himself envious, Clavijo casts Timur as a sort of embodiment of the cardinal sin, which is later strengthened as he aligns the ruler with Cain, the Christian archetype of envy. This is a reflection of Clavijo’s own imperial envy of the potentate’s wealth and power, and the knight’s accompanying search for an upper-hand, that is, a way to assert positional superiority.

The destructive son foreshadows the chaotic infighting that follows Timur’s death, as fighting breaks out between two brothers, echoing Cain and Abel: Homar and another of Timur’s grandchildren, Abobaquir, both of whom are sons of the destructive Miraxan Miraza. Homar Miraza (the rightful heir) makes a play to consolidate power, killing his uncle, who was supposed to share power with him (336) and sending his head to his father. His brother Abobaquir agrees to go and defend his father’s claim to the throne, but Homar imprisons and tries to poison him, before Abobaquir (344) manages to kill the guards and escape with the Timur’s treasure. Having no other option, Homar makes peace with his brother and father, leaving the empire in a dubious state. Timur’s ambition, though driven by good envy, ultimately feeds into Clavijo’s larger project of showing that the Timurid ruler is a transitory, if impressive,

figure. This theme becomes even more apparent in Clavijo's description of Samarqand, Timur's capital city.

Samarqand

Timur's positive association with architecture reaches its peak as the embassy arrives to his capital city. Juxtaposed against the mix of ruins and decaying buildings that stretch all the way to Constantinople, Samarqand (and the empire it governs) is a place of construction and active urban development. Clavijo is, as Daly,²⁹ Carrizo Rueda,³⁰ and Estrada³¹ mention, fascinated by Oriental architecture. As we have commented, juxtaposed against the mix of ruins and decaying buildings that we see in Constantinople, Samarqand (and the empire that it governs) is a place of construction and active urban development, with contradictory elements. To explore this, we will work along David Roxburgh's helpful division of Samarqand into soft and hard architecture (114). Clavijo places at the forefront the dwellings and structures that are temporary and deceptive in the case of soft architecture (such as tents), while addressing afterwards examples of hard architecture (that is, permanent structures) which are left incomplete, or read as a sign of the ruler's excessive ambition. Underneath this fascination, Clavijo recasts how his readers understand these luxurious structures, seeing them rather as proof of Timur's ephemerality. This contradictory mix of admiration and contempt echoes Maclean's notion of imperial envy, as a poorer Castile struggles to justify itself in the face of overwhelming Oriental power and wealth.

²⁹ "Clavijo is fascinated by the great monuments and mosques that Timur has constructed, in some cases to the memory of his own family" (*Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes* 127).

³⁰ Carrizo Rueda notes that the tents must have seemed like "un objeto fabuloso. Por lo que leemos, las tiendas de Tamorlán estaban más cerca de tales artificios que de las que se levantaban en los austeros campamentos castellanos" (85).

³¹ "Los viajeros mantienen la capacidad de notar la belleza de las mezquitas, cuidadosamente construidas, y al mismo tiempo el espectáculo de los que buscan una santidad elemental, lograda con la desnudez y la pobreza manifiesta" ("Ruy González de Clavijo" 531).

Soft architecture and ephemerality

The decadent remains of buildings in Constantinople, Troy, and other places along the way contrast with the vibrant, marvelous soft architecture that the company finds in Timur's temporary court. Like a *momento mori*, the ruins pointing to previous greatness casts a pall over the present, emphasizing that empires are temporary.³² The transitory nature of Timur's empire is highlighted by the focus on what Roxburgh calls "'soft' architecture of various types of tents (some trellis tents, others stayed with guys), awnings, and walls of cloth assembled temporarily for ad hoc purposes" (114). Described in great detail and preceding the physical city, the horde's camp overshadows Samarqand. Timur holds court primarily in a tent, making the camp the Empire's political center.

Clavijo is more interested in the transitory architecture of tents and a city of nomads than the more permanent aspects of Samarqand, which come as an afterthought. Although this attention to 'soft' buildings and the transitory city of tents is due in part to its proximity to Timur, it also evokes two key characteristics that create a contrast between the architectural legacy of Western civilization and the ephemeral qualities of the Timurid Orient. First, they point to Timur's nomadism, suggesting that, while he may be a founder of cities, he is still an outsider to the urbane cultures he represents. Second, the tents feature a *trompe-l'œil* that imitates hard architecture. This points to a larger motif of deception on Timur's part. As we shall see in our next section, the tents harken back to the ephemeral mosques that are left incomplete with Timur's death, as his empire decays into civil war between his grandchildren.

³² As Bryce Maxy notes in his study of Ruins in Cervantine novelas ejemplares, "Burla de la ambición humana, las ruinas simbolizan la vanidad y la muerte" (15).

Clavijo is repeatedly impressed by both the number and beauty of the tents on the outskirts of Samarqand: “en este ordo qu'el Señor avía, podía aver fasta quarenta o cincuenta mil tiendas, que era una fermosa cosa de ver. E sin estas tiendas, avía otras muchas que estavan por huertas e prados e aguas que cerca de la ciudat estavan” (302).³³ This fascination has been noted by Carrizo Rueda³⁴ and López Estrada.³⁵ Eberenz reveals Clavijo’s fascination with the clash between Timur’s nomadism and his domain’s urban nature: “Excellent observateur, il saisit par exemple le contraste entre le nomadisme ancestral de ce peuple et la civilisation urbaine des pays soumis à sa domination” (45). As we’ve seen in our introduction, nomadism was seen as antithetical to the urban, architectural qualities of most Europeans.³⁶

³³ Clavijo returns to this throughout the text: “en esta huerta estavan muchas tiendas, armadas de paños de seda e de otras maneras” (264); “en esta huerta avía muchas tiendas armadas e sombras de tapete colorado e otros paños de seda e de otras muchos color's, d'ellas entretalladas e de otras maneras llanas” (265); “desque las tiendas del Señor fueron armadas, ya savía cada uno de ellos adónde avía de venir a poner sus tiendals e cuál parte;” (270); “antes de tres o cuatro días fueron armados en derredor de las tiendas fasta veinte mil de cada parte” (270); “este día fueron llamados los dichos embaxadores allí onde estava el ordo; e cuando en él fueron, fallaron muchas tiendas” (272-73); “la cerca onde fazia ella esta fiesta era bien grande e guarnida de muchas tiendas [sic] muy ricas. E la dicha cerca era de un paño de lana de muchas colores [sic], fecho a muchos lazos e entretallamientos e letras de muchas maneras, bien fermosas” (297); “levasen a los dichos embaxadores a ver sus tiendas que en esta cerca tenía, en la cual avía muchas e ricas” (298); “en la cual les mostraron muchas tiendas e sombras ricas, de muchas maneras. de paños de seda e de otros paños” (302); “E por estos campos estava asentada mucha gente con sus tiendas e ganados, que eran de la hueste del Señor” (334).

³⁴ She writes “el campamento mongol brindaba unas características privilegiadas” (86), noting that “aparece en estas descripciones cierto recurso retórico que nos parece significativo. Dos veces encontramos la conocida hipérbole ponderativa que consiste en subrayar la insuficiencia de la escritura o del autor para expresar algo extraordinario” (Carrizo Rueda 84).

³⁵ “Si el relator nos dejó una muy apreciable descripción de los grandes edificios de Constantinopla, lo mismo hizo de las construcciones efímeras que pudo ver sobre todo en Samarcanda, que son un documento de primer orden en cuanto testimonio de esta peculiar arquitectura de ciudades móviles” (López Estrada, “Oriente y Occidente” 78).

³⁶ Using nomadism as an epistemological tool to undermine the Timurids here presages the same being used against the Ottomans. In her study of humanists and the Ottomans, Nancy Bisaha writes that humanists drew on Greco-Roman views of nomadism to characterize the Ottoman, including, “judgments that depict nomads-or those presumed to be such-as polar opposites to ‘civilized’ peoples who inhabit cities, farm the land, operate courts of law, and so on” (165), reflecting views like Aristotle’s that “the lazy pastoralist refuses to cultivate the land and is, hence, a slave to the land’s caprices. Farmers, on the other hand, represent the highest form of civilization as they work the land and master it” (76). Intellectuals like the Venetian humanist Lauro Quirini used such bias to show that “Turks are not only unworthy masters of so fine a city but also fundamentally inimical to high culture and learning. Unable to appreciate or support the beautiful architecture and learned arts of Byzantium, the Turks can only despoil or eradicate them” (67).

The tents and the nomadism that they evoke most evidently contrast with the ruins that otherwise permeate the text, rewriting them as symbols of permanence, rather than decadence. If Samarqand is destined to fall into decay like Troy, then, even worse, the city of tents where Timur now resides will leave no trace. The fragile, yet beautiful tents reduce Timur's considerable achievements to a temporary point that lacks the lasting power shown in Christian ruins. This marginalizes the emperor, suggesting that, despite his power, he has no place among the permanent remains of a city, instead being an outsider that occupies the undefined spaces between places.

In addition to alluding to Timur's ephemerality, nomadism also casts him as an interstitial character who is left in the non-place, between the cities that give Clavijo's travels coherence. Timur's nomadism alterizes him, contrasting him with the urban, historied people who are tethered to places within the ambassador's epistemology. Timur's lack of place thus sets him up as a transitory, passing ruler who fittingly dies before signing a treaty with the Castilians, and who is best symbolized by his tents. His interstitiality would have been particularly glaring to medieval readers, for whom Timur's nomadism would have left the ruler perpetually outside of *place*. As Foucault notes in *Discipline and Punish*,³⁷ precisely such uncontrolled spaces (the "domain of the outlaw") were a challenge and antithesis to centers of power and authority represented in cities. Timur (formerly an outlaw, as Clavijo deems worth mentioning) thus remains an outsider to urbanism, even as he is the work's most powerful figure of urban splendor.

³⁷ "In the classical period, there opened up in the confines or interstices of society the confused, tolerant and dangerous domain of the 'outlaw' or at least of that which eluded the direct hold of power: an uncertain space that was for criminality a training ground and a region of refuge; there poverty, unemployment, pursued innocence, cunning, the struggle against the powerful, the refusal of obligations and laws, and organized crime all came together as chance and fortune would dictate" (300).

Timur's nomadism is echoed in his ahistoricity. In the same way that he is untethered spatially, he also exists outside of the Castilian chronology, untethered to previous historical references. Clavijo explains that the trappings of Timur's legitimacy are stolen. We first see this in Clavijo's curious choice of terms, where, despite acknowledging Timur's role in saving Constantinople from the Ottomans, Clavijo writes that "el Tamurbeque... venció al turco e robó la Turquía" (103).

Timur's past as a thief is engraved permanently into the name that Clavijo predominately uses. Timur begins his rise to power as a thief. When younger, Clavijo explains, Timur "iva por las tierras a rovar e furtar lo que podía para sí e para ellos. Otrosí iva por las tierras e por los caminos, e rovaba a los mercadores" (249). The injury in his leg resulting from a raid gave Timur the name "tollido, así como lo era del anca derecha e de los dos dedos pequeño de la mano derecha" (186).

Neither does Timur's lineage properly belong to him. Clavijo explains that the original Chacatay was one of four sons of Dorgancho (Genghis Kahn). The four brothers, as with numerous other families, fall into infighting, despite their father's caution of losing the kingdom (252). The Chacatay subjects "alçáronse contra él e matáronlo e tomaron mucha de su gente, e fizieron un emperador de los del linaje de la tierra" (252-53). The name is inherited by all: "los de la tierra llaman a estos tártalos que allí quedavan, chacatanes" (253), of which Timur is a descendent. Clavijo observes that many have claimed the name falsely because of its prestige—Timur's prestige has been similarly won. Together, his nomadism and ahistoricity emphasize Timur's marginality, and undermine his claims to places such as Samarqand, or Tabriz, despite the luxuriant mosques he builds there. His shallow roots contrast with the architectural, historical

anchor of the text's other rulers,³⁸ casting him as envious of the permanence that these rulers have.

Soft architecture and deception

In Timur's soft architecture, Clavijo also observes a deliberate imitation of urban permanence. The Turco-Mongol horde's winter camp employs 'the intentional simulation of permanent architecture in temporary forms' (Roxburgh 136). Clavijo is particularly interested in "the furniture and textile components of the 'houses,' noting the many mattresses, cushions, and wall hangings that decked the interior and exterior spaces" (Roxburgh 136). This obfuscates "the scale or scope of 'hard' architecture," which "need not be identified with the physical attributes of longevity or monumentality" (Roxburgh 118). The description is thus a "series of experiences of soft architecture which frequently mimicked the morphological and decorative features of permanent architecture" (150), culminating with a wooden mosque that is set-up and taken down as the horde moves from site to site. This fascination and confusion between hard and soft architecture points to a theme of deception that the text foregrounds in both Timur's biography as well as his tents, as they imitate hard architectural features.

³⁸ This nomadic interstitiality contrasts with Clavijo's Castile, where cities were both political protagonists, and also the source of identity for their inhabitants. As Eberenz notes, 15th-century Europe experienced an urban revival. This is the case as well in Castile, where cities were gaining greater autonomy and identity. Following the devastating loss of nobles at the Battle of Aljubarrota in 1385, Enrique III (1379-1406) continued this trend of increased the urban protagonism established by his grandfather: "The promotion of new nobility through grants and privileges was a key aspect of a vast repopulation program involving the reconstruction of communities under the guidance and supervision of this nobility" (Espinosa 38). The need to balance the power of the nobles prompted the king to establish *corregidores* for "la vigilancia del gobierno municipal, especialmente en el terreno de la justicia" (Suárez Fernández, "Nobleza y monarquía" 396).

This increased political importance is reflected by cities' playing a larger role in the nexus of identity in medieval Spain: "Citizens used the social, economic, emotional and religious connections they had to create a sign of identity, which served to give them recognition and place them in society. This identity stayed with them for life" (Asenjo 294). We can thus imagine that Timur's nomadism represents a lack of identity, placing him outside of Castilian epistemology, on the margins of society and civilization. Additionally, cities were also centers of historical memory, as "from the 15th century onwards, cities set down their own chronicles to preserve and recreate the memory of their past glories and values" (Asenjo 297). This adds to Timur's portrayal as an ahistorical figure. Timur's nomadism thus sets him beyond the margins of Clavijo's epistemology.

Like his tents, Timur is deceitful, feigning legitimacy. During his return home, Clavijo writes that Timur's people, the Chacaties, "son gente engañosa e sutil, e nunca dizen verdat" (342). Clavijo has already provided numerous examples of this up until now. For instance, in the village of Pagarrix, Clavijo relates that Timur commanded all the Armenian churches to be torn down, even after the Armenians paid "tres mil ásperas, que es cada áspera como medio real" (187) to prevent this. When the party previously stayed in Macu, they laid siege to a castle belonging to "un cristiano católico que ha nombre Moradin" (193).³⁹ Timur seizes Noradin's eldest son while the latter delivers three horses as tribute. He then "tornó moro por fuerça a este fijo d'este Señor del castillo, e púsole nombre Sogar Mix, e fizole su guarda" (195).

Clavijo mentions a ruse by which Timur tries to entice the emperor of Persia to cross a river by promising friendship and saying "qu'él no venía a pelear con él e qu'él su amigo era, e que Dios nunca quisiese qu 'el mal buscase a él" (320). The Persian Emperor, though, "guardávase d'él, e savía bien que era artero" (320). In another moment, recalling a scene from *Tirant lo blanc*, Timur dresses the women in his horde as men so that the men can ambush the Persian Emperor (320).

Timur's first conquest is Samarqand, which wins him the realm of Samaricant after two men turn the king over to him in an act of betrayal; he then "tomóse a la mujer del Emperador e

³⁹ Macu is one of a few strongholds that Timur is unable to conquer after a siege. For Clavijo's contemporaries, this likely would have evoked Enrique III's siege of Gijón. Count Alfonso Enríquez, illegitimate firstborn of Enrique II, led a rebellion against the young monarch. The fortified peninsula castle proved difficult to take, obligating Enrique III to cut it short for winter. When the fortress fell the next year, Enrique "ordenó derribar el resto de la villa para que nunca fuera ocasión de una empresa semejante" (357).

The present scene merits further attention for how it evokes our previous theme of a Christian enclave, which is emphasized as Clavijo concludes his account with: "É es una gran maravilla durar este castillo entre tantos Moros, é tan alongados de Christianos, é otrosí de Armenios tornarse Cathólicos, que es grande servicio de Dios" (106). The castle presents itself as a place from which Christianity can spread, recalling *Tirant's* evangelizing mission that begins in the cave. Noradin has a second, younger son "que era buen gramático en aquella su lengua, é que quando Dios quisiese que tornasen, que ge lo daría, para que lo traxesen al dicho señor Rey, para que lo encomendase al Papa, é lo ficiese Obispo de aquella tierra" (106). The creation of religious hierarchy that will continue the role of preaching Christianity is an additional colonizing parallel between the two texts.

casóse con ella” (251). Similarly, the second empire of Horzania is won because of the discord between brothers, “E de aquí fue el su comienço” (251). These details undermine Timur’s legitimacy—he has tricked or stolen his way into the trappings (territory, name, wife, and lineage) of a divinely-ordained ruler, giving the appearance of an emperor with a history. As with soft architecture that seems to be a palace and court, looks can be deceitful.

The tents are multivalent symbols: they emphasize Timur’s nomadism and ahistoricity, and also suggest that his impressive success is fleeting. Moreover, Timur’s deceptive nature is represented in the tent’s imitation of stone buildings, reflecting, in part, his personality. Timur is a temporary figure, destined to fade as quickly as he has appeared.

Hard architecture

The positive association between construction and Timur should not be overlooked in a text that is dominated by destruction, especially in the case of Constantinople. Timur’s thriving empire and its architectural projects and protection are a contrast to the decadence that the embassy sees at numerous points. However, beneath this seemingly positive valuation of Timur, the text groups Timur into its larger discourse of envy by painting him as an excessive figure of ‘good envy,’ as he marches against the kingdom of Catay rather than shoring up his dynasty by electing an heir and finishing the numerous projects; the resulting civil war nearly destroys his empire. His ambition drives him to immoderation and brutality, ultimately reinforcing the ephemerality of his might.

As the party enters the Timurid Empire, we find three projects that Clavijo devotes particular attention to: two mosques and a public market. The first mosque is dedicated to Timur’s grandson. Here, in contrast to Timur’s protection of the buildings in Tabriz, Timur’s boundless ambition makes him into a figure of architectural destruction, consequently resorting

to wasteful, or brutal techniques. As a result, Timur leaves projects unfinished. Timur is unhappy with the first iteration of the mosque, demanding something more impressive: “cuando el señor allí llegó, no se pagó de la capilla, que dixo que era baxa.” He then gives them the nearly impossible task of rebuilding it: “e mandóla derrocar e que la fiziesen en diez días, so pena que les puso.” His threats work to incredible effect, as the project is finished on time: “En la cual obra ovo tan grand acucia, que labravan de día e de noche... E aquella capilla fue fecha e acabada en los diez días, que es una maravilla tan grand obra como aquella acabarse en diez días” (304).

We note a parallel instance with “la mezquita qu’el Señor mandó fazer por onor de la madre de Cano” (306). Again, Timur is unsatisfied with the initial results: “E desde que fue acabada, no se pagó de la portada, que era baxa, e mandóla derrocar” (306). He organizes a competition with two officials to see who could finish their portions of the renovations first. To encourage his workers, Timur shows a strange mix of wanton generosity and disregard for the workers, throwing coins and meat into the pit, “como quien la dava a perros” (307). Nonetheless, Clavijo is impressed by (perhaps even envious of) the raw power, noting that “anda va tanta acucia que era maravilla” (307).

A final example is the market at the center of Samarqand, “una calle que travesase de una parte a otra; e en ella, bancos e tiendas para en que se vendiesen las mercaderias. E esta calle coménçase de la parte de la ciudad, e vase fasta el otro cabo, que travésase toda la ciudat” (305). He charges his advisors, making it clear that, if they didn’t invest all their efforts, he’d take their heads, showing tyrannical brutality. They set to work “derrocando quantas casas fallaban por do el Señor mandaba ir la dicha calle,” their residents “salían fuyendo con la ropa é quanto avian.” Clavijo is amazed at the speed of the construction: “antes de veinte días, fue fecha tan grand obra, que era maravilla” (306).

However, this comes at a human cost: “Las gentes cuyas eran aquellas casas que derrocavan, quexávanse por ello, e no lo osavan dezir al Señor.” They thus appeal to the cadis, who mentions it to Timur over a game of chess. Timur grows enraged and responds, “Esta ciudat es mía, e yo la compré por mis dineros: e tengo buenas cartas d'ello, e yo vos las mostraré mañana. E si fuere razón, yo pagaré lo que quisierdes” (306). The impressive display of wealth and power (as well as the destruction of homes, and the wasteful, mercurial decision to raze the mosque) is insufficient to overcome the limitations of time, conveying a sense of vanity that is reinforced as the reader recalls that “esta obra [the mosque dedicated to Cano’s mother] e la de la calle cesó por las niebes, que venían ya,” (307), left uncompleted before Timur dies.

Earlier instances of Timur’s projects confirm this mix of brutality and ephemerality. In Damogan, “cabeza de la Persia,” the party encounter two towers “tan altas quanto podría omne echar una piedra en alto, que eran fechas de lodo e de caveças de omnes,” (219) symbols of Timur’s brutality. The heads belong to white Tatars, who were defeated by Timur and sent to populate the city, which “estava mal poblada” (220). When Timur departed to attack Damascus for withholding tribute, the Tatars “quisiéronse tomar para su tierra, e metiéronse a rovar e destruir quanto fallavan.” Timur responded by beheading all of them. While a ghastly display, Clavijo treats them as macabre architecture. He explains how they were built, “un lecho de caveças, e otro de lodo” (220), delving into their construction, a detail that parallels his description of the mosaics in Constantinople. The transitory nature of these towers is wrapped up in their brutality from the start, as Clavijo observes “esta an otras dos torres caídas en tierra” (219). The fallen towers show that Timur is unable to completely make the transition from a nomadic figure to an urban one. The White Tatars evoke Timur’s nomadic past, one that he is unable to completely subdue.

The party passes through Kesh, Timur and his father's home city. Here, a mosque and chapel are under construction: "Señaladamente avía una grand mezquita que el Tamurbeque mandó fazer, que aún no era acavada; e en ella estava una capilla en que estava enterrado el padre de Tamurbeque. E otrosí avía fecho otra muy grand capilla, qu'el Tamurbeque mandara fazer para sí, en que se enterrase, e aún no era acavada" (246). Both projects are left incomplete upon Timur's untimely death, casting the architectural projects as transitory.

Cain and Enoch

Timur is both a contradictory mix of envy as a figure who benefits from envy while himself envious of urbanism, preferring to live nomadically while ennobling his capital city. In this curious blend, Clavijo compares Timur to another figure of Envy, Cain, casting Samarqand as Enoch, humanity's first city. By considering Cain's contradictory role as a nomadic founder of cities, we are able to understand how Clavijo undermines Timurid wealth and power while insisting on the perpetuity of Christianity, as the text brings Enoch and Augustine of Hippo's theological cities into play with Constantinople and Samarqand.

Cain was a medieval paragon of envy. *Envidia* is an undeniably Biblical theme, as Balint observes.⁴⁰ While there are numerous envious pairs of siblings in the Old Testament, one particularly stands out: "El mas envidioso omne del mundo fue Cayn, que por envidiar malo a su hermano seyendo el mundo de amos a dos" (Bizzarri 375), as we read in the *Diálogo de Epicfeto y el emperador Adriano*. Alfonso X's *General estoria* establishes Cain's *codicia* and *envidia* as defining characteristics: "E diz que el primero pecado mortal de Caím fue cobdicia... El segundo pecado mortal de Caím fue envidia que ovo Caím de Abel porque recibí Dios el sacrificio del

⁴⁰ "Additionally, a great deal of Biblical discord is ascribed to anger or hatred that has its roots in envy: Cain, Esau, the brothers of Joseph, and Saul are envious before they are murderous" (45).

hermano e non el suyo” (4v). Cain is foremost preoccupied with taking his brother’s inheritance, being “muy cobdicioso de ganar quequier e de heredar, assí que con avaricia e con cobdicia de aver fue él el primero que falló arte de labrar la tierra en estrumentos” (3v). Clavijo’s readers would thus see Cain and Abel reflected in his preoccupation with conflicts between biological and religious brethren.

Moreover, echoing the central rift between the Ottoman and Byzantine fathers and sons, Cain is both victim of patricide as well as perpetrator of fratricide: The *General Estoria* devotes its whole 32nd chapter to Cain’s death at the hands of “Lamech [que] fue el séptimo que descendió del linage derecho de Adam por la liña de Caím” (5v). After Cain’s wild appearance scares two women, they tell Lamech, who returns to the spot with a youth. After hearing the rustle of dead leaves, Lamech shoots Cain, wounding him mortally. When Lamech realizes that he will now receive Cain’s curse seventy-fold, he breaks his bow on the servant’s head, killing him (7v-8r). Cain is also a figure of the Orient, taking as birthright the “mejor tierra entre las otras la que era contra dond nació el sol, e fuéronse él e su muger a parte de orient” (5v).

Like Timur, Cain is a contradictory figure of urbanism and nomadism. He is cursed to wander the earth, and his nomadic alterity is particularly evident when Lamech first encounters his forefather, who is “todo fecho velloso, cubierto de cabellos como una animalia e otra, andando siempre fuyendo e morando todo lo más por los montes e por los yermos, e assí iba fuyendo e tal andava toda vía” (7v). However, parallel to Timur’s efforts to ennoble Samarqand, Cain is the founder of the first cities: “E por amor d’él [Enoch] pobló allí Caím una cibdat, e llamóla Enoca del nombre de aquel su fijo Enoc” (5r). These themes become more pronounced as we explore Enoch, which echoes the themes that we have seen above in Clavijo’s description of Timurid architecture.

In addition to these parallels between Timur and Cain, Clavijo also evokes Enoch (humanity's first city, founded by Cain) in his descriptions of Samarqand. Both symbols are brutal, earthly realms that are forcibly populated. The White Tatars, referenced above in the tower of heads, is one instance of this relocation. Another, clearer example is referenced as the party crosses over the Ocus ("Biamo") river into the Empire of Samarqand. Clavijo observes how the Timurids control the border. If people wish to take a boat out of the empire, they must show an official letter, although they can enter freely (241).

This is to prevent people from leaving this empire, because "el Señor ha fecho levar a esta ciudad de Samaricante mucha gente cativa para que pueblen aquella tierra, que faze mucho por la poblar de quantas tierras ha conquistado, e ennoblecerla" (242). Samarqand is a city of captives, a point which is reinforced later with mention of the castle where Timur has "mil omnes cativos" forging swords and helms year-round (314).

This points to Cain, who similarly forcibly populates his own city, taking the descendants of Seth. The *General Estoria* explains that "Apañávalos Caím, e a los que aver non podié faziélos por fuerça venir a morar allí a aquella cibdat" (5v). This repopulation project naturally had a special impact on Clavijo's audience in Spain, where repopulation was voluntary, and accompanied by "royal charters assuring personal freedom and other liberties were issued to attract settlers" (O'Callaghan 700). Timur's expansion would have contradicted Castilian sensibilities as well since it is not outward, but rather inward—rather than populating his newly acquired territories, he instead empties them to build up his capital.

Timur has brought experts in various mechanical arts to inhabit his city (312). The variety of artisans evokes an important distinction between the descendants of Cain and those of Seth: Cain's descendants are masters of "las artes que dizen mecánicas, e los de Set de las artes

liberales e de lo que a ellas perteneció” (6v). Clavijo creates a contrast that depends on understanding how the Middle Ages divided knowledge—into the seven liberal arts, (grammar, rhetoric, logic, and so forth) and the mechanical arts (sword-making, agriculture, glass making and other artisan crafts).

Although the mechanical arts were gaining acceptance in Europe throughout the Middle Ages, the prejudices of the late classical period persisted, where the work of the hands was beneath the work of the soul. For 4th-century St. Augustine of Hippo, mechanical arts sought to gain control over nature, thus perverting God’s design. In the 12th century, Hugh of St Victor writes that the mechanical arts are adulterate, since they focus on imitating nature. The liberal arts, on the other hand, were the pre-requisite to the study of theology, and knowledge of the divine. Accordingly, in tying Samarqand to artisanship and the mechanical arts, Clavijo is contrasting it with his perception of Europe as a place of the superior, celestial liberal arts. This is clear as, in his travels, he highlights sites in the Mediterranean that were associated with the intellectual Avicenna (84) and the poet Virgil (85).

As we have seen, the text defines Timur largely by his acts of architecture, another mechanical art. Timur’s ambition is reflected in his construction projects—while they are impressive and a foil to Christian decadence, they are also monuments to his focus on the mechanical arts at the price of the liberal ones.

City of God

In evoking Enoch, Clavijo also underscores another parallel besides this contrast between the divine liberal arts and the earthly mechanical ones. According to St. Augustine, Cain is “the founder of the earthly city” (454), a recurring symbol in *City of God* that contrasts with the

Heavenly City of God. This reveals another contrast that Clavijo uses to connect the text's two sister cities, Constantinople and Samarqand, casting one as heavenly, and the other as perishable.

Augustine repeatedly places Enoch in opposition to the City of God: "the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self. The former, in a word, glories in itself, the latter in the Lord" (430). The earthly city is characterized by "lust of rule" (438); it is "inflated with pride," and "life-destroying" (434). This recalls Timur's tireless campaigning and brutality. Paralleling the theme of enmity between brothers that advances Timur's interests, the terrestrial city "is often divided against itself by litigations, wars, quarrels." Above all, it is also transitory, being "a city in which nothing more is hoped for than can be seen in this world," (454) while its "victories... [are] short-lived" (434). While these characteristics are not unique to Timur, Clavijo chooses to have them culminate in Timur and his city.

The City of God, in contrast, is found in Christian believers. It has two sides. The earthly one is destined to live on earth until "this mortal condition which necessitates it shall pass away" (551). This resembles the decadent Constantinople, as the text reads the city's architectural ruin as, rather than mere decadence, a sign of a mortality that awaits impending salvation. This anticipates the City of God's other, heavenly side, which "exists ever immortal in the heavens" (301) as "the city which knows and worships one God (268). Regardless of Constantinople's physical fate, its Christian inhabitants (and those of other Christian cities) are "secured by eternal victory and peace never-ending" (387), in contrast to the transitory nature of Enoch.

Samarqand is thus undermined as an earthly, passing realm, overshadowed by the heavenly promise of the City of God, making the emperor an epitome both of Oriental Otherness and an antithesis to Christianity. This casts aspersions on Timur's great empire and its capital

city, suggesting that they are nothing alongside the timeless qualities of Christendom—Timur is an interloper in the Christian cosmos.

This distinction between Constantinople, the City of God, and Samarqand, the earthly city, is best summarized in two contrasting trees to which the author dedicates considerable description. In Samarqand, as the embassy tours the tent of Cano (Timur's first and principal wife, who was married to the previous Emperor of Samarqand), they are dazzled by a gold tree bearing precious fruit: “estava un árbol de oro, fecho a semejança de robre, que avía el pie tan grueso como podría ser la pierna de un omne, con muchas ramas que salían e ivan a una parte e a otra, con sus fojas como de robre” (299), bearing fruit that was “balaxes e esmeraldas e turqueas e çafires e rubís e aljófar muy grueso, a maravilla, claros e redondos e escogidos, e guarnidos en muchas partes por el árbol” (299).

This parallels an earlier “árbol seco en la calle junto con una casa” (201) that the party encounters in Tauris. The tree is prophesied to bloom when “un obispo cristiano ... ha de levar una Cruz en la mano e que ha de convertir a los de aquella ciudat a la fe de lesu Christo” (201). This is tested when people from the city try to cut down the tree and, after three blows, “reventaron” (201). Clavijo affirms that, “este dicho árbol está oy en día allí, en aquella calle, que no osa ninguno llegar a él” (201). Karen Daly explains, “the tree's ability to withstand the abuse the Muslims administer imply a divine protection by the Christian god, until such time that the prophecy is fulfilled” (*Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes* 130). The dried tree becomes a foil to the golden tree in Cano's tent: humble, but divinely eternal. This evokes another parallel in *City of God*, where Augustine further nuances his two cities by comparing them to the two divine trees in the Garden of Eden. One is the immortality-granting tree of life, “the holy of holies, Christ” evoked in the resurrecting tree of Tauris. The other is the tree of the

knowledge of good and evil,” representing “the will’s free choice” (375) for those who ate its forbidden fruit. This evokes the luxurious tree and its fruit, also “pleasing to the eye” (Genesis 3:6), though a symbol of a rebellious soul.

The tree is one of numerous ways that Clavijo insists on the perpetuity of Christianity. It works within a framework in which other natural signs point to the beginning of the world or of the present era, so to speak, whether the rivers that flow from the Garden of Eden; the mountain where Noah’s Ark (which Augustin offers as another example of the City of God (412)) rests; a crevasse that opened “el día que Iesu Christo rescevió Pasión” (87); or the ruins of “la primera puebla que en el mundo fuera fecha despues del Diluvio” (104).⁴¹

Like the decadent Constantinople and the dried tree, these ruins and natural signs are divinely eternal, proof of Christendom’s past and assurance of its future victory, unthreatened by Timur who is enclosed chronologically by biblical history and prophecy. This is most succinctly summarized in the city of Arzinga where, even though Timur has destroyed the churches, the walls still “avía en muchos lugares, fecha de piedra, la señal de la Cruz” (179), as architectural permanence and Christian ephemerality overwrite this destructive act.

⁴¹ Timur’s interstiliarity and ahistoricity is compounded by the way that Clavijo encloses Timur. Here, this is evident chronologically—prior to Timur is the creation of the world, and Christ’s passion, and, after him is the inevitable conversion of all to Christianity before the end of the world. A similar strategy takes places with the work’s geography. Samarqand is surrounded by Christian power, Constantinople to the West, and Cambalec to the East, in Cathay whose “Emperador [...] solia ser gentil, é fué convertido á la fé de los Christianos.” (193). While the kingdom falls to the same infighting evident among both Christians and Turco-Mongols, Clavijo idealizes Catay as a bigger, wealthier, more powerful realm: a witness tells them that Cambalec “que podia ser tan grande como veinte veces Tauris: es la mayor ciudad del mundo” (193); the city’s goods “son las mejores é mas preciadas de quantas allí vienen de otras partes,” and this is a reflection of their wits: “los del Catay asi lo dicen, que ellos son las gentes mas sotiles que en el mundo ay; é dicen que ellos han dos ojos, é que los Moros son ciegos, é que los Francos han un ojo; é ellos llevan la ventaja en las cosas que facen, á todas las naciones del mundo” (191). Catay also hosts a large army: “era costumbre del Señor del Catay, que ningún ome pudiese andar á caballo, salvo el que oviese mil omes de suyo, é destos que avia tantos que era maravilla” (194).

Timur is thus flanked, surrounded by Christianity chronologically and geographically, demonstrating that Christianity will ultimately conquer. This also provides another form of relief for Clavijo’s imperial envy—as wealthy and mighty as the Samarqand might be, Cathay is even more so, and, while Avicenna might cast light on a lack of Castilian intellectuals, Catay promises to be even more clever. Despite being on the margins in Castile, Clavijo can thus find solace in being part of a larger, more powerful Christendom.

Conclusion: Ineradicable Christianity

In sum, Clavijo employs a rich ambiguity in which Constantinople is cast as an Augustinian City of God while it serving as a photographic negative for Samarqand and the terrestrial Enoch. This network of layered cities is held together by a common theme of architecture as an index for envy. Thus, while there are no explicit comparisons or comments on Islam or Timurid religious beliefs, as Karen Daly observes, Clavijo's account offers criticisms of both Christians and of Timur (*Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes* 125). Envy between Christians drives their schisms and urban decadence, and, while Timur is more constructive, the beauty and speedy execution of his works conceal an excessive ambition. He is thus reduced to a passing power.

A framework of heterotopia shows us how Constantinople serves as a screen upon which other cities are projected, either as they are, or in negative. The flexibility that this affords demonstrates Clavijo's fascinating adaptability when dealing with a new power such as Timur. The Castilian draws (consciously or not) on the epistemological resources that he has handy to both explain Timur and establish a positional superiority over him by placing Timur in a position beyond the margins, atemporal and interstitial as we have said. Using this same resourcefulness, Clavijo is able to create allies by including Muslims in his epistemology, pointing out Avicenna's tower, and extending his criticism of Christian envy to include both Persians and Ottomans. Clavijo perhaps wishes to communicate a lesson in the form of a possible contingency plan for the next Timur—an alliance both with the heretic Christians, as well as with the more familiar Muslims against the threat of the unknown. In casting Constantinople in this way, Clavijo offers a vision of Castile: while humbler and poorer against the richer Muslim kingdoms

to the East and to the South, it is promised ultimate victory; at the same time, this vision of Castile is able to unite with religious Others against unknown outside threats.

La Destruycion de Constantinopla (1587)

Despite the distance of nearly two centuries, one can trace many parallels between *Embajada a Tamorlán* and Gabriel Lobo Lasso de la Vega's *La Destruycion de Constantinopla*, (published in 1587, though the date of performance remains unclear), despite the shift from Timurids to Ottomans. After reviewing the play's action and prior criticism, I consider how, again, Constantinople acts as a heterotopia of empire, this time being overlain with other historical besieged cities as well as a foundational city, Lavinium, the first city founded by Aeneas after his conquest of the Latins.

SUMMARY

The work draws extensively on Alonso de Palencia's account of the conquest of Constantinople in *Crónica De Enrique IV* (132). The action opens with Constantino, the Emperor of the Greeks awakens from a nightmare, where a man holds a knife to his throat, threatening to take his empire. Clobando suggests that this is due to an imbalance of humors, and suggests festivities to lighten his mood, but the figure of the Republic affirms that the dream is a warning, urging the monarch to correct the public's carnalities. The action shifts to Mahometo, the Ottoman Emperor (Mehmet the Conqueror, 1432-1481), who is hopelessly in love with his Soltana. Yet, after he falls asleep, he is visited by Discordia, who, with Embidia and Ambición, incites the love-struck potentate to subjugate Spain and the rest of the world, starting with Constantinople. Mahometo vows to punish the proud Byzantine emperor. The next scene centers

on the vacillations of Darpha with her servant Vrila—Darpha loves Veyón, but is skeptical of his promises, until she overhears him confess his feelings for her while hunting in the mountains.

Mahometo meets with his Baxas to plan Constantinople's conquest—he charges Tumumbeyo with 500 galleys, and Veyón with land forces, brushing aside their concerns over him joining them in battle. Guerra then appears, bringing Mahometo a gift of armor from his dead grandfather. In the next scene, Darpha and Soltana lament the departure of their love interests, as Darpha decides to follow Veyón dressed as a soldier. Meanwhile, in Constantinople, Constantino despairs that his subjects haven't left their 'mal camino' (115). When the governor Marciano tries to execute a man, six men free the convict by force and escape. Even worse, a captive brings news of the coming Turkish armada, and Constantino raises the call to arms. The third act opens during the battle, as the Ottomans push the Greeks back. Constantino and Veyón rally their troops, and Darpha takes a bullet for Veyón. The Ottomans breach the wall and Fama narrates the retreat of the Greeks as Iustiniano is shot by an arrow. Seeing him die, Constantino changes out of his royal garb to die as a common soldier. After the battle Veyón realizes that Darpha has risked her life for his, and, as she declares her love, Mahometo declares victory, promising to turn the city into a prison for Christians.

PRIOR CRITICISM

The work has garnered the most critical attention for its treatment of the Ottomans. Jack Weiner explores how the playwright casts the Ottomans as a *flagellum dei*, punishing the sinful Byzantines while the Spanish audience should take note of their own precarious situation. María Elena Frano Carcedo reads the work as a reflection of “la ‘cuestión morisca’ en la península, el problema mediterráneo y la lucha contra el turco” (221), as well as a work that “pretende apartarse del teatro popular, aunque acepta un cierto compromiso con fórmulas y elementos del

teatro nuevo, lopiano” (233). Antonucci Fausta explores contrasting presentations of the Ottomans by comparing the play to Lope de Vega’s *La Santa Liga*, with which it bears numerous parallels. Aaron Kahn discusses the work in his exploration of subversive political discourse, exploring how it subtly casts Felipe II as a tyrannical figure.

My analysis here offers a re-reading of what Carcedo terms Lobo’s “profunda inquietud ante una política de condescendencia con los musulmanes españoles por parte de los grandes títulos” (222). This concern is evident both in Lobos’ extensive interest in the Spanish Reconquest, devoting five (19-23) romances of his first *Primera parte del Romancero y Tragedias*⁴² to the subject, as well as an additional romance (109) celebrating Carlos V’s victory over Suyleman the Magnificent at the Danube. I argue that, beneath the concerns of a resurgent Ottoman Empire and Morisco fifth column that threaten Spain, there is also a concern about the very project of Empire itself in the work projected onto the conquest of Constantinople. In using Constantinople as a heterotopia, the text provides two different visions of Spain. As Constantinople at first seems to merge with Spain, we find a reading that is quite similar to our previous text, *Embajada a Tamorlán*. However, at a deeper level, Lasso de la Vega criticizes the project of Empire, projecting onto Constantinople several other historical besieged cities.

Orthodox reading: “El turco fiero ayrado”

The playwright invites the Spanish audience to see themselves in the threatened Byzantines. In the play’s introit, Lasso de la Vega warns that Constantinople’s “pena no nos alcanza pequeña parte” (77). Elsewhere, Discordia urges Mahometo “a que sujete las Españas y a ser de todo el orbe obedecido y a que tome la insigne y poderosa Bisancio, más que Roma

⁴² Carcedo notes as much, writing that “La actitud del poeta en el tratamiento literario del tema en sus numerosos romances moriscos y de la reconquista es ilustrativo; en los que constituyen la Primera parte del Romancero y Tragedias tenemos ejemplo de una decidida defensa de la integridad religiosa e ideológica de España” (223).

populosa” (90). The play offers a dominant, jingoist view of the city’s conquest, intermingled with *urbs* and envy and encoded with a vision of Spain under Ottoman threat. The city falls to Ottoman ambition as the Christians fail to organize due to infighting. Architecture acts as a locus for the conflict between the two faiths. Motivated by envy and ambition, Mehmet seeks the architectural and permanence represented in Constantinople’s *urbs*, paralleling Timur in *Embajada*. Ultimately, the Ottoman victory is framed as ephemeral as Lobo shows that Constantinople is a palimpsest of which the Ottoman ambitions are merely the latest in a cycle of conquest, rebuilding and destruction.

ENVY AND CONSTANTINOPLE

The theme of envy in the work is particularly evident in the scene introducing Discordia, Envidia and Ambición. Just as we’ve seen in *Embajada*, the two are also linked here. Envidia refers to ‘mi hermana Ambición’ and Ambición adds on “Esnos de gran importancia luego lo que dizes se haga” (90). They also drive conflicts. Discordia says that their “fiereza tiene al mundo en perpetua enemicia” (88).

Different here, though, is the apparently totalizing perspective of the East Mediterranean Orient, where Mehmet is driven both by ambition and envy. As Discordia introduces both, she seems to align Ambición with the Ottomans as Oriental figures, while tying Envidia to Christians victimhood. However, Lasso also criticizes Christians as well. The conflicts that the two figures provoke are different, divided between Oriental ambition to usurp its superiors, and Western invidious infighting. She begins:

¡O tú, Ambición!, sedienta y poderosa,
que a Hano de Carthago compeliste
a que la aue de lengua perezosa
que supiesse dezir ‘dios Hano’ hiziste.
Y a Erostrato la casa sumptuosa

de Diana quemasse permitiste.
Y al inuicto Alexandro se llamasse
dios y por tal la tierra le adorasse.

This series of references contains allusions to the lands now dominated by Islam, either Asian or North African Orients. Hanno is from Carthage, the non-European competitors of Rome,⁴³ which Lobo's audience would have associated with Tunis. This renowned nest for Barbary corsairs had been reconquered by the Ottomans in 1574, 14 years prior to the play's publication. Moreover, birds and their speech were often associated with Arab mysticism.⁴⁴

The remaining references focus on the Asian Orient, drawing on the symbols of ambition that we find also in *Embajada a Tamorlán*. Herostratus, while Greek, is renowned for destroying Athena's temple in the Anatolian city of Ephesus (Selçuk, in Modern-day Turkey). This allusion echoes our previous text's Miraxan Miraza, who destroys the magnificent buildings of Tabriz. The destruction of the temple foreshadows, of course, the destruction and desecration of sacred buildings at the end of Constantinople's conquest. Alexander the Great, as a Western figure who crosses into and conquers the Orient, is juxtaposed with Mahometo, who moves in the opposite direction to conquer. All of these comparisons are disjunct, from disparate categories: men strive to be gods, to exceed, as it were, their class. This recalls the first sin in the Christian cosmos,

⁴³ Hanno was the name of several important Carthaginians, among them the one referenced. As Hermenegildo notes, Lasso de la Vega is drawing here from Claudio Eliano's *Variae Historia* book XIV, section 32. This Hanno is fused with Hanno the navigator, at least in the case of French protestant Polymath Samuel Bochart (1599-1667) in *Geographia sacra, seu Phaleg et Chanaan* (1646), begging the question of whether Lasso de la Vega perhaps referenced both figures blended into one as well.

Hanno the navigator departed from Carthage to explore what lay beyond the Pillars of Hercules, rounding the coast of Africa, while his brother went north, exploring the European coast. Hanno's expedition concludes with encountering a shaggy race of people, of whom his crew manages to catch three females. They prove so fierce that they must be killed, and their skins are brought back to Carthage. The story offers an interesting colonial reading that offers some junctures with the play's anti-imperialist reading, which we discuss below. As an explorer of a non-European space beyond the known, Hanno the navigator also offers an interesting parallel with Alexander the Great and his campaign through Asia.

⁴⁴ As Jan Retsö shows, the classical world as well as Medieval Arabic sources recognized Arabs as diviners of the speech of birds (593-94). This association is reinforced later in the Quranic verse 16 in surah 27, where Solomon declares "O people, we have been taught the language of birds, and we have been given from all things."

where the angel Lucifer strove to be equal to God, the servant seeking to supplant the master. Mahometo's role is no less of a usurpation, as the Muslim emperor of the Orient strives to conquer Christian Constantinople.

While Ambition focuses on the ambitious, the comparisons made to Envy focus, rather, on the victims.

Y tú, Embidia cruel, por quien Homero
recibió de Zoylo mil afrentas
y Háyx Telamón, con brazo fiero
de sí mismo homicida, heridas cruentas,
y el dañado Calígula seuro
mandó en Esio poner manos violentas;
por quien su tierra a partos dio Adriano
de imbidia de los triumphos de Trajano.

Homer is criticized by Zoilus (though, admittedly, several centuries afterwards). Ajax Telamon is driven to suicide after being outwitted by Ulysses in a contest for Hector's armor. Caligula kills Escio, likely referencing Esius Proculus,⁴⁵ the beautiful son of a centurion who an envious Caligula sentenced to fight in the gladiatorial games. The allusions reflect the trope of the envied author, whose fame shines despite the envy of inferior artists. As discussed in our introduction, suffering from *invidia ajena* demonstrates merit, re-affirming Constantinople (and by extension the West's) quality as a civilized, enviable place. This focus on envy's victims stages the grounds for an empathetic reading of the conquered Byzantines, suggesting that they are primarily victims of their own, envy-inspiring greatness. Constantino urges his men to fight on so that "la fama cante / vuestro valor y esfuerzo nunca oydo, / a pesar de la embidia y torpe olvido" (121).

⁴⁵ Hermenegildo suggests that the playwright references Casio "aquel Cassius Longinus a quien Calígula mand'o matar por confusión, siguiendo al oráculo que le había prevenido contra un cierto Cassius" (89). The alternative I suggest here can be found detailed in Seutonius's *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*, in the 35th section under Caligula.

However, this description also underscores the invidious infighting that we have seen in our previous text. Greeks attack Greeks, and Romans attack Romans. The final example references two Roman Emperors born in Italica (near present day Seville), in the Roman province of Hispania Baetica, tying the figure of Envy to Spain. This manifests in the play as the righteous ruler Constantino tries to discipline his unruly subjects. While Lasso de la Vega focuses on the Byzantine “carnalidades” (77)⁴⁶ as their primary sin, the only specific sin that the playwright exemplifies is that of division between liege and subjects. One of the Byzantine gobiernos, Marciano explains:

Y, queriendo ayer saca[r]
seys hombres a justiciar
para exemplo de su yerro,
me los quitaron a hierro
yendo el hecho a executar. (999-1002)

Constantinople can only be conquered by an outside Muslim power because of infighting, which Lasso de la Vega casts as envious in the play’s opening act. As Mehmet Sait Şener mentions “Constantino tenía hombres suficientes para prevenir la caída de Constantinople, pero estaban todos ‘al ocio y larga paz acostumbrados’ (v. 1130), mientras que los ‘moços briosos’ de Mahometo estaban ‘en el hábito bélico estremados’ (vv. 1034-5)” (386). The rebellion is both divisive, but also shows excessive ambition. In freeing the prisoners by sword, the subjects usurp the emperor’s authority. The unruly citizens become a sort of mirror for Mehmet, whose own impulses echo the dregs of Byzantine society. Mehmet is thus a manifestation of Christendom’s worst. Drawing on this and the allegorical descriptions above, Mahometo is constructed as a pastiche of tropes and allusions that represent the West’s own inadequacies, chief among which is envy.

⁴⁶ Echoing the sexual impropriety of King Rodrigo, this is a reminder of how the sins that provoke Constantinople’s fall “no nos alcanza pequeña parte” (77).

CONSTANTINOPLE AND ARCHITECTURE

Both Envy and Ambition drive Mehmet's conquest of the city, which is described as a covetous act, a "cobdicioso saco" (82), done by Ottoman forces who, "con cobdiciosa mano saqueando, por todas partes su rigor se muestra los sagrados lugares profanando" (131). The Sack of Constantinople is written in largely architectural terms, as we find that the Oriental conqueror seeks to attain urban and historical permanence by conquering the Christian city.

Constantinople's conquest is projected onto a series of physical edifices. This is particularly evident in the importance given to the city's walls as a locus of action. In our play, *muro* or *muralla* shows up 10 times, serving as a metonym for the whole city. The battle is all but lost when the walls fall, 20 lines after the walls are breached. This focus on the city walls roots the conquest of Constantinople in its physical *urbs*.⁴⁷

Alongside the city walls, impressive buildings are also underscored. A citizen describes the architectural devastation as the Ottomans enter the city: "Sumptuosos edificios caen dexando." (131) Similarly, Constantino's prophetic dream at the opening of the play expresses fear over the desecration of churches:

Injusta y nueva ley introduziendo,
la falsa de Mahoma se pratica;
su torpe efigie en el lugar poniendo
que a Christo en nuestros templos se le aplica,
de su pasión sagrada escarneciendo,
mil opprobrios el bárbaro publica. (83)

⁴⁷ This is evident from the beginning, where Constantino has a prophetic dream predicting his city's downfall where "gruessa armada por mar que a sangre y fuego / nuestros infaustos muros amenaza" (82). It likewise central in the city's destruction, as the captive warns of Mahometo's coming to "arruinar de Visancio el fuerte muro," (117) and later, Veyón prays that a lethal ray of lightning strike him "Si muro enhiesto o piedra leuantada / mañana aquí quedare" (125). The Greeks are moved to fight more vigorously upon "el ver sus fuertes muros assaltados" (121). Indeed, the allegorical figure of Fame comments, "Ya el griego al turco retira" as the Ottomans advance rapidly: "La barranca el turco ciega. / ¡Ya la passa! ¡Ya se allega / a la segunda también!" (126).

The desecration of the Hagia Sophia is accompanied by the construction of a new mosque to finalize the conquest, at the play's conclusion. A triumphant Mahometo promises to build:

vn templo sumptuísísimo en memoria
prometo de hazerte, do seruido
seas con nunca óyda pompa a gloria
de la merced oy hecha por tu mano
con que el hombre eternizas othomano. (134)

The war between the two religions is thus waged largely in architectural terms.

As Jack Weiner notes, “el turco que él describe en la TDC conquistador de Bizancio un siglo antes, es el mismo turco que todavía amenaza la civilización occidental. Lobo establece esta analogía también entre Tárik, sus huestes y los moriscos” (63). This is particularly so with the play's focus on architecture, as we consider how this mix of destruction and desecration of Christians buildings would have resonated within the historical memory of the *Reconquista*. As Urquizar-Herrera points out, ruins in Spain offered a connection to its Roman past, crucial to Spain's urban identity:

To the humanists, the absence of remains that could vouch for the classical foundation of a city was a crucial issue. It is well known that relics from Roman or pre-Roman times were evidence of a town's status. The physical presence of ancient stones was required to illustrate the nobility of an urban community” (37).

The 711 conquest of Spain was held responsible: “Blaming the lack of classical ruins on Islamic destruction was a successful historiographical strategy. Islamic reuse of existing remains, for instance, was not understood as a mark of respect for ancient heritage, but as evidence of Islamic violence” (38). Mehmet's architectural destruction/reconstruction serves to frighten Lasso's Spanish audience by recreating the 711 conquest. Such tensions with Muslim architecture were at a high point during Lasso's life, when “in the turbulent wake of the Morisco uprising, other buildings and urban remains were either eliminated or their Islamic origin effaced” (Urquizar-

Herrera 47). The play projects Visigoth Spain onto Constantinople by playing off of anxieties over Spain's lack of prestige-creating classical ruins.

Yet, at the same time, it also casts Mehmet as a figure in search of the architectural permanence and history that defines Constantinople. The play's description of Constantinople as an urban, architectural space, with its churches and wall, contrasts with the lack of description of the Ottoman palace as well as the hunting scene's natural imagery of "plantas bellas" and "pedregoso arroyuelo." While the reader cannot question where the Byzantines are (Lasso's introit mentions the city twice), the Ottomans are not linked to a specific place, with the possible exception of Negroponte in the third act (118), a brief mention lacking in the walls and sumptuous buildings that help the audience to imagine the Byzantine capital. The Ottomans are unmoored, floating in an undefined void outside of Constantinople. This ambiguity is historical as well as architectural. While the current ruler Constantino points directly back to the eponymous founder of the city, Mahometo's indirect visit from his grandfather falls short of the millennia of history that Constantinople represents. Conquest of the city remedies what the Ottomans lack—proof of civilizing architecture and history. These are the objects of the potentate's envy, both things that he is unable to create on his own, and thus must steal.

CONSTANTINOPLE AS PALIMPSEST

Mehmet's victory seems unquestionable at the end of the play as he orders, "començá a redificarla, / que ésta será mazmorra de Christianos, / y fuerte defensión de mahometanos" (134). However, the playwright mitigates this finality by portraying Constantinople as an architectural palimpsest in the play's prologue. In the work's introduction, he narrates the city's various iterations as it emerges and re-emerges as a site of wondrous building. When it is first founded by Biçançio, it prospers, growing "en edifficios ricos" (76). The city becomes a coveted object,

as many princes “cobdiciáronla y batiéronla.” It is conquered by Severo, who levels it, “poniendo por tierra y ygualando con el humilde suelo sus fuertes murallas y sobervios edificios” (76). Later, Constantino looks to move his court when an eagle seizes a cord that he was using to measure a site, and leaves it “en los olvidados y batidos cimientos de la gran Constantinopla.” Constantino restores its ruins to prosperity, an echo of Espercius on the isle of Lango in *Tirant lo Blanc*. Constantino rebuilds the city to its former glory, with “edificios tales” (77), and is later referred to as the one who “la reedificó,” casting him as a builder. The prologue creates a sense of cyclical conquest, prosperity and fall.

Mahometo is merely the latest in a cycle of city-building conquerers, similarly entering into a cycle of vain construction, as he vows to rebuild the city. Lasso de la Vega emphasizes this cyclical nature when he attributes Constantinople’s recent fall to Fortune’s fickleness: “como sea propiedad de fortuna muchas vezes leuantar segunda vez a los que primero ha puesto en alto lugar y derribádoslos d’él, para que con mayor caída sientan su rigor.” The cyclical quality is evident as well in the name shared between the first and final ruler of Constantinople: “otro Constantino y hijo también de madre llamada Elena, como el Magno que la reedificó” (77). This cycle now includes Mahometo’s conquest, which, while devastating, is both vain and temporal, allowing the audience to imagine his own defeat within his victory. The playwright then tempers his victory by framing it as passing in a maneuver of positional superiority.

A heterodox reading: An Oriental Aeneas

The play, then, at one level looks outward, toward an envious Orient that threatens the West. However, as we have seen in previous works, this outward gaze is also directed inward on a deeper level. Here, the Orient acts as a mirror that criticizes power in Spain. Lasso de la Vega accomplishes this by subtly linking Mahometo to Aeneas, playing on anxieties over Spain’s

imperial project as he links Aeneas to Ambición. This rewrites Constantinople as heterotopia of besieged cities where it merges with Troy, Carthage, and Numancia.

Aeneas is evoked in the figure of Mahometo. We see this first in the visit from Guerra, the allegorical embodiment of war. It is a densely packed scene that links Mahometo to Aeneas, the mythical Trojan hero who was the forefather of Romulus and Remus, and thus all Romans.

Recalling Aeneas's encounter with the ghost of his father, Guerra is sent by Solimán,⁴⁸

Mahometo's "abuelo valeroso" (107).⁴⁹ Like the hero, Mahometo also receives an indestructible armor crafted by Vulcan:⁵⁰

Estas armas te embía, por la mano
con gallarda inuentiua fabricadas
de la cíclope turba de Vulcano,
de flecha y vala ardiente reseruadas,
de todo arma offensiua y peligrosa
del consorte de Venus releuadas. (107)

Moreover, Guerra also emphasizes that conquest and city-building are a fulfillment of

Mahometo's ancient (though ambiguous) lineage: "Será por ti tu imperio acrecentado / y de la sangre antigua de othomanos / el claríssimo nombre celebrado" (107). Like Aeneas, Mahometo is following a divine mission. This is reiterated in the end, as Mahometo gives thanks to Allah

⁴⁸ Lobo likely wished to evoke Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566), whose death was 12 years prior to the play's publication. Lasso does discuss Suleiman's defeat by Charles V at the Battle of Mohacs in 1526 in his romance 109 in *Primera parte*. Perhaps Lasso is trying to establish a parallel for his audience between a conquering Suleiman as Mahometo's ancestors and a conquered one as his descendant, mirroring the two Constantinos in the play.

⁴⁹ Lasso's use of a grandfather instead of the Virgilian father can be better understood as a generalized reference to a visit from a dead ancestor, as Hermenegildo notes: "mejor, que abuelo tenga el sentido más general de 'antepasado'" (107). The critic also observes that Mehmed II's grandfather was, in fact Mehmed I, and there was no ancestor named Suleiman in Mehmed's lineage.

⁵⁰ While it may be tempting to read this as a reference, instead, to the new armor that Thetis gives to Achilles (which, María Emilia Cairo writes, inspired the episode in the Aeneid), there are several links to the episode from Aeneas. The armor is given shortly before the battle, for instance. The passage refers to Vulcan as "el consorte de Venus," recalling Aeneas's patron goddess, who begs her husband Vulcan to make "Arms for my son to keep him safe in battle" (5:511). The reference to the Cyclopes: "de la cíclope turba de Vulcano" is unique to the account in the Aeneid, where Vulcan commands "the naked Cyclopes, Steropes and Brontes and Pyracmon" to get to work (8:562-3). Mahometo's armor is also indestructible, recalling Venus's promise to her son "with these you need not fear the scornful Laurentians, / Nor hesitate to challenge fierce Turnus's sword" (790-91).

for “la merced oy hecha por tu mano / con que el nombre eternizas othomano” (134). In contrast, Constantino Palaiologos XI’s name already bears the fame that the Ottoman name lacks.

Mahometo’s victory is a sort of birthright. Like Aeneas and Latium, Mahometo’s final battle is a decisive siege (though with no dramatic individual combat). While Aeneas declares: “Let Alban kings and Latium stay through the ages, a Roman people, strengthened by Italy’s courage,” Mahometo builds his Lavinium upon the ruins and bodies of the conquered Byzantine capital (12:826-827). Additionally, Aeneas promises to “build a marble Temple to Diana, and one to Phoebus” (4:100-101). Mahometo similarly builds a mosque at the close of the play.

Both founders must first abandon a beloved woman before they take on the task of city-building. Mahometo leaves his loving Soltana after Envidia and Ambición incite him. Similarly, Mercury urges Aeneas on Jupiter’s behalf to leave Dido. Lobo also draws attention to the Soltana’s grief as Mahometo leaves: “No me dexes en ansia tan llorosa, / de ausencia y de mudança temerosa” (109). This is accompanied by Darpha’s sadness as she learns that Veyón (one of Mahometo’s Baxas, placed in charge of the navy) will also leave. Lasso perhaps plays with an alliterative similarity between Dido and Darpha; both Darpha and Virgil’s Dido⁵¹ are abandoned after sex, which becomes clear as Darpha laments, “Tocó mi planta inocente” (111).

Finally, Mahometo’s and Aeneas’s city-building are part of a larger imperial project. In his concluding speech, he vows, “Prometo más de hazer Visancio sea cabeça de mi imperio y de abitada” (134). This is a fulfillment of the promise that Guerra (who “a unos doy imperios a otros quito”) offers in second act: “será tu imperi acrecentado” (134), paralleling Jupiter’s promise to

⁵¹ It is worthwhile to acknowledge that while Lobo was certainly aware of the *Aeneid*, he rejected its particular reading of Dido as disloyal to her deceased husband Sicheus, as the playwright explores at length in his play *La honra de Dido Restaurada*. Having a differing opinion, however, would not prevent him from using a common literary ‘language’ that he could trust that his readers and audience would understand.

Venus that “I set no time or wealth limits on Romans: I'll give them endless rule” (1:78-9) as she assures Aeneas’s future.

It is worthwhile to note that, despite being the mythical forefather of both Rome and the Habsburgs, Aeneas was still a controversial figure. Alongside Antenor, he treacherously convinces the Trojans to accept the wooden horse. Giulio Romano’s (1499-1546) frescos in the Palazzo Ducale in Mantua portray Aeneas as a coward, “escaping under Venus’ cloak of invisibility” (Harper 171). In the first volume of the *Romancero General*, in a romance on Aeneas’s final battle with the Italian Turnus, Turnus berates the Trojan prince for his lack of mercy, “Tu nombre infamas, tu crueldad pregonas, Pues te llaman piadoso, y no perdonas” (Vol 1, 491). Authors like Lobo were clearly willing to question Aeneas’s morality, despite his unquestionable importance as founder of Rome.

Aeneas was often incorporated into royal genealogies. Felipe II made especial use of the Trojan prince as a model for Imperial rule (Tanner 145). Moreover, various critics have seen the figure of a tyrannical Felipe II in Mahometo. Kahn argues that the INRI hung above the crucified Byzantine Christian’s head would have evoked the Society of Jesus’s motto, “Iustum Necar Reges Impios, or ‘it is just to exterminate or annihilate impious or heretical kings, governments, or rulers’” (43). Carcedo notes that Mahometo’s declaration, “poco haze en conservar vn principe lo heredado” (106) “revela el pensamiento del autor y su postura frente a las guerras y luchas incesantes mantenidas por Felipe II” (Carcedo 225).

Indeed, the figure of endless Ambition would have been especially condemnatory for the tumultuous reign of Felipe II. The Anglo-Spanish War (1585-1609) culminated in the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, a year after the play’s publication. Felipe II presided over a series of state bankruptcies, the most recent occurring in 1575, 13 years before Lobo published his

work. Spain was also embroiled in quelling the revolt in the Netherlands, and it is easy to imagine the 1576 sack of Antwerp in Lobo's description of Constantinople's destruction and slaughter. Casting Mahometo as Aeneas would thus seem to reflect Felipe II, with which the playwright can criticize the Spanish monarch.

However, while reading a particular critique of Felipe II is valid, I suggest that it is nonetheless incomplete. There is a tension in eliding Mahometo's conquest of a city for which he had no legal claim (in contrast to Antwerp) and Felipe II's wars in Europe. Additionally, the bellicose, ambitious Mahometo contrasts with the work's other emperor, the decadent, passive Constantino. Şener notes their parallelism: "Los dos monarcas sueñan, pero sus reacciones al despertarse son totalmente opuestas: Constantino abre sus ojos con gran pavor y acepta que se preparen juegos y distracciones en la ciudad para olvidar su recelo. Mahometo, por otro lado, se despierta con enojo y determinación" (387). The work seems, then, to be as concerned with a tyrannical, cruel emperor as it is with a permissive one, suggesting that Lasso is interested in something broader than the current ruler.

Destrucción de Constantinople is part of Lasso de la Vega's exploration of the theme of siege across two romances and two plays, all following the same pattern of a foreign power clashing with a local one in a prolonged siege. In addition to our present play, the theme is central in Lobo's other surviving play, *La honra de Dido restaurada* alongside two romances in the playwright's *Primera parte del Romancero y Tragedias* "Romance Primero del Palladion Troyano, y engaños del cauto Sinon" (1R), on the siege of Troy, and the other on the siege of Numancia, "Romance Septimo de la ruyna de Numancia (dicha soria en España) por Scipion" (13r). In addition to blurring into Spain and Aeneas's city of Lavinium, the besieged city of Constantinople is also a heterotopia layered with cities like Troy, Carthage, and Numancia. By

considering these works in context, we see that Lasso de la Vega in fact criticizes the project of Empire, beyond contenting himself with underscoring Spanish tyranny.⁵²

The constellation of these besieged cities shares some overlapping elements. The sieges are brutal affairs, as Lasso de la Vega emphasizes the starvation of the Carthaginians, and the slaughter of the Byzantines and Trojans, and the collective suicide of the Numancians.⁵³ The works also share a focus on city walls, as befits a siege. Walls are central both in Troy⁵⁴ and Numancia, which Lobo compares to Troy.⁵⁵ The walls of Carthage are mentioned 11 times in the *La honra de Dido*'s final act.⁵⁶ With the exception of *La honra de Dido* (where the reverse occurs), these four works focus on an overseas power invading and laying siege to locals. They are (with the exception of Troy) sieges that debate possession: Mahometo covets the Byzantine's capital; the Roman general Scipion seeks to dominate the Numancians; similarly, the Numidians lay siege to Carthage to force its queen, Dido, to marry king Hyarbas. With the exception of Troy, the works also are part of larger colonial or imperial projects, within the Roman Empire, Ottoman Empire, or colonial foundation of Carthage. Clearly, the playwright was fascinated by these themes, and likely saw these four works as part of a common thread.

⁵² Alfredo Hermenegildo comes close to this observation in noting that the lengthy list of titles belonging to the Ottoman Sultan recalls the Spanish Empire: "Sugerir la presencia del imperio español, en paralelo, es parte del mensaje. Y por ello, se explica la amenaza de sujetar a las Españas—desafiadoras de la autoridad del turco..." (23). While, for Hermenegildo, this offers a parallel to remind the audience that Constantinople represents Spain, I argue, rather, that it is part of how, in addition to the imperial figure of Aeneas, the playwright criticizes the project of empire.

⁵³ Scipion "apretola con el hambre / cuya gente fatigada" (15r).

⁵⁴ The poem opens "Sobre la mas alta almena / de la Troyana muralla" (1).

⁵⁵ Por la poca, aunque atrevida
Que absconde aquella muralla,
Inexpugnable por ella
Mas que lo fue la Troyana,
Pues quatro mil Españoles
Que la ciudad ocupavan,
A quarenta mil Romanos. (14R)

⁵⁶ They are also key to the city's defense and identity: Marcio praises the city as being "de calles recogida y de muralla escogida, que asegura aduersa suerte" (1128-30), and later adds "Buenos los muros están" (1516). As the city begins to starve, a citizen laments "¡De mucho al grueso muro le aprouecha do no ay mantenimiento, el hondo foso!" (1645-46).

The audience is encouraged to empathize with the besieged more than with the besiegers. In the case of Numancia, Spanish readers would see themselves in the Numantinos' resistance, "cosa dura de creer / que a la potencia romana, / que era señora del mundo, se resistiese en España esta pequeña ciudad / con fuerza tan limitada" (35). We have seen how *Destrucción de Constantinopla* offers numerous connections between the Byzantines and the Spanish, as critics have commented (Kahn 42; Carcedo 226). In the case of the Romance on Troy, Jack Weiner writes that, "como los griegos y los troyanos, nuestro poeta —hasta este momento en su Romancero de 1587—fríamente sigue creyendo que los moriscos son el caballo de Troya para España" (50). The besieged are presented in similar, empathetic light.

Yet the four sieges are also rife with intertextual tensions. Both Rome and the Ottoman Empire are placed in besieging, colonizing positions, an elision that is reinforced in our play as Mahometo acts as a second Aeneas. *La honra de Dido* adds further tension, sympathizing with Rome's mortal enemies, on the one hand, while also breaking the mold of the three other works by favoring the invading foreign power, the besieged Carthaginians. Also, during a time where intellectuals argued that the Ottomans were descended from the Trojans, Lasso de la Vega encourages his readers to empathize with the Trojans without any nuance or qualification. The wheel of fortune turns, as the Trojans are at once the conquered, and, in the figure of Mahometo/Aeneas, the conquerors again. The Fall of Constantinople rewrites the Greeks similarly, first victorious against the Trojans, and now defeated in Constantinople. In calling Constantino the head of the 'imperio romano' in the play's introit, Lasso suggests that the Romans receive their comeuppance after the siege of Numancia. In an unusual maneuver, Lasso de la Vega places the Ottomans and Numidians (who Lobo elides with the Barbary corsairs) in the same, besieging position as the more familiar (and Western) Greeks and Romans.

The reader is consistently asked to empathize with the besieged party, whether Spanish, Carthaginian, Byzantine or Trojan. It seems that, for Lobo, who is attacking whom has less importance than the general devastation of conquest itself. At a time when Spain was striving to expand and maintain its empire on several fronts, Lobo destabilizes narratives of conquest to empathize with the conquered subaltern, going so far as to remind his readers that the Ancient Spanish were once in the very position they are now placing other peoples.

This becomes clearer as we recall that the Roman Empire served a key role in Spain's imperial discourse. Lobo considers the siege of Numancia in a time "when court historiographers sought to create an "official history" of the Spanish Empire, they demonstrated parallels between Roman and Iberian expansionist practice to legitimize Spanish dominion in the Americas" (Simerka 24). Lasso's play thus acts as a response to Spain's shift from the defense of Christendom into a greater ambition of Universal Imperialism in subduing all of Europe.⁵⁷ As we see reflected in his critical portrayal of both Constantino and Mahometo, the playwright questions altogether the project of empire as it shifts from being a vehicle to defend Christianity to subjugating Christianity for the purpose of political expansion.

This is unsurprising as we recall that, between 1571-72, Lobo studies under Alonso de Ercilla (1533-1594). At the time, Ercilla was writing the second part of *La Araucana*, which similarly highlights the price of Spanish imperialism, as David Quint points out. Ercilla's influence on Lobo is particularly clear in their shared use of a non-Virgilian alternative myth of Dido, where the queen immolates herself to protect her subjects while remaining chaste, as well as in the numerous similarities between Lobo's new world epic and Ercilla's. Quint sees in

⁵⁷ Kahn notes, "In the 1570s, an apparent shift in Spanish imperial policy under Philip II sparked concerns over the action of the country's head. Charles V's ideal of Christian Imperialism, meaning that the crown would not attempt to expand its territories in Europe at the expense of another Christian prince, seemed to give way to a Universal Imperialism; this approach sought to unite the world under one king and one religion" (26).

Ercilla's use of the Dido episode a model for "a peaceful colonization to the advantage of both colonist and native... [and] an alternative to the larger epic plot of historical destiny: how the very plot of Spain's history in America could have, perhaps should have, taken a different turn" (185), a reading that applies no less to Lobo's dramatic version. Alongside this, Quint observes that Ercilla also "uses the example of the Ottomans (who in the poem's version of Lepanto seek to conquer Spaniards and other European Christians, whom they regard as 'barbarians') as a foil that calls into question the imperial project of the conquistadors in Chile" (171). In evoking the ambiguous, imperial figure of Aeneas, Lobo follows the example of his teacher.

When we consider the besieged Constantinople as a heterotopia mingling with Lobo's other besieged cities, we see how the play's architectural destruction and reconstruction (contained in the siege and conquest) form part of a critical ambivalence toward imperialism, projecting anxiety over Spanish expansion onto the Ottoman Empire.⁵⁸ The conquest of Troy has both led to the founding of the Roman Empire and also left a psychic wound that manifests in the Fall of Constantinople—the plight of the Trojans in the Romance is now replaced by the plight of the Byzantines. If, as Quint suggests (67), the Aeneid is a conscientious reversal of Troy's original fall, the Fall of Constantinople at first pretends to do the same for the Ottomans/Trojans. Yet Lobo insists that it is a denial of what Quint describes as the "narrative 'sense of an

⁵⁸ It is worth discussing a possible objection to my argument in Lobo's incomplete epic of Cortés's conquest of the Azteca Empire, entitled *De Cortés Valoroso y Mexicana* (1584). As works dedicated to the son and grandson of Cortés, the poem tends more to be in favor of imperialism than opposed to it. Perhaps Lobo thought a criticism of imperialism would not sell as well. However, Lobo has no qualms about noting the moral failures of his countrymen, as Nidia Pullés-Linares notes: "En varias partes de la obra el autor presenta las fallas morales de los soldados españoles; por ejemplo, señala su *codicia, ambición y crueldad* (11. 64; IV. 5; VII. 19). Sin embargo, casi siempre lo hace como punto de comparación entre éstos y el protagonista Cortés, presentado como un ser moralmente superior a sus compañeros" (78, my emphasis).

The work also focuses on Envy. In Canto XII, the idol Tezcatlipuca asks Envidia to sow discord among Diego Velázquez, and the critics who undermine Cortés's valor. Here, Lobo repeats many exemplars of envy, including Ajax, Zoilus and Caligula.

ending,” that “wished to close off past conflict by finally settling old scores” (67), as is the case with the *Aeneid*.

Rather, Constantinople inflicts a new wound on the Spanish public, drawing them to hope for the fall of the Ottoman Empire, yet realizing that this points to the Spanish Empire’s inevitable decline. Settling an old score simply creates a new one, as the cycle of conquest that confines Mahometo in fact threatens to consume Spain as well. Just as the Fall of Troy has led to a vengeful Aeneas conquering Constantinople, and Spain’s own conquests are a reflection of the siege of Numancia, Spain’s imperial expansion promises to be another link in a chain of empires.

Conclusion

The play offers two visions of Constantinople as a heterotopia—a jingoist reading that merges Constantinople with Spain, promoting a terrifying vision of an ambitious Ottoman Other; and a second that layers Constantinople with other besieged cities with an ambivalence that elides Romans and Ottomans, and Trojans with the Spanish in a critique of the human cost of imperial vanity.

The first reading draws heavily on the framework we have seen in *Embajada a Tamorlán*, despite being written two centuries after it. Envy is projected onto an Oriental Other, who is covetous, above all, of Christian architecture, while taking advantage of Christendom’s own seemingly endless divisions. Both authors drawing on a similar type to describe two disparate peoples, the Timurids and the Ottomans. This shows a flexible generalizing where both central Asian powers can be treated in the same way. Despite being written nearly two hundred years after *Embajada a Tamorlán*, several parallels are evident.

In our second reading, Constantinople offers a place to critique Spanish imperialism, as it uses the Ottoman Empire as a reflection of Spain’s own ambitions and the evils that accompany

it. We find a heterodox vision of Spain as a frail empire under the highly orthodox one of Spain under diabolic threat, showing that Constantinople as a heterotopia hosts a broad range of discourses—here, two contradictory ones (the first of more that we shall see in our coming chapters), one which has, in fact, relatively little to do with the East Mediterranean Orient. Constantinople serves as an open, experimental place that allows a freedom of imagination for Lasso would have been impossible elsewhere.

Conclusion

Among Said's list of traits tied to Mohammad, Envy does not factor, even as he is "the epitome of lechery, debauchery, sodomy, and a whole battery of assorted treacheries" (62). Said does note, however, that Europeans were surely conscious that "Islam outstripped and outshone Rome" (Said 74) and ties this to "European ambition for rule over the Orient" (196). Here again, the model of heterotopia demonstrates its value in accommodating contradictory readings. In contrast to our previous chapter, where authors asserted Spain's exclusive right to Europe's classical legacy, here, our present authors are not prepared for something so ambitious. Rather, the ambition to rule becomes, instead, re-written as a vice, even to the extent that it becomes a foil for Spain's own imperial ambitions, as we've seen in our last work. Envy offers Castilian authors a convenient, ambivalent tool to maintain positional superiority over Oriental threats while criticizing Europeans.

Invoking such themes as envy, architecture, or, in our previous chapter, the whole of Classical history, inevitably brought the Orient into non-Oriental contexts. References like Troy and Cain invite readers to consider references to the Ottomans outside of explicitly Oriental settings. Ideas that are independent of the Orient still change because of it, as we have seen with Lasso de la Vega's polemic against empire. The East Mediterranean Orient has a far-reaching

impact on how Spain understood its 'Western' identity, even the very foundation of the 'West' itself.

Part 2: Heterotopias in Constantinople

In addition to Constantinople working as a heterotopia through metaphor, where it is overlain with other past cities, Constantinople also works as a heterotopia through metonymy. Here, spaces within the city—namely the harem and a parallel male-homosocial space—provide a space within the imagined city of overlapping discourses that represent larger visions of Spain and the East Mediterranean Orient. While the previous section was tied intimately to Spain's visions of itself within European history (as well as its place in it with respect to the East Mediterranean Orient), our heterotopias are intimately tied to Spain's founding myth, the last Visigoth King Rodrigo, merging the two disparate times and places. These heterotopias offer an exploration of sexuality along various lines, such as male homosociality, female enclosure, as well as same-sex desire.

Both spaces are also reflected in what Foucault calls Crisis and Deviant heterotopias. The former is “the privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis: adolescents, menstruating women, pregnant women, the elderly, etc” (“Of Other Spaces” 4). The harem reflects this, often serving as a point of sexual awakening (or also sexual impropriety), as Western men voyeur Oriental women. The Deviant heterotopia is for “individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed” (4). Similar to these, our male homosocial space offers a penitential turning point, where our protagonists leave sinful ways and adopt a mode of living more appropriate in the eyes of the state.

The harem and the male homosocial space act as a sort of mirror of one another, connected through a number of threads. They are both partially defined by an archetypal figure, either a sexually aggressive, powerful woman in the case of the harem, or the catamite in our second space. Beyond the gender disparity, while the harem is a place of authority, at the heart of

political power in the royal palace, the male homosocial space is on the margins, in either caves or prisons. Additionally, the harem is defined by voyeurism, as travelers try to see the forbidden women, while the male homosocial space presents, alternatively, the opportunity to escape the controlling social gaze.

As with our first section, both heterotopias offer a number of overlapping, contradicting discourses. They serve as insight into how Constantinople served as a screen on which to explore anxieties about the Spanish state's increasing centralization and regularization, as well as to offer alternative visions of Spain.

Chapter 3: Female Homosocial Heterotopia

The harem in the Western imagination

Our first heterotopia is the harem. The most emblematic symbol of female homosocial space, it is both one of the most prominent symbols of female enclosure, as well as of the Orient and Constantinople. Juan Goytisolo explains: “la visita y descripción del [harén] se conviertan en topoi obligados de todo texto referente a Turquía: historiadores, viajeros, excautivos, narradores, poetas, dramaturgos se servirán de él en sus historias, relaciones, autobiografías, novelas, poemas, obras dramáticas” (*Viaje* 25).

In contrast to the reality of the harem as “the interior living quarters in a private home or of the sultan and his family in the case of the imperial harem,” (Boll “Violating the Harem” 138) the harem in the Spanish imagination was an enclosed, hierarchized place within the center of Oriental power that housed women who expressed a mutual attraction toward the Western men voyeuring them.

Almost as common as the portrayal of the harem are descriptions of how European narrators manage to obtain a glimpse into the forbidden space.¹ This was, of course, motivated in part by temptation and sexuality, yet it allowed Spanish men the chance to demonstrate their power and virility by penetrating the space that the Muslims were protecting. Accordingly, the barriers to the harem were central to its portrayal. In Cory Reed’s examination of various accounts describing the seraglio, the critic explains that “all make frequent reference to confinement and enclosure, particularly when delineating the harem or the protective barriers separating the palace from the outside world... They also consider the black eunuchs that guard

¹ “In their narratives, Western male travelers frequently treated women’s seclusion as a challenge” (Graham-Brown 505).

the female quarters and prevent the unauthorized from entering” (Reed 202). These multiple barriers pointed, as well, to Istanbul metonymically: “Istanbul, itself, was similarly linked to images of gates, passageways and doors as the city was effectively Europe’s entry to the exotic East” (Boll, “Violating the Harem” 139). By entering into this private, ordered place, the Spanish disrupt the Ottomans’ “complete male domination over women’s lives” (Graham-Brown 503), thus asserting their masculinity by throwing into disarray the socially-structured place² that contrasts with idealized male friendship that we will see in the next chapter. Entry into the harem thus became a metonymic victory over the Turkish Orient. The importance of this victory was underscored by the fact that female enclosure was not an alien concept to Europe, where the imagined harem played off of historic anxieties over sexuality.

Space and sexuality

As Michel Foucault indicates, control of space is fundamental to controlling sexuality. “In the space for movement thus conquered, and broadening and organizing that space, methods of power and knowledge assumed responsibility for the life processes and undertook to control and modify them” (*Sexuality* 142). Henri Lefebvre echoes this, explaining how space fosters or limits what occurs within it: “Activity in space is restricted by that space; space ‘decides’ what activity may occur, but even this ‘decision’ has limits placed upon it” (143).

This was the case also in Medieval and Early Modern Spain, where the gradual shift from a homosocial to heterosexual society brought on anxieties about male supremacy.³ Both married

² “The European writers acknowledge the specific roles of the inhabitants of the harem and its hierarchical social structure” (Reed 202).

³ In *The Invention of Heterosexual Culture*, Louis-Georges Tin traces the polemic around a “transition from a formerly homosocial world to a modern heterosexual culture” (3). During the former, “Marriage has its place as a prelude to procreation, but genuine pleasure stems exclusively from the friendship between the two men who constitute the only couple in the novel” (38). Male friendships were at the center of literature during much of the

and unmarried women were encouraged to stay out of public spaces (Clanton 102, 106) and to instead stay at home or join a convent. As part of the Counter Reformation's⁴ interest in regulating sexuality, particular attention was given to creating institutions to rehabilitate unruly women, as Margaret E. Boyle notes.⁵ Institutions like asylums, orphanages, jails and hospitals for women used enclosure to regulate them: "the common, overarching goal of these institutions was the creation of a single-sex environment designed to address the particular physical, spiritual, moral, or economic deficiencies perceived to be experienced by women" (4). Nerea Aresti adds that "The Counter-Reformation in Spain fostered an intolerant attitude towards any gender deviations, increased control over women and encouraged their sequestration, symbolised by the convent" (Aresti 406). In the case of women, control of space meant "simultaneously to incorporate femaleness and to demote it, to establish dominion over it by assigning it a limited portion of space, and to reduce it to a 'femininity' subordinated to the principle of maleness, of masculinity or manliness" (Lebvre 377). Accordingly, enclosing women meant excluding them from public spaces as well as spaces of power.

Paradoxically, this segregation also provoked anxieties, as the spaces that were set-aside as women-only (such as convents) provided a degree of autonomy and freedom from male hegemony. It begged the question of what happened when women were left alone, a question that continually occupied Spanish authors, whether in the form of seduction plots⁶ or wife

Middle Ages, while women were kept on the peripheries. However, starting with the advent of courtly love, Europe underwent a transition to a heterosexual culture "where attraction to the opposite sex predominates and is cultivated, and celebrated" (ix-x). Women were given great importance (which is not to say equality), disrupting the security that homosociality had previously afforded and provoking anxiety.

⁴ Beginning in 1545 with the Council of Trent, but presaged by an increasing centralization of the Spanish state discussed in my introduction.

⁵ "It is possible to trace a pervasive concern with the containment and correction of women throughout sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain" (7).

⁶ The preoccupation with female spaces being penetrated by charming young men is evident in numerous texts, from the comic tale of Pitas Payas in the *Libro de buen amor* in 1330, to the more serious treatment of the theme in Early

murder plays. In the case of the latter, critics have noted that the anxiety over infidelity connects to Europe's larger cultural shift from homosociality to heterosexuality—that is, from a culture that focused on ties between men to one that focused on ties between the sexes, placing the nuclear family (and its capacity for guaranteeing the state's future through procreation) at the center of social discourse, as discussed in our introduction. Michaela Heigl demonstrates, in her analysis of four uxoricidal plays⁷ by Calderón, that the works go beyond avenging adulterous dishonor, revealing instead an anxiety stemming from compulsory heterosexuality:⁸

“Heterosexual love threatened man's inviolability, independence and superiority, because it endangered the process by which male subjectivity was secured” (336). As a consequence, “the husbands of honor displace their ambivalent feelings about desire and sexuality, their fears and longings on to their wives and so punish them for their supposedly excessive, adulterous desire” (Heigl 336). The need to enclose women was framed in a larger anxiety over the increasing

Modern texts like: *La Celestina* (1499); the seduction of Dorotea by Ferdinand in Cervantes's *Don Quijote* (1605); the opening scene of *El Convidado de Piedra* (1630), and so forth.

Texts that demonstrate the fear of male seduction at home naturally formed a part of the context in which harems were described, as is especially obvious in Cervantes's *El celoso extremeño*. Cory A. Reed has adeptly demonstrated how, without ever mentioning it by name, and despite setting the plot in Seville, Cervantes clearly evokes the harem. Accordingly, the way that Spanish authors portray harems must be understood alongside seduction plots, particularly for the stakes that they entailed—the threat of males sneaking into women's spaces in Spain became a way of proving Spanish superiority, even when marginalized as foreigners or prisoners in a more powerful Oriental empire.

⁷ Curiously, there were few reported instances of uxoricide in Early Modern Spain, meaning that it drew playwrights' attention for other reasons (Heigl 334).

⁸ I use the term here in the way that Dian Fox does, referring to a pressure into marriage that was provoked by changes in both marriage law as well as a flurry of treatises on marriage. Carrión notes that, as a result of this activity, “Far from controlling and organizing the existence of all subjects, marriage law translated into a sense of alienation evident in the application of the legal codes to the practice of law” (Carrión, Subject Stages 27). Dian Fox (using Adrienne Rich's term) calls this alienation “compulsory heterosexuality,” finding it in *Don Quijote*:

In a society where a man not serving in the priesthood has a duty to marry and raise a family, a failure to do so would result at the least in the kind of pressure from friends and relatives that Don Juan Roca experiences, to marry. It is an obligation of his sex that arguably drives Don Quijote mad, or at least to invent a phantom and unattainable female that liberates him from the crushing pressure of his culture's compulsory heterosexuality. (309)

This pressure to marry closed off other forms of desire, and cast marriage as the chief end of most Spanish subjects; it also placed greater emphasis on controlling women.

emphasis on heterosexuality, as how women acted became a measure of individual and collective masculinity.

This anxiety over women misbehaving when alone was bolstered by the fact that female homosocial spaces often accompanied greater opportunities for education and power for women. These afforded opportunities for women to gain prestige in the secular world as well, whether as a mystic like Teresa de Ávila, or as a poet like Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz. This necessitated the vigilant eye of a male confessor:

It is in that relationship between the observing ego of the confessors or inquisitors and the female hysterical body of the nun or witch that one gets a glimpse, once again, of the condition of ... the male imaginary—caught in the unending effort to reject and condemn the very aspect of itself to which it is also drawn and on which it depends. (El Saffar 867).

The importance of male vigilance over female spaces was also manifest in Spanish homes where domestic life enabled women to pass down knowledge directly to daughters. Invading the home, the family,⁹ is perhaps the greatest show of the state's reach over individuals as it enters into "a special, still sacred, quasi-religious and in fact almost absolute space," where "the relationship between Home and Ego, meanwhile, borders on identity" (Lefebvre 121).

This extended naturally to the Muslim other as well: "the decrees against the Morisco customs ordered them to leave their doors open during the day," (Cruz, *Gendering* 100). Again, as is the case with our male/female homosocial spaces, homes are the frontier between the individual desire and collective agenda. Ronald E. Surtz points out that Morisca women in particular, who were uniquely positioned to pass down secret knowledge, were judged by the Inquisition for possessing illegal Arabic texts. This intrusion often extended to searching the women's bodies. This act of vigilance over women, however, cannot be completely divorced of

⁹ "The family is the most active site of sexuality" (Foucault, *History* 109).

sexuality: “As the resistance the women offered often resulted in a double symbolic violation, namely, a violation of both their bodies and their homes” (Surtz 421). Vigilance thus becomes an act of voyeurism, echoing Laura Mulvey’s analysis of the male gaze.¹⁰ This is the case as well in the Orient, where the portrayal of female homosocial spaces in Constantinople is accompanied by a voyeurism that insists on the subordination of, and separation from, the sexual object, a “voyeuristic spectacle [which is] enjoyed at a distance that attempts to maintain a boundary between self and other,” (Boone xxi).¹¹ In a time when, as Jeremy Lawrance says, “cultured Renaissance hidalgos were expected to spice their polite conversation with informed views on the Ottomans” (19), it would be impossible to extricate the strategic interest from the erotic in observing women—that is, surveillance and voyeurism inevitably overlapped, and we can find anxiety in the way that the two acts blur, where controlling surveillance opens up the possibility of being seduced by the object of the gaze. Moreover, as we shall see, portraying them as defying local patriarchal norms served a hegemonic interest. The fact that the women that Europeans observe sometimes become sexualized threats who try to disrupt the Europeans’ trajectory brings the act of watching them closer into the realm of ‘pinning it down before anything happens.’

¹⁰ “The first avenue, voyeurism, on the contrary, has associations with sadism: pleasure lies in ascertaining guilt (immediately associated with castration), asserting control and subjecting the guilty person through punishment or forgiveness” (811-12).

¹¹ Florence Dee Boodakian observes the similarity between voyeurism and surveillance: “The goal of surveillance is to pin down anything before it happens and eroticism operates as a state of arousal and anticipation, it’s transitory, and forever lingers in that frightening space of im/possibility” (57). Both are liminal states based on anticipation, whether of sex or wrongdoing, and depend on the same imbalance of power—the voyeur as well as the surveilleur depends on the object of its gaze’s ignorance of its presence, and the voyeur/surveilleur’s unrestricted access is an expression of total access and power over the object’s body.

In the context of the works that I present here, they are designed to entertain, but also are strategically informative. Voyeurism is justified in the name of surveillance. *Tirant* opens with an explanation of chivalric cosmology that draws on Lull’s *Llibre de contemplació* and *Orde de cavalleria* and reads like a manual to reconquer Constantinople and Christianize North Africa. Critics like Julián Apraiz have underscored the informative nature of *El amante liberal*: “También debe llamar nuestra atención el gran conocimiento, de que aquí y en otras novelas da muestras el autor, de las costumbres turcas” (41); and *La gran sultana* begins with a lengthy explanation of the Imperial procession that is equally didactic. *Viaje de Turquía*’s second half is a theme by theme explanation of numerous aspects of Turkish culture. *El Conde Partinuplés* similarly evokes contemporary Constantinople’s Sultanate of Women.

Evoking the harem in Spain thus plays off of these anxieties and the need for vigilance tied to female homosociality. The harem presents itself as a continuation of the patriarchal use of space in Europe, demonstrating that the patriarchy is universal and omnipresent. At the same time, this use of space, or rather, the creation and violation of the harem, becomes a tool to extend European hegemony into the Orient, as voyeurism in the harem serves as a metonymic victory. The subjugation of women thus feeds into the subjugation of the Orient and vice-versa.

At the same time, Spanish society needed to maintain the alterity of the Orient, and to contrast Oriental homosociality as distinct from its own. The harem thus became a more extreme form of female confinement: “In the Middle East these rules resulted in a much clearer physical demarcation between male and female society than existed in most European cultures” (Graham-Brown 504). This offered the Spanish imagination a place to negotiate sexual fantasies and anxieties regarding homosocial segregation, and to interrogate the compulsory heterosexuality.

Thesis

We will trace the evolution of the harem across six sources: *Tirant lo Blanc* (1490), *Viaje de Turquía* (1557), *El amante liberal* (1613), *La gran sultana* (1615), and *El conde Partinuplés* (1653). Here, we shall see how it acts as a heterotopia, hosting different overlapping, and even contradictory discourses as authors adopt it to their means. Two shifts become evident. First, the texts shift from preserving homosociality to promoting marriage. Whereas uncontrolled heterosexual desire is punished or avoided in our earlier texts, heterosexual desire is directed into marriage in our latter ones. Accordingly, the harem shifts from a symbol of temptation and punishment for the West’s unchecked sexuality to instead becoming a site where compulsory heterosexuality can be critiqued, though ultimately promoted. This is accompanied by our second

shift, as the Orient is downgraded from being a threat to Europe to, instead, becoming an imagined colony.

I first look at how violating the harem is prefigured in versions of the myth of Don Rodrigo and the Umayyad invasion in chronicles and in the *Romancero general*. As we shall see in both this and the next chapter, this founding legend sets the tone for Spain's unique view of the Ottoman world. Both here and in *Tirant lo Blanc*, voyeurism is symptomatic of an uncontrolled sexuality that leads to the death of the voyeur and the loss of a kingdom. Our third text, *Viaje de Turquía*, marks a turning point, as the protagonist does not succumb to temptation; his entry into the harem is instead a symbolic defiance against the Orient. This defiance continues in our three remaining texts, all of which take place after the pivotal Battle of Lepanto in 1571. The texts shift from seeing heterosexuality as a threat to a necessity for the Spanish collective, as we see in *El amante liberal* and *La gran sultana*. This is most evident in our final text, *El conde Partinuplés*, where the harem becomes instead a symbol of empowerment for the women in the play.

The last Visigoth King

The legend of the last Visigoth king, Rodrigo, is the archetypal juxtaposition of sexuality and the Orient for Spain and is thus critical to establishing the harem as a heterotopia. In his essay “De «Don Julián» a «Makbara»: una posible lectura orientalista,” Juan Goytisolo explains how, “imputada ab initio por nuestros cronistas y poetas a un delito sexual” (*Crónicas* 38), the legend of the Islamic Conquest had a lasting influence on Spanish attitudes toward sexuality and Islam. King Rodrigo raped the daughter of Count Julian, who, when he discovered this, sought help for dethroning the king from the Moors on the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar. According to Goytisolo, this sired a long literary tradition:

Desde la primera mitad del siglo XI (fecha aproximada de la crónica *Pseudo isidoriana*) hasta bien entrado el siglo XIX (en la obra de destacados poetas románticos como el duque de Rivas, Espronceda y Zorrilla), nos hallamos en presencia de una tradición compuesta de centenares de crónicas, relatos, poemas y dramas que interpretan el hundimiento de la monarquía visigoda mediante una referencia hostil y condenatoria a la sexualidad. (38-39)

The legend shaped Spanish attitudes toward sexuality, linking them to divine punishment: “La satisfacción de los apetitos carnales de don Rodrigo es la causa directa de un castigo—la conquista islámica—que afrentará a España por espacio de ochocientos años” (39). The Muslim invasion was seen as both a punishment for the king, but also for Spain collectively:

las consecuencias perdurables para España—culpable, no lo olvidemos, como recalca el *Chronicon* del siglo IX, de “vivir en la lujuria” a imitación del monarca—escenifican también el fantasma de un invasor moro cruel y lascivo: imagen de lo repudiado por aquélla y objeto no obstante de su fascinación. (41-42)

Here, Goytisolo mentions Alfonso el Sabio’s *Primera Crónica General*, worth citing in part:

“¿Qual mal o qual tempestad non passo Espanna? ... a las mezquinas de las mugieres guardauan las pora desonrrar las, e la su fermosura dellas era guardada pora su denosto” (313). The Spanish King’s rape is punished by a foreign invasion of marauding rapists. As a result, “el fantasma del moro violador y despiadado forjado, repetido e interiorizado por escritores y lectores durante nueve siglos” (Goytisolo *Crónica* 42).

The legend establishes the two spatial elements that serve for this and our next chapter. The first is the voyeuristic scene where King Rodrigo first catches sight of the young Florinda, sparking his lust, presaging the harem scenes that we explore in other texts. The second is his penitence in the cave, where Spain is reborn by relinquishing the lust that initially condemned it. It is important to note that this legend was never communicated or used homogenously. Rather, it was a palimpsest on which authors discussed Spanish sexuality and the Orient. Goytisolo explains that “los creadores sucesivos ilustran y escenifican (introduciendo a menudo variaciones

y elementos nuevos en el corpus literario anterior) un conjunto de anhelos, frustraciones, angustias, fantasías, animosidad, prejuicios” (217).

Pamela Cappas-Toro and Javier Irigoyen-García explain that the legend had a resurgence midway through the 15th century (during the lifetime of Joanot Martorell, and the fall of Constantinople in 1453), “junto con el surgimiento del mito godo en la historiografía y la campaña propagandística de legitimación llevada a cabo por Isabel de Castilla frente a su hermano Enrique IV” (3). This was followed by “un segundo momento de auge del goticismo, hacia mediados del siglo XVI, [que] coincide igualmente con el recrudescimiento de los estatutos de limpieza de sangre en contra de los conversos” (3), during Cervantes’s lifetime and contemporary with *Viaje de Turquía*. The myth was clearly linked to the Iberian peninsula’s Muslim history, presaging the expulsions of both the Moors and the *Moriscos*.

Voyeurism la Cava

The voyueristic scene that begins Rodrigo’s fatal temptation prefigures the harem heterotopia that follows. It shows the proximity of authority, enclosure, and voyuerism. Florinda is a sexualized woman who is sheltered in the King’s palace. In his analysis of one such scene from the ca. 1430 *Crónica del Rey don Rodrigo*,¹² James Donald Fogelquist helpfully discerns the element of power and prohibition in the scene. “The king’s view from on high is a sign of his omnipotence as earthly ruler... the king’s gaze violates the privacy of the woman who undresses below” (37). The king’s political power is thus manifest in his act of voyuerism, as he overcomes the prohibition and privacy that should protect Doña Florinda/La Cava, the eroticized, forbidden woman below.

¹² Also called the *Crónica Sarracina*, by Pedro de Corral (born between 1380 and 1390).

Like the harem, the setting of the encounter is an enclosed, female homosocial space where the young woman (at times accompanied by others) is guarded and hidden from view by the patriarchy. This is evident in written histories of the text. The scene's eroticism is evident from early on, as in Pedro Afonso's *Crónica general de España de 1344*: "Acaesçio qu'lla andando vn dia trebejando sin afaz ninguno e cantando con las otras donzellas muchas, paso por ay el rrei, e acaesçio asy que le vio vn poco del pie a vueltas con la pierna, que lo avia tan blanco e tan bien hecho que non podría ser mejor" (98). Florinda is "sin afaz ninguno," and later Rodrigo sees part of her leg. The explanation suggests an unintended encounter that attempts to mitigate the king's guilt: "Paso por ay el rrei, e acaesçio" (98), portraying accidental voyeurism.¹³

In Pedro de Corral's 1430 *Crónica*, the King catches sight of "la Cava hija del conde don Iulian, que estava en las huertas burlando con algunas donzellas." The author elaborates on the voyeurism above: "ellas no sabian parte del rey ca bien se cuydavan que dormia." The scene is also eroticized, as, in addition to describing her as "la mas hermosa donzella de su casa, y la mas amorosa en todos sus hechos," Pedro de Corral mentions again her accidental nudity: "como ella y otras donzellas jugavan alzo las faldas pensando que no le veyan ninguno, y mostro ya quanto de las piernas, y tenialas blancas como la nieve y assi lisas que no es persona en el mundo que della no se enamorasse" (81v).

The voyeurism becomes even more pronounced in the next scene, when Rodrigo now hides himself deliberately: "y como lo vio [el diablo] que se enamorava de la Cava, pusole en el

¹³ A later copy of the manuscript elaborates on the works' eroticism and its forbidden nature: "E vn dia aconteçio asi que, andando ella en vna huerta con otras muchas donzellas, sin ninguna tocadura, e estando el rrey don Rodrigo en tal guisa que veyan muy bien commo ellas andavan trabajando, viole el jarrete de la pierna. E era tan blanca e asi fecho que non podia mejor ser. E luego que la asi vio, començola de quererla muy gran bien, en tanto que ese movio a la demandar" (98).

coraçon para lo reafirmar mas en el mal que estoviesse en lugar que pudiesse bien mirar lo que las donzellas hazian y encubriose lo mejor que pudo el rey, y no se quiso echar a dormir, estuvo esperando que fin aura los juegos desta donzella” (81r). As he watches, the women compare their bodies, emphasizing the scene’s eroticism while echoing later harem scenes by creating a hierarchy within the collection of women: “Y crecio porfia entre ellas desde una vez gran pieza vuieron jugado de quien tenia mas gentil cuerpo, y vuieronse de desnudar y quedar en pelotes apretados que tenian de fina escarlata, y pareciansese los pechos, y lo mas de las tetillas.” The setting is again underscored as private: “como la huerta era muy guardada, y cercada de muy grandes tapias, y allí donde ellas andavan no las podian ver sino de la camara del rey, y no se guardavan mas hazian lo que en plazer les venia assi como si fuessen en sus camaras” (81v).

The scene had a good deal of popular, oral distribution as well, as established in two of the romances compiled by Agustín Durán that must have coexisted with (or preceded) the eroticized elements we see in *Crónicas* above. The anonymous Romance #585, titled “De cómo el Rey Don Rodrigo se enamoró de la Cava, viéndola lavar sus cabellos á la vera de una fuente,” begins with an erotic description of Don Julian’s daughter’s body:

Está bañando la Cava
El oro de sus madejas.
Sobre el cuello de marfil
Lleva esparcidas las hebras,
Que como sirven de lazos,
También al cuello se acercan (401)

The poem underscores the unexpected, forbidden nature of Rodrigo’s voyeurism by abruptly telling us next that “Mirándola está Rodrigo / Por entre las verdes yedras” (401). Like la Cava, the audience is unaware of Rodrigo’s hidden presence until it is revealed halfway through. While changing the scenery, the description in Romance #586, “Rodrigo viola á la Cava” is similar. La Cava and her maidens are in the garden:

Sentadas á la redonda,
La Cava á todas las dijo
Que se midiesen las piernas
Con un listón amarillo.
Midiéronse las doncellas,
La Cava lo mismo hizo,
Y en blancura y lo demás
Grandes ventajas les hizo.

Again, the forbidden nature of the scene is emphasized as we learn that:

Pensó la Cava estar sola;
Pero la ventura quiso
Que por una celosía
Mirase el rey Don Rodrigo. (401)

The romances and chronicles demonstrate that key elements of how harem was later portrayed were part of the Spanish imaginary long before any of the works we look at here.

Doña Florinda is also represented as a frontier figure that evokes Oriental Muslim beauty, an additional element of the harem. Şizen Yiacoup explains that Florinda's "connection to Ceuta in North Africa tacitly suggests her cultural difference, which has the effect not of rendering her undesirable to Roderick but, quite the opposite, of endowing her with a powerful attraction which draws the king inexorably to her" (22). The allure of a Muslim Other is, as a result, tied to Muslim invasion: "Portraying La Cava's seductive exoticism as the cause of Rodrigo's transgression, the ballads, like the chronicles, contain the responsibility for the fall of Christian Spain within the body of an Arabized, albeit Christian, female" (47). In our following five texts, the Christians who act as voyeurs into the female homosocial spaces are thus judged according to the actions that follow their voyeurism, as references to the legend evoke fear of individual and collective punishment.

Tirant lo Blanc (1511)

Tirant is unusually descriptive in its eroticism, which has attracted the attention of numerous critics. Menéndez y Pelayo found fault with the work for its ribald nature, claiming that the courtship between Tirant and the princess was “un pretexto para cuadros lascivos” (402). Other critics have viewed the work’s sexuality as a step toward realism. Frank Pierce argues that the work’s forthright attitude toward sexuality demonstrates how “sex is introduced with the same apparent general desire to describe things fully and factually” (297). This is similar to Mario Vargas Llosa’s argument that sex is part of the macrocosm that the authors create: “El novelista total es, como Dios, neutral. Martorell no toma partido entre el «amor tímido» y sentimental que Tirant considera el mejor, y el «amor vicioso» que alaba Estefania y predica la casta Plaerdemavida: presenta ambos y deja que el lector juzgue por sí mismo” (20).

Other critics have interpreted the work’s eroticism as the influence of courtly love poetry. Antony van Beysterveldt notes the influence of courtly love in *Tirant* which “pese a ciertas diferencias en su modo de manifestarse, entra de lleno en la concepción del amor canción” (410) and that “ha contribuido, junto a la poesía amatoria del siglo XV, a orquestar la dinámica cultural engendrada por el injerto foráneo del ideal del amor cortés en la vida literaria. (410-11). Vicenç Beltrán establishes *Tirant* as “el primer eslabón de una cadena que, desde mediados del siglo XV hasta mediados del XVI, [el que] está caracterizada por ... la aceptación del componente erótico como material poético” (42). *Tirant* thus is a point of juncture where courtly poetry emerges into the world of prose as it establishes a tradition of eroticism, placing heterosexuality at the forefront. The novel uses the discourse-laden heterotopia of the voyeured female space to combine two different discourses: one on corruptive Oriental decadence, which ultimately dooms Tirant after distracting him from his obligation to preserve Christendom, and another against the

danger of heterosexual desire (which, we shall see, contrasts with a male homosocial cooperation in our next chapter).

I wish to address the question of why the Orient marks this shift, as the setting is, of course, not endemic to courtly poetry. I argue that the text interrogates anxiety produced by the need to regulate women and guard against a heterosexual desire that works against collective good, and the limits of this vigilance, which can be manipulated or also become an act of seduction. The text manages these tensions by projecting them elsewhere, essentially masking concerns about European regulation of sex by covering it with a more hegemonic discourse of Oriental decadence. Accordingly, within moments of arriving to Constantinople, Tirant falls hopelessly for Carmesina when he catches sight of her cleavage, his first sexual experience.¹⁴ I look at the work's use of homosocial heterotopias to transform how sexuality is deployed in Constantinople and (in my next chapter) North Africa.

This connection between topography and sexuality has not been address by critics, which seems particularly important given the negative view that Martorell's contemporaries generally had of the Byzantine Greeks. In "La conquista turca de Bizancio," Miguel Ángel Bunes Ibarra outlines "la pésima visión que se tiene en este momento sobre los habitantes de Oriente" in Spanish texts (94). Their separation from the Western church was seen as 'soberbia,' and the Ottomans existed "para castigar los pecados que los bautizados cometen contra su Creador" (97). Moreover, the Byzantines had had the chance to defeat the Prophet Mohammad early on, but "su

¹⁴ As Michael Harney demonstrates, Tirant's masculinity is fashioned along entrepreneurial lines, earning merit that eventually results in marrying an Eastern princess. Yet Constantinople serves as home to a host of other sexualities, as scholars show. Montserrat Piera looks at various episodes that feminize Tirant, thus uncovering the text's discourse on "the arbitrariness of masculinity, the permeability of sexual roles and the anxiety of sexual performance" (Performing Knighthood 348). Sherry Velasco in her study on Early Modern lesbians, explores the "female homoerotic scenes [between Placerdemivida and Carmesina] designed to arouse the male protagonist while also exciting any readers who are titillated by sexual tension and deception" (149). Rafael Mérida Jiménez comments on the garden scene, examining the historical context of the homoeroticism between Placerdemivida and the Princess Carmesina.

falta de celo y su excesivo egoísmo supuso una dilación de sus deberes como Soberanos y una dejación de las obligaciones con el resto de la Cristiandad” (92). This provides an essential context to reading Tirant’s Constantinople, as well as his illicit affair with the Greek princess, which, the text seems to cast in an alluring light, at least superficially.

Despite being set prior to the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, where a harem would have been anachronistic, the bath scene (Ch. CXIII of book three and on) is nonetheless a moment of male voyeurism penetrating a female homosocial space despite the vigilance of the local patriarchy.¹⁵ After demonstrating the way that the author subtly evokes a harem, I delve into the overlap between Tirant’s voyeurism and his surveillance, which is later used to manipulate him. While the scene is highly eroticized and seems designed to entice its reader, there is nonetheless a moralistic reading, as Tirant is seduced by the sinful Greek Orient into a sterile sexuality that, ultimately, kills him.

Like any description of a harem, our present scene is erotic and carried out for “the voyeuristic benefit of the knight” (Velasco 149). In book 3, chapter CXIII, one night, Placerdemivida sneaks Tirant into her room, where “havia una arca grande con un agujero por que pudiesse resollar, y el vaño que estaba aparejado estaba de cara del arca” (318-19). The duchess leaves the box slightly open, covered in clothing, where Tirant is able to watch as the princess undresses. Placerdemivida intervenes “de manera que el la podia muy bien ver a su plazer” (319). Then, “como de todo fue desnuda Plazer de Mi Vida tomo una candela encendida y por hazer plazer a Tirante mirava la toda la persona que alla no avia nada encubierto” (319). The narrator continues to explain how, “la princesa entro en el baño y dixo a Plazer de Mi Vida que se desnudase y que entrase en el baño con ella” (319).

¹⁵ While Montserrat Piera talks extensively about how “Tirant’s desiring gaze is directed toward Carmesina and Constantinople” (350), she curiously does not mention this scene, nor its panopticon qualities.

The scene evokes a harem in numerous ways. It is voyeuristic, as the phallic candle illuminating the naked body heightens the sexuality by evoking penetration as well as emphasizing how much of the princess's body Tirant is able to see. As we shall see, it also extends Tirant's surveillance, as he is in a forbidden space seeing the forbidden woman with 'nada encubierto.' Elaborating on other harem-like aspects of the scene, the number and eroticism of women evokes a harem. The author cannot resist also mentioning the beauty of the Viuda Reposada, even if he qualifies it: "La princesa le rogo que se bañase con ella. La viuda se desnudo de todo y quedo en calças coloradas y un garuin en la cabeça. Y aun que ella tenia gentil persona las calças y el garuin la afeaban tanto que parecia un diablo" (319).¹⁶ This plurality of women laid out for Tirant adds to the scene's eroticism.

Moreover, other aspects of the bath correspond to the motif of the harem that we will see in later texts. The bath is a female homosocial space, protected by the local patriarchy. Much in the same way that a black Eunuch stereotypically would later guard the harem, here, La Viuda Reposada (who wants Tirant for herself) plays the role of enforcing the Oriental patriarchy as she actively works to keep Tirant from Carmesina, though for the wrong reasons. When she raises the alarm, the emperor (another manifestation of the patriarchy) rushes in with a sword drawn, emphasizing the precarious position Tirant is in as voyeur who has entered the prohibited space.

As is the case with the other harem scenes that we will see, the current scene is also marked by voyeurism and surveillance. Tirant occupies a Panopticon-like position, where he is able to see and hear all, even what is forbidden to him and other men by the Greek male order. Crucially, in this single scene, Tirant is able to clearly and completely view all of the section's

¹⁶ While the narrator assures us that the clothing makes her ugly, he nonetheless mentions that "tenia gentil persona." Martorell similarly makes a point to mention that the Princess tells Placerdemivida to undress and get in the bath, emphasizing that she also joins in the erotic show as a sexual object.

primary female characters at once, demonstrating the power of his gaze.¹⁷ Despite being outnumbered and outpowered among the Byzantine Empire's patriarchy, Tirant gains special entry that demonstrates European hegemony.

Inside, his voyeurism is justified as it reaffirms its own necessity: women do, indeed, need to be supervised, and cannot be trusted alone.¹⁸ His entrance demonstrates one such gap in control, but the unruly women that he sees voyeuristically further shows the Oriental patriarchy's limits. The women discuss more intimate thoughts that challenge the prescribed social order. Placerdemivida suggests that Carmesina allow Tirant to spend an hour in her bed; when asked what she would do if the knight were present that very moment, Carmesina answers, "rogarle ya graciosamente que se fuesse: y si hazer no lo quisiesse deliberaria antes callar que ser diffamada" (319).¹⁹

The hegemonic undertones of this voyeurism should not be missed. Critics such as Meritxell Simó and Monserrat Piera²⁰ have noted the connection between conquest of Carmesina's body and the liberation of the Byzantine Empire.²¹ For instance, as soon as Tirant arrives in Constantinople, he falls hopelessly for Carmesina as he catches sight of "sus pechos dos manzanas de paraisos que parecian cristalinas: las quales vieron entrada a los ojos de Tirante que de alla adelante no hallaron la puerta por donde avian de salir" (145). This comparison to apples

¹⁷ Excluding the Empress, who has a more minor part in the plot.

¹⁸ Evident in this and many other scenes that demonstrate, as Meritxell Simó explains, that Carmesina shows that "que bajo la idealizada imagen que lo paraliza [a Tirant], postrándolo a sus pies, se esconde una mujer dispuesta a los juegos amorosos" (78).

¹⁹ The reply to 'callar' rather than call out for help, while not consent by any means, still may have been perceived as an invitation in the minds of Martorell's readers. Tirant certainly understood it as such, as later he does precisely this.

²⁰ Martorell "equates Carmesina, the Princess, to Constantinople, the city" (354). as he "juxtapose[s] the historical and military imagery to the imagery of lovemaking: both Constantinople and the beloved, Carmesina, need to be conquered and possessed" (354).

²¹ "en progresión casi aritmética, el protagonista irá arrebatando trozos de tierra a los moros a medida que vaya avanzando en la posesión del cuerpo de Carmesina, la bella heredera del imperio bizantino" (69).

is laden with meaning in the context of Constantinople: Pero Tafur describes the Justinian column capped with a statue of the Byzantine emperor: “un caballero ençima dél con el un brazo tendido é con el dedo señalando la Turquía, é con el otro una mançana en la mano, a señal que todo el mundo era en su mano” (97).²² The apple is thus a symbol of conquest; according to the author of *Viaje de Turquía*, it was also a symbol of Constantinople for the Ottomans: “la mançana colorada entienden por Constantinopla” (93). As Monserrat Piera writes, “Tirant’s desiring gaze is directed toward Carmesina and Constantinople” (305). Yet his gaze is more than simply desiring: as he sees her entire body and learns the non-normative thoughts that she keeps hidden, she has already been subdued by him, and his conquest has already been assured.

However, the scene reaches a curious rupture when Tirant tries to act on this conquest, changing from voyeur to actor. When Placerdemivida opens the trunk after the princess falls asleep, the knight freezes, and refuses to go further. After mocking him fails, Placerdemivida “soltale de la mano. Como Tirante le vio sin su guía y no sabia donde se estava por la mucha escuridad con baxa boz la llamava. Y ella le hizo estar alli refriandose cerca de media ora en camisa y descalzo como ella vio y ya serie bien resfriado ovo piedad” (321).

Part of this hesitation comes from Tirant’s underlying anxiety about whether Carmesina is all that she appears, or has, rather, been contaminated by the unruly sexuality that both her city’s punishment and the numerous Muslim slaves symbolize. Recalling that, “en el imaginario occidental de la época los negros y los sarracenos representaban el uso desordenado del sexo” (Simó 80), it is crucial that the ‘desordenado’ use of sex is most evident among the Byzantines, among whom are references to incest, adultery, fornication, and homoeroticism. They seem

²² Tafur continues the passage by explaining that the statue is a prophecy of Turkish conquest: “Este caballero dizen que es Constantino, é que prenusticó que, de la parte donde señalava con el dedo avie de venir la destruycion de la Greçia, é paresçe que así fué” (97).

influenced or contaminated by the Muslims who now threaten to conquer them. This theme of foreign contamination and punishment is directly mentioned in chapter XXXI, book 4, where the author breaks for a description of Valencia, tying Constantinople's fate to Spain's. Valencia faces a "tiempo en gran decaimiento por la mucha maldad que en los abitadores de aquella abra," just as has already happened to Martorell's Constantinople. This is due to the "muchas gentes de diversas naciones: que como ser amezclados la lavor que dellos saldrá será tan malvada" in particular: "La primera de judíos. La segunda de moros. La tercera de cristianos: los quales no vernan de natura que por cause dellos resciban mucho daño y destruycion" (487).²³

Echoing this threat of the religious Other, Constantinople has numerous Moors working as slaves. They frequently act as an obstacle between Carmesina and Tirant. In chapter LIV Book 3, Carmesina takes a young Moor captive, bragging about him before Tirant and her father, the Byzantine Emperor: "Yo me podre alavar delante de nuestro capitán como he sido valiente cavalleresa que dentro del campo de los enemigos con animo efforzado he sabido aprisionar un turco" (238). The scene is, of course, light-hearted, eliciting laughter, as "el emperador ovo el mayor placer del mundo oyendo a su hija con la gentil gracia que dezia" (238). However, her gesture is also erotic, as the Tirant's ideal spot as her loving 'prisoner' and 'slave' is instead occupied by a Moor.²⁴

The threat that a religious Other poses to Tirant's sexual conquest becomes even more apparent later on. In chapter LXXXIII, book 3, Tirant is alone with Carmesina and her handmaidens, who move in when he tries to grope her below her waist. Seeing himself restrained

²³ This perspective of Constantinople is evident as well in Pero Tafur's account, "La çibdat es muy mal poblada é á barrios, pero la costa de la mar faze mayor pueblo; la gente non bien vestidos, mas triste é pobre, mostrando el mal que tienen, aunque non tanto quanto devían, por ser vente muy viçiosa é embuelta en pecados" (101). Constantinople is a city in decline because of its sinful inhabitants.

²⁴ As James and Peggy Knapp note, the erotic prisoner was a trope of courtly love literature (162).

by them, “alargo la pierna y metio gela de baxo delas faldas: y con el zapato tovo en el lugar vedado su pierna le puso entre los muslos” (282). To celebrate this victory, he bejewels the stocking and shoe. At the subsequent tournaments (chapter XCI, book 3), Carmesina’s mother wishes to know the meaning of this, and, hoping he’ll reveal the secret, she arranges to have “un esclavo de aquestos moros” offer to carry him from a boat to land, ‘accidentally’ dipping the bedecked shoe into the water. The slave, however, stumbles under Tirant’s weight: “Como fue cerca de tierra sino de caer mostrando passer gran trabajo con el peso que traya: y queso le mojar el pier mojole todo el cuerpo” (292).

The Moorish slave thus represents a threat to disclose Tirant and Carmesina’s secret flirtations. At the same time, it points to the larger war between the Christians and Muslims. Tirant places his foot on the slave’s head, and vows, “Yo hago voto a dios y a la donzella de quien soy de no dormir en cama ni vestir camisa hasta tanto que yo aya muerto o presionado rey o hijo de rey” (292). Tirant ties the affront of the slave to the Muslims outside of Constantinople’s walls who, similarly, have offered to restore all Byzantine lands “si por premio de tal concordia le querras dar a tu hija Carmesina por mujer” (270). Both the Byzantine slave as well as the invading Muslim army pose an obstacle for Tirant.

The clearest threat, however, is in the elaborate ruse that sends Tirant away from Constantinople temporarily. In chapter CXXXVI, book 3, the jealous Viuda Reposada deceives Tirant, saying that Carmesina “ha entusiado y embuelto con el Lauseta ortolano del huerto del emperador que es esclavo negro comprado y vendido y moro de su natura” (356). She invents an abortion: “Quantas yeruas he ydo yo a coger: y con mi mesma mano se la he puesto por destruyr el preñado de su vientre de mucha infamia” (356). In her explanation, she subtly reminds Tirant

that the baby would immediately reveal Carmesina's guilt, as she worked to "apartar tal nieto de la vista del emperador su aguelo" (356).²⁵

La Viuda Reposada creates an elaborate illusion using a mirror that causes Tirant to believe that he witnesses his beloved princess's illicit involvement with the black gardener Lauseta (in fact, Placerdemivida wearing a mask that the widow had crafted to resemble Lauseta). Simó observes that the charade thus becomes for Tirant the "imagen invertida de aquella Carmesina con «honest vel» que aparece en el primer espejo" (82) that Tirant gives to Carmesina at the start of the Byzantine adventures.²⁶ This is the lowest point in Tirant's fortune, as the knight is unable to leave bed, and soon flees Constantinople.

Alongside Tirant's anxiety over losing to his racial Other is the anxiety over whether Carmesina is indeed willing to violate social norms for him exclusively. Tirant's violation of Oriental patriarchy thus broaches the possibility of the violation of his own patriarchal gaze. He exploits gaps in the Oriental patriarchy by secretly meeting with Carmesina, and, ironically, the Widow's deceitful plot illustrates his own fear of being deceived in the same way. Tirant is thus caught between his confidence in his power as voyeur, and also the anxieties that emerge from this as the limits of his gaze become apparent.

Ironically, it is Tirant who proves untrustworthy—when he returns from Africa, he ignores Carmesina's pleas to stop when he finds himself alone with Carmesina again in chapter XXXV of book 5. As in the current scene where he trespasses uninvited into Carmesina's

²⁵ It is worth noting that, in the Catalan version, Carmesina is compared to a reeking vat of oil. This image again alludes to Lauseta's blackness, showing that Carmesina is now a vessel of oil, whose own whiteness has been erased by her sexual encounter with the Moor.

²⁶ Tirant is particularly fixated on the racial aspect of Carmesina's imagined infidelity. As he recounts the tale to Placerdemivida, Tirant refers to Lauseta as "el negro hortelano" five times through Chapter CLVI book 3, referencing his race with every mention. Tirant also explains that Carmesina's hopes of paradise are now, "mas escura que la noche," and explains that, upon witnessing the ruse, "los arbols que les estava cerca mudaron todos su color por la abominacion de tan feo caso," (444) drawing attention to Lauseta's skin color.

chamber, Tirant is ultimately persuaded by the persistent Placerdemivida. She is a constant pressure for the couple as well as a go-between who arranges both the current scene and their later consummation, all the while pushing against Tirant's doubts. "In the end, it is Pleasure-of-my-life who takes charge, coercively manipulating the lovers, and ushering Tirant into Carmesina's bed" (Piera and Shearn, 91). Yet, unexpectedly, we find that she is an extension of the same patriarchy that she seems to help Tirant to defy. Placerdemivida recognizes the importance of the Western knights in defending the Byzantine empire. When Estefania refuses to kiss the overly-forward Diafebus (Tirant's cousin), Placerdemivida scolds her in chapter XL, book 3:

Señora como soys extraña que en tiempo de tanta necesidad de guerra no sepays conservar la amistad de los cavalleros. Ponen los bienes y las personas en defension de vuestra alteza y de todo el imperio y por un besar os hazeys tanto oyr...E si a vos os quisiesen besar lo deuriades consentir y ansi ponien las manos debaxo de las haldas no lo deuriades extrañar en este tiempo de tanta necesidad. E después como seays en buena paz hacer del vicio virtud. Buena señora engañada andays, en tiempo de guerra son menester las armas que en tiempo de paz no cale ballestas. (212)

She urges Stephania to respond to the English knight's advances in order to entice him to fight, exploiting Stephania's sexuality to save and defend the Byzantine Empire. Later, in chapter CXI, book 3, Placerdemivida adopts a similar argument when trying to convince the emperor to marry her daughter to Tirant. She asks, "Que me aprovecha a mi que fuesse salida del linaje de David y por falta de animoso marido perdiese lo que tengo" and then urges the emperor, "Toma esta consoliacion en tu vida y no esperes que después de tus bienaventurados días se aya de hacer" (316).²⁷

²⁷ She then concludes with an exemplum linking marriage and kingdom: "Mira poderoso señor y delos reyes el mas cristianissimo no quieras hacer como hizo aquel rey de Provenza que tenia una hija muy hermosa y se la demando por mujer el gran rey d'españa Y su padre la amo tanto que no la quiso casar en su vida: allí ella se envegecio en casa del rey su padre de manera que quando el murió no la quiso ninguno: y tomaronle la tierra y ella murió fuera del reyno en el hospital de aviñoa. Y ella de inocente que consintió en la voluntad de su padre y el daño vino sobre ella" (317).

Against the structures that seek to guard the princesses against the foreign knights, Placerdemivida acts to save Constantinople as a state, violating these structures in order to lure the knights into staying, grafting them into Byzantine society. Placerdemivida thus represents another iteration of the Oriental state that seeks to subsume Tirant's vitality into the Greek Orient through marriage. She is willing to sacrifice Carmesina to do so.²⁸ Despite his apparent victory, a broader view of Tirant's time in the Orient begs the question of who is subduing whom.

This defense strategy for Constantinople is laden with criticism of the unrestricted heterosexual desire in Tirant upon which it depends. We see this criticism as the text configures Tirant's difficulty in resisting the temptation of the Greek Orient as something that hinders his ability to save it. As Meritxell Simó observes, "en vano Carmesina intentará persuadirlo para que se aleje del palacio y culmine su campaña militar" (79). For instance, as a result of entering Carmesina's bed, Tirant breaks his leg as the Emperor comes rushing in with a sword after hearing La Viuda Reposada's shouts. Tirant is laid up in bed, incapable of continuing his campaign against the Ottomans.

His immoderate sexual desire is a failure to submit his sexuality to dominant Spanish norms, contradictorily, defying the state even as he plays a role in defending it. This casts²⁹ Tirant's unusually abrupt death after returning from North Africa as a punishment. Shortly after achieving his goals of having (forced) sex with an unwilling-but-later-forgiving Carmesina (chapter XXXV, book 5) and later betrothal to her (chapter XLVIII, book 5), Tirant embarks on a

²⁸ This echoes Pero Tafur's experience in Constantinople, where the Emperor tries to persuade him to stay and marry:

É de aquella ora en adelante me acatava con mucho amor é como á persona de su sangre, é quesiera mucho que yo me quedara en su tierra é me casara é asentara, é bien creo que lo fazíe, allende de las cosas sobredichas, porque la çibdat es mal poblada é an mengua de buenas gentes darvas, é non me maravillo, que con tal gente é tan poderosa contienden (86).

²⁹ This recalls David Quint's reading of the *Aeneid*, where Aeneas's "renunciation of his love for Dido is part of a larger surrender of personality and will demanded of the leader for the sake of community and nation" (91).

brief (15 chapters) conclusion of his campaign in Turkey only to become fatally sick before he can be reunited with Carmesina (chapter LXI, LXX). Tirant thus dies before living happily ever after, leaving no heir, and never sitting on the throne he has just won. His unusual, sterile fate is foreshadowed in the bathing scene's allusion to the Biblical King David and Bathsheba. As a result of David's adultery, the king is punished with the death of the child,³⁰ linking unregulated sex (whether adultery or rape) to sterility. Tirant is similarly denied the possibility of fathering an heir.

At the same time, the scene alludes to one of the romances we mentioned in the previous section, where Rodrigo watches Florinda bathe. Romance #585, "De cómo el rey don Rodrigo se enamoró de la Cava," begins with a description of la Cava's body, and then, in a twist, we are informed of Rodrigo's presence. The play closes with an allusion to Troy as the king cries, "Aunque en España no quedase joya / Qu'el fuego no abrasase como á Troya!" (401), comparing his lust to the destruction of Troy (a theme we will return to in our final chapter). In the same way, Tirant loses the kingdom that he has earned due to his uncontrollable lust, as Hipolit, his squire, marries Carmesina's mother the empress (chapter LXXVIII). The empress subsequently dies, and Hipolit marries an English princess.³¹ The marriage results in "tres hijos que fueron singulares y valentissimos cavalleros" (629). Hipolit, a relatively secondary character, is granted numerous heirs as well as the kingdom that Tirant has earned.

As the allusion to Troy demonstrates, Tirant's uncontrollable sexuality is punished by his untimely death. This contrasts with the prevailing treatment of extramarital sex in chivalric

³⁰ "After Nathan had gone home, the Lord struck the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and he became ill. David pleaded with God for the child. He fasted and spent the nights lying in sackcloth[a] on the ground. The elders of his household stood beside him to get him up from the ground, but he refused, and he would not eat any food with them. On the seventh day the child died" (2 Samuel 12:15-18).

³¹ "la qual fue de grandissima hermosura y onestidad umilde y muy virtuosa: y devotissimas xristiana" (629).

romances like *Amadis of Gaul*; I suggest that here, the author relies on his reader's negative view of the Byzantines. Here, the act of voyeurism offers a clue, as we return to the Biblical David. St. Augustine, in his commentary on Psalm 51, sees in David's voyeurism a precursor for general sexual sin where "Bathsheba figures as an irresistible temptation to carnal appetite" (Lyle 33). St. Augustine explains that, "Carnal pleasure, especially if proceeding unto unlawful and strange objects, is to be bridled, not let loose: by government to be tamed, not to be set up for government" (368). For the church father, then, Tirant's watching Carmesina points to the unbridled carnal pleasure that emerges and prompts other, similar actions.

Reflecting the decadence with which the Byzantines were seen, it is this unbridled passion that kills Tirant, as Rafael Beltrán Llavador demonstrates. The symbolism of the fatal pain in Tirant's side ("tan gran mal de costado y tan poderoso que le ovieron de tomar en brazos llevarle a la ciudad" (610)) is part of an erotic motif evident in several other contemporary works. The critic suggests that "pudiera haber sido utilizado el *dolor de costado* para designar un padecimiento concreto relacionado con alguna de las irremediables consecuencias de la enfermedad de amor" (76). This offers important context to Tirant's hope that, in seeing Carmesina, he might be cured of his illness in chapter LXV in book 5.³²

Tirant's sexual exploits offer a moralistic, didactic reading, recalling that "romances were perceived as manuals of courtesy and general social comportment," (Harney 153). Tirant is, by all appearances, a perfect knight: Rafael Jiménez Mérida notes that "Tirant lo Blanch es el mejor guerrero, el más hábil estratega militar, pero también el amante más paciente y el servidor más sumiso de la princesa, de manera que puede y debe ganar el cetro del Imperio al final de la obra" (167). However, his patience does fail, and Tirant's "cumplimiento del acto amoroso [se hace]

³² "Porque el mayor dolor que tenia era como muria sin ver a la princesa: y que tenia devocion y creya que su vista bastava en darle salud y vida" (612).

destrutivo” (Beltrán Llavador 92). In raping Carmesina, he reveals that he has been seduced and corrupted by the Greek Orient, and thus must make way for the Greek, fecund Hipolit.

In sum, Tirant’s sterile sexuality stands as a symbol of the seductive power of the religious and racial Other, here manifested in the contaminating sexuality of the Muslim Orient that corrupts the Byzantine Empire from within (turning it into another Orient, although Christian and Greek), rendering it incapable of defending itself against the external threat of Muslims. In other words, it is a warning against ‘going native’ in a Greek Orient, where the dichotomy between Christianity and Muslim competes with another of European and Greek. Alongside this, Tirant’s death presents a vision of Spain where collective survival overrides individual desires, as it alternately protects and exploits women for self-preservation while it punishes men for failing to submit their sexuality to the larger mission of fighting in defense of the sexual hierarchy.

Viaje de Turquía (1557)

In addition to debates on authorship, exploring criticism of Spain, and studies of humanist influence on the *Viaje de Turquía*, critics have read the text as tolerant. Marie-Sol Ortolá looks for Utopia in Turkish society, which demonstrates “los principios evangélicos del amor, de la tolerancia y del trabajo” (*La tendencia* 226). Galaretta-Aima finds “la lección final y más importante del libro, la posibilidad de la convivencia pacífica” (251). While undoubtedly Pedro has no qualms about praising aspects of Turkish society, there is a tendency to idealize how Spain (and Pedro) viewed the Ottoman world, inspired, perhaps, by the narrative of medieval *Convivencia*. Writing against such an attitude, Angel Delgado-Gómez expresses the historical context succinctly:

A mediados del siglo XVI no hay rastro de una comparable turcofilia. El enemigo es demasiado poderoso, y habrá que esperar a que pase Lepanto y al genio de Cervantes

para que la exaltación patriótica de los encuentros armados se dé la mano con visiones idílicas de cortesía, refinamiento y sensualidad entre turcos y cristianos en Argel o Constantinopla. (“Una visión” 39)

Certainly, the dedication affirms that “el mayor contrario y capital enemigo que para cumplir su deseo Vuestra Magestad tiene... es el Gran Turco” (88). My aim is to complicate the readings of tolerance/intolerance by showing how Pedro uses the harem for two different ends, both upholding a vision of Spanish superiority, yet also destabilizing this vision by criticizing Spain’s gradual liberation of women. A dichotomous frame of reading falls short of capturing the true complexity of Pedro’s engagement with (and use of) the East Mediterranean Orient.

Pedro Urdemalas narrates his encounter with the harem as one of his most impressive feats in Istanbul. After Pedro casually mentions that he was even able to cure “la hija del Gran Señor,” Matalascallando reacts in shock, “¿Pues una cosa la más notable de todas quantas podéis contar dezís así como quien no diçe nada? ¿A la mesma hija del Gran Señor ponían en vuestras manos?” Pedro brags, “Y aún que es la cosa que más en este mundo él quiere” (194). Pedro highlights his access to the Sultan’s daughter to entice his audience, while Matalascallando’s incredulity underscores how forbidden this access is.

Pedro describes the scene emphasizing his master’s impotent jealousy; he sees no choice but to allow Pedro access to the princess, yet is aware that it is a violation. Pedro’s master Zinán Baxá comes to him one day, asking his advice on a set of symptoms. Pedro insists that he needs to see the patient to be sure. Zinán then reveals that his brother Rustán Baja’s wife, the daughter of the Ottoman Sultan, is the patient in question. When Pedro arrives at her bedside and is forced to kneel, he explains that the Ottomans “como tengo dicho, son tan celosos que ninguna otra cosa vi sino una mano sacada, y a ella le habían echado un paño de tela de oro por ençima, que la cubría toda la cabeza” (197). Pedro mentions his master’s jealousy, which emphasizes the

forbidden nature of the sultana's bedroom. This jealousy is a theme that persists in his description, as he is commanded to kneel, and "no osé vesarle la mano por el zelo del marido." When he takes the Sultanness's pulse, the jealous spouse "me daba gran prisa, que bastaba y que nos saliésemos" (197).

The scene has a voyeuristic quality, as Pedro is determined to see the face under the veil, and thus resorts to Turkish "sin esperar que el intérprete hablase, que ya yo barbullaba un poco la lengua, díxelo: *Obir el vera Zoltana*, que quiere dezir: deme Vuestra Alteza la otra mano." She resists, prompting him further, as he explains, "Yo muy sosegado, tanto por verla como por lo demás, dixelo: *Dilinchica Soltana*: Vuestra Alteza me muestre la lengua" (197). As a result, the sultana finally "descubre toda la cabeza y braços algo congoxada, y mostróme la lengua" (197). The emphatic *toda*³³ adds a voyeuristic³⁴ quality, as Pedro Urdemalas expresses the extent to which he can see beyond the privacy of the veil.

The scene has an eroticism that is not immediately evident; as we shall see, however, this masks a profound manipulation of the gaze as it asserts Spanish hegemony. Pedro's deliberate choice to use and recount his use of Turkish has erotic connotations. To understand this, we must first recognize that it is a show of agency and a tool for transgressing the Turkish social norms that govern sexuality, as we see later in the text. In the present scene, of course, it allows him to

³³ "descubre toda la cabeza y brazos" (197)

³⁴ I acknowledge here that the term 'voyeurism' normally conveys secrecy, and that Pedro is in a room with both the sultana and her husband, both of whom are fully aware of his presence. Yet, I argue, what remains hidden is his sexuality and the erotic aspect of his gaze. Paradoxically, under the pretense of applying a medical gaze, he is able to assert authority while, as a foreign infidel, he is also able to assert his inconsequentiality. The sultana exclaims, "¿Ne exium chafir deila?: ¿qué se me da a mí? ¿no es pagano y de diferente ley?" (197), echoing Cervantes' assertion that "a causa que los moros son en extremo celosos y encubren de todos los hombres los rostros de sus mujeres, puesto que en mostrarse ellas a los cristianos no se les hace de mal; quizá debe de ser que, por ser cautivos, no los tienen por hombres cabales" (166) in *El amante liberal*. Both authors use this cultural difference to seize an authority that, while apparently insignificant for the Orient, conveys hegemony for its Spanish audience. While the Turks do not view the Christians as a threat, the Christians insist on their sexuality to assert that they are indeed rivals.

speak directly to the sultana, circumventing the gatekeepers (her husband and the interpreter). Later, in the chapter on food (XXII), Pedro recounts a time where he requested “sugar,” but mistakenly used the word for “el aceso que el hombre tiene a la mujer,” accordingly telling the woman (“una señora muy hermosa y rica”) that she should erotically “se echase un hombre a cuestras.” Bolstering the Spanish ego, the women’s reaction is one of laughter and flirtation: “Y quando de allí en adelante iba, luego se reían y me preguntaban si quería *zequier*” (480).³⁵ As Matalascallando comments upon hearing the story, “El mejor alcagüete que hay para con damas es no saver su lengua; porque es lízito dezir quanto quisiéredes, y tiene de ser perdonado” (481).

Both the scene that mistakes sugar for sex and the unveiling of the sultana conveys eroticism, where we see a subtle invitation that suggests mutual attraction that echoes Spanish anxieties about containing women at home. Pedro assures us that the sultana “de muy mala gana estaba tapada, y aun creo que tenía voluntad de hablarme” (197). The sultana’s fascination with Pedro becomes more evident after her husband dies, as the Christian flees the city. She first refuses to give Pedro the letter that her husband wrote promising the Christian’s release.³⁶ Later, when Pedro and his companion, an elderly barber, reach Mount Athos in their flight from Constantinople, they encounter a pair of janissaries who are searching for Pedro. One explains that he is searching for “un perro de christiano que se ha huido a la Soltana, el mayor bellaco traidor que jamás hubo, porque le hacían más bien que él merescía y todo lo ha postpuesto y huídose” (259). The language of ‘having it better than he deserved,’ as well as calling him the ‘greatest traitor’ better describes an ungrateful lover rather than an absentee doctor. Moreover,

³⁵ Galarreta-Aima links these confusions to “órbices de entendimiento no solo a nivel lingüístico, sino también [...] a nivel religioso, político y cultural. Problemas similares entre moriscos, cristianos y judíos en la España imperial desencadenaron terribles obstáculos de entendimiento con fines trágicos” (244). I argue instead that it casts an erotic light on Pedro’s use of speech, which is another dimension of Pedro’s special intrusion into the female space.

³⁶ The sultana tells Pedro, “no, por quanto Amón Uglí era muerto, el protomédico de su padre, y no había quien mejor lo pudiese ser que yo, ni de quien el Gran Turco mejor pudiese fiarse. Por tanto, que me tomasen con dos jenízaros, que son de la guarda del Rey, y me llebasen allá, que ella le quería hazer aquel presente” (251).

Pedro adds, “parece ser que aquella noche le había dado un dolor de ijada, y habíanme buscado, y como supieron que había sacado los libros, luego lo imaginaron” (259). The pain in her side recalls Tirant’s fatal lovesickness.³⁷ The fact that these actions all come a few days after her husband’s death, after her previous curiosity toward Pedro (who later asserts that all Turkish women are unsatisfied by their husbands and thus ‘seek their own remedy’) evokes the adultery that we will see in *El amante liberal*, as well as with the Moorish Emeraldine in *Tirant* in the next chapter.

The mutual attraction is echoed in chapter XIX. Here, too, Pedro implies interest on the part of the women whose space he is invading: “y si alguna, por males de sus pecados, quisiera no se esconder por verme, [el eunuco negro] con aquel bastón le daba en aquella cabeza, que la derribaba, aunque fuera la principal” (442). The eunuch (although castrated) enforces the Ottoman Patriarchy, acting as an extension of it, and demonstrating the need to control unruly, curious women, suggesting that, at least in Constantinople, they cannot be left alone.

Moving on to the question of the gaze in our present scene, the text, as a whole, is presented as an eyewitness account. The text is emphatically visual—the author quotes Homer, referring to himself as “*un varón que vio muchas tierras y diversas costumbres de hombres,*” and then explaining how, “Conosciendo, pues, yo, christianíssimo príncipe, el ardentíssimo ánimo que Vuestra Magestad tiene de ver y entender las cosas raras del mundo” (88). Antonio García Jiménez confirms this: “Esta condición de ser testigo de vista es [muy] reiterada en el *Viaje de Turquía*” (540). Encarnación Sánchez García similarly traces the tension between secondhand

³⁷ While it is with a previous chapter in *Viaje* regarding Italians, Rafael Beltrán Llavador extends to the present text (as we have seen with *Tirant*) the idea that the ‘dolor de costado’ is erotic, adding it to his list of texts: “No quisiera acabar la recopilación de ejemplos sin mencionar otro, curioso y divertido, que se da en el *Viaje de Turquía*” (84).

and firsthand knowledge in the text as “Pintura estereotipada vs. pintura del natural, oído vs. ojo” (455). Pedro espouses the latter.

Marie-Sol Ortolá describes the works' visuality in terms of theatricality: “el lector ... la vea como si estuviera presente; pues se le dan los elementos que le permiten visualizar el escenario imaginariamente” (“Modos” 54), and calls attention to the first chapter's “abundancia de verbos de percepción ... llamar la atención y fijarla en aspectos particulares del camino. ... los dos personajes se presentan más bien como observadores: se impone el verbo “mirar”; verbo que supone un acto dinámico por parte de los personajes” (59). This changes, of course, when Pedro arrives: “Mátalas Callando ayuda a desenmascarar la hipocresía del compañero y a revelar que tras una visión unívoca de la realidad se esconde otra, o sea que todo punto de vista es relativo (visión perspectivista). En contraposición, Pedro será el testigo [de lo real]” (66). Pedro thus usurps authority as an eyewitness of the things that his companions can only discuss in abstract. This calls to mind Stephen Greenblatt's explanation of the role of the eye witness as one who “directly possesses the truth and can simply present it; he who has not seen for himself must persuade” (129).³⁸

³⁸ This theatricality has a pedagogical end: “se transforma en actor con un propósito: el de enaltecer una personalidad nueva, un sujeto transformado, cuyo papel en el diálogo consisten en ofrecer nuevas perspectivas de enfoque de una realidad española llena de contradicciones” (Ortolá, “Modos” 77). Pedro changes from agent to witness who now informs his readers, becoming a bridge between the self and Other. Greenblatt writes: “That representation is in turn conveyed, reported to an audience elsewhere, and seeing turns into witnessing. The person who witnesses becomes the point of contact, the mediator between 'ourselves' and what is out there beyond our sight” (122). Jessica Boll explains that Pedro's description of the harem scene gives “the Spanish public ... [a] glimpse into an otherwise forbidden world of luxury, leisure and supposedly unbridled sexuality” (*Tale of a City* 88).

This naturally has imperial implications, as Pedro as a witness is also an extension of Spanish imperialism, and the hope of conquering Constantinople, recalling Europe's colonial aspirations: “Everything in the European dream of possession rests on witnessing, a witnessing understood as a form of significant and representative seeing” (Greenblatt 122).

It is this profoundly visual text through which Pedro's voyeurism into the harem is portrayed.³⁹ The harem scene and what precedes it is a careful negotiation of gazes that tie to authority. Pedro must first argue for the privilege to see the sultana in person when his master hesitates: "Yo le dixese que *viéndola* sabríamos dar remedio. Él dixo que no podía ser *verla*, sino que así dixese; a lo cual yo negué poderse por ninguna vía hazer cosa buena, sin *vista*" (195).⁴⁰ He finally convinces the master: "Como él me *vio* firme." As he waits to see the sultana, Rustán Baxá, her husband "començó de parlar conmigo para *ver* si le paresçería neçio, y procuraba, porque son muy celosos, que le diese el paresçer, sin *verla*" (196). Having partially earned the right to see the sultana, he must now pass the gaze of her jealous husband.

This conversation, however, gives way as Pedro instead redirects Rustán's gaze. Here, to settle the issue of the Spanish and Ottoman empires' comparative sizes, Pedro requests a map to prove the size of the Spanish empire, insisting "si lo quiere *ver al ojo*, mande traer un mappa mundi de aquellos que el embaxador de Françia le empresentó, que yo lo *mostraré*" (196). Right as the map comes, Pedro receives news that "llegó la liçençia de la Soltana que la fuese a *ver*" (197). Pedro is only able to see the forbidden sultana after demonstrating the grandeur of the Spanish empire. He demonstrates mastery over the Oriental gaze both by evading it to see the sultaness, and also by redirecting it to the map, thus demonstrating Spanish hegemony two-fold. Later, after Pedro requests to see the sultana's hand to take her pulse,⁴¹ he notes that "descubrió tantico el paño para *mirarme* sin que yo la *viese*" (197). This sets the stage for her erotic interest in Pedro, provoking her husband's jealousy. However, this briefly places her in the panopticon

³⁹ Goytisolo echoes the connection between sight and the harem: "Nada más lógico entonces que los testigos oculares de los secretos de alcoba del serrallo sean casi tan numerosos como los aficionados que juran y perjuran haber estado en Linares la tarde aciaga en que un Miura empitonó a Manolete" (25).

⁴⁰ My emphasis here and in the rest of this section.

⁴¹ "Obir el vera Zoltana, que quiere dezir: deme Vuestra Alteza la otra mano" (197). In a passage a heavy use of the Spanish *ver*, it is curious to ask whether, for the author, the act of seeing could have been linked to the act of taking as he orders her to *ver*, 'give' in Turkish—that is, could the author have understood *seeing* as a form of being *given*?

position of knowing Pedro while he still cannot see her. Pedro levels the field by asking to see her tongue,⁴² persuading her to remove her veil.

Pedro's very entry into the harem is thus an assertion of hegemony. Pedro later compares the difficulty of entering the harem to "como los encantamientos de Amadís" (441)⁴³ recalling the multiple archways that the knight had to pass through to demonstrate the purity of his love for Oriana. This subtly puts him in the same role as the conquering lover, positioning himself as someone who can one day assume control of the Firm Island, as Amadís does. Moreover, Goytisolo explains that, in this scene, the harem is, in fact, tied to the image of the Oriental despot⁴⁴: "la disposición interior del serrallo tanto cuanto encontramos en ellos los elementos de la fantasmagoría grecorenacentista que aún las nociones de goce y poder sin medida en la figura mirífica y monstruosa del déspota" (25). A violation of the harem is thus a violation of the entirety of Oriental power.

The scene's emphasis on visibility highlights Pedro's medical gaze and the agency it allows him.⁴⁵ It entitles him to a special authority and access even greater than the sultana's family, as multiple critics have commented. Inicarte points out that, "in his capacity as a doctor and having learned Turkish, Pedro finds no door barred, no scene hidden," (9) and García

⁴² "*Dilinchica Soltana*: Vuestra Alteza me *muestre* la lengua." He requests this in her *lengua*, shortly after assuring us that he "yo barbullaba un poco la lengua" (197). This further emphasizes his heightened ability to see into Turkish culture, as well as how language has been crucial in convincing her to unveil.

⁴³ Referring to the passage in the first chapter of the second book, where Apolidón, Ruler of Firm Island, celebrates his love for Grimesa by enchanting a series of arches to only allow the truest lover to one day pass: "puso unas letras en el de cobre que decían. 'De aquí pasarán los caballeros en que gran bondad de armas hubiere, cada uno según su valor así pasará adelante.' Y puso otras letras en el padrón de piedra que decía: 'De aquí no pasará sino el caballero que de bondad de armas á Apolidón pasará.' Y encima de la puerta de la cámara puso unas letras que decían: 'Aquel que me pasare de bondad entrará en la rica cámara y será señor de la insula'" (43-44).

⁴⁴ Said also repeatedly establishes despotism as an "essential idea about the Orient" (205): "An Oriental lives in the Orient, he lives a life of Oriental ease, in a state of Oriental despotism and sensuality, imbued with a feeling of Oriental fatalism" (102).

⁴⁵ In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault shows how the medical gaze is tied up to other forms of control: "The medical supervision of diseases and contagions is inseparable from a whole series of other controls: the military control over deserters, fiscal control over commodities, administrative control over remedies, rations, disappearances, cures, deaths, simulations" (144).

Jiménez echoes this referring to “el serrallo donde él como médico entraba con entera libertad” (540). This, naturally, circumvents the question of Spanish vs. Turkish strength by showing that, even when the Spanish are outnumbered, their innate resourcefulness and cleverness can still outwit Turkish power. This makes the harem a place of metonymic victory, where Pedro can assert his superiority despite being generally powerless in the text.

Returning to the theme of language, this episode also marks Pedro’s first narrated use of Turkish, which proves to be his secret weapon to unveil the Sultana. Pedro’s use of Turkish (in addition to encoding his erotic interest) gives him agency in the foreign space, allowing him to circumvent Turkish go-betweens⁴⁶ and become, rather, a go-between for his own culture. Jessica Boll asserts that “it is his impressive gift for languages that eventually allows Pedro access to the Turkish world. He is able to penetrate their physical space via skillful manipulation of their linguistic space” (*Tale of a City* 107). This also acts to connect him to the city, marking his shift from captive to resident: “Pedro’s dexterous manipulation of Turkish shows his own connection to both the city and its inhabitants” (Boll, *Tale of a City* 108-09). Crucially, to achieve this, Pedro has had to cut-off⁴⁷ the interpreters to speak on his own. This asserts his authority on numerous levels, as he demonstrates his own ability to represent himself over the Turkish interpreter’s ability to do so.

Yet alongside this vision of a hegemonic Spain, Pedro offers a vision of Spain that contradicts this hegemony. The most evident proof of the continuity between confinement at home and in the Orient is the surprising, persistent, comparison between harems and nuns. Pedro

⁴⁶ Steven Greenblatt speaks of the importance of cultural go-betweens as symbols of language’s centrality in European encounters with foreign lands and in the European mechanism of representation. “For European adventurers not only depended upon go-betweens, but were themselves go-betweens, servants of the great representational machine...there is in the sixteenth century a flood of textual representation, along with a much smaller production of visual images, that professes to deliver the New World to the Old” (145). Pedro here usurps the role of go-between.

⁴⁷ “sin esperar que el intérprete hablase” (197).

explains that the harem women have access to everything such that they “no tienen a qué salir en todo el año de casa ni en toda su vida de como allí entran, más que monjas de las más encerradas que hay en Sancta Clara.” He then cites the 63 women in his master Sinán Baxá’s harem, adding, “Mirad si hay monasterio de más monjas” (440), and explains that the space is laid out “si no un cuarto en la suya sin ventana ninguna a la calle, con muchas cámaras como celdas de monjas” (441). When Juan expresses surprise at how difficult it is to recognize Turkish women in public, Pedro explains that “todas visten de una misma manera, como hábitos de monjas” (439).

Pedro’s comparison redirects the reader’s attention back to Spain.⁴⁸ Pedro’s connection of the two female homosocial spaces inevitably projects the problems of the lascivious, uncontrollable women of the harem onto the convent. Yet, in addition to touching on sexualized fantasies about nuns,⁴⁹ this also highlights the anxiety of what women do when left alone in convents. Ana Vian Herrero argues that the scene is subversive: “puede encerrar una ironía, una facecia, la subversión de un pensamiento o un *after thought*... En lo fundamental, el *Viaje de Turquía* es, también desde su estilo, una espléndida obra satírica” (73). Martínez Góngora similarly finds in the comparison that women’s influence in the Spanish public sphere provoked anxiety:

as mujeres se convirtieron en una causa de preocupación, dado que las luchas de los intelectuales burgueses con la nobleza revelan la ansiedad sexual ante la inestabilidad de las posiciones de subordinación y superioridad, por lo que se dirige la atención a éstas, ya que, como subordinadas, podrían amenazar la difícil dinámica de poder. (37-38)

⁴⁸ Commenting on the surprising nature of the passage, Delgado-Gómez sees this as “la búsqueda de símiles,” but expresses surprise nonetheless: “Para Urdemalas el encierro de por vida a que se someten las mujeres del harén las hace comparables ¡a las monjas de clausura del convento de Santa Clara!” (p. 440)” (“Una visión” 45) Jessica R. Boll follows suite, “He draws upon Spanish/Christian ‘equivalents’ in order for his public to grasp the true nature of the Ottoman world. In one of his most creative associations, Pedro equates the confinement of Turkish women to that of the nuns of the convent of Santa Clara” (*Tale of a City* 122) Iniciarte qualifies it as “obvious heretical comparison between a pagan’s seventy three [*sic*] wives and nuns in a monastery” (10).

⁴⁹ Goytisolo suggests that Pedro is redirecting the Harem’s eroticism back to the convent (evoking a popular fantasy in the Western imagination): “la alternancia entre la fachada de austeridad y virtud—monjas, abadesa, clausura—y la realidad del desenfreno --el trato furtivo con cristianos y aun esclavos negros añade una nota picante a los desbordamientos de la imaginación” (26).

As we have mentioned, convents presented women with a level of agency that was much less common outside of the convent.⁵⁰ This concern emerges in the text's discussion of women, where Matalascallando asks "¿No os parece que andaría recta toda la justicia de la cristiandad si no se hiziese caso del favor de las mugeres?" (439). Juan de Voto Dios objects, saying that only women of status are capable of this level of influence, but Pedro suggests that even "la comadre o partera" can help. Juan then asks, "Y si es monja, ¿qué cuenta tiene con la partera?" to which Pedro replies, "El padre vicario os hará dar firmado quanto vos pudierdes notar, aunque no conozcan aquél a quien escriben" (439). A nun can be even more useful than a wet-nurse, since she has access to the vicar, and we should not miss the erotic potential of this access. Nuns, then, represent cracks in patriarchal confinement. They cannot be contained successfully in a convent any more than the women in the harem; rather they come to represent the patriarchy's vulnerability, as women encourage men to abuse authority and thus disrupt the male-order of justice. Superficially, Pedro seems to represent the Ottomans as immune to women's corrupting influence, saying: "En sola una cosa biben los turcos en razón y es ésta: que no estiman las mugeres ni hazen más caso dellas que de los asadores, cuchares y cazos que tienen colgados de la espetera" (437). However, as we have seen, his own entry disputes this. This is reiterated again as we recall that the sultanness refuses to grant Pedro the freedom that her husband gave him, thus usurping his authority.

Pedro is now an adequate representative of Spain, who can communicate directly in Turkish. As we have seen, the present harem scene is preceded by a conversation with Rustán

⁵⁰ We need only consider how Sor Juana defends her poetry by tying it to her religious pursuit as a nun, or how Catalina de Erauso's deft movements in and out of a convent helped her achieve license as a *mujer varonil*.

Baxá, the Sultana's husband, where Pedro asserts the size of the Hapsburg empire,⁵¹ the number of its subjects,⁵² and their loyalty,⁵³ all greater than the Ottoman Empire's. Now breaking into Turkish, he finally communicates his authority textually, as he is uniquely qualified not only to represent his homeland to the Ottomans, but also to represent Turkish society to his Spanish audience (Mata and Juan) and readers. His grasp of language, first used to get a forbidden glimpse of the sultana, is thus strongly linked to his agency and Spanish power. The erotic viewing of the sultana, then, is closely tied to a representation of Spanish hegemony, while it simultaneously evokes Spanish anxieties about women. This presents two overlapping visions for Spain: a Spain destined to triumph over the Ottoman Empire, and a Spain that is also under perceived assault as women attain greater agency and visibility.

El amante liberal (1613)

El amante liberal is one of the twelve stories that constitute Cervantes's *Novelas ejemplares*, first printed in 1613. Rosa Navarro Durán suggests that the work was first written in 1599, though Julián Arpaiz suggests that Cervantes may have begun to write it as early as 1572, two years after Cyprus was conquered by the Ottomans, the topic of Ricardo's lament as the story opens. Ricardo confides the circumstances of his capture to his childhood-friend-gone-renegade Mahamut. After jealously interrupting the wedding of his beloved Leonisa to the

⁵¹ "Pues hago saber a Vuestra Alteza que es mayor señor el Emperador que el rey de Francia y el Gran Turco juntos; porque lo menos que él tiene es España, Alemania, Ytalia y Flandes; y si lo quiere ver al ojo, mande traer un mappa mundi de aquellos que el embajador de Francia le empresentó, que yo lo mostraré." When the map arrives, he relates "En esto vino el mappa y hízele medir con un compás todo lo que el Turco manda, y no es tanto como las Indias, con gran parte, de lo que quedó marabillado" (196).

⁵² "Señor, ¿cómo puedo yo tener cuenta con los mayordomos, camareros, pajes, caballerizos, guardas, azemileros de los de lustre? Diré que trae más de mil caballeros y de dos mill; y hombre hay destos que trae consigo otros tantos" (196).

⁵³ "Antes, digo, ellos, señor, le mantienen a él si es menester, y son hombres que por su buena gracia le sirben, y no queriendo se estarán en sus casas, y si el Emperador los enoja le dirán, como no sean traidores, que son tan buenos como él, y se saldrán con ello; ni les puede de justicia quitar nada de lo que tienen, si no hazen por qué" (196).

handsome, wealthy Cornelio, his speech is in turn interrupted by a corsair raid, where he is captured along with Leonisa, after fighting valiantly.

His attempts to ransom her freedom with his whole estate fail as her captor plans to marry her. Giving her up for lost, he is surprised when he catches sight of her in Nicosia, where she is brought before the Cadi by a Jewish Merchant. The Cadi, as well as two other Bajás, fall for her at first sight, but the Cadi manages to outwit both by promising to protect Leonisa until she can be sent as tribute to the Grand Turk. The Cadi's wife, Halima, falls for Ricardo at the same time, and invites him to her home, after begging Leonisa to put in a good word. Leonisa, having been previously convinced by Mahamut that Ricardo is dead, is shocked to see him. However, the two agree to dissimulate until they have an opportunity to gain their freedom.

Mahamut, Ricardo, and Leonisa continue to encourage the Cadi and wife, who simultaneously plan to kill each other and marry their preferred Christian while on the way to Constantinople. Both, however, are thwarted when the Bajás attack their ship in the hope of abducting Leonisa. The Christians hide as most of the Ottomans kill each other before claiming victory and taking the galley and its accompanying wealth back to Sicily. Ricardo, after renouncing his claim to Leonisa, is accepted by her nonetheless, while Mahamut marries Halima.

Much of the criticism of *El amante liberal* centers on questions of marriage/sexuality, the treatment of Muslims and Christians in the work, as well as on issues with the relationship between Ricardo and Leonisa. Critics like Sandi Thomson-Weightman, Tatiana Bubnova and Lucía López Rubio have looked at the question of consent (and Ricardo's *liberalidad*) and sexuality within the work. Others, such as L. Rouhi, William Clamurro, Barbara Fuchs (*Passing for Spain*), Theresa Howe and Steve Hutchinson ("Andar en almoneda") have looked at the work's subtle criticism of Christianity while using the Muslims as a foil (particularly the figure

of Mahamut). Finally, Nina Cox Davis, Rosa Navarro Durán and Thomas Hart examine the work in light of questions of genre and influence.

Before continuing with our analysis, I wish to justify my inclusion of *El amante liberal*. The obvious objection is that the text does not take place in Constantinople, but rather mostly in Cyprus. Nonetheless, the text is peculiarly centered on the city. The city is mentioned 13 times, assuring that it is constantly on the periphery of both the characters and readers' imagination throughout the short text. It is, of course, the metropole to which Cyprus (on the Islamic/Christian frontier)⁵⁴ points back, just as Sicily points back to Spain. In the novella, Constantinople represents the constant threat of losing Leonisa permanently to the sultan, a sort of event horizon beyond which there is no salvation. More so than any other *novela ejemplar*, (and, in fact, to an exceptional degree within Cervantes's corpus),⁵⁵ Constantinople is present in the work, though never physically.

Moreover, as alluded to in the introduction, the work bears similarities to one of Cervantes's eight plays, *La gran sultana*, which we will explore next—for this reason critics such as Ottmar Hegyi and Barbara Fuchs⁵⁶ have paired the works together in their analyses. Barring Cervantes's lost works, *La Gran Turquesca* and *El trato de Constantinopla*, both this *novela* and *La gran sultana* deal the most directly with Constantinople within Cervantes's corpus. Both works pay a striking amount of attention to Turkish culture. The two works seem linked in Cervantes's mind, as the author wrestles with similar themes in both. Both works center

⁵⁴ As Fuchs points out “Sicily, like Naples, was for centuries part of the Aragonese Mediterranean Empire before it became a Hapsburg possession. In the sixteenth century, it functioned as a frontier province—a bulwark against the Turk. To depict Sicily and Sicilians is thus, at one level, to depict the Spanish imperial self at the margins” (*Passing for Spain*, 65).

⁵⁵ Howe points out that this is also true for the Ottoman Empire within the novelas: “What separates ‘*El amante liberal*’ from the others is its setting, for all of the action occurs in the eastern Mediterranean, specifically those lands controlled by the Ottoman Turks” (115).

⁵⁶ A chapter in her book *Passing for Spain*, entitled “Passing Pleasures: Costume and Custom in ‘*El amante liberal*’ and *La gran sultana*”

on a Christian woman's abduction and the accompanying quest of a man to recover her, as friendly renegades help along the way. Clothing and its exchange are powerful symbols in both, and a woman's decision to consent to an unconventional marriage is central, all on the Eastern Spanish frontier.

Following Georges Güntert's suggestion that *El amante liberal* lends itself to two overlapping readings (138-39), I argue that Cervantes uses male and female homosocial heterotopias to support both of Güntert's readings which here emerge as discourses. First, the male penetration of a female homosocial space is the 'ejemplar' reading, where Ricardo manages to outwit the Ottoman patriarchy and demonstrate his own hegemony. However, as we see, the Sicilian's agency is limited to the marginal spaces outside of Constantinople, a contrast that Cervantes makes with victorious Spanish agency both in this and our next work. Thus, while the Sicilians are triumphant over the Ottomans, Cervantes carefully limits their success so as not to rival Spain. The second reading, dealt with in my next chapter, emerges in the work's male homosocial space and criticizes Christian society.

Ricardo is another European man who sneaks into the harem, although Cervantes does not employ the term. After catching the eye of Halima, the wife of the Cadí, Ricardo is summoned to her house while her husband is at the mosque on Friday. However, the doorman balks at allowing him to enter, showing that it is an enclosed space: "mas no le dejaba entrar un cristiano corso que servía de portero en la puerta del patio, si Halima no le diera voces que le dejase" (539). The initial confusion that can only be resolved by Halima's shouting reminds the reader that Ricardo is entering a space generally forbidden to men and, in doing so, provoking and revealing disruptions of patriarchal control over the homosocial space. This underscores the renegade wife's duplicity, using the solitude of her own quarters as the ideal place to begin

seducing the young Christian. Compounding this is the fact that Leonisa is able to use this to her advantage to reunite with Ricardo as well as, unsettlingly, resistance against the Orient parallels resistance against Spanish sexual norms of control. Here, as with the bath scene in *Tirant*, the female homosocial space is marked by hierarchy (Leonisa is, after all, a slave), and resistance to it, as both women discordantly seek to violate the local patriarchal norms, and Leonisa works against the interests of her mistress.

The whole scene is emphatically visual, emphasizing the voyeuristic elements. Critics have commented on the importance of this visual moment. It marks Leonisa and Ricardo's reunion: "Un momento más, y ella contara a Ricardo cuanto le ha sucedido desde el momento en que sus miradas se encontraron por primera y última vez. Se inaugura una nueva etapa de contacto y comunicación, que llevara a la comprensión entre los dos" (Bubnova 597). Theresa Ann Sears comments how Ricardo:

In telling his tale to Mahamut, casts his desire again and again as an extension of sight: the jealous tears of his eyes 'han derramado, derraman, y derramarán (*Amante* 49), the way they lost their ability to see at the sight of Leonisa with his rival (50) the manner in which Leonisa 'volvió los ojos a mirarme, y los míos, que no se quitaban de ella, la miraron con tan tierno sentimiento y dolor' and how when he loses sight of her, he loses sight and consciousness altogether (53). (Sears 132)

Ricardo's prolonged stare represents the fulfillment of his persistent desires by portraying it with ekphrasis. As soon as Ricardo enters, he is treated to a tantalizing sight as, for the first time since both were captured, he sees his beloved Leonisa, "una visión, estática y estética a la vez" (Bubnova 597). This ekphrastic pause invites the reader to join Ricardo in contemplating Leonisa's beauty and elaborate garb while also showing that it is worthy of painting. Cervantes describes the encounter: "Estaba Leonisa del mismo modo y traje que cuando entró en la tienda del Bajá, sentada al pie de una escalera grande de mármol que a los corredores subía. Tenía la cabeza inclinada sobre la palma de la mano derecha y el brazo sobre las rodillas" (539). Tatiana

Bubnova points out that “Leonisa sentada en la pose de la *Melancolía* de Durero, representa el instante de la reflexión e intelección” (597). This adds a subtle eroticism to Ricardo’s prolonged stare. As Ryan Giles shows,⁵⁷ lovesickness was understood as a form melancholy that could be cured through sex.⁵⁸ Moreover, Cervantes pointedly mentions that Leonisa is wearing the same dress that charmed the three Ottomans previously, recalling her enthralling effect on them as they negotiate to own her in the way that Ricardo, as her sole viewer, now begins to. Crucially, it is the same dress that Ricardo will have Leonisa wear for the return to Sicily, underscoring the importance it has for him in asserting possession over her.

Ricardo’s voyeuristic moment is thus an expression of power that contrasts to the limitations that beset other characters. Steven Hutchinson comments on the importance of power within the work: “De hecho, todo se suma en un solo término, poder, que aparece con insistencia a lo largo de la novela. Los cautivos están en el ‘poder’ de sus amos, y ‘poder’ significa poder apropiarse de lo ajeno y poder hacer lo que a uno le dé la gana con lo suyo” (“Andar en almoneda” 246). Ricardo’s gaze enacts patriarchal power over the woman by reducing her to a fulfillment of his own ideal:

La idealización de la belleza femenina, con matices platónicos o incluso erótica, instituye lo femenino como una otredad misteriosa e inefable, absoluta, sacralizada o divina, pero

⁵⁷ “Lovesickness was first systematically introduced into Western medical discourse by Galen, the second-century physician of Emperor Marcus Aurelius. ... Whereas earlier treatments for this disorder had involved bed rest and dietary restrictions, Galen, like Ovid, advises sufferers to distract themselves with pleasurable activities until the symptoms of feverishness, loss of appetite, insomnia, and melancholy subside. Subsequent Roman physicians further recommend that melancholic patients rehabilitate themselves by engaging in sexual intercourse, a remedy that is also found in Ovid’s work. Classical descriptions of lovesickness as a form of mania and melancholy were later synthesized and expanded on by Arabic writers, before being translated in Toledo and Montecassino during the eleventh and twelfth centuries” (4).

⁵⁸ Additionally, Cervantes may have been referencing a similar painting by Annibale Caracci (1560-1609), *La Maddalena penitente in un paesaggio* (1598). More research would be necessary to determine whether the work was present in print form at any point prior to when the *Novelas* were published in 1613. However, it does demonstrate the general connection between melancholy and eroticism. Linking a penitent Maria Magdalene to Leonisa at once adds a sexual quality to the scene above, strengthening the reading of a harem, while it also suggests that the scene is a turning point for Leonisa, where she leaves behind the earthly pleasures offered by Cornelio, her first fiancée, to pursue the better, perfect love offered by Ricardo.

al fin cosificada, sujeta tan solo al punto de vista masculino. Es la imagen y la manera de ser que a la mujer se le impone por la mirada y el discurso del varón. (Bubnova 596)

Moreover, as Sears points out, “Within the frame provided by Cervantes in his prologue, the heroines are held captive in a series of gazes—the author’s, the characters’, the reader’s” (132). In this scene, Ricardo’s gaze represents, then, his power over Leonisa as her unseen beholder as well as his erotic and voyeuristic interest in her.

His gaze is also an assertion of power that outstrips the other men in the work.⁵⁹ Leonisa is, at this point, forbidden from the views of both Pashas, Alí and Hazán, whom the Cadí has managed to outwit.⁶⁰ Both are in love with the Christian woman and understand that, as the beautiful Christian enters into the Cadí’s control, only extreme means will allow them access to her: “aunque vieron que por aquel camino no conseguían su deseo, hubieron de pasar por el parecer del cadí, formando y criando cada uno allá en su ánimo una esperanza que, aunque dudosa, les prometía poder llegar al fin de sus encendidos deseos” (532).

Moreover, Leonisa is in Halima’s constant care, meaning that the Cadí, while technically possessing her, is unable to see her alone the way that Ricardo can. Also, the reader has been previously reminded of Leonisa’s final destination, the sultan’s harem, from which she can no longer be retrieved. As the Cadí reminds his wife, “pues sabéis que, en llegando a poder del Gran Señor, la han de encerrar en el serrallo y volverla turca, quiera o no quiera” (539). It is Ricardo, however, that manages to find the “esperanza” before them, as he is invited into the very space

⁵⁹ This assertion is even more significant in light of the fact that Ricardo does all this despite being a captive within the power of his masters. Steven Hutchinson highlights this situation’s importance: “Estar en el tiránico poder de otro es, por supuesto, el problema fundamental de los cautivos” (*Andar en almoneda* 246).

⁶⁰ Francisco J. Sánchez explains how the reader’s first view of Leonisa entails an opposition between owning and seeing her: “Pero ella es desde la perspectiva de la recepción y no, así, de su ofrecimiento a la mirada, pues la mano del judío nos indica que la transacción ejecutada sobre la figura es realizada por dinero, por valor de cambio. Esta aparente oposición entre ofrecimiento a la mirada y su recepción da pie al episodio [sic]... en el que Alí y Hazán se disputan la joya por los dos mil escudos que el judío pide” (88). Ricardo, obviously, after having an exclusive visual access to her, later possesses her as well.

that is forbidden to Alí and Hazán. Seeing Leonisa alone is thus a privilege that, through cunning and false pretenses, Ricardo is able to enjoy despite Ottoman authority.

Ricardo, thus, has managed to enter into a space where men are generally prohibited, where he sees the forbidden woman; indeed, it is a space that would have been impossible for him to enter previously as the undesirable Sicilian suitor at home. The scene, as with *Tirant*, is enhanced by the brief tension when Ricardo gazes upon her before she sees him. This is an echo of the fact that he has already learned of her presence in Cyprus while his ally Mahamut has convinced her that Ricardo died of sickness. At both levels, Ricardo asserts power in gazing/knowing her while he is unseen, again resembling the panopticon. This power, however, is at the same time unsettling: Ricardo sneaking into a woman's inner space echoes the disruptive narrative plots where young men sneak into women's bedrooms in works like *La Celestina*, upholding Western superiority while, at the same time, normalizing the breach of female enclosure to Spain, and therein disrupting Spain's dominant sexual norms.

Superficially, then, Ricardo's invasion of the harem is an assertion of power against the Ottoman patriarchy, and over Leonisa as a woman. Yet both of these, upon further examination, are limited, as Cervantes demonstrates the limits of Ricardo's power as a subject of the Spanish Crown. Ricardo's defiance of sexual norms *dos not* take place in the heart of the Ottoman Empire, in Constantinople, but rather in Cyprus. In *La gran sultana*, we shall see that Spanish characters are able to invade the harem and escape (as does Madrigal with his musicians in the final act), and help others evade punishment (as Catalina does with the Transylvanian captives in the same act) in Constantinople. However, in *El amante*, Cervantes seemed to think that Sicilians doing the same would have been less plausible. Rather, the threat of Constantinople continuously looms as an inescapable point of no return. The various Ottomans as well as Ricardo must act

before they lose Leonisa permanently to the Grand Turk. In Ricardo's case, the consequences are even higher, as he must also secure his own means for freedom by seizing a galley and returning home to Sicily.

Ricardo is best contrasted with the sole Spanish name in the novela, Charles V (under whom Ricardo's father served), who defeated the Turkish fleet in Tunis. The presence of the Spanish monarch highlights the Sicilian's general lack of power within the novela, as well as the fact that this is the only *novela* without any Spanish characters. While the King was victorious, Ricardo's brief skirmish with the Ottomans results in his capture and near death; later, during the decisive battle, he hides as the Ottoman renegades turn on one another. Thomson-Weightman claims that "though Leonisa and Ricardo are from Sicily, they are treated as if they were Spaniards" (62). I contend otherwise. For Cervantes, while Ricardo is able to escape in the contested border space of the Mediterranean, Constantinople was inescapable and invincible for non-Spanish characters, as the beleaguered Sicilians are tossed about by vicissitudes. Ricardo's limited agency (emphasized as he helplessly observes the ruins of Cyprus at the beginning) inevitably contrasts with, and points to, the great Spanish victory of the Battle of Lepanto,⁶¹ which is here presaged in the Spanish victory at Tunis.⁶² As we will see, Ricardo's victory is dwarfed by the Spanish agency and ingenuity that entails resisting and inverting the Ottoman systems to their own ends in our next Cervantine work.

⁶¹ Elizabeth Teresa Howe observes that the novela's "setting does allow Cervantes to explore the exoticism associated with the Turks while also addressing the clash of Christianity and Islam which took place with the fall of Cyprus in 1570. First, as noted, this historical event provided a direct link to the formation of the Holy League and the battle at Lepanto a year later. Next, anticipation of that very event could assure readers of the novela of the eventual triumph of the Christian characters over their captives and their return to their own land" (116). Lepanto, then, would have been present in the minds of the readers.

⁶² Though, we must acknowledge that, after Charles V's victory in 1535, the city fell to the Ottomans in 1569, before being recovered after the Battle of Lepanto in 1571, only to fall to the Ottoman's again in 1574. Regardless, Cervantes contrasts Ricardo's vicissitudes with the Spanish victory; at the same time, a subtler reading also acknowledges that the reference to Tunis undermines Spanish hegemony by recalling its loss.

La gran sultana (1615)

Despite being published just two years later⁶³ after *El amante liberal*, *La gran sultana* adopts a different perspective of Constantinople. Published in 1615 along with seven other *comedias* as part of Cervantes's *Ocho comedias y Ocho entremeses*, "Cervantes wrote this play for immediate publishing and supervised the publication of it" (McCoy 254-55). The work demonstrates a sort of Spanish triumphal imperialism after Lepanto, which, while the Ottoman Empire remained a naval power in the Mediterranean, was generally understood by the Spanish as marking a turning point in Turkish fortunes. However, "el Imperio Otomano no se derrumbó de golpe tal como imaginaba o quizás deseaba con ansia Cervantes" (Önalp 324).

In 1606, Spain and the Ottomans signed the treaty of Sirvatorok, nine years before the play was published in Cervantes' *Ocho comedias*. Spain shifted its focus to the war in the Netherlands and North African piracy. Joaquín Casaldueiro notes "está expresando Cervantes un sentimiento compartido: el anhelo de terminar con las guerras intestinas [referring to the on-going conflict in the Netherlands]. Era el sentimiento de toda Europa" (142). Carolyn Morrow notes, "*La gran sultana* señala una menor atención de parte del gobierno español al teatro mediterráneo" (486). In Cervantes's case, however, I argue that it is rather a revised strategy that asserts Spanish hegemony through non-military means.

While, as Luciano García Lorenzo points out,⁶⁴ Cervantes does portray elements of his own captivity in Algiers in the play, it is important to remember that Cervantes never set foot in Constantinople. The play is entirely set in Constantinople, however, and largely set in the harem,

⁶³ Recalling that Rosa Navarro Duran suggests that *El amante* was written around 1599, the texts also seem to have been written within a decade of each other. *La gran sultana* was written between 1607-08, roughly the time that a Persian embassy visited Spain.

⁶⁴ "Cervantes, Constantinopla y *La gran sultana*."

while, in *El amante*, the harem represents Leonisa at her most guarded state. This marks a difference within Cervantes's epistemology, both of how the author viewed Constantinople v. Algiers, but also how he viewed the Spanish v. the border states that were frequently harassed by the Ottoman Empire.

The main action of the play focuses on the titular Great Sultanes, Catalina de Oviedo. The sultan Amurates falls for the captive Spanish woman in his harem, and proposes to marry her, breaking all convention. However, unknown to her, she is not the only Christian in the harem. Lamberto, a young Transylvanian noble, has arranged his own capture and sale into the harem to reunite with Clara. To disguise themselves, Lamberto dresses as the woman Zelinda, and Clara as Zaida. Their story unfolds as a secondary strand while Catalina deliberates the sultan's proposal, torn between martyrdom and marriage, and, in the third act, suffering the misguided reproach of her long-lost father. However, in the end she agrees to marry, provided that she can maintain her name, dress and faith. This union is briefly challenged as the sultan's religious counselor, the *cadí*, urges him to focus on conceiving an heir first. Reluctantly, the sultan brings Lamberto to his chamber, and finally discovers Lamberto's true sex. Threatened with death, Lamberto explains that he miraculously changed sexes, and, as Catalina pressures her husband the sultan with feigned jealousy, the Transylvanian couple gain their freedom.

Previous critics have considered how Cervantes handles the harem. Anne Cruz argues that it acts as a site of female agency that "The space within this architectural framework is effectively a 'counter-site' where women can contest some of the prevailing masculine views of the harem" ("Inside harem walls" 246). Jessica Boll argues that the harem serves as a site of tolerance that acts "to deny exclusive nationalist Spanish discourse and promote a hybrid, world subject, concluding with nothing less than the promise of a triumphant *otomano español*" (145). I

argue that, alongside these readings, the harem is also deconstructed, bereft of its enclosing and erotic qualities as Cervantes breaks through the walls that confine it, and shifts the harem from a place of sexual impropriety to, rather, a place of procreation and submission to the state. This prepares it as a site to affirm the dominant vision of an imperial Spain under Catalina, cast as an exemplary Spanish woman. By sacrificing her individual sexual autonomy and submitting to the Sultan's advances, she both protects the Christians around her and brings Constantinople into Spanish imperial discourse as a potential colony. Her example offers a foil for the other two heterosexual couples in the play who follow the "leyes de gusto."⁶⁵ The text uses these pairings to reduce the erotic potential of the Orient, converting it from a place that combines both fear and titillation as we've seen above, to a knowable place where the dominant vision of a sexually-regulated Spain can take root. Here, the text overwrites the discourse of separation between Christian and Muslim that we've seen in our previous works with, rather, one of colonizing through commingling.

The first of these couples includes Madrigal, the play's picaresque gracioso. His relationship is the only sexual encounter with an exotic Muslim beauty. However, she never appears on stage, and her absence highlights the complete lack of any Muslim women in the work.⁶⁶ Despite being the only Muslim woman, she does not appear in the harem. The harem is thus divorced from its exoticism. Also, the fantasy itself is less lascivious than we have seen in our previous texts. We are not treated to any voyeuristic contemplation of her beauty; rather the scene is referenced as Madrigal is on the verge of being drowned in the sea for punishment,

⁶⁵ "El joven [Lamberto] sigue, como Madrigal, las 'leyes del gusto'; y tiene la suficiente voluntad como para perder 'respetos' (el tema de la honra no aparece en la comedia) y 'miedos', lanzándose con Clara entre las tenebrosas sombras de la noche, en una huida cuyo único fin es el de 'cumplir su gusto'" (Jurado Santos 52).

⁶⁶ As Connor notes: "Los personajes característicos de los habitantes femeninos del harén son todos cautivos cristianos no se menciona a ninguna concubina mahometana" (513).

foregrounding any eroticism with its consequences. His liaison is only referred to, and never portrayed, and it is not the culmination of a sustained persistence, as with our previous men.

In addition to divorcing Oriental women from their stereotypical place in the harem, Cervantes also inverts the harem itself. Lamberto does not connive his way into the harem to gain access to multiple forbidden Oriental women (although the plurality of women is highlighted in the voyeuristic encounters of Tirant and Pedro; even in Ricardo's case, his first encounter with Leonisa is only possible because of the added interest of Halima), but it is rather to be with the same woman with whom he had previously eloped in Transylvania. The promise of seeing exotic beauty is again deflated, as no other women are shown on stage (barring the inaccessible Doña Catalina). More importantly, in contrast to a tantalizing place of forbidden, exotic beauty that awaits Western invasion, the harem here becomes a prison. While Lamberto, like our previous protagonists, has used artifice to enter the harem, he has had to dress as a woman to do so, effeminizing himself,⁶⁷ as Cervantes risks a possible comic reception.⁶⁸

After getting Clara pregnant—making good, in essence, on his original plan to run off with her rather than wait for a wedding—his pursuit of erotic desire collapses and becomes his own condemnation. He despairs:

¿Yo varón, y en el serrallo
del Gran Turco? No imagino
traza, remedio o camino
a este mal (513).

This is a sentiment that his love Clara echoes:

⁶⁷ It is helpful to recall how, during our text's time, effeminate dress was a marker for homosexuality. Rico-Ferrer explains how authors of the time defined masculinity: "Men have to be diligent to use appropriate words when women are present, but also not to resemble them, for example in their gait. . . which illustrates the dangers of effeminization; seen as the counterpoint to excessive masculinity, effeminacy is placed in a continuum where the male has to find the middle ground for a successful masculine performance. The dangers are specifically addressed when warning about male dressers using clothes resembling women's" (278).

⁶⁸ "Podríamos pensar en una parte del público, seguramente machista, soltando la carcajada ante este hombre 'ridículo'" (Jurado Santos 64).

Ningún cohecho es bastante
que a las guardas enterezca,
ni remedio que se ofrezca
que el morir no esté delante (514).

The harem is drained of all the eroticism and titillation that we have seen previously and, instead, becomes a place where the captives await death.

The text shows that Spanish anxieties cut both ways—while penetrating the harem provides constant preoccupation at home, it becomes a means to assert Spanish superiority abroad, as the text demonstrates. The scene neutralizes the familiar sense of triumph as the Christian enters the harem by evoking a sense of anxiety about women at home, as the text punishes the couple for violating the Tridentine rulings on marriage. Lamberto's success in entering the enclosed space is preceded by his success at defying Europe's norms. This redirects an assertion of hegemony back to Spain, as Cervantes clearly links the penetration of the harem to Spanish anxieties over enclosing women at home. Connor insightfully writes that Clara “es más semejante a las damas de comedias de capa y espada situadas en España. Vive encerrada por las costumbres de una sociedad patriarcal, aunque en vez de estar enclaustrada en la casa de su padre español [in reality, Transylvanian] vive encarcelada por el sultán” (514). However, she actually *was* previously enclosed by her Transylvanian father, prior to eloping with Lamberto. As with our previous texts, our play answers the question, what do women do when they are alone? They meet with their forbidden lovers. However, as with the adulterous Greek Halima in *El amante*, the author distances Spain from the anxiety over enclosing women by projecting it onto Transylvanians, which, for Casaldueiro, along with “sus pájaros y sus elefantes, sitúa para el público de la época lo univeral en la zona de la imaginación” (141). Catalina, in contrast to both of these, submits her sexuality to the achieve the dominant vision of a Spain that colonizes the harem.

At the same time, while Cervantes deflates the harem's eroticism, he nonetheless insists on its penetration, asserting Spanish superiority. Jessica Boll's analysis is helpful here. "The meaning of the harem is negotiated in *La gran sultana* by the multiple transgressive acts that take place within its walls" (*Violating the harem* 141). The critic offers three examples: "conventional signification is manipulated first and foremost by the introduction of a man, Lamberto, into the feminine space," (141); "The immense power granted to Catalina by the Grand Turk also disrupts the established hierarchy [*sic*] of the harem and changes the dynamic by destabilizing traditional authority" (143); and last, "the inclusion of Spanish song and dance likewise disrupts the spatial meaning of not only the harem but of the entire palace" (144).

Before dwelling more on the last point, it is worth noting that the very design of the play invites the audience to trespass into the intimate space of the harem. The prologue consists of a conversation between Roberto and his long lost renegade friend Salec as both watch the Sultan's imperial procession. Both characters are never seen within the three threads of the plot, but do reappear in the end as an epilogue. Rather than characters or agents within the play, they are closer to witnesses or audience members (rather than agents) and are limited to observing. This draws attention to the audience's own voyeuristic participation in the play's action. Hernández Araico explains how the prologue forms a window that frames the action within the text.⁶⁹ The voyeuristic, transgressive quality is highlighted by the prologue, which Hernández Araico explains: "el prólogo enmarca vistas lejanas exteriores que aclaran la vaguedad inquietante producida en la conjunción de diversos ámbitos interiores" (180).⁷⁰ This continues in the next

⁶⁹ While the critic refers to a specific production that used a physical window, her analysis is nonetheless valid for our text, despite the lack of mention of a window.

⁷⁰ This element was highlighted in the first actual production of the play in 1992: "la reciente producción de *La gran sultana* coloca la escena inicial de Roberto y Salec en una ventana, signo icónico del perspectivismo cervantino" (Hernández Araico 179).

scene, as the audience shifts from becoming spectators of the parade to voyeurs in the harem, which Hernández Araico points out: “La ventana inicial apunta hacia el eunuco del serrallo para buscar a la bella cautiva Clara. Por tal entrada surrepticia, [sic] el espectador en vez se topa con Catalina de Oviedo, de quien la ventana introductoria no ha revelado nada” (183). In this way, Cervantes emphasizes the audience’s participation in voyeuring the harem.⁷¹

The audience’s viewing of the harem foregrounds the complete collapse of the harem as an Ottoman, female homosocial space at the end of the play. During the final scene, the harem serves as the setting for Dona Catalina’s dance and the performance of Spanish music. Boll explains that “the unanticipated Spanish elements of dance and costume upset the space and destabilize traditional signification” (“Violating the harem” 144). Spanish culture invades even the most protected, intimate space of the harem, collapsing it from an erotic, voyeuristic space into a symbol of Spanish victory.

This has given rise to an idealized view of how Cervantes imagined the Ottoman Empire. Boll contends that “Spatial depiction in the text thus serves as a tool to deny exclusive nationalist Spanish discourse and promote a hybrid, world subject, concluding with nothing less than the

⁷¹ Boll reminds us that a “voyeuristic method of expression goes precisely against the core of the Islamic emphasis on female privacy” (*Tale of a City* 54). In lieu of a single European transgressing the forbidden space, Cervantes draws the entirety of the audience in.

promise of a triumphant otomano español” (145). Many critics are of the same mind, such as Morrow⁷², McGaha⁷³, McCoy,⁷⁴ Castillo⁷⁵ and Jurado Santos.⁷⁶

Certainly, the work does indeed present a much more human, nuanced view of the Orient than is usual for Spain at the time. Yet Díez Fernando argues that “es difícil datar la moderna idea de tolerancia, por lo que, tanto por lo atractivo de la idea en sí misma, como por la revisión constante del pasado” (302).⁷⁷ I agree; there is a difference between making a plea for tolerance in Spain and outside of it—especially when the beneficiaries of tolerance (as is the case here) are Spaniards and Europeans. The play’s plot consists entirely of the Ottomans ceding power—allowing Catalina to preserve aspects of her identity, elevating Lamberto to Bajá of Rhodes, and pardoning Madrigal’s peccadillo.

Catalina’s submission of her sexuality to the state begins to take shape with her performance of Spanishness in the Ottoman Empire’s very center of political power, as the text shifts from a representation of Orientalness with the procession at the beginning of the text, to a finale of Spanish song and dance in the music. The audience would have noted the importance of Catalina’s dance while she preserves her own garb and her own name. Catalina’s surname, de Oviedo, alludes to old Christendom. Emilio Sola compares her in passing to another great

⁷² “El ‘otomano español’ que va a nacer de la unión de Catalina y el Gran Turco sugiere la hipótesis de hibridación intercultural que ofrece Néstor García Canclini, la reconstitución de las identidades étnicas, regionales y nacionales en los sitios donde se cruzan lenguas, etnias, geografías y culturas” (486).

⁷³ “El éxito en esta vida no consiste en triunfar sobre el prójimo sino en aprender a vivir en paz y armonía con él. Y eso exige el sacrificio del egoísmo y la aceptación de avenencias, componendas, y términos medios, es decir, la tolerancia de la etnicidad cultural ajena. Este es el mensaje radical y subversivo de *La gran sultana*, obra muy adelantada a su tiempo, y tal vez, al nuestro también” (229).

⁷⁴ “This ambivalent amalgam of transreligious and even transracial characters...” (254).

⁷⁵ “Y es que es la hibridez que se da en Constantinopla o en Argel la que rompe momentáneamente las fronteras entre cristiano y moro” (224).

⁷⁶ “la comedia presenta la posibilidad de «integrar» dos culturas enemigas, como intento demostrar en este trabajo” (2).

⁷⁷ His article “Sin discrepar de la verdad un punto: ‘La Gran Sultana’: ¿Un canto a la tolerancia?” looks at intolerance on both the part of Christians (Madrigal’s lack of punishment after tormenting the Jews as well as the ingenuous portrayal of the Cadí) and Muslims.

austuriano, Pelayo de Covadonga, who won the first battle of the *Reconquista*.⁷⁸ “una doña Catalina de Oviedo, con un valor simbólico tan complejo y profundo, si no más, que Pelayo de Covadonga—dos maneras de enfrentarse al infiel, de alguna manera... la otra mujer proclive al mestizaje, pacificadora legendario-literaria” (347).

Moreover, Catalina’s performance is a reflection of the Morisco decrees. Javier Irigoyen García writes that in 1567, Felipe II issued “five decrees, each prohibiting, respectively, the use of Morisco clothing, dances and celebrations, bathhouses, slaves, and Arabic” (*Moors Dressed as Moors*, 110). Clothing, musical instruments⁷⁹ and dance as cultural markers pointed to the military victory in Granada, demonstrating the strong link between cultural representation and the larger political struggle between Islam and Christianity. Catalina’s Christian dress inverts the Morisco dress laws in Spain.⁸⁰ Whether it is a critique of these policies or not, Catalina has certainly earned the liberty to wear clothing that reflects her identity, potentially making her the same threat to Turkish hegemony that the Moriscos were to the Spanish.

Moreover, the scene of her dance includes the distinctly Spanish guitars⁸¹ which contrast with the *chirimías* used elsewhere. The musicians are Spanish and, while they do dress “como cautivos” (534), it comes after a discussion where Rustán argues that

A dar lugar el tiempo, mejor fuera
que fueran como libres,
con plumas y con galas,

⁷⁸ At the beginning of Alfonso X’s *Primera crónica general de España*, the author reminds us of this battle’s setting: “en la cueva de onga, que es en Asturias de Oviedo” (321). Catalina’s name thus references the Reconquista now extended into Constantinople.

⁷⁹ Charles V’s 1526 proclamation prohibited “the use of the Arabic language, bathhouses, musical instruments, burials, and any practice perceived as being related to Regarding clothing” (106). The 1567 decree was announced in Granada, January 1st, 1567, intended “in all likelihood to coincide with the anniversary of the Christian taking of Granada and to make a more dramatic connection between the decree and the celebration of the victory over Islam” (Irigoyen García, *Moors Dressed as Moors* 106).

⁸⁰ “As the guarantees of religious and cultural protection offered the Moors at Granada were abandoned over the course of the sixteenth century, the repression of the Moriscos increasingly targeted their clothing” (Fuchs, *Exotic Nation* 70).

⁸¹ “MADRIGAL traiga unas sonajas, y los demás sus guitarras” (535).

representando al vivo
los saraos que en España se acostumbran (530).

Perhaps respecting Cervantes's desire for verisimilitude, Mamí argues, "No te metas en eso, / pues ves que no es posible" (530). Finally, Catalina's dance itself is a declaration of nationality, as Madrigal asserts: "no hay mujer española que no salga / del vientre de su madre bailadora" (537).

We have an enactment of Spanishness that asserts the ability to engage in various rituals in Constantinople that were forbidden for Moriscos in Spain. Such representations of identity in foreign spaces were often symbols of conquest in the New World and emphasize how, as Barbara Fuchs notes in *Mimesis and Empire*, "different sets of confrontations overlap, as the Atlantic flows into the Mediterranean" (6).⁸² While less familiar than the Christian images that Cortes hangs in Aztec temples or the crosses that placate the Spanish at the end of Cabeza de Vaca's account, Catalina's performance and the sultan's accompanying praise ("Paso, bien mío, no más, / porque me llevas el alma / tras cada paso que das" (546)) indicate, at least, a cultural hegemony.

Moreover, Cervantes subtly inserts the New World into his work, as Madrigal asks for 30 escudos to buy:

un papagayo elegante
que un indio trae a vender.
De las Indias del Poniente,
el pájaro sin segundo
viene a enseñar suficiente
a la ignorante del mundo
sabia y rica y pobre gente (549).

⁸² Barbara Fuchs argues later that, in *La gran sultana*, "the vision of an aggressively inclusive Ottoman world reads as an oblique reproach and a potent reminder of the political and military costs of religious authenticity and enforced transparency" (*Passing for Spain* 86). Certainly, in reducing Spanishness to performance as Catalina does, we can see "a challenge to the enterprise of national consolidation according to essentialized hierarchies" (30). Yet, at the same time, we must take into account as well that fantasies of reconquering Constantinople were long entertained in Spain, (as texts like *Tirant* shows), and persisted well into Cervantes's lifetime, as we see in Lope de Vega's *La Santa Liga*. As we shall see below, the text seems to angle this inclusivity into a discourse of dominance.

Francisco López Estrada argues that the scene “ilustra sobre esta concepción de la universalidad de este español que fue Miguel de Cervantes, dispuesto a jugar ante los espectadores con las mayores oposiciones geográficas y su soporte cultural” (35). The parrot puts Constantinople into play with the Americas, placing Spain at the center of two geographic poles: the furthest reaches of the Mediterranean and those of the Atlantic.

I argue that this permits a subtle, colonial read of the texts,⁸³ in which Cervantes casts Constantinople as a potential colony relying on a genealogical discourse that plays off of both *limpieza de sangre* in Spain and mestizaje in the Americas. Through submitting her sexuality to the Spanish state, Catalina, and (thanks to her) Lamberto and Clara, are given positions of power as well as the immediate promise of offspring. They are now permanent parts of the Ottoman power structure, in contrast to the byzantine adventures of Leonisa and Ricardo, for whom Constantinople represents a final, inescapable doom.

Yet Catalina’s submission has further implications as well. Catalina’s pregnancy has been interpreted as being a bold statement that questions *limpieza de sangre* in Spain by McCoy,⁸⁴

⁸³ Hernández Araico also notes a symbolism in the year of the play’s first production, 1992. While not directly indicative of Cervantes’s attitude, it is striking that the work would be inaugurated the same year that Spain was embroiled in discussions of its imperial past:

Acertada selección esta comedia para estrenarse por fin en 1992. En este “año emblemático,” como lo llama el adaptador Cuenca (Boletín, s. p.), en realidad problemático para España, como chivo expiatorio de las potencias colonialistas, felizmente la Compañía Nacional se decide por esta comedia cervantina “a la turca,” de ambiente lejanamente exótico que constituye un mundo políglota [*sic*], multicultural, de inquietantes ambigüedades posmodernas. En un año cuando el imperialismo capitalista maneja los medios de comunicación para enfocar los fuertes ataques de anticolonialismo exclusivamente en la conquista española de América ¡¿qué mejor respuesta escénica que el lúdico multiperspectivismo técnico e ideológico de una comedia de Cervantes “nunca antes representada?!” (163)

⁸⁴ “Moreover, Cervantes seems to express through the Sultan his opposition to the concept of *limpieza de sangre*. In the Sultan’s eyes (and in Cervantes’ words), this child will be superior because of his dual heritage—Catalina and the Sultan have made an ‘otomano español’, or perhaps it could be understood to be an ‘español otomano’ (II, 1217)” (254).

Boll⁸⁵ and Mariscal.⁸⁶ Certainly, Cervantes showed no qualms about marriage between an Algerian Zoraida and a Christian soldier as the captive's tale in *Don Quijote* demonstrates.⁸⁷ However, Cervantes's attitude toward the *moros* and *moriscos* should not be conflated with how he felt about Ottomans—as we have seen in *El amante liberal*, Cervantes goes to considerable lengths to prevent his Sicilians from marrying anyone Turkish. Moreover, an intermarriage that contravenes *limpieza de sangre* in Constantinople is inevitably different from one that occurs in Spain. It is perhaps for this reason that McCoy⁸⁸ and Sola⁸⁹ cannot help but use the term *mestizaje* for Catalina's pregnancy, while Mariscal asks without answering “How did this maneuver relate to another ‘mixed race’ of people being reproduced on the other side of the Atlantic?” (202). Such maneuvers underscore the text's unexpectedly colonial dynamics.

Indeed, there are many striking parallels between *mestizaje* as a colonizing mechanism and the work itself. Mauricio Tenorio writes that the Spanish took advantage of existing noble lineages among indigenous people,⁹⁰ much in the way that Catalina appropriates the power of the sultan's lineage to sire a child who will be an “otomano español.” Laura Catelli, in her analysis of *mestizaje* in the colony La Española arrives at two important justifications for marriage between Christians and locals: reforming Taino sexual norms⁹¹ and evangelization.⁹² Catalina's

⁸⁵ “Catalina's incarnation of religious hybridity, symbolized most deeply by her unborn child, presents a counterargument to Inquisition Spanish dogma” (*Tale of a City* 251).

⁸⁶ “I agree that Cervantes is one of the few Spanish writers of his time to interrogate the blood-based and patriarchal values that inform the comedia” (188).

⁸⁷ Here, he conscientiously punishes the same pairing between Madrigal and his *alárabe*, as both are threatened with death.

⁸⁸ “this work creates an environment of *mestizaje*, of old Christian lineage bound with an intrinsically and increasingly heterogeneous eastern Mediterranean empire” (254).

⁸⁹ Catalina is a “mujer proclive al *mestizaje*, pacificadora legendario-literaria” (347).

⁹⁰ “When the Spaniards, as a matter of necessity, reconstructed the surviving Indian nobility, they preserved old linajes, old ways of making sense of promiscuity” (175).

⁹¹ “Efectivamente, el matrimonio entre ‘indios’ parecía representar para la Corona, a juzgar por su insistencia en la propagación de tal institución, una vía para inducir la conversión, las prácticas sexuales consideradas aceptables como la monogamia, el modelo familiar patriarcal, los comportamientos moralmente aceptables” (228).

⁹² “El matrimonio, en tanto institución religiosa, se convierte en una institución evangelizadora” (233).

jealousy (feigned or otherwise) toward Zelinda/Lamberto after the sultan chooses her as a lover is an assertion of European marriage against Oriental polygamy, as is the couple's marriage. Similarly, while Díez Fernández wonders (316) what religious values the future child will have, Catalina redirects the anxieties of *converso women* contaminating *limpieza de sangre*,⁹³ turning it into a weapon that will weaken the Muslim bent of the Ottoman lineage.⁹⁴ Moreover, the insertion of Spanish blood into Ottoman society places it within Spanish hierarchy; as Catelli mentions was the case in the New World, extending the reach of *limpieza de sangre* legitimized the place of the Spanish at the head of colonial hierarchies.⁹⁵

Cervantes's maneuver here reproduces the same socio-economic marginalization that occurred among the Moriscos.⁹⁶ Like the question of enclosing women, this too cuts both ways, representing anxiety at home, yet also a tool for asserting superiority abroad. None of this should be read as negating a tolerant reading of Cervantes's corpus—rather, it is a nuance of Cervantine tolerance; that is, how and to what extent the Muslim Other would participate in Cervantes's ideal society. This contrasts with the discourse of separation that we've seen in earlier texts, where intermarriage was punished or avoided. The harem takes on traits that we will see in the

⁹³ "Various authors of Spain's Golden Age of literature wrote that Old Christian infants raised on the milk of conversas would judaize, and popular belief similarly held that even if pure by the four corners, children who were raised and suckled by morisca wet nurses would be Islamized (amoriscados). Once infected, these children were permanently marked" (Martínez 55).

⁹⁴ Barbara Fuchs observes a complementary movement in her analysis of Felipe Guzman Poma de Ayala's *Nueva corónica i buen gobierno*, where *limpieza de sangre* is used to resist imperial discourse, as he "ably translates the Spanish preoccupation with class, honor, and 'clean' blood to an Andean context. His account of himself as a subject adapts Spanish notions of racial purity to the New World, first, to enhance his own authority and, second, to argue for a radical separation of the colonizer from the colonized" (*Mimesis and Empire*, 85).

⁹⁵ "Se trata de una estrategia astuta, ya que ese margen, al mismo tiempo, es el sitio discursivo desde el cual se construye la diferencia criolla, la pureza de sangre en una sociedad de castas, que sirve para legitimar [*sic*] su posición [*sic*] en el tope de la pirámide social" (Catelli 252).

⁹⁶ "By prohibiting Moriscos from wearing luxurious items and thus negating the class distinctions that also existed within the Morisco community, Philip II's decree implicitly advocated that all Moriscos be considered as members either of the same lower social class (regardless of their actual socio-economic standing), or of the same group of heretics who had been condemned by the Inquisition as inhábiles (even if they were never formally condemned by the Inquisition)" (Irigoyen-García, *Moors Dressed as Moors* 112).

next chapter on male homosociality, as it becomes a colonizing space, thanks to Catalina's submissive sexuality.

El Conde Partinuplés (1653)

Lauded as “la décima musa” (Urban Baños 385), Ana María Caro de Mallén de Torres (1600-1652) was born a slave in Granada prior to being adopted by a noble family, the Caro Mallén. Hindered by her *morisca* origins, she was unable to marry. As a playwright, she won several awards, was friends with María de Zayas, and also was charged with chronicling local events reporting news from the colonies (García-Martín 71-74).

The present work is based on the 12th-century French *Román de Partonopelus de Blois*, present in translation in Spain starting in 1513, and going through several different versions. According to Delgado (152), Ana Caro is the only playwright to take her plot from the original. De Armas suggests that the work was first performed around 1637 (“Ecos y reescrituras”). The play was published in 1653 in *Laurel de Comedias*, and was represented “con éxito en los escenarios” (Escabias 483). The plot is a gender-swapped retelling of the myth of Psyche and Eros. Rosaura, empress of Byzantine Constantinople, is pressured by her subjects to accept a suitor and marry to have an heir. She is hesitant, though, recalling an astrological prophecy revealed to her father after her mother died in childbirth. The prophecy foretells the destruction of her empire coming as a result of her marriage. With the help of her cousin the sorceress Aldora, Rosaura briefly views each of the three suitors, plus another, the Count of Partinuplés. She falls for him instantly, even though he is pondering the image of his fiancée, Lisbella, daughter of the king of France. Aldora magically sends a crate bearing a portrait of Rosaura that washes ashore in France. When it is brought to him while hunting, the count falls for the mysterious beauty instantly.

He then catches sight of a mysterious beast, and follows it far from the group with his servant, the play's *gracioso*, Gaulín. The two are caught in a storm, and take shelter in a boat that magically conveys them to the Byzantine Empire, where they find a castle. Inside, the count feasts and is entertained with music, and Rosaura explains that, though she loves him, he cannot see her. The Count soon falls for her, but, as England invades France, returns home to save the day after promising to come back to the castle. When he does, however, Rosaura falls asleep as he recounts his feats, and, spurred by his servant, he gives into temptation and fetches a light to see her. She is enraged, and orders his execution, but Aldora saves his life, and arranges for him to enter as a mysterious candidate into the tournament for Rosaura's hand. Lisbella interrupts with an army, coming to rescue the Count. Rosaura defuses the situation, and invites her to the wedding. The tourney then commences, and the Count wins. Rosaura agrees to marry him, and the Count marries Lisbella off to the martial Roberto of Transylvania, as the studious Eduardo of Scotland asks Aldora's hand, and the vain Federico is offered the hand of Roberto's sister.

Critics have observed a series of reversals of proscribed gender norms in the work.⁹⁷ This includes those who show that Partinuplés is given feminine traits while Rosaura is made more masculine. Pérez Romero notes, for instance, that, “Caro nos muestra a un conde enclenque, lánguido, titubeante, de sentimientos desbordados, y a una Rosaura modelo de vitalidad física, energía moral, intrepidez y sentido común” (340). Ellis argues similarly that, “His curiosity displays what is traditionally thought of as a feminine weakness, as Rosaura had earlier acknowledged speaking of herself” (23). In this section, I argue that an additional reversal takes

⁹⁷ Camino notes, for instance the reversal of the hunting metaphor typically used to represent the erotic chase. Partinuplés pursues the mysterious beast until she becomes the woman from the portrait, and we remember that in fact it is Rosaura who hunts Partinuplés “This scenario creates a sense of reciprocity in the relationship of hunted and hunter, normally embedded in strict gender constraints at this time. Caro's presentation of the hunt and the portrait effectively reverses subject and object, thereby renegotiating the relationship between man and woman” (207).

place in the deployment of homosocial spaces, where Rosaura becomes the voyeur in the harem, mobilizing the heterotopia to challenge its previous, androcentric visions of Spain.

Female homosociality and the male harem

Aldora and Rosaura overcome and appropriate the confinement of the Oriental patriarchy. While we delve further into this in the next chapter, this is particularly evident as they evoke and subvert the harem, as the women become the keepers of their enclosed men. They request a two-year delay so that Rosaura can pick the best possible mate, where, importantly, she seizes control of the voyeuristic gaze to which she is initially subjected. What follows is, as Juan Pablo Gil-Oslé observes, a gender-swapped version of the judgement of Paris, where Rosaura chooses between various suitors (*El examen* 177). Certainly, the basic dynamics are here. Just as Paris is wooed by Venus, Athena and Hera, Rosaura is confronted by the studious Eduardo of Scotland and England, “príncipe noble, / sabio, ingenioso y discreto, / filósofo y judiciario,” the valiant Roberto of Transylvania, “de limpio acero / adorna el pecho gallardo,” and the handsome Federico of Poland, with “las perfecciones / del bizarro, airoso cuerpo.” This scene is Caro’s own addition to the original chivalric tale, and features the voyeurism/vigilance, enclosure, and eroticism that have defined the harem heterotopia in our previous works.⁹⁸

However, while Paris converses with each of the goddesses, Rosaura sees them unobserved, thanks to Aldora’s magic. The scene thus acquires a voyeuristic element that foregrounds the importance of how Rosaura evades the Count’s vision. Rosaura explains to her cousin:

Quisiera yo, prima mía
ver y conocer primero
estos caballeros que

⁹⁸ “Nueva invención que Ana Caro introduce en su obra, y que dará lugar a nuevas escenas que girarán en torno al personaje de Rosaura, lo que le conferirá mayor protagonismo” (Urban Baños 391).

mis vasallos me han propuesto,
y si de alguno me agrada
el arte, presencia e ingenio,
saberle la condición,
y verle el alma hacia dentro. (174-75)

She wishes to see them, and see into their souls. Aldora, however, explains that she can only show their appearances:

Discretamente discurre;
mas es imposible intento
penetrar los corazones
y del alma los secretos.
Lo más que hoy puedo hacer
por ti, pues sabes mi ingenio
en cuanto a la mágica arte,
es enseñarte primero,
en aparentes personas,
estos príncipes propuestos (175).

Soufas writes, “What Aldora is able to do is reverse the pattern of the male gaze and its female object. The men to be considered by Rosaura are objects of her scrutiny and vision in the scene that Aldora summons for her” (51). The men, at least momentarily, are reduced to their physical appearance, or beauty, as Rosaura endeavors to make sense of their actions. She has exclusive access to a variety of available men evoking, again, the dynamics of a gender-swapped harem.

The voyeurism is justified both by the larger questions of controlling and regulating men as well as a personal, erotic motive, as with our previous harems. The scene doubles both as an evaluation of each suitor as a partner, but also as a political leader. Gil-Oslé notes, “en general, la asociación del Juicio de Paris con la política provenía de una gran tradición. La alegoría del juicio de Paris se aplicaba a la política en forma de consejos, autorrepresentaciones y parafernalia propagandística” (*El examen* 109). Her criticisms thus range widely. They are personal, wondering about the vain prince of Poland,

Si consulta con su espejo

el de Polonia sus gracias,
y está de ellas satisfecho;
¿cómo podrá para mí
tener, Aldora, requiebros? (179)

She also wonders about the studious prince of Scotland, “¿cómo podrá acariciarme, / ocupado el pensamiento / y el tiempo siempre en estudio?” They are also political:

Y si es tan bravo Roberto;
¿quién duda que batirá
de mi pecho el muro tierno
de con fuerzas y tiranías,
siendo quizá el monstruo fiero
que amenaza la ruina
de mi vida y de este imperio? (179)

The scene thus scrutinizes and prescribes male behavior, linking how men treat women to the fate of the state. This contrasts markedly with the Spanish preoccupation with regulating women for the same reason. Men are reduced to their relationship with women, the inverse of social gender norms that (in our previous texts) reduced women to marriage and procreation.

Yet the most important detail here is that, like the harems we have seen before, the power of the gaze is contested between men and women. Numerous critics have commented on the ways that the play engages with the male gaze. The central axis of the play is Partinuplés inability to accept Rosaura’s existence beyond his gaze. Pérez-Romero notes that “Caro hace hincapié en la superficialidad del conde, que como representante del patriarcado hace caso omiso de la belleza interna de la mujer para concentrarse en lo externo, en lo material, en suma, en las posibilidades eróticas que el físico femenino le va a proporcionar” (Pérez-Romero 340). This is seen when, for instance, Rosaura’s beauty is emphasized by her advisors with “¡Qué hermosa!”; “Gran Señora, bellísima Emperatriz”; and “Rosaura hermosa” (167). The fear that Rosaura’s beauty will one day fade has brought Rosaura’s lack of marriage to a head, as Emilio explains,

Cásate, pues, que no es justo

que dejes pasar la aurora
de tu edad tierna, aguardando
de que de tu sol se ponga (168).

Accordingly, “she becomes the objectified courtly dama, gazed upon by the entire court and scrutinized as to her physical attractiveness from the male perspective” (Soufas 47).

Caro, however, underscores the failures of the various men to accurately interpret Rosaura visually, emphasizing the limits of their gaze. The men at court underestimate her cunning, while the count is unable to trust the darkness that shrouds her. Gaulín acts as the most extreme example. As his master the count, Lisbella, and the king of France see the painting of Rosaura that washed up mysteriously, the company puzzles over the mysterious initials R and A. Gaulín’s list of misogynistic guesses⁹⁹ “has the potential to be interpreted as both a literal recitation and a parody of misogynistic traditions that, in the comedia, were translated into dramas de honor that represented structures of surveillance, adultery, purification, and castigation of women's bodies under the rubric of marriage” (Carrión *Portrait of a lady* 246). Gaulín tries and fails to make sense of Rosaura’s image to understand her true character, evoking wife-murder plays that similarly depend on evidence¹⁰⁰ to establish a wife’s guilt.

Rosaura, in contrast, manages to correctly assess the characters of each of her suitors as she judges the evidence provided with each object they bear. She is thus a foil to Gaulín, who fails to read her, limited to reading the external letters that mark the beginning and end of her name, without being able to pry further, into the inner letters. This is reinforced later when

⁹⁹ “Lámase romana, o rapada o relamida, rayada, rota o raída, rotunda, ratera o rana, respondona o Rafaela; Ramira, ronca o rijosa, Roma, raspada o raposa, risa, ronquilla o rafuela, o regatona o ratina. el A quiere decir ave y la R, de rapiña” (185-86).

¹⁰⁰ Gibbon similarly compares the current play to the wife-murder genre, demonstrating how Caro deals with male anxiety regarding compulsory sexuality. She comments on the importance of props that serve as evidence of guilt: “The symbolic and metaphorical functions of props in the comedia are most striking in the ‘wife-murder’ plays. In *El medico de su honra*, Enrique’s dagger symbolizes the substitution of Enrique for Gutierre in Mencia’s bedroom, thereby ‘incriminating’ Mencia for her dishonorable behavior” (124).

Gaulín tries to temper Partinuplés enthusiasm by saying that “siempre la discreta es fea / y siempre es necia la hermosa” (225).¹⁰¹ The servant’s misogynistic inability to correctly understand at first Rosaura’s internal beauty, and then her external beauty, is complemented by his master the Count’s. Partinuplés is unable to connect the portrait to her mysterious admirer, a question which hopelessly preoccupies him. Rosaura’s choice to conceal her own body, then, is an act of agency seized from the patriarchy, as she protects herself from misreading: “The outcome of Rosaura’s emulative, envy engineered, performance... is the concealing of a female body traditionally exploited for display and spectacle” (Torres 221).

In denying the Count’s gaze, she intensifies the imbalance of power between her and the Conde, reducing him to the object of the women’s gaze. This objectification, however, in addition to being erotic, is also political, as Urban Baños shows: “Partinuplés se configura definitivamente como un mero objeto de los personajes femeninos de la comedia, pero en ningún caso es un objeto amoroso, sino que es el objeto político de las dos damas, pues ambas lo desean para poder ejercer su derecho a gobernar sus respectivos reinos” (396). Partinuplés’s value does not depend on his military prowess—his military feats in France bore Rosaura to sleep, and, rather than allowing him to play a central role in defeating Lisbella’s French forces, Caro opts for a peaceful, diplomatic solution. Lisbella happily surrenders him, declaring “no le quiero amante ya” (253), showing, as Soufas notes, that “the women monarchs throughout have acted out of a desire to preserve their realms and societies” (57).¹⁰² The Count is most valuable as a means of social security rather than as a lover.

¹⁰¹ Cohen notes here that Caro is criticizing the hypocrisy of the institution of shame, where “A woman is expected to be discreet, exhibit restraint, and be out of public view but when she does she is still judged harshly. Gaulín’s statement suggests that the woman who is honorable must be ugly because she hides herself, while the beautiful woman is always ignorant” (199).

¹⁰² Urban Baños agrees, writing, “Pero el motivo que mueve al personaje varonil de Lisbella no es el amor—como cabría esperar—sino, en primer lugar, defender el honor de Partinuplés” (395).

Beyond the question of the gaze, the allusion of the harem becomes even more pronounced as she keeps him exclusively for herself in her own palace. Gaulín notes that the castle “escucha a fuer de convento” (223)¹⁰³, and later refers to it as “de este convento de amor, / donde servimos a escote / por la comida” (232). Gaulín uses “una metáfora religiosa que le sirve tanto para burlarse de la Iglesia como para destacar la condición de prostituta de Partinuplés” (Villariño Martínez 567).

Like in the previous harems, prohibition enhances the eroticism. Aldora assures her cousin that

Éste es más digno de ser
entre los demás, tu dueño,
a no estar,—como te he dicho—
tratado su casamiento
con Lisbella (178).

Rosaura replies:

¿Con Lisbella?
por eso, Aldora, por eso
me lleva la inclinación
aquel hombre.

And, after Aldora objects:

pero, si lo miro ajeno,
¿cómo es posible dejar,
por envidia o por deseo,
de intentar un imposible,
aún siendo sus gracias menos? (178).

She concludes with “Yo lo difícil intento, / lo fácil es para todos,” (180) a statement that could be said just as easily by any European who managed to sneak into the harem. As Soufas concludes, “it is the existence of a rival for Partinuplés that makes him more unattainable and thus more desirable” (51). In sum, Caro evokes the harem motif in numerous ways: the confinement,

¹⁰³ Echoing Pedro de Urdemalas’s comparison of harems and convents in *Viaje de Turquía*.

voyeurism, objectification and sexual nature of the palace located in Constantinople evoke a male harem.

Byzantine and Ottoman Constantinople

Using the harem to highlight both Rosaura's perspicacity and the limitations of the men around her is part of Caro's larger effort to advocate for a broader role for women in society. While not immediately obvious, Caro subtly evokes aspects of Constantinople's Ottoman identity to undermine what initially seems to be the fantastic quality of the work. In doing so, she offers the Ottoman Empire as a real space where women are able to rule as de facto viziers during the Sultanate of Women. These allusions, though, are understated, given the risk of publicly praising an aspect of Spain's enemy, which, as we've seen above, hindered *Viaje de Turquía's* publication. However, the allusion allows Caro to express a present, contemporary resistance rather than hope for future ruler.

It is here useful to recall that, as Elena García Martín previously highlighted, Caro was a journalist, a position which gave her access to the latest events in Spain's colonies,¹⁰⁴ as well as its ongoing conflicts with the Ottoman world. The critic also highlights how the Ottomans remained an active force during her life (1590-1650).¹⁰⁵ The Ottoman Empire had mounted a brief, unsuccessful invasion of Poland in 1620, in 1645, seized control of Crete, and in 1661 quelled an uprising in Transylvania. The topic, naturally, did not cease to interest the Spanish

¹⁰⁴ "Caro was the first female writer to be commissioned as a journalist to report on public festivals and receive regular payments for her work, a task that would give her a privileged and authoritative access to public spaces in an era obsessed with female containment" (73). Her *relaciones* covered events as far-reaching as martyrdom's in Japan and a victory over the Moors in Ceuta.

¹⁰⁵ "Ana Caro (1590–1650) was witness ... renewal of the hostilities against the Ottoman Turks" (69).

public: Octavio Sapiencia's *Nuevo tratado de Constantinopla* was published in Madrid in 1622.¹⁰⁶

Caro instills her protagonist with an unusual political perspicacity. In light of the persistent association between Constantinople and Troy,¹⁰⁷ the text is deliberate in evoking the Judgment of Paris. This provided the spark that set into motion the Trojan War and consequent destruction of Troy. Lisbella sets out to rescue her betrothed, but she and Rosaura come to terms, and avoid war, demonstrating how women are able to avoid a situation that Homer's men could not.

The text subtly Orientalizes Rosaura. Ellis, moreover, observes that Partinuplés “belongs to this long tradition in which the hero arrives at the kingdom or island of a beautiful queen or sorceress and forgets about his other duties, becoming increasingly weak and effeminate as his love for the temptress takes control and obliterates his earlier heroic nature” (22). In Spain, this was best understood as falling under the motif of the Moorish princess. Meritxell Simó's description (64-69) is helpful. According to Simó, the trope involves a woman who is “extremadamente bella, y muy joven, una adolescente” (64), recalling Emilio's caution to Rosaura:

no es justo
que dejes pasar la aurora
de tu edad tierna, aguardando
de que de tu sol se ponga (168).

¹⁰⁶ Published at least six years before the dates that Villariño Martínez suggests as Caro's active period: “Doña Ana Caro escribió y publicó, entre 1628 y 1645, obras dramáticas, relaciones de fiestas y sucesos y poemas laudatorios” (576). *La Santa Liga* was written between 1598 and 1603 and the action of the play recreates both the splendor of the Ottoman Empire and its defeat by the European powers.

¹⁰⁷ Octavio Sapiencia, for instance, writes, “que los cimientos de los arruinados edificios, que deshacen los Turcos, y llevan la piedra para sus fabricas de Constantinopla, como han hecho de los abrasados de la que fue Troya y de Athenas, que oy están reducidas a ser bosques, como dize Virgilio” (8r). Pero Tafur writes, “¡bien an fecho la venganza de Troya los turcos! Que aun ante que yo vienesse é Constantinopla fuese tomada, tan subiectos estaban como agora, é sinon ponían las manos en ellos, era por miedo de non ensañar los xpianos del Poniente, porque non les fuesen en contra” (94).

Rosaura similarly demonstrates what Simó calls “audacia en el plano amoroso. Siempre son ellas las que toman la iniciativa amorosa y no muestran ningún pudor a la hora de solicitar las caricias del cristiano” (65). The Empress lures the Count from his betrothed, inverting the trope, which “Normalmente se trata de una princesa, con frecuencia prometida a un poderoso caudillo sarraceno que le ha impuesto su padre” (64). Moreover, Rosaura relies on astronomy to foresee danger while her cousin provides a magical mirror.¹⁰⁸ Caro thus subtly ‘Orientalizes’ her protagonist, further aligning her with the Ottoman Empire.

Additionally, one of the suitors in particular evokes aspects of the Ottoman Empire:

Roberto of Transylvania. He is the only to be head of an “Imperio” (220), which includes

cuatro grandiosas regiones,
que son Valaquia o Moldavia,
que todo es uno, la Servia,
la Transilvania y Bulgaria,
reinos distintos que incluye
el gran imperio de Dacia. (219)

All four were either under Ottoman control (Moldavia, Serbia, and Bulgaria) or, like Transylvania, under constant Ottoman threat—the Roman province of Dacia included as well portions of the modern-day Ukraine and Hungary, and would have evoked the Ottoman empire for Caro’s audience. He is introduced as “el de Chipre y Transilvania,” (172), adding another Ottoman territory.

He is, initially, the threat that Rosaura most fears, and, indeed, the only of the three suitors who inspire fear for her Empire as well.¹⁰⁹ This offers insight into the marriage between

¹⁰⁸ “Menciones para acabar que otro rasgo muy característico de la bellas sarracenas de los cantares de gesta es su sabiduría, pues se trata de mujeres cultas que destacan por sus conocimientos lingüísticos y científicos. Muchas saben astronomía, competencia que a veces se confunde con las artes mágicas y adivinatorias, de manera que la figura de la sarracena sabia acaba confluyendo con la de la sarracena maga” (Simó 66).

¹⁰⁹ “Y si es tan bravo Roberto; ¿quién duda que batirá de mi pecho el muro tierno con fuerzas y tiranías, siendo quizá el monstruo fiero que amenaza la ruina de mi vida y de este imperio?” (Caro 179).

Lisbella and Roberto. France's alliance with Spain was a persistent complaint among Spanish writers, as in *Viaje de Turquía*, "Del rey de Francia, por la amistad que con el turco tiene," (458-59), as well as *Nuevo Tratado de Constantinopla*, where Sapiencia comments, "Solía el gran Turco hazer el gusto de sus casas a los Embaxadores de Francia, de Ungria, y de Inglaterra" (45r).

Additionally, his introductory speech echoes the lengthy *título* of Sultan Mahameth that captivated Sapiencia's interest enough to reproduce it in a portion of his fourth chapter: "Para que se vea la vanidad, soberbia y superstición de Titulos de que usa el gran Turco en sus provisiones, y patentes, me pareció poner en gracia de los curiosos, estos de que usava Sultan Mahameth en las suyas" (18r). In contrast to the other two suitors (whose speeches range are 20 and 15 lines each), Roberto praises himself for 56 lines. Also, Eduardo focuses on his land and its "fertilidad, riqueza, asiento, / belleza y temple de su sitio hermoso," (218), while Federico offers

el más rico, según mi sentimiento,
es el vivir pacífico y contento,
de su reino leal obedecido,
de todos los extraños bien querido. (218).

Roberto begins:

Yo soy, bella Emperatriz,
aquel prodigio a quien llama
Alcides fuerte la Europa,
invencible Marte el Asia (219).

This parallels Sultan Mahameth's declaration, "Yo Que soy ... Emperador de Emperadores, dador de las coronas, y mayor Principe que ay sobre la haz de la tierra, servidor de Dios Sacratissimo, y señor de augustissimos" (18r). Just as Sapiencia affirms the 'soberbia' of the Sultan's title, Roberto recognizes his own bombast:

Perdona si te he cantado
en mis propias alabanzas,
que no suele ser vileza,
cuando a las verdades falta
tercero que las informe,
razones que las persuadan (179).

The content of both speeches functions along similar lines, both demonstrating ‘sobervia’ and the speaker’s particular military bent.

Roberto boasts of military supremacy, calling himself the Hercules of Europe and the Mars of Asia¹¹⁰ (219). In addition to this *soberbia*, his prowess as a warrior is the second element of his personality:

más me precio de ser
inclinado a lides y armas,
que de los reales blasones
de sus ascendencias claras;
pues ya diez y siete veces
me ha mirado la campaña
armado, sin que me ofenda
de enero la fría escarcha,
de julio el ardiente sol,
con su hielo o con sus llamas. (220)

Sultan Mahameth claims a similar martial prowess, as he refers to places “conquistada con la nuestra fulminante escapada” and others that are “de baxo de nuestra fuerza, y de nuestra belicosa virtud” thanks to his “infinitos centenares, y millares de vitoriosos exercitos” (18v).

Roberto’s claims of fame on three continents would have seemed unrealistic for Caro’s audience. Transylvania was, after all, caught in a game of tug-of-war between the Ottoman and Habsburgs for much of Caro’s life. The audience’s attention would have naturally focused on the truer terror of the three continents, as Sapiencia records: “señor de la mayor parte de la Europa, del Asia, y Africa” (18R) which echoes Roberto’s earlier boast of fame. When Roberto claims

¹¹⁰ “Alcides fuerte la Europa, invencible Marte el Asia,” and that “tiembla África de mi nombre, sabe mi esfuerzo Alemania, Dalmacia teme mi brío, venera mi aliento España” (Caro 220).

that his deeds “tiene impresos / el tiempo en la eterna España / de las memorias,” and that Spain “venera mi aliento” (220), both statements would have resonated more for the Ottoman Empire than for Transylvania.

A final parallel is the trajectory of a portrait from Constantinople to Europe. Readers of *Sapiencia* would have recalled that “era inclinado el dicho gran Turco a imagines, y retratos de Christianos, aunque ellos no las acostumbran, ni las hacen. Embiava diversas veces apedir las al Embaxador de Francia, y después de averllas visto se las bolvia” (19r). The same ploy is present in Lope de Vega’s *La Santa Liga* (perhaps written in Caro’s lifetime, between 1598-1603, (Pinto-Muñoz, 380)), where the artist Titian is commissioned to paint Rossa Sultana by the Sultan Selín.

Critics have provided various readings to Rosaura’s name.¹¹¹ It is curious to contemplate whether Caro might not have also meant to evoke Rossa Sultana, Suleyman’s preferred concubine whom he later married—she was a powerful figure that intrigued the Western world: “Europe was full of news of her beauty and her control over the greatest enemy of Christian Western Europe” (De Armas 196). In addition to *La Santa Liga*, she is also likely to be an inspiration for Cervantes’s *La gran sultana*. The allusion underscores the fact that Caro wrote during the Sultanate of Women,¹¹² of whom Roxelana was the first. Her suggestion that a woman could be an apt, competent ruler not only had precedence in the exceptional examples in Europe,¹¹³ but was a continuous practice in Constantinople. This shift is important. While it may

¹¹¹ Weimar and Camino have tied her to Calderón’s Rosaura in *La vida es sueño*, as we have seen. Villariño Martínez suggests that “El orden natural está representado en la simbología del nombre: Rosaura, alude a la belleza renacentista de la mujer, mezclando la flor, el color y la luz” (570).

¹¹² “The seventeenth century... has often been referred to as the era of the sultanate of women, when several powerful queen mothers practically ruled the empire even though the position of regent supposedly did not exist in the empire at this point” (Isom-Verhaaren 198).

¹¹³ Teresa Soufas-Scott compares Rosaura to Queen Isabel (44), and María Mercedes Carrión compares her to Queen Elizabeth (*Portrait of a lady* 260-61). Thomas P. Finn lists other examples:

be tempting to understand Constantinople as a convenient exotic location where Caro can safely project fantasies, Caro deliberately, though subtly, evokes the Ottoman Empire to demonstrate that the fantasy is, in fact, a reality. Moreover, the fact that Ottoman women ruled behind the scenes through their husbands recognizes Spanish women's actual subversive practices in seizing agency within marriage.

The work thus provides a final inversion with regards to the compulsion to marry. Here, it is not the Count who is pressured to marry—he switches from being one fiancée to another, and has no identity outside of this. It is rather Rosaura who must be coerced.¹¹⁴ Rosaura seems to quickly realize the futility of resisting, and instead picks a good, manageable husband through reading the signs that men fail to. She must, at first, educate him, following Erasmus's view of marriage, which largely guided Tridentine reformation of marriage. In her analysis of Erasmus's exemplum, Barbara Correll notes that, "in the ideal figure of Eulalia, Erasmus offers the exemplar of a woman intelligent enough and sublimely skilled in navigating the dualities and double binds of gendered power structures, to educate her husband to rule her well" (248). Thus does Rosaura, teaching the Count to love her over her physical beauty, while accustoming him to the domesticated role of Empress's husband. Rosaura thus assures that her "Marriage [...] provides a 'negotiated space' for women" (Camino 210) by selecting a husband that values her

The Spanish notion of a transitory female ruler parallels a rethinking of a woman's position in European society at this time because, as mentioned, women were coming into positions of authority during this period in Europe. In Spain, Margaret of Austria (wife of Philip III) strongly represented her country's interests from 1599-1611 (Sánchez 91-101), as did Queen Mariana after her husband, Philip IV, died, acting as regent for their son, Charles II, from 1665-1672 (Campbell). Despite Salic Law, which held that women could not sit as sovereign, France, also, saw two regnant queens. Marie de Médicis held the reins of power from 1610-1616 and Anne of Austria from 1643-1661. (134)

¹¹⁴ "But discomfort over an unmarried—uncontrolled—female ruler is unbearable for the populace. Rosaura can reign only as the wife of a co-ruler, a dramatized situation that inscribes the dual feminist perspectives of the Renaissance: the partnership of the male and female couple is preserved at the end of the play, and it is accomplished through the exercise of reason and virtues—regardless of gender—by the principal characters in individualist feminist strategies" (Soufas 57-58).

over her position, and is willing to turn down the kingdom of France to be with her. He thus removes the possibility of political competition, guaranteeing that, through marriage, Rosaura maintains her throne de facto, while sharing it de jure and thus satisfying the dominant sexual discourse while also advocating for a vision of Spain where women have greater autonomy, both in marriage and in the public sphere.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have traced the use of the harem as heterotopia for navigating anxieties stemming from compulsory heterosexuality in Spain as well as questions of Spanish imperialism, sharing the public space with women, and Orientalism. *Tirant lo blanc* and *Viaje de Turquía* portray the harem as a site of tempting sexual decadence that threatens to bind both works' protagonists permanently to the Orient. Yet, the harem also gives grounds for asserting a metonymic victory in both *Viaje de Turquía* and *El amante liberal*, where the European protagonists can outwit the Oriental patriarchy through symbolically mixing voyeurism and surveillance despite being greatly outnumbered. In *La gran sultana* and *El conde Partinuplés*, the harem is changed, becoming a site instead of marriage. In the former, Cervantes rejects the harem's erotic qualities and instead uses it to show the submission of sexuality to the state in order to promote a colonializing agenda. Caro inverts the harem completely by placing men inside of it, reducing the imbalance between men and women while pointing to the Sultanate of Women as a legitimation of power through marriage.

In sum, the harem is host to a number of disparate visions of Spain, as some protagonists struggle to gain the upper hand over the Orient; others resist the dominant vision of marriage while nonetheless relinquishing extra-matrimonial sexuality (like Madrigal and Pedro de Urdemalas); some affirm marriage as a means of redemption (as do Cervantes's characters);

while others use the space as to advocate for more agency for women, like Rosaura. As our heterotopia shows, pre-Modern Spanish Orientalism is not only a discourse of asserting hegemony over the Orient, but also one of asserting (or less commonly pushing back against) hegemony over the Occidentals who travel to it.

Sexuality and Said

As we have seen, the Orient goes beyond being solely “a political doctrine willed over the Orient because the Orient was weaker than the West, which elided the Orient’s difference with its weakness.” It offers screen-like heterotopias for disputing or reinforcing ideologies at home. Orientalism, in a sense, is as much (if not more so) about Spain coming to grips with itself as with an East Mediterranean Other. Orientalism extends the West’s reach into Oriental lands, but also further into the Western imagination, the patriarchy extends into the furthest reaches of the imagination, even to the imagined Orient.

Said’s explanation of both women and the harem proves too restrictive to accommodate the diversity that we’ve seen in how authors mobilize it. Said mentions the harem only, classifying it under the topic of ‘licentious sex,’ that appealed to a 19th-century Europe beset by stricter sexual norms, such that “the Orient was a place where one could look for sexual experience unobtainable in Europe” (190). However, female sexuality underpins much of how the Orientalist sees the Orient—perhaps most significantly, “The Middle East is resistant, as any virgin would be, but the male scholar wins the prize by bursting open, penetrating through the Gordian knot despite the ‘taxing task’” (309). Sexuality is a channel through which the West exerts hegemony over the Orient.

As we have seen, this was not the case with Spain, where, as a heterotopia, Constantinople evokes both a fear of contagious Oriental decadence and an anxiety over

marriage, but also affirms marriage as a Spanish subject's highest end, especially marriage between Occidentals and Orientals. Said also argues that "an Arab Oriental is that impossible creature whose libidinal energy drives him to paroxysm of overstimulation" (312). As we have seen, though, our authors are more preoccupied with controlling the libidos of their protagonists.

The Orient provides means to resist androcentrism, defying the misogyny that defines Said's view: "women are usually the creatures of a male power-fantasy. They express unlimited sensuality, they are more or less stupid, and above all they are willing" (*Orientalism* 207). As Kim. M. Phillips notes, though, "The relationship between medieval European and Asian regions was by no means one of a submissive, feminine East to the masterful, masculine West as in Said's construction of Orientalism" (59). In our texts, women are also not stupid:

Placerdemivida, while the most sensual, has a careful, effective plan that saves her country; the same is true for the machinations of Rosaura and Halima. Women in the Orient likewise can pose a threat to Western men. This includes women of agency capable of using Constantinople's power structures to subdue Western men, like the sultanness in *Viaje*, Placerdemivida, or Rosaura. Left on their own in female homosocial spaces beyond the reach of the male gaze, they undermine the established sexual order.

Understanding Spanish Orientalism as a heterotopia recognizes the numerous overlapping discourses that authors drew on when approaching the East Mediterranean, which included numerous themes, such as Spain's Muslim past and present, imperial ideology, Spanish sexual anxieties, and more. These discourses contradict and shift as authors offer rivaling visions of Spain, subsuming the Oriental space under Spanish hegemony and also using its heterotopias to mount resistance against dominant discourse. This contrasts starkly with Said's vision, where European hegemony creates a monolithic discourse.

Chapter 4: The Male Homosocial Heterotopia

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick observes in her book *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, that female homosociality¹ is inherently intertwined with male homosociality, despite superficial differences: “the historically differential shapes of male and female homosociality—much as they themselves vary over time—will always be articulations and mechanisms of the enduring inequality of power between women and men” (5). Male and female homosocial spaces at first seem quite opposite, yet, with further examination, their interrelations become clear, as both draw from and resist the patriarchy. It is therefore worthwhile to complement our study of the harem’s female homosociality with a second heterotopia that emerges as its inverse in our texts. As we shall see, this space takes numerous forms that serve as a foil to the Oriental² female homosocial harems, which we have just examined. Indeed, the two tropes acts as mirrors, offering complementing perspectives on prescribed roles for women, as well as for men.

Defining the male homosocial space

As this trope has received little scholarly attention, it is worthwhile to consider it in depth before we look at how it plays off of and parallels the harem. Where harems discuss voyeuristic control, the male space interrogates ideas like male homosociality and inviolable solidarity despite exterior threats. Emerging in marginal spaces such as caves, prisons, or ghetto dwellings, they convey a sense of community and calm through various recurrent traits. They erase racial,

¹ As in my third chapter, I use homosocial and like terms to refer to the relationships between people of the same sex, acknowledging, as does Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, that homosociality exists on a spectrum that includes friendship as well as homoerotic desire. I contrast homosociality with ‘compulsory heterosexuality,’ by which I here mean the increasing elevation of marriage as an essential, albeit anxiety-laden, part of male identity that intruded on the previous emphasis on bonds between men.

² I use ‘Orient’ (and related terms) to emphasize the ways in which Spain’s idea of the Muslim Orient influenced and shaped its encounters, reflecting what Said terms a “flexible *positional* superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (7).

sexual, and social divides, replacing them with shared meals and familial ties. They share a frontier with the religious Other, acting as enclaves in the Orient. As utopian, protective spaces, they offer safety for Christians despite the external menace of the Orient, compulsory heterosexuality, and other threats. As a consequence, they are either beyond the reach of women or, when this is not the case, threatened by the entry of a woman, such that heterosexuality destabilizes the male comity. This leads to a consolidation of identity that often takes the form of a turning point, where characters begin to show a greater agency or repent a previous wrong. The male homosocial spaces are also liminal entry points, where the male character first arrives to the Orient. As mentioned above, the two spaces complement one another. The male and female homosocial spaces are linked through antithesis: in the case of men, these spaces are often on the peripheries of the Oriental domain—jails, caves, ghettos—that avoid the enemy gaze. In contrast, the female space is at the seat of Oriental power in the harem that inevitably serves as object of the Spanish gaze. The male homosocial space also defends itself against the penetration that marks a Spanish victory in the harem.

Yet, while the two differ, both heterotopias are versions of the home,³ private spaces that represent the family,⁴ and places where its members sleep and share a meal—in short, living spaces. This makes them ideal settings as crisis heterotopias, ideal for reimagining Spanish society, and for projecting it into the Orient. The homosocial male space in particular acts as a sort of colony, a reproduction of Spanishness in the Orient. For this reason, it is especially convenient as a space in which to inscribe overlapping notions of utopia. The different visions of

³ Henri Lefebvre is helpful here: “any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships—and this despite the fact that a space is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)” (82-83). Accordingly, while the physical setting for male or female homosociality changes (from a bedroom to a prison to a cave, and so forth), the most crucial aspect of the ‘home’ they create is the relationship between those within.

⁴ “An agency of control and a point of sexual saturation” (Foucault, *History* 120), the family “supported, even empowered the state, since procreation had implications for regions and countries” (Heigl 335).

Spain that the space hosts at times militate against Islam, as well as against hegemonic Spain as we shall see below.

As a heterotopia of crisis, our male homosocial heterotopia also offer an optimal ‘nowhere’ for a recurrent figure that is excluded from the male homosocial space, the catamite.⁵ The male homosocial space offers a place to discuss what could not possibly occur in Spain (though certainly numerous exceptions defy this dominant vision of Spain)—the reconciliation of those who were not permitted to exist within Spanish sexual norms. In our texts, these are often renegades who had reneged in their youth, and seek to return to Christendom, or at least are often unexpected allies to Christians. They are more than sexual objects while simultaneously being lesser than the actualized men in whose periphery they are found, yet they are often treated with a compassion that either empathizes, or even tries to ‘redeem’ them back into the dominant vision of Spain.

Historical context

Spaces just for men are tied innately to patriarchal power, and an inviolable sense of community between men. Just as women were restricted from power through the control of space, men’s access to power was similarly spatial. Space was a mark of male authority. “Men’s occupations of discrete spaces (the household, an office, a place at the table) established the pattern of their subjection in certain domains and authority in others” (King 4). Their ability to act in public places or places of power like the court was both an emblem of and a perpetuation of their dominance over women.

⁵ As we have seen in our introduction, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick defines homosociality as “a strategy for making generalizations about, and marking historical differences in, the structure of men’s relations with other men,” which includes “the potential unbrokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexuality” (Sedgwick 2). Catamites are thus essential to understanding male homosociality, despite being outside of the space.

In Medieval and Renaissance Spain, male homosociality was categorized within the concept of friendship. Like the motif of the male space, friendship depended on a sense of community and equality among men that reacted both against the anxieties posed by compulsory heterosexuality, and against an increasingly intrusive state. Ideally, male homosocial spaces “[oppose] heterosexual desire with homosocial friendship, [which] bear[s] witness to early modern cultural anxieties about the concept of difference as represented by sexual identity” (Wojciehowski 201). This anxiety about sexual difference is present in the social transition from a homosocial to a heterosexual culture, and the increased pressure to enter into a marriage defined by church and state.

Friendship also acted as a foil against authoritarianism: "the unsubordinating relation of friendly equals represents an alternative to the subordination without limits attempted by the tyrannical ruler and always potential in an ideology of more or less absolute monarchy” (Shannon 56). Friendship thus presented a foil for and refuge against the state and Church’s compulsory heterosexuality. Male homosociality thus acts as a male-only utopia where men see themselves as equal while the entrance of women or of tyrannical men threatens to destroy the comity.

The unity and patriarchal control found in male homosocial spaces was challenged as throughout its ongoing conflicts with the Ottoman Empire, Spain experienced a centuries-long shift from a homosocial culture to a heterosexual one, described in Louis-Georges Tin’s *The Invention of Heterosexual Culture* (2008). During the former, male friendships were at the center of literature during much of the Middle Ages, while women were kept on the peripheries.⁶ This

⁶ “Feudal society was homosocial. Women were held to be of little account and, accordingly, relegated to a peripheral role, not least since they were not considered capable of arousing or experiencing deep-seated emotions” (Tin 13).

was compounded by the medieval church, which was “inimical to heterosexual culture and inclined instead toward a society of pious brotherhood and saintly predilection” (56). However, starting with advent of *courtly love*, Europe underwent a transition to a heterosexual culture “where attraction to the opposite sex predominates and is cultivated, and celebrated” (ix-x). During this gradual transition, “All-male friendships—the very stuff of heroic legend—were increasingly suspect, widely criticized, and often maligned” (3).

This shift is manifested in two ways that are relevant here. First, marriage was increasingly encouraged as the only legitimate expression of sexuality in a gradually more vigilant state. Being married became a religious as well as national marker, as Carrión observes: “the heterosexual coupling and their (desired) offspring became an emblematic site for the reproduction of values of One Faith, One Race, and One Kingdom” (*Subject Stages* 4). Pushed by the Church, the State, and the literati, marriage acquired a greater importance among the Spanish than it previously had. Naturally, this increased pressure for marriage, unsurprisingly, was accompanied by anxieties. “Far from controlling and organizing the existence of all subjects, marriage law translated into a sense of alienation evident in the application of the legal codes to the practice of law” (Carrión, *Subject Stages* 27). Dian Fox (using Adrienne Rich’s term) calls this alienation “compulsory heterosexuality,” finding it in *Don Quijote*:

In a society where a man not serving in the priesthood has a duty to marry and raise a family, a failure to do so would result at the least in the kind of pressure from friends and relatives that Don Juan Roca experiences, to marry. It is an obligation of his sex that arguably drives Don Quijote mad, or at least to invent a phantom and unattainable female that liberates him from the crushing pressure of his culture’s compulsory heterosexuality” (309).

Second, there was an increasingly systematic approach to defining and curtailing homosociality. Fertility was also a sign of heterosexuality, while sterility was associated with homoeroticism (Milligan and Tyles 31) that was increasingly monitored by the Inquisition and secular courts.

Allyson M. Poska notes, “because the primary purpose of marriage was the reproduction of the species, the validity of marriages without offspring could always be questioned” (879). To some extent, then, actualizing one’s identity as a man depended on marriage and children, both of which were points of vulnerability.

Homoeroticism

Tied up in homosociality is homoerotic desire, as Kosofsky mentions.⁷ Carvajal observes that “[early modern theologians] linked sodomy with perceptions of manliness, a category inextricably intertwined with notions of class, religion, xenophobia, and empire” (43). Sodomy⁸ was seen as feminizing behavior that made it less likely for men to marry and procreate, thus guaranteeing the state’s next generation of soldiers and mothers. Gerry Milligan and Jane Tylus observe the motif in literature that “often associates heterosexuality with fertility and fruitfulness and its homoerotic ‘other’ with sterility” (31). Additionally, sodomy was an affront to the sanctity of the male body. Percy comments in her study of Inquisitorial archives in Seville that “the real crime of sodomy was not in ejaculating nonprocreatively, nor in the use of the anus, but in defiling or invading the male recipient’s body” (79).

Penrose notes that, due to the Inquisition, “Writers often slyly insinuated such relations in some of their characters, but they had to veil their language in complex nuances... By the imprint that queerness created, we are able to discern a sort of background noise that delineates an extant if subtle homosexuality” (69). Accordingly, there is a process of deciphering necessary here in order to understand the characters as Spanish readers would have at the time.

⁷ Referring to “male homosocial (including homosexual) desire” (25).

⁸ I use the term *sodomy* throughout this chapter to avoid complexities of anachronistically applying the term ‘homosexuality,’ which was developed much later and has come to refer to an identity as opposed to, as our texts understood it, an act. *Sodomy* was used to describe numerous non-normative forms of sex, though here I use it to refer to sex between men.

Penetrating young Spanish bodies was an attack on Spanish masculinity, but also a wounding of it that evoked compassion and a need to heal. As Perry notes, while adult sodomites were frequently punished with death, their younger partners were treated with more leniency. “Boys younger than seventeen were considered accomplices rather than culprits, and those who were caught were punished according to their ages and the accusation against them” (78). There was also a heightened sense of children’s vulnerability: “contemporaries felt a great concern about the sexual use of children, perhaps because some idealized children as the innocent nonsexual beings portrayed in the paintings of Bartolomé Murillo” (78). This creates a sense of empathy: “This view of childhood innocence... must have perceived children as particularly vulnerable to exploitation by adults who offered them money, gifts, or a place to sleep” (78). A clear case of this is in Cervantes’s *Baños de Argel*, where the Cadí gives Francisquito a top as part of his effort to convert the Spanish child. The compassion toward young homosexuals is at the same time normalizing. For Renaissance Spain, as Berco points out, “the most common male-to- male sexual relationship was intergenerational” (356). It suggests that a same-sex experience can be a natural step toward reproductive heterosexual actualization, as we see below.

At the same time, the threat of sodomy was tied to the image of Moriscos in Spain. Perry notes that a 1568 resettlement of Moriscos in Seville was accompanied by a surge in sodomy cases. “Resentment of the outsiders, added to a traditional association of Muslims with homosexuality, may have led to more accusations not only against Moriscos, but also against any man suspected of approving of their practices” (76). It likely provided, as well, an easy scapegoat to draw attention away from sodomy among Christians, which is a preoccupation we will see in the texts that follow.

Perry also relates a case in which “Hamete, a Negro Turk, was accused of forcing

sodomy on a boy of nine or ten” (81). A case like this confirmed pre-existing stereotypes about Muslims, (despite being a rarity), and must have fed into anxieties regarding youths being captured and used as *garzones* (often connoting sexual slavery) in the Ottoman Empire. The same Hamete also “told of being paid eight ducats each time he took the active role in male sodomy, and he said that Moors and Ottomans were sought by other men because they were believed to be ‘very potent’ and had large genitals” (81).⁹ This confirms what Irvin Schick mentions, that “inter-racial homosexuality was, without doubt, an important element of sexualized xenological discourse” (161). In our current works, these interracial elements center on the penetration of young Europeans as the passive partners, who are often dealt with in generous, empathetic terms.

Thesis

I look at how the male homosocial space provides a heterotopia in which to wrestle with anxieties stemming from compulsory heterosexuality¹⁰ as well as questions of national hegemony, offering another tool for authors as they imagined Constantinople. As with our previous chapter, we begin by examining the myth of the last Visigoth king, the archetype for both our homosocial heterotopia as well as the penetrated and redeemed Western body.

We can note two contrary moments that show the changing concerns in Spanish discourse on masculinity as well as its persistent heterogeneity. The male homosocial space gradually becomes more porous and less imperial. The male homosocial space marks the start of the Reconquista with Pelayo’s coronation, Tirant’s North African conquest, and Pedro’s rise to

⁹ This reveals a specific set of sexual preference within Spanish culture that would also shape how Constantinople was viewed, though this does not seem evident in our current texts.

¹⁰ Here, rather than referring solely to sex between men and women, I instead mean heterosexuality as the reproductive, normative model prescribed by the state, that is, as ‘non-queer’ sexuality. The Spanish state sought to curb homosexuality, but also extramarital sexuality and non-reproductive sexuality.

fame as a doctor. However, Cervantes and Ana Caro begin to undermine it, shifting it from a symbol of Spanish superiority over Dar al-Islam to, rather, alternative visions that reflect how Spain could be. In *El amante liberal*, Cervantes inverts the heterotopia into a protective place where Leonisa can escape the European vigilant gaze. In *La gran sultana*, the homosocial space becomes a foil for antisemitism, while in *El Conde Partinuplés*, it is inverted from a male refuge into male confinement. Assertions of Spanish hegemony against the Orient gradually give way to promoting compulsory heterosexuality among European captives.

Simultaneously, we note that the catamites increasingly move from the peripheries, back into Christendom, even as it ceases to be homosocial. Our works show an increasing compassion toward catamites that accompanies the state's harsher punishment of sodomy. While penetration in the Orient emerges as repentance for King Rodrigo, and then a threat in *Tirant*, it appears in the form of empathetic characters in *Viaje de Turquía*. In *El amante*, we meet the renegado Mahamut, who returns to his native Sicily. In *La gran sultana*, we observe a gradual humanization of the *garzones*. However, in *Conde Partinuplés*, Caro avoids the topic of homosexuality, which would weaken her advocacy for women's importance. Against this, we see how sodomy is evoked to excise Spanish shame for the defeat of 711. Recalling the harem's multiple levels of discourse, the male heterotopia, then, provides a diversity in discourse that presents several points of continuity and disjuncture with Said's Orientalism, which I explore in my conclusion.

The last Visigoth King

We must again return to the legend of the fall of Spain to understand the typology for the male homosocial heterotopia, which serves as a sort of discourse upon which other discourses

are placed. We have previously discussed how Rodrigo voyeurs the daughter of Don Julian, later raping her. This drives Julian to seek vengeance with the help of the Moors, who invade Spain, and oust the Christians who flee to the mountains. The voyeuristic scene that triggers the fall of Spain is complemented by two penitential moments that demonstrate Spain's rebirth. The first is Rodrigo's final penance, where, after the last Visigoth king flees from the final decisive battle, he encloses himself in a tomb with a snake that emasculates him, evoking both his previous rape as well as the collective rape of Spain. The second is the coronation of Pelayo in a cave in Covadonga, which starts the Reconquista. Male homosociality, sodomy and national hegemony are combined as Rodrigo's penetration opens the way for Pelayo's victorious entry into Muslim territory. The two scenes work together to remove Spanish shame over the invasion of 711 while providing, as we shall see, future grounds for the metonymic victories that enable an extension of the Reconquista into Constantinople, and later on, grounds for alternative visions of Spain, where men who had been in same-sex relationships could regain a place in Spanish society.

Rodrigo's penitence and emasculation

The legend's second homosocial moment, acting as a bookend to the first, where Rodrigo voyeurs Doña Florinda, is Rodrigo's penitence after retreating from the final battle against the invading Muslim army and living as a hermit. Rodrigo must lock himself in a cave with a serpent that will eat his penis. Rodrigo's emasculation serves as the remedy to his previous uncontrolled sexuality and demonstrates his reconciliation with his Spanish identity. The earliest written version is found in *Crónica D'Espayña de García de Eugui*, finished in the late 1300s:

Et la noche pusose en oration, & obo revelation de Dios que lo pusiese en una cuba fecha para aquel acto & pusiesse conel una culuebra pequeyna, & le mandasse que obviess pasçiençia alo que la culuebra faria et aquella lo mataria & seria salbo. & el santo obispo dixo esta rebelation al rey Rodrigo, el qual con grant contriction llorando, reçibio esta penitencia. Et el obispo secretament lebo lo asu posada & puso lo en una cuba como es

dito, & sino alli algun tiempo ata que la culuebra fue cresçida. Et el obispo visitaba lo cada dia & avino assi que quando la culuebra fue grant, cometiolo, & se comio sele primerament el miembro, & despues para alli entro sele enel vientre, & assi murio el rey Rodrigo. & la ora por si tocaron todas las canpañas. (285)

According to Aengus Ward's introduction, it is "la versión existente más antigua de la leyenda" (de Eugui 63), but this does not preclude, as Ward writes, that "en efecto, los romances sobre la penitencia del rey estaban difundidos" (62). The scene concludes with a celebratory reconciliation. When Rodrigo dies, "la ora por si tocaron todas las canpañas" (285). His penitence is a joyful rejoining of the Spanish collective. Ward notes that "parece claro que "cuba" se usaba en Navarra con el sentido de "cueva" en castellano" (65). The place of Rodrigo's penitence must have had some flexibility as it was referred to in multiple versions. This helps to understand the movement from Rodrigo's tomb to a cave in *Tirant* and *El amante*, and later becomes a general marginalized, dark place as authors take up the theme.

Pedro de Corral's account of the Conquest of Spain (1430) also mentions the penitential scene, adding now the encouragement of a hermit. This further emphasizes reconciliation with the Spanish collective. Rodrigo "fallo la losa, desde ovo alzado fallo las tres culebras quel mayoral le avia dicho, y tomo la que tenia dos cabezas, y traxola, y echolca en un gran cantaro que faria una grande carga de vino, y criola alli fasta que fue de aquella grandeza como la boz de viso" (218r). After further tearful confession, "antes del quinto dia que la culebra era grande el rey y el mayoral se fueron para el luzillo, y a limpiaron lo muy bien de dentro. Y el rey metiose en el desnudo qual nascio y culebra consigo" (218r). The scene focuses on encouragement and reconciliation, as "el mayoral le dixo que dios era con el y que se esforzasse que agora avian sin todas sus persecuciones del cuerpo y del anima." Later, the hermit prays on Rodrigo's behalf: "el mayoral se fue a su posada, y no quiso assentar a comer, antes se metio en su camara, y llorando de sus ojos rogava muy devotamente a nuestro señor que diesse esfuerzo al rey por que

cumpliese su penitencia” (218v).

Food also appears as a familiar symbol of male homosociality. After being tempted by various of the devil’s apparitions (including Florinda, his original temptation), Rodrigo departs to find penitence. At the first place he stops, “y el rey oya la missa del buen hombre, y tomo el verdadero cuerpo de nuestro señor Iesu Christo” (217v). Next he goes to a monastery of “monges negros,” where he shares another meal: “Y demandolo si querria comer como el usava, o como comian los otros monges, y el rey le dixo que assi como selo diesse y el abad le hizo trae un pan de panizo y de mijo todo rebuelto y una jarra de agua, y de la otra parte le hizo trae vianda como los monjes lo usavan” (217v). Finally, when he approaches the hermitage where he will entomb himself, he requests of the hermit, “Vos quisieredes embiarme cada día mientras que aquí estuviere un pan de panizo y del agua yo con ello sere contento, y el mayoral se lo ortogo: y artiose luego del y fuesse a suposada. Y embiole luego un pan de panizo y del agua” (218r). The food marks Rodrigo’s entry into the religious communities, a step in his reconciliation with Spain and Christendom. Fittingly, the account closes as “el espiritu a nuestro señor el qual por la su sancta merced lo lleve a la su gloria.” Bells miraculously ring on their own, “E alli conosco el mayoral que el rey era muelro y su alma era salva” (218v).

The romance version (#606, “Rodrigo penitente y su muerte”) features the same motif as the Visigoth king is told that “le meta en una tumba / Con una culebra viva, /esto tome en penitencia” (411). Food reappears as an important element, as Don Rodrigo is accompanied by a shepherd on the way to the hermitage:

Pidió al hombre que le diese
De comer, si algo tenia
El pastor sacó un zurrón,
Que siempre en él pan traía;
Dióle del, y de un tasajo... (410)

However, the scene also features a sense of homosociality as the king is reconciled with the community that he formerly ruined. “Por el mal que hecho habia. / El ermitaño al Rey / Muy alegre se volvía” and “El Rey d'esto muy gozoso” (411). When Rodrigo implores, “ruega por mí, el ermitaño, / Porque acabe bien mi vida,” his companion is supportive:

El ermitaño lloraba,
Gran compasión le tenia:
Comenzóle á consolar
Y esforzar cuanto podía. (411)

When the serpent finally begins to eat “por la parte que todo ló merecía, por donde fué el principio,” the hermit is encouraging: “El ermitaño lo esfuerza,” as the romance closes with the assurance that “el rey Rodrigo, / Al cielo derecho se iba” (411). Rodrigo’s reconciliation is framed by solidarity with a fellow man, and presages the reconciliation of our protagonists below, as they reform their sexuality before going on to become exemplars of Spanish conduct in the Orient.

In their article, “¿Vaos bien con la compañía?”: Violación colectiva y fantasía política en el romance ‘Después que el Rey Don Rodrigo,’” Pamela Cappas-Toro and Javier Irigoyen-García further elaborate on the implicit sodomy in the serpent scene in the romance above: “la presencia de la culebra en la tumba simboliza una suerte de inserción sodomítica por parte del ermitaño-culebra” (10). As Barbara Weissberger demonstrates, this is a culmination of his uncontrollable sexuality: “The serpent, agent of Rodrigo’s grotesque punishment, again marks the king as feminized victim of his own lust and of feminine seductiveness” (110). This is presaged as Rodrigo is offered bread by the shepherd (“la agresión orosexual”), which, for the critics “supone sólo la primera etapa de una simbólica iniciación sodomítica continuada a lo largo del romance” (8). The phallic violation of Rodrigo’s body is thus his penitence and reconciliation. Yet the act is collective as well, representing, “the traumatic originary wound of

the sexualized body politic of Hispania” (Weissberger 111). As Mary Elizabeth Perry states, “the real crime of sodomy was not in ejaculating non-procreatively, nor in the use of the anus, but in defiling or invading the male’s recipient body” (79) and, in the case of a royal body, a ‘defiling or invading’ of the entire nation.

Rodrigo’s penetration is thus tied to Spain’s own collective violation by the Muslim Umayyads in 711, providing the archetypal lens through which the violation of youths in the Orient must be understood. Rodrigo and the *garzones* share a similar shame—just as Rodrigo’s individual act of rape has doomed the whole of Spain, so too does the penetration of European bodies correspond to the rape of the collective Spanish state by Orientals. Both the *garzones* and Rodrigo must be reconciled with the Spanish collective before they can be saved, either ascending into heaven or returning to Christendom. Rodrigo’s emasculation as penitence mitigates the shame of sodomy for the catamites. This provides them a path to redemption: the renegado *garzones* support and aide Christian captives. The *garzones*, in turn, reenact the healing of Spain by returning to the West, in an act that mitigates the shame of Muslim victory as their agency is restored. Their homecoming shows that there can be life after sodomy, and that there can be a Spain after Muslim defeat. Accordingly, just as Rodrigo is reconciled and brought into Heaven, our *garzones* are similarly treated with compassion and, with some qualifications, allowed to return from the Orient.

Pelayo and the cave

The redemption of Rodrigo in a tomb marks the fall of Visigoth Spain that immediately precedes the birth of modern Spain with the first Christian victory and the coronation of Pelayo. This, significantly, occurs in a cave, recalling Rodrigo’s tomb/cave. The episode marks the beginning of Alfonso X’s *Primera crónica general de España* (composed in the late 13th

century): “La estoria contara el comienzo del rey don Pelayo, que fue el primero rey de Leon, el qual cercaron los moros en la cueva de Onga, que es en Asturias de Oviedo, et por quien Dios mostro muy gran miraglo en aquel lugar” (321). The cave setting is emphasized in other histories as well. Garcia de Eugui writes, “Pelayo la hora con su conpayña empeço de buendezir a Dios, & los moros partieron se dende mucho quebrantados. En tanto Pelayo sallo dela cueba con los suyos & conpeço de ferir en ellos, et los moros fuyeron et mato et priso muchos sin gusa, los otros fuyendo murieron en un rio como los del rey Faraon” (293). Pedro de Corral writes the same: “E fizieron todo de consuno a don Pelayo el Montesino rrey, que estava en una cueva en la peña que dizen Onga” (200).

Don Rodrigo, last Visigoth King, enters into a living burial, serving as a bookend to Don Pelayo, first king of the Reconquista, who emerges from a cave. There are numerous parallels between the two episodes. Just as Rodrigo is reconciled with Spain and God (including, in some cases, the miraculous ringing of bells), Pelayo is similarly favored with a miracle, where “Ca las piedras et las saetas et los tragazetes que los moros alañavan a los de la cueva, por la uertud de Dios tornavanse en ellos mismos et matavanlos; e por el iuyzio de Dios et por este miraglo tan nueuo que dezimos moriron alli mas de veynte mill de los moros” (323).¹¹

Finally, the episode contains a purgation of the treacherous Visigoths who sided with the Muslims. As narrated in Alfonso’s chronicle, “Quando Alohor, rey de Cordova, oyo dezir de la mortandad de los moros et de la mal andança que ovieran, sospechando que fuera por consejo de los fijos de Vitiza et del cuende Julian, crebanto el pleyto que ellos pusieran con Tarif, et mandolos luego descabesar” (324). This, of course, was present in the popular sphere as well.

¹¹ This is reiterated in later romances. Lorenzo de Sepulveda writes: “Las piedras y las saetas / Y dardos que habían tirado, / Vuélvense contra los moros” (412). Gabriel Lobo Laso de la Vega also writes, “que todos los tiros, ... Resultaban en su daño, Y volviéndose á los moros” (412).

Garbiel Lobo Lasso de la Vega's (1555-1615) romance explains that:

Hijos de Vetiza el malo;
Y á su mujer la Condesa
Los moros apedrearon,
Y un hijo, que el Conde tuvo
Pequeño, le despeñaron.
En esto pararon todos,
¡De su traición justo pago. (413)

In addition to being a penitential space where the king is reconciled with his kingdom, the male homosocial space is also a place where the nation is likewise purged of corruption. Rodrigo repents and earns salvation as he renounces his uncontrolled heterosexuality that previously sundered the nation and opts for peaceful homosociality instead; Spain is similarly forgiven by rejecting the traitors that cooperated with the Moors. The male homosocial space becomes a place to renounce heterosexual desire in favor of homosocial community in our next texts. However, this changes when Cervantes and Caro write as champions of heterosexual desire, using it to disrupt male homosociality.

The setting also serves as an entry into the Muslim world, evoking Pelayo's entrance into Muslim Spain with his first victory. This has been foregrounded by Rodrigo's reconciliation with the Spanish male collective, where he rejected the uncontrolled heterosexuality in exchange for male solidarity. As we shall see below, our protagonists pass through a similar site (at times a cave, but also a prison or darkened room) that presages their entrance into the Muslim Orient. This heterotopia may demonstrate Spanish imperial hegemony as does Pelayo in his first sally; yet, it also provides a space in which to resist this dominant vision of Spain, as well as its norms of sexuality.

Tirant lo Blanc (1511)

In our first text, we see how emasculation in the form of threatened sodomy plays on Spanish anxieties about Oriental hegemony, as well as how Spanish hegemony employs male solidarity

to assert Western superiority. Tirant, the English knight who has come to save Byzantine Constantinople from the Ottomans flees the city after being tricked into thinking that his love, the princess Carmesina, has been sleeping with the Moorish gardener. In keeping with the pattern seen in our previous section on Rodrigo and Pelayo, Tirant also must leave behind his previous uncontrolled lust in Constantinople to become a conquering hero in North Africa. This begins with a homosocial scene that undoes Tirant's previous overblown heterosexuality, and that makes Tirant a champion of the patriarchal norms that he previously tried to break as he establishes European order among the Moors. In the chivalric novel, both Byzantine Constantinople and Muslim Barbary are orientalized differently: while, as we have seen, Tirant's sexual adventures with the Byzantine princess led to his demise, here North Africa proves to be a land ripe for imperial gain as Tirant returns to following the proper sexual norms.

The cave

After Tirant departs from Constantinople, where his uncontrollable lust has both hindered his military and romantic endeavors, he shipwrecks in North Africa, taking shelter in a cave where he is discovered by friendly Moors. This marks a transformation of his sexuality that contrasts with the corruptive heterosexuality that summarized our harem scene, where he watches Carmesina bathe and breaks his leg trying to escape. In an assertion of European hegemony in the Orient, Tirant's exit from the cave commences his successful campaign to Christianize North Africa. Here, Tirant is himself fully submitted to European hegemony as he no longer risks becoming Orientalized by the seductive-but-corrupt Byzantines. In her book *Tirant contra el Islam*, María Jesús Rubiera Mata demonstrates how, although Martorell shows

an extensive knowledge of Islamic culture,¹² the episode in North Africa does not reflect this,¹³ suggesting that it was written by the deceased author's friend, Joan Martí de Galba, who was unfamiliar with the mudejár culture to the South that shapes Marotell's writing.¹⁴ This supports a reading of two separate Orientalist perspectives within the work. This is bolstered by the complementary tie between Barbary and Constantinople: Tirant's presence in Africa is crucial to his exploits in the Byzantine city. He acquires here the necessary resources to definitively win the war for Constantinople and route the Ottomans' combined forces. More importantly, as we explore here, it is clear that Barbary is a complement to Constantinople—Tirant changes from lustful to chaste; the Muslims change from friend to foe, and Carmesina's bedroom is changed for a cave on the shore. Both the Greek and Berber Orientalism are, naturally, connected to the text's shift in sexuality, as we see how Tirant's erotic desire (as well as the diverse sexualities that surround him in Constantinople) must be tamed before he can conquer and evangelize (impose Western order) on Muslim lands.

Crucially, Tirant's shift from a violator to a founder of patriarchy is marked by male homosociality that coincides with his entry into North Africa. Of course, the whole of the text is

¹² "El *Tirant* refleja con bastante exactitud el mundo del Mediterráneo oriental o, al menos, el que era conocido en la Valencia del siglo XV. Así, a pesar del protagonismo de los turcos otomanos tras la conquista de Constantinopla, Joanot Martorell muestra conocer mejor a la dinastía de los mamelucos de Egipto, como seguramente corresponde a las relaciones comerciales y militares de la Corona de Aragón en la primera mitad del siglo XV" (14).

¹³ For instance, "Joan Martí de Galba ignoraba lo que comían los musulmanes específicamente. Como Martorell, describe un banquete y mientras el autor valenciano incluye el occidental 'cucuso' en la comida oriental, Joan Martí de Galba dice de forma general que el rey Escarriano, que había invitado a cenar a Tirant, hizo poner '*moltes naturales de viandes davant ell*' para salir del aprieto del que su ignorancia sobre lo que podía comerse en el Norte de África le ponía" (60).

It's similarly evident in the case of religion: "en el mismo orden de cosas, en estos capítulos del Norte de África nos encontramos errores sobre los cultemas musulmanes que no se habían producido antes. Por ejemplo, el autor supone que los musulmanes usan imágenes" (59). Additionally, "la transferencia de la personalidad divina de Jesucristo a Mahoma se repite en diversas ocasiones en los capítulos del episodio del Norte de África comprendidos entre el 300 y 349" (59).

¹⁴ "Las razones por las que Joan Martí de Galba desconocía hasta este grado a los musulmanes son porque era catalán no estaba tan familiarizado con los mudéjares como un valenciano, ya que en Cataluña no había una población mudéjar tan importante, especialmente en Cataluña la Vieja, como en el Reino de Valencia, como hemos mencionado antes" (60).

largely male-centered, and there is no shortage of scenes of just men. As Antony van Beysterveldt explains, “Hemos recalcado el privilegio que gozan los caballeros del Amadís y del Tirante de poder acceder libremente al medio ambiente femenino, libertad no estorbada todavía por un código de honor muy estricto a este respecto” (424). Simultaneously, the knights move within “una esfera de vida típicamente masculina de la cual queda rigurosamente excluida la mujer” (424). However, while there are many scenes in which women are absent, these are almost entirely centered on conflicts between men that serve as the counterweight for erotic encounters between battles. Our present scene stands out as a moment of special community between men (in particular, Muslims and Christians who have fought bitterly up until now), one of the few peaceful moments in the novel. This is particularly noteworthy considering that Tirant is, as the sole Christian, woefully outnumbered. Women no longer pose the distraction (or additional plot material) that we have seen in Constantinople, but rather are fundamental supports in Tirant’s work to establish a patriarchy.

After being shipwrecked on his way to the Castle of Malvesi, Tirant and a fellow survivor wash ashore in a vineyard on the Barbary Coast and “como toviern los estomagos llenos de razimos vieron alli una cueva y metieronse dentro a dormir desnudos aun como estaban. Como despertaron sintieronse frios: levantaronse y mudavan piedras de una parte a otra por escalar” (449). The combination of a shared meal and refuge in a cave to hide from an exterior enemy evokes a sense of home and community, affirming the scene’s distinctive male homosociality. Importantly, this moment comes after a storm nearly kills both men, reinforcing the sense of safety.

Afterwards, both men fall asleep together naked. They are discovered by a hunting party of Moors, who watch the still-nude Tirant as he sleeps. As mentioned in our previous chapter,

this is the culmination, albeit briefly, of Tirant's feminization, as the vulnerable, nude Tirant is now voyeuristically watched by several armed Moors. The North African coast was often associated with sodomy, a trope seen elsewhere in later texts like Cervante's *Baños de Argel*, and *Topografía e historia nueva de Argel* by Antonio de Sosa.¹⁵ For the Spanish audience, this would have also drawn on the collective rape of Spain as well as the punishment/penitence of Rodrigo. The cave similarly serves as a penitential place for Tirant, who is now subjected to the same voyeurism and threat of sexual violence that he directed toward Carmesina, recalling the parallel justice of Rodrigo's own penetration and being penetrated. For the reader,¹⁶ there is a moralistic reading where, as a consequence of Tirant's unregulated heterosexuality, sodomy threatens to penetrate the European youth. At the same time, there is also a reconciliation, as Tirant ingratiates himself with the Moors and becomes part of their community, though simultaneously an extension of the West as he battles, advises, and leads. Yet in addition to extending the reach of the patriarchy to the far shores of the Mediterranean, the reference to sodomy emphasizes the Otherness of the Muslim Orient. Crucially, sodomy is only present as a threat—this allows the author and audience to comfortably associate it with the Other, rather than accepting its presence at home, although later texts deal with this directly.

Tirant's physical beauty is emphasized throughout the encounter, emphasizing that he is the focus of homoerotic desire. The Moor that first finds him in the cave returns to the Ambassador, explaining that:

Señor yo no creo que natura pudo formar vn cuerpo mortal con mas perficion y hermosura que el que yo he visto... El debe estar mas muerto que bivo—por que la tez dela cara tiene descolorada con el mas hermoso gesto y lustre que yo jamas vi sus ojos

¹⁵ Joseph Armengol explains the homoeroticism of the setting by first highlighting how the North African coast, imagined to be home of a number of sexual vices, “becomes the place where the Christian knight momentarily undergoes a peculiar reversal from a position of power as voyeur to a position of subordination or passivity in his subjection to the lustful gaze of non-Christian others” (23).

¹⁶ Although our knight seems to have learned nothing when he rapes Carmesina after returning to Constantinople.

parecen robies engastados. En el universo mundo no creo que se pueda hallar un cuerpo mortal con tan linda propocion de miembros. (450)

As Armengol points out, the comparison between Tirant and “the attractiveness of the male and female nudes in Medieval and Renaissance painting” and also the comment on the whiteness of his skin and the ruby-like quality of his eyes (though here used to emphasize the knight’s sadness) evokes “descriptions of female beauty supplied by Petrarch” (24). The leader complies to the invitation to see the knight “con gran plazer” and, when he sees the knight, seems entranced as he does not speak until “por buen espacio estuvo mirando” (450). When he does speak, the ambassador says, “La gran beldad y hermosura que veo que tu persona posee me causa mucha piedad lastima de ti” (450).

The victorious champion of Christendom is now juxtaposed with the hare¹⁷ that the Moors pursue, taking its place and becoming the object of the hunt, long a symbol of erotic conquest. The armed Moors are in a clearly dominant position, which inverts the classical Petrarchan imagery of the hunter as the lover pursuing his beloved.

The scene, though brief, is the culmination of Tirant’s progressive feminization. Prior to coming to Africa, Tirant is at his lowest point in the novel: “An episode which follows a triple crisis caused by Carmesina’s seeming degradation, apparently given over to a blackamoor ‘hostile to our holy faith’ (chapter 283), and the defeat and fall of Bellpuig and of a good number of Tirant’s friends at the hands of the Turks (chapter 288)” (Hauf 69). Tirant’s overwhelming sexuality has been accompanied by a gradual feminization of the knight, culminating here. Earlier, Tirant dons Carmesina’s undershirt, which was given to him as a favor. Observing that “The construction of masculine identity in this episode is fraught with contradictions and signals the hero as female or a woman” (350), Piera refers to this as ‘drag,’ though it might be more

¹⁷ Recalling that rabbits were a symbol of licentiousness.

accurately understood as a cross-dressing effeminization.¹⁸ Later, when Tirant breaks his leg trying to jump down to the garden after invading Carmesina's bed, "Sus quejas de dolor, casi femeninas, provocarán otra delirante escena (cap. 234)" (Beltrán 115). Tirant's feminization culminates with his awakening in the cave (long a symbol of female genitalia) where, surrounded by men, he shifts from being subject to Carmesina's beauty to the object of the Moors' gaze. The cave is a pinnacle of feminization: "It is here that the tables are turned on Tirant: although he had shortly before spied secretly upon Carmesina in the garden near the cottage, it is now his body that serves as an object of inspection by various sets of Muslim eyes" (Barletta 69). As the Moors gaze upon his vulnerable, sleeping body and contemplate his beauty—a clear parallel to our previous scene where Tirant gazed on the bathing Carmesina before entering her bed as she sleeps—, Tirant is surely at his most effeminized.

As we saw in our previous chapter, the scene's tension becomes obvious later as the ambassador compares him to Saint Sebastian: "como te vi desnudo sin camisa mirando tu gentil y bien proporcionado cuerpo semejante, al de San Sebastian que fue asaeado: y el tuyo fue visto lleno de heridas" (454).¹⁹ This makes clear the homoerotic attraction that has been implied up until now. However, by now, Tirant has been able to provide a second reading that changes how the Moors see him, seizing agency on the margins of the Muslim Orient, as he converts from a beautiful, homoerotic Saint Sebastian to a scarred, indomitable Saint Sebastian, and, at the same time, the cave from a symbol of effeminacy into one of rebirth through solidarity with other men. Tirant is recruited to help the ambassador, as the possibility of sodomy soon gives away to

¹⁸ Tirant, in donning the aljuba given to him by the embajador's son, is correcting his previous gender transgression here with, curiously, a racial one. Embracing the (male) Moorish Other ultimately enables him to succor the Byzantine emperor. Published long prior to the expulsion of the Moriscos, and even prior to the fall of Granada, *Tirant* portrays a future in which converted Muslims had a place in Christendom, though, as we have seen, not necessarily in Constantinople or Valencia.

¹⁹ Armengol explains the homoeroticism implicit in the reference to San Sebastian "as an extraordinarily popular subject for painters and [who] frequently depicted, as discussed earlier, with strong homoerotic undertones" (25).

family ties that foster a sense of belonging and community. The commander of the party insists to Tirant, “Yo te juro por nuestro santo profeta Mahoma que te ha librado de tan gran peligro y te ha hecho gracia que seas venido en mi poder... Yo tengo tres hijos tu seras el quarto” (450).²⁰ Sodomy is only an unspoken threat, which changes in our next works. However, simultaneously, the possibility of homosexual desire enables Tirant to integrate quickly into the Muslim society.

Adding to all this, the commander’s son “prestamente... se desnudo un aljuba y sela dio” (451). This gesture of sharing clothes both reaffirms that Tirant is a member of the family (the commander has already told his son, “le ternas a este como a hermano” (450)) but it is also a charitable gesture that seeks to remedy Tirant’s need. Later, Tirant is lent a horse, and escorted through the hostile territory to safety. This is paralleled as the commander insists on knowing what ails Tirant while presenting his own dilemma: “despues que abre acabado una empresa que es interese del mayor de mis hijos porque forciblemente le quieren tomar su esposa, la qual cosa jamas consentiré de mi grado: porque es doncella muy virtuosa e hija del rey de Termicen” (451). This naturally is accompanied by a promise: “que yo te hare rico como sea buelto a mi casa que agora no puedo: porque los hados adversos de fortuna no han querido que el matrimonio que esta jurado sea venido assi que desseamos” (451).

The two thus enter into a communal contract, agreeing to help one another and creating a homosocial bond where, as men, differences in religion, age, blood lines do not matter. The reader naturally understands that the undefeated Tirant, through his various skirmishes with other knights and the battles he has commanded along the way, is the best possible solution to save the chief’s son and his wife from the hostile Rey Escariano. In the same way, the commander’s promise to make the now-destitute Tirant rich and to resolve the source of his sadness is, for Tirant, a great show of

²⁰ This is repeated again: “prometiendo te por nuestro santo profeta Mahoma que yo te tenga en cuenta de hijo” (451) and then finally, “porque al presente te ruego como a hijo que ayas compasion de mi miseria” (454).

humanity and of the commander's nobility, as he says,

De mucha humanidad y gentileza procede a ver piedad y compasion delos miserables afligidos y a mi es mucha consolacion y gloria aver acertado a ser venido en poder de vuestra señora por captivo o prisionero. Por ves ser cavallaro tan magnifico y virtuoso que me aveys prometido galardón delo que la fortuna justamente me ha quitado. (451)

The mutual praise, and the willingness to help one another with problems through sharing resources and skills paint a picture of social cohesion and unity.

In a curious maneuver, however, it is ultimately not sodomy that threatens Tirant, but rather heterosexual jealousy, paralleling the jealousy over Carmesina that sent Tirant from Constantinople at the beginning of this episode. The present sense of community is disrupted when Tirant is taken to a castle selected specifically by the commander for Tirant's protection. "para que el rey de Tunez no se enterase de nada, ya que le habian tomado en su tierra, decidieron enviarlo a uno de sus castillos, para que lo tuviesen bien guardado y no huyese" (452). Once Tirant arrives at the castle, which belongs to the commander's oldest son, "el qual estava desposado con la hija del rey de Termicen: y dixeronle como su padre avia embiado alli un prisionero cristiano: el qual era hombre de muy gentil disposicion... El desposado mando que fuesse bien guardado y le pusiesen cadena y grillos y ansi le hizo" (452).

Significantly, this first-born son is engaged to the princess of Tremicen, the same princess that King Escariano falls for and plans to steal. This drives a collective rupture in male homosociality, as woman disrupts the concord between the Moors, driving the war that Tirant now joins. Moreover, on an individual level, Tirant, is also affected by divisive heterosexual desire, imprisoned for, seemingly, no other reason than his "gentil disposicion." The son seems jealous of Tirant, and worried that he will seduce the princess, making Tirant the same class of threat as King Escariano. However, this disruption simultaneously provides the stage upon which Tirant can perform as a crusader and evangelizer: where heterosexuality proved a distraction for

Tirant in Constantinople, it now provides a point of entry between the divided Moors, as he chooses a side and conquers. This emphasizes the importance of the homosociality that has defined Tirant's adventures in North Africa thus far, as the entrance of a single woman destroys the sense of community and mutual understanding between men. This contrasts with the new Tirant, for whom the cave marks a turning point, as he is no longer preoccupied with wooing Carmesina. While up until now, his military successes in the Byzantine empire have been countered by his uncontrollable sexuality,²¹ he is now able to subdue the entirety of Africa with relative ease, becoming a champion of homosociality.

Crusader

The homosocial cave becomes a staging ground for Tirant's larger missions to evangelize and civilize his Muslim hosts, spreading the European mode of organizing sexuality, as the cave's male homosociality becomes a template for the new society of converts. Moments after the Moors find him, "Tirant is transformed into a missionary reformer and organizer" (Casanovas 105). Just as with Pelayo, Tirant's rebirth from the cave (a vagina-turned-womb) signals the conquest of Muslim lands. This begins when, upon leaving the cave, Tirant trips, and the Moors take it as a bad omen. Tirant, instead, explains:

a mi me llaman blanco y la luna es clara blanca y hermosa en esta hora en que soy caydo. Y la luna queda en derecho de mi cabeça y de los braços señalando el camino que devo hazer: y no ha quedado atrás ni al costado. Y mis manos han quedado abiertas y estendidas azia la luna: por que se muestra que yo con ayuda de la divinia potencia tengo de conquistar toda la berberia. (453)

Albert Hauf sheds light on how Tirant quickly pivots his fall into an eschatological moment:

"Tirant relates the intense brightness of the moon—the emblem of Islam—to his own lineage,

²¹ "Ha luchado contra sus impulsos sexuales, difíciles de refrenar (Tirant no es, como se ha dicho, un tímido) y contra las peores circunstancias" (Beltrán 116).

which he now says is his ‘true name’ (chapter 301)” (71). Moreover, the knight, “with his arms extended, superimposes the sign of the Cross on the earth which is dominated by the moon” (71).

Accordingly, Tirant becomes, shortly after leaving the cave,

the military leader who Machiavellianly puts into practice one of the most insistent predictions of apocalyptic messianism: the destruction of the Mohammedan sect and the conversion of the infidels in a stage prior to the imminent coming of the Antichrist. With the curious detail that Tirant himself is the subtle prophet of his own action. (73)

The male homosocial utopia into which Tirant arrives serves as the first step in a larger attempt to convert the whole of North Africa, which aides his battle to reclaim Constantinople.

The community between the two Christians extends to encompass the whole of North Africa, turning it into an extension of Europe. As mentioned, this includes building a local patriarchy modeled after the Christian one that Tirant tries to violate in Constantinople, founded and enabled by the homosociality of the first scene. The patriarchal assertion of authority endeavors to put men at the center of African society, paralleling the opening scene’s homosociality. This happens along two different lines—through establishing patriarchal lineage and androgenizing the women.

In evangelizing, Tirant also restructures the Oriental organization of sexuality. This is most evident after Tirant’s campaign, where Queen Emeraldine imposes marriage on the Ethiopians, who previously held all women in common (recalling Tirant’s unregulated heterosexuality), and had not recognized paternity with their children. In addition to this, Tirant also creates a hereditary chivalric order, thus regulating questions of genealogy and establishing the importance of men as sole indicators of social class.²² There are several mass baptisms: in

²² “Despues que la mistad fue confirmada Tirante hizo esta ordenacion y privilegio militar. Primeramente ordeno que todo hombre que mantoviesse caballo y armas fuesse dicho gentil hombre o libertado: y el que toviesse dos caballos fuese gentil hombre y hombre de paje. Quien toviesse tres caballos fuesse dicho gentil hombre y hombre generoso y cavallo. E la casa destes tales o pagasen ningún derecho al rey. E cada uno destes si toviesen lugares

book 4, chapter XXXI, Tirant must stop his campaign due to the flood of Saracens;²³ later in book 5, chapter III, Tirant must use every vessel that can be found for all the baptisms;²⁴ in book 5, chapter IX, a multitude of Ethiopians are baptized²⁵. After the latter, Tirant and the converted Queen Emeraldine order the construction of churches and monasteries. While baptism serves as a public proclamation of conversion to Christianity, it also reinforces the family unit by demonstrating paternity and tracking genealogy.

Most crucially the women in the text are desexualized and submitted to the state—in contrast to the women of the Greek empire, who are unanimously eroticized to different degrees, the women here are, instead, brought into the male homosocial sphere (a contrast with Tirant’s contrary feminization as he pursues Carmesina). In chapter XL book 4, Tirant conscripts “*todos quantos hombres y mujeres muchachos aver pudieredes*” (501), dressing them as men, “*a todos las camisas sobre las aljubas: y busquen se tantas calabazas y barriles como aver se pueden y cada muger y los mozos pequeños traygan aquellas tan altas como pudieren y cubran las de paño blanco*” (501). The strategy works, as the opposing army is fooled into overestimating the size of the Christian forces; the underlying moral is that women are best when acting as men.

Later, the women join in the fighting: “*la reyna con todas las otras mugeres subieron a cavallo y pusieronse en orden assi com avian acostumbrado*” (507). Here, women are made more

granjas o alquerías todos fuesen francos y libres. E por esta ordenanza fueron hallados los hombres generosos en la berveria” (491).

²³ “E complidas las cosas sobredichas Tirante torno a batizar y la priessa era tanto de los moros que se querían batizar que Tirante no basta de noche y de días en darles el sancto baptismo” (487).

²⁴ “Despues que el sermon fue acabado todos los moros que no eran cristianos con grandes bozes demandaron el santo baptismo. Y luego Tirante en la dicha plaza hizo traer grandes baces llenos de agua y otros aparejos y ovo tanto frayles y clergios como allí se pudieren aver que Tirante avia hecho edificar muchos monasterios en las ciudades que avian ganadas: y muchas otras iglesias: y avia hecho venir muchos clerigos y frayles de otras partes de la cristiandad, y a que todos se batizaron allí los que avian de yr como los que quedavan, y dentro de tres días fueron bautizados ccc.xxx.iiii. mil personas entre hombres y mujeres y niños” (553).

²⁵ “Ella como llevo en la ciudad de Trogodita hizo predicar al pueblo que se hiziessen cristianos. y muchos por amor del rey y de la reyna que eran cristianos. y otros por devoción se bautizaron. Y entonces la reyna hizo luego edificar muchos monasterios e iglesias y el rey les dio muchas rentas” (558).

masculine, shifting the dividing line from sexual to religious, as both men and women work harmoniously to defend their society. This contrasts with both Constantinople, where the women are diametrically opposed to the men along sexual lines, and also with the Muslim Barbary now divided over a woman, as the two sides fight to marry the Moorish princess. Juxtaposed on the conflict between the two rival factions of Moors is the conflict between Tirant's male homosociality and the opposing Muslims given to heterosexuality. This becomes evident when Tirant first recounts Placerdemivida, and faints. One of his companions fears that he has been seduced, asking "que haze aqui esta hechizera y de diablos invocadora," and moves to attack her before Tirant stops him. (522). Heterosexuality (crucially in the form of Placerdermivida, the go-between that drives Tirant's obsessive pursuit of Carmesina) presents itself as the only true threat to Tirant's campaign. Tirant's victory in the larger war against the opposing Moors and heterosexuality (as the two sides fight over the princess) is preceded by his own internal victory in the cave, as he submits his sexuality to the service of the European Church and state.

In contrast to the imbalanced sexuality that hinders, and ultimately kills him in the Greek Orient of Constantinople, Tirant is both able to resist any sexual temptation as well as exploit his own sexuality to assist his colonial attempts, using it to further the agenda of the West. Contrary to his previous voyeurism, in the cave, he is an object of beauty, as his gallant looks help him to ingratiate himself to the Moors, enthraling them as he convinces them of his valor as a warrior.²⁶

The Queen of Tunis is charmed similarly by Tirant in chapter XXIII of the fourth book, exclaiming after calling him to her bedroom, "como yo mas piadosa que otra tuve tanto

²⁶ As Tirant's ambassador later explains in Constantinople during his account of Tirant's success in Chapter XCII of book 4: the chief of chiefs, "viendo su hermosa disposicion hizole baena compañia: y tomole en tanto amor que le lleva una consigo en la guerra" (542-43). Tirant's nude body's beauty at first enthralles, but soon, as his masculinity reasserts itself, it becomes a record of his numerous victories, as he pivots from a beautiful to an invincible Saint Sebastian.

contentamiento de tu virtuosa persona de tanta singularidad proporcionada que aborresci a mi esposo no teniendo ojo con que ve le pudiese” (480). When Tirant objects due to religious differences, she offers to convert²⁷. Tirant responds by leading her on.²⁸ Again, Tirant uses his sexuality to gain influence among his Muslim hosts. The support that he receives from the Christianized queen results in the conversion of her husband (chapter xxviii book 4, pg. 484) that leads to the mass baptisms above.

As an extension of Tirant’s own sexuality, now controlled, he urges the ribald Placerdemivida finally to marry during the North African Crusade, closing her off as a threat of non-normative sexuality. She is a figure of non-normative sex-for-pleasure being unable to have children, and expressing attraction for Carmesina while she bathes, and later acting as go-between for both Tirant and Carmesina, as well as their cousins. She embodies an unrestricted sexuality that regularly spurs on the knight as he pursues Carmesina. Now, Tirant, after subduing North Africa, awards her with Fez and Bougie, and then insists that she marry a knight to help her defend her realms, using against her the logic that she previously used to persuade Estefania and Carmesina to succumb to the advance of their western suitors.

Tirant’s male homosociality thus serves as a beachhead from which the unregulated heterosexuality of the Moors can be organized into a mirror image of patriarchal Spain. While sodomy menaces the knight, it also provides him agency as an attractive almost-catamite who charms his way into a powerful Berber family. This ambivalence recalls Rodrigo’s punishment, where his emasculation permits the vindication of Spanish identity and the Reconquista.

²⁷ “En lo que dizes que siendo yo mora y tu cristano que tal matrimonio ser no puede: yo hare buen remedio con que se pueda bien hacer... si hacer no lo querras queriendo dezir que tu ley es mejor que la mia: de buen grandio lo creere y siempre dire que assi es” (482).

²⁸ “delibro de mostrar mucho amor a la reyna porque toviessse gana de se hazer xpriana: no perjudicando en nada el amor que a la su preincesa tenia: y con cara alegre mostrando se muy contento della con gracioso jesto y habla hizo principio a tal respuesta” (482).

Tirant's adventures in North Africa therefore reveal a crucial shift when in contrast to Greek Constantinople discussed in our previous chapter. In Christian Constantinople, the harem-like scene becomes a sexual trap, through which Tirant ultimately sacrifices the place that he has worked hard to earn win a hegemonic Christianity. In contrast, the knight adopts a more chaste, controlled approach on the shores of Muslim North Africa. Several important differences become evident in the novel's use of two different Orientalisms. Fantasy about an exoticized sexual Other is not unique to imaginings of the Muslim world; rather, to find eroticized, voyeured women, one need only go as far as the edge of Christendom. The task of subduing and dominating the Muslim Other is fairly direct and simple—the superiority of European ways is self-evident. A much greater challenge is fighting the threat from within of unbridled sexuality.²⁹ Meanwhile, our next text chronologically offers an opposing example, as Pedro de Urdemalas resists the temptation of the harem, and thus escapes death in the Orient.

Viaje de Turquía (1557)

The anonymous *Viaje de Turquía* has a similar scene, demonstrating again how a vision of hegemonic Spain asserts itself by using our male homosocial heterotopia. Catamites now become an extension of the community that Pedro first finds in the prison. Pedro narrates his escape from Turkey to his friends in Spain while on his way to Santiago de Compostela. After Pedro had been taken captive on the Mediterranean and forced to row as a galley slave, he arrives in Constantinople and is imprisoned. Our male homosocial space here is similar to Tirant's, providing shelter and solidarity from an external Muslim threat. However, sodomy is no longer an implicit threat, but rather a reality for the *pajes* that Pedro encounters. He offers an empathetic

²⁹ Recalling Chapter XXXI, book 4 of *Tirant*, which predicts the fall of Valencia due to the presence of foreigners and converts.

reading of them that connects them to sodomy in Spain, now prosecuted more heavily than in the time of our previous text. The work thus joins our previous one in defending homosociality against the pressure to marry, and in so doing couching an alternate vision of Spain within an assertion of Spanish hegemony against the Orient.

The prison

Immediately when Pedro arrives into the Turkish baths (within a page of where his account of life in Constantinople begins), we find a moment that parallels the previous scenes of male homosociality. The scene is significant in two ways: this is the only anecdote that he narrates about life within the prison, and is a contrast to his descriptions of the procedures and structures of it, standing out for its intimate narration. It is also a bookend to the harem scene which follows it, as Jessica Boll observes: “From the exterior street space, the foci of the works shift sequentially to the interior spaces of the palace, the harem and the domains of Christian captivity” (*Tale of a City* 88). The harem and the prison are thus linked, both by gender and spatially.

The scene fits our previous description most obviously as it emphasizes homosocial community. Pedro introduces the scene by mentioning that his companions are all men: “estábamos quinze caballeros y yo una noche entre muchas sin tener que çenar otra cosa sino media escudilla de vino.” The sense of concord is developed further in the ensuing discussion of what to do with the short candle “como tres dedos de largo, que fue la primera que en tres meses habíamos tenido” that a captive gave them. The candle is so important that it must be decided democratically, as between equals: “Fue menester botar entre todos de qué serviria” (160). This structure of social equality (evident also in that Pedro refers to his co-captives all as ‘caballeros,’ putting everyone on the same socioeconomic plane) underscores again the social cohesion,

recalling Tirant's family of Moors as well as Rodrigo's concerned hermit. Despite the fact that there is a man who "más autoridad tenía y a quien todos obedecíamos" (160), the sixteen Christians are able to arrive at a compromise that meets various ends, agreeing to use the candlelight to delouse and provide light for a meal.

The prison recalls the caves of our previous texts. As in Tirant's cave, the question of being the object of an Oriental gaze is also evoked, though, it is the Christians who now control and provide the light, shielding them from the Other. Pedro is beyond the reach of the gaze of the Ottomans and jailers, a contrast to the cave in *Tirant* where the knight took refuge from the storm and hostile Moors. Both the cave and prison are marginalized zones, the polar opposite of the harem at the center of the metropolis. The prison is a communal space, offering a utopian vision marked by shared food and social cohesion. The dinner consists of both the above-mentioned wine and "gracias a Dios [...] pan fresco, aunque negro pero ciertamente bueno" (160). The shared bread and wine evoke the Last Supper, strengthening Pedro's comparison of life as a captive to martyrdom, while it also conveys a sense of apostle-like solidarity. The distribution of the wine is organized without hierarchy, such that "destajamos que ninguno metiese dos veces su sopa en la escudilla de vino, sino que, metidas dentro tantas quantos éramos, cada uno sacase la suya por orden" (160). Equal servings and organization of who is served first point to a cohesive, even harmonious group, that contrasts with the hierarchy of "tiranía" with which Pedro labels the Ottoman state (94).³⁰ The prison is a refuge despite the cruel Turkish masters outside, and contrasts with the hierarchy that we have seen in the harem.

Adding to this parallel, the communal delousing at the end of the meal adds to the intimacy and recalls how Tirant and his companion removed their dry clothes as well as

³⁰ "aquel monstruo turquesco, vituperio de la natura humana, sea destruido y anichilado de tal manera, que torne en livertad los tristes christianos oprimidos de grave tiranía" (94).

Rodrigo's own penitential nudity. Pedro explains, "Tras esto cada uno se desnudó, y comenzamos de matar jente, de cada golpe no uno sino quantos cabían en la prensa" (160). The partial nudity here reinforces the sense of homosocial community.

In addition to this sense of community, the prison cell represents a safe, intimate place, evoking a home. This is reinforced by the setting in which Pedro recounts his captivity. Two chapters prior, Pedro enters a house for the first time in his long journey home: "Vendito sea Dios por siempre jamás, que ésta es la primera vez que entro en casa hartos días ha. Buena quadra está ésta por cierto" (117). The prison and the house parallel one another in numerous ways. Most importantly, they mark Pedro's entry into a new society, first Turkey, and now, back into Spain; the two are put on the same level, suggesting that Pedro's return home is as laden with challenges as his imprisonment in Turkey, alluding to the compulsory heterosexuality he resists as discussed below.

Moreover, both are places of male homosociality and conviviality, as Ana Vian Herrero comments: "El traslado a la casa, donde cenar, ... ha de entenderse como uso significativo del motivo, para recapitular, acentuar el aspecto de entretenimiento y ocio y someter sus temas a la receta útil de la convivialidad" (65). Both the house ("el espacio íntimo y secreto de la casa de Juan y de Mátalas Callando" (Ortola, "Modos" 64)) and prison are defined by community, but also by their marginality—Pedro's detour delays his arrival to Santiago de Compostela. Both spaces mark Pedro's initiation into a new space, whether Constantinople or Spain, a sort of marginal zone where he transitions from one identity to another (from picaro to captive to Spaniard, as we shall see). The text uses these parallels to collapse the prison into the domestic space, which in turn brings an alternative vision of Spain back into the domestic space, the locus of the dominant Spanish discourse.

The house is crucial to foregrounding the prison as a penitential space.³¹ “Having left Spain a mischievous pícaro, Pedro is unexpectedly shown the error of his ways while in the land of the infidels” (Boll, *Tale of a City* 110), which further foregrounds this moment. Ortolá elaborates further on Pedro’s past, comparing him to Lazarillo de Tormes: “This account is not concretely related to his birth or family history. Very little attention is paid to ancestry, a minor factor in the life of a Christian. . . . Pedro's background is no more nor less respectable than Lázaro's. His cultural heritage is responsible for the numerous tribulations he suffers” (Ortolá, *Spiritual Awakening* 91).

The prison scene marks a break from Pedro’s life as a *pícaro*, as does the house for Juan de Voto a Dios. It is the first time that Pedro speaks with an account of Constantinople and, crucially, he shifts from being an antisocial figure who took advantage of society by running cons (as does Juan) to, in the small community of the dark cell, one who is central in organizing it. Recalling the similar pivots of Rodrigo and Tirant, the scene is thus a vital transformation for Pedro and marks repentance from his previous life. Pedro says, “paresciome que valia mas la enmienda tarde que nunca, y esa fue la causa porque me determine a dexar la ociosa y mala vida, de la qual Dios me ha castigado con un tan grande azote que me le dexo senalado hasta que me muera” (123).

Echoing its antagonistic role in the legend of Rodrigo and in *Tirant*, here too does heterosexuality pose a threat. Pedro explains that Christian guards are enticed to betray their co-

³¹ Ortolá notes: “Es en el espacio de la casa donde Juan confesará su pecado y pedirá la receta de la enmienda,” referring to the friend’s practice of conning pilgrims. The home is also a place where Pedro can demonstrate his own changed nature: “ahí es donde Pedro demostrará la importancia de practicar una religión interiorizada y de renovarse espiritualmente, volviendo sobre su pasado y presentando su vida en cautiverio como aprendizaje de una sabiduría que pasa por una reforma de sí-mismo” (“Modos” 70). Juan de Voto a Dios’s penitence foregrounds Pedro’s narration of his own repentance from life as a rogue prior to his captivity.

religionaries in order to spend time in taverns and brothels.³² Discussing the temptation to go from prostitute to prostitute triggers a conversation on prostitution that draws further emphasis to how sex plays a role in destroying the fellowship between Christian men. This is in keeping with the broader misogyny of the text seen in our previous chapter.³³

The all-male prison cell reflects “la definitiva ubicación en los márgenes de la mujer turca que defiende la obra” (Martínez Góngora 38) as does the previous dialogue comparing convents and harems.³⁴ Martínez Góngora suggests that this relates to “la valoración positiva de la experiencia turca [que] radique en la manera en que han sabido utilizar a las mujeres para solucionar con éxito las dificultades relacionadas con la conflictiva construcción de la identidad masculina” (38). This criticism of the destructive effects of unrestrained sex gives cover to a criticism of compulsive marriage and the compulsory heterosexuality that underpins it.³⁵ Pedro indirectly criticizes the Tridentine elevation of marriage to a sacrament by praising the ease of divorce in Constantinople, as Ohanna notes in her analysis of the work:³⁶ “El divorcio era un tema candente: la sesión del Concilio de Trento del 11 de noviembre de 1563 se consagró a la doctrina del sacramento del matrimonio, decretándose en ella la excomunión para quienes

³² Matalascallando asks why Christian guards betray their co-religionaries by working as guards in the baños: “¿Pues quieren más aquella vida de guardar christianos que estar acá?” Pedro answers, “porque acá han de vivir como quienes son, y allá, siendo como son ruines y de ruin suelo, son señores de mandar a muchos buenos que hay cautibos, y libres para emborracharse cada día en las tabernas y andarse de ramera en ramera a costa de los pobres súbditos” (164).

³³ Aleida Tamayo Portuondo attributes this to the author’s Erasmian leanings, “Finalmente hablemos de la misoginia en ambos autores. Erasmo, célibe, es agresivo y despectivo con las mujeres; las ataca por su vanidad, tontería y liviandad, considerándolas seres inferiores a los hombres” (XXXV).

³⁴ And also consistent with the later chapter on women, where Pedro praises the Turks as a society that was more homosocial and less heterosexual: “En sola una cosa biben los turcos en razón y es ésta: que no estiman las mugeres ni hazen más caso dellas que de los asadores, cuchares y cazos que tienen colgados de la espetera” (438).

³⁵ Interestingly, Marie-Sol Ortola compares Pedro to a knight, evoking the genre that Tin associates with Europe’s homosocial past, “It should also be mentioned that Pedro flees Turkey in the company of the old surgeon who taught him wit, greed and medicine. Thus the return to Spain is not a solitary journey. It is rather the journey of a Christian knight and his squire” (*Spiritual Awakening* 95).

³⁶ In particular, of Pedro’s description and defense of divorce among Christians in Constantinople: “Están juntos como marido y muger hasta que se quieran apartar o se arrepientan, por mejor dezir. ... desta manera están casados quantos ... cristianos muchos que han sido cautivos y son ya libres, viendo que hay mejor manera de ganar de comer allá que acá, luego toman sus mugeres y hazen casa y hogar” (408).

argumentaran a favor de su disolubilidad” (55).

Further demonstrating this, when pressed on the subject of why he didn't marry, he replies, rather cryptically, “Porque me vine al mejor tiempo, que de otra manera creed que lo hiziera por gozar del barato que hartas me pidían” (409). His reply “me vine al mejor tiempo” is evasive and non-descript—he does not describe what the ‘best time’ might have been. He has already rejected any subtle advances by the sultana,³⁷ and does not confirm plans for marriage after ending his pilgrimage. Additionally, the insistence on the ‘best time’ rejects any pressure of marriage on societal terms—it affirms, rather, his own agency to choose when. His past as a pícaro suggests that Pedro may simply lack interest in marriage and rejects social pressure, recalling “the mature pícaro’s failed amorous relations with women” (Cruz, *Figuring Gender* 7). Rejecting marriage to a religious or ethnic Other functions as a launchpad for rejecting marriage entirely, thus challenging the dominant vision of Spain where such a submission to the state was necessary.

Garzones and pajes

The male homosocial solidarity extends itself beyond the prison, as Pedro finds unexpected allies among the *garzones* who serve the Ottomans. This is part of a subtle strategy that the author deploys to draw the young, violated men back into the European sphere while also closing the distance between homoeroticism in the Orient and at home. The result is a different view of Spain, where same-sex attraction could be tolerated.

³⁷ The sultana is an appealing option, as being the richest, most powerful woman in the Ottoman Empire, and, as Pedro has admitted, beautiful. It is plausible to attribute this to concerns of *limpieza de sangre*, or that Pedro would be tempted to convert to Islam, but it is worth noting that this did not pose a problem for Cervantes, as we'll see in *La gran sultana*, and that the conversion of a Saracen queen for love of a Christian knight was a trope in chivalric romance, as we've seen with *Tirant* and in Sharon Kinoshita's article “The politics of courtly love: ‘La Prise d'Orange’ and the conversion of the Saracen queen.”

The pages, typically enslaved European youths, often help Pedro to survive and navigate Constantinople. In Chapter VIII, the Rustá Baja's page warns Pedro that the Jewish doctors are plotting to slander him. Later, in the same chapter, another renegade page explains that his master will not pay the necessary medical bill, unless by artifice. In other moments, pages serve as translators, or to bring the narrator up-to-date (Chapter IX) on medical cases. Crucially, Pedro does not pause to condemn the pages as renegades or catamites. Perhaps the culminating moment of Pedro's insistence on seeing the pages as human rather than sexualized beings is during a moment where Pedro's master falls very ill, to the point of death. Pedro enters the room, "Y quedamos a puerta zerrada un gentil hombre que se llamaba Perbis Agá, thesorero suyo y el más privado de toda la casa, que me tenía tanta y tan estrecha amistad como si fuéramos hermanos y el que jamás se apartó de la cama del Baxá en toda su enfermedad, y el barbero y yo y un paje" (235). The warm description of Perbis Agá, a close friend who never left his master's side, evokes an intimate, emotional scene.

Moreover, while the treasurer's presence is justified and the barber and narrators are both there for medical ends, the page's presence is curious. While having pages was unremarkable (Pedro later mentions another page who helps dress his master), calling attention to something that would have been ordinary is, in fact, extraordinary. This invites further consideration. It is not unreasonable to think that the page might be among those who, "quando yo estaba en la cámara de Çinán Baxá los vía los muchachos entre sí que lo deprendían con tiempo, y los mayores festejaban a los menores" (418). The scene thus subtly and tenderly shows a lover accompanying his master's bedside, underscoring the author's insistence on downplaying the importance of their sexuality here. Moreover, the narrator gives the page a voice in representing his decision to stay by his master's side. Instead of being reduced to the victim of the

circumstances as a catamite, he is able express himself by his presence.

In addition to establishing them as empathetic characters, Pedro also delays mentioning their sexual purpose. In contrast, he establishes the frequency of sodomy among the Ottomans quite early, in Chapter V: “Y aun bujarrones son los más, que lo deprenden de los turcos” (164) when answering a question about prostitution in the city. The penetrated partner, *paje*, is put into sexual terms much later, in Chapter XVII, when Pedro answers Matalacallando’s question of whether or not there are prostitutes in the army: “En todo el ejército de ochenta mill hombres que yo vi, no había ninguna. Es la verdad que, como son bujarrones y lleban pajes hartos, no hazen caso de mugeres” (421). This passage thus shows a humorous, rather than moralistic, treatment of sodomy, which Jeremy Lawrance calls “priggishly jocose” (31).

The use of the term *paje* rather than *garzon* is also striking. The more laden *garzon* is used to describe young penetrated partners in works like *La gran sultana* and Diego de Haedo’s *Topografía e historia general de Argel*. Here, while the Ottomans are repeatedly classified as *buxarrones* (the penetrative party), Pedro prefers instead the less exotic term *paje* for the penetrated party. This closes some of the distance between the concept of catamites and Spanish culture. *Paje*³⁸ retains its more obvious meaning, an errand boy charged with domestic duties. The term both establishes the importance of the catamite’s domestic rather than erotic value, and also redirects the reader’s attention back to Spain, where pages were also subject to the advances of older men.³⁹ In contrast, *garzon* was used far less frequently, and was used within erotic contexts to evoke young male beauty.⁴⁰ Moreover, according to Covarrubias, it has an Arabic

³⁸ Covarrubias writes: “PAGE, comunmente le tomamos por el muchacho que sirve algun señor.” Covarrubias then explains its Greek and Latin etymology, “que vale muchacho” (573).

³⁹ As was the case with the famous actor Cosme Perez, whose 1636 case involved the page of the Count of Castrillo.

⁴⁰ A cursory look on the database Teatro de Siglo de Oro shows that its corpus contains 472 uses of *paje*, in contrast to 15 uses of *garzon* (and no uses of the variant *garçon*). Of the 15, three are from *La gran sultana*, the Cervantine work set in Constantinople, and eight of the remaining times uses are in a romantic if not erotic context.

etymology: “Garçon, vale tanto como mancebo. El padre Guadix dize ser Arabigo, y que vale planta nueve: la alusión es buena porque el hombre dizen, que es un árbol buelto al revés con las raizes que son los cabeos hazia el cielo, arbor, inversa” (429). The sense of the word as Arabic in origin further aligns it with the Muslim world.

Unlike in *Tirant*, sodomy is not a foreign, Oriental act that exists at a safe distance from Spain, but, instead, a common ground between both Spain and Constantinople, challenging the dominant version of Spain, where such acts cannot exist. As Jeremy Lawrance writes, “Whether or not we take seriously Pedro de Urdemalas's boutades against Turkish pederasty... we are constantly brought back to the fact that this mode of discourse involves a corresponding Image of Europe” (31). Lawrance highlights a particular line, where Juan de Voto Dios reacts to Çinán Baxá’s harem of 63 wives: “¿Qué quería hazer de tantas mugeres? ¿No le bastaba una, siendo buxarrones como deçís?” (440), which “presupposes that a single wife can only satisfy the appetites of a man if he has the alternative solace of sodomy.” This is nestled within the work’s opposition to compulsory heterosexuality, as Juan suggests, albeit playfully, that “polygamy intrinsically offers more pleasure (*gozo*) than monogamy” (31). The work thus opposes marriage at numerous junctions—Pedro refuses to marry, and polygamy and homosexuality are suggested as more pleasurable alternatives.

This move is particularly daring, given the increasing restriction of same-sex attraction during the work’s era. In 1497, seven years after the Catalán publication of *Tirant*, sodomy was promoted to a crime of heresy that “specified as penalties death at the stake and the confiscation of all the culprit’s possessions” (Pérez 91). In Aragon, it was under the purview of the Inquisition in Aragon,⁴¹ thanks to “authorization from Pope Clement VII in 1524 to prosecute those

⁴¹ While in Castile, sodomy was prosecuted by the state, after the town of Cartagena protested against inquisitorial involvement in 1504 (Pérez 92).

apprehended under charges of sodomy in response to anxieties concerning the sexual mores of the morisco population in the area” (Vélez-Quiñones 37). The Spanish state became increasingly invested in curtailing sodomy; parallel to this, we note that, in contrast to *Tirant*, where being sodomized by Muslims was only implicit, in our current text, catamites are clearly portrayed. However, this portrayal shows two contradictory visions of Spain. As per the official version of Spain, the text’s catamites are excluded physically from other Christians. Yet, a subversive vision of Spain is also present, as the *garzones* are connected back to Spain through the unusual use of *pajes*, and, in the particular case of the page who watches over a dying Çinán Baxá, alludes to the intergenerational relationships that were persecuted in Spain. Additionally, the *pajes* prove to be allies (an extension of the supportive Christian community shown in the prison), demonstrating that they have not lost their faith. While the narrative superficially decries sodomy, a closer reading resists and questions Spain’s harsh punishment of same-sex desire—here again, two different Spanish utopias overlap.

Homosociality is thus asserted both against Ottoman hegemony, yet also against the compulsory heterosexuality that is central in dominant Spanish discourse. The male space, as well as support from the *garzones* demonstrate the versatility of the Christians to defend and support each other even in captivity. In contrast, Cervantes takes a more modern approach by embracing (though never without problematizing) the Spanish state’s view on marriage. The male homosocial space is thus inverted and redirected back to criticize Spain, as, more daringly, Cervantes suggests that catamites have a positive role to play in Christian societies.

El amante liberal (1613)

Writing after the decisive Spanish rout of Ottoman forces in the Battle of Lepanto in

1571 and more active Spanish punishment of sodomy,⁴² Cervantes moves the question of European hegemony to the background. Instead, the author adapts a critical view of male homosociality that has proven to be a refuge until now in our previous texts. Cervantes opts to promote marriage and, with it, heterosexuality rather than male solidarity. Catamites now appear within European society, a step closer to furthering their compassionate treatment. This provides another vision of Spain that is even more opposed to the hegemonic one than what we have seen previously.

Cervantes's novella narrates the captivity of Ricardo and his reluctant love, Leonisa. The two are captured by Ottomans, and manage to manipulate them into fighting each other, allowing the couple to return home along with their renegade allies, Mahamut and Halima, who wish to convert back to Christianity. Here, the male homosocial heterotopia offers criticisms of Spain. *Garzones* are now invited to reintegrate into Western society (crucially, not Spain), yet only under the condition of submitting to compulsory heterosexuality by marriage. As in our first chapter, the author uses Sicily as a foil to demonstrate Spanish hegemony.

Prior to beginning our analysis of *El amante liberal*, it is helpful here to recall Georges Güntert's suggestion that the work lends itself to two overlapping readings, one official, and the other ironic.⁴³ We have explored the first in our previous chapter and will now consider the latter. Here, Cervantes subtly encodes resistance to heterosexuality in two characters (Leonisa

⁴² Perry notes that:

There is also reason to believe that marriage rates declined after 1580. Foreign wars and voyages to the New World disrupted the lives of many young people of marriageable age. Clusters of prosecutions for sodomy may have resulted as officials became more concerned that young men were not marrying, ignoring God's 'natural order' and their responsibility to it. In a society in which religion exalted chastity, it may have seemed all the more important that any sexual activity be procreative. (77)

⁴³ The first corresponds to "los postulados del Discurso social, de ascendencia católico-nacionalista y tradicional" which he characterizes as "fanatismo oficial y de estilo propagandista... [y] el gran número de prevenciones xenófobas." (139) We have already explored this in our third chapter, as we saw how Ricardo took possession of Leonisa. Parallel to this is a second reading, "mostrándose más comprensivo con los turcos y con el judío [...] llega a criticar a los cristianos" (138).

and Mahamut), who present a critique of the European institutions at home. While Leonisa must ultimately submit to the state and marry Ricardo, she first finds refuge in a male homosocial space where she is both granted solace from her various unwanted or worthless suitors, and also escape from the male gaze that endeavors to control her through them. Mahamut, Ricardo's childhood friend-turned-renegade, is a catamite who is able to reintegrate into Western society, encouraging a more lenient view of sodomy at home. While Cervantes cautiously sets the work outside of Spain, the characters nonetheless assert desires that challenge Spain's dominant sexual discourse.

The cave

El amante liberal presents a similar moment of solidarity and rebirth that resembles the previous cave episode in *Tirant lo Blanc* and the prison scene in *Viaje*, which echoes the male homosociality of previous texts. This space acts as a heterotopia, overwriting the previous text's anxiety over women. In contrast to the other texts, a woman, Leonisa, is allowed to enter into this masculine space,⁴⁴ and moreover does so without disrupting the community; a second contrast is that the homosocial space is projected back into Christendom, not the Orient as in our previous texts. After her galley is destroyed during a storm and her captor Yzuf dies when he is cast against some rocks, Leonisa takes shelter with the other survivors of the crew in a cave on the island of Pantelleria. She explains, "Ocho días estuvimos en la isla, guardándome los turcos el mismo respecto que si fuera su hermana, y aún más. Estábamos escondidos en una cueva, temerosos ellos que no bajasen de una fuerza de cristianos que está en la isla" (541).

This is a marked contrast with a previous scene where Leonisa was caught between the

⁴⁴ Undoubtedly, the cave would have been a familiar image for Cervantes, who "hid in a cave for seven months with fourteen other Christian captives waiting to board a Mallorcan ship, but the plan failed as a result of a betrayal and all fugitives were eventually recaptured" (Boll, *Tale of City* 70).

competing nuptial advances of two men. The cave is decidedly free from heterosexual desire, as the Ottomans (unlike the other Ottomans⁴⁵ in the novella who pursue her as a sexual object).

Elizabeth Howe observes that this is a surprising contrast to the reader's expectations:

“Ironically, the only group that has not attempted to compromise her virtue (and, thus, her value in the slave market) is the crew of Yzuf's galley, Muslims all” (119).⁴⁶ While the scene is not technically homosocial, it recalls the same harmony that we have seen in similar previous moments, presenting it as a foil to the compulsory heterosexuality that had previously entrapped Leonisa.

As previously, the cave serves as a protection from an enemy, a religious Other, outside of the cave, though in this case, they are Christians. The cave is marked by a sense of social cohesion, in that Leonisa is treated as family (just as Tirant was adopted as a son), with even more respect than a sister;⁴⁷ she also shares meals, recalling our three previous works:

“sustentáronse con el bizcocho mojado que la mar echó a la orilla, de lo que llevaban en la galeota, lo cual salían a coger de noche” (541). The cave in the Island of Pantilleria hosts a

⁴⁵ Barring the exception of the Renegade Fetala who prefers his “dos muchachos hermosísimos, de nación corsos” (522).

⁴⁶ A sentiment repeated by Clamurro: “Oddly enough, the situation of Leonisa during her time with Yzuf and the other Muslim captors who make up Yzuf's crew presents a startling counter-example, a set of surprising episodes that sharply belie the likely prejudiced and negative view of sexual probity and restraint—that is to say, the presumed lack of it—among Muslim captors in possession of a female prisoner” (94).

⁴⁷ Enhancing this is the fact that the major male friendship in the novella (between Mahamut and Ricardo) is, in part defined by pragmatic exchange. Juan Pablo Gil-Osle labels this as a friendship defined by “los condimentos necesarios para preparar una historia de los dos amigos al uso de la época: una comunión de crianza, gustos, virtud y por supuesto altruismo.” (*Escipión* 5) The *altruismo* however, is rooted in the mutual benefits that both receive, as Gil-Osle also shows. Mahamut, with “la calculada actuación de Mahamut,” (*Escipión* 5) performs a “servicio para reinsertarse dentro de la comunidad católica” (*Escipión* 4) and, Ricardo benefits, obviously, from Mahamut's knowledge and ability to navigate the foreign culture.

However, while Leonisa is later sold by the Turks when they are rescued, the economy of exchange is not as strongly evident here. The Turks treat her better than merchandise, yet, other than her mercantile value, she offers nothing in exchange for such treatment. Moreover, they are the only men in the novel who don't participate in the series of economics organized around her body, where “Leonisa functions as the multivalent, mediating body through which their struggle for power is carried out” as “the men of the narrative relate to each other through her desirable body” (Cox Davis 113). Rather, the invocation of family and sorority bespeaks a truer, less pragmatic altruism that contrasts with the men's.

predominately male refuge that is unaffected and immune to the destabilizing effects of Leonisa, the woman in their midst, or a religious Other.

The alterized Christians beyond the cave pose more of a threat to the virginal Leonisa than her loyal Ottomans. Casting Christians as potential rapists⁴⁸ is a shocking inversion that acts as a critique of Europe's obligatory heterosexuality. In the refuge of the cave, Leonisa is no longer subject to the multiple pressures to marry⁴⁹—in fact, it is the only point in the text where she is free from this, as Ottomans and Ricardo fight over her.

The Christian threat on the exterior corresponds with the fact that Leonisa's suitors are all flawed. Though the match originally seemed logical on account of Cornelio's wealth, which appealed to her parents, and his pleasing looks, which appealed to Leonisa, Cornelio soon proves himself worthless, as he is unwilling to defend or ransom his bride. As Lucia López Rubio points out, "Leonisa... comprende enseguida que casarse con su prometido Cornelio supondría un gran error. Este hombre ha revelado un carácter cobarde al permitir que fuese Ricardo quien arriesgara su vida para rescatarla" (170). Paradoxically, the sudden invasion of the Ottomans rescues her from what would have been a miserable marriage, despite the positive outward signs and the accompanying social pressure. Accordingly, the Christians on the island, rather than a potential rescue, represent a return to the society where she must choose between marrying the wealthy but worthless Cornelio or the devout Ricardo who does not attract her.

⁴⁸ Moreover, we recall that *La fuerza de sangre*, a later novella, deals precisely with rape in Spain.

⁴⁹ The centrality of marriage in this and other novellas is demonstrated by Thomas R. Hart, who says of the work, "El motivo de la creación de una familia ejemplar es aún más evidente en *El amante liberal* que en *La Gitanilla*, ya que aquélla, como *La fuerza de la sangre*" (316). Rubio Lucía López establishes Leonisa's final speech within the context of the Council of Trent: "podemos decir que el estudio de la declaración de amor que realiza Leonisa es relevante ya que pone de manifiesto el conocimiento del personaje, y por tanto del autor, de las nuevas reglas impuestas por el Concilio de Trento y de las normas sociales sobre el comportamiento femenino" (172).

Most relevant to our analysis here, Sears explains how the freedom of consent is actually specious, writing that "In the majority of the novelas, the story hinges on marriage, and on how a woman's will, rhetorically conceived as 'free' is brought to choose the role that society has already chosen for her" (8).

Her time in the cave is thus a penitential moment, as she is disabused of and free from her marriage to Cornelio. It is one step in her transition from loving the beautiful, foppish Cornelio⁵⁰ who, as an effeminate man evokes sterility, to accepting the more masculine (and fertile) Ricardo, linked to reproduction and answering the demands of the state. In the present scene, she has just witnessed how, while she was being kidnapped by the Ottomans, Cornelio sat helplessly as Ricardo tried to rescue her. This lays the groundwork for her later total rejection of Cornelio in favor of Ricardo, a step toward her reconciliation with the European patriarchy as she submits to marriage.

At the same time, she is also free from her more aggressive suitors, the Ottomans, but also from Ricardo who, unlike the effeminate Cornelio or heterodox Turk, comes to represent the ideal Christian suitor. He is therefore a second manifestation of the compulsive heterosexuality that Leonisa manages to escape briefly. Her time in the cave is uniquely beyond the sexual gaze of the various suitors who pursue her—it is the only moment where she is alone. It also contrasts with Ricardo's intent gaze a moment before, as discussed in our previous chapter. Here, both the reader and Ricardo must rely entirely on her account (not the narrator's nor Ricardo's) of what happened in the cave. This uncomfortable gap in patriarchal control revolves around the question of her virginity,⁵¹ for which Ricardo (and the reader) must simply take her word. This ambiguity emphasizes how Leonisa, as long as she remains “the object of heated pursuit and exchange among his rivals” (Cox Davis 114), acts as “a threat to the stable conceptions of religious purity

⁵⁰ During Leonisa and Cornelio's wedding near the beginning of the work, Ricardo's speech undermines the groom's masculinity, as he tells Leonisa, “Llégate, llégate, cruel, un poco más, y enrede tu yedra a ese inútil tronco que te busca; peina o ensortija aquellos cabellos de ese tu nuevo Ganimedes, que tibiamente te solicita.” (518) He adds later, “Si esa tu reposada condición tuviera Aquiles, bien seguro estuviera Ulises de no salir con su empresa, aunque más le mostrara resplandecientes armas y acerados alfanje. Vete, vete, y recreáte entre las doncellas de tu madre, y allí ten cuidado de tus cabellos y de tus manos, más despiertas a devanar blando sirgo que a empuñar la dura espada” (519).

⁵¹ “It is essential that Leonisa's virginity, at this point in the narrative, be maintained so that the honra question does not arise to demand redress” (Clamurro 94).

and nobiliary honor harbored by Ricardo” (Cox Davis 112).

This moment, where she is beyond the reach of the compulsory heterosexuality that pursues her across the Mediterranean contrasts with her wedding in the end, where, despite Ricardo’s proposal being in front of the entire town, she is no longer worth vigilance. “The heroine, the principal motive for the plot’s development until its end, then recedes from view to bear Ricardo’s heirs, her will to biological subjugation being rendered, paradoxically, in the novela’s ideology as indication of her heroic—that is, manly—virtue” (Cox-Davis 112). As a mother and married woman, she finally conforms to the role that the narrator has set out for her.

Yet even this subjugation is less perfect than it initially appears. While Manuel Merry y Colom argues that Leonisa’s decision to marry Ricardo is based on love⁵², and Sandi Thomson-Weightman affirms that Leonisa’s consent is a show of empowerment,⁵³ other critics offer a different perspective. Clamurro asks whether Leonisa is sincere⁵⁴ and concludes that the text does not give a clear answer. Sears argues that, within the context of the Council of Trent “the fiction of individual consent serves to conceal the extent to which society (family, the Church, the political system) use marriage to maintain social order by limiting the endless possible reflexes of desire and choice” (28), underscoring that Leonisa’s speech accepting Ricardo as a suitor doesn’t mention love,⁵⁵ and observing that she recoils after Ricardo seizes her hand.⁵⁶

Leonisa’s solace in a male homosocial space, then, represents a temporary escape from

⁵² “Recompensando Leonisa con su amor la liberalidad de Ricardo” (23-24).

⁵³ “Leonisa... [is] empowered through making their own decisions and determining their own fate” (70), and later “Leonisa is empowered when she affirms her control over herself” (71).

⁵⁴ “Does the evasive Leonisa come around to a sincere affection at the end, or have her true feelings always been there, only finding the moment to be declared once their shared ordeals of captivity have ended?” (39).

⁵⁵ “But Leonisa says only that she will marry Ricardo out of gratitude and that she will belong to him, not that she loves him” (Sears 164). For Howe, as well, “Leonisa’s acceptance of Ricardo seems more an act of duty in recognition of his perceived heroism than one of free will” (120).

⁵⁶ “Ricardo kneels at her feet, tightly grasping Leonisa’s hands while he weeps and kisses them. Since he accomplishes this only by force, we imagine Leonisa pulling back, attempting to withdraw from Ricardo’s extravagant emotional display” (Sears 178).

the compulsory European heterosexuality that runs at odds with her desire. In contrast to *Viaje de Turquía* where the prison offered a refuge from the Ottomans, Cervantes deploys the male homosocial space as a refuge from Early Modern Europe, offering a criticism of the limits of consent while undermining the predominant, androcentric version of Spain. Moreover, rather than affirming an imperial vision of Spain by showing unity among men, Cervantes demonstrates that such unity (as well as upholding Spanish sexual norms) is possible outside of Europe, unexpectedly among the Ottomans who share a cave with Leonisa. By placing Leonisa at the center of the homosocial space, Cervantes asserts that her agency and desires are as important as the men's who have previously taken her place, despite her not being able to act on them.

While the scene is short, it is nonetheless important structurally. This intermediary point where Leonisa is free from being desired is bookended in two ways. Most obviously, Leonisa is caught between Ricardo/Sicily, and the various Ottomans/Cyprus and the accompanying compulsory marriage they represent. However, she is also caught between two supreme rulers. She is, of course, set aside for the sultan in Constantinople. Yet parallel to the Sultan is another mentioned but absent character, King Charles the V, who appears in Ricardo's anecdote. While the monarch is campaigning in Tunis, a captive is brought before him. Steven Hutchinson demonstrates that "esta interesante digresión en el texto nos obliga a ver a las dos bellísimas cautivas como ambivalentes y equiparables desde distintos lados de la frontera étnico-religiosa, y a Carlos V como homólogo cristiano de los competidores musulmanes en Chipre" (*Esclavitud* 147). Hutchinson notes a crucial difference, that the king "no tiene que competir porque es el imperator a quien están destinadas por derecho las cautivas más deseables" (*Esclavitud* 147), which, I would argue, evokes also the invincible, inescapable power of the Great Turk. Both women are presented as captives before a supreme ruler, and, moreover, are blonds of singular

beauty.⁵⁷

The conflation of the two women is a reminder of “el tratamiento de esclavas como propiedad sexual inasimilable en las sociedades cristianas,” (Hutchinson, *Esclavitud* 151), which is evoked again as a Catalan poet must finish the rhyme started by an Andalusian that praises her beauty. This disrupts the appreciation of her beauty by showing that, while her beauty might be ideal, the appreciation of it is not. Moreover, the fact that multiple men can appreciate her beauty highlights the way that Muslim slaves were sold from one Christian master to another (as Hutchinson demonstrates in his analysis of the *Vida* of Miguel de Castro (*Esclavitud* 139-44)), even as multiple Ottomans compete to, instead, marry Leonisa exclusively. The captive mora Aja’s fate of being passed off from one man to the next is imperfectly covered by poetic expression of beauty. This expression is used by Ricardo to describe Leonisa’s beauty,⁵⁸ and thus reflects Leonisa’s own fate, as Ricardo’s similar own profession of beauty covers the fact that, in front of a town with the now-rich suitor, she is no less a captive,⁵⁹ and an object of exchange, as Ricardo steals the poetry to praise the woman he is trying to steal, both from Cornelio and now from his Turkish rivals. Yet it is worth noting that Ricardo, without realizing it, is a captive as well. To express his love during this emotional reunion, his own praise up until now proves inadequate, and he is reduced to parroting a poem created and approved by the Spanish court.

Cervantes undermines the fantasy of a loving marriage, casting it as a fulfilment of the

⁵⁷The captive, Aja, is “una mora por cosa singular en belleza, y que al tiempo que se la presentaron entraban algunos rayos del sol por unas partes de la tienda y daban en los cabellos de la mora.” (535) While the beautiful blond Moorish woman is a surprisingly common trope, Cervantes carefully underscores the exceptional nature of the captive, saying “cosa nueva en las moras, que siempre se precian de tenerlos negros.” (536) This not only replicates Leonisa’s captivity, but also echoes her own appearance, as she is “la de más perfecta hermosura que tuvo la edad pasada, tiene la presente y espera tener la que está por venir; una por quien los poetas cantaban que tenía los cabellos de oro” (516).

⁵⁸ He explains, “Y esto mismo se me vino a la memoria cuando vi entrar a la hermosísima Leonisa por la tienda del bajá, no solamente escureciendo los rayos del sol si la tocaran, sino a todo el cielo con sus estrellas” (536).

⁵⁹ And, moreover, one whom Ricardo also tried to buy as ransom, paralleling the bidding between the Turkish suitors.

requirements of compulsory heterosexuality, thus challenging it as a satisfactory end for Spanish subjects.

Mahamut

Contrary to Leonisa's movement away from oppressive Christendom, another character moves back to it, challenging Spain's dominant sexual norms as well. Continuing the theme from *Viaje de Turquía*, Mahamut, the renegade, is subtly presented as a former *garzon*. This is a step further in empathizing with catamites, perhaps a move in response to the harsher prosecution of sodomy due to lower marriage rates during Cervantes's lifetime.

We must first establish that our renegade is indeed a catamite. Martin Von Koppenfel's article *Cervantes y los renegados* is useful. The critic writes that generally:

El renegado queda excluido de ese centro definido como heterosexual y cristiano. (Y, por cierto, regularmente se le pone en relación con la homosexualidad masculina ya que, muchas veces, en el Siglo de Oro la masculinidad musulmana sirve de pantalla de proyección para la representación de la homosexualidad). (48)

In Mahamut's case, while we don't know the specific circumstances under which he reneged,⁶⁰ the renegado does cite his youth as a partial cause: "la fe de Jesucristo, de quien me apartó mi poca edad y menos entendimiento, puesto que sé que tal confesión me ha de castar la vida; que, a trueco de no perder la del alma" (514). This connection to his "poca edad" evokes the image of the youthful *garzon*.

⁶⁰ Clamurro comments on this gaping omission: "Mahamut's initial articulation of why he left Christianity and his homeland for Islam really tells us nothing of what we want and need to know" (Clamurro 93).

Boone observes that European associations between the Orient and sodomy may have encouraged gay men to renege:

Robert C. Davis, in regard to the travel accounts that were to follow in the early modern period, speculates that allusions like these may have inspired homosexually inclined European men to become renegades, a common enough phenomenon in the Mediterranean world. Himself a captive in Algiers from 1579 to 1582, the Spaniard Diego Haedo's hyperbolic testimony that Christian apostates make for the greatest sodomites of all may thus express an unconscious truth—namely, that European articulations equating Muslim culture with male homoeroticism inspired some Europeans to "turn Turk" for reasons not merely mercenary. (30) Perhaps, for Cervantes's readers, Mahamut may have renegged to avoid punishment for his preference for men.

Moreover, Mahamut is among the three male characters who are *not* willing to risk their life for Leonisa. We see that the Renegade Fetala also is not interested in risking his life for Leonisa. When Yzuf wants to buy Leonisa from him, Fetala sells her with little hesitation, in contrast to the bidding war over the Sicilian woman between Ali and Hazan. Ricardo implies that this is because of his preference for *garzones*. Fetala gains from the trade “seis cristianos, los cuatro para el remo, y dos muchachos hermosísimos, de nación corsos, y a mí con ellos,” and ‘los dos muchachos hermosos,’ naturally, are for sexual ends (522).⁶¹ In the final battle at the end of the novella, while Hazan, Alí and the Cadí meet to fight over Leonisa, Fetala is, of course, absent.

Another uninterested party is Cornelio, whose masculinity Ricardo publicly insults during the former’s wedding. Ricardo compares him to Ganimedes, a common symbol for same-sex desire during the Renaissance: “peina o ensortija aquellos cabellos de ese tu nuevo Ganimedes, que tibiamente te solicita” (518). Ricardo also compares him with Achilles when the Greek hero is dressed like a woman to hide from Odysseus: “Si esa tu reposada condición tuviera Aquiles, bien seguro estuviera Ulises de no salir con su empresa, aunque más le mostrara resplandecientes armas y acerados alfanjes” (519). Ricardo’s diatribe concludes even more directly, as he places Cornelio among women and comments on the femininity of the groom’s hands and hair: “Vete, vete, y recreáte entre las doncellas de tu madre, y allí ten cuidado de tus cabellos y de tus manos, más despiertas a devanar blando sirgo que a empuñar la dura espada” (519).

Clothing appears as an important element, as Ricardo says to Cornelio, “no quieres

⁶¹“But at the same time, the reader—and especially the Spanish reader of Cervantes’s epoch—might also suspect that, based on the common prejudice of the time about the reputed licentiousness and irregularity of sexual interest in the Muslim world, Fetala’s real interest in the two boys could have been more sexual than aesthetic” (Clamurro 93).

moverte a defendelle por no ponerte a riesgo de descomponer la afeitada compostura de tu galán vestido” (519). Effeminate clothing was associated with sodomy (José R. Cartagena-Calderón 318), so it should not surprise us that Mahamut also makes several references to his clothing hiding his true nature. Moreover, despite being Leonisa’s betrothed, Cornelio shows little interest in defending or recovering her.⁶²

Similarly, as Barbara Fuchs observes, “Mahamut is emphatically (and conveniently) uninterested in erotic conquest” (Fuchs, *Passing for Spain* 72). Ricardo expresses his surprise that Mahamut does not immediately recognize his description of Leonisa’s beauty: “Que ¿es posible, Mahamut, que ya no me has dicho quién es y cómo se llama? Sin duda creo, o que no me oyes, o que, cuando en Trápana estabas, carecías de sentido” (516). His friend replies “En verdad, Ricardo..., que si la que has pintado con tantos extremos de hermosura no es Leonisa, la hija de Rodolfo Florencio, no sé quién sea; que ésta sola tenía la fama que dices” (516). While Mahamut recognizes Leonisa’s reputation, he seems less invested in it than Ricardo is, or than the liberal lover expects. Moreover, later on, despite having linked the woman to her reputation of beauty, Mahamut does not recognize her, again provoking Ricardo’s surprise: “—¿No la conoces, amigo? —No la conozco —dijo Mahamut. —Pues has de saber —replicó Ricardo — que es Leonisa” (532). Mahamut does not connect Leonisa’s actual beauty, which has seduced the majority of the other men in the work, with the fame of her beauty of which he already is aware. This underscores the renegade’s immunity to Leonisa’s charms.

We can add to these reasons the passivity and lack of passion in Mahamut’s marriage to

⁶² This is evident when, after Ricardo finished recalling his tirade against Cornelio’s masculinity, he adds to his friend Mahamut that, “A todas estas razones jamás se levantó Cornelio del lugar donde le hallé sentado” (519). When Cornelio has the chance to ransom his bride-to-be, Ricardo explains that “ni Cornelio movió los labios en su provecho.” (522) As Howe demonstrates, the juxtaposition of Cornelio with Fetala locates sodomy back in Europe, “the perceived ‘Muslim vice’ of homosexuality suggested in the desires of Fetala for the beautiful young boys mirrors the description of the effete Cornelio” (118).

Halima. “The transition to Christianity is both straightforward and oddly unmotivated, much like Halima’s sudden affection for Mahamut. He has not alluded to his religious fault since early in the narrative... There is no protestation of true faith, no formal examination by the Inquisition, simply a reconciliation as facile as the romance dénouement” (Fuchs, *Passing for Spain* 68). Their marriage is presented thus: “Reconciliáronse con la iglesia Mahamut y Halima, la cual, imposibilitada de cumplir el deseo de verse esposa de Ricardo, se contentó con serlo de Mahamut” (555). It is Halima who chooses Mahamut, and only as an acceptable alternative to Ricardo. What is implicit in the sentence, as well, is that their couple’s reconciliation of the church is strengthened or assisted by the resulting marriage. Moreover, as mentioned before, there is no mention of any progeny coming from this union, in contrast to the marriage of Ricardo and Leonisa, in who case “hasta hoy dura en los muchos hijos que tuvo en Leonisa” (555). The apparent lack of passion in the marriage repeats the problem between Halima and her first husband. However, in this case, we already know that Mahamut has not found Leonisa attractive in the same way that the masculine Ricardo has. “Once again, Cervantes writes to close the space of desire, to block its tendency to move beyond the order of the text” (Sears 140).

Mahamut as a catamite thus redeems himself through helping his friend Ricardo. As Gil- Osle shows, with “la calculada actuación de Mahamut,” (*Escipión* 5) the renegade performs a “servicio para reinsertarse dentro de la comunidad católica” (*Escipión* 4). At the same time, Mahamut is only able to offer this crucial service because of his past sodomy, offering a passive support for his sin. This connects the renegade with the trope of the last Visigoth king, where Rodrigo’s emasculation is necessary for the restoration of Spain.

Although Mahamut does re-convert back to Christianity, the question of his masculinity remains open. Moreover, Mahamut never adopts a Christian name. As Von Koppenfells says, “la

cuestión del nombre que había recibido el renegado en el bautismo ocupa un lugar central ... en los protocolos de la inquisición... Los relatos de renegados son, en tanto que historias de los que cambian de nombre” (53). The lack of a Christian name in his case casts doubt onto the sincerity of his conversion. However, he is still able to marry and return to Sicily as a Christian. Cervantes thus exposes the limitations of marriage as an indicator of psychological disposition, whether of true love, in Leonisa’s case, or true belief, in Mahamut’s.

In keeping with our previous chapter, there are several further distinctions made between Spain and Sicily. Mahamut is permitted to reside in a peripheral Christian space, yet neither here nor in our next work does Cervantes permit *garzones* to reenter Spain. Leonisa similarly reveals cracks in her apparent consent to the state’s ideal marriage, expressing her resistance and ability to evade patriarchal control as she occupies a homosocial space. Moreover, Ricardo is, at best, a performer of Spanishness as he recites a stolen poem to praise Leonisa. Cervantes’ willingness to criticize marriage is, at least in these works, limited to the distant zone of Sicily. Crucially, Cervantes’s objections to marriage do not stem from the nostalgia for male homosociality like our previous texts. Rather, he sides with the catamite, the *mujer esquiva*, and the pair of renegados to challenge the dominant vision of Spain by demonstrating how marriage can reintegrate them into society, albeit imperfectly. In our next work, Cervantes pushes his tolerance of catamites and *garzones* even further, showing that they have a welcome space in his ideal society.

La gran sultana (1615)

Adding another discourse to our heterotopia, Cervantes continues to destabilize the Christian male homosocial space that was central in our first three works, further inverting it into a criticism of Spanish identity; this inclusive space now welcomes catamites.

As seen in our previous chapter, Catalina de Oviedo, a lowly harem slave kidnapped from Spain, becomes de facto ruler of the Ottoman empire after the sultan falls madly in love with her. She thus leads the city's transformation into a colonized, utopian space; here, the great agency that the Spanish have in the heart of the Ottoman empire means that they no longer need to take refuge, as the absence of a Christian male homosocial space emphasizes. However, there is an echo of the harmony that previously defined a male homosocial space in other texts, as a Jewish father and son take shelter against the work's *gracioso*, the Spanish Madrigal. This presents a criticism of Spanish identity, as Madrigal demonstrates his Spanish valor by attacking the helpless family, while refusing to return home, or go to war against the Ottomans. Madrigal instead stays to pursue an illicit love with a Moorish woman before eventually deciding to return to Spain after imprisonment. Parallel to this movement from the periphery to the center, Cervantes demonstrates that the *garzones* that were marginalized in our previous works have a place in colonized, marriage-oriented Constantinople.

Spanish dominance

In contrast to our previous, pre-Lepanto texts, here Christians have no real need for a male homosocial refuge. We have seen this with the lack of barriers for the harem in our previous chapter, as Christians are able to move freely in and out of restricted female homosocial space. Here, the Ottomans no longer pose a threat.⁶³ They are a vehicle to demonstrate Spanish grandeur. Cervantes, rather, opts to invert the male homosocial space as a foil against Spain: beneath the affirmation of Spanish superiority, there is a criticism of both Spanish antisemitism as well as of the nostalgic homosociality of our previous works. Cervantes offers two contrasting

⁶³ In contrast to *El amante liberal*, “no queda duda para los espectadores sobre la seguridad básica de este mundo musulmán” (Araico 162).

deployments of sexuality: complementing Catalina as the ideal woman who submits to the vision of the imperial Spanish state and thus brings Ottoman society under Spanish control, Cervantes uses Madrigal as her foil who rejects marriage as he directs his attention to superficial demonstrations of Spanishness by tormenting a Jewish family.

All the captives in *La gran sultana* are, in reality, there deliberately, or at least do not seem to mind staying. Doña Catalina's father, while held captive in Algiers, has come to Constantinople in search of his daughter, as Madrigal narrates:

vino a buscalla
por discursos y rodeos
dignos de más larga historia
y de otra sazón y tiempo. (544)

Lamberto has come to find his love, Clara.⁶⁴

There are two instances in the text in which a Christian is condemned to death by a Turk. In both cases, the Christians are able to avoid the Turk's punishment, which demonstrates how they are not mere victims of Turkish power. The first example is Madrigal, who is caught *in flagrante* with a Muslim woman, for which he is condemned to death. However, through some quick thinking, he is able to convince the Cadí that he is gifted with the ability to interpret the language of birds.⁶⁵

In the second example, Lamberto's life is endangered when he is discovered in the harem. However, Catalina's intervention not only guarantees his life but makes him Cadí of Rhodes. This is a further demonstration that the Christian Doña Catalina is the true ruler in

⁶⁴ His guardian Roberto explains that, when the search party sent out to find Clara returns, Lamberto stays behind: "Aposta, a lo que sospecho, porque nunca ha parecido desde entonces, vivo o muerto" (474).

⁶⁵ In *El amante liberal*, Ricardo depends on the Turk's self-destruction to gain his freedom (showing his inability to save himself or Leonisa), and Tirant and Pedro de Urdemalas are able to confound their enemies through their innate skills (both having to struggle and prove their worth among equals, whether it be other doctors or other knights). In our present text, however, Madrigal is instead constantly able to dupe his way out of problems with little effort, fooling various Turks into thinking that he is a teacher, tailor or musician. Fooling his captors so easily puts them into a comical position, thus deflating their authority.

Constantinople. In contrast to *El amante liberal*, where Ricardo and company can only hope for the Ottomans to conquer themselves, “Catalina is instantaneously promoted from a captive herself to head of both the harem and the entire Ottoman Empire. She is immediately granted her own personal liberty and the power to liberate others” (Boll *Violating the harem* 142).⁶⁶

Additionally, among the Christians, there is a general harmony and convivence in the play. The Renegade Salec helps Roberto find his bearings in the city; Andrea arranges Madrigal’s return home; Madrigal encourages a fearful group of prisoners to perform as musicians, and so forth. In our previous works, we have seen Christians taking shelter from external threats in enclaves that mark religious differences. Here, however, the quantity of Christian characters rivals the number of the Ottoman ones. In the shifted power dynamic, the Christians are able to move about within the Muslim space quite freely, having no need for an enclave.

Madrigal

Writing some decades after the Battle of Lepanto, Cervantes seems more interested in exploring other possible readings of Constantinople here. This is reflected in the play’s deployment of the male homosocial space, here a non-Christian one when we first encounter Madrigal. He is quietly eavesdropping on a Jewish home, and, when Andrea asks why, he explains,

Entrè sin que me viesen en su casa,
y en una gran cazuela que tenían
de un guisado que llaman boronía,
les echè de tocino un gran pedazo (483).

⁶⁶ In the first act, the Sultan kneels before Catalina, declaring her his equal: “Deste modo se adereza lo que tú ves después: que, humillándome a tus pies, te levanto a mi cabeza. Iguales estamos ya” (494).

One of the Jews sticks his head through the window to curse Madrigal, and then apparently⁶⁷ feigns being hit in the head with a rock, crying out, “¡Ay, sin ventura, / que entrambas sienes me ha quebrado! ¡Ay, triste!” (487-88). Andrea responds, “Sí, que no le tiraste” while Madrigal concurs, “¡Ni por pienso!” (484). Another Jew inside urges Zabolón to withdraw his head,

Quítate, Zabolón, de la ventana,
que ese perro español es un demonio,
y te hará pedazos la cabeza
con sólo que te escupa y que te acierte.

Zabolón adds a parting shot, “¡Qué!, ¿aún no te has ido? ¿Por ventura / quieres atosigarnos el aliento?” (484).⁶⁸

The Jewish house (of which the audience would never see the inside) echoes the male homosocial spaces that we’ve seen previously. It offers refuge to Zabolón against the threat that Madrigal poses as he pretends to throw a stone and then later looks for a fruit to throw. Moreover, it suggests the same sense of familial cohesion seen in our previous examples, a shared meal and family, as the Jew inside calls Zabolón ‘hijo’ when urging him to leave the window. The home in the judería is in a peripheral zone that contrasts with the centrality of the palace, recalling the caves and prisons of our previous works. However, rather than being foil to disruptive heterosexuality, the male homosocial space is disrupted by Madrigal. Madrigal disturbs the sanctity and refuge-like qualities of the house by stealing into it. He makes the meal

⁶⁷ Though, a sardonic reading is possible here as well, where Madrigal and Andrés would both deny that the rock was actually thrown to comic effect for the audience who just witnessed it.

⁶⁸ While the scene’s *entremés* quality (Morrow 384; Kanellos 49) may make it tempting to dismiss it as an *entremés*, it is nonetheless the most defined space after the harem. Araico, in fact, notes the symmetry—after the audience’s voyeurism into the harem, in the next scene, “El chocarrero Madrigal acaba de escapar, al parecer, por otra ventana que habrá facilitado su acceso subrepticio a la casa de un judío” (184). As Araico succinctly states: “Del interior del palacio Topkapi, la acción sale a las calles de la judería de Constantinopla” (184). Another symmetry is the audience’s privileged view into the harem, which contrasts here with the obscuring of a view into the Jewish home. In the same way that the first scene in the harem is preceded by a procession, the scene in the judería is closed by one, as Andrea and Madrigal direct their attention to the procession of Persian ambassadors. The scene foregrounds the main action by “orientándola con la introducción del tema de un amor transgresivo entre personas de diversa religión” (Jurado Santos 5).

inedible, and disrupts the family's cohesiveness, as Zabolón ignores his father's call to leave the window. His actions reveal a vulnerable Jewish family, whom he torments; yet, this proves an impotent gesture as, within minutes, all is forgotten as the family resumes its life.

The house in the judería represents a strange blind spot for the audience. If, as McCoy argues⁶⁹, the play is based on blurring the lines between what outwardly distinguishes Spanish from Other, what are we to make of this anomalous scene, where the Jewish Other is visible while remaining hidden? Cervantes leaves the inside of the Jewish home beyond the imagination, even as he gives us unlimited access to the harem. The house itself is a symbolic judería, representing the Jews who are also confined to it. They never appear on stage, but rather through a window and from within the house.

Portraying a Jewish space itself would have been striking for the audience, as in Cervantes's Spain, there were no juderías, nor discernable Jews. The idea of a single location in which one could consistently find evident Jews is as antithetical as possible to fear of an omnipresent crypto-Judaism. Madrigal's anecdote of acquiring the *tocino* from the Janissary boar hunters echoes this, as it evokes, "the enduring Iberian tradition of conceiving the religious Other as a wild boar that has to be chased and eventually expelled from the nation," (Irigoyen-Garcia, *Diana* 278). Still present in Cervantes's time,⁷⁰ the critic writes that "what is finally idealized in wild boar hunting is the presumption that the Other can easily be identified, hunted, and contained in the absolute position of the object" (*Diana* 286), the very dynamic that a judería

⁶⁹ "Cervantes implies through the mouth of his characters that sometimes, perhaps even often, Christians are hard to differentiate from their Muslim counterparts. The implications of this revelation are far-reaching. Firstly, he suggests that a system of racial profiling in order to expel all Jews and moriscos from Spain might never function, because in effect these communities are not so physiologically or fundamentally different from their "pureblooded" Spanish counterparts" (248).

⁷⁰ "The literary representation of wild boar hunting does not diminish with the end of the reconquest, nor with the inquisitorial repression of judeoconvertos and the expulsion of the Moriscos, but instead soars in fictional genres during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as if the actual disappearance of the opposing Other unleashed a compulsive, compensatory ritual of national identity" (Irigoyen-Garcia, *Diana* 286).

presents.

In finding a Jewish home in a Jewish neighborhood, Madrigal attains precisely this, yet seems not to know what to do when finally faced with the Other. He hopes to “dar sepultura a estos malditos” (483) by throwing in a piece of bacon. The act itself, though, is laughable; the Jews are as likely to die from pork as they are from Madrigal’s poisonous breath. Moreover, the prank fizzles out sooner than Madrigal might like, as Andrea comments “Ya parece que callan; ya en silencio / pasan su burla y hambre los mezquinos” (485).⁷¹

The scene is not about the Jews as much as it is about Madrigal and his antisemitism. The Jews are defined entirely by their reaction to Madrigal’s antagonism—the epistemology of how to deal with Jews overwrites the question of who the Jews are, criticizing Spanish paranoia regarding conversos. The true comedy is the irrational hatred that Madrigal bears toward the Jews,⁷² and the symptomatic misdirected brutality, and the bizarre lengths to which Madrigal will go to torment the Jews. It seems to be a longstanding pastime of his, as Madrigal has built up a reputation with them. They refer to him as

espantajo,
de nuestra sinagoga asombro y miedo,
de nuestras criaturas enemigo
el mayor que tenemos en el mundo! (483)

The scene’s ambiguity has garnered much critical interest, defending it as antisemitic or not, as is

⁷¹ Moreover, while Andrea pontificates on the Jew’s theological errors, Madrigal’s reaction is visceral and uninterested in correcting or condemning. Madrigal says of the Jews, “tengo rencor y mal talante; a quien el diablo pape, engulla y sorba” (483). He has a profound hatred of them and wishes to kill them. Also, his prank (in contrast to the Sacristan in *Los baños de Argel*, who extorts and is then ransomed by the Jews) does not afford him any benefit, and, in fact, represents his own investment of effort and time to pull it off. In contrast to Pedro Urdemalas’s various squabbles with Jewish doctors to assert his own medical authority, Madrigal is not harassed by Jews, and, in fact, must seek them out. His victims are harmless and have not earned the brutality (nor does Madrigal justify it other than with his deep hatred). Rather, Artiga points out that the Jews fear that Madrigal will poison them, the inverse of the common trope of Jews poisoning Christians: “He titulado el artículo ‘el reverso del crimen ritual’, ya que un cristiano desea envenenar a unos judíos. El crimen ritual era la difamación que adjudicaba a los judíos de matar niños cristianos para valerse de la sangre en la celebración del Pesaj” (47).

⁷² This act of pointless violence toward defenseless beings perhaps echoes the fool that torments dogs at the beginning of the second part of *Don Quixote* by dropping rocks on them.

the case with Díez Fernández,⁷³ Casalduero⁷⁴ Artiga⁷⁵ and others. McGaha writes “Cervantes sí quería que el público aplaudiera la conducta antisemita de Madrigal y se identificara con él al principio-del mismo modo que involucra al lector en las locuras de don Quijote—para hacerle reflexionar y sentir vergüenza después” (220). I argue that, instead of a sense of guilt, that Cervantes uses the futility of antisemitism to criticize Madrigal’s rejection of marriage and refusal to submit his sexuality to the Spanish state. The scene is inverted from penitence to obstinacy. Andrea berates the Jews for

 vuestro vano esperar, vuestra locura
 y vuestra incomparable pertinacia,
 a quien llamáis firmeza y fe inmutable,
 contra toda verdad y buen discurso! (484-89)

However, moments later, Andrea is now dumbstruck as Madrigal again stubbornly refuses his help in returning to Spain, asking “Luego, ¿en valde será tratar yo agora / de que os vengáis conmigo?” Madrigal replies, “En balde, cierto,” and Andrea reacts, “¡Desdichado de vos!” (485-86). The obstinacy of the Jews now serves as a foil for Madrigal’s own obstinacy. While the Jews cling stubbornly to their religion, Madrigal clings to his illicit relationship: “Importa también señalar que las veleidades y componendas de Madrigal contrastan fuertemente con ‘la incomparable pertinacia, firmeza y fe inmutable’ que Andrea atribuye a los judíos” (McGaha 220).⁷⁶

Madrigal describes the party that Andrea is taking to Spain: “Cuatro bravos soldados os esperan, / y son gente de pluma y bien nacidos” (487), a homogenous group of equals that recalls

⁷³ “Hay que anotar que Madrigal no solo no recibe ninguna reprimenda por su acción, sino que parece gozar de la simpatía del autor, de manera sorprendente para los que defienden la tesis de la tolerancia en *La gran sultana*” (306).

⁷⁴ “La acción no tiene nada de antisemita, sentimiento inexistente en España” (136-37).

⁷⁵ “Se puede pensar, entonces, que Cervantes conocería los escritos difamatorios y que, a su manera, quiso reafirmar que lo que sucedía en España era el reverso del crimen ritual, o que los cristianos mataban a los judíos y destruían su civilización” (49).

⁷⁶ Kanellos echoes this sentiment, describing Madrigal as “a character who is sinful and unattractive,” as he notes that “one of the reasons for his intolerance of the Jews is their strict observance of their religious practices” (51).

Pedro de Urdemala's *caballeros*, Tirant's Berber brother, and Leonisa's respectful Ottoman siblings. Andrea assures him that "Yo los tengo escondidos y a recaudo" (487), evoking the characteristic refuge that we've seen in prior male homosocial spaces. However, "in his rejection of 'la agradable libertad' offered by Andrea, Madrigal opts to remain subjugated to his own desire [...] and thus rejects the freedom praised so highly elsewhere in the texts of the ex-captive Cervantes" (Mariscal 203). His rejection reflects his preference for illicit sex with his *alárabe* over homosocial (and Spanish) solidarity. The male community is disrupted by a woman as in our previous texts. In contrast to the other men in the play, Madrigal is neither willing to serve as a soldier to escape, nor to remain to father children in the way that Clara and Catalina do. He chooses instead to remain in a nebulous zone, and rejects serving the Spanish state as either soldier or father.

His antisemitism masks his insecurity in his Spanishness.⁷⁷ When pressed on whether he is Spanish, he vows impossibly to return a wealthy hero with three galleys in tow, an attempt made even more laughable as the extent of his valor is pointlessly tormenting helpless Jews. He seems shameful at the thought of returning from Constantinople empty-handed, yet cannot stay. His final decision to leave is prompted by his decision to become a playwright, as he finally finds a fitting role in Spanish society.

⁷⁷ Under his brutality, Barbara Fuchs observes a certain anxiety as he lashes out. She comments that "his very deliberate prank is an attempt to mark his difference from both Jews and Muslims who surround him" (Intimate Strangers 268). When Andrea asks whether Madrigal is really Spanish, he bombastically vows:

por el alto, dulce, omnipotente deseo que se encierra bajo el hopo de cuatro acomodados porcionistas, que he de romper por montes de diamantes y por dificultades indecibles y he de llevar mi libertad en peso sobre los propios hombros de mi gusto, y entrar triunfando en Nápoles la bella con dos o tres galeras levantadas por mi industria y valor, y Dios delante, y dando a la Anunciada los dos bucos, quedaré con el uno rico y próspero; y no ponerme ahora a andar por trena, cargado de temor y de miseria. (486)

His assertion is hyperbolic (however, while it's unrealistic that Madrigal could pull off such a feat, this is precisely what Ricardo does in *El amante liberal*, emphasizing Madrigal's impotence here), reflecting both "his inflated opinion of his own heroic potential" (Mariscal 203) as well as an anxiety about his Spanishness. Barbara Fuch's comments, "Madrigal protests too much" (Intimate strangers 267).

This sheds light on Madrigal's opposition to marriage. Parallel to Pedro de Urdemalas, Madrigal is another picaresque character. He changes jobs at an astonishing rate, from captive to teacher to tailor to musician to playwright. Also, like Pedro, his rejection or antagonism of the religious Other disguises a preference to avoid the marriage and procreation that his Spanishness demands. Symbolically, he lashes out at a Jewish son, whose father later calls him from the window. He asks "¿Los plantos de Ramá volvéis al mundo, / canalla miserable?" which Ruth Fine (252) explains is a reference to Jeremiah 31:15,⁷⁸ where the matriarch Rachel weeps for her children. This establishes the Jews within a larger, ethnic family, and places the issue of offspring at the forefront. Madrigal lacks such genealogy: when pressed to choose between reneging to marry his Muslim lover and death, he opts for death. As McGaha notes, "la idea de casarse le inspira tanta repugnancia como la de renegar" (220). In his own words, Madrigal affirms that,

casarme y ser moro
son dos muertes, de tal suerte,
que atado corro a la muerte
y suelto mi ley adoro (497).

Thus, like Pedro de Urdemalas, he is a figure who opposes marriage, though it is safely couched within his refusal of a Muslim woman.

Madrigal's pointless prank in the judería parallels his own fruitless deployment of sexuality. Both his affair and his antisemitism become insignificant in the larger pictures of Constantinople, the shift of empires, and his own survival. While he is crafty enough to penetrate the Jewish household (and their *cazuela*) and seduce his *alárabe*, both are fruitless gestures. Madrigal's attack of the Jews is ultimately pointless, an impotent aggression against a fragile

⁷⁸ "Thus says the Lord: "A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping. Rachel is weeping for her children; she refuses to be comforted for her children, because they are no more" (ESV).

non-enemy that reveals his own precarious state. In contrast, Catalina arrives to the center of the empire, controlling it by submitting his sexuality to Spanish norms. Her productive sexuality cements this role, and, refraining from needlessly torturing them, she is quietly helped by Jews, who host her father and also provide her a dress.

Garzones

Like *El amante liberal* and *Viaje de Turquía*, *La gran sultana* closes the distinction between sodomy in the Orient and back at home, drawing the catamites from the periphery where they are excluded from the action of the play into the society organized under the Christian sultana Catalina de Oviedo. As we have seen in our previous chapter, the play demonstrates Spain's hope for colonizing the Orient, thus 'reconquering' Constantinople. However, beneath this vision of a hegemonic Spain, is another, alternative one: the treatment of *garzones* goes further than the previous works by actively restoring them into the Spanish body politic under the Sultanness Catalina de Oviedo.

The importance of the *garzones* is foregrounded in the opening scene, where Roberto and his renegade friend, Salec watch a royal procession. Salec explains to his friend that the street is lined with petitioners seeking justice, who carry reeds that they'll light on fire to get the Sultan's attention. Next, Salec explains "Luego, a un bello garzón, que tiene cuenta / con estos memoriales, se le entrega, / que, en relación, después, dellos da cuenta" (469). The procession then comes on stage, "detrás del TURCO van otros dos GARZONES con dos bolsas de terciopelo verde, donde ponen los papeles que el TURCO les da" (469). The Gran Turco is surrounded by young men, of which Susana Hernández Araico reminds us, "A través de casi todos los otros textos cervantinos sobre el mundo mahometano, los vocablos "paje" o "garzón" conllevan perversión sexual de cautivos" (161). It is in this context that Roberto comments of the

Gran Turco, “Por cierto, él es mancebo de buen talle / y que, de gravedad y bizarría, / la fama, con razón, puede loalle” (469). While mentioning proportions when praising men is not rare, the particular context of praising the Sultan as he is surrounded by youths who are often sexualized evoke an erotic reading to Roberto’s praise.

Later, after Roberto has seen the *garzones* bringing petitions, he narrates: “El moro llega; un memorial le ha dado; / el Gran Señor le toma y se le entrega / a un bel garzón que casi trai al lado” (470). He echoes Salec in repeating “bel garzon;” yet here, it is not an explanation of the ceremony to come, but, rather, a reaction to the *garzon*’s beauty. This is the context in which, after the procession has passed, Roberto begins to talk of his lost ward:

Aquel mancebo que dije
vengo a buscar: que le quiero
más que al alma por quien vivo,
más que a los ojos que tengo (471).

The endearing language borders on idolatry, as Roberto loves Lamberto more than his own soul.⁷⁹ As homosexual relationships were often intergenerational in Golden Age Spain, the scene suggests that Roberto and Lamberto were lovers.

Reinforcing this reading of Lamberto as the penetrated partner, we soon discover that Lamberto has disguised himself as a woman in order to hide in the harem, which further undermines his masculinity.⁸⁰ Crucially, this European same-sex pairing is not Spanish, but Hungarian, thus preserving the Spanish moral high ground; as with *El amante liberal*, Cervantes again undermines Spanish sexual norms, even as he sets his work outside of Spain.

Lamberto is thus a doubly queer character, both for challenging the nuclear family

⁷⁹ Moreover, the repetition of the word ‘mancebo’ recalls its previous use, where it described the pleasing proportions of the Sultan.

⁸⁰ As José R. Cartagena-Calderón underscores, effeminate dress was seen as a marker of homosexuality in contemporary sermons, where there was “a widely disseminated association” and “a connection between sodomy, effeminacy, and clothing” (318).

construct, as well as for his same-sex attraction. This reaches its culmination when, dressed as the beautiful Zelinda, he is brought to the Gran Turco's bedroom in the third act. The fact that it is the Gran Turco, rather than Lamberto, who interrupts the coitus curiously inverts the expectations of the audience—the sultan, not the Christian, stands for heteronormativity. This moment also represents a turning point in Lamberto's actualization. He started as a catamite, and slowly asserts his masculinity until the final scene. First, he leaves his relationship with Roberto to elope with, rescue and later impregnate Clara. Yet it is only with the Gran Turco's recognition of his masculinity that Lamberto is now able to reassert his male identity, which is later rewarded as he becomes Bajá of Rhodes. Lamberto's subplot thus reads as a natural transition from a relationship with an older man to another with a woman of the same age, as Lamberto fulfills his ideal role as a man for a Spanish audience, and echoes Mahamut in *El amante liberal*.

This transition is symbolized as well in the trajectory of the *garzones*. As previously mentioned, they appear in the first scene as silent characters who, instead of having their own voice, are only able to convey the voices of the petitioners by gathering the written requests and relaying them to the Gran Turco.⁸¹ In this same scene, and later, when *garzones* are mentioned explicitly, it is always as objects, and with objects, reducing them to props. As previously mentioned, Roberto and Salec both mention the “bel garzones,” and, later on, Madrigal correctly accuses the Cadi, saying “andabas tras un garzón” (520).

The *garzones* appear exclusively as silent servants through the first two acts, and Cervantes goes so far as to specify that actors who play the *garzones* follow Mamí's instructions to lay out pillows, spread the rug, and spread flowers “todo esto sin responder los GARZONES”

⁸¹ Moreover, the props they carry, an arrow and two felt bags, suggest the sexualized nature of how they are represented: Susana Hernández Araico highlights “la connotación sexual de la utilería y su ubicación requerida por el rito de las peticiones de los pobres—en frente una flecha levantada para ensartarlas y atrás dos bolsas verdes para guardarlas” (161).

(538). However, in this same scene, Mamí, the eunuch, now names them, “Tira más desa parte, Muza, tira; / entra por los cojines tú, Arnaut; / y tú, Bairán, ten cuenta que las flores” (538).

This is an additional step toward humanizing and giving the *garzones* agency, similar to when the Sultana corrects Lamberto’s fake name, Zelinda, to the masculine Zelindo, symbolically finalizing his masculine actualization: “Bajá de Xío, Zelinda o Zelindo es ya” (560).

It is only in the final scene that the *garzones* finally speak: “salen los GARZONES del TURCO por el tablado, corriendo con hachas y hachos encendidos, diciendo a voces: "¡Viva la gran sultana doña Catalina de Oviedo! / ¡Felice parto tenga, tenga parto felice!" (564). It is especially significant that, despite being the sterile passive sexual partners, they are now capable of celebrating a Christian ruler’s fertility.

Both the *garzones* and Lamberto trace a process in which they move from passive objects to active, fertile agents. This normalizes same-sex desire by showing that it does not necessarily exclude socially useful marriage and procreation. Moreover, it works against the aspersion of captives who were raped before returning home, showing that they can reintegrate. The *garzones* redeem themselves through their recognition and support of the Spanish Sultana. Yet simultaneously, their cheers affirm Catalina’s legitimacy and hegemony in the now-colonized Constantinople, meaning that their penetration has placed them in a role that is beneficial to Spanish hegemony. This recalls Rodrigo’s own penetration as penitence, as sodomy becomes a means of saving both the individual and Spain. While none of them return to Europe, it is clear that they have a role in the new order under the Spanish Sultanness, provided that homosociality (erotic and otherwise) be exchanged for a heterosexuality submitted to the state.

Lamberto and the *garzones* act as a foil for Madrigal. Both represent non-reproductive sexualities that must end in order to support the new cultural order under Catalina de Oviedo.

Thus, Cervantes uses the male homosocial heterotopia to mark a shift from a nostalgic view of male homosociality to a nuanced support of heterosexuality that prioritizes marriage.

El conde Partinuplés (1653)

Ana María Caro de Mallén's play continues the theme found in our past two works, by violating the male homosocial space to promote marriage; however, she takes it further by eliminating homosociality altogether, leaving marriage as the only option. After the Empress of the Byzantine Empire, Rosaura, manages to lure the gallant Count Partinuplés to Constantinople in hope of marrying him, she confines him and his servant Gaulín in a dark wing of her dungeon to test his love. In contrast to our previous works, the play eschews homoeroticism completely, thus allowing heterosexual marriage to monopolize desire. Echoing Madrigal in *Gran Sultana*, Gaulín, Caro's gracioso, again becomes a representative of male homosociality. However, while Cervantes provides a road for Madrigal to return to Spain despite his aversion to marriage, Caro punishes Gaulín's misogynistic insistence on homosociality by leaving him excluded from the various marriages at the end of the play. This makes women the sole outlet for desire. The work thus goes the furthest yet in negating the possibility of male homosociality to promote compulsory heterosexuality in the form of marriage.

Subverting the male space

Caro first establishes the trope prior to disrupting it. At the end of the first act, Partinuplés and his servant Gaulín pursue the mysterious beast/woman into the marginalized wilds. Gaulín comments:

¡Qué tierra de Barrabases
es esta donde no hallamos
sino fieras y animales,

que burlen y que aporreen! (195).

As thunder sounds overhead, the duo must seek refuge in a boat. Gaulín emphasizes their dire situation:

A estos cuerpos miserables
es fuerza que les busquemos
albergue donde se guarden
... mas para librarte
de las fieras de estos montes
esta noche, allí nos hace
del ojo una nao que está
varada en aquel paraje,
que debieron de dejar
surta allí los temporales
esta noche (195).

He mentions again the threat of beasts, saying, “al menos / podrá esta noche albergarte / de las fieras” (195). The boat thus serves as a marginal refuge, yet also a device to convey them to a distant shore, even further into France’s periphery. The male homosocial space here does not play the role of a shelter that we have seen previously.

There, feeling hungry, they take refuge in “un castillo bellissimo” (199) that seems abandoned.⁸² The castle, as with the boat, serve as refuges on the margins. The twist is that the abandoned castle is actually Rosaura’s private quarters: “de mi palacio el retiro” (209). The space at first seems to be on France’s margins, but, in reality, is the political center of the Byzantine Empire, the center of Rosaura’s power. The proximity between Rosaura’s political and private spaces is underscored as, immediately after the scene where the suitors are presented, the Count asks, “¿Que es Constantinopla?” and Gaulín affirms “Sí” (222). The two men’s refuge becomes, by surprise, a sort of harem, where Rosaura, not the Count, is the center, and where Rosaura keeps her lover out of sight. The male homosocial space is thus inverted from refuge

⁸² “Sí, mas no hemos visto gente en sala ni camarín, patio, tinelo o cocina” (201).

into a space of male enclosure, like the harem of our previous chapter.

Shared food also emerges as an element, as the Count and his servant are treated to a meal that appears magically. However, the castle that offers refuge becomes, rather, a place of anxiety, as Pérez-Romero comments “Cuando tratan de comer, la comida se esfuma; la ansiedad del conde y de Clarín se acentúa al verse encerrados e incomunicados en el castillo” (338). This is one of many ways in which, as Teresa Soufas observes, “the situations that Caro [...] dramatizes deconstruct the depicted androcentric practice of authority” (41). Rosaura and Aldora subvert the male homosocial space, an act that inevitably reveals its own fragility.

Additionally, in contrast to our previous scenes of male homosociality, the relationship between Gaulín and the Conde is not one of peers. Rather, “the companion whom Caro creates for the Count is a valet rather than a peer, so the issue of a rival homosocial tie does not arise” (Simerka 508). The Count, exceptionally, invites Gaulín to eat with him, potentially eradicating the division between master and servant: “Come éste; por vida mía; / pues esta licencia da, / el ver que nadie nos ve” (204), and then later “come, Gaulín, come aquí / en este plato, a este lado. / Huéspedes somos los dos” (206). However, Aldora’s magic intervenes, as birds spring out of the empanada Gaulín is about to eat while later Gaulín’s hand is grabbed before he can touch a plate that the Count offers him. Soon, the Count is too preoccupied with the magical spectacle, and later with Rosaura to notice that Gaulín goes hungry (beyond replying, “No te aflijas” (208) when Gaulín complains). The Count’s attempts to close the socioeconomic distance is thus undermined as Aldora’s magic insists on maintaining the hierarchy.

The men try to turn the space into a place of community. However, from the first, it is deflated by Gaulín’s hyperbolic fearfulness, making his dependence on male comity the butt of the joke. He begs his master as both are lost in the forest, “Ven; / que de ti quiero agarrarme”

(196). The homoeroticism that we've seen in previous works is now recast as a joke to underscore Gaulín's cowardice. As both head toward the castle, Gaulín repeats this sentiment, "Vamos, aunque sea al abismo. / Contigo, al infierno mismo / no temeré, claro está" (200). As the two decide to sleep, a torch leads the Count's way, as he explains, "La luz por mi norte sigo" and Gaulín follows with, "Yo la tuya por mi sol" (213). However, Aldora grabs him, and leads him to his own quarters, disrupting the homosociality even further as the sorceress prevents the servant from joining his master. This parallels el Conde's lack of concern for Gaulín, as he is now preoccupied entirely with the mysterious Rosaura. A woman thus disrupts the male friendship, negating male homosociality in the text.

The male homosocial space fractures and fails, making way for a vision of female hegemony, as women control the men and demonstrate the comity that is lacking between Gaulín and the Count. Like the caves and prison that we've seen previously, the castle is also a dark place. Gaulín observes:

Ya es de noche y encerrados
en esta trampa o castillo
estamos, sin luz, sin camas;
por Dios, que pierdo el juicio;
parece, señor, que adrede,
aún mas presto ha anochecido
que otras veces. (207-08)

However, the darkness is selective, as Rosaura has previously commanded Aldora, "Procura que no nos vea" (201). In our previous works, darkness has been a natural extension of the circumstances that, through cooperation, men are able to overcome. It depends rather on the women who use it to their advantage to hide themselves. The light is not brought by friendly Moors (as with *Tirant lo blanc*), nor by the light of a shared candle (as with *Viaje de Turquía*), but rather it (and the vigilant gaze it permits) is mysteriously and exclusively controlled by the

women. When the Count later usurps control to see his admirer, the price is death: after Rosaura falls asleep while the Count recounts his heroic feats in France, the Count seizes the lantern and breaks his promise by looking at Rosaura. The Count thus fails to learn the one lesson that Rosaura endeavors to teach him; after falling for the mysterious empress when he sees her in a portrait, Rosaura insists on remaining unseen, arguing, “Conde, creedme y queredme. / Ciego es amor” (212). Breaking the expected harmony, it is Gaulín who provokes the Count’s skepticism and need to see Rosaura, and in a further divergence from our previous male spaces that breaks with our first few texts, the darkened palace is not a penitential space, nor one of reconciliation.

The comity between the play’s women contrasts strongly with the divisions between the two men. Lisbella and Rosaura are able to arrive at a peaceful conclusion and avoid war. Aldora, in addition to being Gaulín’s antagonist as we have seen, is similarly a foil for him. While Gaulín is ignored by his master at various points while ultimately providing the final push that convinces the Count to violate Rosaura’s trust, Aldora is a supportive companion in a harmonious relationship. Voros writes that the sorceress gives “solid advice when the nobles present Rosaura with the ultimatum to marry that the decision should be delayed for one year.... She plays the role of adjuvant and protectionist, to the extent that Rosaura notes her absence during the tournament scene” (169).⁸³ In sacrificing his claim to the French throne for the explicit purpose of being with Rosaura, Partinuplés enters into this community of women. In other words, “Partinuplés happily chooses human interconnection over isolation and rejects the impersonal precepts that would deny it to him, among them the principle of sacrifice in the name

⁸³ In his comparison of the play with Calderón’s *La vida es sueño*: “The solidarity of Aldora and Rosaura certainly stands out when compared with the solitude faced by both Rosaura and Segismundo in *La vida es sueño*, during and, one can safely assume, after the play ends. The solitude of Calderón’s Segismundo and Rosaura and the friendship of Caro’s Rosaura and Aldora are the source of some of the most enduring images of both plays” (Camino 210). Weimar echoes this point (140-41).

of order” (Weimar 140). A fragile male homosociality is replaced with a strong heterosexual bond.

Gaulín

Driving the Count’s misogyny is Gaulín’s own, linked to his homosocial preference, which is ignored and subverted as his relationship with the Count becomes increasingly one-sided. He alone is excluded from the circle of matrimony that concludes the play, as all major characters are married off. The gracioso comments:

Bueno,
todos y todas se casan;
sólo a Gaulín, -¡Santos
Cielos!-, le ha faltado una mujer,
o una sierpe, que es lo mesmo. (258)

And, when the Count argues that, “No te faltaré, Gaulín,” Gaulín insists, “Cuando hay tantas, / yo lo creo; mayor dicha es que me falte” (258).

Due to his obstinate preference for men and rejection of women, Gaulín is punished for his refusal of heterosexuality long before the end, however. As the two women work to keep the men separate, Aldora seems to take a particular delight in punishing the misogynistic Gaulín. She insists that he does not have the same right to the food as his master, and seems to separate him for extra punishment. When after confronting him for his burlesque tirade against Rosaura, Gaulín pleads for mercy. She assents, “Bien está,” and, as Gaulín calls himself her slave, she says, “Ven conmigo, / que de todas estas erres / has de llevar un recibo.” It is unclear what the ‘recibo’ is, yet Gaulín’s reply is “¿Relámpagos a estas horas? / Sobre mi dio el remolino” (215), seemingly indicating a ‘remolino’ of blows.⁸⁴ Gaulín, as a stubborn symbol of male

⁸⁴ Though an erotic reading is no less fascinating; the parallelism of the two cousins’ sleeping with the men of their choice further strengthens their homosocial solidarity. Moreover, it offers a queer reading, in which Aldora pursues

homosociality, is defeated by female solidarity as well as heterosexual unity. Caro overwrites the trope of male homosocial solidarity with a discourse of male homosocial fragility.

Rosaura's entry into the male homosocial space must be framed both by how she does just this in the play's political space, yet also by Caro's own consciousness of being a woman writing for a public, primarily male space. Villariño Martínez describes her as an author who is "ubicada en un espacio mixto entre lo privado y lo público" (576), being the first woman reporter in Spain. García Martín explains:

women's writing at the time was circulated in the privacy of the home or in the restricted circles of the convent or the court. Caro was the first female writer to be commissioned as a journalist to report on public festivals and receive regular payments for her work, a task that would give her a privileged and authoritative access to public spaces in an era obsessed with female containment.⁸⁵ (73)

Caro was well aware of her uniqueness in the public sphere. Montauban maps out Caro's carefully constructed public persona, suggesting that the playwright realized that fame "se construye mediante... la imagen que el público diseña a partir de la frecuentación de las obras" (25). This is particularly evident in the case of Gaulín, who anticipates any misogynistic criticism from the audience.⁸⁶ This, in fact, underscores the author's identity as a woman: "Ana Caro se sirve de los comentarios metateatrales del gracioso para simular la aceptación de las convenciones dramáticas (y de paso, de las convenciones de su género) para construirse eficazmente como autora" (Montauban 25). While she is outside of the work, controlling it,

pleasure, rather than marriage in seducing Gaulín. Finally, it makes Gaulín's final decision to reject marriage a protest against the limitations of class. As a servant, he would not be able to marry Aldora, who is selected by Prince Eduardo. Caro's own difficulty in contracting a marriage because of her Moorish heritage thus would come into play.

⁸⁵ The critic continues by noting how Caro's career violated the proscribed place of a woman at home: "In effect, Caro's behavior stood in direct contravention of the directives of moralists such as Fray Luis de León, who affirmed in *La perfecta casada* [The Perfect Wife] (1583) that the good and honest woman was the one who followed the divine mandate to remain silent, obedient, and enclosed" 73.

⁸⁶ In particular, Gaulín's direct, metatheatrical criticism of the author: "¡Qué gastan de hiperbatones! Infeliz lacayo soy, pues he prevenido el orden de la falsa, no teniendo dama a quien decirle amores. Descuidóse la poeta. Ustedes se lo perdonen" (236).

Gaulín remains confined inside, reframing his enclosure in the castle for much of the work, and strengthening his final omission from among the married couples.⁸⁷

Female homosociality thus overcomes male homosociality as Caro champions heterosexual unity, unrivaled by any other form of desire. As we have seen in our previous chapter, the question of hegemony over the Orient is overwritten, as Caro uses symbols of the Orient like the harem and Sultanate of Women to give women greater agency. The play is thus the furthest point from the cautions against heterosexual desire that we find in Rodrigo's myths and first few sources. It is also the clearest manifestation of the state's desire to control sexuality, which, as we've seen, has only been possible first by controlling spaces as it regulated homosociality. We have seen, as Foucault describes, how, "In the space for movement thus conquered, and broadening and organizing that space, methods of power and knowledge assumed responsibility for the life processes and undertook to control and modify them" (*Sexuality* 142).

Conclusion

The male homosocial space shows a discursive heterogeneity that is similar to the harems in our third chapter. In *Tirant*, *El amante liberal* and *Viaje de Turquía*, homosocial spaces offer a refuge from an exterior, sexualized threat. Here, the protagonists repent and begin their progress

⁸⁷ The same is true for Rosaura and Partinuplés. Again, Caro's construction of her public persona offers further insight into her use of space, where both playwright and protagonist are able to move between the public and private, interior space. Partinuplés is thus, crucially, confined to a feminized space that parallels what would have been the prescribed space for the author. Rosaura is a public figure who speaks before her subjects, and later before her suitors, not unlike Caro in her roles as playwright and reporter.

This demonstrates how the natural order has been reversed, domesticating the Count. "El orden natural ha sido invertido. Partinuplés ha trastocado el espacio exterior, símbolo de la actividad y la fuerza del hombre, por el interior, símbolo de la pasividad y sumisión de la mujer, adoptando el papel reservado a la mujer en la institución matrimonial" (Villariño Martínez 565). Moreover, when the Count is shown outside, whether caught in a storm, or far from food, or exiled by his love interest, he seems impotent: "De esta forma los espacios exteriores simbolizan para el conde un caos, un desconcierto del que se librará perfectamente en los espacios interiores, más propios sin embargo del sexo femenino" (Villariño Martínez 563). Rosaura, on the other hand, is able to move between both the public and private space with ease, handling matters of state while attending to her guest.

of reintegrating themselves into the Spanish collective, forsaking the pursuit of personal pleasure. This coincides with a moment of community as they enter into the Orient. In other, later texts, however, homosociality is disputed. In *La gran sultana*, Cervantes turns homosocial space into a foil that demonstrates the solidarity that Madrigal rejects; within this is a criticism of antisemitic attitudes as Madrigal's effort to violate the Jewish family's home are ultimately futile. Caro similarly deconstructs the space by showing how Rosaura and Aldora are manipulating the space that Gaulín and the Count take shelter in.

Parallel to this, we note an increasing willingness to portray and empathize with sodomy in the Orient in our texts as it is increasingly attacked institutionally in Spain. While symbolically evoked in the legends of King Rodrigo, sodomy is alluded to as a more obvious threat in *Tirant*. It becomes explicit in *Viaje de Turquía*, which includes a compassionate treatment of garzones. This goes even further in Cervantes's two texts, where catamites marry and are allowed to integrate into the Christian order. However, despite this, our authors evoke the original emasculation of Rodrigo to heal both the gap between catamites and an increasingly heteronormative society, as well as to heal the psychic wound of Spanish defeat and occupation by Muslims. By assisting Spanish captives, catamites earn their way back into Christendom, showing that their penetration and emasculation is instrumental to the salvation of Spain, paralleling Rodrigo's archetypal penitence.

The overt discussions of Spanish hegemony over the Orient thus convey a nostalgic view of homosociality that gives way over time to a preference for compulsory heterosexuality in the form of marriage. Sexuality thus marks our protagonists' entrance into and exit from the Orient. Rodrigo's, *Tirant's*, and Madrigal's uncontrolled heterosexuality drive them to the Orient, while homosociality offers them a return home. Heterosexual marriage allows for the return of

Leonisa, Lamberto and the garzones, and, in the case of Count Partinuplés and Catalina, a permanent place in the Christian Orient. A preference for homosociality drives Pedro de Urdemalas to return home, and omits Gaulín from heterosexual society. Pre-modern Spanish Orientalism becomes both a discourse of asserting hegemony over the Orient, but also of asserting (or less commonly pushing back against) hegemony over the Occidentals who travel to it.

Sexuality and Said

The evolving use of homosocial space and gradual entry of catamites into it has an important implication: formulating a Spanish Orientalism for Middle Ages and Renaissance must begin with an understanding of Spain's shifting attitudes toward sexuality, and its need to undo the original trauma of Spanish defeat in 711.

This better enables us to exam the points of continuity and disparity between Spanish attitudes toward the Ottomans and Said's framework for Orientalism. Said recognizes that Orientalism is a "male conception of the world" (208) and that "Orientalism itself, furthermore, was an exclusively male province" (207). Like our present Orientalism, Said's is predominately male. However, we must object to Said's qualification that "like so many professional guilds during the modern period, it viewed itself and its subject matter with sexist blinders." This perhaps minimizes the importance that male homosociality played in the Orient. Rather than a casual consequence of sexism at home, male homosociality was a hegemonic weapon used against the Orient that demonstrated the inviolability of Spanish solidarity. This is especially pronounced during the transition from a homosocial culture to a heterosexual one. For Said's orientalists, such questions would have long been resolved and fallen into the backdrop as unstated cultural norms. For our authors, however, there was a greater cultural consciousness of

these changes: increasing pressure from the state to marry, increasing persecution of those convicted of sodomy, and an increasing suspicion of male comity that had previously been the dominant cultural paradigm—all of these uniquely shaped the Orient in the Spanish imagination as refuge, prison, utopia, and purgatory.

Additionally, Joseph A. Boone points out, “the practice of Orientalism theorized by Edward Said has frequently been viewed as a heteroerotic one, in which an all-powerful, masculine ‘West’ seeks to penetrate a feminine, powerless, and sexually available ‘East’ in order to possess its resources” (XXI). Indeed, sodomy is mentioned just as one of the litany of Mohammad’s depravities as understood by medieval Christians. This is, of course, at odds with its actual importance. Boone notes that

a surprising number of these accounts turned their narrative eye, at least for an instant, and at often equally surprising moments, to homoerotic forms of sexual expression that, in contrast to the literally veiled mysteries of female life, appeared—to Western sensibilities—all too visible, too public, staring the observer right in the eye, contrapuntal dialogue. (29)

Irvin Schick agrees, writing “Interracial homosexuality was, without doubt, an important element of sexualized xenological disource” (161). As we have seen, this was no less the case for Spain where, due to the original trauma of the Umayyad invasion of 711, sodomy acquired a special association with the Muslim world.

Yet both critics suggest that the Orient was a sort of playground of erotic pleasure for visiting Europeans.⁸⁸ Contrasting this model of European sex tourism, while the interracial element remains, in our current works it is the Europeans who are penetrated, presenting national shame as Spanish bodies were violated by Orientals.

⁸⁸ Boone suggests that “the essence of any Orientalizing erotics lies in the projection of desires deemed unacceptable or forbidden at home onto a foreign terrain, in order to reencounter those desires” (5). Said similarly states, “What they looked for often...was a different type of sexuality, perhaps more libertine and less guilt-ridden” (190).

Epilogue

During the late medieval and early modern periods, Constantinople acted as a multi-faceted heterotopia that uncovers a wealth of different visions of Spain in the East Mediterranean Orient. Dividing my dissertation into two halves, we first explored Constantinople as a heterotopia, and then as containing heterotopias, placing it into a network of places that often point back to Spain. Constantinople as a topos is thus defined by the other topoi that it is connected to, both externally, and internally.

This overlap of places makes it an ideal site for authors to comment on Spain while remaining outside of Spain, giving rise to discourses that constitute Constantinople as an imagined site, composed of different visions of Spanish society along a spectrum of more and less orthodox. To demonstrate this, this dissertation considers four different aspects of Constantinople as a heterotopia.

The first part studies how the city simultaneously acts as an archetype for fallen cities, as well as foundational ones. For the former, Troy in particular provides a model with which Spanish authors can frame the Ottoman Empire as it threatens Europe by casting them as Trojans, authors provide assurance that, ultimately, Christianity will prevail. This grants Spain what Said calls positional superiority, seeking or inventing relationships between Spain and the East Mediterranean Orient that give Spain the upper hand. However, as Spain grows to see itself as an empire, this insecurity gives way to a sense of entitlement. Spanish authors lay claim to the whole of classical heritage, to Greece as well as to Troy, couching within these claims an argument for the superiority of Humanist didacticism against outmoded Ottoman learning.

As we see in the second chapter, Constantinople is also a prototypically foundational city, evoking others like Enoch and Lavinium. In these cases, Spanish authors

criticize the project of empire and the ambition behind it, at times providing solace to a Spain that perceived itself on the margins of the known world. However, in contrast to our readings up until now, we now see how Lasso de la Vega uses Ottoman Constantinople to critique the endless ambition that drove Spanish imperialism. At the heart of both of these readings is a fixation with the physical *urbs* of the city, as architectural destruction and recreation serve as an index of envy and ambition, playing off of Spanish concerns of its Mudéjar architectural legacy. Alongside our previous visions of a Spain that could hold its own against the Ottomans, and a Spain that was entitled to the whole of Classical heritage, we also see a vision of a non-imperial Spain.

The last half of the dissertation considers how Constantinople also contains heterotopias. Utilizing five different texts, I focus on two recurrent heterotopias: the Harem and a Male homosocial space on the margins. Both spaces offer a rich commentary on how Spain changes its approach towards sexuality, as marriage was increasingly regulated and encouraged by the state while non-heterosexual behavior, whether male homosociality or male homoeroticism, was increasingly marginalized. The two spaces also draw on two bookending episodes from Spain's founding myth, the last Visigoth king, Rodrigo. The first episode parallels the Harem, which Spanish visitors desperately tried to enter as voyeurs to the forbidden Oriental beauties. This recalls how Rodrigo watches the nude Doña Florinda and later rapes her. On the one hand, the Harem acts as a sort of metonymic victory, where travelers demonstrate their superiority over the Ottomans by violating their Harem. Yet, at the same time, the Harem allows Spanish authors to grapple with the increased prominence that women were given in their own society, at first projecting fears of female sexuality onto the city by tying it to Rodrigo's voyeurism, yet

upholding marriage as the highest end for men as well as a form of wielding power against the Orient.

My final chapter follows a parallel route, as I consider a space that accompanies the Harem across various texts—a male homosocial space that is on the margins of society and that inverts the containment of the Harem into a refuge from a hostile Muslims exterior. It offers numerous parallels with Rodrigo's final penitence, where the dethroned king buries himself alive with an emasculating serpent to finally atone for the fall of Spain; simultaneously, Pelayo also leads his men out of the cave in Covadonga to the first victory against the Umayyad armies. The male homosocial prisons and caves in these texts act similarly as a space of reconciliation, as well as a refuge against a stronger Muslim foe. Yet this too points back to Spain's regulation of sexuality, as the sheltered space of homosociality provides a space of resistance against compulsory marriage in Spain. In so doing, it also casts marriage as a means of redeeming catamites, allowing them to find a place in Christian society despite their improprieties.

My consideration of Constantinople draws on ten different primary sources as well as treatises, romances, paintings and chronicles to locate the city within the Spanish imaginary both chronologically and geographically. The immediate result has allowed me to take initial steps in developing a framework through which the Byzantines and later the Ottomans were understood by the Spanish—composed of essential tropes that, while evolving, nonetheless served as boundary markers for the East Mediterranean Orient as it contrasted (or, in the case with the Al-Andalusi and American Orients, overlapped) with other Orientalized spaces.

My research has deeper implications as well. The Ottomans as well as Byzantines were deeply essential not only to defining Spanishness by contrast, but also by providing a distanced space to offer new perspectives on a changing Spain. Spanish authors dialogued with

previous texts in these imagined spaces while resolving (or underscoring) their own anxieties and desires. Some of these visions challenge the dominant status quo in ways that may not have been possible anywhere outside of the speculative fiction-like space of Constantinople, whether condoning same-sex desire, or criticizing Spanish imperial ambitions. I consider these alternative visions of Spain, a Spain where homoeroticism is normalized, and a fragile Spain that is vulnerable to over-extending its empire. While perhaps less surprising, no less significant are the Orthodox visions of Spain that are projected onto Constantinople, where, for instance, marriage as the highest end of Spanish men attains a perfection in Constantinople that contrasts with the lived reality of a Spain whose official discourse was always subtly resisted and contested. At the same time, these Orthodox visions provide a means to universalize such views, creating in our present example the illusion that a particular notion of marriage is universal rather than contingent; the patriarchy thus becomes ubiquitous, ruling both in Spain and in the Orient. I hope that this will encourage other readings that post beyond the essentializing dichotomy of fear and fascination.

My study sheds light on unexpected connections, such as the surprising overlaps between the Ottoman and Byzantine Empires in a number of texts studied, such as the continuity of voyeurism. This suggests a more complete, complicated picture of Spain's engagement with its Muslim Others, where the alterity of the Greek Christian Empire is no less significant than the alterity of Islam and the Ottoman Empire, and where the Ottoman Turks can serve as an ally in a pinch against a greater threat like the Timurids. At the same time, despite seeing the Ottomans as an existential threat, imperial fantasies of recovering Constantinople for Christendom persist, as authors cast the Ottoman as potential Spanish subjects.

Additionally, we have also uncovered a peculiar symmetry at a couple of points in our analysis, where what produces anxieties in Spain can be reversed into a weapon abroad. This is the case with voyeurism, where the need to watch over women also evokes anxieties of being seduced by them. Similarly, the confinement of prison becomes, rather, a refuge and a place of resistance against a hostile Ottoman exterior. We have also seen it in how *limpieza de sangre* readily becomes a means to bring the Ottomans into Spain's genealogical orbit while placing Spain at the center. This symmetry allows us to place Constantinople into juxtaposition with Spain's larger imperial ambitions in the Americas.

These elements also suggest a new direction for thinking of Orientalism. Rather than limiting ourselves to the unidirectional relationship of power over the Orient as Said conceives it, we can see an Orientalism that is rooted in preoccupations with Spain itself, as well as its various cultural shifts. At times, particularly when Byzantine Constantinople emerges as a fantastic space long after its conquest, Constantinople is less about the Orient, and more about Spain itself, though, as we have seen in *El Conde Partinuplés*, Caro still depends on her audience's awareness of the Ottoman Empire. Constantinople thus acts as a multi-faceted screen that offers insight both into how Spanish authors understood a unique East Mediterranean Orient, and how they used this Orient as a mirror to interrogate their own changing society.

Works Cited

- Afonso, Pedro. *Crónica general de España de 1344*. Edited by Diego Catalán and María Soledad de Andrés, Gredos, 1971.
- Akbari, Suzanne Conklin. *Idols in the East: European Representations of Islam and the Orient, 1100-1450*. Cornell UP, 2012.
- Alemany Ferrer, Rafael. "Artus i Espèrcius o el culte al meravellós en el Tirant lo Blanc." *Actes del x congrés internacional de l'associació hispànica de literatura medieval 2003*, edited by Rafael Alemany, Josep Lluís Martos and Josep Miquel Manzanaro, Institut Interuniversitari de Filologia Valenciana. 2005.
- Alemany Ferrer, Rafael. "El mito de Troya en el espejo del Tirant lo Blanc." *Actas del XVII Simposio de la Sociedad Española de Literatura General y Comparada 2010*, edited by Montserrat Cots Vicente and Antonio Monegal, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2014.
- Alfonso X. *Primera crónica general de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289*. Edited by Pidal Ramón Menéndez y Pelayo, Madrid, Bailly-Baillière é hijos, 1906.
- Alfonso. *General Estoria*. Edited by Antonio G. Solalinde et al., vol. 2. Tomo I. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Jerónimo Zurita, 1957.
- Angold, Michael J. *Fourth Crusade: Event and Context*. Routledge, 2017.
- Antonucci, Fausta. "Del turco vencedor al turco derrotado: La santa Liga de Lope de Vega y su relacion con La destruycion de Constantinopla de Gabriel Lobo Lasso de la Vega." *EHumanista*, vol. 33, 2016, pp. 123-34.
- Apraiz, Julián. *Estudio histórico-crítico sobre Las novelas ejemplares de Cervantes*. Vitoria, Domingo Sar, 1901.
- Asenjo, María. "Urban Identity in Castile in the 15th Century." *Imago Temporis: Medium Aevum*, no. 10, 2016, pp. 291-312, doi:10.21001/itma.2016.10.12.
- Aresti, N. "The Gendered Identities of the 'Lieutenant Nun': Rethinking the Story of a Female Warrior in Early Modern Spain." *Gender & History*, no. 19, 2007, pp. 401-18. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0424.2007.00491.x
- Artigas, María del Carmen. "Singular pasaje en La Gran Sultana de Cervantes: ¿El reverso del ritual?" *Maguén Escudo*, vol. 131, Apr. 2004, pp. 47-50. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2006320959&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Augustine of Hippo. *City of God*. Edited by Marcus Dodds, Hendrickson Publishers Inc, 2009.
- Augustine of Hippo. *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*. Translated by John Henry Parker, vol. 2, London, F. and R. Rivington, 1848.

- Balint, Bridget K. "Envy in the Intellectual Discourse of the High Middle Ages." *The Seven Deadly Sins*, Brill, pp. 41–56, doi:10.1163/ej.9789004157859.i-312.15.
- Barletta, Vincent. *Death in Babylon: Alexander the Great & Iberian Empire in the Muslim Orient*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 2010.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *Erasmus y España, estudios sobre la historia espiritual del siglo XVI*. vol. 2, 1950.
- Bataillon, Marcel. "Andrés Laguna, auteur du Viaje de Turquía, à la lumière de recherches récentes." *Bulletin Hispanique*, 8, 2, 1956, pp. 121-81.
- Béguelin-Argimón, Victoria. "Viaje y diferencias culturales: la visión del otro en La Embajada a Tamorlán." *Acta del coloquio internacional de la AEPE: El español y la cultura hispánica en la Ruta de la seda*, edited by María Pilar Celma Valero et al., Asociación Europea de Profesores de Español, 2012, pp. 27–38.
- Beltrán Llavador, Rafael. "Los libros de viajes medievales castellanos Introducción al panorama crítico actual: ¿Cuántos libros de viajes medievales castellanos?" *Filología Románica*, no. 1, 1991, pp. 121–64.
- Beltrán Llavador, Rafael. "La muerte del Tirant: elementos para una autopsia." *Actes del Colloqui Internacional Tirant Lo Blanch: L'arbor de la novel·la moderna europea*, 21-22 October 1994, Ais de Provença, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997, pp. 75-93.
- Beltrán, Vicenç. "Realismo, coloquialismo, y erotismo en Tirant lo Blanc." *Estudios sobre Tirant lo Blanc*. Edited by Juan Paredes, Enrique J. Nogueras Valdivieso, Lourdes Sánchez Rodrigo. Universidad de Granada, 1995, pp. 27-43.
- Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.
- Bizzarri, Hugo, editor. *Diccionario Paremiológico e Ideológico de La Edad Media (Castilla, Siglo XIII)*. Seminario de Edición y Crítica Textual, 2000.
- Boll, Jessica Ribble. "A Tale of a City: The Image of Istanbul in "La Gran Sultana", "Viaje De Turquía" and "Cautiverio y Trabajos De Diego Galán"." Dissertation. The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2011. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2013420642&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Boll, Jessica Ribble. "Violating the harem: Manipulation of Spatial Meaning in Cervantes' "La Gran Sultana." *International Journal of the Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 5, 2011, pp. 137-147. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=91798167&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Boodakian, Florence Dee. *Resisting Nudities: A Study in the Aesthetics of Eroticism*. Peter Lang,

2008.

- Boone, Joseph A. *The Homoerotics Of Orientalism*. Columbia UP, 2014. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Accessed 13 July 2016.
- Borrás Gualis, Gonzalo M. "Mudejar: An Alternative Architectural System in the Castilian Urban Repopulation Model." *Medieval Encounters*, vol. 12, no. 3, Brill, Nov. 2006, pp. 329–40, doi:10.1163/157006706779166075.
- Boyle, Margaret E. *Unruly Women: Performance, Penitence, And Punishment In Early Modern Spain*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2013. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Accessed 18 Jan. 2017.
- Bravo García, Antonio Pedro. "La Constantinopla que vieron R. González de Clavijo y P. Tafur: Los monasterios." *Erytheia: Revista de Estudios Bizantinos y Neogriegos*, no. 3, InterClassica, Universidad de Murcia, 1983, pp. 39-47.
- Bravo García, Antonio Pedro. "La Crónica De Los Gattilusios Y Otras Cuestiones De Historia Bizantina En La Embajada a Tamorlán." *Estudios Clásicos*, vol. 26, no. 88, 1984, pp. 27-38.
- Bravo García, Antonio Pedro. "La imagen de Bizancio en los viajeros medievales españoles: notas para un nuevo comentario a sus relatos (I)." *Bizancio y la Península Ibérica: De la antigüedad tardía a la edad moderna*, edited by Inmaculada Pérez Martín and Pedro Bádenas de la Peña, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2004, pp. 381-436.
- Bravo García, Antonio Pedro. "Viaje y Prejuicio : Bizantinos , Turcos y Judíos de La Constantinopla Medieval y El Estambul Moderno Vistos Por Los Españoles." *Logos Hellenikós: Homenaje Al Profesor Gaspar Morocho Gayo*, vol. 2, 2001, pp. 620–71.
- Bubnova, Tatiana. "El cronotopo del encuentro y la idea del otro en *El amante liberal*." *Actas del 11 Congreso Internacional de Cervantistas*. Edited by Giuseppe Grilli. Napoli, Istituto Filologico Orientale, 1995, pp. 587-99. *Cervantes virtual*, https://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/cervantistas/congresos/cg_II/cg_II_50.pdf
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "Constantinopla en la literatura española sobre los otomanos (siglos XVI y XVII)." *Erytheia*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1987, pp. 263-74.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "Cristianos y musulmanes ante el espejo en la Edad Moderna los caracteres de hostilidad y de admiración." *Quaderns de la Mediterrània*, no. 8, 2007, pp. 307-11.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "El orientalismo español de la edad moderna: la fijación de los mitos descriptivos." *El orientalismo desde el Sur*. Edited by José Antonio González Alcántud, Anthropos, 2006, pp. 37-54.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "El paisaje de la ciudad de Estambul." *Hispania*, vol. 56, no.192, 1996, pp. 13–27.

- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "La conquista turca de Bizancio según los cronistas europeos de los siglos XVI y XVII Autores." *Erytheia*, no. 13, 1992, pp. 89-102.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. *La imagen de los musulmanes y del norte de África en la España de los siglos XVI y XVII: Los caracteres de una hostilidad*. Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1989.
- Bunes Ibarra, Miguel Angel de. "La visión de los musulmanes en el Siglo de Oro: las bases de una hostilidad." *Torre de los Lujanes*, no. 47, 2002, pp. 61-72.
- Burton, David G. "The Question of 'Disparity of Cult' in La Gran Sultana." *Romance Notes*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1987, pp. 57-61.
- Canónica, Elvezio. "De Babel a Pentecostés: plurilingüismo explícito e implícito como estrategia argumentativa en El viaje de Turquía." *e-Spania*, 29, 2018.
- Cappas-Toro, Pamela, and Javier Irigoyen-García. "¿Vaos bien con la compañía?: violación colectiva y fantasía política en el romance 'Después que el Rey Don Rodrigo'." *Hispanofila*, vol. 173, no. 3, 2015, pp. 3-20. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edslr&AN=edsgcl.472004355&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Carbó, Laura. "El otro lejano: La descripción del extranjero y su entorno natural en La embajada a Tamorlán." *Jornadas de Estudios Clásicos y Medievales*, vol. VII, 2015.
- Carpintero Benítez, Francisco. "*Mos italicus*", "*mos gallicus*" y el Humanismo racionalista: una contribución a la historia de la metodología jurídica. Vittorio Klosterman 1977.
- Caro Mallén de Soto, Ana. *Las comedias de Ana Caro*. Edited by María José Delgado, New York, P. Lang, 1998.
- Carrión, María Mercedes. *Subject Stages: Marriage, Theatre and the Law in Early Modern Spain*. Uof Toronto P, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2010. University of Toronto Romance Series.
- Carrión, María Mercedes. "Portrait of a Lady: Marriage, Postponement, and Representation in Ana Caro's 'El Conde Partinuplés.'" *MLN*, vol. 114, no. 2, 1999, pp. 241-68. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.3251548&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Carrizo Rueda, Sofía M. "Tradiciones Tópicas y Propósitos de Objetividad En La Embajada a Tamorlán." *Revista de Literatura Medieval*, no. 4, Universidad de Alcalá, 1992, pp. 79-86, <https://ebuah.uah.es/dspace/handle/10017/7909>.
- Carrizo Rueda, Sofía M. *Poética del Relato de Viajes*. Reichenberger, 1997.
- Casaldueiro, Joaquín. *Sentido y forma del teatro de Cervantes*. Madrid: Gredos, 1966.

- Castillo, Moises R. "¿Ortodoxia cervantina?: Un análisis de *La gran sultana*, *El trato de Argel* y *Los Baños de Argel*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2004, pp. 219-40. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/boc.2004.0013.
- Casas Rigall, Juan. *La Materia de Troya en las letras romances del siglo XIII hispano*. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999.
- Castro Hernández, Pablo. "Un estado de la cuestión sobre las Andanças e viajes de Pero Tafur: Discusiones historiográficas y problemáticas de estudio." *Revista Historias Del Orbis Terrarum*, vol. 6, 2013, pp. 27–71.
- Castillo, Moises R. "¿Ortodoxia cervantina?: Un análisis de *La gran sultana*, *El trato de Argel* y *Los Baños de Argel*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2004, pp. 219-40. Project MUSE, doi:10.1353/boc.2004.0013.
- Cáseda Teresa, Jesús Fernando. "El viaje de Turquía: Algunas notas sobre la autoría y la referencialidad extratextual de la obra." *Etiópicas*, 14, 2018.
- Catelli, Laura. "'Y de esta manera quedaron todos los hombres sin mujeres': el mestizaje como estrategia de colonización en la española (1501-1503)." *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, vol. 37, no. 74, 2011, pp. 217–38. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.41940845&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edited by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo, Editorial Castalia, 1997. 2 Vols.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Galatea; Novelas ejemplares; Persiles y Sigismunda*. Edited by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas, Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 1994.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Ocho comedias: La gran sultana y El amante liberal*. Edited by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas, Madrid, Alianza, 1998.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses: El trato de Argel y La Numancia*. Edited by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas, vol. III, Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 1995.
- Chapelle Wojciehowski, Hannah. "Triangulating Humanist Friendship: More, Giles, Erasmus, and the Making of the Utopia" *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700*. Edited by Daniel T. Lochman, Maritere López, and Lorna Hutson. Farnham, Surrey: Routledge, 2011. eBook Collection (EBSCOhost). Accessed 17 Jan. 2017.
- Clamurro, William "El amante liberal de Cervantes y las fronteras de la identidad." *AIH Actas*, Irvine 5, 1992, pp. 193-200. *Cervantesvirtual*, https://cvc.cervantes.es/literatura/aih/pdf/11/aih_11_5_023.pdf.

- Clanton, Dan W. *The Good, the Bold, and the Beautiful : The Story of Susanna and its Renaissance Interpretations*. New York: T & T Clark International, 2006. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Accessed 18 Jan. 2017.
- Cohen, Jaclyn M. "Writing the Emotions: A Study of Shame and Guilt in Female-Authored Texts of Spain's Golden Age." Dissertation. The Johns Hopkins U. 2011. <https://search-proquest-com.proxy.uchicago.edu/docview/880575550?accountid=14657>.
- Colish, Marcia L. "Juan Luis Vives on the Turks." *Medievalia Et Humanistica*, vol. 35, 2009, pp. 1-14.
- Connor, Catherine. "La sexualidad, el 'orientalismo' cervantino y el caso de La gran sultana." *Actas del III Congreso de Hispanistas de Asia*. Tokyo: Asociación Asiática de Hispanistas, 1993, pp. 512–18.
- Costa, Ricardo da, and Armando A. D. Santos. "A Inveja Em Curial e Guelfa (Séc. XV) e Sua Representação Na Arte Do Outono Da Idade Média." *Mirabilia*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2015, pp. 159–79.
- Corral, Pedro de. *Crònica del Rey Don Rodrigo con la destruycion de España, y como los Moros la ganaron*, Casa de Iuan Gutierrez Ursino, 1586.
- Correll, Barbara. "Malleable Material, Models of Power: Woman in Erasmus's "Marriage Group" and Civility in Boys." *ELH*, vol. 57, no. 2, 1990, pp. 241-62. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.2307/2873071.
- Covarrubias Orozco, Sebastián de. *Tesoro De La Lengua Castellana, o Española* . Luis Sanchez, 1611.
- Cox Davis, Nina. "The Tyranny of Love in *El amante liberal*." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* vol. 13, no. 2, 1993, pp. 105-24.
- Cruz, Anne J. "Figuring Gender in the Picaresque Novel: From Lazarillo to Zayas." *Romance Notes*, no. 1, 2010, pp. 7-20. *EBSCOhost*, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.279462529&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Cruz, Anne J. "Gendering the disenfranchised: Down, out, and female in early modern Spain." *Living Dangerously: On the Margins in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt and Anna Grotans. University of Notre Dame Press. pp. 87-112.
- Cruz, Anne J. "Inside harem Walls: Gendered Space and the Place of Women in Cervantes's La Gran Sultana Catherine Infante." *Sex and Gender in Cervantes*, edited by Esther Fernández Rodríguez and Mercedes Alcalá Galán, Reichenberger, 2019, pp. 243–55.
- Curley, Michael J. *Physiologus*. U of Chicago P, 2009.
- Da Costa, Ricardo, and Armando Alexandre Dos Santos. "A Inveja Em Curial e Guelfa e Sua

- Representação Na Arte Do Outono Da Idade Média.” *Mirabilia: Revista Eletrônica De História Antiga e Medieval*, vol. 20, 2015, pp. 156–79.
- Daly, Karen. “Hombres Virtuosos y Mujeres Escandalosas En Las Andanzas de Pero Tafur”.” *Maravillas, Peregrinaciones y Utopías: Literatura de Viajes En El Mundo Románico*, Publicacions de la Universitat de Valencia, Departament de Filologia espanyola, 2002, pp. 359–67.
- Daly, Karen. *The Fifteenth-Century Spanish Libros de Viajes: Travel Discourse Prior to Columbus*. Indiana UP, 2003, doi:10.1177/001088048102200214.
- De Armas, Frederick A. “The Allure of the Oriental Other: Titian’s *Rossa Sultana* and Lope de Vega’s *La Santa Liga*.” *Brave New Words. Studies in Spanish Golden Age Literature*, Edited by Edward H. Friedman and Catherine Larson, UP of the South, pp. 191-208.
- De Armas, Frederick A. "Ecos y reescrituras de Calderon en El conde Partinuplés de Ana Caro: La gran Cenobia, La dama duende y La vida es sueño," Anuario Calderoniano 13 (2020) In press.
- De Armas, Frederick A. "Sultanas, reinas, damas y villanas figuras femeninas en la comedia ecfrástica del Siglo de Oro." *Hispanófila*, no. 175, 2017, pp. 46-62.
- . “De cómo el Rey Don Rodrigo se enamoró de La Cava, viéndola lavar sus cabellos á la vera de una fuente.” *Romancero general ó colección de romances castellano*. Edited by Agustín Durán. Vol 1, Madrid, M. Rivadeneyra, 1877, p. 401.
- Delgado Gómez, Ángel. “El viaje como medio de conocimiento el Viaje de Turquía.” *Actas del VIII Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas: 22-27 agosto 1983*, edited by A. David Kossoff, Ruth H. Kossoff, Geoffrey Ribbans, José Amor y Vázquez, Vol. 1, 1986, pp. 483-90.
- Delgado-Gómez, Ángel. "Una visión comparada de España y Turquía: El viaje de Turquía." *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos: Revista Mensual De Cultura Hispanica*, vol. 444, June 1987, pp. 35-64.
- Díaz-Mas, Paloma. “El eco de la caída de Constantinopla en las literaturas hispánicas.” *Constantinopla 1453. Mitos y realidades*. Edited by Pedro Bádenas and Inmaculada Pérez, Madrid, CSIC, 2003, pp. 317-49.
- Díaz Tanco, Vasco. *Libro intitulado palinodia de la nephanda y fiera nacion de los turcos*. Orense, 1547.
- Díez Fernández, J. Ignacio. "Sin discrepar de la verdad un punto: ‘La Gran Sultana’: ¿Un canto a la tolerancia?" 2011. *Lectura y Signo*, no. 1, 2006, pp. 301-22.
- Eberenz, R. “Ruy González de Clavijo et Pero Tafur, l’image de La Ville.” *Études de Lettres*, no. 3, 1992, pp. 29–53.

- Ellis, Jonathan. "Royal Obligation and the 'Uncontrolled Female' in Ana Caro's *El Conde Partinuplés*." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, 62, 1, 2010, p. 15-30. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsglr&AN=edsgcl.325092556&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- El Saffar, Ruth. "The 'I' of the Beholder: Self and Other in Some Spanish Golden Age Texts." *Hispania*, vol. 75, no. 4, 1992, pp. 862-74. EBSCOhost, doi:10.2307/343855.
- Escabias, Juana. "Los locos personajes femeninos de Ana María Caro Mallén: Rosaura y Aldora de 'El conde Partinuplés.'" *Locas, escritoras y personajes femeninos cuestionando las normas: XII Congreso Internacional del Grupo de Investigación Escritoras y Escrituras*. Edited by Milagro Martín Clavijo, Mercedes González de Sande, Daniele Cerrato, and Eva María Moreno Lago. Alciber, 2017, Sevilla, pp. 479-93.
- Espejo Surós, Javier. "La Sublime escena. Estudios de tema turco y teatro aureo. Notas a modo de preludio." *EHumanista*, vol. 33, 2016, pp. i-v. *Gale Literature Resource Center*, Accessed 20 Jan. 2020.
- Espinosa, Aurelio. *The Empire of the Cities : Emperor Charles V, the Comunero Revolt, and the Transformation of the Spanish System*. Brill, 2009.
- Espinosa, Aurelio. "Early Modern State Formation, Patriarchal Families, and Marriage in Absolutist Spain: The Elopement of Manrique de Lara and Luisa de Acuña y Portugal." *Journal of Family History*, vol. 32, no. 1, Jan. 2007, pp. 1-18. doi: 10.1177/0363199006294765.
- Eugui, García de. *Crónica d'Espayña de García de Eugui*. Edited by Aengus Ward and Patricia Plaza Arregui, Gobierno de Navarra, Departamento de Educación y Cultura, 1999.
- Evatt, Jeffrey Michael. *The Primacy of National Sentiment in the Embajada a Tamorlán and Andanças é Viajes*. The U of Texas at Austin, 2006.
- Fine, Ruth. "Los rostros de Ester—Tres versiones dramáticas auriseculares del Libro De Ester: 'La hermosa Ester' de Lope de Vega, 'La reina Ester' de Godínez y 'La Gran Sultana' de Cervantes." *Hispania Judaica Bulletin*, vol. 7, 2010, pp. 233-59.
- Finn, Thomas P. "Women's Kingdoms: Female Monarchs by Two Women Dramatists of Seventeenth-Century Spain and France." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 59, no. 1, Jan. 2007, pp. 131-48. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edspmu&AN=edspmu.S1944092807100063&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *Exotic nation: maurophilia and the construction of early modern Spain*. Penn, 2009.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *Passing for Spain: Cervantes and the Fictions of Identity*. U of Illinois P, 2002.

- Fuchs, Barbara. "Intimate Strangers: Humor and the Representation of Difference in Cervantes's Drama of Captivity." *In and of the Mediterranean: Medieval and Early Modern Iberian Studies*. Edited by Michelle Hamilton and Nuria Silleras-Fernandez. Vanderbilt UP, 2015, pp. 259-76.
- Fogelquist, James Donald, "Pedro de Corral's reconfiguration of La Cava in the Crónica del Rey don Rodrigo," *eHumanista: Monographs in Humanities*, III.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Random House, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces:" Translated by Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* 16.1, 1986, pp. 22-27.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. vol. 1, Random House, 1978.
- Fox, Dian. "Performing Masculinity, Nationalism, and Honor in Early Modern Spain: Calderon de la Barca's *El pintor de su deshonra*." *The Poetics of Masculinity in Early Modern Italy and Spain*. Edited by Gerry Milligan and Jane Tylus. Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2010, pp. 293-316.
- Friedman, Edward H. "Female Presence, Male Prescience: The Creation of the Subject in La Gran Sultana." *Estudios en Homenaje a Enrique Ruiz-Fornells*. Edited by Juan Fernández Jiménez, et al. Asociación de Licenciados & Doctores Españoles en Estados Unidos, 1990, pp. 218-25.
- Galarreta-Aima, Diana. "Anotaciones sobre Viaje de Turquía." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 93, no. 3, 2016, pp. 235-53. EBSCOhost, doi:10.3828/bhs.2016.15.
- García Cárcel, Ricardo. "La psicosis del turco en la España del Siglo de Oro." *Los imperios orientales en el teatro del Siglo de Oro*. Edited by Felipe B. Pedraza Jiménez and R. González Cañal, Almagro Universidad de Castilla, 1994, 15-28.
- García Jiménez, Antonio. "El viaje de Turquía, el viaje iniciático de Bernardo de Quirós." *Lemir*, no. 20, 2016, pp. 533-46.
- García Lorenzo, Luciano. "Cervantes, Constantinopla y La gran sultana." *Anales Cervantinos*, no. 31, 1993, pp. 201-13.
- García-Martín, Elena. "Gendered Representations of the Militant Church: Ana Caro's and Luisa Roldán's Rhetoric of War and Religion." *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 7, Fall 2012, pp. 69-100. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/23617532.
- García Salinero, Fernando. *Viaje de Turquía (la odisea de Pedro de Urdemalas)*. Madrid: Catedra, 1986.
- Gibbons, Megan E. "Speaking Out from within: Ana Caro and Her Role as a Woman Writer in Seventeenth-Century Spain." Dissertation, Boston University, 2012. ProQuest Dissertations

& *Theses Global*, <https://search-proquest-com.proxy.uchicago.edu/docview/927931724?accountid=14657>.

- Giles, Ryan. "A Galen for Lovers: Medical Readings of Ovid in the Medieval and Early Renaissance Spain." *Ovid in the Age of Cervantes*. Edited by Frederick de Armas. U of Toronto P, 2010, pp. 3-19.
- Gil-Osle, Juan Pablo. "El examen de maridos en *El Conde Partinuplés* de Ana Caro: La agencia femenina en El juicio de Paris." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 61, no. 2, 2009, pp. 103-19.
- Gil-Osle, Juan Pablo. "Escipión y la amistad en *El amante liberal* de Cervantes." *Lejana: Revista Crítica de Narrativa Breve*, no. 7, 2014, pp. 1-11.
- González, Nicolás. *Crónica Troyana*, edited by Manuel R. Rodríguez, vol. 1, La Coruña, La Casa de Misericordia, 1900.
- González de Clavijo, Ruy. *Embajada a Tamorlán*. Edited by Francisco López Estrada, Castalia, 2005.
- González Cañal, Rafael. "Las Comedias Sobre El Gran Tamorlán de Persia." *Memoria de La Palabra: Actas Del VI Congreso de La Asociación Internacional Siglo de Oro*, edited by Francisco Domínguez Matito and María Luisa. Lobato López, Centro Virtual Cervantes, 2004, pp. 917-28.
- González-Casanovas, R. J. "Religious and Cultural Politics in Tirant Lo Blanc: The Mediterranean Contexts of Chivalry." *Catalan Review: International Journal of Catalan Culture*, vol. 5, no. 1, July 1991, pp. 95-120. *Biblioteca virtual Miguel de Cervantes*. <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcsf345>
- Goytisolo, Juan. *Crónicas sarracinas*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 1998.
- Goytisolo, Juan. "El Viaje de Turquía." *Quimera: Revista De Literatura*, no. 6, April 1981, pp. 20-27.
- Graham-Brown, Sarah. "The Seen, the Unseen and the Imagined: Private and Public Lives." *Feminist Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. edited by Reina Lewis and Sara Mills. Routledge, 2003, pp. 502-19.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. U of Chicago P, 1991.
- Güntert, Georges. *Cervantes: novelar el mundo desintegrado*. Libros Puvill, 1993.
- Harper, James G. "Turks as Trojans; Trojans as Turks: Visual Imagery of the Trojan War and the Politics of Cultural Identity in Fifteenth-Century Europe." *Postcolonial Approaches to the European Middle Ages: Translating Cultures*, edited by Ananya Jahanara Kabir and Deanne Williams, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp. 151-79.

- Hart, Thomas R. "Renaissance dialogue and narrative fiction: The Viaje de Turquía." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2000, p. 107+. *Gale Literature Resource Center*, Accessed 26 Mar. 2020.
- Hauf, Albert. "The Eschatological Framework of Tirant's African Adventure." *Tirant Lo Blanc: New Approaches*. Edited by Arthur Terry, *Tamesis*, 1999, pp. 69-82.
- Harney, Michael. "Ludology, Self-Fashioning, and Entrepreneurial Masculinity in Iberian Novels of Chivalry." *Self-Fashioning and Assumptions of Identity in Medieval and Early Modern Iberia*, edited by Laura Delbrugge, Brill, 2015, pp. 144-66.
- Hart, Thomas R. "La ejemplaridad de *El amante liberal*." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, no. 1, 1988, pp. 303-18. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.40300760&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Heigl, Michaela J. "Erotic Paranoia and Wife Murder in Calderonian Drama." *Hispanic Review*, no. 3, 2002, pp. 333-53. EBSCOhost, doi:10.2307/3247206.
- Hegyí, Ottmar. *Cervantes and the Turks: Historical Reality Versus Literary Fiction in La Gran Sultana and El amante liberal*. Juan de la Cuesta, 1992.
- Hetherington, Kevin. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering*. Routledge, 1997.
- Hernández Araico, Susana. "Despolarización posmoderna en *La gran sultana*: una ventana de vistas diversas." *Studia Aurea. Actas del III Congreso de la AISO (Toulouse, 1993). Volumen II*. Edited by Ignacio Arellano. Toulouse/Pamplona: GRISO/LEMSO, 1996. pp. 177-88.
- Herrera, Antonio Urquizar. *Admiration and Awe Morisco Buildings and Identity Negotiations in Early Modern Spanish Historiography*. Oxford UP, 2017.
- The Holy Bible*, New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan House, 1984.
- Howe, Elizabeth Teresa. "Cervantes and the Mediterranean Frontier: The Case of '*El amante liberal*'." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2014, pp. 113-23. *MLA International Bibliography*, Accessed 14 Dec. 2016.
- Hutchinson, Steven. "Andar en almoneda su alma: Cautivos y esclavos en *El amante liberal*." *La media semana del jardincito: Cervantes y la reescritura de los códigos*. Edited by Martín Morán and José Manuel. Padua, Unipress, 2002, pp. 237-51.
- Inciarte, Monique Dascha. "Travel Dialogues under Counter-Reformation Pressure: A New Vehicle for Polemics in 16th Century Hispanic Literature." Dissertation, University of Berkley, 2011. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*, <https://search-proquest.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/docview/1441348737?accountid=14657>.

- Isidore of Seville. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, translated by Stephen A. Barney et al, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Isom-Verhaaren, Christine and Kent F. Schull. *Living in the Ottoman Realm: Empire and Identity, 13th to 20th Centuries*. Indiana UP, 2016.
- Irigoyen-García, Javier. "Diana and Wild Boar Hunting: Refiguring Gender and Ethno-Religious Conflict in the Pastoral Imaginary." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 88, no. 3, 2011, pp. 273-287. EBSCOhost, doi:10.3828/bhs.2011.8.
- Irigoyen-García, Javier. "*Moors dressed as Moors*": clothing, social distinction and ethnicity in early modern Iberia. U of Toronto P, 2017.
- Jeffery, David Lyle. "Bathsheba in the Eye of the Beholder." *Sacred and Profane in Chaucer and Late Medieval Literature: Essays in Honour of John V. Fleming*, edited by Robert Epstein and William Robins, U of Toronto, Buffalo, NY, 2010, pp. 30–45.
- Jesús, Rubiera Mata María. *Tirant contra el Islam*. Altea, Aitana, 1993.
- Jurado Santos, Agapita. "Silencio/palabra: estrategias de algunas mujeres cervantinas para realizar el deseo." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, vol. 19, no. 2, 1999, pp. 140-153. *Cervantesvirtual*
<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcmw4f0>
- Kagan, R. L. *Urban images of the Hispanic World, 1493-1793*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.
- Kanellos, Nicolas. "The Anti-Semitism of Cervantes' Los Banos De Argel and La Gran Sultana: A Reappraisal." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 27, 1975, pp. 48-52. *Project MUSE*, doi:10.1353/boc.1975.0009
- Keller, Marcus and Javier Irigoyen-García. *The Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Marcus Keller, Javier Irigoyen-García, Springer, 2008, pp. 1-14.
- Kelly, M. G. "Against Prophecy and Utopia: Foucault and the Future." *Thesis Eleven*, vol. 120, no. 1, pp. 104–18. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1177/0725513613520621. Accessed 3 Jan. 2020.
- Kinoshita, Sharon. "The politics of courtly love: 'La Prise d'Orange' and the conversion of the Saracen queen." *The Romanic Review*, vol. 86, no. 2, 1995, pp. 464-74, *Literature Resource Center*. Accessed 17 Jan. 2017. *Literature Resource Center*,
go.galegroup.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/ps/i.do?p=LitRC&sw=w&u=chic_rbw&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA18529375&asid=04a415a0d79bc4cf78dc05a0d65f1aef. Accessed 20 Sept. 2017.
- King, Thomas Alan. *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750, Volume 1: The English Phallus*. U of Wisconsin P, 2004.
- Knapp, James F., and Peggy A. Knapp. *Medieval Romance The Aesthetics of Possibility*. U of Toronto P, 2018.

Knight, Kelvin T. "Placeless Places: Resolving the Paradox of Foucault's Heterotopia." *Textual Practice*, vol. 31, no. 1, Feb. 2017, pp. 141–58. EBSCOhost, doi:10.1080/0950236X.2016.1156151.

LaBarge, Margaret Wade. "Pero Tafur: A Fifteenth-Century Spaniard." *Florilegium: Papers on Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, vol. 5, 1983, pp. 237-47.

Lacarra, María Jesús. "La Imaginación En Los Primeros Libros de Viajes." *Actas Del III Congreso de La Asociación Hispánica de Literatura Medieval: Tomo 1*, edited by María Isabel Toro Pascua, Departamento de literatura española e hispanoamericana, 1994, pp. 501–09.

Lanz, Courtney. *Social and Political Ambitions in the "Andancas e Viajes de Un Hidalgo Español" and the "Embajada a Tamorlan."* U of Wisconsin, 2009.

Larrea Velasco, Nuria. *Historia Troyana Polimétrica. Edición Crítica.* Universidad nacional de educación a distancia, 2012.

Lawrance, Jeremy. "Europe and the Turks in Spanish Literature of the Renaissance and Early Modern Period." *Culture and Society in Habsburg Spain: Studies Presented to R.W. Truman by His Pupils and Colleagues on the Occasion of His Retirement.* Edited by Nigel Griffen, Clive Griffin, Eric Southworth, and Colin Thompson. Tamesis, 2001, pp. 17-34.

Lee, Christina H. *Anxiety of Sameness in Early Modern Spain.* Manchester UP, 2018.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1991.

Legassie, Shayne. *The Medieval Invention of Travel.* U of Chicago P, 2017.

Liu, Benjamin. "Re-Orienting Medieval Spanish Travel Narratives." *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, no. 52, pp. 19–30.

Lobo Lasso de la Vega, Garbiel. "Al mismo asunto." *Romancero general ó colección de romances castellano.* Edited by Augustín Durán, vol 1, Madrid, M. Rivadeneyra, 1877, pp. 412-13.

López Estrada, Francisco. "Fama de Tamorlán en la España de los Siglos de Oro." *Estudios de Filología y Retórica en Homenaje a Luisa López Grigera*, edited by E. Artaza et al., Universidad de Desuto, 2017, pp. 303–10.

López Estrada, Francisco. "La Embajada a Tamorlán Como Libro de Relación Entre Occidente y Oriente En La Edad Media." *Mélanges*, edited by María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti and Abdeljelil Temimi, Fondation Termini pour la recherche scientifique et l'information, 1999, pp. 73–80.

López Estrada, Francisco. "La Época de Los Viajeros y El Redescubrimiento: Los Viajeros Medievales y El Reencuentro Con Oriente: González de Clavijo." *La Aventura Española En*

- Oriente (1166-2006)*, edited by Joaquín María Córdoba et al., Ministerio de Cultura, , 2006, pp. 65–70.
- López Estrada, Francisco. “Ruy González De Clavijo. La Embajada a Tamorlán. Relato Del Viaje Hasta Samarcanda Y Regreso (1403-1406).” *Arbor: Ciencia, Pensamiento Y Cultura*, vol. CLXXX, no. 711/712, 2005, pp. 515–35, doi:10.3989/arbor.2005.i711/712.456.
- López Estrada, Francisco. “Viajeros Españoles en Asia: La Embajada de Enrique III a Tamorlán.” *Rev. de La Universidad Complutense*, no. 3, 1981, pp. 227–46.
- López Estrada, Francisco. “Vista a Oriente. la española en Constantinopla.” *Cervantes y el teatro, Cuadernos de Teatro Clásico*, no. 7, 1992, pp. 31-46.
- López Rubio, Lucía. "El amante liberal y la importancia del territorio en la cuestión matrimonial" *Anales Cervantinos*, vol. 42, 2010, pp. 163-75.
- López-Vázquez, Alfredo Rodríguez. “Cristóbal de Villalón y el Viaje de Turquía: Una refutación lingüística.” *Artifara: Revista de lenguas y literaturas ibéricas y latinoamericanas*, 17, 2017.
- Lowe, Lisa. *Critical Terrains: French and British Orientalisms*. Cornell UP, 1991.
- MacLean, Gerald M. *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Macmaster, Thomas J. “The Origin of Origins: Trojans, Turks and the Birth of the Myth of Trojan Origins in the Medieval World.” *Atlantide*, vol. 2, 2014, pp. 1-12.
- Mariscal, George. "La gran sultana" and the Issue of Cervantes's Modernity.” *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*, vol. 28, no. 2, May 1994, pp. 185-212.
- Martinez, Maria Elena. *Genealogical fictions: limpieza de sangre, religion, and gender in colonial mexico*. Stanford UP, 2011.
- Martínez Crespo, Alicia. “Los Libros de Viajes Del Siglo XV y Las Primeras Crónicas de Indias.” *Literatura Hispánica, Reyes Católicos y Descubrimiento : Actas Del Congreso Internacional Sobre Literatura Hispánica En La Época de Los Reyes Católicos y El Descubrimiento*, edited by Manuel Criado de Val, PPU, 1989, pp. 423–30.
- Martínez García, Pedro. “‘Andanças e viajes’: el otro Pero Tafur.” *Edad Media Revista de Historia*, no. 11, 2010, pp. 263–84, <http://uvadoc.uva.es/handle/10324/9682>.
- Martínez Góngora, Mar. “Las tecnologías de poder del 'otro' Imperio: Disciplina e identidad masculina en el Viaje de Turquía.” *Crítica Hispánica*, vol. 24, 2002, pp. 25-40.
- Martínez Martínez, Faustino. "El derecho común en la obra de Lope de Vega: unos breves apuntamientos." *Revista Opinión Jurídica*, vol. 4, no. 8, 2005, 131-44.

- Maroto Camino, Mercedes. "Negotiating Woman: Ana Caro's 'El Conde Partinuplés' and Pedro Calderón de la Barca's 'La vida es sueño'." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*. vol.2, 2007, pp. 199-210. *Project MUSE*, muse.jhu.edu/article/232413.
- Martorell, Joanot. *Los cinco libros del esforzado e invencible caballero Tirante el Blanco de Rocasalada, caballero de la garrotera*. Translated by Diego de Gumiel, A Coruña, Editorial Orbigo, S. L., 2012.
- Mas, Albert. *Les Turcs dans la litterature anglaise du Siecle d'Or*. 2 vols. Institut d'Etudes Hispaniques Paris Center de Recherches, 1975.
- Mason, Patricia E. "The Embajada a Tamorlán: Self-Reference and the Question of Authorship." *Neophilologus*, vol. 78, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994, pp. 79–87, doi:10.1007/BF00999953.
- McCoy, Christina Inés. "Engendering the Orient: Cervantes' La gran sultana." *eHumanista/Cervante*, vol. 2, 2013, pp. 245-59. http://www.ehumanista.ucsb.edu/sites/secure.lsit.ucsb.edu.span.d7_ah/files/sitefiles/cervantes/volume2/ehumcerv2.McCoy.pdf
- McGaha, Michael. "La Gran Sultana: La 'Delicia Turca' de Cervantes." *Studies in Spanish Literature in Honor of Daniel Eisenberg*. Edited by Tom Lathrop. Juan de la Cuesta, 2009, pp. 213-30.
- Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino. *Orígenes de la novela. 1, Influencia oriental. Libros de caballerías*. Edited by Reyes Enrique Sánchez and Miguel Artigas Ferrando. vol. 13, Madrid, Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1961.
- Mérida Jiménez, Rafael. "Amor, Pasión y Muerte en un Jardín Imperial." *Cuadernos del CEMYR*, no. 21, 2013, pp. 163-79.
- Merino Jerez, Luis. *Retórica y Artes De Memoria En El Humanismo Renacentista: (Jorge De Trebisonda, Pedro De Ravena y Francisco Sánchez De Las Brozas)*. Universidad de Extremadura, 2007.
- Merry y Colom, Manuel. *Ensayo crítico sobre las novelas ejemplares de Cervantes: con la bibliografía de sus ediciones*. Sevilla, Impresor de Gironés y Odruña, 1877.
- Milligan, Gerry, and Jane Tylus. "Introduction." *The Poetics of Masculinity in Early Modern Italy and Spain*. Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2010, pp. 13-40.
- Molina Molina, Ángel Luis. "Pedro Tafur, un hidalgo castellano en Tierra Santa y Egipto." *Cuadernos de Turismo*, no. 27, 2011, pp. 641–62.
- Molina Molina, Ángel Luis. "Viaje de Pero Tafur por las Islas Griegas, Constantinopla y Mar Negro (Octubre De 1437-Mayo De 1438)." *Estudios sobre patrimonio, cultura y ciencias Medievales*, vol. 18, no. iii, 2016, pp. 855–904.

- Montauban, J. "The Poet Did Neglect; Forgive Her That": The Funny One in the Comedies of Ana Caro." *Hispanic Research Journal-Iberian and Latin American Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, n.d., pp. 18-33. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eds wah&AN=000288066200002&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Morrow, Carolyn. "Nacionalismo y otredad en Los baños de Argel y La gran sultana." *Estudios del teatro áureo: texto, espacio y representación: actas selectas del X Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Teatro Español y Novohispano de los Siglos de Oro*, [México], Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2003, pp. 379-86. *Cervantesvirtual*, <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcth963>
- Mosquera, Juan José. "Viaje de Turquía y el uso de los personajes populares como refuerzo de la veracidad del relato." *Philobiblion: revista de literaturas hispánicas*, 1, 2015.
- Nadal, Jorge. *La población española: Siglos XVI a XX*. Ediciones Ariel, S.A., 1966.
- Navarro Durán, Rosa. "La historia de los dos enamorados Ozmín y Daraja, fuente de inspiración cervantina." *Revista de Filología Española*, vol. 82, No 1/2, 2002, pp. 87-103. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/rfe.2002.v82.i1/2.145>.
- Núñez Esteban, G. "La Constantinopla del 'Viaje de Turquía'." *Minerva: Revista de Filología Clásica* 2 (1988): 333-50.
- Ochoa Anadón, José Antonio. "Pero Tafur un hidalgo castellano emparentado con el emperador bizantino. problemas de heráldica." *Erytheia: Revista de Estudios Bizantinos y Neogriegos*, no. 6, 1985, pp. 283-93.
- Ochoa Anadón, José Antonio. "La Embajada a Tamorlán. Su Recorrido." *Dicenda, Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica*, no. 10, pp. 149-68.
- Ochoa Anadón, José Antonio. "The Way towards the Orient: The Embajada a Tamorlán from Trebizond to Tabriz." *Hē Epikoinōnia Sto Byzantio (= Praktika Tu Deuteru Diethnus Symposiu, 4-6 Okt. 1990)*, 1993, pp. 565-75.
- O'Callaghan, Joseph F. "Reconquest and Repopulation." *Medieval Iberia: An Encyclopedia*, Routledge, 2013, pp. 697-700.
- Ohanna, Natalio. "The Invention of Europe and the Intellectual Struggle for Political Imagination: Spanish Humanism on the Ottomans." *The Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Marcus Keller, Javier Irigoyen-García, Springer, 2008, pp.101-17.
- O'Kane, Bernard. "From Tents to Pavilions: Royal Mobility and Persian Palace Design." *Ars Orientalis*, vol. 23, 1993, pp. 249-68.
- Ortolá, Marie-Sol. "La tendencia utópica en *El Viaje de Turquía*." *Neophilologus*, vol. 70, no. 2, Apr. 1986, pp. 217-27.

- Ortolá, Marie-Sol. "Modos de representación en el diálogo *Viaje de Turquía*: su función." *Ehumanista*, vol. 33, July 2016, p. 50-77. *Ehumanista*, http://www.ehumanista.ucsb.edu/sites/secure.lsit.ucsb.edu/span.d7_eh/files/sitefiles/ehumanista/volume33/5%20ehum33.ortola.pdf
- Ortolá, Marie-Sol. "The Significance of the Spiritual Awakening Motif in Two Sixteenth-Century Works: *La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Viaje De Turquía*." *Revista Canadiense De Estudios Hispánicos*, no. 1, 1986, pp. 87-98. EBSCOhost, <http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.27762474&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Önalp, Ertugrul. "Algunas realidades otomanas en dos obras de Cervantes 'El amante liberal' y 'La gran sultana doña Catalina de Oviedo.'" *Volver a Cervantes: Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Cervantistas*. Edited by Antonio Pablo Bernat Vistarini, 2001, pp. 379-86.
- Padrón, Ricardo. "Mapping Plus Ultra : Cartography , Space , and Hispanic Modernity." *Representations*, vol. 79, no. 79, 2002, pp. 28–60, doi:10.1525/rep.2002.79.1.28.
- De Palencia, Alonso. *Crónica De Enrique IV*. Translated by D. A. Paz y Melia, vol. 1, *Revista de Archivos*, 1904.
- Pérez, Joseph. *The Spanish Inquisition: a history*. Translated by Janet Lloyd, Notable Trials Library, 2012.
- Pérez-Romero, Antonio. "'Si me buscas me hallarás:' mujer duscada, hallada y admirada en El Conde Partinuplés de Ana Caro." *Ehumanista*, 2011, pp. 334-140. *Ehumanista*, http://www.ehumanista.ucsb.edu/sites/secure.lsit.ucsb.edu/span.d7_eh/files/sitefiles/ehumanista/volume17/14%20ehumanista17.perez.pdf
- Perry, Mary Elizabeth. "The 'nefarious sin' in early Modern Seville". *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Edited by Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. Harrington Park, 1989, pp. 67-89.
- Phillips, Kim M. *Before Orientalism: Asian Peoples and Cultures in European Travel Writing, 1245-1510*. U of Pennsylvania, 2014.
- Piera, Montserrat and Jodi Shearn. "Gendering Action in Iberian Chivalric Romance." *Medieval Feminist Forum*, vol. 45, no. 2, 2009, pp. 85-103.
- Piera, Montserrat. "Performing Knighthood: The Hero Tirant Lo Blanc in Drag." *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 15, no. 4, 2012, pp. 346-66.
- Pierce, Frank. "The Role of Sex in the Tirant Lo Blanc." *Estudis de literatura catalana: oferts a Jordi Rubió i Balaguer en el seu setanta-cinquè aniversari*. *Estudis Romànics*, 1967, pp. 291-300.
- Pinto-Munoz, Ana. "Roxolana in the Spanish golden age." *EHumanista. Journal of Iberian*

Studies, vol. 19, pp. 376–89. *Ehumanista*,
http://www.ehumanista.ucsb.edu/sites/secure.lsit.ucsb.edu.span.d7_eh/files/sitefiles/ehumanista/volume19/17%20ehumanista19.pinto.pdf

Plato. *Phaedrus*. Edited by Robin Waterfield. Oxford UP, 2002.

Polić Bobić, Mirjana “El ‘Viaje de Turquía’ y una de sus posibles fuentes de información sobre ‘las cosas del Turco.’” *Actas del Congreso “El Siglo de Oro en el Nuevo Milenio.”* Edited by Carlos Mata Induráin, Miguel Zugasti Zugasti, Vol. 2, 2005, pp. 1415-1426.

Porto Rodríguez, Rosa María. “Troy-Upon-Guadalquivir: Imagining Ancient Architecture at King Alfonso XI’s Court.” *Troianalexandrina*, vol. 5, 2005, pp. 9–35.

Poska, Allyson M. “When Love Goes Wrong: Getting out of Marriage in Seventeenth-Century Spain.” *Journal of Social History*, vol. 29, no. 4, 1996, pp. 871–882. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.3788669&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Priego Pérez, Miguel Ángel. “Encuentro del viajero Pero Tafur con el humanismo florentino del primer cuatrocientos.” *Revista de literatura*, vol. LXXIII, no. 145, 2011, pp. 131–42.

Priego Pérez, Miguel Ángel. “Estudio Literario de Los Libros de Viajes Medievales.” *Epos: Revista de Filología*, no. 1, 1984, pp. 217–39.

The Qur'an. Saheeh International version. Al-Muntada Al-Islami Trust, 2010.

Reed, Cory A. “harems and Eunuchs: Ottoman-Islamic Motifs of Captivity in El Celoso Extremeño.” *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 76, no. 2, Apr. 1999, pp. 199-214.

Renuncio Roba, Miguel. “El mundo islámico en La Santa Liga de Lope de Vega.” *Anaquel de estudios árabes.*, no. 16, 2005, pp. 205-17.

Retsö, Jan. *The Arabs in Antiquity: Their History from the Assyrians to the Umayyads*. Routledge, 2014.

Rico-Ferrer, Jose A., and Gerry Milligan. “In Earnest and in Jest: Disciplining Masculinity through Narration and Humour in *The Spanish Galateo*.” *The Poetics of Masculinity in Early Modern Italy and Spain*. Edited by Jane Tylus. Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2010, pp. 267-92.

Romancero general ó colección de romances castellano. Edited by Augustín Durán, vol. 1, Madrid, M. Rivadeneyra, 1877.

Rodríguez, Jimena. “Tamorlán y Moctezuma: El Encuentro con un gran señor en la mirada de viajeros de los siglos XV y XVI.” *Medievalia*, no. 42, 2010, pp. 38–46.

Rodríguez, Manuel R., editor. *Cronica Troyana: Códice gallego del siglo XIV de la Biblioteca Nacional De Madrid*. vol. 1, La Casa de Misericordia, 1900.

- Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garci. *Amadis de Gaula: Historia de este invencible caballero, en la cual se tratan sus altos hechos de armas y caballerias*, vol. 2, Juan Oliveres, 1848.
- Rouhi, L. "Miguel De Cervantes, Early Modern Spain, and the Challenges to the Meaning of Islam." *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2011, pp. 7-22.
DOI: 10.1163/187398611X553706
- Roxburgh, David J. "Ruy González de Clavijo's Narrative of Courtly Life and Ceremony in Timur's Samarqand, 1404." *The "book" of Travels: Genre, Ethnology, and Pilgrimage, 1250-1700*, edited by Palmeira Brummet, Brill, 2009, pp. 199–226.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalismo*. Debolsillo, 2008.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1979.
- St. Augustine of Hippo. *The City of God*. Translated by Marcus Dods, II, T. & T. CLARK, 1887.
- Sánchez, Clemente. "Edición Del Libro De Los Exemplos Por A.B.C. (1ª parte)" *Memorabilia* , Edited by María del Mar Gutiérrez Martínez, vol. 12, 2009-10.
- Sánchez, Clemente. "Edición Del Libro De Los Exemplos Por A.B.C. (2ª parte)" *Memorabilia* , Edited by María del Mar Gutiérrez Martínez, vol. 13, 2011.
- Sánchez, Francisco J. *Lectura y representación: Análisis cultural de las Novelas ejemplares de Cervantes*. Peter Lang, 1993.
- Sanchez García, Encarnación. "Viaje de Turquía: Consideraciones acerca del género." *Revista de literatura*, LVI, 112, 1994, 453-60.
- Sapiencia, Octavio. *Nuevo tratado de Tvrqvia: con una descipcion del sitio, y ciudad de Constantinopla, costumbres del gran Turco, de su modo de gobierno, de su palacio, consejo, martyrios de algunos martyres, y de otras cosas notables*. Madrid, printed by La Viuda de Alonso Martin, 1622.
- Sears, Theresa Ann. *A Marriage of Convenience: Ideal and Ideology in the 'Novelas Ejemplares'*. P. Lang, 1993.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Sener, Mehmet Sait. *El Tema Turco En El Teatro Español de Los Siglos XVI-XVII*. 2017. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. PhD disertation. *EBSCOhost*.
- Serralta, Frédéric. "El mito de Troya en la escritura teatral de Lope." *Hipogrifo*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2017, pp. 421-31.
- Serrano y Sanz, Manuel, *Autobiografías y Memorias*, Madrid, Bailly-Baillière, 1905.

- Sevilla Arroyo, Florencio. "Diálogo y novela en el *Viaje de Turquía*." *Revista de Filología Española*, 77, 1/2, 1997.
- Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign amity: figures of friendship in Shakespearean contexts*. U of Chicago P, 2002.
- Simerka, Barbara. "Early Modern Literature and Contemporary Feminist Philosophy: Alison Jaggar, Carol Gilligan and Ana Caro's *El Conde Partinuplés*." *Revista De Estudios Hispánicos*, vol. 33, no. 3, 1999, pp. 495-512. EBSCOhost, proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=6415801&site=eds-live&scope=site.
- Simó, Meritxell. "Sexualidad y contacto entre culturas en la literatura medieval: motivo de la bella sarracena al erotismo oriental del Tirant lo blanc." *Escritura de la sexualidad*. Edited by Joana Masó, Icarí Editorial, 2008, 63-86.
- Sola, Emilio. "Historia de la frontera y oralidad: una cautiva que llega a gran sultana." *Las Relaciones de Sucesos en España (1500-1750). Actas del I Coloquio Internacional*. Edited by Mara Cruz Garca de Enterra et al. Pars-Madrid, Publications de la Sorbonne-Universidad de Alcalá, 1996, pp. 339-48.
- Soto, Ana Caro Mallen de. *Las comedias de Ana Caro*. Edited by Delgado María José. P. Lang, 1998.
- Soufas, Teresa. "Repetitive Patterns: Marrying Off the "Parthenos" in Ana Caro's *El conde Partinuplés*" *Dramas of Distinction: Plays by Golden Age Women*, edited by Teresa S. Soufas. The UP of Kentucky, 2015, pp 93–106.
- Spencer, Terence. "Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance." *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 47, no. 3, Modern Humanities Research Association, July 1952, p. 330-33, doi:10.2307/3719018.
- Suárez Fernández, Luis. "Nobleza y Monarquía En La Política de Enrique III." *Hispania: Revista Española de Historia*, no. 48, 1952, pp. 323–400.
- . "Problemas Políticos En La Minoridad de Enrique III." *Hispania: Revista Española de Historia*, no. 47, 1952, pp. 163–231.
- Surtz, Ronald E. "Morisco Women, Written Texts, and the Valencia Inquisition." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2001, pp. 421–33. EBSCOhost, doi:10.2307/2671740.
- Tafur, Pero. *Andanças e Viajes de Un Hidalgo Español*. Edited by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada, Miraguano, 1995.
- Tamayo Portuondo, Aleida. "Viaje de Turquía de Christobal de Villalon: edición e estudio." Dissertation. The Catholic University of America. 1975.
- Tanner, Marie. *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: the Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the*

- Emperor*. Yale UP, 1993.
- Tardieu, Jean-Pierre. *Cimarrones de Panamá: La forja de una identidad afroamericana en el Siglo XVI*. Iberoamericana, 2009.
- Tenorio-Trillo, Mauricio. *Latin America: The Allure and Power of an Idea*. U of Chicago P, 2017.
- Thomson-Weightman, Sandi. "The Representation of Woman in "El amante liberal: Goddess, Chattel and Peer." *Mester*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1992, pp. 61-71.
- Tin, Louis-Georges. *The Invention of Heterosexual Culture*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2012. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Accessed 11 Jan. 2017.
- Titian. *La Religión socorrida por España. 1572-75*, Museo del Prado, Madrid. *ARTstor*, library-artstor-org.proxy.uchicago.edu/#/asset/LESSING_ART_10310120270.
- Torres, Isabel. "'Pues tanto se esconde': Elusion at (Inter)Play in Ana Caro's El Conde Partinuplés." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, vol. 92, no. 8-10, Oct-Dec 2015, pp. 203-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14753820.2015.1108094>
- Trueblood, Alan S. "Some Aspects of the Art of Dialogue in Viaje de Turquía." *East meets West: homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.* Edited by Roger L. Hadlich & J. D. Ellsworth. University of Hawaii, 1988, pp. 306-14.
- Usandizaga, Guillem. *La representación de la historia contemporánea en el teatro de Lope de Vega*. 2010. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, PhD dissertation.
- Urban Baños, Alba. "'El yugo de Himeneo': obligación, elección y desenlace en 'El conde Partinuplés' de Ana Caro." *Dramaturgos y espacios teatrales andaluces de los siglos XVI-XVII. Actas de las XXVI Jornadas de Teatro del Siglo de Oro*, Almería, edited by Elisa García-Lara y Antonio Serrano, Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, 2011, pp. 385-402. *Cervantesvirtual*, <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcd8137>
- Urquizar-Herrera, Antonio. *Admiration and Awe : Morisco Buildings and Identity Negotiations in Early Modern Spanish Historiography*. Oxford UP, 2017.
- van Beysterveldt, Antony. "El amor caballeresco del Amadís y el Tirante." *Hispanic Review*, vol. 49, no. 4, Autumn 1981, 407-25. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.2307/472746.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. *Carta de batalla por Tirant lo Blanc*. Seix Barral, 1991.
- Vasiliev, A. "A NOTE ON PERO TAFUR." *Byzantion*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1935, pp. 65–66.
- Vasiliev, A. "Pero Tafur: A Spanish Traveler of the Fifteenth Century and His Visit to Constantinople, Trebizond, and Italy." *Byzantion*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1932, pp. 75–122, www.jstor.org/stable/44167894.

- Vega Carpio, Lope de, and Juan Udaondo Alegre. "“La Santa Liga.”" *Comedias de Lope de Vega. Parte XV*, edited by Luis Sánchez Laílla, vol. 1, Gredos, 2016, pp. 689–874.
- Velasco, Sherry M. *Lesbians in Early Modern Spain*. Vanderbilt UP, 2011.
- Vélez-Quñones, H. "Caponés, Italianos, Ermitaños y Lindos: Towards a Queer Subjectivity in Golden Age Poetry." *Calíope: Journal of the Society for Renaissance and Baroque Hispanic Poetry*, vol. 5 no. 1, 1999, pp. 35-45. Project MUSE, muse.jhu.edu/article/672094.
- Vian Herrero, Ana. "El Legado Narrativo en El Diálogo Renacentista: Un Caso Ejemplar, El ‘Viaje De Turquía.’" *Studia Aurea*, vol. 9, 2015, pp. 55-11. <http://studiaaurea.com/article/viewFile/v9-vian/173-pdf-es>
- Villalba Ruiz de Toledo, Francisco Javier. "Fatigas y Contratiempos Del Viaje En Los Albores Del Siglo XV: El Relato de Ruy González de Clavijo." *Isimu*, vol. 19, pp. 361–75.
- Villalba Ruiz de Toledo, Francisco Javier. "El Viaje de Don Pero Tafur (1436-1439)." *Arbor*, vol. CLXXX, 2005, pp. 537–50.
- Villalón Cristóbal de. *Viaje de Turquía: (La Odisea De Pedro De Urdemalas)*. Edited by Fernando G. Salinero, Madrid, Cátedra, 2010.
- Villariño Martínez, Beatriz. "Dimensiones Semánticas Y Pragmática en ‘El Conde Partinuplés,’ de Ana Caro." 2006. *Signa: revista de la Asociación Española de Semiótica*, vol. 15, 2006, pp. 561-590. *Cervantesvirtual*, <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/nd/ark:/59851/bmcm6209>.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Translated by Edward McCrorie, U of Michigan P, 1995.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *Obras Completas*. Translated by Riber Llorenç, vol. 2, M. Aguilar, 1948.
- Voros, Sharon D. "Fashioning Feminine Wit in María de Zayas, Ana Caro, and Leonor de la Cueva." *Gender, Identity, and Representation in Spain's Golden Age*, edited by Dawn L. Smith and Anita K. Stoll, Bucknell UP, 2000, pp. 156-77.
- Wacks, David A. *Framing Iberia Maqāmāt and Frametale Narratives in Medieval Spain*. Brill, 2007.
- Weimer, Christopher B. "Ana Caro's *El Conde Partinuplés* and Calderón's *La Vida es Sueño*: Protofeminism and Heuristic Imitation." *Bulletin of the Comediantes*, vol. 52, 2000, pp. 123-146. *Project Muse*, [doi:10.1353/boc.2000.0002](https://doi.org/10.1353/boc.2000.0002).
- Wright, Elizabeth R. "Enredos historiográficos: Lope ante Lepanto." *Anuario Lope de Vega. Texto, literatura, cultura*, XVIII, 2012, pp. 146-74.
- Wright, Elizabeth R. "Epic Temptation: Lope De Vega’s Battle of Lepanto." *The Early Modern Hispanic World: Transnational and Interdisciplinary Approaches*, edited by Kimberly Lynn and Erin Kathleen Rowe, Cambridge UP, 2017, pp. 319–40.

Yiacoup, Şizen. *Frontier memory: cultural conflict & exchange in the romancero fronterizo*.
Modern Humanities Research Association, 2013. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt4cg93r.

Ynduráin Francisco. *Los moriscos y el teatro en Aragón: Auto de la destrucción de Troya y comedia pastoril de Torcato*. Diputación Provincial, 1986.