

Copyright
by
Anna Coons Pyeatt
2005

**The Dissertation Committee for Anna Coons Pyeatt certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

Lazarillo de Tormes and the Medieval Frametale Tradition

Committee:

Madeline Sutherland-Meier, Supervisor

Matthew Bailey

James Boyden

James Nicolopoulos

Cory Reed

Lazarillo de Tormes and the Medieval Frametale Tradition

by

Anna Coons Pyeatt, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2005

Dedication

In Memory

Amy Burdett Brown

(1969-2005)

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my dissertation director, Madeline Sutherland-Meier, for her guidance and support in the preparation of this study. She has been a consistent source of knowledge and encouragement in my study of medieval and Golden Age literature, for which I am truly appreciative.

To the members of my committee I would like to give thanks for their insightful suggestions regarding both my topic and my articulation of it. Working with Prof. James Boyden in the early stages of this project helped me to define several core problems that proved enlightening to revisit throughout my investigation. I appreciate his interest and involvement in my exploration of these and related issues. I am indebted to Prof. Matthew Bailey for introducing to me invaluable bibliographical resources and for casting a certain perspective on my project that guided me through its completion. To Prof. Cory Reed I express my gratitude for asking good questions that led me to develop ideas within new

contexts, and for encouraging my continued pursuit of this topic. I thank Prof. James Nicolopoulos for his helpful words of advice concerning my study.

This investigation was conducted with the support of three fellowships: Medieval Studies Graduate Fellowship (2003), David Bruton, Jr. Graduate Fellowship (2002-03), and Carrie Lee Kennedy Fellowship (2002-03). A further source of aid deserves mention for it enabled me to conduct research abroad in Madrid, Spain in the field of Golden Age literature, and that research informs the current project: Oliver William Kennedy Fellowship (1998-99). I am sincerely grateful for these sources of assistance.

I wish to express my appreciation for the support of friends and colleagues in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at The University of Texas at Austin. I offer a special thank you to Taran Johnston, Amy Schreiber, Malia LeMond, and Sharon Foerster.

Finally, a very warm and sincere thank you goes to my family and intimate friends not yet mentioned who have been involved in my education both at home and abroad, in school and out. I appreciate the value you place on my academic endeavors that I find so pleasurable and worthwhile. My husband, Mark Pyeatt, earns my profoundest appreciation of all.

Lazarillo de Tormes and the Medieval Frametale Tradition

Publication No. _____

Anna Coons Pyeatt, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisor: Madeline Sutherland-Meier

Sixteenth-century Spain witnessed with the anonymous publication of Lazarillo de Tormes (1554) the birth of the picaresque novel. Yet the origins of this pseudo-autobiographical narrative of an itinerant rogue remain somewhat enigmatic to this day. The purpose of my research is to demonstrate the manner in which the Lazarillo adapts and, in some cases, subverts conventional features of one of its literary antecedents: the medieval frametale. The particular emphasis of my study is on the structural and organizational devices that serve to unify diverse material within a single work. The internal structure of frametale collections, or the affiliation of enclosed tales, may be understood in terms of a tale-within-a-tale arrangement (boxing technique), and linking devices that balance or group tales on the basis of theme or motif, gradation and climax, setting, plot elements, imagery, characters, and situations, words, and phrases. External organizing devices, those that tie together the framing story and constituent tales, include the

theme of wisdom, the storyteller, and the frame. The last of these structural devices entails the participants and the pretext for storytelling, both of which construct the context in which the enclosed tales are to be understood. Lastly I examine the flexibility and open-endedness of frametales, despite the degree to which the works are otherwise unified. The frametales that I study in terms of these features include the Panchatantra, Kalila and Dimna (also known as the Fables of Bidpai), Book of Sindbad (called Seven Sages of Rome in the Western tradition), Disciplina clericalis, Conde Lucanor, Libro de buen amor, Decameron, and Canterbury Tales. In my assessment of Lazarillo de Tormes with respect to these frametale characteristics, I highlight the ways in which the picaresque novel utilizes them to similar effect in the pursuit of comparable goals, or subverts them towards unique objectives. My aim is that by drawing such connections between the two genres I will illustrate both the manner in which the frametale helped lay the groundwork for the emergence of the Lazarillo, and the Lazarillo's role in the continuity and manipulation of the medieval frametale tradition.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Tale and the Frametale	6
The Tale.....	8
The Frametale.....	30
Chapter 2: Medieval Frametales.....	36
<u>Panchatantra</u>	38
<u>Kalila and Dimna (The Fables of Bidpai)</u>	40
<u>Book of Sindbad (Seven Sages of Rome)</u>	44
<u>Disciplina clericalis</u>	50
<u>Conde Lucanor</u>	55
<u>Libro de buen amor</u>	61
<u>Decameron</u>	68
<u>Canterbury Tales</u>	79
Chapter 3: Structure and Organization of the Frametale.....	90
Linking Devices	98
The Wisdom Theme	112
The Storyteller.....	114
The Frame.....	129
Flexibility and Open-endedness	150
Chapter 4: <u>Lazarillo de Tormes</u>	163
Linking Devices	169
The Wisdom Theme	193
The Storyteller.....	201
The Frame.....	213

Flexibility and Open-endedness	229
Conclusion.....	237
Notes.....	242
Works Cited.....	273
Vita	286

Introduction

Sixteenth-century Spain witnessed with the publication of Lazarillo de Tormes (1554) the birth of a literary genre. Yet while many critics consider this pseudo-autobiographical narrative of an itinerant rogue as the first picaresque novel, such a classification could not have been possible without regard to subsequent works for which the Lazarillo served as a model. As Alan Deyermond observes, “It is obvious that the author of Lazarillo de Tormes did not know that he was writing a picaresque novel, even though his successors in the genre knew that he had written one. Indeed, he can hardly have realized that he was writing a novel at all” (Critical Guide 95). Instead, the anonymous author’s creative inspiration derived from the works that preceded his own, and to the traditions to which those works belonged. While acknowledging that the Lazarillo reflects a confluence of multiple traditions, I focus my current investigation on the congruencies and contrasts between this work and the frametale tradition inherited from the Middle Ages. I aim to demonstrate the manner in which the Lazarillo adopts, adapts, and, in some cases, subverts key structural and organizational elements characteristic of the frametale.

The frametales I will examine in my study are the Panchatantra, Kalila and Dimna (also called Fables of Bidpai), Book of Sindbad (known as Seven Sages of Rome in the Western tradition), Disciplina clericalis, Conde Lucanor, Libro de buen amor, Decameron, and Canterbury Tales. My decision to choose a greater number of frametales and to treat them concisely, as opposed to a select few to

treat in detail, is to better illustrate the patterns, and the variations of these patterns, that emerge from recurring traits. These designs are not as easily discernible from a reduced selection of texts since features that are conspicuous in some frametales may be more obscure in others, or altogether absent from still others. Even frametale collections of the same period may share certain attributes but differ in substantial ways. Each collection in its own way works at once to constitute and to redefine the frametale genre during the course of evolution. I have elected, therefore, to broaden my scope of frametale collections in the hope that patterns of structure and organization, and of meaning, become evident of the medieval generic tradition as a whole, for it is not any single tale or individual collection to which I find the Lazarillo tied, but a vast and diverse frametale tradition with which it is connected.

The approach which I have chosen to best illustrate my focus would quickly encumber my reader with unnecessary and repetitive detail were I to discuss each of the eight frametale collections with respect to every trait. I therefore limit my illustrations to those collections that are most representative of a particular feature or that exhibit the most striking parallels to, or in some instances contrasts with, the Lazarillo. This selection is a highly subjective task, not unlike the process of narrowing my original pool to eight. I am aware that the areas of parallel that I attempt to highlight between the frametale and the Lazarillo may not be exclusive to these works. Certain features are indeed evident in other literary forms of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Perhaps none of these traits considered individually is sufficient to draw convincing conclusions about the

connections between the frametale and the Lazarillo, yet when taken together they form a larger pattern of association and the points of contact begin to stand out against the differences. The differences should not be underestimated, however, since they often shed light on where and how the similarities occur. It is my aim that by identifying areas of coincidence and by illustrating these similarities with specific and clear examples, my readers will recognize associations between the frametale and Lazarillo de Tormes that will inform their reading of both. Perhaps some of the ideas that I put forth in this work will offer a new perspective on past investigations, or find a place of relevance in future studies in this field.

In the first chapter I review genre terminology used in medieval works of literature and modern works of criticism related to my topic of investigation. As the nomenclature related to this area of study is abundant and ambiguous, I attempt to clarify the meaning of certain terms and their application in studies that examine the texts that I treat in my current investigation. In my consideration of the various terms that denote an individual story (cuento, exemplum, fable, popular tale, traditional tale, folktale, and tale), I explain my reasons for rejecting or adopting them for my present work. Next I consider the types of collections, framed and unframed, in which individual stories are contained. Finally, I conclude the chapter by offering my own definition of frametale.

In chapter 2 I justify the criteria I have used to select the frametale collections I consider in my investigation. I follow with a brief introduction to each frametale in which I identify its author, compiler, or translator, discuss certain sources and analogues of the collection, summarize its framing story, and

note some aspects of its transmission history. I hope not only to familiarize my readers with these diverse collections, but also to offer a sense of how they relate to each other and thus help define the frametale genre. My goal is also to demonstrate the likelihood that the frametale contributed to the literary ambience of sixteenth-century Spain, and that it helped lay the groundwork for the emergence of the Lazarillo.

The structure and organization of the frametale is the focus of chapter 3. I begin by reviewing characteristics of the Panchatantra that are evident, perhaps in adapted form, in later medieval frametales and that help define the genre. The internal structure of frametale collections, or the affiliation of enclosed tales, may be understood in terms of a tale-within-a-tale arrangement (boxing technique), and linking devices that balance or group tales on the basis of theme or motif, gradation and climax, setting, plot elements, imagery, characters, and situations, words, and phrases. External organizing devices, those that tie together the framing story and constituent tales, include the theme of wisdom, the storyteller, and the frame. The last of these structural devices entails the participants and the pretext for storytelling, both of which construct the context in which the enclosed tales are to be understood. Lastly I examine the flexibility and open-endedness of frametales, despite the degree to which the works are otherwise unified.

In the fourth chapter I illustrate how the structural and organizational features that are characteristic of the frametale are manifest in diverse ways in Lazarillo de Tormes. Both internal linking devices and external structural techniques work to similar effect in the picaresque novel, although not always as

the reader would anticipate. It is the subversion of audience expectations that often highlights the similarities of the two genres. In this chapter I offer evidence that I hope suggests a reasonable explanation for some of the persistent uncertainties concerning the novel, particularly with respect to its structure and organization.

Chapter 1: The Tale and the Frametale

Much of the terminology used in medieval Western Europe to denote types of literature was fluid and inexact.¹ On one hand, any number of diverse terms might refer to a single concept or genre. John Tolan advises that Petrus Alfonsi, for example, refers to his stories in the Disciplina clericalis as narrationes, exempla, and fabulae, while noting, “It is not clear that Alfonsi would have made any distinctions in meaning among these three terms” (82). When stating his intentions in the prologue to the Decameron, Boccaccio likewise expresses a variety of terms that may equally signify story: “. . . raccontare cento novelle, o favole o parabole o istorie che dire le vogliamo . . .” (4) (“. . . to tell a hundred tales, or fables or parables or histories, call them what you will . . .”; lxii).² Additionally, Alan Deyermond observes that Juan Ruiz’s use of genre terminology in the Libro de buen amor is “plentiful and varied,” yet unlike the simple enumeration that the Archpriest so enjoys in other areas (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 114). Story, for example, is designated by the terms estoria, fabla, fablilla, fazaña, juguete, razón, and romance, while proverb is expressed variously by fabla, fablilla, fazaña, parlilla, pastija, pastraña, proverbio, retraher, and the phrase “como dize la vieja” (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 116). Moreover, Juan Ruiz employs as many as eleven distinct terms to represent poem: cançión, cantar, cántica, cantiga, canto, chançon, chançoneta, ditado, nota, rima, and troba. Deyermond cautions, however, “. . . if these mean different kinds of poem, I do not see how we can learn to distinguish them” (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 116).³

On the other hand, a single term may have multiple meanings and may suggest more than one generic type. In his appraisal of the Libro de buen amor, Deyermond identifies nearly a dozen polysemous terms that signify two or more types of writing. As evidenced by the lists of terms above, fablilla, for instance, means both proverb and story, as do fazaña and fabla. Fabla may also mean doctrine (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 115-16). Likewise, estoria denotes both picture and story in Juan Ruiz’s work (Deyermond, “Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 115). In a similar observation, Guillermo Serés notes that in the Conde Lucanor Juan Manuel uses the term exemplo (also written exenplo, exienplo, enxiemplo, enxemplo, and enxiemplo), to refer variously “al relato en sí, al conjunto formado por el marco y el relato, a las sentencias del marco narrativo . . . y a los cuentos incluidos dentro del marco” (XLIX). The tales in Juan Manuel’s story collection are labeled and numbered as exempla I through LI, but when he states in his prologue “fiz este libro conpuesto de las más apuestas palabras que yo pude, et entre las palabras entremetí algunos exienplos de que se podrían aprovechar los que los oyeren,”⁴ Serés understands that palabras refers to the stories told and exienplos to the proverbs or morals that follow the tales (12-13). And Juan Manuel is not alone in the ambiguous use of the term exemplo. The anteprologue to the Conde Lucanor states that Juan Manuel “puso en él los enxiemplos más aprovechosos que él sopo de las cosas que acaescieron” (7).⁵ Enxiemplo as used here, Serés asserts, “vale tanto por ‘ejemplo’ (con el sentido de ‘ilustración de una doctrina o lección moral’, ‘semejanza’) cuanto por ‘fábula’, ‘historia’ o ‘cuento’; así como por ‘proverbio’, ‘refrán’, ‘conseja’, ‘máxima’ o ‘sentencia’” (7). Serés

deduces from this manifold use of exemplo that “en la época de don Juan Manuel este término designaba más el concepto de ejemplaridad que sus distintas manifestaciones concretas o généricas” (XLIX).

The use of ambiguous genre terminology is not unique to medieval authors. Contemporary scholars also face the challenges posed by vague or imprecise vocabulary used in their areas of research. In the following pages I attempt a clarification of certain terms used by other scholars working with the same texts that I do, and offer an explanation for my rejection or use of those terms in my present study. I begin by reviewing the various terms employed to denote an individual story: cuento, exemplum, fable, popular tale, traditional tale, folktale, and tale. In the second part of this chapter I consider different types of story collections, unframed and framed. By means of evaluating selections from the critical contribution of two medieval-frametale scholars, namely Helen Cooper and Katharine S. Gittes, I arrive at my own definition of the term frametale.

THE TALE

Most of the story collections that I examine in my current work frequently appear in studies of medieval short narrative in Spain. María Jesús Lacarra, one of the foremost scholars in this field, acknowledges that the extensive and diverse corpus of medieval stories did not present a typological challenge to the medieval man (who would not have noticed the difference in many of the stories) as it does to modern criticism (Cuento y novela corta 27). Despite the array of “narraciones caracterizadas por su brevedad y por su valor ejemplar,” Lacarra states that the

present consensus (presumably among critics writing in Spanish) is to “englobar el conjunto de relatos medievales bajo el nombre común de ‘cuentos’” (“Panorama” 27).

Although Lacarra selects the term cuento to denote tale, or story, in her own studies, she rightly admits that this term does not appear in early medieval texts (“Panorama” 27).⁶ Not for this reason, however, do I find the term inadequate for my current investigation. Nor do I universally object to the adoption of terminology in a foreign language in a scholarly work. My principal reservation about employing a Spanish term here is due to the possibility of misleading my readers in the belief that medieval story collections are either uniquely or predominantly Spanish in character or origin, as novella might imply with respect to Italian literature, or fabliau to French. In my evaluation of the frametale tradition and its relevance to the Lazarillo, I analyze works that are not Spanish, such as the Canterbury Tales and the Decameron. Furthermore, while I do take into account a number of “Spanish” story collections, the term Spanish should be qualified. Some works were close translations or adaptations into Spanish of texts written in another language, therefore a claim that such works were intrinsically Spanish would be debatable. Other works were compiled in Spain, but were not written in the vernacular. It would be incongruous in an English essay to favor the Spanish term cuento over an English alternative when referring to the Disciplina clericalis, for example, a collection of tales written in Latin, perhaps first composed in Arabic or Hebrew before being translated.⁷ In view of the fact that the author was a native of Spain, it is curious that “frente a

las traducciones medievales al francés, islandés, inglés, italiano y hebreo, no nos ha llegado ninguna de una lengua peninsular” (Lacarra, Cuento y novela corta 28). Additionally, as Deyermond indicates, “Although the Disciplina had considerable influence in Spain (it was also used as a source of the Siete partidas and other works), its vogue seems to have been much greater in the rest of Europe” (Literary History 97). Whether works such as the Disciplina should be classified as definitively Spanish is not of concern in my study. Since my investigation is written in English, and because it involves an evolving generic tradition that is represented by works of diverse countries and languages, I find inappropriate the term cuento that Lacarra and others writing in Spanish find satisfactory to their critical needs.

Because certain works in my analysis are closely associated with the term exemplum by various modern literary critics and historians, it is worthwhile to consider this term and its suitability to my project. In his study L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique de Moyen âge, Jean Thiébaud Welter offers the following definition of the term: “Par le mot exemplum, on entendait, au sens large du terme, un récit ou une historiette, une fable ou une parabole, une moralité ou une description pouvant servir de preuve à l'appui d'un exposé doctrinal, religieux ou moral” (1). Welter further describes exempla as stories of diverse types, origins, and times:

Celui-ci comprenait, d'après les compilateurs mêmes des recueils d'exempla, non seulement les historiettes et les légendes d'origine sacrée et profane, les anecdotes extraites de l'histoire de l'antiquité

classique et du Moyen Age ou empruntées aux souvenirs de l'auteur, à la tradition et au génie populaire, mais encore les fables et les contes orientaux et occidentaux, les récits plaisants, les moralités ou les descriptions tirées des bestiaires ou des traités d'histoire naturelle, bref tout le fond narratif et descriptif du passé et du présent. (2)

Despite their diversity, exempla have certain aspects in common. Welter highlights the three essential elements of an exemplum: “un récit ou une description, un enseignement moral ou religieux, une application de ce dernier à l'homme (3).

Although Welter's understanding of exemplum is broad in scope, the term has not always carried such a general meaning. Through the ages the exemplum has taken on various forms and functions, thus the term has signified different things during different periods of history. In The Medieval Imagination, Jacques Le Goff offers a brief account of the exemplum from antiquity to the Middle Ages:

A legacy of the Greeks and Romans, the exemplum was an historical anecdote employed in a rhetoric of persuasion. Used in antiquity by political and legal orators, it became in the hands of Christian moralists an instrument of edification. Between the first centuries of Christianity and the central Middle Ages, however, the exemplum changed in nature and function. No longer did it revolve around the imitation of an individual: Christ had been the

quintessential exemplum. Now it was a narrative, a history, to be taken in its entirety as an object useful for instruction and/or edification. (78)

Le Goff defines the thirteenth-century exemplum as “a brief narrative presented as truthful (that is, historical) and used in discourse (usually a sermon) to convince listeners by offering them a salutary lesson” (78). Le Goff explains that the exemplum, as well as other forms of brief narrative, was aptly suited to the needs of a society that, at the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth century, began to conceive of the world in new ways and to alter conventional systems of order and authority. Moreover, “the exemplum was associated with a new kind of preaching that came into vogue” also at this time (78). The close correlation between the exemplum and the thirteenth century, “the golden age of the genre” (78), is evident in Le Goff’s discussion of the genre, and the title to his chapter on the subject drives this point home: “The Time of the Exemplum (Thirteenth Century).”

In his work A Literary History of Spain: The Middle Ages, Deyermond uses the term exemplum to designate an illustrative, or exemplary, story of the type medieval preachers incorporated in their sermons (62, 96-99). In line with Welter’s assessment, he notes that the exemplum was far from uniform: “Almost anything could be used as an exemplum: Aesopic fables, historical and biblical events and persons, classical mythology (this was less frequent in sermons than in formal literature), and events which the preacher had, or claimed to have, witnessed or experienced” (97). However, like Le Goff, Deyermond

demonstrates the patent association between the exemplum and the thirteenth century. Although he credits the classical Latin period with the birth of exemplum collections (97), and remarks on the revitalization of the genre in the fifteenth century after an apparent lapse in the fourteenth (excepting Juan Manuel's contribution), Deyermond recognizes the thirteenth century as the period in which the genre "flourished" (144). The compilation and use of story collections of this sort increased particularly during the thirteenth century as part of "a general movement to bring Christian instruction to the people in their own language (even though much of the original material is of non-Christian origin)" (96).

Not all medieval story collections are so closely tied to the thirteenth century, however, and many differ significantly from preachers' exemplum collections in terms of their form and function. In his book Petrus Alfonsi and His Medieval Readers, Tolan considers three possible terms to identify stories in the Disciplina clericalis: exemplum, tale, and fable. He rejects the term exemplum, claiming it is "loaded with meaning later given to it by thirteenth-century preachers" (82). The term tale he finds appropriate only once the didacticism of Alfonsi's stories loses ground to their entertainment value in the hands of storytellers such as Boccaccio (82, 133, 156-57). Instead Tolan prefers the term fable since Alfonsi uses fabulae most often to denote his brief narratives. Tolan acknowledges, however, that the term fable, as well, is problematic. Frederick Whitesell's definition of fable as "a story that contains a moral and that is humorous" is too subjective in Tolan's view (qtd. in Tolan 235). Tolan reveals

that even Whitesell identifies only fourteen of the thirty-four stories in the Disciplina as fable, and that he fails to offer an explanation as to why he chooses some and excludes others (235). For my own purposes, I do not discount the term tale, although later I will reconsider its meaning. While I do join Tolan in rejecting the term exemplum, unlike him I find the term fable unsatisfactory, in part because of the very ambiguity that Tolan indicates.

The term fable can be misleading also because a casual use of the word may suggest an animal fable in the style of Aesop. In his book The Fable as Literature, H. J. Blackham disregards this simple interpretation of fable as a literary genre: “Nor is it [a fable] merely or mainly a story with animals for characters, nor a story with a moral” (xi). Yet Blackman is compelled to admit that “any non-literary person asked about fable would most likely think of Aesop” (xi). I would suggest that even those who study literature might make this association unless fable is related to their particular area of research. Nonetheless, while I do not wish to exclude Aesop’s fables, Aesopic fables, or animal fables from consideration in my present study, I prefer a term that will clearly signify other types of stories as well.

There are further complications in adopting the term fable for my study, even as defined more precisely by Alan Dundes in his preface to Pack Carnes’s Fable Scholarship: An Annotated Bibliography:

Generally speaking, it [a fable] is a short narrative, single episode, typically with dramatis personae consisting of animals and plants. Occasionally the characters are humans or objects. Fable is

intended to be understood metaphorically rather than literally, and almost invariably it includes an explicit moral or didactic message.
(ix)

Dundes goes on to admit that such a definition would allow for classifying almost any animal tale, oral or written, as a fable. The trouble resides among contemporary fable scholars, Dundes warns, who would not favor such a comprehensive understanding of the term:

But the conventions of folklore scholarship have decreed, somewhat ethnocentrically, that the fable is a largely literary form, confined to the Indo-European and Semitic world. Most of the great compilations of fables bear the marks of literary style even though the story-line may have originally stemmed from oral sources. To the extent that the fable is deemed, rightly or wrongly, a literary narrative genre, it is not presumed to flourish among peoples without a written language. . . . It may well be that future generations of fable scholars will reject this somewhat arbitrary restriction of the genre, but the history of fable studies to date does reveal a fairly consistent emphasis upon literary texts. (ix-x)

The attempt to establish a strict boundary between the oral tale and the written one seems an artificial and unfeasible endeavor since an overlap in these traditions is natural and inevitable, as Lacarra explains:

No es posible encontrar tradiciones orales puras. . . . Más difícil aún resulta discernir entre el cuento popular recogido por un autor

culto, del que podemos llamar cuento popularizado. La gran difusión alcanzada por algunas historias ‘cultas’, como ocurre con las numerosas versiones y traducciones de relatos orientales, acaba dando paso a relatos vivos en la tradición oral moderna. . . . Pero ante estas coincidencias cabe preguntarse si la popularidad de lo escrito no habrá contribuido a crear un proceso de folclorización. Las respuestas ante estas cuestiones nunca pueden ser seguras; en muchos casos habrá más bien que pensar en interinfluencias que abran paso a caminos de ida y vuelta. (Cuento y novela corta 36-37)

The confluence of oral and written traditions is an integral aspect of storytelling and, therefore, an issue closely related to my thesis. In fact, each of the written works I examine depicts oral storytelling. Hence I should not wish to diminish the importance of orality on the *frametales* tradition, either directly or by implication, by choosing a term that modern critics employ to confine a tale to the literary realm. In sum, I have chosen not to use the term fable because it is too ambiguous, overly restrictive, and encumbered with meanings and associations that are unsuitable to my purposes.

Dundes identifies fable as a subgenre of folktale (Preface ix). The term folktale, however, pertains to yet another area of ambiguous terminology, that of folklore. This confusion has been a critical issue in studies on the relation of folklore to the picaresque novel in general, and, in particular, to the Lazarillo, “el banco de pruebas por antonomasia de esta controversia” (Camarena 67). In her

article “Función del cuento popular en el Lazarillo de Tormes,” María Rosa Lida de Malkiel identifies two camps with respect to this issue, those who overemphasize the role of folklore and negate the originality of the Lazarillo’s author, and those who recognize the essential role played by folklore, but who do so in support of a thesis that is “dirigida a negar el realismo de la novelita o su valor como sátira de la sociedad coetánea” (349). To counter these sweeping arguments, Lida de Malkiel proposes “la enumeración de los motivos narrativos del Lazarillo y su confrontación con los repertorios de motivos folklóricos y de cuentos populares” (349). Despite her meticulous review of the novel’s narrative elements and some clever insight into the work, Lida de Malkiel never offers a clear definition of cuento popular. Only by piecing together her reasons for denying any connection between specific narrative elements of the Lazarillo and the cuento popular can the reader begin to infer her understanding of the term.

Lida de Malkiel’s argument is obscured somewhat also by her use of the term folklórico, at times seemingly synonymous with popular. Yet when speaking of the “cuentecillo de ‘Manténgaos Dios’” in the third tratado, she suggests a different context for folklórico: “no es folklórico, en el sentido de existir en muchos lugares y desde siglos atrás, aunque no excluyo la posibilidad de que hubiese comenzado a circular oralmente por España poco tiempo antes” (357). Still it is not clear whether she is speaking of a strictly oral tradition. On occasion she implies that this is so by contrasting “la literatura” and “el folklore” (354, 356). However, when Lida de Malkiel speaks of motivos folklóricos, the term folklórico takes on a different meaning since the only motif-index that she

mentions, Stith Thompson's Motif-Index of Folk-Literature, does not impose this restriction of orality on the folktale:

Stories that have formed part of a tradition, whether oral or literary, find a place here. The folktale, the myth, the ballad, the fable, the mediaeval romance, the fabliau, the jest, the exemplum, and the local tradition have all been included. . . . In general, I have used any narrative, whether popular or literary, so long as it has formed a strong enough tradition to cause its frequent repetition.

(11)

Nor does Thompson restrict his classification of folktales to oral tales in his work dedicated to the study of this genre, The Folktale: "In the present work we are confining our interest to a relatively narrow scope, the traditional prose tale—the story which has been handed down from generation to generation whether in writing or by word of mouth" (4).

In his article "El cuento de tradición oral y la novela picaresca," ethnologist Julio Camarena Laucirica attempts to identify some of the terminological confusion surrounding folklore:

Lo primero que llama la atención en este debate es la disparidad de la terminología empleada. Así, mientras la filóloga argentina [Lida de Malkiel] habla del 'cuento popular' y de 'motivos narrativos,' otros hablan de 'materiales folklóricos,' expresión en la que queda sin precisar el papel del elemento narrativo, o, más aún, de

‘materiales tradicionales,’ donde lo que queda por dilucidar es si se refiere a la tradición oral o a la literaria. (68)

In order to clarify the purpose of his own study, Camarena offers the following definition of cuento folklórico: “todo relato en prosa que narre sucesos ficticios y que viva autónomamente en la tradición oral en versiones o variantes” (68). With the care he takes to define cuento folklórico, it is a wonder that Camarena chooses a different term, cuento de tradición oral, for the title to his article. Perhaps he sought a phrase that would more clearly link the tales he treats to the oral tradition. But he does not stop with these two terms, bringing the term cuento popular into play as well. In fact, Camarena names his section on the Lazarillo “Lazarillo de Tómes: parodia de cuento popular,” without justifying his sudden change from cuento folklórico, which he had defined in the previous section. Nor does he ever explain precisely how cuento folklórico, cuento popular, and cuento de tradición oral are related. Does he mean them to be identical in meaning, or are there subtle differences? Despite the ambiguity of his own terminology, it remains clear that Camarena uses all of these terms to refer to tales that circulated orally.

Camarena is not alone in classifying the cuento folklórico as an oral tale. Before him, Maxime Chevalier had studied the role played in Golden Age literature by both the cuento folklórico and the cuentecillo tradicional. In Folklore y literatura: el cuento oral en el Siglo de Oro, Chevalier observes, “Entre cuentos folklóricos y cuentecillos tradicionales existen unas semejanzas básicas: unos y otros son de carácter oral y vivieron dentro de una civilización de tipo

tradicional” (44). Notwithstanding their likeness, the tales are distinct on other accounts. Resisting commitment to a precise definition of the cuento folklórico, Chevalier instead begins a process of comparison for the purpose of reconstructing “el corpus de los cuentos folklóricos que hubieron de circular por la España del Siglo de Oro” (16-17). He illustrates this practice of identifying cuentos folklóricos by comparing various types of tales, some contained within Spanish texts or other European works of the Golden Age, and others catalogued in modern Spanish, Spanish-American, Arabic, or Sephardic folktale collections (16-37). Although it is not always clear from these comparisons what criteria he uses to categorize the cuento folklórico or to distinguish it from other types of oral tales, from his illustrative examples of the comparative process, it can be gleaned that Chevalier considers tales folkloric if they circulated in various countries or languages at the same time (indicating a considerable diffusion), or if they can be found in the oral tradition of different times (signaling a substantial lifespan).

Chevalier treats cuentecillos tradicionales more precisely in the following chapter of Folklore y literatura where he regrets, “Perezosamente los solemos calificar de anécdotas o de historietas” (39). Dissatisfied with this categorization, he offers a fresh definition: “un relato breve, de tono familiar, de intención jocosa, en general de forma dialogada y de aspecto ‘realista’” (41). Chevalier insists on the humorous quality of cuentecillos tradicionales and often refers to them as cuentecillos jocosos or relatos jocosos. While he concedes that many medieval texts “demuestran claramente la presencia de narraciones folklóricas,” he claims

that, with a few notable exceptions, their inclusion specifically of cuentecillos tradicionales is not common:

Pero fuerza es observar que, en contra de lo que han de hacer los escritores del Siglo de Oro, poetas y prosistas los emplean en aquellas fechas [the Middle Ages] con parsimonia.

Varios cuentecillos de estos salen en el Libro de buen amor y en El caballero Cifar; asoman algunos en El Conde Lucanor. En la literatura española del siglo XIV no hay más, si no ando equivocado. Es poca cosa en comparación de los fabliaux franceses y el Decamerón. (61)

Chevalier indicates that the Spanish Golden Age has an altogether different relationship with the cuentecillo tradicional than did the Middle Ages, for it is during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that such tales not only form the heart of numerous collections, such as those of Juan de Timoneda, but they pervade most other types of literature of the period as well (Folklore y literatura 61-62). The Renaissance, he says, “se apasionó . . . por el relato oral y tradicional” (Folklore y literatura 62).

The year following the publication of Folklore y literatura, Chevalier published an article titled “Des contes au roman: l’éducation de Lazarille” in which his treatment of the conte traditionnel, called cuentecillo tradicional in his previous work, focuses on the Lazarillo. Immediately upon mentioning the contes traditionnels, he draws a distinction between two types of oral tales: contes folkloriques and historiettes traditionnelles. Although he defines neither term in

his article, he insists, “Cette distinction est nécessaire” (189). Chevalier reminds his reader that the distinction between these tales is a modern one:

. . . elle n’aurait eu aucun sens pour un contemporain de Charles Quint ou de Philippe III. Pour les Espagnols du XVI^e et du XVII^e siècle, pour les écrivains du temps qui ont recours à ces matériaux, les récits que nous appelons contes folkloriques ou historiettes traditionnelles se confondent en un ensemble unique: celui des contes traditionnels, qui appartiennent à la tradition orale. (189)

Chevalier recognizes in a footnote that some tales that are classified as folkloric and that appear in Golden Age texts are not likely to have circulated orally at that time. Once more he emphasizes that his interest lies in the oral tradition: “Je pense ici uniquement aux contes folkloriques dont il est vraisemblable qu’ils ont circulé oralement dans l’Espagne du XVI^e et du XVII^e siècle” (189). Regrettably, Chevalier never clarifies in his article what he means by conte traditionnel beyond the “ensemble” that derives from the two oral tales mentioned above, and a reference several pages later to “récits ou . . . burlas de caractère traditionnel” (192). Again, what does he mean by traditionnel, and how does it differ from folklorique? One must resort to his earlier publication Folklore y literatura to find a definition of conte traditionnel.

In consideration of this definition, it becomes apparent that Chevalier and Lida de Malkiel are working from different premises in their study of the Lazarillo. Chevalier, for instance, identifies the episode of “la calabazada” against the stone bull as one of only four contes traditionnels in the Lazarillo.

While Lida de Malkiel recognizes the episode as both a folk-motif and “una broma pesada (practical joke) que se practica entre niños” (this recalls Chevalier’s “intención jocosa”), she nonetheless declares, “nada tiene que ver con el cuento folklórico” (351). The incongruity between the two scholars’ classification is highlighted by the fact that Chevalier considers the cuento folklórico to be one of two essential components of the “ensemble” that makes up the conte traditionnel. The discrepancy extends to Camarena in that he makes no mention whatsoever of this episode when identifying cuentos folklóricos in the Lazarillo. While Camarena’s omission may presumably be a deliberate indication that he does not classify this story as a cuento folklórico, it is noteworthy that with other stories under consideration he at least offers an appraisal of the tale before explaining his reasons for rejecting it. Does the complete absence of the “calabazada” episode from his study indicate that he has an entirely different reading of it than Chevalier and Lida de Malkiel, or that his understanding of cuento folklórico is at such odds with theirs?

Further inconsistencies surface upon comparing other tales that Lida de Malkiel, Camarena, and Chevalier treat in their works. The episode of “la casa lóbrega y obscura . . . donde nunca comen ni beben” (Lazarillo 96, 97), for example, is regarded differently by these scholars.⁸ Lida de Malkiel believes the episode to be folkloric, but “no por los argumentos esgrimidos [by others] a este fin” (356). One claim that she refutes is that the episode is folkloric because it appears in the Liber facetiarum. “Me parece indudable,” she argues, “que la compilación . . . es posterior al Lazarillo,” principally because the collection

explicitly mentions “una parte del libro llamado Lázaro de Tormes” (356). The episode cannot be considered folkloric, she asserts, simply on the grounds of appearing in a later work than the Lazarillo (356). Chevalier, in turn, recognizes the folkloric nature of the episode by labeling it a conte traditionnel. Yet he supports his position, in part, by the inclusion of the episode in the Liber facetiarum (“De contes au roman” 194), an argument that Lida de Malkiel had deemed untenable. Chevalier also acknowledges the presence of the tale in Arabic folklore, an argument that Lida de Malkiel did not discuss in her study, undoubtedly because this discovery had not yet come to light.⁹ Finally, Camarena’s judgment is unlike that of either Chevalier or Lida de Malkiel. Whereas Camarena acknowledges that this “relato está reputado como tradicional,” and he identifies its place in Thompson’s Motif-Index as J 2483, he denies its classification as a cuento folklórico because “no se conocen versiones orales” (71).

Although I use here only two episodes to illustrate the point, consideration of other tales in the Lazarillo only further demonstrates the inconsistencies in folklore terminology and scholarship with respect to the Lazarillo.¹⁰ A principal disadvantage to using the terms folktale, traditional tale, or popular tale is the heavy emphasis that is placed on their association with the oral tradition, in some cases to the exclusion of tales which are perceived to threaten the purported boundaries between written and oral traditions. I do not wish to impose such a restrictive qualification on the tales I consider, some of which participate in both traditions, even simultaneously.

One term that I have deliberated, folktale, nevertheless stands out among the others as deserving further consideration due to its broader interpretation by one preeminent Lazarillo scholar. This term, or, rather, its counterpart in Spanish and in French, I have already shown to be equivocal as used by several scholars studying folklore and the Lazarillo. Within this context of Lazarillo studies, I wonder, is it the ambiguity of the Spanish and French terms, or their explicit link to the oral tradition that leads Fernando Lázaro Carreter to adopt the English term folktale in his study *Lazarillo de Tormes en la picaresca*? There must have been a compelling reason for him to prefer an English term to a Spanish one in a study that he composed in Spanish. Perhaps he chose a foreign expression to clearly differentiate the purpose of his study from that of others in the same field, and to align his work with a distinct school of thought about the folktale. The meaning that Lázaro Carreter accepts for folktale, after all, is more inclusive than that which is understood by a good number of his fellow Lazarillo scholars, some of them mentioned above. His understanding of folktale derives from Stith Thompson's study *The Folktale*, in which Thompson, himself, acknowledges diverse uses of the English term:

Although the term "folktale" is often used in English to refer to the "household tale" or "fairy tale" (the German Märchen), such as "Cinderella" or "Snow White," it is also legitimately employed in a much broader sense to include all forms of prose narrative, written or oral, which have come to be handed down through the

years. In this usage the important fact is the traditional nature of the material. (4)

Lázaro Carreter explains how this notion of folktale relates to his study of the Lazarillo:

Con esta condición, incluye también en la noción de folktale la novella ('the actions [sic] occurs in a real world with definite time and place') y el Hero tale, que narra aventuras de un mismo personaje, las cuales pueden suceder en un mundo fantástico o seudorrealista. . . . El Amadís y las novelas de caballerías son Hero tales; el Lazarillo pudo haberlo sido también, morfológicamente, de no haber preocupado a su autor, precisamente, evitar que lo fuera, rehuyendo la estructura tradicional del folktale; es, justo, lo que intentamos probar.” (87)

Lázaro Carreter's vision of Lazarillo is as a novel that arises from the “encrucijada entre tradición e innovación” (64). In order to demonstrate how the anonymous author surpasses the limitations of folklore, Lázaro Carreter first considers his dependence on it: “El Lazarillo nace . . . de un denso contexto folklórico—refranes, creencias, supersticiones, tópicos, folktales, etcétera—y la narrativa de esta naturaleza posee una configuración básica, en cuya descripción han trabajado críticos extranjeros eminentes” (87). Lázaro Carreter relies predominantly on the folklore scholarship of the British Lord Raglan, the aforementioned American Stith Thompson, the Dane Axel Olrik, and the Russian Vladimir Propp. Noting the indebtedness of the picaresque novel to folklore,

Lázaro Carreter distinguishes the Lazarillo from its folkloric predecessors primarily on the basis of the author's new methods of organizing his materials: "El proyecto innovador del autor se delata, principalmente, en la construcción" (64). His purpose, therefore, is to undertake an investigation of "el problema de la composición interna del Lazarillo, aplicando métodos formalistas y estructurales" (8). Lázaro Carreter's morphological study of the Lazarillo is based on structural analysis¹¹ as schematized by Propp in Morphology of the Folktale.¹² In his introduction to the second edition of Propp's Morphology, Dundes explains this process:

In this type [of structural analysis], the structure or formal organization of a folkloristic text is described following the chronological order of the linear sequence of elements in the text as reported from an informant. Thus if a tale consists of elements A to Z, the structure of the tale is delineated in terms of this same sequence. Following Lévi-Strauss . . . , this linear sequential structural analysis we might term "syntagmatic" structural analysis, borrowing from the notion of syntax in the study of language. . . . (xi)

I appreciate Lázaro Carreter's broad conception of the folktale with respect to the Lazarillo because my own purposes require a term that signifies a variety of narrative forms and that favors neither the oral nor the literary tradition to the exclusion of the other or to the point of minimizing the other's importance. Nonetheless, how this Lazarillo scholar applies his notion of the folktale to his

understanding of the anonymous picaresque novel differs significantly from my own approach. Where my work is concerned with structure, I focus not on how the isolated components of an individual folktale relate to each other, in other words, the organization of discrete elements or episodes within a single tale, but on how tales, as units in themselves, relate to the frame and to other constituent tales in a framed story collection.¹³ As such, a fundamental difference between our analyses is what we take to be the part and what we take to be the whole. Whereas Lázaro Carreter's "whole" is the tale itself, mine is the collection of tales. It follows that his reading of the Lazarillo is with respect to the folktale, while mine is to the frametale. Given that Lázaro Carreter's study has been widely read and highly influential among Lazarillo scholars, my use of the term folktale in a study dedicated to this picaresque novel might erroneously imply a similar approach to the text. To avoid the likelihood of leading my readers to this misunderstanding, I elect not to use folktale in my study to refer to individual stories in a framed collection.

Among the diverse terms cuento, exemplum, fable, popular tale, traditional tale, and folktale, all of which are employed in critical works that analyze the same texts that I treat, none is adequate for my purposes, for none denotes an individual tale without encumbering it with undue meaning or shrouding it in ambiguity. The endeavor to differentiate these terms, in fact, has limited appeal. Thompson acknowledges that although the scholar's efforts to categorize oral narrative "according to origin or form or content" is a worthwhile educational undertaking for the scholar himself, "he must realize that the men and

women who tell them neither know nor care about his distinctions” (The Folktale 7). As I demonstrated at the beginning of this chapter, the concern for generic distinction was likewise lacking among medieval storytellers of written narrative. That is not to say that a review of terms as they are used in scholarly discussion is futile. “Some very general terms,” Thompson asserts, “are not only helpful but necessary” (The Folktale 7). I hope that my above review of genre terminology not only illustrates some of the preceding work accomplished in this area of study, but that it also helps to demonstrate how my project differs from these studies, and to justify my own choice of terminology when treating many of the same works.

Because my current interest lies not in classifying individual tales by type, but in how they function within the context of storytelling in framed story collections, I opt for the broadest of terms to signify such a narrative: tale. I must clarify that by this term I do not necessarily imply a narrative intended principally for amusement, as Tolan suggests with respect to Boccaccio (82, 133, 156-57). My understanding of tale is in its most general sense as the product of storytelling, whether written or oral, and I use the term interchangeably with story. This understanding is congruent with the definition of tale offered in A Dictionary of Literary Terms:

A narrative, written (in prose or verse) or spoken. When in prose, barely distinguishable from a short story. If there is a difference, then a tale perhaps suggests something written in the tone of voice

of someone speaking. Usually the theme of a tale is fairly simple but the method of relating it may be complex and skilled. (683)

Certainly there are dangers inherent to using a term that may signify such a great diversity of narrative, yet this diversity does not pose a problem for my study since it is a key characteristic of the frametale genre.

THE FRAMETALE

Since my focus on tales is principally within their framed literary context, I view them as components of a larger narrative system that both assigns a level of meaning to the individual tales and derives its own significance from them. This interdependence in meaning is established and reinforced by structure and content in framed story collections, the genre to which I now dedicate my attention to defining.

Helen Cooper presents a useful description of medieval story collections in “The Frame,” her study on the sources and analogues of the frame of the Canterbury Tales:

Story-collections were a distinct genre to themselves in the Middle Ages, with their own conventions of organization, content, purpose and audience expectation. They do not, however, constitute a homogeneous form. They vary in structure from collections of brief narratives assembled without any kind of introduction or attempt at linking, to collections that are articulated in the most elaborate ways. (3)

At one end of the spectrum of story collections, “the simplest kind of collection has either no frame at all or just a prologue” (3). A second category within Cooper’s survey consists of works offering “a simple linking mechanism between tales in addition to providing a prologue announcing the nature of the work” (4). A third classification identifies “works that develop the frame to make a story in its own right,” with varying degrees of autonomy with respect to the enclosed tales (5). Another category, exemplified by oriental story collections, consists of works characterized by “the most sophisticated methods of articulating their constituent tales” and “a highly complex structure in which stories are recessed within stories” (6).

Although Cooper’s survey of story collections leads her to observe that the Canterbury Tales “participates in a widespread current fashion for such works,” her emphasis lies less in what Chaucer’s work has in common with its generic analogues than in how his work differs from most of them (7-8). The contrast is drawn specifically “in the dynamics offered by its frame story, in the articulation of its tales, and in its refusal to offer any consistent moralization” (8).¹⁴ This differentiation between the Canterbury Tales and other story collections that Cooper examines prompts her to reopen the debate concerning Boccaccio’s Decameron as a model for the Canterbury Tales.¹⁵ Her argument concerning these two works is both sound and fruitful (offering details to which I will return later), but I find somewhat misleading her method of arriving at the Decameron as the “primary model” (13) for Chaucer’s story collection. By a process of contrasting the Canterbury Tales with other story collections, she underestimates

the possible indebtedness of Chaucer's work to these analogues and, therefore, too readily dismisses them. In speaking of oriental story collections, for example, Cooper acknowledges some similarities between them and the Canterbury Tales, but she pointedly negates a close relation: "Chaucer does not base his work on collections of this kind" (6). Her focus on singling out the Decameron as the primary source for the Canterbury Tales leads her to de-emphasize the possible influence of other individual frametale collections and to play down the likelihood that Chaucer was inspired by a variety of these collections, some with which he is known, others suspected, to have been familiar.

Adopting a different approach in her analysis, Katharine S. Gittes conducts a selective chronological survey of the frame narrative, or frametale, in medieval Europe, concentrating on both the direct and indirect influences of these collections on the Canterbury Tales. In the introduction to her book Framing the Canterbury Tales: Chaucer and the Medieval Frame Narrative Tradition, Gittes outlines her purpose:

I find in the Canterbury Tales a blending of two different literary traditions, Eastern and Western. One tradition originates in India and the Near East, the other in ancient Greece. Understanding the ways in which these two traditions merge in the Canterbury Tales can clarify the aesthetic principles that underlie Chaucer's frame narrative and thus help resolve some important and persistent critical problems. (1)

Gittes examines the tensions between these Eastern and Western traditions, not as a static condition at any particular point in the Middle Ages, but as an ongoing, evolutionary process in which the interplay of diverse influences entails both change and continuity in the *frametale* genre.

In defining frame narrative and in justifying the works she selects for her study, Gittes uses as one point of departure an earlier work by Cooper, namely the 1983 edition of The Structure of the Canterbury Tales (Gittes 3-5). Cooper's classification of story collections has been condensed and somewhat modified in the more recent article I cite above, but it is clear that in both studies she offers a range of categories in which story collections are distinguishable, in part, on the basis of their structure and organization. The principal division among story collections that concerns Gittes's definition of terms and her selection of texts is between those collections that are framed and those that are not. I follow Gittes, and Cooper before her, in discounting such unframed works as compilations of animal fables, collections of saints' lives and miracles, and preachers' handbooks (Gittes 4).

As I move toward a definition of *frametale*, I must advise that not all framed collections that contain tales are essentially framed story collections. Lacarra explains that in the production of medieval didactic works, "se buscarán procedimientos que faciliten el aprendizaje y la retención de lo aprendido, y, siguiendo habituales caminos didácticos, se recurrirá a combinar cuentos, comparaciones, frases sentenciosas, etc." (Cuento y novela corta 49). As was previously noted, these forms of writing were not always clearly delineated in the

mind of the medieval author, yet the hindsight afforded by a contemporary critical perspective allows for the distinction to be made. Story collections and collections of sententiae, “sayings of famous men which conveyed wisdom in concentrated form” (Deyermond, Literary History 97), are identified today largely on the basis of which type of writing predominates in the collection (Lacarra, Cuento y novela corta 49). The Poridat de poridades and the Libro de los buenos proverbios are two examples of framed collections that contain tales. They are not, however, frametales since their content is chiefly sententiae.

Nonetheless, one should not underestimate the prevalence and the importance of forms of writing other than short narrative in frametales collections. Chandra Rajan describes the Panchatantra, for example, as “an intricately designed text interweaving tales with maxims and precepts, discourse and debate” (xlviii). Sententiae and other forms of aphoristic sayings are particularly integral to many frametales. Arthur Ryder notes that the use of epigrammatic verses, “for the most part quoted from sacred writings or other sources of dignity and authority,” is as characteristic of Eastern works as the device of the framing story itself (xii). He goes as far as asserting, “These wise verses it is which make the real character of the Panchatantra. The stories, indeed, are charming when regarded as pure narrative; but it is the beauty, wisdom, and wit of the verses which lift the Panchatantra far above the level of the best story-books” (xii). Another example is the Conde Lucanor, of which Juan Manuel’s pithy verses are an essential component, although they do not generally receive such high critical praise as Ryder bestows on the verses of the Panchatantra.

A frametale, then, is a collection that consists of a significant number of tales that are organized within a framework. It often contains other forms of writing as well, particularly aphorisms in verse or prose, yet stories are the principle form. The frametale may range in structural and narrative complexity from simply framed and loosely linked tales to an elaborate network of connections between the frame and its enclosed tales, and among the tales themselves. The framework consists of a framing story, the narrative account of the circumstances or events within which the storytelling takes place. The framing story accounts for the purpose and participants of the storytelling, and thus provides a context for understanding the tales that are contained within the frametale collection.

Chapter 2: Medieval Frametales

The frametales I have chosen for my study are the Panchatantra, Kalila and Dimna (also known as the Fables of Bidpai), Book of Sindbad (called Seven Sages of Rome in the Western tradition), Disciplina clericalis, Conde Lucanor, Libro de buen amor, Decameron, and Canterbury Tales. I have selected this body of frametale collections on the following basis: there must be some evidence that supports an association, direct or indirect, between each frametale collection and at least one of the other collections that I treat; each collection must have existed, in one or more versions, prior to the publication of the Lazarillo; finally, there must be a reasonable possibility that one or more of the texts was accessible to the author of the Lazarillo and his readers. The first criterion supports the notion that the authors of these collections conceived of their works, at least to some degree, in relation to other texts that form part of the frametale tradition. It lends credence to the idea that, despite the degree of originality in these works, their authors were conscious of working within a tradition characterized by certain conventions. That they may be seen to push against the boundaries of the genre, to manipulate its conventional features toward their own ends, only shows that they had an understanding of these generic features in the first place. With respect to the second stipulation, I do not infer that only texts predating the Lazarillo are characteristic of the frametale tradition that I attempt to sketch. Indeed, this tradition continues well beyond the birth of the picaresque novel. My concern here is with collections that could plausibly have helped lay the

groundwork for the emergence of the Lazarillo, thus requiring works that precede it. The final criterion I hope shortens the distance that modern readers and scholars may perceive between the medieval European *frametales* and the Spanish Golden Age picaresque novel. In establishing the availability of any specific collection in Spain during first half of the sixteenth century my intention is not to demonstrate a direct influence on the Lazarillo. Although it has been argued that certain *frametales* served as a model for specific aspects or a particular episode of the Lazarillo, my goal is neither to hunt for immediate sources nor to establish a decisive link with any single author. I aim instead to show that the literary environment in which the Lazarillo came to light was colored by the medieval *frametales* tradition, and that the body of texts in my study could be reasonably understood as representative of this generic tradition that reaches Renaissance Spain and beyond.

In the present chapter I offer a succinct introduction to each *frametales* I will treat in my investigation, including information on its author, compiler, or translator, selected sources and analogues of the work, a synopsis of its framing story, and some notes on its transmission history. I must acknowledge first, however, that many of the works have a transmission history that is, at best, complex, and, in some cases, highly obscure. Through the ages, as individual tales passed back and forth between the oral and written traditions, they took on different forms, contents, contexts, or purposes. Heavy borrowing among various collections also complicates textual transmission. Furthermore, a variety of manuscripts and printed editions of these works have been produced, a great

many of which are no longer extant. There have been attempts by scholars to reconstruct lost texts on the basis of remaining versions, yet it must be understood that such a synthesis is no more the original version of a work than it is a definitive one.¹⁶ Indeed, the *frametales* genre allows for a multitude of variants of these collections, some of which develop into traditions themselves. This diversity and complexity pose a challenge to the scholar who proposes to discuss a certain work. In some instances, I rely on a single version of a work, or a translation of it, yet in others I work from a reconstructed text. In each case, I identify my primary source and direct my reader to information on that source.

PANCHATANTRA

I begin with the *Panchatantra*, written first in Sanskrit and dating perhaps between 200 BC and AD 500.¹⁷ As part of the Indian tradition of storytelling, the tales in the collection come from anonymous authors of ancient times. The preamble identifies the author of the work as Visnu Sarma, but who he was remains unclear. Rajan suggests that either he was a fictional character acting as narrator, “perhaps an archetypal storyteller,” or he was the first storyteller to commit a body of tales to writing in the artistic form that makes the *Panchatantra* (xii). In the latter case, states Rajan, “The names of the storytellers who went before him and who came after have perhaps been subsumed under his revered name, not an uncommon practice in India. . . . It is reasonable therefore, to consider a multiple authorship for the *Panchatantra*” (xii).¹⁸

The framing story of the *Panchatantra* is set up by an anonymous narrator in the preamble (Rajan xii). A wise king, dismayed at seeing his three sons

lacking in good judgment and disinclined to learn, calls forth his counselors to find a remedy: “Some means have got to be adopted to awaken the intelligence of the princes; to rouse them from their present torpor” (4). One wise counselor recommends the Brahman Visnu Sarma, to whom the king entrusts his sons for their education. Promising the king, “In six months time, your sons will possess unsurpassed knowledge of all branches of practical wisdom” (5), Visnu Sarma receives the princes, takes them home with him, and devises an appropriate method of instructing them. This instruction is compiled within five books in which Visnu Sarma recounts edifying tales and recites aphorisms to his pupils. The preamble confirms that the plan was successful, because the princes, “learning through these stories, became in six months what Visnu Sarma had promised they would” (5). The benefit that results from using this work is not confined to characters within the text, however. The reader or listener is also told, “Since then, this work on practical wisdom has become celebrated as an excellent means of awakening and training young minds. It has travelled far and wide in this world” (5).

The dissemination of the Panchatantra owes much to the oral tradition of storytelling, in which Rajan observes a process of change, or adaptation (xx-xxii). With each new telling, there are necessarily alterations that reflect the talent, imagination, and will of the storyteller, and that suit the sensibility or needs of his audience. At the same time, however, storytelling is restricted within certain parameters (Rajan xxi). “A skilled storyteller,” Rajan explains, “is both creator and narrator. By making revisions in the oral text handed down to him he

exercises his rights as a creator while preserving the continuity of the tradition” (xxi). The Panchatantra, because it participates in this tradition, has undergone significant modifications through the ages (Rajan xx). The “retellings” were written down from time to time, leaving in the extant recensions evidence of the revisionary process (Rajan xxii). Aphorisms and discourse differ among the various recensions, as well as the tales. Stories have been added, omitted, rearranged within a book, or chapter, and even moved to a different book (Rajan xxii). Despite these changes, many features of the work are preserved. As in the oral tradition, the literary tradition of the Panchatantra exhibits both continuity and change. It is to this dual quality that Barry Taylor attributes the endurance of the Panchatantra by way of its descendents: “These tales have proven so durable because each translator at once invests his text with his own concerns and conforms to models laid down by generations of his literary ancestors” (198).

KALILA AND DIMNA (THE FABLES OF BIDPAI)

The Panchatantra’s influence spread from India throughout the West via the collection known generally as Kalila and Dimna, or The Fables of Bidpai. The precise relationship between the Panchatantra and the Kalila is unknown, and although scholars articulate this relationship in diverse terms, most recognize a significant indebtedness of the Kalila to the Panchatantra.¹⁹ Probably the first extra-Indian Kalila and Dimna was a Pahlavi (Middle Persian) version created around AD 570 by a court physician named Burzoë at the request of the Emperor of Iran, Khosro Anushirvan (Rajan xvi, xxiv). “Although he presents it merely as his translation of the text from the Sanskrit” (Tolan 79), many scholars believe

that Burzoë drew material from other sources and introduced substantive changes (Tolan 79; Rajan xvii, xxiv-xxv; Atil 56).²⁰ One key alteration that presumably occurred with the Pahlavi redaction was the addition of a prologue containing Burzoë's biography and an account of his mission to India on which he encountered his source and composed his work (Atil 56; Rajan xvii). Other changes at this stage may include additional tales (Atil 56; Tolan 79; Rajan xxv) and a new main framing story in which a philosopher gives lessons to an Indian king by recounting tales (Tolan 79). Just how the Pahlavi version treats its Sanskrit source (and how that work relates to the original, or primitive, Panchatantra) is not known since the works are now lost (Rajan xxiv). The changes that are thought to have been introduced in the Pahlavi version are supported by two texts that derive from this source, a Syriac version in AD 570 called Kalilag wa Dimnag, and an eighth-century Arabic version, the Kalilah wa Dimnah (Rajan xvi).

The Arabic Kalilah wa Dimnah was compiled around AD 750 by Abdallah Ibn al-Muqaffa, a Persian Zoroastrian convert to Islam.²¹ Most of the Panchatantra is incorporated to make up about two thirds of the Arabic Kalilah wa Dimnah (Keller and Keating, Book of Count Lucanor 17), but the omissions, additions, and other modifications make for two distinct works.²² Names of some of the characters and places are revised in accordance with a new audience. Kalilah and Dimnah of the title, for example, are Arabizations of the Sanskrit names Karataka and Damanaka given to the two jackals in book 1 of the Panchatantra (Rajan xvi). Decidedly more important changes, some of which

bear upon the meaning of the work as a whole, include an added preface,²³ new stories, and additional books, or chapters.²⁴ One key change that distinguishes the Arabic Kalilah wa Dimnah from the Panchatantra is “The Trial of Dimnah,” inserted as book 2 in some versions, as book 5 in others.²⁵ In this interpolated chapter justice is served, for Dimnah, the cunning jackal, is put on trial, sentenced, and executed. The general disparity that Rajan recognizes between the Indian Panchatantra and the Arabic Kalilah wa Dimnah (probably via the Pahlavi intermediary) she attributes to “changes suited to the mores of another culture and religion” (xxiv), that of Islam (xxv).²⁶

The eighth-century Kalilah wa Dimnah was, in turn, “the parent of nearly all the European versions of the Pancatantra known generally in medieval Europe as The Fables of Bidpai” (Rajan xvi).²⁷ The collections that stem, either directly or indirectly, from this Arabic version are written in many languages: Hebrew, Latin, Greek, German, English, Italian, Armenian, French, and Spanish, among others (Rajan xvi). The first Spanish translation, Calila e Digna, was produced around 1251 under Prince Alfonso, who was soon to become Alfonso X, El Sabio.²⁸ Although Lacarra contends that the Spanish manuscript version experienced limited diffusion (“Panorama” 31), it clearly played a substantial role in the creation of an early-fourteenth-century Latin version intended for the French court (Taylor).²⁹ Furthermore, in his Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica, José Simón Díaz identifies two fifteenth-century manuscripts of the Calila, one of which contains “notas marginales de la letra atribuída a Isabel la Católica” (3.165).³⁰ Finally, Thomas Ballantine Irving credits the Spanish Calila

with assisting to no small degree in today's understanding of the confluence of Arabic and Spanish cultures, particularly the linguistic and literary influence of the former on the latter (xi).

Likely the most influential of the Western versions stemming from the Arabic Kalilah wa Dimnah was John of Capua's Latin translation titled Directorium humanae vitae. Dated sometime between 1263 and 1278,³¹ it was based on an early-thirteenth-century Hebrew version by one Rabbi Joel (Irving xi). Its widespread popularity is attested, in part, by eight extant texts, four manuscripts and four early printed editions (Taylor 183). Furthermore, the Directorium served as "the basis for nearly all Western vernacular versions of the medieval and early modern periods" (Taylor 183). Among these was an anonymous mid-fifteenth-century Spanish version, Ejemplario contra los engaños y peligros del mundo, printed some dozen times in Spain between 1493 and 1547, and at least once in Antwerp in the late sixteenth century (Lacarra, "Pervivencia" 261, 265-66; Simón Díaz 165-66).³² Such was the success of this Spanish version during the Golden Age that Lacarra lists it among those story collections that "podrían figurar en una lista de los libros de mayor éxito" ("Panorama" 37). The Ejemplario's influence reached beyond Spain as well, and was translated into Italian in 1552 by Antonio Francesco Doni as La moral philosophia (Rajan xvi). This work, in turn, was the source of another sixteenth-century translation, the first in English, by Sir Thomas North in 1570 called The Fables of Bidpai: The Morall Philosophie of Doni.³³ This list of Western descendents of the Kalilah wa Dimnah is by no means exhaustive, but it does offer an indication of the

pervasiveness of the work in medieval and Renaissance Europe and, more specifically, it helps depict the literary ambiance in Spain around the time of the publication of Lazarillo de Tormes.³⁴

BOOK OF SINDBAD (SEVEN SAGES OF ROME)

Another frame tale tradition with an obscure origin and a long and complex history of transmission is one which is generally divided into two branches: the Eastern branch referred to collectively as the Book of Sindbad, and the Western branch known under the name Seven Sages of Rome.³⁵ Morris Epstein explains that the fundamental difference between the two branches “has been ascribed to the vagaries of oral transmission. This leaves unanswered the question of where and how these oral accounts first took literary shape, and in what language” (333). Sanskrit, Pahlavi, and Greek have all been proposed as the original language of composition, but there is no consensus among scholars (Tolan 233).

The Eastern tradition is the older of the two, with the original version possibly dating to the fifth century BC (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii). The earliest extant mention of the Book of Sindbad, however, dates many centuries later.³⁶ The versions pertaining to this branch are Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, Persian, Syriac, Turkish, and Spanish. The primitive Spanish version was carried out in 1253 under Prince Fadrique, brother to King Alfonso X and Don Manuel, Don Juan Manuel’s father. Called Libro de los engaños e los asayamientos de las mugeres based on a sentence in the prologue,³⁷ this text “bears striking resemblance to its fellow Eastern versions, particularly to the Greek and Syriac versions, and in some instances to the Hebrew version” (Epstein 332). According

to Lacarra, the Libro de los engaños “supone un hito importante en los orígenes de la prosa por su fidelidad al modelo oriental. Con esta obra, y con el Calila e Dimna, aparecen en la literatura castellana una forma literaria, el marco narrativo, y unos cuentos . . . de gran popularidad en la Edad Media” (Cuento y novela corta 79-80). Despite its important position in the history of Spanish prose narrative, the work appears to have exerted little influence in Spain and throughout the rest of Europe (Lacarra, “Pervivencia” 264). The limited diffusion of the Libro de los engaños may be evidenced by its existence today in only one text, a defective fifteenth-century manuscript with sixteenth-century interlinear emendations.³⁸ The Eastern tradition nonetheless circulated in multiple variants and, in at least one fifteenth-century Spanish version, its frame structure remains nearly intact despite alterations to its plot (Lacarra, “Panorama” 36).

The Western tradition “is even more complex than the Eastern,” notes Epstein (333).

It is, however, accepted that the Seven Sages first achieved wide popularity in France and from there spread until it had appeared in almost every language of Europe. The romance first appears in the West in two forms or groups, the Dolopathos and the Seven Sages of Rome. (Epstein 333)

These groups, “two distinct, though not unrelated, Western narrative traditions,” ultimately derived from the Book of Sindbad, but precisely when and how continues to be a matter of debate.³⁹ The Dolopathos was first composed in Latin by Johannes de Alta Silva between 1184 and 1200.⁴⁰ Although its sources are not

known with certainty, among the possibilities suggested are the Book of Sindbad, the Seven Sages of Rome, “other folktale traditions, including oral ones, . . . [and] a combination of these” (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii).

The Seven Sages of Rome group predates the Dolopathos; the lost parent version is estimated between the tenth century and 1150, while the oldest extant text dates to approximately 1155.⁴¹ Among the numerous variants of the Western Seven Sages of Rome are three Spanish prose versions. The earliest of these versions, and the only medieval one, derives from the Latin Liber de septem sapientibus, “a lost, thirteenth-century prose redaction transmitted in the Scala celi” (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 137).⁴² In the fifteenth century, Diego de Cañizares translated this part of Johannes Gobiuss’s Scala celi and suitably titled his work Novella que Diego de Cañizares de latín en romance declaró y trasladó de un libro llamado Scala Çeli (Lacarra, Cuento y novela corta 80).⁴³ Another Spanish version called Libro de los siete sabios de Roma “is the most widely-represented Spanish text of the Western branch of the Seven Sages” (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 149).⁴⁴ It was printed a half dozen times or more in Spain during the sixteenth century, at least five times by mid century.⁴⁵ Lacarra comments that the Siete sabios tradition continued in chapbook versions until the eighteenth century (“Pervivencia” 261). The Historia lastimera del príncipe Erasto is a third Spanish prose version of the Western branch.⁴⁶ Translated from an Italian text by Pedro Hurtado de la Vera, pseudonym of Pedro Faría (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 154), it was printed in Antwerp in 1573 (Lacarra, “Pervivencia” 262; Simón Díaz 3.170). Although this appears to be the sole

edition of the Spanish translation of Version I, its Italian source “went through about twenty editions in the sixteenth century alone” ((Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 128), many of them dating prior to the publication of the Lazarillo in 1554.⁴⁷ Notwithstanding the access Spanish readers might have had to the Seven Sages in languages other than Spanish (some of these editions were even published in Spain), the frame tale’s success based solely on the three Spanish prose versions prompts Lacarra to consider the collection a best seller during Spain’s Golden Age (“Panorama” 37).

Yet the aforementioned references only hint at the Seven Sages of Rome’s degree of success. “It was, throughout the Middle Ages and beyond, an extremely popular work which spread into virtually all European languages” (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xi). In their introduction Hans R. Runte, J. Keith Wikeley, and Anthony J. Farrell note the proliferation of the Seven Sages of Rome, including its variants and translations:

At least forty different versions, upwards of two hundred manuscripts and nearly two hundred and fifty editions of The Seven Sages of Rome were counted by Campbell almost eighty years ago. In the light of the present bibliographical update, his estimates must be considered conservative, and his speaking of the work’s “vogue,” an understatement. (xiv)

Given that Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell published these words over twenty years ago from the present, I will surmise that these numbers may be revised upwards even more.

Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell assert that the success of the work “may be said to have been founded on a number of features distinguishing The Seven Sages of Rome from other compilations of exempla,” chief among them the frame structure (xi). The frame structure is one feature that remains relatively constant between the Eastern Book of Sindbad and the Western Seven Sages of Rome, despite the differences in their enclosed stories (Epstein 6). Epstein offers the following summary and comparison of the branches’ framing story:

The story in the East runs somewhat as follows: A king with many wives but no children is finally blessed with a refractory son who dislikes to study. He turns his son over to the sage Sindibad, who undertakes to complete the prince’s education in six months or forfeit both life and property. The terminal date approaches. Then a horoscope reading tells Sindibad that the prince’s life is in danger if he does not maintain silence for one week. The king, grief-stricken by his son’s silence, allows one of his royal wives to entreat him to speak. In the privacy of her chamber, he rejects her amorous advances. In classic fashion, she cries “rape” and the prince is sentenced to death. At this point, seven of the king’s advisers each tells one or two stories dealing with the wiles of women. The queen counters with tales warning of the evil that lies in the heart of a son.

Execution is thus delayed until the seven days are up. The prince speaks and the woman is given a sentence which varies

from version to version. In the Greek Syntipas, her head is shaven and she is led through the streets on a donkey while heralds proclaim her cunning; in the Old Spanish Libro de los Engaños she is burned in a dry cauldron; only in Mishle Sendebat is she allowed to go free, upon application of the talmudic version of the Golden Rule.

These, then, are the outlines of the Eastern form of this antifeminist romance. Generally, they apply as well to the Western form, except that there the king's son acquires his wisdom under the guidance of seven sages of Rome. (5)

In spite of disparities in the framing story such as this, the differences are minor compared to the changes that occur with the enclosed tales. In the Western Seven Sages versions, the sages tell only one tale whereas in the Eastern form they tell two or more (Epstein 6; Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii). Furthermore, the two branches have only four stories in common, known by their Latin names as canis, gaza, puteus, and inclusa (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii).⁴⁸

Through its long and convoluted transmission history, the Seven Sages of Rome suffers alterations to both the framing story and the tales.⁴⁹ Many changes, such as the names of people and places, tend to reflect a more Western and contemporary culture, as occurs during the evolution of other frame tale traditions in medieval Europe. Despite these alterations, however, key features of the frame tale persist, not the least among them the frame structure within which individual tales are enclosed. The changes, in fact, help highlight the remarkable

degree to which conventional frametale characteristics can be adapted to meet the diverse needs of various authors and their audience. Such adaptability, then, is a chief reason for the tradition's success.

DISCIPLINA CLERICALIS

Not all scholars agree that Petrus Alfonsi's twelfth-century story collection, the Disciplina clericalis, is a frametale. Cooper does not consider the Disciplina a frametale on the grounds that its frame is too tenuous and its speaker inconsistent, alternating between a dying father, a teacher and a philosopher (qtd. in Gittes 5). Gittes, however, believes that this apparent multiplicity of narrators may be the result of a language barrier: “. . . Petrus Alfonsi probably wrote his book in Arabic, then translated it into simple Latin, a language with which he may not have been all that familiar . . .” (5). Furthermore, her argument goes, Alfonsi's dying father may have also been a teacher and a philosopher (5).

While I concur with Gittes's assessment of the Disciplina as a frametale collection, I do not support her underlying speculations about Alfonsi's poor knowledge of Latin nor his use of such disparate terms to refer to the dying father who instructs his son. I recognize instead that the frame of the Disciplina is deliberately both loose and erratic. The father-son dialogue in the frame at times gives way to a teacher-pupil or philosopher-king dialogue, but this mutability does not eradicate the frame altogether. Rather its flexibility naturally accommodates any number of storyteller-listener combinations, in some ways similar to the multiple storytellers in other frametale collections such as the Panchatantra, Seven Sages, Decameron, and Canterbury Tales. It is also worthy

of mention that when excerpts of the Disciplina are reworked and incorporated into one of the eight books of the 1489 Spanish Ysopet, the variation in frame persists. The frame of the dying father and his son is retained in fable 1, which combines a number of Alfonsi's sayings with his tales of the half-friend and the whole friend (Aesop's Fables 198-202). This frame is replaced in fable 7 by "a learned man" and his son (210) and in fable 8 by a master and his disciple, which in turn boxes a tale of a fabulist and his king (211-12). In view of the many liberties that some medieval story compilers took with Alfonsi's Disciplina, at times rendering his tales nearly unrecognizable, the fact that one fifteenth-century story collection preserves several of his tales within its alternating framework justifies the flexible frame to some degree. In such a collection where the great majority of tales (mostly Aesopic) are unframed, the preservation of Alfonsi's frames suggests that the compilers and translators did not find fault with the multiplicity of narrators.

Lacarra refers to the Disciplina clericalis as "la colección más popular en toda la Edad Media que sirvió de auténtico puente entre Oriente y Occidente" ("Pervivencia" 266). In many ways Alfonsi's biographical background itself represents a blend of Eastern and Western cultures and religions.⁵⁰ A Jew in Muslim Spain, "Alfonsi had a solid (though by no means outstanding) knowledge of Hebrew, of the Bible, and of the Talmud. Alfonsi also had an Arabic education in letters, science, and philosophy" (Tolan 11). He immigrated to Aragon, where in 1106 he converted to Christianity and changed his name to Petrus Alfonsi in memory of Saint Peter and in honor of his godfather Alfonso I of Aragon, the

Battler. He later spent some time living and teaching in England and France, perhaps serving at one point as the personal physician to England's King Henry I.⁵¹ Alfonsi wrote and translated several works during his lifetime, among them Dialogi contra Iudaeos (composed between 1108 and 1110), Epistola ad peripateticos (written after 1116), and Disciplina clericalis. There is no certain date for the composition of the Disciplina, nor for the date of Alfonsi's death (Tolan 11).

The general sources for Alfonsi's Disciplina are stated in his prologue: "For this reason I have compiled this small volume, taking it in part from the parables and counsels of the philosophers, in part from the parables and counsels of the Arabs, from tales and poems, and finally, from animal- and bird-fables" (34).⁵² Alfonsi mentions some philosophers and Arabs by name, but most proverbs are associated simply with the term philosophus, which meant "wise man" or "sage" in the Middle Ages (Tolan 78).⁵³ Tolan notes that the direct sources of Alfonsi's proverbs and tales are uncertain: "The problem is . . . there are too many possible sources, each with extremely complicated manuscript traditions and histories of transmission" (79). "Nevertheless," he continues, "sources for the Disciplina can be identified with certain cycles of stories—more traditions than texts, as their contents varied greatly" (79). Of these traditions that served as both model and source for Alfonsi, Tolan identifies two that I treat in my study, the Kalila and Dimna and the Book of Sindbad (79-80). Not only does Alfonsi participate in a long tradition of wisdom literature in which the Kalila and Sindbad are significant players, but he also incorporates in his collection

individual tales that derive, directly or indirectly, from these works: tales 5 and 24 appear in the Kalila, while tales 10, 11, 13, and 14 occur in the Sindbad (Tolan 79-80, 232).

“The influence of the Disciplina Clericalis is incalculable,” assert Joseph Ramon Jones and John Esten Keller (27). Suggestive of the immense popularity that the work enjoyed in the Middle Ages is the survival of seventy-six medieval manuscripts (Tolan 74, 132). These manuscripts differ widely and thus indicate the Disciplina’s varied readership and the distinct purposes for which the collection was utilized by “countless medieval writers, moralists, lawmakers, preachers, and storytellers” (Tolan 132). Tolan summarizes:

. . . Alfonsi conceived the Disciplina clericalis as a piece of Wisdom literature, a didactic and moral text containing proverbs and fables. Many of Alfonsi’s readers, in all periods of the Middle Ages, see the text in the same light, as a pagan moral text similar to works of Seneca and Aesop. In the thirteenth century, however, preachers such as Jacques de Vitry begin to use the Disciplina’s stories in their sermons: the fables of the Disciplina become exempla, and as such they attain their greatest distribution and popularity. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, scribes and authors rewrite the stories in the Disciplina once again, emphasizing neither their didactic nor their religious uses, but delighting in them simply as tales. (132-33)

Like the Panchatantra, Kalila, and Sindbad, the Disciplina in new hands undergoes changes that tend toward the reality of the writer and his readers (Tolan 133). The names of people and places are changed to become more familiar, for example (Tolan 133, 135). Tolan notes, too, that some changes occur to tighten the work's structure (133), to lengthen and dramatize the tales, to expand description, to increase dialogue, and to unify the framing story (135). Others use his work more liberally, substantially reworking the narrative and attaching new moral lessons to his tales (Tolan 142).

Tales from the Disciplina began to circulate within collections of Aesop's fables during the fifteenth century (Tolan 138). "It is in this form," states Tolan, ". . . that the stories from the Disciplina were best known from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries" (138). One such collection is the aforementioned 1489 Spanish Ysopet. According to Keller and L. Clark Keating, this was the text from which "all the later Spanish editions came, and from this tradition all Spanish writers who mentioned Aesop or used his fables in their work drew their references" (Aesop's Fables 4). Perhaps further attesting to the diffusion of Alfonsi's tales in Spain at this time, Keith Whinnom claims, ". . . it seems probable that Aesop surpassed Marco Aurelio and rivalled Celestina" in terms of popularity in the Golden Age (194).⁵⁴ The excerpts from the Disciplina that are included in the Ysopet undoubtedly differ from Alfonsi's original text, yet some of the fundamental structural features and didactic aims endure (I discuss some of these issues in subsequent chapters). Tolan recognizes that the Disciplina's association with Aesop

shows that Alfonsi's fables continued to be read with the purposes he himself had in mind: moral instruction as well as entertainment. The grouping of the Disciplina itself (and of its French translations) in manuscripts alongside other moral works of established pagan auctores shows that the Disciplina as a moral work was an unqualified success. (138-39)

As mentioned previously, the didacticism of the Disciplina was not the only attraction of the work to medieval authors. Tolan mentions several authors that show a greater interest in the entertainment value of the tales than in the lessons they can offer (154-158). The tendency in these cases is to strip the tales of their moralizations. In at least one Latin version of the fifteenth century, the rewriting serves to lengthen and enliven the narrative with "a longer, more dramatic story, with more dialogue and a more intricate plot" (Tolan 156). The same scribe alters another tale by adding dialogue and explaining the character's motivation where in Alfonsi's text it was implicit (Tolan 156). Considering the numerous translations and adaptations of the Disciplina throughout the Middle Ages and beyond, and the multiple uses to which it was put in the works of diverse authors and storytellers, it is evident that Alfonsi's work "enjoyed a resounding and lasting success" (Tolan 72).

CONDE LUCANOR

One of the authors on whom the Disciplina clericalis appears to bear a remarkable influence is Don Juan Manuel (1282-1348).⁵⁵ Born to Doña Beatriz of Savoy and the Infante Don Manuel, Juan Manuel was, consequently, the grandson

of Fernando III, El Santo, nephew of Alfonso X, El Sabio, and cousin of Sancho IV, El Bravo.⁵⁶ Juan Manuel was highly educated and trained in matters of politics, military, law, hunting, religion, and, not least of all, letters. According to Keller and Keating, “No Spaniard of his times surpassed him as scholar, thinker, and writer. Few read more widely or studied in as many diverse areas, no layman delved as deeply into philosophy and religion; and no one, layman or cleric, wrote more copiously” (Book of Count Lucanor 1). Among Juan Manuel’s vast literary production are a number of didactic texts, such as the Libro del cavallero y del escudero (mid 1320s), the Libro de los estados, also known as the Libro del Infante (early 1330s), and the Libro infinido, also called the Libro de castigos et de consejos (mid 1330s) (Sturcken 58-61).⁵⁷

The work of Juan Manuel that concerns my present study is his masterpiece, the one “that has been the basis for his literary reputation” (Sturcken 65). The Conde Lucanor, completed in 1335, is described by Lacarra as “la cristalización perfecta de la suma de tradiciones didácticas y narrativas que venían difundándose desde siglos anteriores” (Cuentos de la Edad Media 66). It follows in the footsteps of other medieval story collections in which tales are “structurally linked in fictional frames” (Sturcken 64).⁵⁸ Narrated by Juan Manuel, the Conde Lucanor’s framing story consists of a dialogue between the nobleman Count Lucanor, who solicits advice or consolation concerning a specific difficulty that he is experiencing, and his counselor Patronio, who responds. First Patronio tells his master a tale that illustrates his advice or opinion. Upon concluding the story, Patronio addresses the count’s specific concern either by advising him on his

particular predicament, or by consoling him in his current despondency. The narrator then indicates that Count Lucanor understood Patronio's advice to be good, did as his counselor advised, and was thus able to resolve his difficulty to his benefit. The reader is then told that because Juan Manuel recognized the story as good, he included it in his work and composed a simple aphoristic verse to sum up and conclude the illustration.

Although Juan Manuel lends much originality to the frame and to the individual tales in his collection, the author also relies heavily on tradition. In their introduction to The Book of Count Lucanor and Patronio, Keller and Keating examine similarities between the Conde Lucanor and several frametale collections, beginning with the Disciplina clericalis:

Don Juan Manuel seems to have been an assiduous reader of the Disciplina, since he used some of its better-known tales in the composition of his own exemplos. Indeed, quite probably he developed the format of presentation in his Conde Lucanor from that used by Pedro Alfonso in his work. (15)

Keller and Keating further suggest, "Calila e Digna also served Don Juan Manuel well as he assembled his tales" (17). Since its translation from an Arabic version was sponsored by his uncle, Alfonso X, they reason that Juan Manuel would have had access to it in the royal library (17). Yet they do not discount the possibility of his having used an Arabic version "since it is likely that he could read Arabic" or have someone read it to him in translation (17). Keller and Keating maintain

that specifically the chapters recounting the story of the jackals Calila and Digna supplied Juan Manuel with tales for his collection (19).

In Cuentos de la Edad Media, Lacarra supports the notion that Juan Manuel could have been familiar with Eastern story collections, judging from the prologue of the Libro de la caza (67):

Et por que don Iohan, su sobrino, fijo del infante don Manuel, hermano del rey don Alfonso, se paga mucho de leer en los libros que falla que conpuso el dicho rey, fizo escriuir algunas cosas que entendia que cunplia para el de los libros que fallo que el dicho rey abia conpuesto. . . . (520)

Lacarra nonetheless maintains that there is little evidence of a close relation between the Conde Lucanor and Alfonso's translation of the Calila, although she does not discount the possible influence of oral or written intermediary versions (67). Yet elsewhere Juan Manuel is understood to take considerable liberties in adapting his sources to suit his purposes. Even Lacarra recognizes this process with respect to the author's use of his Western sources in constructing the Conde Lucanor: ". . . no se limita a copiar ni traducir, sino que recrea libremente . . ." (Cuentos de la Edad Media 67). Might the perceived distance between the Conde Lucanor and its Eastern influences, including the Calila, be due to Juan Manuel's artistic license and originality as well?

Keller and Keating rightly remind us of the limits and challenges of identifying literary influences: "It is always difficult to ascertain the exact sources of medieval stories" (Book of Count Lucanor 28). H. Tracy Sturcken advises that

some stories circulated in various Latin and vernacular collections and were “so well known throughout Europe that many should be considered traditional, popular motifs” (65). The oral tradition is another possible source of the tales included in Juan Manuel’s collection. Keller and Keating recognize the close ties that the Infante maintained with the Dominican order and assert, “No order was more assiduous in the use of exempla, and none was more ubiquitous” (Book of Count Lucanor 29).⁵⁹ Contact through extensive travel was a likely vehicle for the exchange of tales, not only among the Dominicans, but also at court (Keller and Keating, Book of Count Lucanor 29).

The popularity of the Conde Lucanor during the Middle Ages may be judged in part by its manuscript copies, which, according to Daniel Devoto, “. . . parecen haber sido abundantes . . .” (292). Giménez Soler recalls that Queen María requested a copy of the Conde Lucanor from Fernán López de Stúñiga, while Gayangos indicates that a copy is listed among Queen Isabel’s possessions (qtd. in Devoto 292). The circulation of the Conde Lucanor was not restricted to the secular elite, however, as indicated by Albert A. Sicroff’s analysis of records from the 1485 Hieronymite inquisition of the Monastery of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe. According to Sicroff, “. . . the Old Christians of Guadalupe . . . complained about Converso monks who read such books as the works of Boccaccio, the Libro de la disputación del judío and, peculiarly, El conde Lucanor” (104).

Manuscripts of the Conde Lucanor reached the hands of sixteenth-century readers and writers as well, including one “enterprising antiquarian,” Gonzalo

Argote de Molina (Sturcken 65). Admittedly working from three manuscripts, his own copy defective, Argote reconstructed the text and published the editio princeps of the Conde Lucanor in Seville in 1575.⁶⁰ Justifying his publication, Argote claims, “. . . juzgaba ser cosa indigna que un príncipe tan discreto y cortesano y de la mejor lengua de aquel tiempo anduviese en tan pocas manos” (qtd. in Devoto 299). Argote’s sense of duty in making a worthy piece of literature accessible to a greater public must have been coupled with the impression that there would be a favorable market for such a work, as indeed there was. The tremendous popularity of the Conde Lucanor during the Golden Age is attributable to Argote’s edition and its influence is detectable in the works of prominent writers such as Lope de Vega, Cervantes, Calderón, Ruiz de Alarcón, Tirso de Molina, and Gracián (Lacarra, Cuento y novela corta 167; Devoto 294, 299). Juan Manuel’s impact is manifest in the Arte de ingenio, Tratado de la agudeza, for example, where “Gracián retoma, casi literalmente o reescribiéndolos, cuatro ejemplos de El Conde Lucanor . . . a más de los juicios elogiosos que repite reiteradamente, como lo hará en El Criticón” (Devoto 301-02). Attesting to the continued popularity of the Conde Lucanor during the seventeenth century is a 1642 reprinting of the Argote edition in Madrid (Sturcken 65; Devoto 301).

Despite “the numbers of manuscripts [of the Conde Lucanor] which we may surmise were copied in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries” (Sturcken 65), the collection exists today in only five manuscript versions, one estimated from the end of the fourteenth century, three from the fifteenth, and one from the

sixteenth.⁶¹ The manuscripts that were meticulously reviewed by Juan Manuel himself and placed at the monastery of Peñafiel for safekeeping have been lost, as have an undetermined number of others.

LIBRO DE BUEN AMOR

A Spanish contemporary of Don Juan Manuel was an author by the name of Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita (a small town near Alcalá de Henares). Extant manuscripts indicate that in 1330 Juan Ruiz first composed his masterpiece collection called Libro de buen amor (Willis xxiv).⁶² Aside from his name, his ecclesiastical position, and his living during the first half of the fourteenth century, Juan Ruiz's biographical data is entirely obscure.⁶³ Nonetheless, from his literary creation can be gleaned a good deal about the author's personality, religious and worldly concerns, artistry, literary background, and genius. Raymond S. Willis eloquently details what the work communicates about the artist:

His poetry reveals the temper of his mind: his love of life and of love itself; his hatred of sin and death; his enormous store of information; his gaiety; his sincere devotion to Jesus and Mary; his sharp perception of nature—the sting of frost, or the color of a partridge's feet; his delight in music; his enjoyment of bright colors and distinctive forms; his fascination with the contours, sounds, and meanings of words; his mischievous wit and unsmirking enjoyment of vulgarity; his little vanities, like his

satisfaction in having a small foot; and his authentic pride in his talents as poet and musician. (lii)

No less complex than the Archpriest himself is his Libro de buen amor. In her book The Status of the Reading Subject in the Libro de buen amor, Marina S. Brownlee assesses several critical investigations that each propose a distinct generic tradition to which the collection belongs (111-21). While Brownlee sees that many scholars have concentrated on assigning the Archpriest's work to a single genre (the anthology, or miscellany, the Arabic risala, or the Hispano-Hebraic maqamat, for example), she believes that, taken independently, their views offer only partial explanations and "are insufficient indications of the work's protean nature" (114). She concludes instead that the Archpriest exploits "a whole storehouse of generic traditions or frames of reference" (115), an assessment with which I concur.

Although Brownlee does not explicitly identify the *frametale* as part of the "generic compendium" that makes up Juan Ruiz's work (116), she does highlight the importance that many scholars place on the autobiographical framework of the collection (111-14). Lida de Malkiel, for example, argues that with regard to structure, the most important element of the Libro de buen amor is the autobiographical novel, which she describes as ". . . a novel in autobiographical form, repeatedly interrupted, which serves as a frame-story for . . . a series of tales and fables . . ." (Two Spanish Masterpieces 18).⁶⁴ The main framework consists of a succession of amorous episodes or affairs, or, as Willis states, ". . . erotic adventures that illustrate love in the literature and life of the period" (xxviii-

xxix).⁶⁵ While the autobiographical frame is not a consistent feature of the medieval frametale genre, several important frametale collections are indeed framed by a first-person narrative, specifically one that reads as the voice of the author himself.⁶⁶ For this reason, and because several of the autobiographical episodes depict an argument or debate in which illustrative tales are framed, I include the Libro de buen amor in my present study of the medieval frametale tradition.

Juan Ruiz, who makes use of copious sources, “delights in exhibiting his reading” (Lida de Malkiel, Two Spanish Masterpieces 8). In the first hundred stanzas alone Deyermond finds “nine references to sources or authorities, sometimes vague (‘los antiguos astrólogos,’ ‘el sabio’), more often precise (Aristotle, Cato, Ysopet, Plato, Ptolemy, Solomon)” (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 115). Scholars have examined the Archpriest’s treatment of numerous literary traditions, many of which he subjects to parody: courtly love, the Latin elegiac comedy, the diviso intra (“learned sermon”), the serranilla, or pastorela, the fabliau, and the popular tale, to name only a few.⁶⁷ Willis warns, however, that while the Libro de buen amor may rely on various traditions, Juan Ruiz’s work is unique in its own right, bearing “in every word and phrase the unmistakable imprint of the Archpriest’s artistic originality” (xlix).

References to the Libro de buen amor or its author span centuries and cross linguistic borders.⁶⁸ Deyermond proposes that the collection “must have been widely read in the first hundred years of its existence” (Literary History 115). Three extant manuscripts written “some decades later” than the original

composition and its revision (Deyermond, Literary History 133), offer some indication of the early popularity of the collection.⁶⁹ Willis claims that none of these manuscripts “is a text penned by the Archpriest himself, or even a copy of his autograph text, but at best a copy of a copy” (xxii). While Willis laments the alterations to the Archpriest’s text as it passes through the hands of scribe upon scribe (xxii), the copies they produced at least imply a notable dissemination of the work at an early stage in its transmission history.

Further indications of the collection’s early diffusion and influence are found in other languages. Evidence suggests that Chaucer, for example, may have known and been influenced by the Libro de buen amor (Garbáty 457-70).⁷⁰ Additionally, an extant late-fourteenth-century manuscript contains a portion of the Archpriest’s work translated into Portuguese (Moffatt 36; Simón Díaz 3.226). Lucius G. Moffatt believes that this manuscript derived from an even earlier translation dating to about 1370, and observes that neither of these is the work cited in the 1438 inventory of Portuguese King Duarte’s library (36).

A pair of the earliest allusions to the Libro de buen amor may be found in the fifteenth-century Cancionero de Baena. The Baena represents the work of two generations of poets, the first of which includes Pero Ferruz. Deyermond argues that Ferruz’s possible reference to Juan Ruiz’s first serranilla is most significant in that “it seems to provide that in the late fourteenth century LBA was so well known that Ferruz could rely on his readers to see the point without any need to mention the book or author by name” (“Early Allusions” 321). Of the second generation of poets contained in the Baena, Ferrán Manuel de Lando recalls the

fabliau “Pitas Payas,” which he likely knew in the Libro de buen amor version (Moffatt 38; Deyermond, “Early Allusions” 318-19).

Numerous citations of or references to the Libro de buen amor substantiate its vogue throughout the fifteenth century. Fragments of Juan Ruiz’s masterpiece written by a fifteenth-century hand were discovered by Menéndez Pidal on a fourteenth-century manuscript of the Crónicas Generales (Moffatt 37). Although purported by some scholars to be the repertoire of a juglar cazarro, they have also been explained as a sermon notebook or a florilegium.⁷¹ In either case, the fragments indicate that “the Libro de Buen Amor was known and cited in the first half of the fifteenth century” (Deyermond, “Juglar’s Repertoire” 227). Furthermore, Moffatt claims that Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, Archpriest of Talavera, demonstrates in El Corbacho (1438) “an intimate knowledge” of the Libro de buen amor, referring to the Archpriest by name on two occasions and citing part of his text “almost verbatim” (38). Shortly thereafter, in a letter to the Constable of Portugal written sometime between 1445 and 1449, the Marqués de Santillana mentions “el libro del Archypreste de Hita” (qtd. in Moffatt 39).⁷² Moreover, in two different studies, Samuel G. Armistead identifies three connections between the Libro de buen amor and the 1476 Libro de las bienandanzas e fortunas by Vizcayan nobleman García de Salazar.⁷³ A further link is a reference to a collection titled Arcipreste de Yta, as listed in the library inventory of Pero Sánchez Muñoz, who died in 1483 (Deyermond, “Early Allusions” 317).⁷⁴ Additional allusions to Juan Ruiz’s work (specifically stanzas 553 and 1450) occur as glosses in an ars poetica that dates probably between 1462

and 1508, most likely to the latter part of the estimated range (Faulhaber 31-33).⁷⁵ As these glosses from a vernacular work are used to illuminate a Latin text, “a novelty for the time and place,” Charles B. Faulhaber recognizes their value in terms of “the light they throw upon late medieval literary interests and scholarship” (33-34).

At least two sixteenth-century allusions to the work of Juan Ruiz have been identified. In his Miscellanea, the Toledan humanist Álvarez Gómez de Castro (1515-80) “quotes fairly accurately thirty lines from the Libro de Buen Amor interspersed among stanzas 766-829” (Moffatt 39).⁷⁶ Secondly, Argote de Molina is known to have possessed in his library a manuscript copy of the “Cancionero del Arcipreste, de canciones antiquísimas de tiempo del Rey Don Alonso XI” (qtd. in Millares Carlo 145).⁷⁷ Moffatt suspects that this manuscript is Argote’s source of “the jumbled verses from a serrana of the Archpriest” that he copies in his Elogios and erroneously identifies with a thirteenth-century minstrel (40).⁷⁸

Based on some of these and other references to the Libro de buen amor and its author, Armistead concludes, “. . . Juan Ruiz enjoyed a sizable readership at least from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century” (“Two Further Citations” 76). Moffatt, however, is less optimistic about the extent of the work’s transmission and argues, “After the time of the Marqués de Santillana the Archpriest becomes only a name, and the writers who mention him by chance know nothing of him or his work” (43). Lida de Malkiel conveys a similar skepticism concerning the work’s later popularity when she states that the Golden Age is “a century in which Juan Ruiz was totally unknown” (Two Spanish

Masterpieces 19). Judging the available evidence, I suspect that the popularity of the Libro de buen amor during the sixteenth century lies much closer to the suggestions offered by Moffatt and Lida de Malkiel than to that made by Armistead.⁷⁹

I must reiterate, however, that my aim is not to argue a direct link between any specific frametale collection and the Lazarillo. I regard the Libro de buen amor as an integral player in the frametale tradition, whose possible influences on the first picaresque novel may have been circuitous, and even anonymous, but no less important. Indeed I am heartened by studies that point to significant similarities between the Libro de buen amor and the picaresque genre without claiming the former was a direct model for any specific novel. In Romances of Roguery, for example, Frank Wadleigh Chandler notes that Juan Ruiz “was the first Spanish ancestor of picaresque fiction” (184). He explains: “In parody and burlesque he found his element, and the same confused formlessness, ironic observation, and love of autobiography that marked his verses reappeared in prose in the romances of roguery” (184). Furthermore, despite Lida de Malkiel’s assertion that the Libro de buen amor was unknown at the time, I am encouraged by her claim: “If it invites comparison with something, it is with the Spanish novel of the Golden Age . . . the picaresque novel and Don Quijote . . .” (Two Spanish Masterpieces 19). I intend to draw some of these comparisons in subsequent chapters.

DECAMERON

One of the most widely read and influential medieval framed tale collections is the Decameron, composed by Giovanni Boccaccio around 1350 (McWilliam xlii-xliii, liv).⁸⁰ Boccaccio, who would become a preeminent scholar and author of numerous Latin and vernacular texts in both prose and verse, initially followed in the footsteps of his father and was apprenticed in banking, “for which he had no natural inclination whatsoever” (xxxiii). He later studied canon law in the thriving intellectual and cultural center of Naples, and although Boccaccio would eventually quit this career path as well, “it enabled him not only to begin assembling the vast store of erudition that underpins all of his literary work, but also to establish influential contacts in the fields of scholarship and culture in general” (xxxiii). During his sojourn in Naples, Boccaccio wrote several influential works including Filostrato, Filocolo, and Teseida (xxxv).⁸¹

Boccaccio returned to Florence sometime between 1340 and 1341, where he composed the Elegy of Madonna Fiammetta and the Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine, known commonly for its protagonist as the Ameto (xxxviii-xxxix). Boccaccio may have been living elsewhere when the plague of 1348 afflicted Florence, killing perhaps as much as three fourths of the city’s population (xliii-xliv). Although Boccaccio claims in his Decameron to have witnessed personally the abominable effects of the plague on Florence, G. H. McWilliam warns, “His description of the plague is heavily dependent on literary antecedents . . . and there is no external evidence to support Boccaccio’s contention . . .” (xliv). Boccaccio himself admits in another work that he was not in Florence at this time

(xxxvii). Nonetheless, it is known that he suffered the loss of numerous friends, acquaintances, and family as a result of the catastrophic pestilence that he depicts shortly thereafter in his introduction to the first day of the Decameron (xliv). McWilliam observes, “In all probability, Boccaccio gave definitive shape to the Decameron between the years 1349 and 1352,” even though “the idea of assembling a collection of stories had probably rooted itself in his mind long before the year of the great plague . . .” and some of his tales had appeared in previous works (xlii-xliii).

McWilliam recognizes a distinct phase in Boccaccio’s life from 1350 (the year in which he met and befriended Francesco Petrarch) until his death in 1375. This time is marked by “a steadily increasing involvement in humanistic culture combined with the growth of the reputation for diplomacy and eloquence he had already achieved among his Florentine fellow citizens” (xliv). During this period, Boccaccio undertook a number of important diplomatic missions for Florence that carried him to Romagna, Avignon, and Padua, among other destinations (xlvi). Despite Boccaccio’s involvement in such affairs, his literary production did not wane. Instead, many of his most important works were begun, completed or revised during this time. Two Latin works from this period that became popular throughout Europe in the following two centuries were De casibus virorum illustrium and De mulieribus claris (l). Additionally, sometime between 1355 and 1365 Boccaccio finished the Corbaccio, a work “which documents in the most convincing fashion Boccaccio’s conversion to the kind of literary asceticism to which he became increasingly committed after his encounter with Petrarch”

(xlvii- xlviii). The Genealogia deorum gentilium, “which was to become a standard work of reference on classical mythology for the next 500 years,” was begun before 1350 but not finished until about 1360 (xlv). Like many other of Boccaccio’s works, it underwent multiple revisions until late in the author’s life, some of which took place in 1375, the year of his death (xlv, li, liii). Boccaccio’s careful revision of the Decameron was carried out sometime between 1370 and 1371 (liv).

Among the numerous literary precursors of Boccaccio’s Decameron, story collections most be noted among the foremost. Some of the author’s narrative material derives from tales contained in unframed or simply framed collections such as the Disciplina clericalis, the anonymous late-thirteenth-century Novellino, compilations of fabliaux, and exemplum collections (McWilliam lviii; Cooper, “The Frame” 4).⁸² McWilliam argues, “From a structural viewpoint, however, the most obvious of the Decameron’s antecedents were the collections of stories that had originated in the East during the early Middle Ages and were circulating, in translation, throughout western Europe in Boccaccio’s own lifetime” (lviii-lix). The Panchatantra, which McWilliam speculates that Boccaccio knew through a Latin version of the Kalila and Dimna, is similar to the Decameron in terms of its structural complexity as a framing story that contains other tales, which may in turn box other tales (lix). Yet there are thematic affinities between the Kalila and the Decameron as well considering “the prominence accorded to the role of intelligence in the Decameron” and the lesson in the Kalila “that guile and cunning are essential in the management of human affairs” (lix). The parallels

that McWilliam judges between the Decameron and the Seven Sages are likewise structural and thematic. Both collect stories that are set within a framing story, and both, like the Panchatantra and Kalila, stress the importance of wisdom (lx). McWilliam cautions, however, that these and other literary precedents should not lead Boccaccio's readers to underestimate the author's own contribution to the work's structural plan: "But no amount of source hunting can obscure the fact that the frame of the Decameron is a unique and original creation, the product of a fertile and imaginative intellect which had already supplied the impetus for several of the more important genres of western literature" (lxi).

The frame of the Decameron tells the story of a party of ten Florentines who, together with seven servants, escape their plague-afflicted city and spend fourteen days in three countryside estates entertaining one another with story, song, and dance. The storytelling occurs over a period of ten days, not successive, with each of the ten storytellers narrating one tale on each of those days. The storytellers also take turns presiding over the storytelling, each acting as king or queen for a day. Their leadership entails dictating the theme or topic of the ten tales to be told on their day of reign. Boccaccio, however, presides over the collection as a whole for he is the principal narrator. In the prologue, he states, ". . . intendo de raccontare cento novelle, o favole o parabole o istorie che dire le vogliamo. . . . Nelle quali novelle piacevoli e aspri casi d'amore e altri fortunati avvenimenti si vederanno così ne' moderni tempi avvenuti come negli antichi . . ." (4-5) ("I shall narrate a hundred stories or fables or parables or histories or whatever you choose to call them. . . . In these tales will be found a

variety of love adventures, bitter as well as pleasing, and other exciting incidents, which took place in both ancient and modern times”; 3).

The Decameron’s diffusion throughout Europe began early and extended widely. David Wallace states that by 1373 the collection “already enjoyed immense popularity and was moving around the European trade routes with the merchant classes who figure so prominently in its pages” (108-09). Vernacular translations expanded the collection’s reception in countries such as Spain, where the earliest extant manuscript in Catalan dates to 1429, and that in Castilian to the middle of the fifteenth century.⁸³ Printed Spanish editions of Boccaccio’s *frametales* appear to have been no less significant, as suggested by Giulio Massano in his article “Influence italiane sulla genesi e struttura del romanzo picaresco spagnolo:”

Dalla fine del 1400 le traduzioni spagnole di collezioni di novelle italiane si susseguono a ritmo notevole, specialmente se si considerano i metodi primitivi della stampa dell’epoca. . . . Il Decameron fu tradotto per la prima volta anonimamente nel 1492; traduzioni posteriori apparirono a Siviglia nel 1496, a Toledo nel 1524 e a Valladolid nel 1550. (84)

To this enumeration of printed Spanish translations of the Decameron, Massano adds the publication of Boccaccio’s works in Medina del Campo by a family of Genoese publishers (84).⁸⁴ This is a remarkably successful run for a work before it was prohibited by the Inquisition in 1559,⁸⁵ yet still the figures fail to offer a complete representation of Boccaccio’s readership in Spain. The popularity of the

Decameron and other Italian story collections was greater than the sheer number of translations indicates “per il fatto che i lettori spagnoli conoscevano sufficientemente l’italiano per leggerne le opere nell’originale” (Massano 84). John J. Reynolds confirms that in sixteenth-century Spain the Italian novellieri were “widely read, in translation or in the original” (12). He states that among the most influential of the novellieri in Spain was Boccaccio (12).

The influence that Boccaccio’s Decameron exerted on renaissance and baroque Spanish literature was great, not only on collections of short stories, or novelas, but on other forms of literature as well. In “The Decameron in Spain,” Robert E. Bayliss asserts, “. . . it is difficult to imagine what would have become of Golden Age Spain’s great literary traditions, especially the picaresque novel and the comedia, and its great prose masterpiece, Don Quixote, had the Decameron never been known in Spain” (134). In further consideration of the picaresque novel, Bayliss states,

The contribution made by Boccaccio in paving the way for this genre is tremendous. . . . The realism recognized in the picaresque is unimaginable without Boccaccio’s own naturalism preceding it. The emphasis on psychological motivations and the view of the world offered—a total departure from that of romance—can easily be discussed as an amplification of these same traits in Boccaccian short fiction. (137-38)

Bayliss observes that the tales of “trickery and roguery” in the Decameron are particularly illustrative of the “nonidealized perspective” from which Boccaccio

portrays human behavior (134). To this “nonidealized” treatment, also referred to in this article as “naturalism” (138) and “protorealism” (134), Bayliss finds the picaresque novel heavily indebted (134).

The theme of roguery has long been suggested, and disputed, as a link between Italian novella collections and the picaresque novel. Chandler addresses this issue in Romances of Roguery, where he states,

In the early stages of the rogue romance attention was bound to be focussed [sic] less upon the doer than upon the thing done; the deeds proper to a rogue therefore filled the foreground. Such deeds are cheats, tricks, and frauds; and from time immemorial lists of these had existed as a part of the stock of popular story. Specific examples were presented in great numbers by fabliaux and Italian novelle, in which a particular style of anecdote dealt exclusively with the tricks played by one person upon another. . . . Massuccio, Straparola, Sacchetti, and Cinthio furnished sharpening incidents later incorporated in the romances of roguery, and the series of cheats suffered by Calandrino at the hands of his brother artists, Nello, Bruno, and Buffalmacco, in the eighth and ninth days of the Decameron, were essentially picaresque in kind. Moreover, aside from mere tricks, the novelle gave to the Spanish novel and its successors a host of gallant ruses and of tragic situations. (6-7)

Although his study centers chiefly on the theme of roguery, Chandler additionally notes that the novella and the picaresque novel similarly depict, not the “imaginary free world” of the romance of chivalry and the pastoral, but the real world, “that actually about” (17-18). Due to the renaissance appreciation of “the matter of everyday experience,” the novella observed “life in its simplest realities” (18). Chandler argues that the novella was at the beginning of this process of recognizing the quotidian as a worthwhile subject for the artist. Yet this genre did not, he observes, carry out the process, rather it left this role to subsequent literary forms: “Pointing the line of development that should succeed, it might not itself follow along that way because of mediæval limitations” (18). He identifies the picaresque novel as one genre that came to reinforce the novella in this endeavor (17-18).

In “Boccaccio and the Picaresque Tradition,” Joseph V. Rikapito engages in the debate concerning “the influence of the Decameron and other works in the frame novel tradition” on the picaresque genre (309).⁸⁶ Like his predecessor Chandler, Rikapito addresses the question with an emphasis on the theme of roguery. Whereas in a separate study he focuses on a specific influence between a novella and a picaresque novel,⁸⁷ here his approach is defined in broader terms:

. . . I shall speak of the Decameron as a general presence and influence whose substance could easily lend itself to possible imitations and extensions. I shall review specific stories or cycles of stories of the Decameron for their identification with those

aspects of the picaresque figure, the pícaro or the pícarra, and those adventures which occur within picaresque novels. (310)

He proceeds to highlight certain picaresque traits of both the characters and the episodes of the Decameron that occur in various picaresque novels. These traits include “the tendency of the picaresque anti-hero to revel in adventures which are used defensively and offensively by the pícaro or the pícarra as well as situations which involve a negative point of view or a negative view of human behaviour” (310-11).

Some of these coincidences between the Decameron and the picaresque tradition Ricapito draws with specific reference to the Lazarillo (314-15, 317, 319, 327). Boccaccio’s seventh tale of the second day, for example, illustrates a significant connection, as Ricapito explains:

The daughter of the Sultan of Babylon is given to the king of the Algarve as a virtuous maiden after the daughter is kidnapped and has had numerous experiences with many men in the course of four years. What stands out in this episode is not the deception of passing off a worldly woman as a virtuous maiden but rather the duplicity behind it, which, to judge from the story, has no negative stigma attached to it. Boccaccio would have us believe what later picaresque writers revel in: the end—marrying off the daughter well—justifies the means. In a parody of this motif, Lazarillo will marry the mistress of the Archpriest knowing all the while that she

has been and still is the Archpriest's companion; yet the young opportunistic rogue chooses to live the lie of her virtue. (314-15)

Through sketching connections such as this between the Decameron and the picaresque novel, Ricapito is lead to conclude,

In short, Boccaccio in his Decameron has set essentially an important model for picaresque heroes and adventures yet to come. It is difficult for me to see how this work, so imposing in its understanding of all aspects of deception, cunning and guile—the keynotes of the picaresque genre—was not present in the minds of the various authors of Spanish picaresque novels. (326)

Although the previously reviewed studies by Bayliss, Chandler, and Ricapito are relevant to my own work, our approaches are grounded on distinct terms and project a different focus. Firstly, underpinning each of these studies is a conception of the Decameron that is narrower than my view of the work as it pertains to, and helps define, the frametale tradition. Bayliss's article, for example, focuses specifically on the influence that the Decameron, as an individual work and not as part of a generic tradition, had on Spanish Golden Age letters. Ricapito's study is only somewhat broader in context, for Boccaccio's work is introduced as one Italian "frame novel" among others that have influenced the picaresque genre (309). Nonetheless, his focus shifts quickly to the Decameron in particular and remains there throughout his study. On the whole, Chandler, too, considers the Decameron's impact on the picaresque in light of its being an Italian novella collection (7).⁸⁸ Yet the realism and roguery that these

scholars recognize as a matter of influence on the picaresque novel are unique neither to the Decameron, specifically, nor to the Italian novella tradition in general. Both features are also key characteristics of the larger frametale tradition to which the Decameron and other framed novella collections belong. Tales of rogues and roguery fill the pages of frametale collections, and, as Gittes notes, realism is “a consistent feature of the frame narrative” (87). It is worthy of mention that Ricapito does recognize in a footnote that roguery can be found in other works besides the Decameron, and that he cites, significantly, another frametale to illustrate his point: “It would be rash to assert that only Boccaccio is at the source of the picaresque. The Spanish literary tradition could have easily turned to one of the most fecond [sic] sources for a great deal of later literature. I refer to don Juan Manuel’s El Conde Lucanor” (326).⁸⁹ Yet despite Ricapito’s reference to two frametales with respect to roguery, he does not tie this feature explicitly to the frametale tradition.

While realism and roguery are, in themselves, beyond the scope of my immediate concerns,⁹⁰ they are indeed integral features of the frametale, and thus any study that centers on these topics as a point of contact between frametale collections and the picaresque novel, or, more specifically, Lazarillo de Tormes, should be viewed as complementary to the mission of my own project. My aim focuses instead on structural and organizational features (whether in common or in contrast) between the two, an issue which is either negated or merely implied in the aforementioned studies. Chandler states, for example, “In form, the romance of roguery was a retrogression and a rebeginning. The story for the story’s sake

had already reached a highly organized form from centuries of cultivation; but the new fiction disregarded the tradition of its predecessors . . .” (16). Bayliss also negates a structural and organizational association between the genres. Concerning Boccaccio’s Decameron, he asserts, “. . . with Lazarillo de Tormes, the influence is not to be found in formal or structural characteristics” (138). Ricapito, however, hints at such a connection: “. . . the Lazarillo utilized a structure that recalls that of the novella” (327). Unfortunately, he does not elaborate on this idea. I intend to do so in the following chapters within the context of the frametale tradition.

CANTERBURY TALES

Boccaccio’s literary influence has been noted in the work of his English contemporary Geoffrey Chaucer, who, like Boccaccio, had a notable civil career as well as a fruitful literary one.⁹¹ Born between 1340 and 1345 to John Chaucer, a prosperous vintner or wine merchant, and Agnes de Copton, wealthy in her own right, Chaucer began to run in influential circles from an early age (Wright xii-xiii). By 1357 he was a page in the household of Elizabeth, wife of King Edward III’s son Lionel (Wright xii). Around 1366 he married Philippa de Roet, whom David Wright says “made her own career, and seems to have become a person of some consequence,” first as lady-in-waiting to Edward III’s wife Queen Philippa of Hainault, and, upon the queen’s death in 1368, to Constance of Castile, second wife of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster and son of Edward III (xiv). Chaucer, as “an eminent civil servant, diplomat, administrator, Justice of the Peace, and Member of Parliament” (Wright xii), was involved in numerous affairs at home

and abroad. His foreign missions lead him to Spain, France, and Italy (Wright xiv, xxvi). Chaucer's public service should not be considered at odds with his career as a scholar and a poet, however, since these various life experiences exposed him to diverse people and new literature that would come to enrich his literary works (Wright xviii-xix).

According to Wright, Chaucer "was a man of exceptionally wide reading, not only by the standards of his times: he read and spoke French and Italian as well as Latin, was expert in astronomy, and had more than a smattering of physics, history, theology, philosophy, medicine, law, and even alchemy" (Wright xix). Although books were rare and expensive, Chaucer owned sixty (Wright xv). Innovative in his use of the vernacular and of French versification in his poetry, Chaucer "invented that staple of English poetry, the rhyming pentameter or heroic couplet," which would become "the ideal vehicle, not only for either rhetoric or the plain style, but narration, description, and conveying the rhythms of ordinary talk" (Wright xv-xvi). This versification forms the basis of his Canterbury Tales.⁹²

The sources and analogues of the stories in the Canterbury Tales are numerous and various (Correale). Tales have been linked to classical, patristic, and medieval sources, and although Chaucer's immediate sources for several of his tales remain uncertain, close analogues offer an idea of the material with which Chaucer may have been familiar when he created his collection (Correale vii). The Decameron (Cooper, "The Frame" 9-10) and the Conde Lucanor

(Serrano Reyes) are among the medieval frametales that have been identified as having analogous tales.

Possible sources and analogues for the literary framework of the Canterbury Tales are likewise copious and diverse (Gittes; Cooper, "The Frame"). In "The Frame," in which Cooper surveys generic analogues to Chaucer's frametale, she reviews story collections such as the anonymous Novellino (4), Alfonsi's Disciplina clericalis (4-5), Gower's Confessio amantis (5), Boccaccio's Ameto and Filocolo (5-6), the Seven Sages of Rome (6), the Thousand and One Nights (6), the Kalila and Dimna (6), and Ovid's Metamorphoses (7). Although she finds various similarities between the Canterbury Tales and these and other story collections, Cooper claims, "Very few works offer any detailed resemblance . . ." (8). Among those that do, she contends, ". . . the Decameron is by far the closest, to the point where deliberate imitation, not coincidence, becomes the only plausible explanation" (8). This does not necessarily imply that Chaucer wrote his collection with a copy of Boccaccio's work in front of him (8). Instead, Cooper argues, ". . . the closest parallels show the kind of creative reinvention that would more plausibly come from thinking about Boccaccian ideas than from reworking his precise words" (9).

Among the most striking parallels between the two works, Cooper identifies the following: storytelling in the frame that occurs as a pastime among multiple narrators (whom are depicted with an air of authenticity) who meet by chance and who "agree to spend time together . . . and to tell stories under the direction of a master of ceremonies" (9); "a high proportion of parallel stories,"

whether Boccaccio's served as an immediate source for, or were merely analogous to, Chaucer's tales (9); the function of the author within the work, or, more specifically, that "in both works, the authors use their presence to offer the same justifications for writing, the same excuses for their stories not all being moral, the same transferring of ethical responsibility to their audience or readers, and similar discussions of the relation of word to meaning" (11); an emphasis on diversity with respect to both the storytellers (notably, the variety of audience reactions to the tales they hear) and their tales (especially the mixture of styles) (11-12); and the use of certain linking devices to connect diverse tales to each other and to tie them to the frame (12-13). In her comparison of the Canterbury Tales and the Decameron, Cooper observes that what the "many and various parallels" between these two works demonstrate, "over and over again, is a convergence of interpretations as to what a story-collection might be, and of solutions to the problem of how to articulate such a very diverse array" (13). She concludes, "The most obvious interpretation of this convergence is that it represents Chaucer's own elaboration of a model he recalled from the Decameron" (13). Robert A. Pratt and Karl Young, who, like Cooper, survey numerous story collections and compare them to the Canterbury Tales, stress the uniqueness of Chaucer's role as author, despite any indebtedness to his literary antecedents: "Whatever his obligations to those who preceded him, his chief dependence was upon his own observation of life, and his own genius for portraying it" (33).

The framing story of the Canterbury Tales takes the form of a pilgrimage from the Tabard Inn in Southwark (on the outskirts of London) to Canterbury to visit the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket. The collection's narrator Chaucer recounts in the General Prologue (GP) that one evening in April, twenty-nine pilgrims meet by chance at the inn and become acquainted. Also a pilgrim lodging at the inn, Chaucer meets them all, joins their company, and agrees to travel with them to Canterbury. The narrator interrupts his story at this point to offer a portrait of the individual pilgrims. Returning to his account of the eve of the pilgrimage, Chaucer tells that the pilgrims' host, the innkeeper Harry Bailey, suggests that they tell stories along the way to shorten the journey, each pilgrim telling two stories on the way and two on the return. The best storyteller, that is, he who "telleth in this caas / Tales of best sentence and moost solaas" (30; GP 797-98) ("whoever best acquits himself, and tells the most amusing and instructive tale"; 21), will enjoy a meal at the expense of his fellow pilgrims upon their return to the Tabard Inn.⁹³ The host decides to join the pilgrims as their guide, and the group consents to his leading their journey and judging their tales. The company sets forth on its pilgrimage the following morning and the storytelling begins.⁹⁴ Thus the plan of organization for the Canterbury Tales is laid out within the prologue.

But Chaucer did not execute the plan in full. Although the author began his frametale about 1387 and continued to work on it until his death (Wright xvii), John M. Bowers lists the Canterbury Tales, "his last major poetic project," among Chaucer's "unfinished, unpublished works" (1). As Derek Pearsall notes, the

Canterbury Tales was left as “a series of unlinked fragments, and there is no manuscript evidence that Chaucer arranged these fragments in any final order” (14). Nonetheless, when the author died in 1400, “the body of his poetry remained to take on a life of its own” (Bowers 1). Bowers proposes that a group of individuals, that likely included the author’s son Thomas Chaucer, sorted through the author’s literary materials and arranged the ten fragments of the Canterbury Tales into a reasonable order (1). This task, Bowers claims, had a strong and lasting effect on Chaucer’s work and on his name:

Their efforts in the first two decades of the fifteenth century produced the landmark manuscripts, notably Ellesmere, upon which Chaucer’s reputation was established for an ever-widening reading public. The success of their project is reflected in the fact that eighty-two manuscripts survive, whole or partial, from the century following the poet’s death. (1)

That is not to say that medieval editors and scribes produced a uniform, definitive version of Chaucer’s collection. They took great strides in supplementing the work that Chaucer left behind, but these strides took them in different directions. Bowers summarizes the four types of supplemental writing to the Canterbury Tales:

(1) The pilgrimage narrative was expanded to allow the pilgrims to reach Canterbury, then begin their return trip to Southwark, in Lydgate’s Prologue to the Siege of Thebes and in the anonymous Canterbury Interlude and Merchant’s Tale of Beryn. (2) The

intermediate frame-narrative was patched together with “spurious links” for tales lacking authentic prologues. (3) Tales without ending were provided with make-do conclusions, most fully in the version of The Cook’s Tale. . . . And (4) a pilgrim who never told a tale, the Plowman, was given a chance to make his contribution. (1-2)⁹⁵

Yet despite the many hands that played a part in creating the various versions of the Canterbury Tales that exist today, and regardless of the unfinished state in which the author left his work, there is clear evidence of Chaucer’s very own organizational plan. Pearsall observes, for example, that the Canterbury Tales “have a fixed beginning and end” (16). Moreover, “within these limits, the integrity if not the position of certain fragments is assured” (Pearsall 16).

The fifteenth century was not only a time of prolific manuscript production of the Canterbury Tales, but also the period in which Chaucer’s frametale was first printed. The editio princeps of the Canterbury Tales was published by William Caxton in 1476 after he returned to England with a printing press (Blake 1). In The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales, N. F. Blake observes, “That Caxton issued this text so soon after his return to England is an indication of its popularity, for he needed to sell many copies of any printed work if he was to make a financial success of his publishing venture” (1). Caxton followed his first edition with a revised edition only six years later in 1482 (Blake 3), and this work, in turn, served as the basis for a 1492 publication by Pynson

(Blake 5). Wynkyn de Worde, “Caxton’s assistant and eventually successor,” published an edition in 1498 (Blake 5).

Numerous sixteenth-century publications of Chaucer’s story collection attest to its continued popularity. Pynson printed another edition in 1526, but it was William Thynne’s 1532 edition, printed by Thomas Godfray, that was most responsible for the diffusion of the Canterbury Tales for the next two and a half centuries (Blake 5, 7). Blake notes:

This edition, frequently reprinted and augmented, remained the main text of Chaucer till Tyrwhitt’s edition of 1775-8. Chaucer is the first English poet to have his works issued in a collected edition—a fact which underlines his considerable reputation. In the volume The Canterbury Tales has pride of place as the first text. (5)

Blake further observes that those who followed Thynne in publishing Chaucer’s collected works often did no more than reprint his work, the first of these appearing in 1542 (7).

All of the frametales that I have sketched above not merely meet my basic criteria for inclusion in this study, but in most cases far surpass them. The first criterion that there must be evidence of a connection, whether direct or indirect, between each collection and at least one other is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt. The relation may be close, as between the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales, the former having been identified as the primary model for the latter, notwithstanding additional influences and the author’s originality (Cooper, “The

Frame” 7-13). Or the association may consist of heavy borrowing that forms tight bonds among traditions, as occurs between the Kalila, Sindbad, and Disciplina (Taylor 197-98). While the coincidence of structure or material among frametales does not necessarily signify a direct source, even an analogous relation may indicate a common understanding of generic characteristics. Despite the disparity among them, all of the collections included in my study bear a generic resemblance because they share certain fundamental frametale features. In the following chapters I examine some of these features more closely with respect to frametales and to the Lazarillo.

Regarding the second stipulation that each frametale have existed in at least one version prior to 1554, the most recent collection, the Canterbury Tales, predates the Lazarillo by some 150 years, a number of other collections by several hundred years, and one, the Book of Sindbad, by perhaps two thousand. All collections undergo changes as they pass through time and the hands of various storytellers, but even those with considerably long histories retain many of the features that distinguish the works as frametales. Furthermore, several frametales, such as the Kalila and Dimna and the Book of Sindbad, exist in copious variants in Europe throughout the Middle Ages.

Also fulfilled beyond modest satisfaction is the third requirement that the author of the Lazarillo and his readers could have had access to at least one of the frametales. Such a stipulation establishes the minimal practical possibility that both the writing and the reading of the Lazarillo were informed to some degree by an understanding of the frametale tradition. Although certain collections, such as

the Libro de buen amor, were unlikely available in Spain in the first half of the sixteenth century, others were widely popular. Publications of these works in Spanish before mid century substantiate a sizable readership: an odd dozen editions of the Ejemplario; five of the Siete sabios, and at least five of the Decameron, for example. Several tales of the Disciplina clericalis, still framed, were widely disseminated within the Spanish Ysopet: “It can be stated without fear of contradiction that the romantic life of Aesop and the collection of fables made available to Spaniards in 1489 was the most widely read body of literature across at least two centuries in Spain” (Keller and Keating, Aesop’s Fables 4). This says nothing of the great numbers of *frametales* that were published before 1554 in languages other than Spanish, but that could have been understood by many Spanish readers (French, Italian, and Latin, for example).⁹⁶ Some of these non-Spanish versions were even printed in Spain. Moreover, that several of these collections underwent further editions or translations after 1554 establishes that the genre’s vogue had not died out at the time of the birth of the picaresque novel. In addition to the numerous printed editions of *frametales* with which the Lazarillo author and his readers could have been familiar, the manuscript versions of some of these collections must have continued to circulate among sixteenth-century Spanish readers. Finally, previous research has shown several *frametales*, above all the Decameron, to have close ties with the picaresque genre in general, and much in common with the Lazarillo in particular. Thus rather than a distant memory or a vague notion, the *frametale* genre, I believe, was very much alive in the mind of sixteenth-century Spaniards. By highlighting in subsequent chapters

some of the connections between Lazarillo de Tormes and the frametale genre, I hope to build the case that this tradition, inherited from the Middle Ages, helped lay the groundwork for the first picaresque novel.

Chapter 3: Structure and Organization of the Frametale

Storytelling in medieval frametale collections operates on multiple levels with diverse combinations of narrators and audiences. The first level consists of the narrator of the collection as a whole, that is, the principal storyteller, and his audience of all readers and listeners “at all times and in all places” (Rajan xlviii). The narrator begins his art of storytelling (level 1) by constructing a frame that will come to support from a simple to a highly elaborate narrative structure. By introducing the frame, or main framing story, the principal storyteller has created a new narrative level that contains its own narrator(s) and audience(s) (level 2). As storytelling in the main framing story commences, yet another layer is woven (level 3). In some of the more complex frametales, the structure continues in this fashion for several more narrative levels (levels 4, 5, 6, etc.) until numerous tales are enclosed, or boxed, within others. At any given level of narrative a number of storytelling episodes may occur; any of these, in turn, may box additional tales. Within this complex narrative system two distinct structural and organizational modes are in operation at once, one of the enclosed tales and the other of the frame (Gittes 14). In the present chapter, I begin with a brief review of how these forces are at work within a single framed story collection, the Panchatantra, in order to illustrate a number of the chief structural and organizational features that remain evident, if altered, in subsequent frametales and that contribute to a pattern of characteristics by which the frametale genre may be identified. I follow Gittes in using this early frametale as a point of departure because, as she explains, “The

Panchatantra's influence spread over many centuries and cultures and played a large role in shaping the frame narrative in medieval Europe" (9). I proceed by demonstrating several of the various and complex ways in which individual frametales adopted and adapted these features in light of conflicting aesthetic principles and literary ideals that were in play as the genre evolved.⁹⁷ In the following chapter, I endeavor to illustrate how Lazarillo de Tormes shares many of the same structural and organizational characteristics of these literary precursors while deviating from them in significant ways. It is my aim that by drawing such connections between the two and highlighting some of their differences, I will raise in my readers an awareness of the Lazarillo's role in both the continuity and manipulation of the frametale tradition.

Regarding the two techniques that contribute to the Panchatantra's structural complexity, Gittes observes, "The tightly structured boxing system, often used in Indian collections, contrasts strikingly with the loosely structured framing system; the result is a tension between the two" (14).⁹⁸ The first of these devices, the boxing technique, is characterized by multiple levels of enclosed tales in a vertical, hypotactic arrangement (14). "Hypotaxis," Gittes explains, "refers to the arrangement of material with clear connections and subordination" (9). Beginning with the outermost narrative layer and descending into subordinate ones, the following example illustrates this technique:

Level 1: The principal storyteller tells all readers and listeners the (main framing) story of

Level 2: Visnu Sarma and the three princes, in which Visnu Sarma tells the three princes the story of

Level 3: the “Estrangement of Friends” (book 1), in which Wily (a jackal) tells Lively (the bull) the story of

Level 4: “The Lapwing who Defied the Ocean,” in which a wise bird tells the concourse of birds the story of

Level 5: “The Ancient Wild Goose and the Fowler,” in which the Ancient Wild Goose tells Garuda, King of Birds, and the concourse of birds the story of

Level 6: “The Lion and the Lone Ram.”⁹⁹

Resembling a Chinese box, the Panchatantra’s tale-within-a-tale arrangement organizes numerous stories within multiple layers of narration. Although several narrative levels may be at work simultaneously, each boxed tale is completed before the tale within which it is enclosed is resolved. In the above example, the tale of the Lion and the Ram is finished before the story of the Goose and the Fowler is concluded, and so on until the plot of book 1’s framing story is resolved when Tawny (the lion) kills his former friend Lively. Thus the enclosed tales, including the framing stories of the five books¹⁰⁰ (those that descend from the main framing story of Visnu Sarma and the princes), as well as the individual stories boxed within each of these five books, are rightly characterized by Gittes as “finished and conclusive, with tightly resolved plots” (14).

In addition to being conclusive, the enclosed tales “exist as independent or interchangeable units” (Gittes 16). Because the stories surface within question-

and-answer dialogues that lack a single focus, their topics range widely and shift quickly from one arbitrary question to the next (Gittes 12). The seemingly haphazard arrangement of the tales gives the impression that switching their grouping or their order within a group would not significantly damage the structure or the function of the collection. The episodic nature of the enclosed tales, their variety of form and content, and their largely arbitrary arrangement together define a key structural scheme of the Panchatantra.

Boxed tales represent only one of two structural and organizational modes at work within the frametale, however. Counter to the tight, vertical, hypotactic structure of the enclosed tales of the Panchatantra, the collection's framing story is loosely structured according to a horizontal, paratactic arrangement (Gittes 12, 14, 17). "Parataxis' refers to a less continuous, discrete mode of organization" (Gittes 9). The Panchatantra is formally divided into five books according to theme: the loss of friends, the winning of friends, war and peace, loss of gains, and rash actions.¹⁰¹ Gittes maintains that, although this grouping of tales by theme implies a basic plan of organization, "the arrangement of books within the frame is arbitrary" (16). "The only exception to this random order," she concedes, "occurs in the occasional balancing of theme," that of losing friends to that of winning them (16). But on the whole there is no underlying principle for the order in which they are presented, and rearranging their order would have no apparent effect on the collection as a whole (Gittes 16).

Yet the collection's plan of organization according to theme warrants further consideration. Closer inspection reveals a greater flexibility in the plan

than the books' titles would lead the reader to believe. The assumption is that tales will adhere to the topic of the book in which they are enclosed, but it soon becomes apparent that the design is not strictly carried out, for numerous tales are unrelated to their expected theme (Gittes 15-16). Gittes offers the following example:

In book II, for instance, some of the tales have nothing to do with the winning of friends, though the title of the book suggests otherwise. The stories of Mother Sandili (which focuses on intelligence) and [of] the greedy jackal have nothing to do with the winning of friends, although they appear in the book purportedly devoted to that topic. (15)

Gittes concurs with A. Berriedale Keith's explanation for the breakdown of the plan, that the author of the *frametale* simply wanted to tell the tales (15-16). Without discounting this hypothesis, I would add that perhaps the author chose to portray the often unpredictable and somewhat inexplicable workings of the mind of a storyteller. Digressions are often an integral part of storytelling, for ideas simply come to mind during the storytelling process. Or maybe flexibility in the collection's organizational plan portrays the author's attempt to imitate the arbitrary nature of storytelling among diverse storytellers. Of the Panchatantra, Rajan notes, "There is a multiplicity of narrators at several levels in the narrative, each with his/her immediate audience. In addition, they speak to a whole range of audiences . . . ending with the modern reader" (il-1). The multiplicity of narrative voices feeds an uncertainty, the ambiguity of just who is telling the story. Indeed,

from the depths of the boxed tales, the principal narrator of the collection appears far removed from subordinate storytellers who seem to have an independent will and purpose as narrators of their own tales, not merely as characters in the stories narrated by others. Only when the audience widens its focus from the individual tales to the collection as a whole does it gain a larger perspective from which the thematic or topical discrepancies of the enclosed tales become conspicuous. Thus given the number and diversity of the storytellers in the Panchatantra, the collection's transgression of thematic unity, or deviation from the anticipated plan, is understandable. Such disruptions to whatever order there may be are not unlike the randomness of life in general. That is not to say that utter randomness is the basis for the collection's plan of organization (this very notion is a contradiction, in fact). However tenuous, flexible, or fluid the plan may be, it presupposes some design of order. It matters not whether the plan was clearly articulated or merely implied through an established pattern. A key element is the breakdown in the audience's expectation for the division of the collection and the arrangement and content of its constituent parts. The very tendency to stray from an apparent plan of organization is a recurring trait in later medieval *frametales*.¹⁰²

A further distinction exists between the two structural forces at work within the Panchatantra. Gittes observes that in contrast to the "closed" and "complete" nature of the boxed tales, the framing story is "open-ended" and "unfinished" (14). Although the preamble of the collection indicates that Visnu Sarma accomplished his task of educating the three princes, the main framing story to which these characters belong does not return after the framing story of

book 5 is resolved. The lack of closure at the end of the final book of the collection leaves the impression that the work (and by implication the education of the princes) is ongoing, “that it could continue indefinitely” (Gittes 14). Rajan likewise acknowledges the open-endedness of the Panchatantra: “The text does not impose an ending, narratively or otherwise. It leaves it open to listeners and readers to ponder over the matter and wrestle with the disturbing possibilities” (xxix). “This inconclusiveness,” she suggests, “is deliberate” (xxix).

The Panchatantra is no mere collection of stories, Rajan insists. It is “an artistic whole with a highly organized and complex structure” (xlvi). The work’s uniqueness and allure she attributes to its intricacy of structure: “the art and artistry with which the tales are interwoven with the discourse; the skillful blend of narrative and dialogue with maxim and precept; the over-arching frame in which the tales and everything else are set . . .” (xix). As previously illustrated, it is the dual system of structure and organization, one mode represented by the enclosed tales and the other by the framing story, that underlies the integration of a multitude of diverse material into a single collection without compromising its heterogeneity. This elaborate system of artistic design was not, however, impervious to change. The very nature of the *frametales* lent itself to adaptation. This quality is evidenced in part by the long and varied history of the Panchatantra within the oral and written storytelling traditions.

The *frametales*’s capacity for adaptation is also made clear by the Panchatantra’s literary legacy. Key features of this collection’s structure and organization are manifest in subsequent medieval *frametales*, often in adapted

form to accommodate the particular needs and tastes of diverse authors and their audience. The alterations, due in large measure to differences in the cultural environment in which works were composed and through which they circulated, also reflect each author's individual response to a growing force that pushed against the conventional bounds of a longstanding tradition. Sketching the evolution of the *frametales* genre in medieval Europe, Gittes illustrates both the continuity and change of the tradition as the loose design, flexibility, and open-endedness typical of Eastern *frametales* met with increasing pressure from "literary ideals of unity, symmetry, and completeness" inherited from Greco-Roman aesthetic principles (Gittes 2-3).¹⁰³ She explains:

When Western medieval writers began to use the frame narrative structure, they retained the Arabic features, but altered them. The changes in the frame narrative's development result from a response to a strong Western demand for internal unity and tight structure, a demand that placed great pressure on the Near Eastern genre, which, in its inception, required little or no internal coherence. (144)

The medieval European *frametales* consists of a synthesis of these structural and organizational tendencies, each representation of that genre being unique in its treatment of the opposing influences. "Each author's mode of experimentation," Gittes affirms, "made his frame narrative distinct and different from the others" (71). She nonetheless contends, "However different from one another these individual books may be, they share a single underlying pattern with many

common features” (Gittes 71). This pattern is partly discernible in the ways in which collections employ both internal and external devices to organize and unify diverse material while simultaneously maintaining a degree of flexibility and open-endedness. In my examination of the structural and organizational techniques used by authors to unify their *frametales* collections, first I center on several internal linking devices, then I shift my focus to three principal external devices: the wisdom theme, the storyteller, and the frame.¹⁰⁴ Finally, I address the *frametale*’s formal structure in terms of varying degrees of flexibility and open-endedness.

LINKING DEVICES

As complete units in themselves with tightly structured plots, individual tales enclosed within a collection retain a quality of autonomy and often adhere to a seemingly arbitrary plan of organization. As such they may give the impression of a series of independent episodes randomly clumped or strung together. Yet enclosed tales do not exist in isolation; the various relationships among them range from loosely- to tightly-knitted associations. Nor is the arrangement of tales, in terms of both order and grouping, entirely haphazard. Their organization shows certain patterns of balance or repetition within a work, at times stressing similarity between individual tales, at other times contrast. These associations of similarity and contrast may be established by means of a variety of internal connective techniques, or linking devices, on the basis of theme or motif, gradation and climax, setting, plot elements, imagery, characters, and situations, words or phrases. Although linking devices may function independently to

strengthen the internal cohesion of a *frametale*, they frequently work in conjunction with others to tighten further a collection's internal structure. Internal connective schemes may, in turn, be reinforced also by structural devices that function externally to tie enclosed tales to the frame. A common external technique that highlights the association between enclosed tales is the reference to past tales by storytellers in the frame, or by the principal narrator. This tactic may range from a subtle allusion to an overt explanation of the link.¹⁰⁵

Alfonsi's twelfth-century *frametale* is similar to the Panchatantra with respect to the relatively loose organization of its enclosed tales. Gittes observes, "As in most Arabic literature, the arrangement of stories in the Disciplina clericalis appears to be arbitrary. Each story is complete, its plot tightly resolved, and if the order of most of the tales were shifted drastically, the work would not suffer in the least" (64-65). Yet in spite of the generally loose articulation of the Disciplina's tales, the numerous instances of internal connections among the tales should not be underestimated as a unifying factor. Eberhard Hermes describes Alfonsi's approach:

The basic component idea that lies as a foundation for all ideas of experience of life, is that everything is two-sided. This is not, as in classical works, treated as a rational principle on which to build, but operates in our book, in a loose form that relies on association. The operation is unobtrusive with the result that the individual motifs are always being taken up again, and contrasted with one another in a dialectical manner. (31)

The first two tales of the collection, “The Half Friend” and “The Perfect Friend,” for instance, balance each other in their treatment of friendship. Hermes explains the contrast inherent in the pairing of these two tales on the basis of a common motif: “The story of the ‘half-friend’ mirrors what is generally so in reality. The story of the ‘perfect friend’ is told here, in order to set this reality against an ideal yard-stick” (31).

Although the balancing of two tales on the basis of theme or motif is common in the *frametale*, enclosed tales can also form larger groups with this type of association. Cooper notes that in the Decameron, establishing “connections of theme and motif between tales . . . is done most explicitly through the setting of a specific topic for each day (the first and ninth excepted), though it is often treated with wit or parody” (“The Frame” 12).¹⁰⁶ Thematic linking between multiple stories also occurs in the Canterbury Tales, in the “marriage group” and among the Knight’s, Miller’s, and Reeve’s tales, for example (Provost 91; Cooper, “The Frame” 12). Cooper observes that here, too, parody and subversion are at work (“The Frame” 12). Although the pilgrimage scheme would lend itself to a division of the work and a grouping of tales according to days with an established thematic program, as occurs in the Decameron, Chaucer’s work, as it is known to us, is not organized as such (Cooper, “The Frame” 12). Nonetheless, Cooper observes, “. . . the groups of tales he did leave work on a principle of interrelatedness less explicit than Boccaccio’s but otherwise closely similar” (“The Frame” 12). The structure of the Canterbury

Tales is tightened in part by the thematic association that exists among diverse tales, as Cooper describes:

As the tales accumulate, a further principle develops, whereby similar themes, ideas, and plot motifs can be taken up by tales at some distance from each other. Chaucer both selects and adapts stories to fit with these larger concerns; a collection of the tales' sources would show few of the centripetal qualities that his own versions acquire. The variety of the tales is turned to advantage in the process of integration, as recurring themes and motifs appear in new and unexpected lights and patterns.¹⁰⁷ (Oxford Guides 16)

In addition to the balancing or grouping of tales according to thematic similarity or contrast, the association of tales in terms of gradation and climax is another linking device found in the frametale. This technique occurs in the Disciplina clericalis among three consecutive tales on the guile of women: "The Vintner," "The Linen Sheet," and "The Sword," tales 9, 10, and 11, respectively. In all three tales a woman and her lover are either feasting together or about to dine when the husband unexpectedly returns home. The husband is deceived and the secret love affair is undiscovered. Although the fundamental storyline is common to all three tales, gradation is evident in the key players, tools, and outcomes of deception. In the first tale of the series, the wife works alone to deceive her husband. Her primary tool of deception is a simple physical act, for by covering her husband's good eye with kisses, she blocks his view and thus enables her lover to escape unnoticed. In the second tale, the wife's mother

assists in the deception by devising the ruse to deceive the husband. Here the tool of deception is a linen sheet, a physical object that represents the feminine sphere of influence, the home. Furthermore, the sheet is an object crafted by women, an observation explicitly made in the story by the mother to her daughter: “woven by your hands and mine” (121).¹⁰⁸ The linen sheet forms a physical barrier in order to obscure the husband’s vision and to allow the lover to escape unseen. In the third tale, the wife, her mother, and the lover all participate in the trick to deceive the husband. The tool of deception is a sword that, in contrast to the linen sheet, is a representation of the world of men. Not only is it man-made, forged through sheer strength, but it is also symbolic of male sexuality. The husband’s sword is thrust into the lover’s hand by the mother under the pretense that he is pursued by men who wish to kill him. In this way his presence in the house is explained to the husband. Metaphorically speaking, the husband’s sexual role has been handed over to another man by his mother-in-law. The power of the sword is lost not only as a sexual symbol, but also as a weapon of defense because the deception is carried out with the precise tool that the husband might otherwise have used to defend his honor and avenge his wife’s adultery. Additionally, the ruse plays out before the husband’s own eyes, for his vision is not obscured (by either the act of kissing or the physical barrier of a sheet). Rather he is led to believe that the circumstances of what he sees are different from what they truly are, and as such the husband’s credulity plays an important role in his own deception. The climax of the series is heightened in the husband’s reaction to events. First he compliments his mother-in-law for her actions: “You have done well, noble lady,

to save this young man from death in such a way” (122). The irony of the man’s words is that the husband himself was the real threat of death for the lover, if only he had understood the truth. Finally, the husband, whose wife had instigated the adulterous affair by inviting her lover to dine at the start of the tale, extends the invitation himself at the tale’s conclusion: “And he came in and called his wife’s lover to him and made him sit down and eat with him. He calmed him with sweet words, and when it was late evening let him go” (122). Thus the lover, who in the previous tales had sneaked out without the husband’s notice, now takes his leave before the victim’s very eyes, his fears allayed and his appetite satisfied to boot. The gradation and climax with respect to the participants, tools, and results of deception in the tales demonstrate not only a clear association among the group of three, but also the importance of their order within the group.

Cooper observes the connective scheme of gradation in the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales specifically among stories that deal with deception and revenge, or the guiler beguiled (“The Frame” 13). Dioneo’s tale on the eighth day, for example, represents the climax of such stories told thus far in Boccaccio’s *frametales*. This internal link among tales is made explicit by the storyteller himself in the introduction to his tale:

Graziose donne, manifesta cosa è tanto più l’arti piacere quanto più sottile artefice è per quelle artificiosamente beffato. E per ciò, quantunque bellissime cose tutte raccontate abbiate, io intendo di raccontarne una tanto più che alcuna altra dettane da dovervi aggradire, quanto colei che beffata fu era maggior maestra di

beffare altrui che alcuno altro beffato fosse di quegli o di quelle
che avete contate. (573; 8.10)

Gracious ladies, it goes without saying that the more cunning a
person is, the greater our satisfaction in seeing that person
cunningly deceived. And hence, whilst the stories you have told
have all been excellent, the one I propose to relate should afford
you greater pleasure than any of the others, inasmuch as it
concerns the duping of a lady who knew far more about the art of
deception than any of the men or women who were beguiled in the
tales we have heard so far. (632)

Tales of deception and revenge are capped by stories of like kind also in
Chaucer's work, where this linking device appears largely motivated by rivalries
among the storytellers of the frame. As Cooper notes, Chaucer is "fond of motifs
of overgoing, where the aesthetic competition between stories turns into requital
or revenge" ("The Frame" 13). In the prologue to the Reeve's Tale (RvT), for
example, the Reeve makes clear that his tale is to retaliate for the Miller's story:

This dronke Millere hath ytoold us heer
How that bigyled was a carpenteer,
Peraventure in scorn, for I am oon.
And, by youre leve, I shal hym quite anoon;
Right in his cherles termes wol I speke. (127; RvT 3913-17)
This drunken miller has just told us here
About the diddling of a carpenter;

As I'm one, it's to scoff at me, perhaps.

If you don't mind, I mean to pay him out;

It's his own loutish language that I'll speak. (99)

Yet his goal is not merely to meet his adversary, the Miller; he aims to best him. One consequence of the storytellers' attempts to outdo one another is the progression or intensification of a theme, and, as in the gradated tales of the Disciplina clericalis, adultery is a central theme in the Miller's and Reeve's stories. Cooper explains how this theme in the tales escalates alongside the desire for vengeance in the frame: "The Miller told of one Oxford student who slept with a carpenter's wife; the carpenter Reeve will tell of two Cambridge students who sleep with a miller's wife and daughter. In this particular competition, the Reeve achieves double his opponent's score" (Oxford Guides 114). The revenge that the Reeve seeks against the Miller is patent not only in the content of his tale, but also in his concluding remark to his pilgrim audience in the framing story: "Thus have I quyt the Millere in my tale" (141; RvT 4324) ("And so I've done the miller with my tale"; 109).

The association of tales according to setting is another internal connective technique used in the frametale. It works in conjunction with other devices to link the Miller's Tale and the Reeve's Tale, as noted above, both of which are associated with a university setting, the first Oxford and the second Cambridge (Cooper, "The Frame" 13). This device also functions in the Decameron, in which "two tales of the same day may be set in the same area or town" (Cooper, "The Frame" 13). In introducing the fifth story on the fifth day, for example,

Neifile refers to the previous story's setting as the impetus for her own: "Poi che Filostrato ragionando in Romagna è intrato, a me per quella similmente gioverà d'andare alquanto spaziandomi col mio novellare" (362; 5.5) ("Since Filostrato crossed the borders of Romagna for the subject of his tale, I too shall take the liberty of roaming for a while in that part of the world"; 399). Yet the stories need not be consecutive, as occurs with the third and tenth stories of the seventh day, both of which take place in Siena. Moreover, these tales share a basic plot, another internal linking device. The affiliation of these tales on the basis of a common setting and parallel plot elements is further tightened as Dioneo, the storyteller of the tenth tale, explicitly refers to the earlier story while introducing his own (Cooper, "The Frame" 13). Thus Boccaccio's *frametales* is unified by the combined effect of several internal linking devices working together and external devices reinforcing those links.

Similarity of plot as a linking device is also found between certain tales in the *Disciplina clericalis*. When an Arab advises his son, "Follow the main roads even if they are a longer way round than the footpaths," the son responds, "What you have said about high roads is true" (135). He proceeds to tell tale 18, "The Footpath," in which his personal experience validates his father's advice. He recounts that late one day when he and some friends were following the main road on their way to town, they ran across a path that appeared to be a more direct route to the city. They asked the advice of an old man that they had chanced upon, who responded, "The path is nearer to the city than the high road, but you will arrive quicker at the city by taking the high road rather than the path" (135).

Misunderstanding the enigmatic truth, they believed the old man a fool and took the path instead. By nightfall they were lost. Had they stayed the course on the main road, they would have arrived at the city by then.

The father follows with a story of his own, “The Ford,” that is also based on personal experience. As in his son’s tale, the father and his company ask an old man to advise them on which route they should take to town, in this case the road through the ford or the one over the bridge. The old man tells them that the former is nearer to the city by two miles, but that they will arrive earlier via the latter. At this point the father recalls, “Some of our people laughed at the old man, just as did some of yours in the earlier story . . .” (136). Those that followed the road through the ford either saw their companions drown, lost their baggage and horses, or got their clothes wet, and were thus delayed on their journey. By contrast, the travelers who took the bridge route arrived happily at the city.

These stories, told in succession, not only follow a parallel sequence of events, but they also share the lesson that the shortest route is not necessarily the quickest one, in essence, that the truth of the matter may be other than it appears on the surface. In addition to being internally linked by a common lesson and similar plot elements, these tales are externally connected when the father, a storyteller in the frame, directly recalls his son’s tale in the middle of recounting his own. Again, internal and external devices work in conjunction to unify the frametale collection and to strengthen its structure.

Imagery is another technique that serves to link diverse tales, although it may also function by connecting tales to the frame. In the Canterbury Tales, for

example, the images of sweat and the color red not only link the Second Nun's Tale to the Canon's Yeoman's Tale, but they also connect both tales to the Canon and the Canon's Yeoman in the frame (Gittes 114-15). The image of gold is even more pervasive in Chaucer's frametale, yet its significance shifts, Gittes notes, according to the context in which it appears or to the character with whom it is associated. She offers the following illustration of how this change in meaning occurs:

Gold appears in the General Prologue's description of the Parson as analogous to virtue and to spiritual wealth ('if gold ruste, what shal iren do?' 1.500), but it acquires a different significance in the description of the Physician, where it becomes a symbol of greed and of earthly wealth (1.443-44). The more insidious powers of gold are underscored in the tale of the Canon's Yeoman, whose alchemical connivances, which involve turning base substances into gold, have given him, ironically, a 'leden hewe' (8.728), and instead of acquiring gold, he has been forced to borrow it (8.734-35). In the Pardoner's Tale, gold is a destructive power, a symbol for both greed and, ultimately, death; for, told where to find Death, the three men instead find gold, which leads to their deaths. (113-14)

The reappearance of characters in distinct tales also serves to strengthen the internal cohesion of a frametale. Although often clustered in a group, these tales need not be consecutive. In the Decameron, for instance, characters such as

Calandrino and Maso del Saggio make repeat appearances, thereby connecting a series of stories. Yet instead of all being told in succession, the tales' arrangement appears to follow a more arbitrary pattern dictated by the diverse wills and recollections of the group of storytellers. For example, following Elissa's story in which both Calandrino and Maso first appear as characters (8.3),¹⁰⁹ Emilia is not prompted to follow suit by telling a story involving either of these characters, rather she is intent on telling her own story (8.4). Filostrato, however, who succeeds Emilia, announces that Elissa's earlier tale has inspired him to tell a tale about Maso instead of the story he had intended to tell before hearing her story (8.5). Now Filomena's turn to tell a tale, she recalls both Filostrato's and Elissa's tale in the introduction to her own:

Graziose donne, come Filostrato fu dal nome di Maso tirato a dover dire la novella la quale da lui udita avete, così né più né men son tirata io da quello di Calandrino e de' compagni suoi a dirne un'altra di loro, la qual, sì come io credo, vi piacerà. (529; 8.6)

Gracious ladies, just as Filostrato was prompted to tell you the previous tale by hearing the name of Maso, in precisely the same way I too have been prompted by hearing the names of Calandrino and his companions to tell you another, which I believe you will find to your liking. (579)

Thus a single character or a group of associated characters may serve to thread tales whether they are told in succession or not. Moreover, this type of link among tales may even transgress certain formal boundaries. The tales of

Calandrino, for example, are told not within a single day but over the course of two days (8.3, 8.6, 9.3, 9.5). The structure of the Decameron is tightened not only by the internal linking of tales to one another by the reappearance of a character or affiliated characters, but also by the commentary of the storytellers in the frame. Their deliberate recollection of a character from a previous tale is an external organizing device that, in addition to grouping their tales together, ties them more closely to the frame.

In the Canterbury Tales, Chaucer puts an interesting twist on this linking device by inverting the role of who recalls whom: Justinus, a character in the Merchant's Tale, refers to the Wife of Bath, a character in the framing story. "This passage," states Gittes, "though it teases the reader, can also be seen as linking the Merchant's Tale to the Merchant, to the Wife of Bath, and to her tale" (114). In this fashion a complex web of associations is formed among the tales themselves and with their tellers in the frame.

As I have indicated, linking devices may work independently or collaboratively to strengthen the association between certain pairs or groups of tales. The association among tales is compounded, however, when a single tale forms multiple and various links with multiple and various tales. As the meaning of a tale is determined by its context, its significance changes as its context changes. In "Framing the Story, Framing the Reader: Two Spanish Masterpieces," Peter N. Dunn examines not only how "symmetries, balances, and repetitions among the stories" in the Conde Lucanor function internally to give

meaning to the overall collection, but also how the meaning of individual tales shifts depending on where these links occur. He illustrates:

Exemplos 1 and 50 frame the whole collection with stories on the pursuit of truth through labyrinths of desire and deceit, with desire against desire, deceit against deceit, with words acting, and actions speaking. But in story 50 the end of the collection is also linked to its centre, because both stories 25 and 50 have as their protagonist Saladin, and in each story he loses a priceless object of desire, but rejoices in having imparted a truth (Exemplo 25) and discovered a truth (Exemplo 50). Our reading of Exemplo 50 changes according to whether we read it with Exemplo 1 as framing the whole collection, or whether we pair it with its epistemological companion, Exemplo 25. But Exemplo 25 is also paired at the centre of the collection with Exemplo 26, 'De lo que contesçio a la Verdat et a la Mentira' ('What Happened to Truth and Falsehood'). . . . Here at the collection's centre is a mutual and variable framing of contiguous stories. Again, the significance of Exemplo 25 varies according to whether we read it with Exemplo 26 or with Exemplo 50. (97-98)

While some frametales exhibit a greater internal balance or unity than others, even in the more loosely organized collections various linking devices among the enclosed tales function to strengthen the internal structure of the work. In addition to these internal connective techniques, there are structural devices

that work externally to unify a collection. Whereas “enclosed tales can, if necessary, stand independent of the framing story,” (Gittes 143), as constituent parts of a *frametales* collection, they do not. Gittes observes, “The apparently random order and organization in the arrangement of stories, their autonomy and diversity, is atoned for by external organizing devices,” among them the theme of wisdom, the principal storyteller, and the framing story (143). All of these external devices not only provide cohesion for the array of stories within a single work, but they also establish diverse contexts for the tales that endow them with distinct meanings. This variety of meaning, when taken as a whole, portrays a more comprehensive and balanced view of the complex and ever-changing world in which we live.

THE WISDOM THEME

Whether the material of enclosed tales derives from secular or sacred sources, or directly from the experience of life, the manner in which it is presented in the *frametales* is often closely associated with the theme of wisdom. On one hand the tales may teach practical wisdom, on the other, moral virtue, and although on occasion these goals may be aligned, there is, as Taylor observes, an “inherent tension between ethics and pragmatism in much wisdom literature” (197). Gittes observes that the wisdom theme in the *frametales* “often centers on secular knowledge and the importance of wit and intelligence as a means of survival in the world” (143). Yet the term survival may be somewhat misleading, for most *frametales* focus not merely on subsisting, or barely getting by, but on “living wisely and well in the truest sense of these terms,” as Rajan defines niti

(xiii). Thus getting ahead, or directing one's life to gain some benefit or advantage, conforms to one of the principal goals of the Panchatantra and of most subsequent frametales: "Education in the art of living wisely and well" (Rajan xxxv).

Rajan addresses the theme of wisdom with respect to the Panchatantra:

Three words used in the Preamble give us a clue. Buddhiprabodhanam, awakening of the intellect; prabuddhah, with their intellect fully awakened—both depth and extensive range of understanding are signified by the prefix 'pra;' and avabodhanartham, for the purpose of awakening the intellect. Buddhi signifies not merely the intellect; it includes understanding and signifies the whole intellectual process. All three point to one aim—the awakening of the mind or intellect and understanding. (xxxi)

She goes on to explain that Visnu Sarma's goal was to "teach the princes how to think, not what to think" (xxxiii), illustrating this aim with the following excerpt from Book II: "With mere book-learning men remain fools; / the man who acts using his knowledge, he is wise" (233; 2.109.1-2). Visnu Sarma has devised and carried out a method of instruction "which uses life and its varied experiences as the textbook" in order to "rouse and sustain the interest of his pupils while teasing them into thought" (xxxiii). Whereas pieces of specific knowledge (facts, formulas, definitions, etc.) are finite, the application of this knowledge is boundless.

THE STORYTELLER

Frametales by definition share the basic external unifying feature of the frame within which various individual tales are enclosed. A somewhat less conspicuous external organizing device is the storyteller who designs, constructs, and presents the collection as such. Speaking of the Panchatantra in a manner that applies to other frametales as well, Rajan observes that behind the diversity of the collection is the “storyteller who sits at his loom, weaving all the richness spread before us. He provides the thread of unity” (1). Rajan’s metaphor of the storyteller as weaver is not insignificant; she notes that the Sanskrit word tantra from the title “has several meanings: text, a chapter of a text, a loom or frame” (439).¹¹⁰ The weaver of tales has an organizing effect on a collection for he selects, shapes, arranges, and binds the material presented to his audience. Furthermore, all that is told is filtered to his readers and listeners through him: his understanding, his memory, his preferences, his skill, and his purpose.

The degree to which a storyteller punctuates the work he narrates varies from frametale to frametale. In some collections, the narrator surfaces in the prologue and/or epilogue of a work, while withdrawing to a less conspicuous position in the body of the collection. The subtlety of the storyteller’s voice allows the audience to engage more fully in the individual narratives as fictions in themselves. The stories here take the foreground while the narrator, although always present, fades into the background. The narrator is unobtrusive in the Book of Sindbad, for example, which some critics claim possesses “a frame story narrating its own existence” (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xi). Using a faint voice

can also be an effective tactic for allowing a subordinate narrator's voice to be heard. By foregrounding another storyteller, the principal narrator may be absolved of some responsibility for the tales themselves and for the circumstances in which they are recounted. On other occasions the voice heard is deliberately vague or ambiguous, thus confusing the identity of the narrator, blurring the context of the storytelling, and obscuring the true purpose behind it.

Other narrators are more intrusive, their intermittent interruptions throughout the work reminding the reader or listener of the storyteller's presence and thus tightening the structure over which he presides. The more noticeably he controls the narrative with his voice, the greater his demand on his audience to widen its focus from the tales as separate, self-contained entities to include the background setting against which they are told and in which the storyteller and his audience both reside.

The anonymity of a narrator does not undermine his structural importance in a frame tale. The Panchatantra, for example, was allegedly authored by one Visnu Sarma, but the frame tale is remembered, reworked and retold by a long line of anonymous storytellers. In the preamble,¹¹¹ the unnamed narrator introduces the main framing story of Visnu Sarma, the king, and the three princes. Beginning with book 1, Visnu Sarma's voice takes over the narration of the five framing stories that make up the five books of the Panchatantra.¹¹² Yet the anonymous storyteller is not entirely obscured behind the narrator in the main framing story. At one point in book 1, for instance, his voice resurfaces to address not the princes, but his own audience: "Dear Reader, since you are far

removed in time and space from this ancient story-book world, permit me to explain . . .” (12). This type of intrusion in a subordinate storyteller’s narration reminds the reader or listener to adjust his focus from individual tales or narrative levels to include the very act of storytelling of which he is a participant, because where the principal storyteller’s voice emerges in the text, so, too, does the audience’s presence. In this way the mirror is raised to reflect the various levels of storytelling layered within the *frametale*’s structure, ending with the principal storyteller and his audience.

While an anonymous storyteller may possess a certain authority principally by virtue of his role as narrator of a work, a narrator who is identified as the known author or compiler of a collection carries an authority established also on the grounds of who he is: his name, his knowledge, and his experience. Such is the case, for example, of Petrus Alfonsi in the Disciplina clericalis and Juan Manuel in the Conde Lucanor. But just what is in a name? Although Alfonsi’s pages are filled with aphorisms of anonymous figures (“A philosopher said . . .”), he often evokes the authority of the past by citing famous figures such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Marianus, Moses, Job, and Solomon (Tolan 76). The author also takes care to clarify the names of other certain wise men: “the philosopher Enoch, called Edris in Arabic” and “Balaam, who in Arabic is called Lukaman” (105). Lacarra notes that the use of famous names aided in the success of works such as sententiae collections: “La Edad Media basaba su noción de saber en la referencia a unos antiguos en quienes la sabiduría tuvo un desarrollo incomparable” (Cuento y novela corta 49). Despite the fact that many words of

wisdom have been falsely attributed to certain famous figures, these sayings nonetheless retain the weight of authority in large part because they have been associated with true historical figures (or at least presumed to be real) whose prestigious reputations have survived the test of time.¹¹³ In cases such as these, the narrator of the *frametales* is associated with a genuine author whose very authenticity lends credence to the sources he cites, even if these are dubious. That the known author or compiler stands behind his sources and vouches for their veracity is one variation of the boxing technique that Gittes refers to as a “chain of eyewitnesses” (61). She illustrates how this device operates in the Disciplina:

The reader knows that Petrus Alfonsi . . . , who clearly identifies himself as the narrator of the Disciplina Clericalis, actually exists; in like manner, people supposed that Balaam . . . , an Old Testament figure from the book of Numbers, actually lived. Thus, the framing story of the Arab and his son appears to be an episode which actually occurred because a real Balaam tells it and a real Petrus Alfonsi knows what Balaam said. In a sense, Petrus Alfonsi personally accounts for the accuracy of all the material in the Disciplina Clericalis. (61)

This technique, Gittes notes, “furnishes the Disciplina Clericalis with authenticity and accuracy” (61).

Although the validity of a *frametales* rests to some extent on a chain of authenticators that leads to the composer of the collection, it must be said that more than the composer’s position in this chain is important. His authority to

transmit wisdom derives in part from his having a good knowledge and understanding of what he relays. Furthermore, the very obligation to perform this role grants him the authority to do so. This duty may arise from a personal sense of debt to one's fellowman and to posterity, or it may be assigned to him by someone else, or both. Indeed, a similar basis for the authority of a storyteller is found within framing stories. As Dunn observes in the Conde Lucanor, for example, "The count's request for advice confers upon Patronio both the duty and the authority to advise" ("Framing the Story" 96). That Count Lucanor believes Patronio capable of fulfilling this obligation well is evident in the qualifications he often states in his requests: "Et por el buen entendimiento que Dios en vós puso . . ." (82; ex. 20). Moreover, having an obligation to share one's knowledge (specifically by means of storytelling) does not negate the desire, the honor, or the pleasure to do so, as Patronio often indicates prior to relating his tale: ". . . plazerme ya que sopiéssedes lo que contesció . . ." (165; ex. 41). Similar grounds of authority are also evident in the framing story of the Decameron, as the introduction to the eighth story of the second day illustrates: ". . . a Elissa rivolta impose che con una delle sue l'ordine seguitasse. La quale, lietamente faccendolo, incominciò . . ." (141; 2.8) (" . . . she [Filomena as queen] turned to Elissa and enjoined her to continue the proceedings with a story of her own. Being only too pleased to oblige, Elissa began as follows . . ."; 148). That Elissa fulfilled her obligation as a storyteller is noted at the beginning of the following tale: "Avendo Elissa con la sua compassionevole novella il suo dover fornito . . ." (155; 2.9) ("Elissa's touching tale being at an end and her duty done . . ."; 165).

Finally, wisdom as a credential for Elissa's authority as a storyteller is understood, for, as McWilliam notes, "Each of the seven young ladies is described from the start as being wise (savia ciascuna)" (lx).¹¹⁴ A final example is offered by the framing story of the Disciplina clericalis, in which the various storytellers (father, teacher, philosopher) are authorized to tell stories and share their wisdom not only because they are wise and experienced, but also because they have a responsibility to impart their wisdom for the sake of their contemporaries and that of future generations. This obligation is expressed in various ways, although usually within the dialogue between the storyteller and his audience. It occurs, for example, in the introduction to tale 19: "The son said: 'Tell me, father, [so] that posterity may gain something useful.' And so the father began" (136). On another occasion, a pupil says to his teacher:

. . . if you have laid up anything of this type gained from the sages in the library of your spirit, I beg you to tell me your pupil, and I will commend it to my faithful memory so that sometime I may be able to set before my fellow students who here in school are nurtured on the milk of wisdom, a tasty dish. (130)

As the principal storyteller of the Disciplina clericalis, Alfonsi expresses his motivation for composing his work in terms of both his wisdom and his responsibility to share it with others: "Therefore because God has designed to clothe me in his many-sided wisdom, although I am a sinner, in order that the light given to me should not be hid under a bushel, and at the prompting of that same holy spirit, I have been moved to write this book" (103). Speaking of the

author's body of work, Tolan argues, "Alfonsi shaped (and at times distorted) the knowledge he was transmitting, in accordance both with his understanding (or misunderstanding) of that knowledge and with his perceptions of the needs and desires of his newfound audience" (3). His link in this chain of transmission was a strong one, for, as Tolan notes, "Alfonsi texts were enthusiastically received—he became an auctor, an authority to be quoted" (3).¹¹⁵ Thus in his role as principal storyteller of the Disciplina, Alfonsi serves, on one hand, to unify his frame tale and to tighten its structure by choosing, forming, arranging, and tying together all of the enclosed material. On the other hand, by authenticating this material and sharing it with others on the basis of his authority, Alfonsi links his collection to the storytelling tradition that perpetuates the transmission of wisdom.

Don Juan Manuel is another author whose role as narrator helps authenticate his collection by lending it authority and increasing its verisimilitude. As the principal storyteller, he performs a significant function in validating Patronio's advice by telling his audience that the Count understood the advice to be good, that he followed it, and that he benefited from it ("El conde tovo este por buen consejo, et fízolo assí et fallóse dello muy bien").¹¹⁶ Although the narrator's presence here (and repeated at this juncture of every tale) strengthens the organizational and structural coherence of the collection, the process of reinforcement is not yet complete. The truth, as advised by Patronio and exemplified by his tale, as tested and proved by Count Lucanor, and as verified by the narrator, is then validated, according to Dunn, by "the fictional persona, 'Don Juan Manuel,'" who, as the reader is told, approves of the whole transaction ("este

exienplo”) and determines it appropriate for inclusion in his collection (“Framing the Story” 96). The collection, in turn, is housed at the Monastery of Peñafiel, intended by its author to preserve the narrative tradition it represents for future generations of readers and listeners (Dunn, “Framing the Story” 96).

Although a recognized author serving as narrator strengthens the overall structure of a collection, an even more complex structure forms in *frametales* in which a single figure is identified as author, narrator, and character within the framing story. In her study The Status of the Reading Subject in the Libro de buen amor, Brownlee calls the tripartite role of Juan Ruiz “the narrator/protagonist/author configuration” (59).¹¹⁷ She suggests that the configuration presents an important paradox in the Libro de buen amor, the understanding of which relies on avoiding the error of equating these three roles:

How can the Archpriest simultaneously be the embodiment of sin (a parody of Christian values) and a Christian exemplar (a spokesman for these values)?

The answer lies in the necessary distinction which must be made between protagonist, narrator, and author figure. The Archpriest both as protagonist and as narrator is—as he openly states in stanza 76, a sinner, a condition which will remain constant throughout the poem, since he is writing from the present of the time of writing. However, beyond these two levels of narration there is a third which must be taken into account, that of the silent author figure who structures his work in such a way that the

implied reader—he who is of good understanding—will perceive
the didactic structure of the work. . . . (72-73)

Here Brownlee adds a footnote of particular interest to my study: “This author figure is analogous in function to the one who exists in the sixteenth-century paradigm of confessional literature—Lazarillo de Tormes, as defined by Stephen Gilman in his important study, ‘The Death of Lazarillo de Tormes’ . . .” (73). I will examine the structural role of this threefold figure in the Lazarillo in the following chapter.

Chaucer, too, plays a complex organizing role as author, narrator, and character. As a character in the Canterbury Tales, Chaucer the pilgrim exists on the same narrative level as the other pilgrims/storytellers in the main framing story. Although an important aspect of his role on this level is the careful observation of those in his company, Chaucer is no mere onlooker, for he interacts with the group. Like the others, he participates in the storytelling along the way and is subjected to their judgment. He draws sharp criticism, in fact, from the Host for his Tale of Sir Thopas (Th): “Thy drasty rymyng is nat worth a toord!” (371; Th 930) (“Your shithouse rhyming isn’t worth a turd!”; 173). It is through his contact with the other pilgrims that Chaucer as character witnesses and forms impressions of them that he will later recount as narrator of the Canterbury Tales. Nonetheless, as E. Talbot Donaldson points out, on their level Chaucer “is, usually, acutely unaware of the significance of what he sees, no matter how sharply he sees it” (929).

Chaucer as narrator reinforces the structure and organization of the Canterbury Tales, particularly where his voice surfaces in the prologue and in the material linking the enclosed tales.¹¹⁸ “Such transitional passages,” explains Gittes, “strengthen the organizing role of Chaucer as pilgrim and eyewitness, for the more pervasive the authorial presence, the better that presence organizes the work” (128). The narrator’s voice serves as a reminder to his audience that he acts as both reporter and interpreter, but there are limitations to each role. In his ostensibly objective role of strictly recounting the pilgrims’ stories in their own words, the narrator hopes to absolve himself of responsibility for anything his audience might find unseemly. Thus in one sense, as Andersen notes, “he consolidates the authenticity of the framework fiction” (191). Yet in the same role he also holds the powerful position of mediator of truth:

For this ye knowen al so wel as I,
Whoso shal telle a tale after a man,
He moot reherce as ny as evere he kan
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
Al speke he never so rudeliche and large,
Or ellis he moot telle his tale untrewe,
Or feyne thyng, or fynde wordes newe.
He may nat spare, althogh he were his brother;
He moot as wel seye o word as another. (28; GP 730-38)
For, as you all must know as well as I,
To tell a tale told by another man

You must repeat as nearly as you can
Each word, if that's the task you've undertaken,
However course or broad his language is;
Or, in the telling, you'll have to distort it
Or make things up, or find new words for it.
You can't hold back, even if he's your brother:
Whatever word is used, you must use also. (19)

While the narrator stresses the importance of faithfully rendering the storytelling, he also hints at the inherent impossibility of fully achieving this ideal. Despite a teller's will to depict the truth, he can achieve only "as ny as evere he kan." That the narrator's aims are confined by his own human imperfections or shortcomings, such as a limited or faulty memory, underscores the narrator's role in the process of retelling. Thus the audience is subtly reminded of a feature of key importance: storytelling entails not only continuity but also change. The narrator's position at the core of this change, no matter how slight, reinforces his organizational role behind all that which he recounts.¹¹⁹

As interpreter or evaluator of what he witnesses, the narrator plays an even greater organizing role over the material he presents, for his impressions are necessarily mediated by who he is: personal biases, past experiences, literary aims, storytelling skills, and, as indicated above, degree of understanding. In the preface to his portraits of the pilgrims, Chaucer vows a full description of each, while in the same breath suggesting the subjective nature of such an endeavor:

But nathelees, whil I have tyme and space,

Er that I ferther in this tale pace,
Me thynketh it acordaunt to resoun
To telle yow al the condicioun
Of ech of hem, so as it semed me. . . . (4; GP 35-39)
But, before I go further with this tale,
And while I can, it seems reasonable
That I should let you have a full description
Of each of them, their sort and condition,
At any rate as they appeared to me. . . . (2)

The phrase “so as it semed me” highlights Chaucer’s role as eyewitness to that which he is about to report, thus lending credibility to his account. At the same time, however, the phrase warns the audience that the eye of the beholder is not impartial. Charles A. Owen, Jr. notes, “With the portraits themselves, we discover that the modest ‘so as it semed me’ takes precedence over the promise of a complete description for each pilgrim” (49). Here Chaucer exercises his authority as narrator to determine what to tell and how to tell it based on his own impressions. In his portraits the narrator evaluates various qualities of his fellow pilgrims, and this authoritative role of assigning value reinforces his organizational role in the collection. As Donaldson points out, however, “our guide on such a pilgrimage” (929) belongs to a tradition of the fallible first person (934). Moreover, he argues, that these are the impressions of a naive, myopic, and biased narrator indicates that the overt set of values imparted in the text is skewed by these human shortcomings, despite any good intentions.

Yet, like Chaucer the character, the narrator of the Canterbury Tales exists within the fiction created by the real Chaucer, the author who functions behind the scenes on a different structural and organizational level. As in the case of Juan Ruiz, the skill, understanding, and motives of the fictional character and narrator are subsumed under those of the true author. Thus Chaucer as author is not restricted as is his narrator to a faithful rendering of the tales as he knows them. Whereas the narrator insists on a word-for-word representation of what he hears, the author can be seen moving vaguely among his literary analogues or liberally reworking his sources to create an original work that nonetheless bears the marks of tradition.

Another distinction between Chaucer's role as author and his roles as narrator and character is manifest in the portraits of the pilgrims. Allegedly based on Chaucer the character's impressions, and ostensibly depicted by Chaucer the narrator, the portraits are in fact creations of Chaucer the author and are subject to his personal biases, experiences, and agenda. Owen observes that the author, not content simply to follow literary convention to portray his characters, imitates life based on his own observations and impressions (49). Owen further suggests that it is through this acute observation by the author, as well as his use of diverse strategies to deliver it, that Chaucer engages his audience in these portraits:

The shifting interplay in the portraits between detail and generalization, between the fact and its implications, between the explicit and the omitted, between the naive and the witty, between

the ordered and the random, keeps the reader's expectations constantly alert. (49)

Further evidence of the author's structural and organizational role behind that of his narrator and character is in the multiplicity of meaning of an individual tale depending on the circumstances and participants of the storytelling. Of the Tale of Sir Thopas, for example, Chaucer the fictional character tells his audience of pilgrims, ". . . it is the beste rym I kan" (370; Th 928) (" . . . it's the best ballad that I know"; 173). To Chaucer the author and his audience, however, the tale is what John Halverson calls "a good joke, cleverly made," for "most of the standard ingredients and the style of romance are made fun of in the tale" (370). Beyond the parody of chivalric romance, the humor extends to the author's choice of character to carry out the joke. Chaucer the poet, father of the rhyming pentameter in English verse and author of numerous poetic works in addition to the Canterbury Tales, selects his namesake to tell the Tale of Sir Thopas, for which he is interrupted by the Host and soundly criticized for his "drasty speche" (370; Th 923) and "rym dogerel" (370; Th 925). On this level of storytelling the discreet reader and the self-effaced author communicate, negotiating certain meaning in the text of which neither the character nor the narrator is fully aware.

Chaucer's exploitation of a tale's capacity for variable meaning depending on the participants and context of the storytelling enhances the complexity and subtlety of his work as a whole. Yet manipulations such as these reveal a diversity of understanding not only among the various levels or layers of storytelling, but also within any given level. In the level of storytelling in which

the author and his audience participate, for example, Chaucer's subtleties are not transparent to all readers and listeners alike, and even his more discerning audience will not agree on a single meaning. The field of literary analysis, in fact, is driven largely by diverse reader response, including conflicting interpretations and different aesthetic reactions. This diversity in audience response is reflected also on a narrative level within the Canterbury Tales, in the multiple ways in which the stories are received by the pilgrims in the frame. In the prologue to the Reeve's Tale, for example, the pilgrims' reactions to the Miller's Tale are described:

Diverse folk diversely they seyde,
But for the moore part they loughed and pleyde.
Ne at this tale I saugh no man hym greve,
But it were oonly Osewold the Reve. (125; RvT 3857-60)
Then different folk had different things to say,
But for the most part were amused, and laughed;
And none took umbrage at the tale, save only
Oswald the reeve, so far as I could see. (98)

The variety of reactions among the pilgrims mirrors the diversity of the pilgrims themselves. It must be remembered, however, that as reported by Chaucer the narrator, this observation carries a meaning that will become more profound only when considered within the much larger scheme of the author. And the author's plan was not to chart a straight forward course, as Gittes observes: "Standing behind Chaucer the reporter is Chaucer the poet, a figure, who, unlike Petrus

Alfonsi, is a manipulator of irony, of details, of structure—the fabricator of a design so inextricable that one can see only some features with certainty while others can only be sensed” (127).

THE FRAME

In the medieval *frametale* tradition, one of the chief roles of the primary narrator is to introduce the frame, while one of the principal functions of the frame is to establish the venue and pretext for storytelling. Among the predominant framing devices of this genre are a dialogue in which stories model the precept intended to guide the listener’s attitude or behavior; an argument or debate in which tales are used to illustrate a point or to counter the claims of an opponent; telling tales for the purpose of halting or postponing an action; and storytelling in its own right, as an end in itself.¹²⁰ The frame may exhibit more than one of these techniques at once, or, as in some of the more structurally complex *frametales*, a subordinate frame may fulfill a distinct function from that of the main frame.

All of these narrative structures depend on the ability of stories to affect the listener or reader by calling into play his judgment, sensibility, or behavior. Lacarra stresses the persuasive influence of storytelling: “En el origen del recurso [the *frametale*] subyace una gran fe en el poder persuasivo de los cuentos, pues con ellos se espera modificar la conducta de quienes los escuchan” (*Cuento y novela corta* 78). A further purpose of storytelling is to justify one’s own actions, whether past, present, or future. In this case, a tale offers a rationale for one’s behavior based on an established precedent whose authority is validated, on the

one hand, by the lesson imparted by the tale, and on the other, by the very telling of the story. While much storytelling serves either to influence actions and attitudes or to justify them, or both, on other occasions the primary intention is to impress the audience with the storyteller's ability. The storyteller's chief purpose in this case is to receive praise, and certainly to avoid censure, for the performance of his skill. Undoubtedly some of the most effective storytelling entails the marriage of these goals: an appeal to the listener's sensibility and judgment coupled with the successful evocation of a desired response of action.

One of the principal structural devices that motivate storytelling in the frame is the dialogue. To varying degrees of sophistication, the dialogue structure takes the form of a request and its fulfillment, or an inquiry and its response, between two parties: son and father, student and teacher, or ruler and counselor (or philosopher). The exchange may be simple, as in the Kalila and Dimna in which the king requests a story on a general topic from the philosopher. The philosopher obliges, typically responding first with an aphoristic saying that he likens to the events or characters of a particular tale. The king inquires, "How was that?" and the philosopher commences storytelling. Although the dialogue frame does not return at the end of each book after the tales have been told, it faithfully resurfaces at the start of each new one. The books are laced together as the king, reciting the gist of the story of the previous chapter, acknowledges that he has heard the tale. He then requests the philosopher tell another story on a different topic. Thus the cycle continues.

The son/student/ruler's request may concern a more complicated situation that troubles him on a greater personal level, to which the father/teacher/counselor, in turn, offers an explanation, solace, or guidance. The veracity of his response is exemplified by the story he tells. This narrative structure is represented by the frame of the Conde Lucanor, in which the dialogue between Count Lucanor and Patronio motivates the telling of each tale.¹²¹ Lacarra, in fact, suggests that the type of problem posed by the Count to his counselor may well be what most separates Juan Manuel's work from its Eastern predecessors. Whereas the issues raised in story collections such as the Kalila are of a more general or abstract nature, Count Lucanor's concerns are closer to home: family, neighbors, and himself (Cuentos de la Edad Media 69).

Lacarra cites a further distinction between the Conde Lucanor and its antecedents in Juan Manuel's use of indirect speech when the Count requests Patronio tell the tale to which the counselor has just alluded. The direct quotation "How was that?" typical of previous *frametales* is replaced by the indirect expression "Et el conde le preguntó cómo fuera aquello" (Cuentos de la Edad Media 69). A slight variation of this formula is also frequently used: "El conde le rogó que dixiese que cómo fuera aquello." The interruption of the dialogue by the voice of the narrator is a subtle reminder that the dialogue itself is part of a greater story. At the moment at which Patronio is about to commence his storytelling, the principal narrator's brief presence encourages the reader to momentarily step back and recall that he, too, is engaged in a similar process. Patronio's storytelling serves a purpose in the world of Count Lucanor much as

Juan Manuel's story of Patronio and the Count is intended to touch his readers' lives.

The frame's structure is reinforced when the dialogue resumes upon the conclusion of each tale. Here Patronio readdresses Count Lucanor directly with advice or consolation specific to his difficulty. The exchange between the Count and his counselor is repeated with a high degree of regularity throughout the book, yet the work is neither simple nor monotonous. "Stability in the frame," notes Dunn, "permits subtlety and flexibility in the individual stories" ("Framing the Story" 96). Hence the dialogue structure of the framing story is deceptively simple, for it not only forms horizontal links between diverse constituent tales, as well as between the five separate books that make up the collection as a whole, but it also connects the various vertically-arranged levels of narrative, from Patronio and Count Lucanor to Juan Manuel and his audience both present and future.

Despite the uniformity of the framing story of the Conde Lucanor, some frametale collections exhibit considerable variety within the dialogue structure. As noted previously, the framing story of the Disciplina clericalis sustains diverse dialogues, between father and son, for example (though they are not the same father and son throughout the work),¹²² and between teacher and student. At times these roles overlap, as in the case of a philosopher, who is also a father, who instructs his son, who is also called a pupil (142). In most dialogues of this frametale, the father/teacher/philosopher is the figure who illuminates a truth through illustrative tales and sayings, thereby sharing his knowledge or wisdom

with his son/student/ruler. On numerous occasions, however, the storyteller/listener roles of the preponderant dialogue scheme are reversed. This occurs with the aforementioned tale, "The Footpath," where the variation in the dialogue structure highlights several key points. The son's own experience that serves to illustrate a certain truth is doubly legitimized, first, by the very act of storytelling, and, second, by the father's explicit reference to his son's tale within his own story. The son is thereby shown to understand the wisdom of his father's admonition, his own experience verifies it, and his father's affirmation of his tale validates its worthiness. This process of validation is similar to that which occurs in the Conde Lucanor in which the reader is told that the Count recognized the value of Patronio's advice, that it was tested and proved true, and that Don Juan Manuel judged the tale suitable for inclusion in his work. Yet in the Conde Lucanor the Count's personal experience of testing and validating the truth occurs beyond the narrative, whereas in the Disciplina the son's validation of his father's advice is the substance of the story itself.

In Alfonsi's frametale, not all of the stories that the son recounts to his father are based on firsthand experience; some are tales that he has heard from another source. When the son mentions an old story that his teacher told, the father replies, "Tell me, my son, what you have heard? . . . Such a story will be a joy and delight to heart and soul" (138). At the conclusion of the tale, the father judges that the outcome of the tale was just. First by encouraging his son's storytelling and then by reinforcing his tales, the father aids in perpetuating the tradition of storytelling itself. Perhaps this multiplicity of storytellers in dialogue

format foretells framing stories such as in the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales in which a company of diverse people partake in the storytelling.

A second structural scheme common to the frametale genre is the use of stories in an argument or a debate. Viktor Shklovsky employs the term “debate of stories” to describe the framing technique in which “one story is called upon to refute another story” (66). Pitted against each other, opposing sides argue their point and support their claims with illustrative tales. In some instances, however, tales may be used to exemplify a point of argument in the absence of an overt counter-argument or rebuttal. In either case, however, the basic purpose of the tale remains: “to demonstrate some idea” (Shklovsky 66). This function is not unrelated to its role in the dialogue structure.¹²³ Dunn recognizes the relevance of both techniques to the Conde Lucanor, in which “the stories do not serve only as models for conduct (exempla), they may also serve as arguments for a mode of conduct” (emphasis in original; “Framing the Story” 98). “Argument,” he continues, “is a conspicuous function of the embedded stories in Panchatantra and Kalila-wa-Dimna, the oriental collections most accessible to Don Juan Manuel . . .” (“Framing the Story” 98).

In his study “The Function of the Popular Tale in the Libro de buen amor,” Ian Michael examines the collection’s thirty-five tales within their context and arrives at, among others, two important conclusions related to the argument/debate scheme of framing tales within a larger narrative. First he determines, “In every case except the last (“Song of the Clerics of Talavera”) the function of the tales is to illustrate a point of argument. It is clear that they

perform the function of the illustrative analogue, not that of the allegorical parable” (215). He further concludes, “The tales occur in particular groups in the Libro because they occur only at moments of argument or debate: the author’s address to the reader, the Archpriest’s Debate with Don Amor, Trotaconventos’s arguments with Doña Endrina and with Doña Garoza” (216).

A closer look at the relationship between two enclosed tales and the frame will illustrate Michael’s conclusions concerning the argument/debate structural scheme. The debate of stories between Trotaconventos and Doña Garoza begins when the old woman advises the nun to receive the advances of the Archpriest, to which Doña Garoza responds by telling the story “The Gardener and the Snake” (1348-54). In Juan Ruiz’s version of this tale, the gardener happened upon a half-dead snake in the middle of winter, took pity on it, carried it home, and nurtured it until it grew rather large. Once the weather was favorable, the snake emerged from its hole in the kitchen floor and, in a fit, began spreading its poison around the house. When the gardener attempted to banish the snake, it instead set to strangling the man around the neck. At the conclusion of her tale, Doña Garoza offers the following moralizations:

Alégrase el malo en dar por miel venino,
e por fruto dar pena al amigo e vezino;
por piedad, engaño, d’onde bien le avino:
assí derechamente a mí de ti me vino.
Tú estavas coitada, pobre e sin buena fama;
d’onde oviesses cobro non tenías adama;

ayudéte con algo, fue grand tiempo tu ama;

conséjame agora que pierda la mi alma. (1354-55)

A bad person delights in giving poison in return for honey, and in return for fruit giving pain to friend and neighbor; deceit for kindness to the one from whom good was done to him: in just this way it comes straight to me from you.

You were in difficulty, poor and without a good name; you had no beloved lady from whom you could get assistance; I helped you with money, I was your employer for a long time; now you advise me to send my soul to perdition. (366)¹²⁴

Doña Garoza first expresses a broad moralization, using general terms such as “malo,” “amigo,” and “vezino” (st. 1354). She then leads into an explanation of how the tale’s moral directly relates to the situation at hand, thus clarifying the following analogy: the snake is to the gardener as Trotaconventos is to Doña Garoza.

Without denying the accusations against her, Trotaconventos spins her reaction as if the nun’s anger were truly motivated by a reason much less just than the one she has claimed. The go-between suggests that Doña Garoza insults her because on this occasion she has not brought the nun a gift as she used to do. The old woman then likens the situation to the tale “The Greyhound and His Master” (st. 1357-66), in which a greyhound is rewarded and praised in his youth for his successes at hunting, but beaten by the same master when later the dog’s old age prevents him from capturing and delivering his prey. Michael observes,

“Trotaconventos uses this Aesopic tale to counter Doña Garoça’s tale of the Gardener and the Snake. Its function at first is to illustrate ingratitude (her counter-accusation) . . .” (209). The old go-between then moves to stress the theme of disrespect for elders before returning to the issue of ungratefulness (Michael 209). Upon concluding her tale, she expresses several general statements of truth exemplified by the story before applying the tale’s moral to the precise situation between the storyteller and the listener. “As in the previous tale,” states Michael, “there is a double parallel: Trotaconventos is like the aged greyhound and Doña Garoça is like the ungrateful hunter” (209). The debate of tales between the old woman and the nun continues in a similar manner until another eight tales are told.

In the Libro de buen amor, the relationship between the enclosed tales and their frame is determined by the demands of the frame. Dunn’s view regarding the function of exempla explains this association:

. . . exempla are nothing without a frame. They are employed precisely to give concreteness to an abstraction or a generalization; they may be used on either side of an argument (a practice that has caused puzzlement to some modern readers of Juan Ruiz’s Libro de buen amor); that is to say that they do not carry a precise moral or intellectual freight of their own. They operate rather as narrative shifters, or wild cards, acquiring whatever value may be ascribed to them by the speaker’s rhetorical intent. (“Framing the Story” 100)

In the storytelling episodes of Juan Ruiz's work, two key functions of the characters' arguments are justification and persuasion. Thomas R. Hart addresses this point with respect to two episodes in his article "Exemplary Storytellers: Trotaconventos and Doña Garoza." Of the multiple similarities between the episodes of Doña Endrina and of Doña Garoza, he argues, "the most important is that both Doña Endrina and Doña Garoza retell traditional fables to justify their refusal to accept Trotaconventos's invitation to meet her client, just as Trotaconventos also relies on fables in her attempt to persuade them to do so" (emphasis added; 165).

That individual tales are malleable tools of debate is illustrated in "The Greyhound and His Master" by the degree to which Trotaconventos shifts her argument to stress different points of the tale in order to sway her listener on more than one issue. Of course Juan Ruiz, creator of both the fictional storyteller and her audience, is the true mastermind and manipulator of tales. And manipulate them he does. Although the author's direct sources are unknown, Michael offers numerous examples of how Juan Ruiz adjusts a given tale in order to illustrate a point or draw a lesson that is not commonly associated with that tale but that corresponds with the immediate needs of his framing story. The tales, Michael rightly claims, are "always subordinated to his main purpose" (182-83).

Despite any alterations that he may make to a tale to suit his intentions in the main narrative, Juan Ruiz does not insist on a precise fit between the tale and the frame. Michael explains:

There is always one bridge between the tale and the outer narrative, in a few cases there are two or more, but it is rare for the events or situation in the tale to match exactly those in the outer narrative. . . . [H]e may not have been aiming at a fuller integration and thus, after making one connection between a tale and the outer framework, he felt free on occasion to exploit the tale for its own sake. . . . (215-16)

Thus Juan Ruiz demonstrates his skill in adapting a tale to satisfy the purposes dictated by an argument or debate in his framing story, while at the same time allowing the tale to retain a degree of autonomy that expresses the author's sheer delight in storytelling.

Debate is a conspicuous structural component of the Canterbury Tales as well (although this frametale may also be identified with the fourth framing scheme concerning storytelling for its own sake). Not only is the storytelling organized as a contest or competition among the pilgrims, but it also takes shape according to the conflicting attitudes of the storytellers. Chaucer's technique of motivating some of the storytelling by means of establishing individual rivalries among the storytellers is a tactic that Gittes describes as "an elaborate adaptation of the earlier use of debates to frame stories" (121). "Besides parodying the Knight," she illustrates, "the Miller quits (counters) him; the Reeve quits the Miller; the Merchant quits the Clerk; the Friar, Summoner, and Franklin quit the Wife; the Canon's Yeoman quits the Canon; and the Friar and Summoner quit

each other” (121). Debate, then, serves a critical role in organizing the diversity of the frametale collection, as Cooper explains in “The Frame”:

The social and moral variety of Chaucer’s pilgrims and the stylistic and generic diversity of their tales are not ends in themselves. They enable Chaucer to set up a series of different and opposed assumptions about human existence and experience, and to present various attitudes to specific issues that were matters of dispute in the larger world. The narrative articulation of the tales works through the Host’s calling on one pilgrim to follow another; but the tales are also connected as a series of elements in a debate, or in several debates. (14)

Many of the subjects addressed in the Canterbury Tales are common to the long tradition of debate in the Middle Ages, such as the topic of experience versus authority, or the question of the nature of women. Chaucer also depicts “the issue of fortune versus fate versus Providence,” that Cooper contends

is discussed as an issue in itself in the Knight’s Tale, but then pursued more generally through the way in which later tales assume one principle or another in presenting their action: chance in the Miller’s Tale, Fortune in the Monk’s Tale, rival principles of fate (in the shape of the stars . . .) and Providence in the Man of Law’s Tale, the absolute divine control of events in the Second Nun’s Tale. (“The Frame” 15)

Cooper explains that debate played a much greater role in everyday public life in the Middle Ages than in the modern age (“The Frame” 14). Debate was not only “the medium of much intellectual activity and of the procedures of administration,” but it was also integral to public entertainment as “debate for its own sake” (Cooper, “The Frame” 14). In the latter realm, the emphasis shifted from arriving at a definitive conclusion to the quality of the argument itself (Cooper, “The Frame” 14). Cooper contends that the lack of a decisive judgment in a debate is evident in much medieval debate poetry that serves as a powerful analogue of the Canterbury Tales (“The Frame” 14-15). Thus, she concludes, “Chaucer’s avoidance of any conclusion, or any judgement between them, is itself broadly typical of one major element of the debate genre” (“The Frame” 18).

Gittes likewise identifies the expression of multiple points of view in the absence of any definitive resolution as a key feature of the debate/contest element of the Canterbury Tales (121-22). Yet while Cooper regards this characteristic as a point of contrast between Chaucer’s work and its story collection analogues, Gittes argues the opposite. First she points to a similar tendency in Arabic literature in which the reader must arrive at his own conclusions (122). Gittes further notes that the audience’s role in discerning the truth from a variety of facts (or viewpoints) is characteristic of Chaucer’s predecessors in the *frametales* tradition as well (122).

Within a third structural scheme used to generate stories, storytelling serves “to retard the main action” (Dunn, “Framing the Story” 95), or “to postpone an execution” (Deyermond, Literary History 98). This type of framing

technique Shklovsky refers to as a “device of deceleration” which functions by “dragging out the time and forestalling a hasty decision” (42).¹²⁵ Yet this type of framing device not only acts as a “delaying tactic” (Shklovsky 43), it also implies that the tales themselves may serve as powerful tools of persuasion.

Such is the frame structure of the Seven Sages of Rome, in which, according to Lacarra, “contar es salvar la vida” (Cuento y novela corta 78).¹²⁶ In this *frametale*, seven counselors tell stories in an attempt to delay the king’s action for seven days until his son is allowed to break his imposed silence and speak in his own defense against his stepmother’s false accusations. The frame structure of the Seven Sages also resembles the argument/debate scheme in that the sages’ stories advocating prudence and justice are countered by the tales told by the king’s wife, who attempts with her stories to sway her husband to take immediate action in condemning the prince. The tales of the sages and of the wife both prove persuasive, for the king vacillates between calling for his son’s execution and his acquittal. When finally the son is able to speak after the forced delay is over, in some versions he mounts his own defense by engaging in storytelling himself. In this way the prince simultaneously proves his innocence and illustrates that he has gained knowledge and understanding through the sages’ instruction.

McWilliam observes a structural analogy between the Seven Sages and the Decameron, in which “the telling of stories is the means whereby the spectre of imminent death is held at a manageable distance, in the one case death by execution, in the other, death from bubonic plague” (lx-lxi). The escape of the

company of Florentines from their plague-afflicted city to the serene countryside presents a stark contrast within the framing story. While the journey emphasizes the physical separation between such distinct settings, the storytelling highlights this contrast, for it serves as a mode of entertainment to enliven the group and to distance their thoughts from the death that pervades their city. Dioneo's remarks to the ladies on the first day stress the association between the physical separation from death and the mental and emotional one, the former as a result of travel and the latter brought about by their activities:

. . . io non so quello che de' vostri pensieri voi v' intendete di fare: li miei lasciai io dentro dalla porta della città allora che io con voi poco fa me ne uscì' fuori: e per ciò o voi a sollazzare e a ridere e a cantare con meco insieme vi disponete (tanto, dico, quanto alla vostra dignità s'appartiene), o voi mi licenziate che io per li miei pensier mi ritorni e steami nella città tribolata. (22; 1, Introduction)

I know not what you intend to do with your troubles; my own I left inside the city gates when I departed thence a short while ago in your company. Hence you may either prepare to join with me in as much laughter, song and merriment as your sense of decorum will allow, or else you may give me leave to go back for my troubles and live in the afflicted city. (20)

Pampinea's reply to Dioneo reaffirms this relationship: “. . . festevolmente viver si vuole, né altra cagione dalle tristizie ci ha fatte fuggire” (22; 1, Introduction)

(“A merry life should be our aim, since it was for no other reason that we were prompted to run away from the sorrows of the city”; 20).

Boccaccio’s use of the deceleration or delaying technique in the Decameron functions not only by distancing his storytellers from the afflicted city of Florence and placing them in a country setting, but also by establishing a distinct sense of time. The sojourn from their homes and the reprieve from their regular routines allow the group to create, and recreate, its own time schedule. There is yet another temporal division, that which distinguishes the framing story from the enclosed tales. As Bonnie D. Irwin observes:

. . . the time frame of each narrated story is different from the temporal movement of the framing story. This creates a kind of pushing and pulling movement as each interpolated tale stops time and forwards it simultaneously. As readers, we will not reach the end of the framing story without passing through the interpolated ones, but each interpolated tale effectively stops time for the reader while it is being narrated, although it fills time for the audience within the text. (26-27)

Toward the stated goal of “a merry life,” storytelling in the frame of the Decameron is also associated with the fourth structural scheme of telling stories “for the sake of story-telling itself” (Dunn, “Framing the Story” 95).¹²⁷ A key feature of this framing device is the sheer entertainment that the pastime offers to all of those involved. Pampinea makes this association clear in her recommendation that the company spend the hottest part of the day “novellando

(il che può porgere, dicendo uno, a tutta la compagnia che ascolta diletto)” (25; 1, Introduction) (“telling stories—an activity that may afford some amusement both to the narrator and to the company at large”; 23). Even when Filostrato as king decrees that the theme for stories on the fourth day will be those whose love ended unhappily, and he requests that Pampinea tell a gruesome tale, she finds a means to obey the directive of the leader while remaining faithful to the storytelling objective of the group:

Pampinea, a sé sentendo il comandamento venuto, più per la sua affezione cognobbe l’animo delle compagne che quello del re per le sue parole: e per ciò, più disposta a dovere alquanto recrear loro che a dovere, fuori che del comandamento solo, il re contentare, a dire una novella, senza uscir del proposto, da ridere si dispose. . . . (276; 4.2)

On hearing herself singled out as the next speaker, Pampinea, knowing that her own feelings were a better guide than the king’s words to the mood of her companions, was more inclined to amuse them than to satisfy the king in aught but his actual command; and so she decided that without straying from the agreed theme, she would narrate a story to make them laugh. . . . (302)

Inherent to the framing device of storytelling as an end in itself is an appreciation for a well-told story, regardless of how accurate or appropriate or beneficial the content of the tale may be. In the final story of the third day, for example, Dioneo tells to his refined and gracious audience a bawdy story only

remotely related to the day's prescribed theme: "di chi alcuna cosa molto da lui disiderata con industria acquistasse o la perduta ricoverasse" (177; 3, Introduction) ("of people who by dint of their own efforts have achieved an object they greatly desired, or recovered a thing previously lost"; 189). Although he purports that his tale will advise the ladies of his company how to put the devil back in Hell, and thus how to serve God and take pleasure in this service at the same time, the content of the tale reveals that putting the devil (male genitalia) back in Hell (female genitalia) signifies copulation. Although a naive young virgin, Alibech, is tricked by a monk, Rustico, into having sex under the pretext of religious beneficence, the issue of immorality is subdued by such wit that instead of inciting moral outrage, the skillfully narrated story greatly pleases Dioneo's audience: "Mille fiate o più aveva la novella di Dioneo a rider mosse l'oneste donne, tali e sì fatte lor parevan le sue parole. . . ." (256; 3, Conclusion) ("So aptly and cleverly worded did Dioneo's tale appear to the virtuous ladies, that they shook with mirth a thousand times or more"; 279).

The Florentine storytellers are not the only ones to take such pleasure in the tale of Alibech and Rustico, however. Indeed the first time an audience is amused by this account is told as an incident within the story itself when Alibech explains to the women of her hometown how she put the devil back in Hell: "La giovane tra con parole e con atti il mostrò loro; di che esse fecero sì gran risa, che ancor ridono. . . ." (254-55; 3.10) ("Partly in words and partly through gestures, the girl showed them how it was done, whereupon the women laughed so much that they are laughing yet. . . ."; 279). The story, told first by one of the

protagonists herself, continued to entertain audiences as it was recounted time and again: “Poi l’una all’altra per la città ridicendolo, vi ridussono in volgar motto che il più piacevol servizio che a Dio si facesse era rimettere il diavolo in inferno: il qual motto, passato di qua da mare, ancora dura” (255; 3.10) (“The story was repeated throughout the town, being passed from one woman to the next, and they coined a proverbial saying there to the effect that the most agreeable way of serving God was to put the devil back in Hell. The dictum later crossed the sea to Italy, where it survives to this day”; 279). Dioneo’s account is then told to entertain his audience of Florentines seeking amusement in pleasurable pastimes in the countryside. Thus the life events of an ingenuous Alibech are told innocently to an audience who immediately understands the inherent humor in them and shares them with other audiences, and these with still others. The process of retelling the events transforms them into an amusing tale that eventually Dioneo adeptly narrates to his audience and that, behind him, Boccaccio as principal storyteller skillfully recounts to his. Likewise, the laughter evoked by the first telling is mirrored by the second, and so on until the laughter of today’s reader underscores Boccaccio’s awareness of participating in a long tradition of storytelling for the sake of storytelling.

That is not to say that how a story is told takes uniform precedence over what is told. In the Decameron, the company’s discussion of a tale almost invariably centers on its content. The narrator of the framing story often remarks that the Florentines deliberate on a story’s subject matter and compare it to what they have heard in other tales. Moreover, the characters themselves often

compare their stories to those of their fellow storytellers in terms of content. In their introductions they may promise to exceed previously told tales, or in their conclusions they may ask the audience to judge whether this has been done. In the fifth story of the tenth day, Emilia does both. She begins: “Morbide donne, niun con ragion dirà messer Gentile [from 10.4] non aver magnificamente operato, ma il voler dire che più non si possa, il più potersi non fia forse malagevole a mostrarsi: il che io avviso in una mia novelletta di raccontarvi” (657; 10.5) (“Dainty ladies, no one can seriously deny that Messer Gentile [from 10.4] acted munificently, but if anyone should claim that to do more would be impossible, it will not be too difficult to prove that they are wrong, as I propose to show you in this little story of mine”; 726). Emilia later concludes her tale by asking, “Che direm qui, amorevoli donne? . . . Sciocca cosa mi parrebbe a dover credere che quella liberalità a questa comparar si potesse” (660; 10.5) (“What is to be our verdict here, fond ladies? . . . In my view it would be quite absurd to suppose that the first of these generous deeds could be compared with the second”; 730-31). Judgments such as these that compare one tale to another with respect to a common topic or theme link the Decameron’s frame structure to the argument/debate scheme as well.

The association of the Canterbury Tales with the framing device of storytelling for its own sake is manifest in Harry Bailey’s comments in the General Prologue. Even before he proposes dinner as a reward for the best storyteller, an indication that the storytelling will be a competition of sorts, the

Host expresses his desire to think up some sort of amusement for the group of pilgrims while on their journey:

And wel I woot, as ye goon by the weye,
Ye shapen yow to talen and to pleye;
For trewely, confort ne myrthe is noon
To ride by the weye doumb as a stoon;
And therefore wol I maken yow disport,
As I seyde erst, and doon yow som confort. (29; GP 771-76)
And I'll be bound, that while you're on your way,
You'll be telling tales, and making holiday;
It makes no sense, and really it's no fun
To ride along the road dumb as a stone.
And therefore I'll devise a game for you,
To give you pleasure, as I said I'd do. (20)

Thus storytelling, the Host proposes, will serve as a pleasurable pastime “to shorte withoure weye” (29; GP 791) (“to shorten the long journey”; 21).

Although the tales are to be judged on the basis of “sentence” and “solaas” (30; GP 798), the favorable reaction of the pilgrims to certain tales indicates that even where ethical concerns and didactic aims may be lacking, the ability to entertain makes the storytelling a success. Of the Miller’s Tale, Cooper observes, “Ethical issues are never raised; the story is not immoral so much as cheerfully amoral. It does not even mete out justice within the terms of its own plot” (Oxford Guides 101). Nonetheless, its general approval by the pilgrims as

indicated by their amusement and laughter (excepting the Reeve), signals the tale accomplished the overt goal of amusing the pilgrims while on their journey.

Although the pretext for storytelling in medieval frametale collections is evident in diverse structures, four of which I have discussed above, these devices are not necessarily independent of each other. As I have shown, frametales such as the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales illustrate the confluence of two or more of these framing techniques. In the following chapter I aim to show that the framing device used in Lazarillo de Tormes may be viewed as a synthesis of all four previously described structural schemes of the frametale tradition.

FLEXIBILITY AND OPEN-ENDEDNESS

The formal structure of a frametale is often reflective of an overall plan of organization that is related to the storytelling scheme of the collection. In some works the scheme is proposed or described by the storytellers within the framing story. In other works the principal narrator devises or introduces the plan. In still others, a pattern emerges over the course of the storytelling and the plan becomes apparent without explicit justification or explanation. Regardless of who contrives the plan, however, or whether it is overt or implied, the plan lays the groundwork for the collection's structure and organization. The degree of flexibility in the number, grouping, and order of a frametale's constituent parts, and the extent to which the frame is open-ended are largely determined by the interplay of two organizational modes common to the frametale tradition.

As I have previously noted, Gittes argues that the organization of the medieval European frametale is reflective of two distinct and opposing outlooks,

one Eastern, the other Western (72-73).¹²⁸ She observes that “the Eastern tendency to keep structural boundaries open” contrasts with “the Western tendency to tighten structures and to impose limitations on material” (72). The *frametale* reflects a fusion of these tendencies, for although one mode may predominate in any given collection, there is evidence, however subtle, of the other mode as well. It may be helpful to conceive of a spectrum with one end represented by the Eastern mode and the opposite end by the Western mode, with individual collections, indeed each of their various versions, falling at diverse points in between. While the evolutionary trend of the medieval *frametale* is decidedly toward the Western mode of organization characterized by a tighter, more orderly structure and a greater consistency in upholding the plan of organization, in most collections there persists to some degree the Eastern tendency toward flexibility, fluidity, and open-endedness. Expressed in diverse ways, the last of these traits is one of the most steadfast characteristics of the *frametale*. In her concluding remarks to her book on the medieval *frametale* tradition, Gittes explains, “The open-endedness of most framing stories is the most distinctive and enigmatic feature of the frame narrative. Sometimes the open-endedness is associated with the theme of rebirth, sometimes it is manifested in an inconclusive plot, . . . and sometimes in the suggestion that the storytelling might continue indefinitely . . .” (143-44).

Alfonsi’s *Disciplina clericalis* is an example of a *frametale* with strong Eastern tendencies in part because it follows a seemingly arbitrary and open-ended plan of organization. Although, as I have previously illustrated, a degree of

unity and symmetry among enclosed tales is achieved through internal linking devices such as the balancing or grouping of tales according to theme or motif, gradation and climax, and the repetition of plot elements, there is no overarching scheme for the collection as a whole that dictates how the tales are grouped, the order in which they are told, or even how many are recounted. As indicated earlier, even the simple pattern of storytelling in the frame is disrupted as the roles of the narrator and the audience are occasionally reversed. Furthermore, the inconclusiveness of the Disciplina's framing story reflects the Eastern tendency toward open-endedness, as Gittes describes:

. . . the framing story, like that of the Panchatantra, is incomplete, for the Arab father never dies, we never learn that the son gained wisdom, and the framing story disappears before the work ends. The open-endedness of the Disciplina Clericalis effectively enhances the theme of the Epilogue: Christian rebirth after death. Similar links between structure and theme, between open-endedness and rebirth, appear in the Thousand and One Nights. . . . That the Epilogue deals with Christian rebirth makes the open-endedness appear logical because death for a Christian is not an end but a continuation. (65)

The flexibility and open-endedness of the Disciplina's structure allow for variation in the content, number, and arrangement of tales within the collection. Indeed later versions of the Disciplina reflect these changes, even as the

tendencies toward a tighter structure and a more unified framing story take root (Tolan 133, 135; Gittes 64-65).

A collection that is particularly useful in examining Eastern versus Western tendencies in the organization of a frametale is the Book of Sindbad/Seven Sages of Rome (Gittes 71-73). The Eastern branch of the Sindbad, for example, establishes a pattern of storytelling whereby for seven days the king's seven counselors tell two stories, to which the wife responds with one. As Gittes observes, there are disruptions to this plan in the Mishle Sendebār, the Hebrew version of the work: ". . . the wife breaks the pattern on the sixth day by not telling a tale, and at the end of the seventh sage's tale, two additional tales are told" (72). Sindbad contrasts with its Western counterpart, Seven Sages, in large part because the latter "has a distinctly more confining and orderly structure, for it adheres to the structural patterns imposed at the outset with greater rigidity and regularity than the Eastern version adheres to similar patterns" (Gittes 73). Gittes further observes that one version of the Western branch of the Seven Sages exhibits greater symmetry than the Eastern branch with respect to the number seven: "the seven sages teach seven arts, which the son learns in seven years, taught in a hall with seven chambers, decorated with pictures pertaining to the seven arts" (73).¹²⁹

Boccaccio plays with the two contrary modes of organization in his Decameron, in which strong Western organizing forces are suddenly, unexpectedly, and repeatedly undermined by Eastern ones. The deviation from an established pattern or plan gives the semblance of order or purpose giving way to

chance or randomness. This perceived assault on reader expectation must be carefully examined, however, for what may appear at first glance to be an abrupt change in the anticipated plan, upon further consideration may be understood as merely an alternative perspective of the status quo. As I will illustrate below, even Boccaccio as the principal narrator insists on a strict organization for his collection, only to challenge that form himself by manipulating the structural boundaries that he has designed. Hence the rigid organization of the Decameron is alternately challenged and preserved time and again in a continual play between order and randomness, between finitude and inconclusiveness.¹³⁰

Briefly introduced by the principal storyteller in the prologue, the storytelling scheme of the Decameron is developed in greater detail among the Florentines in the introduction to the first day. Pampinea, who insists, “Ma per ciò che le cose che sono senza modo non possono lungamente durare . . .” (22; 1, Introduction) (“Nothing will last for very long unless it possesses a definite form”; 20), proposes a plan whereby each day a different member of the group will act as leader, thereby sharing “il peso della sollecitudine insieme col piacere della maggioranza” (22; 1, Introduction) (“the burden of responsibility and the pleasure of command associated with sovereign power”; 20). The storytellers of the frame quickly agree upon and commence carrying out the plan of the work: for ten days the ten members of the brigata will each tell a tale, with a different member presiding over each day. Despite the implied structure of Pampinea’s plan, there is also an inherent arbitrariness to it because each leader will have license to make whatever arrangements he wishes for the duration of his rule.

That the structured scheme is amended several times in the course of carrying it out is often permitted by the very provision that each leader is free to vary the plan. For example, the initial plan implies that the ten days of storytelling will be consecutive, but upon the conclusion of the second day, Neifile instigates a change in the plan to which the company is already accustomed. She proposes to leave off storytelling on Fridays and Saturdays in order to dedicate that time to fasting, rest, prayer, and ablutions. The ten days of storytelling are therefore extended over a period of fourteen days. Although the expectation that the storytelling will occur over a ten-day period is ultimately satisfied according to the letter, it falls short with respect to the sense in which the plan was originally understood by both the storytellers and the reader.

The storytelling scheme of the Decameron is altered not only according to a time line, but also with respect to the tales' topics. After the first day in which the precedent is set that each storyteller is at liberty to tell a tale on the topic of his choice, Filomena proposes a change for the remaining days: "cioè a ristignere dentro a alcun termine quello di che dobbiamo novellare e davanti mostrarlovi, acciò che ciascuno abbia spazio di poter pensare a alcuna bella novella sopra la data proposta contare" (69; 1, Conclusion) ("namely, to restrict the matter of our storytelling within some fixed limit which will be defined for you in advance, so that each of us will have time to prepare a good story on the subject prescribed"; 67). The scheme is reversed for the ninth day, however, when Emilia dictates, ". . . non intendo di ristignervi sotto alcuna spezialtà, ma voglio che ciascuno secondo che gli piace ragioni . . ." (583; 8, Conclusion) (" . . . I do not propose to

confine you to any particular topic; on the contrary, I desire that each of us should speak on whatever subject he or she may choose . . .”; 645). The storytelling scheme is reverted yet again as the thematic restriction returns for the tenth and final day of storytelling. The topical scheme is further thwarted as Dioneo is permitted to veer from the established plan of recounting tales related to a prescribed topic for a given day. Therefore, although the symmetrical and orderly ten-by-ten structure of the Decameron remains intact in terms of the number of storytellers in the frame and the number of days on which the storytelling occurs, disruptions in the plan occur with respect to the succession of these days and to the topical program for the stories themselves.

Further deviations from the established plan occur when Boccaccio himself tells a tale in the introduction to the fourth day. Not only does the principal narrator disrupt the scheme that all tales will be told by the seven ladies and three young men of the framing story, but he also tells an incomplete tale in contrast to the finished stories told by the company of storytellers. Boccaccio advises that his tale is deliberately unfinished so as to draw a distinction between his tale and those of the framing story:

. . . mi piace in favor di me raccontare, non una novella intera, acciò che non paia che io voglia le mie novelle con quelle di così laudevole compagnia, quale fu quella che dimostrata v’ho, mescolare, ma parte d’una, acciò che il suo difetto stesso sé mostri non esser di quelle; e a’ miei assalitori favelando dico. (262; 4, Introduction)

. . . I should like to strengthen my case by recounting, not a complete story (for otherwise it might appear that I was attempting to equate my own tales with those of that select company I have been telling you about), but a part of one, so that its very incompleteness will set it apart from the others. (285)

Boccaccio's tale is of a man who, upon the loss of his beloved wife, determines that he will raise his young son in a remote cave to prevent his being exposed to and led astray by the objects and issues of human existence. On occasion, however, the father must travel to Florence to collect certain of life's necessities. On one such occasion, the father is convinced to allow his son to accompany him so that the son, being younger and fitter, may learn to take over the task some day. In Florence the son finds fascinating a multitude of new things, but one thing above all snatches and holds his interest, women ("goslings," as the father calls them). He immediately and fervently wishes to take one home with him, but his father warns his son against them, claiming that they are evil. The tale concludes with the father's sudden understanding of the situation in which he finds himself: ". . . e sentì incontanente più aver di forza la natura che il suo ingegno; e pentessi d'averlo menato a Firenze" (264; 4, Introduction) ("But no sooner had he spoken than he realized that his wits were no match for Nature, and regretted having brought the boy to Florence in the first place"; 287).

Despite the fact that the father in Boccaccio's tale recognizes both his underestimation of the force of Nature and the error of his actions, his anagnorisis does not lead to the resolution of the tale's plot as would be expected. Instead,

Boccaccio clearly marks the end of his narration by insisting that his tale is incomplete: “Ma avere infino a qui detto della presente novella voglio che mi basti . . .” (264; 4, Introduction) (“But I have no desire to carry this tale any further . . .”; 287). Curiously, in the same breath he implies that his story is conclusive enough to achieve the purposes he has in mind for its intended audience: “. . . e a coloro rivolgermi alli quali l’ho raccontata” (264; 4, Introduction) (“. . . I shall now direct my attention to the people for whose ears it was intended”; 287). Although Boccaccio’s tale remains unfinished, he has finished telling it. Indeed its conclusiveness is recognized by many of Boccaccio’s readers, as McWilliam suggests:

The tale, of oriental origin, is in fact sufficiently complete for commentators to refer to it as the 101st story of the Decameron. In the English translation of 1702, the editors not only dispense entirely with the frame, but included this story in place of the account of Alibech’s incarceration of the Devil (3.10). (826)

Hence as an unfinished tale, it runs contrary to the implication that all tales will be complete, with conclusive plots; as a finished tale, it skews the rounded total of one hundred stories by adding one tale to the count.

If Boccaccio’s tale on the fourth day breaks the proposed plan of an even hundred stories, this plan is further threatened when, as Gittes describes, “at the end of the last day, the king suggests that the group may either return to Florence or choose a king for the next day and continue the storytelling, an intimation that the stories can continue indefinitely” (87). This type of open-endedness exists in

earlier *frametales*, Gittes says, but is carried out with greater subtlety in the Decameron (87). “These two violations of the rigid structural plan suggest that if it can be overthrown once, it can be overthrown any number of times, an undermining of the tight organizational plan” (Gittes 87).

The Decameron’s open-endedness in several ways is a larger projection of the inconclusiveness that occurs on the level of the individual tale. It could be said of both the collection as a whole and of Boccaccio’s tale in the introduction to the fourth day, for example, that Boccaccio finishes narrating a story that nonetheless remains unfinished. In both cases, the work is inconclusive in that it raises questions for which it does not provide answers. Part of what is left unsaid is the way in which the characters respond to their discoveries, that is, whether and how they put into practice what they have learned. The uncertainty at the end of the collection is highlighted by the unfulfilled formula for wisdom that Dioneo spells out in the conclusion of the tenth day:

Addorne donne, come io credo che voi conosciate, il senno de’ mortali non consiste solamente nell’avere a memoria le cose preterite o conoscere le presenti, ma per l’una e per l’altra di queste sapere antiveder le future è da’ solenni uomini senno grandissimo riputato. (713; 10, Conclusion)

Graceful ladies, the wisdom of mortals consists, as I think you know, not only in remembering the past and apprehending the present, but in being able, through a knowledge of each, to

anticipate the future, which grave men regard as the acme of human intelligence. (795)

Within the scope of the collection, the question remains unanswered whether after the Florentines return home they will benefit from their experiences during their sojourn from Florence. Do they have a good understanding of the lessons afforded by the tales themselves and by the storytelling experience? Will they clearly and accurately perceive new circumstances or challenges that will arise? Will they remember the past and adequately understand their new experiences in terms of their past ones?

Questions arise and remain unanswered also in the tale that Boccaccio tells on the fourth day. After the father has recognized the true nature of the situation, for example, what will be his course of action? Boccaccio, for his immediate purposes, does not attempt to answer this question within the story itself. By instead curtailing the story at the point at which the father acknowledges his mistakes, Boccaccio highlights the theme of understanding. Only after the tale has concluded does the author address the issue of carrying that understanding into action by relating it to his own circumstances as an author who is criticized for his work. By interpreting the tale within the context of justifying his writing the *frametales* to please young ladies, Boccaccio draws two key parallels. On the one hand he is like the son in that he cannot overcome the force of Nature, or, more specifically, his attraction to females. The naive son does not understand the situation in which he finds himself, however, for as a result of his seclusion he has no past experience by which to judge his current one. Rather it is

the father, both experienced and wise, who recognizes this powerlessness, and therefore with whom Boccaccio is juxtaposed with respect to relying on experiences of the past and understanding the present. Boccaccio's literary project is undertaken in full knowledge of his circumstances, whereas the author's detractors are ignorant of what they criticize: "né la virtù della naturale affezione né sente né conosce" (264; 4, Introduction) ("ignorant of the strength and pleasure of natural affection"; 288). Since it is their lack of understanding that is at the root of their allegedly unjust criticism, Boccaccio chooses to stop his story at the point at which the theme of understanding is emphasized.¹³¹ Because at the moment at which Boccaccio composed his introduction to the fourth day his collection was still unfinished, it follows that the critics to whom the author addresses his unfinished tale had not yet seen his completed collection. Whether his critics were aware of or familiar with previously circulated portions of his work, or whether Boccaccio was simply creative in his preemptive objections to their anticipated criticisms, the fact remains that their response to his finished collection was still yet to come when he narrated his tale on the fourth day. In this fashion the inconclusive plot of the tale, the uncertainty of the father's reaction to his discovery, mirrors the still pending response of the readers of his *frametales* collection.

The final story of Boccaccio's collection likewise addresses the theme of understanding and adds an element of uncertainty to the work. According to Gittes, the tale of Griselda illustrates "that the ending of the Decameron is more indecisive and more open-ended than its apparently tight structure would suggest"

because the storytellers in the frame disagree about the tale's meaning and never come to a consensus (88). Gittes argues that this tale, because it is the last of the collection,

should bring order to the whole text and complete the design, but, instead, the problems the tellers encounter in interpreting the tale preclude a satisfying conclusion. Thus the tale lacks closure, and since it lacks closure, so does the tenth day, and, by implication, the whole work. . . . The breakdown of order at the end of the Griselda story and the resulting open-endedness parallels the open-endedness implied . . . in the conclusion, that is, the king's suggestion that the storytelling could go on far longer. (89)

In the preceding pages I have examined fundamental structural and organizational frametale characteristics such as internal linking devices, the wisdom theme, the storyteller, framing devices, and flexibility and open-endedness in the frame. Although these are consistent features of the frametale genre, authors have utilized them to varying degrees and in diverse manners as suits their particular needs and tastes, as well as those of their audience. I now turn my focus to how the anonymous author of Lazarillo de Tormes appropriated these characteristics and adapted them to his own work.

Chapter 4: Lazarillo de Tormes

In *Lazarillo de Tormes: A Critical Guide*, Deyermond examines possible models for the structure of the anonymous picaresque novel. Although he acknowledges that folktales are the source of much of the content of the *Lazarillo*, and, based chiefly on Lázaro Carreter's research, that they may have had some structural influence on certain portions of the novel, on the whole Deyermond considers folktales too structurally incoherent to have served as a structural model for the work: ". . . in the mid-sixteenth century the only way in which writers were accustomed to combine them was the loose organization of the jest-book and its medieval ancestor the *exemplum* collection" (34-35). In these unframed collections the autonomous stories were often arranged haphazardly, or, in some cases, thematically or alphabetically for the simple purpose of facilitating their location within the collection. Notwithstanding the popularity of these loose and unframed story collections in Spain at this time, they were by no means the only story collections available to readers and writers of the period. As I have shown in chapter 2, *frametales* were prevalent, some of them even regarded today as having been among the most widely read works of the Golden Age (Lacarra, "Panorama" 37; "Pervivencia" 261-67). Furthermore, although *frametales* often give the initial impression of being episodic and arbitrarily organized, this view becomes less tenable upon greater scrutiny. Aided in part by Gittes's and Cooper's findings, I have demonstrated in chapter 3 that the methods whereby authors of medieval *frametales* organized and unified their diverse material is a

synthesis of influences, one characterized by an overarching structure that is constructed through external organizing devices such as the wisdom theme, the storyteller, and the frame (that remains somewhat flexible and open-ended in a way reminiscent of earlier *frametales*), and the other tending toward a tighter, more cohesive internal structure via linking, or threading, devices. In the present chapter I aim to illustrate not only that the manner in which the anonymous author of the Lazarillo organized his varied material into a single work is in many ways consistent with the structural and organizational methods used in *frametale* collections, but also that where his work differs from its antecedents he is nonetheless engaged in fulfilling similar goals. His technique, I hope to show, is both a continuation and a manipulation of that used by his *frametale* predecessors.

The structure of Lazarillo de Tormes is deceptively simple. It consists of a prologue and seven tratados of disproportionate lengths and diverse content. The first impression given by the work is that it follows one of the epic laws of popular narrative identified by Olrik and explained by Lázaro Carreter as “la inconexión de los episodios, el ‘enfilage’ o sarta” (88). Deyermond notes that this is a typical feature of the genre in general:

The picaresque novel is characteristically episodic in structure: a series of episodes is arranged in a more or less arbitrary fashion, and the chief unifying factor is the appearance in all of them of the same protagonist. . . . Most of the episodes in most of the novels could be omitted or transposed without effecting any fundamental change. . . . [T]he general impression given by almost all of these

novels is . . . that of a largely random accumulation of incidents.

(Critical Guide 33-34)¹³²

The Lazarillo, however, differs in this respect from the majority of picaresque novels, a fact that Deyermond argues can be attributed in part to its being the first of the genre and, therefore, its author's having "no way of knowing what the norms for the genre would be" (34). Deyermond explains that in Lazarillo de Tormes "many episodes could be transposed only at the cost of destroying the novel's pattern (Tratados IV and V, and V and VI, are interchangeable, but IV and VI could not easily be transposed, and I, II and III have to occur in their present order" (Critical Guide 34).

As with the medieval *frametale*, the structure of the Lazarillo seems at first to be episodic, but closer inspection reveals a number of internal and external organizing devices that serve to unify the diverse components of the work. Many of the techniques that I have illustrated in the *frametale* are employed to similar effect in the Lazarillo. Episodes that, in one sense, are complete, independent narrative units with a certain intrinsic value in themselves, become components of a larger work when they form connections with other episodes and with the frame. These connective threads weave a broader context from which the tales or episodes derive a certain meaning that might be quite distinct from that of the tales told in isolation or within a different context. In many cases, internal linking techniques serve to emphasize a theme or themes, and, in the Lazarillo as in the *frametale*, a great many themes are not only interwoven, but they are also closely associated with the external organizing device of the wisdom theme. As noted in

chapter 3, subsidiary themes include intelligence and understanding, the importance of a good teacher or advisor, virtue, fortune, free will, desire, deceit, and hypocrisy, among others.

Before examining some of the key structural and organizational features that the Lazarillo and the frametales share, I must note that the picaresque novel is undeniably different from its literary antecedent. Yet the contrast between the two, far from blurring their similarities, encourages a comparison that leads to greater insight into how the picaresque novel is indebted to the frametales. One of the most important and predominant, if not entirely unique, structural features of Lazarillo de Tormes is the development of plot around a central figure that leads to a change in his character and circumstances (Deyermond, Critical Guide 34).¹³³ The work's structure, Deyermond explains, "is tightened by a fairly strong element of causality" (Critical Guide 43). It is not character and plot development in themselves that distinguish the Lazarillo from frametales, however. Rather it is the degree to which they are used and the manner in which they are manipulated that makes the novel distinctive.

Although this structural feature exists in only rudimentary stages of development, if at all, in most medieval frametales, it should be noted that in two collections that I have treated only marginally, plot (the dynamics not only of the storytelling in the frame but also of the tales themselves) has a significant impact on character development. In Boccaccio's Ameto, for example, both the protagonist Ameto and the eavesdropping first-person narrator have been "spiritually elevated" and have "experienced a rebirth" as a result of the tales they

hear (Gittes 76). An even stronger example can be found in Gower's Confessio amantis. Gittes notes that the protagonist Amans, who in book 8 is identified as the author Gower himself, receives fuller characterization than that seen in previous frametales (99). Amans's transition occurs as a result of his dialogue with Genius, in which the former confesses his joys and woes of past loves and the latter tells tales of virtue and vice that he applies to the subject of love in order to instruct Amans (Gittes 97). Gittes observes, "The sharp distinction between the knowledgeable Genius and the ignorant Amans makes the process of Amans' self-discovery and inner growth appear all the more impressive because he was initially so unknowing" (100). Moreover, the character's transition is progressive, as Gittes notes:

Gower presents Amans as initially blind, and we see him progress in understanding until at the end he comprehends Christian love. Amans' progression towards spiritual understanding is gradual and thus differs from Ameto's swift and sudden conversion at the end of the book from erotic to Christian love. (99)

Although some frametales indicate that characters learn from their storytelling experience and apply these lessons to their own lives, if there is any explicit evidence of this at all within the text, it is seldom portrayed in terms of substantial character growth.¹³⁴ In Gower's frametale, however, "Amans' spiritual growth, his process of self-discovery, . . . runs through the entire poem, [and] clearly plays a unifying role" (Gittes 100). Gittes notes that the development of this structural feature late in the frametale's evolution is a result of Western influence (100).

This gradual process of character growth is a fundamental structural feature of Lazarillo de Tormes, one that is reinforced by the connections between episodes and stories that depict the character's lifelong learning process. Yet this process of transformation is distinctly unlike the one Amans undergoes in his spiritual awakening and self-discovery, or even the changes experienced by less developed characters who nonetheless learn lessons and put those lessons into practice to their benefit. The Lazarillo instead portrays the progressive degeneration of the protagonist, that is, the process of his moral degradation and self-deception. Deyermond observes,

From the Blind Man he learned not only tricks but total self-centredness that took some time to dominate his character, but that eventually and implacably brought him to what he describes as the height of his ambitions. Yet this new life is really a lowering, not a raising: it is a moral death in a worldly life, and we witness a disturbing parody of resurrection. (Critical Guide 31)

The process of corruption is shown as a consequence of misguidance from bad teachers and advisors (or a lack of guidance altogether), misunderstanding of the lessons afforded him, and misapplication of the lessons learned. I intentionally reiterate the prefix mis in order to highlight the contrast between the badness or wrongness of Lázaro's process and the general notion in the *frametales* tradition that the transmission of wisdom, that is, the instruction for living wisely and well, entails guidance, understanding, and works that are essentially good. In fact, in the Conde Lucanor there is a rather consistent tendency to espouse the term good

to these notions, creating the highly repeated expressions “buen consejo,” “buen entendimiento,” and “buenas obras.” That is not to imply that the notion of good is never ambivalent in the *frametale*.¹³⁵ Many of the lessons imparted in these works concern differentiating good from bad, especially when one has the appearance of the other. Rajan advises that rarely are the two clearly discernible: “Stark distinctions of black and white, right and wrong, good and evil can seldom be made in the sphere of human actions . . .” (xxvii). Yet underlying even these gray areas is the general idea of goodness as virtue based on a set of principles including honor, integrity, and justice. Several of these concepts that in the *frametale* serve as guiding principles for attitude and behavior are consistently misunderstood in the *Lazarillo*, however, for Lázaro follows his guides in defining honor and goodness by a different set of standards. He comes to equate goodness and respectability with material wealth and social status, and to view honor not as virtue in the sense of moral correctness, but as public opinion and privilege, or benefit. These key differences underpin the entire structural apparatus of *Lazarillo de Tormes* and inform a reading of the work in terms of both its adaptation and its subversion of certain *frametale* features. Thus my review of the novel’s structure and organization is guided by these fundamental considerations.

LINKING DEVICES

The thematic balancing of sections in the *Lazarillo* is one linking device that tightens the structure of the novel. The structural scheme suggested by Deyermond is comprised of a balance between “the learning of lessons in brief

episodes with the Blind Man” and “their application in brief episodes of Tratados IV-VII,” with “two extended narratives of lessons reinforced and roles reversed (II and III)” in between (Critical Guide 36). Although I strongly concur that the picaresque novel’s structure is closely tied to the process of learning lessons and putting them into practice (I will discuss the wisdom theme later in this chapter as an external organizing device), I do not find a tidy or consistent fit between Deyermond’s proposal and the anonymous author’s structural and organizational methods. Firstly, this design does not account adequately for all episodes. In what way, for example, does Lázaro’s service with the Tambourine Painter demonstrate the application of a lesson learned? Secondly, I observe that both the learning of lessons by the protagonist and the application of lessons learned take place much earlier than this scheme indicates. I see that the seeds of Lázaro’s education are planted by his family, both at home and as Lázaro’s family members interact with society. Finally, in my view, Lázaro’s guidance, or misguidance, does not end as early as Deyermond’s outline implies, rather it continues well into the final tratado in his dealings with the Archpriest.

Nonetheless, there are clear balances between episodes of the novel that strengthen the coherence of individual tratados and of the work as a whole. In tratado 1, for example, the episodes of the stone bull and the stone pillar are generally recognized as balancing each other in terms of Lázaro’s harsh initiation into the service of the Blind Man and the boy’s brutal retaliation for this incident as he leaves his first master (Rico, Spanish Picaresque Novel 8-9; Deyermond, Critical Guide 37). Deyermond notes that imagery reinforces this connection: “. .

. his head has been banged ('una gran calabazada') against the stone bull by his master, and now he causes the Blind Man to dash his own head ('tan recio como si diera con una gran calabaza') against a stone pillar, behind which the boy stands 'como quien espera tope de toro'" (Critical Guide 67).

Although the balance of the first and last episodes between Lázaro and the Blind Man structurally unifies the boy's service with his first master, the final episode plays a much greater organizing role when viewed as the culmination of Lázaro's tutelage under his sagacious mentor. The final scene is set up very carefully throughout the tratado in terms of the traits and actions of both characters. Lázaro as narrator insists, for example, on the Blind Man's astuteness and intelligence ("desde que Dios crió el mundo, ninguno formó más astuto ni sagaz", 25; tr. 1; "el sagacísimo ciego", 37; "a las astucias del maldito ciego nada se le escondía", 39), vigilance ("era con tan gran vigilancia", 28; "nunca después desamparaba el jarro", 31), and keen understanding and good judgment ("Y aunque yo juraba no lo hacer con malicia . . . no me creía, mas tal era el sentido y el grandísimo entendimiento del traidor", 35; "noté mucho la discreta consideración del ciego", 37). Although he is deceived on numerous occasions by the boy, until the final episode he is repeatedly portrayed as prudent and wise. It is his blindness, and not any lack of judgment or fault of understanding, that allows Lázaro to gain the upper hand from time to time. Lázaro makes a reference to this point in tratado 2, in fact, when comparing the Priest and the Blind Man: "Para usar de mis mañas no tenía aparejo, por no tener en qué darme salto. Y aunque algo hubiera, no podía cegalle, como hacía al que Dios

perdone—si de aquella calabazada feneció—, que todavía, aunque astuto, con faltalle aquelpreciado sentido, no me sentía . . .” (2.51).

Lázaro, on the other hand, is depicted in the process of gaining wisdom and prudence. Upon the cruel initiation of the ingenuous Lázaro, the Blind Man calls him “Necio” (23; tr. 1), but, significantly, only a few lines later the reader is told that the Blind Man was pleased with how sharp Lázaro was and how quickly he learned what he was taught: “. . . en muy poco días me mostró jerigonza, y como me viese de buen ingenio, holgábase mucho . . .” (23; tr. 1). Despite possessing a keen natural wisdom, or innate intelligence, the young Lázaro nonetheless has much to learn. The Disciplina clericalis draws a distinction between these kinds of wisdom: “There are two sorts of wisdom, one a man is born with, the other he gains through learning and experience. Neither of these, however, can exist without the other” (110). The Blind Man’s role in initiating Lázaro into the lifelong process of learning the lessons of life is critical. He serves as Lázaro’s first and most important guide, and his influence will last a lifetime. The Blind Man promises Lázaro, “Yo oro ni plata no te lo puedo dar; mas avisos para vivir muchos te mostraré” (23; tr. 1). Although part of Lázaro’s education consists of learning by example as he observes the Blind Man deceive others, much of his edification derives directly from personal experience in his mutual struggle with his master. In the episodes depicting the two pitted against each other, Lázaro’s characteristics and actions are often described in opposition to those of his adversary. The Blind Man’s revenge on Lázaro for the multiple tricks he played with the wine jug, for example, is successful not only because he

has been prudent in waiting for and judging the right occasion, but also because Lázaro's carelessness and lack of judgment have offered the Blind Man this advantage ("no pensando el daño que me estaba aparejado", 32; *tr.* 1; "el pobre Lázaro, que de nada desto se guardaba, antes, como otras veces, estaba descuidado y gozoso", 32-33). This episode and others like it offer a perspective from which the reader will observe in the final episode that Fortune's wheel has turned and the anticipated roles of the Blind Man and Lázaro have reversed.

The contrastive link between the final story and the previous episodes is achieved in part due to highly resonant descriptions of the two characters and their conflicts. Only now the Blind Man is portrayed in opposition to earlier depictions of him as cautious, prudent, understanding, and wise: "Como llovía recio y el triste se mojaba, y con la priesa que llevábamos de salir del agua, que encima de nós caía, y, lo más principal, porque Dios le cegó aquella hora el entendimiento (fue por darme dél venganza) creyóse de mí" (45; *tr.* 1). In this brief paragraph the reader is informed of three of the Blind Man's faults that lead directly to his calamity: haste ("la priesa . . . de salir del agua"),¹³⁶ poor judgment ("Dios le cegó . . . el entendimiento"), and placing his trust in the untrustworthy, or the depositario infiel ("creyóse de mí"). The last of these echoes Lázaro's critical error in the story of the stone bull ("Yo, simplemente, llegué, creyendo ser ansí", 23; *tr.* 1), but whereas the naive Lázaro did not possess the worldly experience with which to judge the Blind Man, the Blind Man understood very well that he was dealing with a deceitful adversary. Lázaro's dishonesty had been proven time and again by both words and actions. Yet when Lázaro advises his

master on how to manage their current predicament, the Blind Man rashly lets down his guard, errs in judgment, and misplaces his trust. In terms that ironically recall the relationship and repeated exchange between Count Lucanor and his loyal and prudent advisor Patronio, the Blind Man is shown to trust and carry out his faithless guide's advice: "Parescióle buen consejo y dijo: Discreto eres, por esto te quiero bien. Llévame a ese lugar . . ." (44; tr. 1).¹³⁷ However, unlike Count Lucanor who benefits from putting his counselor's advice in to practice (" . . e fízolo assí e fallóse ende bien"), the Blind Man suffers severely from doing so.

Furthermore, the discretion that the Blind Man lauds in the boy, rather than an innate virtue, is a crafty lesson learned from the Blind Man himself in the episode of the wine jug: ". . . halló la fuente y cayó en la burla; mas así lo disimuló como si no lo hubiera sentido. Y luego otro día . . . sintió el desesperado ciego que ahora tenía tiempo de tomar de mí venganza" (32; tr. 1). Shortly after the Blind Man's brutal retaliation, Lázaro asserts, ". . . considerando que, a pocos golpes tales, el cruel ciego ahorraría de mí, quise yo ahorrar dél; mas no lo hice tan presto, por hacello más a mi salvo y provecho" (33-34; tr. 1). Later in the pillar incident, he achieves his goal not only because he applies the lesson of delaying revenge to his advantage, but also because he, like the Blind Man in the earlier episode, has the wisdom to recognize the opportunity when it arises: "Yo que vi el aparejo a mi deseo, saquéle de bajo de los portales y llevélo derecho de un pilar o poste de piedra . . ." (44; tr. 1).

Verbal repetition is a further linking device that highlights the turn of events between the episodes. The term venganza, for example, applies first to the Blind Man's revenge on Lázaro ("tomar de mí venganza", 32; tr. 1), and then to Lázaro's revenge on the Blind Man ("fue por darme dél venganza", 45). Diverse forms of the term aparejo emphasize the contrast between Lázaro's position as victim in the wine jug episode ("no pensando el daño que me estaba aparejado", 32; tr. 1) and then victor in the pillar incident ("Yo que vi el aparejo a mi deseo", 44).

Imagery also serves to link the two stories. One pair of images that connects these stories, and that links other parts of the novel as well, is sight, or enlightenment, and blindness.¹³⁸ In the wine jug incident, Lázaro's vision is obscured ("un poco cerrados los ojos", 32; tr. 1), whereas in the final episode, although "la noche se venía y el llover no cesaba" (44), he sees clearly the means to gain his desired revenge ("Yo que vi el aparejo a mi deseo", 44). By contrast, in the same episode the Blind Man's judgment is blinded ("Dios le cegó aquella hora el entendimiento", 45; tr. 1). The connection between the two episodes is further strengthened by images of paths and stones that are presented in Lázaro's reaction to the episode of the wine jug: "Y en esto yo siempre le llevaba por los peores caminos, y adrede, por le hacer mal y daño, si había piedras, por ellas" (34; tr. 1). In the episode of the pillar, the final path on which Lázaro leads the Blind Man is the worst of all, for the stone on this particular route is the "poste de piedra" that does more than injure the Blind Man, it leaves him half dead. Lastly, images of rising and falling form a contrastive connection between the episodes.

In the tale of the wine jug, the narrator describes how he was in a position facing upward (“mi cara puesta hacia el cielo”, 32; tr. 1) when the Blind Man raised the wine jug and brought it crashing down with all his might (“alzando con dos manos aquel dulce y amargo jarro, le dejó caer sobre mi boca . . . con todo su poder”, 32). With his face raised toward the sky, Lázaro felt that very sky fall upon him (“verdaderamente me pareció que el cielo, con todo lo que en él hay, me había caído encima”, 33; tr. 1). In the pillar incident, the Blind Man’s rash action is portrayed as antithetical to Lázaro’s prudence, and because of this contrast the characters undergo another change in position, or reversal of roles, this time with Lázaro coming out on top both literally and figuratively. The image of his rise is depicted by his jump behind the pillar (“doy un salto”, 45; tr. 1), whereas the Blind Man’s jump is followed immediately by his fall (“tomando un paso atrás de la corrida para hacer mejor salto . . . y cayó luego para atrás medio muerto”, 45). The images of rising and falling are closely associated with the revolution of Fortune’s wheel, both here and elsewhere in the novel, although the connection is treated with subtlety.

As in the *frametale*, individual stories take on diverse meaning depending on the context in which they are understood. The complex structure of interwoven connections between tales that Dunn describes in the Conde Lucanor is also apparent in Lazarillo de Tormes. This structure is evident in the first tratado alone, in fact, specifically among the tales of Lázaro’s service to the Blind Man.¹³⁹ As I have illustrated, the final episode of the pillar may be understood in terms of balancing the episode of the wine jug (the second of five principal

incidents), or the initial incident of the stone bull. Or it may be viewed as the climax of a series of guile-beguiled deceptions between the characters. The linking device of gradation and climax that occurs frequently in the *frame tale*, especially where themes of deception and revenge are concerned, F. Courtney Tarr recognizes among the episodes depicting the battle of wits between Lázaro and the Blind Man. He suggests that these incidents “show an increasing attention to detail and dramatic effect,” and that the dialogue in them, “although not extensive, is used in increasing measure” (406). He further observes, “These incidents all have the same motivation—the hunger conflict—and are arranged in order of climax” (406-07).

The episode of the wine jug likewise forms various connections with distinct tales. Again, it may be read with respect to the final pillar episode. Or it may be paired with the sausage episode (the fourth in the series), the two of which Deyermond observes “are similar in planning and in outcome” (Critical Guide 37). Rico explains the similarities of pattern between the wine jug and sausage incidents:

The blind man detects Lázaro stealing wine right under his nose and punishes him by bashing him on the head with the jug. Of course, he takes pity afterwards, and washes the wound with the very object of the crime, adding with a smile: “What do you think of this, Lázaro? What made you sick heals you and makes you well”. . . . Later, when the boy steals a sausage from him and is soundly beaten in return, the beggar cleans the bruises with the

same crude antiseptic, commenting as he does so: “Truly, this lad costs me more wine washing in one year than I drink in two. At least, Lázaro, you owe more to wine than to your own father, because he bred you once, but wine has given you life a thousand times over.” And then he recounted how many times he had smashed my head and scratched my face and then healed them with wine. “I tell you”, he said, “that if any man is to be lucky with wine, it will be you.” (9)

Thus the wine jug and sausage incidents are connected to each other, but the sausage incident, in turn, is also linked to the final pillar episode. When the Blind Man smashes his head, it is now Lázaro’s turn to taunt his victim with witticisms as he himself had been teased: “¿Cómo, y oliste la longaniza y no el poste? ¡Olé, olé!” (45; tr. 1).

The linking devices among episodes of tratado 1 alone are numerous, but the same and other devices connect these stories to different parts of the novel as well. Rico notes, for example, that the wine motif not only ties the wine jug and sausage episodes together (“. . . the wine that Lázaro drinks, the wine he goes to fetch when he substitutes the turnip for the sausage, the wine which heals him so many times . . .”), but it also forms a link with the novel as a whole since it is by hawking the Archpriest’s wines that Lázaro becomes involved in “el caso” for which Vuestra Merced has asked for an explanation (9).

The same connective device of gradation and climax that Tarr observes with respect to the hunger theme within the first tratado also operates to link certain other tratados. He illustrates:

The motivation [hunger] and technique [gradation and climax] evolved in this first chapter will be carried to their logical conclusion in the two succeeding ones. Hence the first tractado possesses not only a distinct unity in itself but forms with the next two a larger and much more artistically perfect unit, of which it is in many respects the germ. (407)

Setting also serves as an internal link among various parts of the Lazarillo. As in *frametales* in which a pair or a group of tales may take place in the same town or part of the country, or in a similar setting, so, too, are the picaresque novel's stories connected by such associations. It is imperative to recall at this point that Lázaro's autobiography is a peripatetic one and that his very itinerancy dictates a change in setting. (I will examine this feature later within the context of the novel's flexibility.) Nonetheless certain tales are associated on the basis of setting, and this connection, as occurs in the *frametale*, is often strengthened by additional connective techniques such as thematic balance, grouping, or climax, repetition of words or situations, and parallel plot elements.

Home as a setting is an important linking device in the Lazarillo that balances the beginning of the first tratado to the end of the final one. In tratado 1, the protagonist's home is not simply his dwelling place, however, for Lázaro's house changes but his home is consistently tied to where his mother is. From

Lázaro's birthplace (12; tr. 1) to "una casilla" in Salamanca while his mother is in the service of the Comendador de la Magdalena (15), to the "mesón de la Solana" (20), his mother remains a constant feature when other family members come and go: his father is exiled and, in the meantime, killed (14-15), his "step-father" Zaide gradually joins the household (16), his half-brother is born (17), and, lastly, Zaide is separated from the family and forbidden to return (20). Moreover, when Lázaro's own departure from home occurs on two occasions, the first when he leaves his family to serve his new master, the second when he leaves Salamanca for good, his mother is present on both occasions to send him off.

Lázaro's definitive departure from home marks the beginning of his worldly education with the Blind Man, but after experiencing trials and hardships with various masters in the intervening stories, in the final tratado Lázaro looks to settle down ("por tener descanso y ganar algo para la vejez", 128; tr. 7). This new domestic setting consists of Lázaro's marriage to the Archpriest's maid and concubine and "una casilla" (132; tr. 7) adjacent to the Archpriest's. Thus, as Tarr observes, "The book ends as it begins, with a case of amancebamiento" (418). Like the university settings of the Miller's Tale and the Reeve's Tale with which it is paired, the home settings in the Lazarillo are not identical. They are nevertheless sufficiently similar to beg the comparison between Lázaro's circumstances as a boy and those in which he finds himself at the end of the work, the same circumstances that prompt Vuestra Merced to solicit an explanation. Deyermund draws this comparison:

In one sense, his position has changed for the better: food is more plentiful, security is greater, status higher. This is the aspect which he stresses. . . . As we have seen, the adult Lázaro's home is very similar to that of the child's in its precarious dependence on a woman and her lover; indeed, the similarities are greater than the differences, though the differences are real enough. (Critical Guide 37)

Setting as a linking device between the first and final tratados is reinforced by other internal connective devices, two of the most frequently used throughout the novel being thematic symmetry and the repetition of words or phrases. Tarr notes, for example, "Lázaro, like his mother, 'determino [sic] de arrimarse a los buenos,' and thus becomes himself a hypocrite . . ." (418).¹⁴⁰ A further, and perhaps more subtle, link is achieved by the use of parallel plot elements, similar yet dissimilar, that describe the threat to the peace and stability of Lázaro's home. In the first case, Zaide's illicit doings come to the attention of his superior ("llegó a oídos del mayordomo", 18; tr. 1), and when Lázaro is questioned on the matter, out of fear he tells all, thereby unwittingly implicating his mother in the affair: "Y probóse cuanto digo y aun más; porque a mí con amenazas me preguntaban, y, como niño, respondía y descubría cuanto sabía, con miedo: hasta ciertas herraduras que por mandado de mi madre a un herrero vendí" (20). As a naive child, Lázaro does not understand the true circumstances of his home environment. In the final tratado, however, Lázaro is not only aware of them, but he is also intent on preserving them. Thus when "malas lenguas" (132; tr. 7)

threaten his peaceful and profitable position “en la cumbre de toda buena fortuna” (135) by bringing to his attention his wife’s current and past illicit affairs, he conspires with the Archpriest and his wife to ignore the reality of the situation: “Y así quedamos todos tres bien conformes” (134; tr. 7). Not only will the three of them not speak on it (“Hasta el día de hoy nunca nadie nos oyó sobre el caso . . .”, 134; tr. 7), but Lázaro also silences others who attempt to broach the issue. This makes for an interesting twist to his role in the earlier episode; whereas the young Lázaro divulges all he knows when threatened, the adult Lázaro threatens others to keep quiet: “Mirá, si sois mi amigo, no me digáis cosa con que me pese, que no tengo por mi amigo al que me hace pesar.”¹⁴¹ . . . Que yo juraré sobre la hostia consagrada que es tan buena mujer como vive dentro de las puertas de Toledo. Quien otra cosa me dijere, yo me mataré con él” (134-35; tr. 7). Although his challenge is seemingly successful (“Desta manera no me dicen nada, y yo tengo paz en mi casa”, 135; tr. 7), one must wonder if the “malas lenguas” found their way to the ears of the Archpriest’s friend and superior, Vuestra Merced, who in asking for an account of “el caso” once again jeopardizes the security and stability of Lázaro’s home.¹⁴²

In *frametales*, as I have previously noted, links between tales are formed when themes or ideas that are introduced in one story surface again in later stories to present a similar or contrastive perspective. This technique functions in the *Lazarillo* with the themes of telling versus keeping quiet (contar versus callar), for example, as I have shown in the preceding paragraph. Yet this thematic linking device does more than help reinforce the balance of similar domestic settings in

the first and last tratados, it also serves to form thematic clusters among several other parts of the novel, as well. When Lázaro's father's thefts are discovered and he is arrested, he confesses and is subsequently punished: “. . . achacaron a mi padre ciertas sangrías mal hechas en los costales de los que allí a moler venían, por lo cual fue preso, y confesó y no negó, y padesció persecución por justicia” (14; tr. 1). Similarly, as we have seen, when the crimes of Zaide and Lázaro's mother have been revealed, a confession (this time made by Lázaro while under threat) leads to the punishment of the offenders: “Al triste de mi padraastro azotaron y pringaron, y a mi madre pusieron pena por justicia, sobre el acostumbrado centenario, que en casa del sobredicho comendador no entrase ni al lastimado Zaide en la suya acogiese” (20; tr. 1).¹⁴³ Thus while still a child in the care of his parents, Lázaro has witnessed the negative effects of telling the truth, for not only do his protectors and providers suffer dishonor and punishment as a result, but his home is also torn apart.

It is perhaps the circumstances of these early experiences (the unlucky detection of deceitful actions, the confessions of truth, and the ensuing adverse consequences) that have taught Lázaro an important lesson that he puts into practice as early as in his service with the Blind Man. Here Lázaro is guided whether to tell, to deny, or to keep quiet, not by any moral compass signaling right from wrong, or any legal precept discerning lawful from unlawful, but simply by which action will lead to his greatest personal advantage. This benefit, portrayed variously in different episodes, may be anything from the gain of food or material goods, to the avoidance of punishment, to the protection of his

reputation. In the episode of the grapes, for example, the Blind Man and Lázaro agree to take turns eating one grape at a time. But when the Blind Man breaks their agreement by taking two at a time, instead of calling the Blind Man on his dishonesty to set the matter right, Lázaro's reaction is to keep quiet and outdo his opponent in the same deception: “. . . no me contenté ir a la par con él, mas aun pasaba adelante: dos a dos y tres a tres y como podía las comía” (36-37; tr. 1). Furthermore, when the Blind Man exposes Lázaro's deceit, the boy immediately denies it: “No comí” (37; tr. 1). Thus in this episode Lázaro demonstrates an important feature of his character that will surface in subsequent stories: he will neither condemn nor expose nor admit a wrong if he can profit by upholding it and preserving its secrecy. Lázaro's response to keep quiet for his own benefit even when he himself has been affronted by the dishonorable act is highlighted by the Blind Man's perspicacious observation: “¿Sabes en qué veo que las comiste tres a tres? En que comía yo dos a dos y callabas” (37; tr. 1).

Elsewhere Lázaro is shown to divulge secrets, even after promising to keep them, when they will serve his purposes. In the third tratado, for example, the Squire requests that Lázaro keep his service to him private even if it is not likely to be discovered: “. . . te encomiendo no sepan que vives conmigo, por lo que toca a mi honra. Aunque bien creo que será secreto, según lo poco que en este pueblo soy conocido” (88; tr. 3). In response, Lázaro assures his master, “De eso pierda, señor, cuidado . . . , que maldito aquel que ninguno tiene de pedirme esa cuenta, ni yo de dalla” (88). Yet when Lázaro is later detained and interrogated by the Constable and the Clerk (“Mochacho, tú eres preso si no

descubres los bienes deste tu amo”, 108; tr. 3), he squeals out of fear for his safety: “Yo, como en otra tal no me hubiese visto . . . , yo hube mucho miedo y, llorando, prometíle de decir lo que preguntaban” (108). Furthermore, at this point Lázaro has already been deserted by the Squire so there is no personal benefit to him to refrain from telling what he knows.

In the final tratado, as I have illustrated, the themes of telling and keeping quiet are both in play. Lázaro has agreed with his wife and the Archpriest to not speak of their adulterous arrangement, and he attempts to silence the “malas lenguas” who want to discuss the issue. In this way he can preserve the benefit he derives from being married to the Archpriest’s mistress: “. . . me hace Dios con ella mil mercedes y más bien que yo merezco” (134; tr. 7). Yet when the Archpriest’s friend requests an explanation of the matter, Lázaro must respond. In his answer to the inquiry, that is, the novel recounting his life story, Lázaro can be seen carefully and skillfully juggling these very themes of contar and callar, supposedly to his advantage. He intends for the stories he tells to portray him as a virtuous example of how to rise socially and economically from lowly beginnings, but he is careful to omit certain tales of his life. That these episodes exist at all and yet are consciously not recounted is evidenced by the narrator’s mentioning them to his reader without elaborating. For example, his story of the Friar of the Order of Mercy, the fourth tratado, is only eleven lines long (in Rico’s edition). Its abbreviated form is highlighted by his allusion to a longer version that he refuses to tell: “Y por esto y por otras cosillas que no digo, salí dél” (111; tr. 4). Again, at the end of the fifth tratado, the narrator hints that he is not telling his

reader the whole story: “Finalmente, estuve con este me quinto amo cerca de cuatro meses, en los cuales pasé también hartas fatigas” (emphasis added; 125; tr. 5). Although he had already warned his reader that he would tell only one of many examples of the Pardoner’s “mañosos artificios” used to deceive the people (115; tr. 5), at the conclusion of the tratado he refers to his own suffering with this master. Furthermore, the narrator’s use of a parallel construction in the next paragraph at the beginning of the sixth tratado emphasizes his deliberate intention to withhold certain information: “Después desto, asenté con un maestro de pintar panderos, para molelle los colores, y también sufrí mil males” (emphasis added; 125; tr. 6). Perhaps these silenced episodes would reflect negatively on his reputation and, therefore, would not support his cause in writing the novel. Recall that we have seen Lázaro do this before when giving an account of his life to the Squire. In trying to impress his new master favorably, Lázaro is selective in what he tells: “. . . yo le satisfice de mi persona lo mejor que mentir supe, diciendo mis bienes y callando lo demás . . .” (103; tr. 3).

One of the most pervasive ideas in the Lazarillo is hypocrisy, a theme also common to the frametale. As a thematic link it connects various tratados in which virtuous qualities are attributed to characters in whom these virtues are distinctly absent. Often this discrepancy occurs because outward appearances indicate an admirable or honorable quality, but good intentions and good actions are lacking. Indeed a character’s true intentions and behavior often point to vice. Deyermond observes that the first character who is consciously hypocritical is the Blind Man (Critical Guide 90). He gives the appearance of being devoutly religious (“Ciento

y tantas oraciones sabía de coro: un tono bajo, reposado y muy sonable, que hacía resonar la iglesia donde rezaba; un rostro humilde y devoto, que con muy buen continente ponía cuando rezaba”, 25-26; tr. 1), yet his actions prove otherwise. Once those who have paid him to recite a prayer are out of earshot, he cuts the prayer short and begins calling out for new business (30; tr. 1). Furthermore, despite earning a substantial income with his pseudoreligious prayer, as well as via his patently non-religious “artes” (27; tr. 1) of prophesy and advice, the Blind Man is utterly avaricious: “. . . ganaba más en un mes que cien ciegos en un año. Mas . . . jamás tan avariento ni mezquino hombre no vi . . .” (27).

The theme of hypocrisy serves to link most of the remaining tratados of the novel, although it plays a stronger role in some stories than in others, as Deyermond observes:

Hypocrisy reaches a peak with the Priest of Maqueda, who labels his own blatant avarice and gluttony as generosity and temperance. . . . It recedes in Tratado III, though not for reasons that do much credit to the Squire, since the gap between what he seems to be and what he is on the social and economic level is at least as wide as it is on the moral level with other characters. Moreover, his ambition is to be the hypocritical adviser of a great lord. (Critical Guide 90)

Beyond the third tratado, hypocrisy serves as a linking device on the basis of gradation and climax. Deyermond describes the intensification of the hypocrisy theme:

The growth of hypocrisy, having faltered a little in Tratado III, is strongly resumed in IV (the Friar), and above all in V (the Pardoner), reaching its true climax in Tratado VII, where Lázaro and the Archpriest are in tacit agreement, a conspiracy of hypocrisy, to deny the true nature of Lázaro's marriage. (Critical Guide 90)

In the *frametale*, hypocrisy is closely tied to the theme of wisdom because wisdom allows one to identify and to avoid hypocrisy through understanding the truth and distinguishing it from falsehood. Learning to recognize someone's true nature and motivation despite false appearances is key to living wisely in the world. In the Lazarillo, however, the lessons on hypocrisy that Lázaro learns are how to become a hypocrite and how to benefit from being one. In the very early stages of Lázaro's worldly education he follows the Blind Man's example of using pretense for material gain. Whereas the Blind Man feigns piety for money, Lázaro pretends to be cold for wine: “. . . fingendo haber frío, entrábame entre las piernas del triste ciego a calentarme en la pobrecilla lumbre que teníamos, y al calor della, luego derretida la cera, por ser muy poca, comenzaba la fuentecilla a destilarme en la boca . . .” (31; tr. 1).

Lázaro is so effective at pretending to be something that he is not that several of his masters mistake in him virtuous qualities. In the episode of the pillar, for example, Lázaro pretends to have the Blind Man's best interest at heart when he suggests scouting a narrow place to cross the creek. He appears to show good judgment and sensitivity to his master in dealing with the negative situation

in which they find themselves, and the Blind Man goes so far as to praise him for his discretion: “Discreto eres, por esto te quiero bien” (44; tr. 1). The words of the Blind Man are echoed by the Squire in the third tratado when he applauds Lázaro’s supposed self-restraint in eating: “Virtud es ésa, dijo él, y por eso te querré yo más” (77; tr. 3). Both of Lázaro’s masters commend him for qualities that, under different circumstances, would be virtuous. Yet in these instances they are not, for neither trait is genuine. Lázaro’s purported discretion is merely a deceitful means of achieving a brutal revenge, and his temperance is hollow since it is a lack of food, and not will power, that controls his appetite. Furthermore, in this episode with the Squire, Lázaro admits twice to his readers that he feigns temperance, first with respect to food, second to wine. Upon realizing that the Squire is destitute, Lázaro states, “Y con todo, disimulando lo mejor que pude:—Señor, mozo soy, que no me fatigo mucho por comer . . .” (76; tr. 3). A short while later when the Squire offers him a drink of what he supposes to be wine, he admits, “Yo, por hacer del continente, dije:—Señor, no bebo vino” (78; tr. 3). But when he learns that it is water instead, he confesses to his readers, “Entonces tomé el jarro y bebí. No mucho, porque de sed no era mi congoja” (78; tr. 3). Thus in both tratados Lázaro’s outward appearance is in stark contrast to his true nature and intentions.

Diligence is another quality that loses its virtue within certain contexts. Lázaro learns from the Squire that diligence is a means for a servant to gain his master’s favor, but it lacks virtue because it is insincere: “. . . ser muy diligente en su persona en dicho y hecho; no me matar por no hacer bien las cosas que él no

había de ver . . .” (105; tr. 3). Furthermore, persistence, hard work, and effort in doing something are virtuous only if they are applied in a worthwhile endeavor or toward honorable goals. In the second tratado, Lázaro’s diligence is directed principally toward breaking into the chest in which the Priest guards his bread. In this story Lázaro’s diligence is portrayed as being at constant and direct odds with two chief forces, the Priest’s own diligence in protecting his goods, and misfortune, or bad luck: “Mas no quiso mi desdicha, despertando a este lacerado de mi amo y poniéndole más diligencia de la que él de suyo se tenía (pues los míseros, por la mayor parte, nunca de aquélla carecen) . . .” (61; tr. 2). After a series of episodes in which Lázaro gains an advantage only to lose it again (what Lázaro works to do, these influences work to undo), he eventually loses the struggle for good. His persistence and hard work are for naught, for, as he states, “. . . cuando la desdicha ha de venir, por demás es diligencia” (68; tr. 2). In the end his deceit is discovered, he is beaten soundly in the process (and likely afterwards, as well), and upon modest recovery he is dismissed from the Priest’s service. When releasing Lázaro to fend for himself (which, ironically, he has been doing all along), the Priest comments, “Lázaro, de hoy más eres tuyo y no mío. Busca amo y vete con Dios, que yo no quiero en mi compañía tan diligente servidor. No es posible sino hayas sido mozo de ciego” (71; tr. 2). Diligence in a servant would be a favorable attribute under different circumstances, but it lacks virtue when directed toward dishonorable and deceitful ends. Thus it is not surprising that, in the final tratado, when a complicit Lázaro refers to his wife as a diligent servant, it is within the context of the benefit that her attentive service as

maid and concubine to the Archpriest affords him: “Y, así, me casé con ella, y hasta agora no estoy arrepentido, porque, allende de ser buena hija y diligente servicial, tengo en mi señor acipreste todo favor y ayuda” (131; tr. 7).

Another linking device that strengthens the internal cohesion of the picaresque novel is the explicit reference to previous episodes or characters. Perhaps the most subtle example of this linking device is the Priest’s comment: “No es posible sino hayas sido mozo de ciego” (71; tr. 2), for he recalls the Blind Man of the first tratado without having any true knowledge of him. In most instances, however, this device functions by means of memory. Deyermond illustrates that in the first three tratados both the young protagonist and the adult narrator recall the past on repeated occasions:

When the Blind Man crashes into the pillar, Lazarillo reminds him of the sausage episode . . . , and the narrator recalls the pillar trick early in Tratado II. . . . The Blind Man and the Priest are both recalled in 3 . . . , and Lazarillo remembers bitterly, when he discovers the extent of the Squire’s poverty, that he had wondered whether he would find a more miserable existence than that with the Priest. . . . There are other instances . . . ,¹⁴⁴ but a particularly interesting one is “como yo este oficio le hobiese mamado en la leche, quiero decir que con el gran maestro el ciego lo aprendí” [87; tr. 3], which seems to recall Lazarillo’s infancy, but turns out to be a reference to his days with his first master. (Critical Guide 41)

Although Deyermond suggests that Lazarillo de Tormes may be indebted to La Celestina in “the use of memory as a structural device” (Critical Guide 85), the possible influence of the *frametales* genre should not be discounted. As I have illustrated in chapter 3, this device functions to similar effect in numerous *frametales*.

The reappearance of characters in distinct episodes or stories, a linking device used in some *frametales*, is not, with one chief exception, used in the Lazarillo. The exception is, of course, the protagonist, Lázaro, who appears in each tratado. The novel is the story of his life, after all. However, he is not always the principal focus, and his diminished role in tratados 3, 4, and 5 has been explained in terms of the recurrent structural device of gradation and climax:

Since there is no conflict between them [Lázaro and the Squire], the master gradually usurps the center of the stage, Lázaro fading into the background, his natural position as a servant. . . . And this subordination of Lázaro to his master will be carried to still greater lengths in the next two tractados, where he will be the mere narrator of what goes on, the pretext for introducing new types. (Tarr 411-12)

Despite his temporary retreat to the background in certain episodes, Lázaro as protagonist remains the principal link that internally unifies the entire novel. It is around this central figure that plot develops, and as such his characterization is much more detailed than that of any *frametales* character, although we have already seen this pattern begin to emerge in collections such as

the Ameto and the Confessio amantis. A principal difference between the Lazarillo and its frametale predecessors is where this characterization and plot development occur in the work. In frametale collections, evidence of the trend toward greater characterization and more highly-developed plot is most profound in the framing story. Gittes observes this effect in Chaucer's work, for example: "The fullest characterization appears in the Canterbury Tales; for the individual pilgrims are characterized by their descriptions in the General Prologue, by their behavior, by their interaction with the other pilgrims, and by the stories they tell; such characterization makes the work more dramatic" (145). "In the Confessio amantis," Gittes continues, "characterization is of a different sort, appearing principally in Amans' spiritual growth and in his process of self-discovery which continues throughout the poem" (145). In the Lazarillo, on the other hand, the development of plot and character occurs within with stories themselves while the framing story, consisting of Lázaro as narrator and Vuestra Merced, is reminiscent of earlier frametales with a slight or brief framing story. Brevity should not be confused with insignificance, however, for the Lazarillo's frame is a critical feature of the work. Whereas linking devices function by tightening the internal structure of the novel, as I have illustrated, the wisdom theme, the storyteller, and the frame serve to unify the work externally. It is to these external organizing devices that I now direct my attention.

THE WISDOM THEME

The theme of wisdom is one technique that functions externally to unify the diversity contained in Lazarillo de Tormes. This theme is clearly expressed in

the moral of the novel, the reason Lázaro offers in the prologue for writing the work: “. . . porque consideren los que heredaron nobles estados cuán poco se les debe, pues Fortuna fue con ellos parcial, y cuánto más hicieron los que, siéndolos contraria, con fuerza y maña remando salieron a buen puerto” (11; Prologue). This idea is reiterated in tratado 1 after Lázaro’s head is banged against the stone bull and he begins his worldly education with the Blind Man: “Huelgo de contar a Vuestra Merced estas niñerías, para mostrar cuánta virtud sea saber los hombres subir siendo bajos, y dejarse bajar siendo altos cuánto vicio” (24; tr. 1). Thus in the prologue he represents the story of his life (“entera noticia de mi persona”, 11; Prologue) as paradigmatic, an example through which others can learn what a virtue it is to rise from low beginnings. This notion of wisdom, that one can learn through the experience of others, is “a central concern” in *frametales* (Gittes 121), as I have shown in chapter 3. The specific episodes of his life that the narrator tells, “estas niñerías” with the Blind Man as well as later incidents with other masters, purportedly illustrate virtue, the means by which the protagonist rises. However the virtue that Lázaro equates with effort and skill (“fuerza y maña”) is exposed in the course of his storytelling as hypocrisy and deceit, which he has learned and put into practice with various masters in pursuit of his own social and economic advantage. Lázaro’s self-interest belies his purported honorable intentions as an author as well, for although he suggests that some benefit can be derived from his work, his objective in writing the novel is unequivocally linked to his own literary ambitions and desire for fame. His citation of Cicero (“La honra cría las artes”, 6; Prologue) is a misappropriation of a classical source to

express his personal agenda that runs at odds with the meaning its author assigned to it. Cicero's idea that honor as virtue is necessary for the creation of art is distorted in the hands of Lázaro to imply that through art an artist achieves fame and glory. Thus in terms of his literary project, Lázaro's goal, the safe harbor ("buen puerto") toward which he directs his effort and skill ("fuerza y maña"), is recognition and praise for that very effort and skill. As such, his literary aspirations mirror his social and economic goals, which he claims in the final tratado to have achieved: "Pues en este tiempo estaba en mi prosperidad y en la cumbre de toda buena fortuna" (135; tr. 7).

The wisdom theme is one of the most significant organizing forces in Lázaro's autobiography, for the protagonist's lifelong process of learning lessons (or not) and putting those lessons into practice (often misapplying them) are integral to his purportedly exemplary rise in society. As a small child Lázaro begins to learn certain truths about life. In the "coco" episode, for example, he rather insightfully observes, "¡Cuántos debe de haber en el mundo que huyen de otros porque no se ven a sí mismos!" (18; tr. 1). Yet the lessons that will have the greatest impact on Lázaro throughout his life are those that he learns while serving the Blind Man. The influence of his first master, Tarr notes, "runs through the book like a fine connecting thread" (419). Several issues concerning the wisdom theme that appear both in the *frametale* tradition and in the Lazarillo beginning with the protagonist's tutelage under the Blind Man are the importance of education (including both guidance and correction), life's experiences as a method of instruction, and the necessity of good advice and advisors.

With respect to the importance of education, there are numerous parallels between frame-tale collections and the picaresque novel. Just as the king in the Panchatantra and in the Sindbad tradition hands over his son(s) to a sage (or seven sages) to be educated, so, too, does Lázaro's mother entrust her son's education to a wise man, the Blind Man. This transference of responsibility is not merely implied in the narrative, rather it is portrayed as a matter of ceremony: “. . . ella me encomendó a él . . . y le rogaba me tractase bien y mirase por mí . . . Él respondió que así lo haría y que me recibía no por mozo, sino por hijo” (21-22; tr. 2). This exchange in the Panchatantra is expressed with a similar formality that denotes the significance of the event:

‘Do me a favour, sir, and take the princes in hand; teach them, instruct them, so that they become unsurpassed in their mastery over all matters relating to practical wisdom.’ . . . He sent for the princes and handed them over to Visnu Sarma. . . . Visnu Sarma accepted charge of them and took them home with him. . . . (5, Preamble)

A further similarity between the two works is the emphasis on the awakening of intellect. Regarding the Panchatantra, Rajan notes,

The princes (and we ought to be clear on this point), are not stupid; they are ‘unlettered’ and ignorant. As the king, their father says, ‘they lack judgement’, being ‘averse to learning’. How to awaken their intelligence is the problem the king faces. . . . ‘To

awaken the intelligence': this is Visnu Sarma's objective.

(emphasis in original; xxxii)

Lázaro's initiation by the Blind Man in the episode of the stone bull also stresses this point. Upon his first lesson he awakens to the harsh reality of having to look out for himself in a hostile world: "Parescióme que en aquel instante desperté de la simpleza en que, como niño, dormido estaba. Dije entre mí: 'Verdad dice éste, que me cumple avivar el ojo y avisar, pues solo soy, y pensar cómo me sepa valer'" (23; tr. 1). Lázaro is not dim-witted; recall that the Blind Man soon recognizes he is "de buen ingenio" (23; tr. 1). He is simply naive and thus in need of guidance and experience. In this the Blind Man promises to play a role: "Yo oro ni plata no te lo puedo dar; más avisos para vivir muchos te mostraré" (23; tr. 1).

Rico notes that these words of the Blind Man recall two Biblical passages, one from Acts, the other from Psalms (Lazarillo 23). I find a closer resemblance to several passages in praise of wisdom in Proverbs. For example, the Blind Man's words bear a likeness to wisdom's call: "Receive my instruction, and not silver; and knowledge rather than choice gold" (Holy Bible, Prov. 8.10). There is also a similarity to "My fruit is better than gold, yea, than fine gold; and my revenue than choice silver. I lead in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment" (Holy Bible, Prov. 8.19-20). Recalling a rather different path, Lázaro remarks, "Y fue así, que . . . éste me alumbró y adestró en la carrera de vivir" (24; tr. 1). Finally, another verse states, "How much better is it to get wisdom than gold! and to get understanding rather to be chosen than silver!"

(Holy Bible, Prov. 16.16). The similarity between the words of the Blind Man and these verses from Proverbs strengthen the picaresque novel's association with the theme of wisdom. Although a religious work may be an analogue or a source for the Blind Man's claim, it should be remembered that the lessons in the Lazarillo, like those of the medieval *frametale*, center predominantly on practical wisdom rather than religious ethics.

The role that the Blind Man plays in Lázaro's edification is of such significance, that its absence is felt as early as in the following tratado. Here Lázaro finds himself in a predicament and in need of advice, as occurs with Count Lucanor, for example. But whereas the count turns to Patronio, Lázaro has no one. Though he must rely on himself in this world ("pues solo soy"), he has not the experience with which to judge a course of action: "Pues estando en tal aflicción . . . y sin saber darme consejo . . ." (54; tr. 2). He finds relief, albeit short lived, only because Chance or God steps in to lend him assistance: ". . . llegó acaso a mi puerta un caldero, el cual yo creo que fue ángel enviado a mí por la mano de Dios en aquel hábito" (54-55; tr. 2).¹⁴⁵

In the final tratado, Lázaro is faced with another difficult situation, the immoral character and behavior of his wife, in which he is complicit. While others attempt to warn Lázaro, the Archpriest advises him not to heed what other people say. He cautions Lázaro to focus on what is ultimately favorable to his own economic and social well-being:

Lázaro de Tormes, quien ha de mirar a dichos de malas lenguas
nunca medrará; digo esto porque no me maravillaría alguno,

viendo entrar en mi casa a tu mujer y salir della. Ella entra muy a tu honra y suya. Y esto te lo prometo. Por tanto, no mires a lo que pueden decir, sino a lo que te toca: digo a tu provecho. (132-33; tr. 7)

This situation is resonant in several ways with the second exemplo of the Conde Lucanor, “De lo que contesció a un omne bueno con su fijo,” in which a father and son are criticized by others for how they go to town with their donkey, whether the father rides and the son walks, the son rides and the father walks, the father and son both ride, or they both walk. Within the tale the father encourages his son to do what is best and most advantageous to him without regard to what others may say:

Et por ende, si tú quieres fazer lo mejor et más a tu pro, cata que fagas lo mejor et lo que entendieres que te cunple más. Et sól que non sea mal, non dexes de lo fazer por recelo de dicho de las gentes, ca cierto es que las gentes a lo demás siempre fablan en las cosas a su voluntad et non catan lo que es más a su pro. (26; ex. 2)

Patronio advises Count Lucanor, in turn, to do what benefits his own interests and, once settled on a course of action, not to falter for fear of what people may say: “Et de que estas cosas guardáredes en lo que oviéredes de fazer et lo falláredes que es bien et vuestra pro, conséjovos yo que nunca lo dexedes de fazer por recelo de lo que las gentes podrían dello dezir” (27; ex. 2).

Although this advice is highly similar to the advice that the Archpriest offers Lázaro, there are stipulations in Patronio’s advice that are conspicuously

absent from that of the ecclesiastic. Patronio warns the count to consider all advantages and disadvantages carefully (“que cuydedes toda la pro o el dapño que se vos puede ende seguir”, 26-27; ex. 2), not to trust his own judgment on the issue (“que non vos fiedes en vuestro seso”, 27), to take care not to deceive himself by letting his will, or desires, win out over good sense (“que vos guardedes que vos non engañe la voluntad”, 27), and to seek the advice of wise, loyal, and discreet advisors (“que vos consejedes con los que entendiéredes que son de buen ententimiento et leales et de buena poridat”, 27). When Lázaro states that he had already decided to keep in the company of good people (“yo determiné de arrimarme a los buenos”, 133; tr. 7), he essentially goes against all of the aforementioned warnings that Patronio gives Count Lucanor. His mind is already made up to seek what his will desires, for the lessons of his past experiences and the guidance of his past masters have taught him to be an accomplished hypocrite and proven that hypocrisy pays. Furthermore, the provision that the son’s actions not be bad (“sól que non sea mal”), a condition repeated in Don Juan Manuel’s verse at the end of the exemplo, is not even given lip service in the Archpriest’s admonition. He instead portrays the wife’s actions as serving both her and Lázaro’s honor. This appears to be a satisfactory explanation to Lázaro, which is not surprising since he considers that his association with such an esteemed person can only bring advantages and favors (“visto por mí que de tal persona no podía venir sino bien a favor”, 130-31; tr. 7). That the Archpriest’s esteem is based on his prominence in society and not on virtuous actions or intentions does not diminish the benefit that Lázaro’s

relationship (and arrangement) with the archpriest confers (“todo favor y ayuda”, 131; *tr.* 7). And so Lázaro’s notion of honor as the outward appearance of respectability, an attitude adopted by much of society including the Squire, remains intact and his marriage to the Archpriest’s concubine as a pretense for social propriety fits snugly into this understanding while granting him certain privileges and benefits.

This is Lázaro’s wisdom, a wisdom he, as protagonist, has gained from following the instruction and example of various members of society that not only hold these values, but also perpetuate them by initiating, habituating, and reinforcing them in people under their influence. This is also the wisdom that Lázaro as narrator of the novel credits in a roundabout way for his rise in society. According to Lázaro himself, he aims to illustrate that, despite adversity, he has risen by virtue of his own efforts and skill, and as such portrays himself as a self-made man.¹⁴⁶ Yet ethics, whether practical, moral, or otherwise, are not a personal matter, rather they are the patrimony of society. In his role as narrator, Lázaro participates in the transmission of wisdom whereby these ethics are purportedly justified by the content of the stories, by the very act telling of them, and by his authority as the principal storyteller of his work.

THE STORYTELLER

As protagonist, Lázaro is the principal thread among several that unifies the novel by weaving the various stories together, but as storyteller, like the storyteller of the *frametale*, he supplies this cohesive thread. At times his voice is prominent, making his readers aware of his presence and, therefore, conscious of

his control over all that which he recounts. On other occasions his voice is faint, seemingly ceding the floor to other narrative voices such as that of the boy Lázaro or one of his many masters, or even to the narrative itself. In such instances the reader may become more fully engaged in what is being told and temporarily lose sight of who is telling it and why. In this fashion Lázaro as narrator manipulates his audience by directing them boldly to what he wants to highlight and diverting them subtly from what he prefers to silence. As a technique of the anonymous author, however, it functions by providing both a range and a depth of perspective that allows for diversity of meaning. This multiplicity of perspective is achieved by shifting the focus among different storytellers and audiences on a single narrative layer as well as among those on a variety of levels.

Lázaro's authority as the principal storyteller of his work appears to be established on similar grounds as the authority of many frame-tale storytellers is based. However this very criteria that ostensibly legitimizes Lázaro's authority often works to undermine it instead. First, as the purported author of the work, his name, lineage, and place of birth would seem to grant him a degree of influence by giving the impression that he was a genuine, historical person who stood behind his literary creation and vouched for its authenticity. Lázaro gives this account of his origins at the beginning of the first tratado:

Pues sepa Vuestra Merced, ante todas cosas, que a mí llaman Lázaro de Tormes, hijo de Tomé González y de Antona Pérez, naturales de Tejares, aldea de Salamanca. Mi nacimiento fue dentro del río Tormes, por la cual causa tomé el sobrenombre; y

fue desta manera: mi padre, que Dios perdone, tenía cargo de proveer una molienda de una aceña que está ribera de aquel río, en la cual fue molinero más de quince años; y estando mi madre una noche en la aceña, preñada de mí, tomóle el parto y parióme allí. De manera que con verdad me puedo decir nascido en el río. (12-14; tr. 1)

Yet the parodic treatment of this autobiographical data and the true author's complete self-effacement underscore the ironic use of the storyteller as a structural device.¹⁴⁷ Whereas in many *frametales* the principal storyteller validates what he relates in part by his association with the true author whose name is known and whose existence is verifiable (or at least credible),¹⁴⁸ in the *Lazarillo* the narrator is understood to be a fraud whose very inauthenticity is one of several motives for the reader to be suspicious of a tale that has certain trappings of legitimacy. Even anonymous *frametales* storytellers appear more authentic than the picaresque novel's narrator, for at least their validity has not had cause to be doubted.

Although a creation of fiction himself, Lázaro nonetheless lends the novel an air of truth by utilizing some other strategies that are employed by *frametales* storytellers to establish their authority and legitimize their works. By first admitting to their own sins or imperfections, limits to their knowledge, or possible defects in their works, *frametales* narrators ingratiate themselves with their readers, and thus their alleged good intentions are more likely to be taken at face value. As noted above, for example, Alfonsi and Juan Ruiz are admittedly sinners. Even

so, they, like other storytellers, declare a desire to share the wisdom they have gained for the benefit of their readers. The degree to which the content of their collections proves them sincere is a matter of interpretation and, therefore, in the hands of their audience. Most *frametales* narrators caution against the error of misunderstanding their work and their intentions in part because, as an extension of themselves, their literary creation affects their reputation. Furthermore, whatever faults may exist in their work or their knowledge are generally taken as exceptions to the rule, and the narrator's admission of lacking in these areas may in most cases be understood in terms of the humility *topos*, or feigned modesty. As we have seen, the knowledge and experience of storytellers such as Alfonsi, Juan Manuel, and Boccaccio, for example, help to establish their authority. As I have also illustrated, that these qualifications of the principal storyteller are significant in the authentication of the collection is highlighted by the emphasis placed on the same traits that characterize the storytellers in the framing story, who, in turn, validate their own tales. Alfonsi's storyteller in the frame, whether father, philosopher, or teacher, is wise and experienced; Juan Manuel's Patronio has "buen entendimiento;" and Boccaccio's ladies "all possess in full measure the quality of wisdom (*saviezza*)" (McWilliam lx). One has only to recall storytellers such as Visnu Sarma of the *Panchatantra* and Sindbad and the seven sages of the *Sindbad* tradition to expand the list of wise storytellers, and there are others still.

Lázaro as narrator shares many of these concerns and uses similar devices. Not only does he admit to being a sinner and allude to the shortcomings of his work, but he also claims to have good intentions for its use:

. . . confesando yo no ser más sancto que mis vecinos, destanada, que en este grosero estilo escribo, no me pesará que hayan parte y se huelguen con ello todos los que en ella algún gusto hallaren, y vean un hombre con tantas fortunas, peligros y adversidades. (8-9; Prologue)

However, most of what is said here can be read on various levels. In one sense, the narrator's confession not to be holier, or more perfect, than his neighbors seems to be an apology for any mistakes or shortcomings with respect to the composition of his work. It may also be understood as a challenge to any reader who may find objectionable material in his work, for how can his reader, also a sinner, judge the sins of the writer? In his prologue Alfonsi poses a similar challenge to his would-be detractors:

If, however, anyone should flick through this work with a human and therefore superficial eye, and see something in it where human nature has not been sufficiently on its guard, I advise him to re-read it again and again, and I propose that he, and all others who are perfect in the Catholic faith, correct what is wrong. For in anything invented by man, there is no perfection, as the philosopher says. (104)

Since no man is perfect, it would follow that no one would be justified in correcting (or condemning) his work. In the Lazarillo a third meaning comes into play since, in addition to being the narrator of the novel, Lázaro is its protagonist. The imperfection to which he alludes may be understood not only as his faults or

weakness as a storyteller (in terms of both what he tells and how he tells it), but also as his transgressions as the principal character in the story about him. Thus the comparison to his “vecinos” calls into question the sins and corruption of other members of society, thereby enlarging the focus of blame from Lázaro alone to implicate others as well, including those of his audience who might be inclined to condemn him.

Lázaro’s authority as storyteller, like that of many *frametales* narrators, is established partly on the basis of wisdom. Yet as I have illustrated, Lázaro’s wisdom derives in large part from following the precept and example of people who neglect or, worse, defeat the purpose of their position in society. Although he cites by name famous figures such as Cicero and Pliny, the wisdom Lázaro aims to impart through his work is not based on the authority of ancient wise men. It is his own life that illustrates the lesson he wishes to teach, that despite adversity man can rise in society and achieve prosperity by virtue of his own merits and hard work. Ironically, it is the telling of that life story that reveals how devoid Lázaro is of virtue as goodness and moral uprightness.

Lázaro expresses a sense of duty to share his life experiences with both a specific audience, *Vuestra Merced*, and a wider audience of readers: “que a todos se comunicase” (5; Prologue). He introduces the notion of a large audience in the opening line of the prologue: “Yo por bien tengo que cosas tan señaladas, y por ventura nunca oídas ni vistas, vengan a noticia de muchos y no se entierren en la sepultura del olvido, pues podría ser que alguno que las lea halle algo que le agrade, y a los que no ahondaren tanto los deleite” (3-4; Prologue). Deyermond

recognizes in the novel's first sentence a combination of two topoi: "the duty to preserve knowledge of famous deeds, and novelty . . ." (Critical Guide 60). As it applies to Lázaro's role as narrator, this declaration conveys the idea that the wisdom of his experience (as illustrated by his stories) should be shared with others instead of hidden or wasted, and as such it resembles the obligation expressed by many frametales storytellers to share their wisdom for the benefit of mankind, now and in the future.¹⁴⁹ Yet there are important differences in the way this duty is articulated in the Lazarillo and in frametales collections. Lázaro's wisdom, I have noted, was gained principally from learning lessons in the school of life, thus his duty to share his wisdom will be fulfilled by recounting these personal life experiences. These life events are described as important but by chance unknown (never seen or heard), whereas most stories told by frametales narrators are either acknowledged or understood to belong to the storytelling tradition, and therefore to have been passed by memory or text from storyteller to audience for generations. Therefore the validity of many frametales stories, despite their adaptation into distinct versions, is grounded in a time-tested tradition in which the principal storyteller of a collection authenticates his own new telling of the tales. Lázaro's promotion of his stories as perhaps unique to his audience seems to be in contrast to the frametales tradition. However the two may have much more in common than has thus far been recognized. That Lázaro's stories should reach many people and not be buried in the grave of oblivion to be forgotten for all time implies two key aspects of the storytelling tradition: a wide diffusion and a prolonged existence. The notion that his tales should be preserved

through memory and transmission aligns his duty as principal storyteller that of frametale storytellers.

A further consideration may shed light on coincidences between Lázaro's role as storyteller of his work and the function of frametale narrators in their collections. As we have seen, Lázaro claims at the very beginning of his work that the things he will tell have perhaps never been seen or heard before ("por ventura nunca oídas ni vistas"). If they are indeed tales that recount his own life experiences, why would there be any doubt about their novelty? The answer lies with those who have shared these life experiences with Lázaro. Not only are Lázaro's various masters familiar with the events he tells because they have played a crucial role in them, but several of them have also already begun to tell some of these tales by the time Lázaro writes his novel. The reader knows this information because Lázaro depicts these storytelling episodes within his very work.

In the first tratado the Blind Man is portrayed on several occasions telling stories of Lázaro's tricks. The narrator tells how the incident of the wine jug, for example, is later converted into a tale and recounted by his master:

Y si alguno le decía por qué me trataba mal, luego contaba el cuento del jarro, diciendo:

—¿Pensaréis que este mi mozo es algún inocente? Pues oíd si el demonio ensayara otra tal hazaña.

Santiguándose los que lo oían, decían:

—¡Mirá quién pensara de un muchacho tan pequeño tal ruindad!

Y reían mucho el artificio y decíanle:

—Castigaldo, castigaldo, que de Dios los habréis.

Y él, con aquello, nunca otra cosa hacía. (34; tr. 1)

This single description by the narrator demonstrates a number of key coincidences between the Lazarillo and the *frametale*. First, this description shows that the Blind Man's story arises out of a dialogue between those who ask for an explanation of his ill treatment of the boy, and the Blind Man who answers their inquiry with a tale which he intends to be exemplary, that is, to illustrate his point that Lázaro is not as innocent as he appears. He introduces his story with a characteristic formula: "Pues oíd. . . ." The audience's reaction to the tale recalls the dual intention of storytelling in the *frametale* tradition: to instruct and to entertain. The audience not only appreciates the cleverness of the story (their amusement is indicated by their laughter: "reían mucho"), but it also learns a lesson (as implied by the statement of the story's moral that appearances can be deceiving: "¡Mirá quién pensara de un muchacho tan pequeño tal ruindad!"). The audience further recognizes that the boy's behavior is wrong and should be corrected: "Castigaldo, castigaldo, que de Dios lo habréis." To correct the boy is the Blind Man's duty, the audience implies, but he does so not in order to teach Lázaro the wrongfulness of his actions, but to take pleasure in repaying him brutally for his deception.¹⁵⁰ Thus the lesson that the protagonist learns from this experience is not just to pay his master's ill treatment back with the same, but to

enjoy doing so even at his own cost: “Y en eso yo siempre le llevaba por los peores caminos. . . que aunque yo no iba por lo más enjuto, holgábame a mí de quebrar un ojo por quebrar dos al que ninguno tenía” (34-35; tr. 1).

Finally, this account demonstrates the use of the boxing technique, or tale-within-a-tale arrangement, for the principal storyteller of the novel tells his audience the story of another storyteller telling his audience a story. That is, the Blind Man’s story is framed within the narrator’s telling of it. Yet this technique is treated with irony because, although it generally functions to portray a variety of perspectives, here the reader never hears the Blind Man’s version of the tale. The narrator effectively silences the Blind Man’s rendition by preemptively telling his own story based on his interpretation of events. Thus the narrator is seen to manipulate the use of this structural device toward his own advantage first by painting himself in a favorable light while depicting the Blind Man as the dark figure, and, second, by never fully ceding the floor to his adversary. Yet a further twist occurs as the anonymous author who stands behind his fictional narrator plies the boxing technique toward his own ends. The narrator’s attempt to influence his readers, to sway them to his point of view by denying them access to his opponent’s perspective, in actuality works to defeat his purpose. The use of the boxing technique merely reminds the reader that there is always more than one side to an issue and that Lázaro’s account therefore cannot be taken as a full and accurate measure. As we have seen demonstrated in the *frametale*, it is through a variety of perspectives, none of them entirely right or entirely wrong in themselves, that one can begin to gain a true understanding of an issue or event.

The episode of the grapes is another of Lázaro's experiences with the Blind Man that becomes a tale on several levels with diverse narrators and audiences. Its capacity to instruct and to entertain is also evident within a variety of contexts. First, Lázaro as a character in the story sees the episode in this light, for when the Blind Man sizes up the matter with his clever observation of the truth, Lázaro both laughs and learns a lesson: "Reíme entre mí y, aunque mochacho, noté mucho la discreta consideración del ciego" (emphasis added; 37; tr. 1). Immediately following the protagonist's reaction to the grape episode is the narrator's observation that this and other tales are mutually entertaining and noteworthy: "Mas por no ser prolijo, dejo de contar muchas cosas, así graciosas como de notar, que con este mi primer amo me acaescieron . . ." (emphasis added; 37; tr. 1). The proximity of comments that reiterate an idea within similar terms encourages a comparison of the two, and my conclusion is that Lázaro's reaction as the protagonist serves as a model for the reader's reaction. The humor in the tale is self-evident, and, as illustrated earlier, at least one important lesson is Lázaro's willingness to keep silent a wrong, even if he is the injured party, so long as he can gain an advantage. This message is indeed worthy of note for its relevance to Lázaro's complicity in "el caso" of the final tratado. It is on this level that the reader develops a greater understanding of both the structure and the meaning of the work.

Tales of Lázaro's life are told time and again by characters within the text to an audience within the text. There are other storytelling episodes involving the Blind Man, but the Priest also recounts Lázaro's stories: "De lo que sucedió en

aquellos tres días siguientes ninguna fe daré, porque los tuve en el vientre de la ballena, mas de cómo esto que he contado oí, después que en mí torné, decir a mi amo, el cual a cuantos allí venían lo contaba por extenso” (69; tr. 2). Here Lázaro as narrator is clear to distinguish what he knows as an eyewitness and what he has been told. Since he was unconscious for three days, his knowledge of what transpired during that time is based on hearsay thus he cannot vouch for its truthfulness. Such an admission by the principal storyteller of the novel helps to lend his work an air of authenticity much in the way *frametales* narrators sometimes validate their tales by indicating their source or by discerning what they have read, heard, seen, or experienced themselves.

The above excerpt from tratado 2 is also significant in demonstrating the diffusion of tales about Lázaro’s life. The narrator’s reference in the final tratado to “malas lenguas, que nunca faltaron ni faltarán . . . diciendo no sé qué y sí sé qué” (132; tr. 7) further substantiates the tellability of his life stories, in this case those involving his wife and the Archpriest. These storytelling episodes, whether gossip or entertainment or otherwise, offer clear evidence that Lázaro’s life experiences are the stuff that tales are made of. And indeed this is true, as indicated by the widespread use of tales of wit and deception in the *frametales* tradition.¹⁵¹ But this idea brings us back around to the question of whether the stories Lázaro tells as narrator of his work are novel, that is, “nunca oídas ni vistas.” The narrator can do no more than state that this may be so (“por ventura”) because the tales that he will include in his written text are already circulating orally in some version or another thanks to the Blind Man, the Priest,

“malas lenguas,” and perhaps others. Thus this is the case of an individual who, on one hand, narrates his tales because he is obliged to explain “el caso” to another individual, and, on the other hand, stands as both protagonist and narrator at the confluence of oral and written storytelling traditions that use life itself as the instruction for life.

THE FRAME

The principal function of the frame of Lazarillo de Tormes is to establish the circumstances of the storytelling: who tells stories to whom and why. As such it fulfills a similar purpose as the framing story of *frametales* collections. Furthermore, the framing technique used in the picaresque novel is in essence a synthesis of the four predominant framing devices whose use in *frametales* I have previously addressed: a dialogue format in which tales illustrate a truth or model conduct to be either imitated or avoided, an argument or debate in which stories exemplify a point made in support of a contention or in opposition to one, as a delaying tactic to halt or postpone a course of action, and as the practice of a skill as a pleasurable and amusing pastime, that is, storytelling for its own sake. These devices work to similar effect in the *frametales* and in the Lazarillo in that they bear upon the audience’s judgment, sensibility, or behavior, or a combination of these. In this way, the telling of stories serves to justify an action or attitude (whether past, present, or future), to influence behavior, beliefs, or a point of view, or to give and take pleasure. Most often the storytelling in these works satisfies a variety of these functions, thus is didactic and entertaining at once.

The dialogue scheme of *frametales*, as I have noted, may vary in complexity but is fundamentally a request and its fulfillment, or an inquiry and its response. Sharing this basic dialogue structure, the framing story of the Lazarillo takes the form of a letter or report written by Lázaro in response to an inquiry made by *Vuestra Merced* concerning a certain matter. Without attempting to suggest any connection to the *frametale* genre, certain Lazarillo scholars highlight this characteristic of the novel's structure: Claudio Guillén refers to the novel as “*epístola hablada*” (“*La disposición temporal*” 268); Víctor García de la Concha mentions “*la estructura . . . del dialogismo epistolar*” (79); and Rico observes, “. . . the epistle is one side of a conversation (*‘velut pars altera dialogi’*), and our narrative will be interspersed with appeals to its addressee . . .” (Spanish Picaresque Novel 4).

In contrast to the active participation of both interlocutors in the framing story of a *frametale*, the role played by *Vuestra Merced* is inactive for it occurs beyond the scope of the narrative. His request for an explanation is instead reported by the narrator within his own response: “Y pues *Vuestra Merced* escribe se le escriba y relate el caso muy por extenso . . .” (10; Prologue). Although this tactic differs from the recording of direct speech in *frametales* such as the Kalila and Dimna, Sindbad, and Disciplina clericalis,¹⁵² it nonetheless performs the same function of expressing the solicitation of an account or story. A closer parallel exists with formulas of reporting indirect speech in the frame of the Conde Lucanor, such as, “El conde le rogó quel dixiese que cómo fuera aquello. . . .” The difference in choice of verbs (escribir and relatar versus rogar and decir) does

not obscure the coincidence of structure and meaning between the phrases. However, a chief disparity does exist between the contexts in which these requests appear. In Juan Manuel's work, the request interrupts the dialogue between the count and his advisor in which the former's dilemma or troublesome situation has been explained. Conversely, in the Lazarillo there is no preceding explanation of how the request is relevant to the life of either party. The narrator of the novel alludes to Vuestra Merced's inquiry in the Prologue but conceals the reason for it until the final tratado. In this way, the reader's overt guide for the interpretation of the enclosed tales is the narrator's alleged reasons for telling them, not Vuestra Merced's motivation for requesting them. The letter format, then, is a manipulation of the dialogue scheme, for although it consists of two parties, it effectively amplifies one voice while silencing the other. And, as we shall see, where the dialogue emerges in the novel, the reader is reminded of the imbalanced perspective it offers.

As an external organizing device, the dialogue scheme functions by linking various sections of a work. The more pervasive the dialogue is, the more firmly it holds the work together. Yet unlike in *frame*tales such as the Panchatantra, Kalila, and Conde Lucanor in which the dialogue of the framing story resurfaces at regular intervals (at the beginning of individual books or tales, at the end, or both), in the Lazarillo the narrator addresses Vuestra Merced with less uniformity. These incidents of direct address tend to occur more often in the first half of the novel, above all in the first tratado, but beginning in the prologue. Lázaro directs himself twice to Vuestra Merced, his specific audience, in the latter

part of the prologue (in the first part he appeals to a more general audience), and he opens the first tratado by recalling him again: “Pues sepa Vuestra Merced . . .” (12; tr. 1). Rico notes that the “Pues” of this expression “podría corresponder al ‘Pues’ coloquial con que se reemprende un discurso o se comienza un cuento” (Lazarillo 13), and he illustrates this point with the opening line of the following paragraph: “Pues siendo yo niño . . .” (14; tr. 1). The narrator resorts to this form again as he begins to recount the Blind Man’s tricks (“Pues, tornando al bueno de mi ciego y contando sus cosas, Vuestra Merced sepa que . . .”, 25; tr. 1), and, as we have seen on a subordinate narrative level, the Blind Man introduces his story of the wine jug by addressing his audience with the same term (“Pues oíd . . .”, 34; tr. 1). Although the dialogue does not emerge with the regularity seen in some *frametales*, when it does surface, it is often to introduce a story or change a subject. Thus despite the inconsistency of the dialogue scheme in the Lazarillo, its function is similar to that in the *frametale*: to delimit material and to establish the context from which stories derive meaning.

The narrator calls attention to the storytelling process on several more occasions in the first tratado in ways that bring to mind the *frametale*. I will limit myself to two brief examples, in both of which Lázaro shows a consciousness of his audience’s presence. First, prior to the grapes episode, Lázaro states, “Y porque vea Vuestra Merced a cuánto estendía el ingenio deste astuto ciego, contaré un caso de muchos que con él me acaescieron, en el cual me paresce dio bien a entender su gran astucia” (35; tr. 1). Aldo Ruffinatto recognizes in this formula a significant parallel in medieval exemplum literature: “Lázaro-narrador

se ciñe en esta circunstancia a la técnica medieval del exemplum. Es decir que el ‘caso’ que se apresta a relatar aspira a la calificación de ‘ejemplar’” (160). This function is also, I have noted, a defining trait of the dialogue framing device of the medieval *frametales*.

Second, when describing the avarice of the Blind Man and his own skill in outwitting his master, Lázaro outright insists that he is telling the truth, thereby seeming to validate his claim and to forestall an objection by his reader: “Digo verdad: si con mi sotileza y buenas mañas no me supiera remediar, muchas veces me finara de hambre” (27; *tr.* 1). Andersen notes that in the Canterbury Tales some storytellers “assure their audience that what they relate is the truth, not fiction” in order to satisfy the “demand of authenticity” placed on the tales (180). In both of these works, the authenticating device between the narrator and his audience is sometimes parodied. In this episode of the Lazarillo, the impossibility of such a flagrant hyperbole (dying of hunger many times over) not only undermines the narrator’s insistence on the veracity of his statement, but it also adds an element of humor to the novel. The parody in Chaucer’s work occurs, for example, when the Nun’s Priest claims, “This storie is also trewe, I undertake, / As is the book of Launcelot de Lake . . .” (399; NPT 3211-12) (“This tale is just as true, I do attest, / As is the story of Sir Lancelot . . .”; 212). Since, as Halverson notes, “The romance of Lancelot and Guinevere was a well-known fiction . . .” (399), the Nun’s Priest’s claim of authenticity is a comic contradiction.¹⁵³

I move now from the first to the last tratado to offer a final example of how the dialogue functions as a structural framing device in the Lazarillo. Deyermond observes that the anonymous author “imposed a firm structure on his diverse material” and that the pattern of this structure is made clearer

if we look beyond the narrative to the narrator’s explanation: the concluding paragraphs, with their reference to “el caso” . . . and address to “vuestra merced” . . . , balance the prologue, and lead from the narrative into the situation that produced it (the enquiries made by the Archpriest’s friend). (Critical Guide 36)

While the narrator’s explicit reference to Vuestra Merced in the final tratado helps to mark the confluence of the frame and the enclosed tales, this reference also serves as a reminder to Lázaro’s wider audience that his part in the dialogue is coming to an end. The letter form as a subversive variation of the dialogue scheme has, by silencing the voice of the audience, afforded the storyteller freedom in weaving his tales with his own design. Yet, implicit even in this manipulated dialogue scheme is an anticipated response. If Vuestra Merced has inquired into the matter and requested that Lázaro relate the story (“escribe se le escriba y relate el caso muy por extenso”, 10; Prologue), and Lázaro’s novel is the response to Vuestra Merced’s inquiry, or the fulfillment of his request (“Pues sepa Vuestra Merced”, 12; tr. 1), would there not be some further response from Vuestra Merced? In the *frametale* this dialogue scheme of a request and its fulfillment, or an inquiry and its response, anticipates that the listener will apply to his own life what he has learned from his storytelling experience. So what

might be the implications if Vuestra Merced were to do the same? I do not imply that the reaction of Vuestra Merced would be intended as a sequel to Lázaro's novel, or that it is the subject of a missing chapter. As I have stated earlier, in many *frametales* precisely how the listener puts his lessons into practice is not explicitly portrayed. But the practical application of the knowledge gained from the storytelling experience is understood to be an integral part of the process and the storyteller has this in mind when recounting his tales. Patronio's storytelling, for example, is guided by specific concerns in the count's life. The Arab father of the Disciplina knows that his stories will teach his son to make his way in life. In the Sindbad, which does portray the king's response to hearing tales, the storytellers are acutely aware of the consequences of their stories. Here it is a matter of life or death. How, then, might the anticipation of some response from Vuestra Merced affect Lázaro's storytelling? I begin to answer this question in terms of the argument/debate framing technique.

Within the argument/debate framing scheme, the function of tales is to illustrate some idea or point of argument, or to refute another story. The storyteller may shift his focus any number of times within a single tale in order to emphasize a variety of points, as we have observed in Trotaconventos's telling of "The Greyhound and His Master." She moves from stressing ingratitude to disrespect for elders, then back to ingratitude, all within a single story (Michael 209). Lázaro narrates the tale of the wine jug in just such a fashion, alternating his emphasis several times between his stealth and skill in fulfilling his desires on one hand, and the Blind Man's avarice and astuteness in foiling those desires on

the other. At the end of the tale, the narrator places a heavy emphasis on his master's cleverness and cruelty in attaining his own desire for revenge.

As Dunn observes with respect to exempla, a tale may be used to support opposing sides of an argument because its significance is not inherent, rather it is determined by the speaker's objective ("Framing the Story" 100). In the Lazarillo this can be seen in the different intentions that Lázaro and the Blind Man have for telling the same story. The Blind Man relates the aforementioned story of the wine jug for two apparent purposes, that is, to illustrate that Lázaro is no innocent youth, and to justify his punishment of the boy: "Y si alguno le decía por qué me trataba mal, luego contaba el cuento del jarro, diciendo:—¿Pensaréis que este mi mozo es algún inocente? Pues oíd si el demonio ensayara otra tal hazaña" (34; tr. 1). Lázaro, on the other hand, recounts the tale to demonstrate his "sotileza y buenas mañas" (27; tr. 1) with which he outwits his master, while not only maintaining that he is innocent, but also suggesting that he is the victim: "Y aunque yo quisiera asentar mi corazón y perdonalle el jarrazo, no daba lugar el maltratamiento que el mal ciego dende allí adelante me hacía, que sin causa ni razón me hería . . ." (34). However the narrator's case is undermined by his having introduced this and other similar episodes as "burlas endiabladas" (27; tr. 1), and the Blind Man's allusion here, and elsewhere, to the devil only reinforces this idea of Lázaro's lack of innocence. Recall that at Lázaro's initial loss of innocence in the episode of the stone bull, the Blind Man warns, "Necio, aprende, que el mozo del ciego un punto ha de saber más que el diablo" (23; tr. 1). Various later allusions to the devil point to the protagonist's success in acquiring this

knowledge. In Lázaro's trick of changing half blancas for blancas, for example, the Blind Man states, "¿Qué diablo es esto . . . ? En ti debe estar esta desdicha" (30; tr. 1). Yet, as I have mentioned above, this is not a wisdom founded on virtuous principles. Hence the tales that the narrator tells to illustrate his argument that he is a model of a virtuous ascent are the same tales that demonstrate the counter-argument made by the anonymous author. I do not contend that the true author was opposed to social ascent in itself. I concur with Deyermond's observation that the author's "parody of 'homo novus' treatises need not imply hostility to the socially mobile, any more than his Biblical parodies imply hostility to Christians . . ." (Critical Guide 93). It is the lack of virtue and the betrayal of one's responsibility to society that the author attacks in his protagonist as well as in his other characters. Thus a tale's capacity for diverse meanings depends on the various purposes assigned to it, whether by a single storyteller, multiple tellers, or the anonymous author standing behind them all working to achieve his own goals.

We have seen how tales function in the Libro de buen amor for the purposes of justification and persuasion, and it is toward these goals that Lázaro also narrates his stories within the debate/argument scheme. Deyermond notes, "Whether or not we try to establish Vuestra Merced's reasons for asking Lázaro for his account,¹⁵⁴ it is obvious that the account is aimed at self-justification, that Lázaro thinks it will illustrate a general point (the self-made man is to be admired . . .), and that it is to some extent suspect" (Critical Guide 72). The episodes with the Blind Man, as well as those with subsequent masters, are all framed within the

narrator's demonstration to his reader of the adverse forces which he has had to face in life, and the virtues of effort and skill which he has exercised both in overcoming these adversities and in rising to a position, by his standards, of honor, prosperity, and prestige. As Deyermond explains, "The assertion that true nobility consists not in high rank and inherited wealth but in virtue, intelligence and effort seems platitudinous today, but in the Renaissance it was a hotly debated issue" (Critical Guide 86). In this sense, Lázaro's narrative may be seen as supporting an argument in the debate of this issue within society at large, much as Chaucer's storytellers with their tales address the topics of debate in the Middle Ages. Some of the controversial issues treated in both the picaresque novel and frametale collections are experience versus authority (this topic is related to the debate on what constitutes honor and nobility), fortune versus fate versus Providence,¹⁵⁵ and fortune versus virtue. Of the last of these Rico notes, ". . . la contraposición de 'fortuna' y 'virtud' constituyó . . . uno de los temas más abordados en los siglos XV y XVI, desde las composiciones populares a los tratados latinos que los humanistas escribieron . . ." (Lazarillo 12).

The purposes of justification and persuasion thus seem evident in terms of Lázaro's participation in a wider forum of debate, but is there a purpose that concerns a debate closer to home? I suggest that it does in the rivalries between the narrator and subordinate storytellers such as the Blind Man, the Priest, and the "malas lenguas," much in the way that the rivalry between Chaucer's pilgrims produces different perspectives of an issue of debate. Although in the Lazarillo the other points of view are not elaborated by characters in their own words, there

are nonetheless strong indications within the text of what these views may entail. The role of the “malas lenguas” is critical in the argument that concerns Vuestra Merced, for they are spreading tales related to “el caso” about which the Archpriest’s friend has inquired. As the “malas lenguas” are seen to frustrate Lázaro’s purpose, not only as protagonist, but also as narrator, his tales may be viewed as argued in opposition to their stories. Meddlers also work against the protagonist and his go-between in the first affair of the Libro de buen amor. In Juan Ruiz’s work they are successful, as Willis notes: “. . . the affair is broken up by the traditional tale-bearers (mescladores) . . .” (xxix). In the Lazarillo the narrator is still arguing his case.

Telling stories as a means of persuasion is also associated with the framing device of deceleration.¹⁵⁶ In this technique storytelling serves as a delaying tactic to draw out the time, to put off some action or event, or to forestall a rash decision. It often involves storytelling in the face of danger, as in the Book of Sindbad and the Thousand and One Nights. As an external framing device in Lazarillo de Tomes it functions by diverting his reader from a probable but undesirable course of action and by leading him to adopt the narrator’s point of view that encourages praise instead of censure or punishment. One of Lázaro’s chief purposes in telling his stories, I suggest, is to prevent or attenuate the negative repercussions of his complicity in his wife’s affair with the Archpriest. Being in some capacity the superior of Lázaro (“el día de hoy vivo y resido a servicio de Dios y de Vuestra Merced”, 129; tr. 7) and the Archpriest (“mi señor, y servidor y amigo de Vuestra Merced”, 130), Vuestra Merced has perhaps some

authority to act on the information he learns from Lázaro's account, and possibly to impose some punishment on one or the both of them. Although there is no conclusive proof in the novel to support this idea, I believe that there is sufficient circumstantial evidence to substantiate this claim. Much of this supporting information is in how characters within Lázaro's narrative (including the protagonist himself) use storytelling toward the same or similar ends.

On at least two occasions, Lázaro as a young protagonist is shown to give an account when he is threatened with some danger, and in both incidents he is portrayed as innocent. The first of these episodes occurs in tratado 1 when Lázaro is interrogated about his mother and Zaide: "Y probósele cuanto digo y aun más; porque a mí con amenazas me preguntaban, y, como niño, respondía y descubría cuanto sabía, con miedo . . ." (20; tr. 1). Deyermond notes, "It is one of the ironies of the book that naivety and fear should lead Lazarillo to betray his mother before his corruption by his masters begins" (Critical Guide 90-91). In the third tratado while the Squire is in the middle of recounting the story of himself to Lázaro, they are interrupted by the Squire's creditors: "Desta manera lamentaba también su adversa fortuna mi amo, dándome relación de su personal valerosa. Pues estando en esto, entró por la puerta un hombre y una vieja" (106; tr. 3). This interruption in the storytelling becomes the impetus for Lázaro's eventual retelling of the Squire's tale when he is interrogated with threats by the Constable and the Clerk: ". . . yo hube mucho miedo y, llorando, prometíle de decir lo que preguntaban" (108; tr. 3). Lázaro, as he was in the earlier episode, is depicted as innocent: "Señores, éste es un niño inocente . . . y no sabe. . . . Vista mi inocencia,

dejáronme, dándome por libre” (109; tr. 3). If, as we have seen on other occasions (and will see again shortly), the reactions of characters in the book may serve as a guide for the reactions of the reader, it follows that Vuestra Merced is to see in Lázaro’s account the proof of his innocence with respect to the story he has requested. We, the wider audience of readers, are also to follow this precedent.

The delaying technique also functions by manipulating time between the frame and the enclosed tales. In the Decameron, Boccaccio uses storytelling within the frame as a method of deceleration. Time in the life of the storytellers is filled by the act of storytelling, and yet time appears suspended as the group engages in the stories themselves. Within the narrative of the Lazarillo, the Squire uses storytelling as a delaying tactic by asking Lázaro for a detailed account of his life at the time when the afternoon meal would normally be served: “. . . preguntándome muy por extenso de dónde era y cómo había venido a aquella ciudad” (75; tr. 3). Since there is no food, there will be no meal, and his inquiry tactically puts off the humiliating issue, first by diverting the would-be subject for that time of day, and, second, by occupying the time they would otherwise spend eating. The hungry Lázaro is not easily distracted from his principal focus of food, however, and his concern for the length of his tale at such an inopportune time draws the reader’s attention to the Squire’s strategy: “Yo le di más larga cuenta que quisiera, porque me parecía más conveniente hora de mandar poner la mesa y escudillar la olla que de lo que me pedía” (75; tr. 3).

Lázaro as narrator practices a similar delaying tactic. Upon telling the story of the grapes he states, “Mas, por no ser prolijo, dejo de contar muchas cosas, así graciosas como de notar” (37; tr. 1). Deyermond suggests that this is an example of the brevity topos, “an assurance to the audience that they would not be detained long” (Critical Guide 61). Deyermond further observes, “A topos may . . . express an author’s real position, or it may be mere convention; the question can be answered only by a study of the individual context, if at all” (Critical Guide 60). The context reveals that the narrator attempts to give his reader the impression of hurrying his account along, while in truth he prolongs it. In the same sentence as the aforementioned brevity topos, Lázaro claims, “. . . quiero decir el despidiente y, con él, acabar” (37; tr. 1), yet what remains is more than a third of his entire story of the Blind Man.

The relative length of Lázaro’s story of the Blind Man, the recurrent direct address to Vuestra Merced within this section, and the repeated references to his first master in later tratados all point to what seems to me a deliberate attempt by the narrator to draw his reader’s attention to this character. I have already noted the significance of the Blind Man’s role in the protagonist’s life in terms of his education, and in the narrator’s novel in terms of structure. Another key influence of this figure, one that the narrator appears intent on highlighting, is in the practice of his narrative art for the sheer pleasure of it, that is, storytelling for the sake of storytelling. Although we are not told so directly, storytelling may well be one of the many skills that Lázaro learned from his first master. Certainly the attention that the narrator draws to the Blind Man’s storytelling episodes, in

which the protagonist was among the audience, would indicate that this is a possibility. I will offer a final example of the Blind Man's storytelling, which I believe illustrates several parallels with the *frametale* tradition, as well as an analogue for Lázaro's own storytelling experience.

After the episode of the turnip and the sausage, Lázaro receives such a sound punishment from the Blind Man that Lázaro suspects he would have lost his life if not for the arrival of others. As occurs in the wine jug incident, the Blind Man tells his audience the story, only this time he recounts over and over several of the boy's tricks. The audience's response is a laughter more enthusiastic than before, and even Lázaro is moved to laugh in spite of himself:

Contaba el mal ciego a todos cuantos allí se allegaban mis desastres, y dábales cuenta una y otra vez así de la del jarro como de la del racimo, y agora de lo presente. Era la risa de todos tan grande, que toda la gente que por la calle pasaba entraba a ver la fiesta; mas con tanta gracia y donaire recontaba el ciego mis hazañas, que, aunque yo estaba tan maltratado y llorando, me parecía que hacía sinjusticia en no se las reír. (41; *tr.* 1)

This storytelling episode demonstrates several key features of storytelling that occur in the medieval *frametale*. Firstly, the telling of tales is an activity whose pleasure can be shared by the storyteller and his audience alike. In the *Decameron*, for example, this idea is expressed in Pampinea's suggestion of storytelling as a pleasurable means for everyone to spend the hottest part of the day. Secondly, storytelling has the power to transform even the most contrary of

attitudes. In Sindbad, a king whose mind is firmly set on the exoneration of his own son can be moved by storytelling to condemn him to death. Thirdly, how a story is told may have greater sway on an audience than the topic or content of the tale itself. In the Decameron, Pampinea's tale on the fourth day provokes laughter from her audience despite the dismal theme for the day. Finally, life events, potentially humorous in themselves, when told with wit and grace may become tales that will be recounted time and again to give pleasure to many audiences. A similar chain of events occurs in the Decameron as Alibech's life becomes the substance of an amusing tale that is widely diffused.

This storytelling episode of the Blind Man I suggest serves as a strong model for Lázaro's account of his life. Not only does he explicitly express a pleasure in recounting tales ("Huelgo de contar a Vuestra Merced estas niñerías . . .", 24; tr. 1), but the humor of his final product, the novel, also bears this out. Written in response to Vuestra Merced's request concerning "el caso," Lázaro's intentions also include self-justification and swaying his reader to his point of view, thus a well-told story will serve him to that effect. He has witnessed first hand from the Blind Man the formula for successful storytelling, and his novel is sprinkled with clever observations and witty remarks that recall the Blind Man's "donaire" that Lázaro as protagonist did not appreciate. Finally, in addressing his wider audience, Lázaro expresses a desire to give pleasure ("podría ser que alguno que las lea halle algo que le agrade, y a los que no ahondaren tanto los deleite", 3-4; Prologue), in the process of subverting the topos of "enseñar deleitando" (Deyermond, Critical Guide 61; Rico, Lazarillo 4).

The anonymous author, who stands behind his fictional protagonist and narrator, also engages in storytelling for the sake of storytelling, notwithstanding didactic intensions. Deyermond observes:

First of all, this is a comic book, and at least part of the author's intention must have been to make his readers laugh. This is not only a reasonable deduction from the fact that readers do laugh at many of the incidents (and did in the sixteenth century—the preface to David Rowland's translation refers to “much mirth”); we can in addition observe characters in the story laughing at a number of the incidents. (Critical Guide 92-93)

Thus from the Blind Man to the narrator to the anonymous author, the various layers of storytelling and its accompanying laughter help tie Lazarillo de Tormes to the medieval frametale tradition.

FLEXIBILITY AND OPEN-ENDEDNESS

In the introduction to his article “Literary and Artistic Unity in the Lazarillo de Tormes,” Tarr observes that many scholars have the impression that the anonymous novel is “a poorly sustained or even unfinished piece of work” (404). He questions, “Is the Lazarillo really so loose, so disproportionate, or so unfinished a book as the first quoted opinions and figures seem to indicate?” (405). In the course of answering in the negative, Tarr offers an insightful study of the work's unity. Yet he argues that the division into chapters and the headings are not the work of the anonymous author (415). The short tratados he instead identifies as transitional paragraphs to the larger ones in their proximity (413-14,

417-18). Years later, however, Deyermond observes, “Most of the book’s recent critics . . . rightly believe this division [and headings] to be part of the original work” (Critical Guide 33). If this is this case, then we have a work with “an air of incompleteness” and an “arbitrary division into chapters” (Tarr 420-21) that are deliberate, but we do not have a clear indication of why. I suggest that when viewed in terms of the flexibility and open-endedness of its *frametales* predecessors, the Lazarillo’s structure and organization is not so surprising or troubling.

Frametales, as we have seen, follow an overall plan of organization, whether explicit or implied, but most collections can be seen to break from this plan from time to time in ways that recall the Eastern tendency toward flexibility and open-endedness. In much the same way, Lazarillo de Tormes breaks from certain established patterns or anticipated organizational plans. Deyermond observes, “Since Tratados II, III, IV and V each deal with Lazarillo’s life with one master, and since these occupy about two-thirds of the book, it is easy to form the impression that the division made by the author is natural and inevitable, with one tratado for each master” (Critical Guide 33). The headings assist in building this one-for-one expectation for the division of the work. These expectations are not met, however, since the first tratado (“Cuenta Lázaro su vida y cuyo hijo fue”, 12; tr. 1) deals both with his parents and with the Blind Man, the sixth tratado (“Cómo Lázaro se asentó con un capellán y lo que con él pasó”, 125; tr. 6) recalls the Tambourine Painter and the Chaplain, and the final tratado (“Cómo Lázaro se asentó con un alguacil, y de lo que le acaesció con él”, 127; tr. 7) treats the

Constable, Lázaro's position as town crier, and the Archpriest. This kind of flexibility exists in the *frametale*, particularly in terms of a deviation from the anticipated grouping of stories or from the expected number of tales to be told. Concerning grouping, for example, we have seen that Dioneo's stories in the Decameron do not conform to the prescribed theme for a given day. Furthermore, I have noted that several of the enclosed tales in the Panchatantra are not related to the theme of the book in which they are contained. Regarding the projected number of tales to be contained within a group, the Canterbury Tales illustrates how a plan may go awry. The arrangement established by the Host in the prologue is that every pilgrim will tell two tales on the way to Canterbury and two on the return. Yet the Monk, for example, implies a change to this program when he states that he will tell "a tale, or two, or three" (378; MkT 1968) and mentions that he has a hundred such stories in his cell. He does indeed transgress the expected limitations of the storytelling, and he appears likely to go on telling tales for some time when the knight finally interrupts him after he has told seventeen.

The Lazarillo breaks from expectations again when the narrator promises to give "entera noticia de mi persona" (11; Prologue), but the reader finds instead large gaps in his chronology and an unequal distribution of the novel's parts. Lázaro dedicates a large portion of his work to the time he spends with his first three masters, but relatively little space to the rest. Relying on Foulché-Delbosc's restitution of the editio princeps of the Lazarillo, Tarr notes that the first three tratados occupy 49 1/2 pages out of 60 1/2 (qtd. in Tarr 404), that is, over 80% of the work. Disproportion can be noted in the Panchatantra, for example, in which

a rough calculation reveals that the first book constitutes over 40% of the collection, the second and third books occupy approximately 20% each, and the fourth and fifth each take up less than 10% of the whole. The imbalance of parts is not a defect in a *frametale*'s structure, rather it is reflective of the genre's accommodation of diversity and its tendency toward looseness and flexibility. Lázaro's prerogative as narrator to expand certain tales and to condense others leads to a similar flexibility in the structure of his novel. The discrepancy between the protagonist's length of service with a master and the narrator's length of story in recounting that service is evident in the sixth tratado, for instance, since in fewer than twenty lines Lázaro recalls his four-year service with the Chaplain. Such an abridgement is not so surprising when one considers the subject matter of the story. What is so amusing or remarkable (or, to use Lázaro's terms following the grape episode, "gracioso" or "de notar") about the daily routine of doing an ordinary job, in Lázaro's case, the mundane task of selling water? The protagonist's previous conflict that served as a major theme for the first three tratados, namely, hunger and the struggle for food, has been resolved at this point in his narration: ". . . mi boca era medida" (126; tr. 6). What is indeed noteworthy about this tratado is that Lázaro spends his savings of four years to buy second-hand clothes and, once seeing himself dressed "en hábito de hombre de bien" (127; tr. 6), quits his job that he now considers beneath him.

Like certain *frametales*, the anonymous picaresque novel also deviates from the expectation that all of the stories will be complete. In the Canterbury Tales, Chaucer's Tale of Sir Thopas is interrupted by the Host and the Monk's

Tale is curtailed by the Knight, for example. In the Decameron, Boccaccio himself narrates a tale in the introduction to the fourth day that he intentionally leaves unfinished. Likewise, Lázaro recalls his service with the Tambourine Painter, but this is a story that he deliberately will not finish. His entire story of this master is expressed in a single sentence: “Después desto, asenté con un maestro de pintar panderos, para molelle los colores, y también sufrí mil males” (125; tr. 6). Nonetheless, no matter how abbreviated a tale may be, it serves a function when called to mind. The mere mention of a story may effectively bring it to the forefront of an audience’s memory. Lázaro as protagonist does this in the episode of the stone pillar as he reminds the Blind Man of the sausage incident. By repeating the protagonist’s words in his novel, Lázaro as narrator simultaneously reminds his reader of the same incident. In the sixth tratado Lázaro’s reference to his task of grinding paint colors for the Tambourine Painter may perform a similar function, for sixteenth-century readers perhaps understood the allusion to the chore to be sexually suggestive. In his epilogue to the Decameron, Boccaccio certainly points to the double entendre of the tools of this task: “. . . dico che più non si dee a me esser disdetto d’averle scritte che generalmente si disdica agli uomini e alle donne di dir tutto di ‘foro’ e ‘caviglia’ e ‘mortaio’ e ‘pestello’ e ‘salsiccia’ e ‘mortadello’, e tutto pien di simiglianti cose” (718; Conclusion) (“. . . I assert that it was no more improper for me to have written them than for men and women at large, in their everyday speech, to use such words as hole, and rod, and mortar, and pestle, and crumpet, and stuffing, and any number of others”; 799). Thus the simple allusion to Lázaro’s service

with this master may have brought to readers' minds a story that there was no need to tell.

On several occasions Lázaro offers only one example of any number of stories that he could tell to illustrate a point. Of the Blind Man's cleverness he states, ". . . contaré un caso de muchos . . . , en el cual me parece dio bien a entender su gran astucia" (35; tr. 1), and he repeats this practice when referring to the Pardoner's clever tricks to sell indulgences: ". . . diré uno muy sutil y donoso, con el cual probaré bien su suficiencia" (115; tr. 5). This narrative strategy contributes to the open-endedness of the novel's structure by suggesting that there are a great many more tales in the storyteller's memory that await an occasion to be told. A parallel in the Canterbury Tales is the Monk's assertion that he will tell two or three stories when he has a hundred like tales at his disposal. Similarly, in the Disciplina clericalis, an old man states, "There are many more stories about Maimundus on these same lines" (151), but he tells only a handful.

Lastly, the novel is inconclusive, for it raises many questions that it leaves unanswered. As I have discussed above, the matter about which Vuestra Merced inquires is subtly indicated in the seventh tratado, but the issue is not resolved within the scope of the work. What will be Vuestra Merced's reaction to the stories, and how will Lázaro's larger audience respond? The ambiguity of the Lazarillo's final tratado, and thus of the work as a whole, resembles the uncertainty of the last tale of the Decameron and, consequently, of the entire collection. The concluding comment in the tenth day about wisdom, and the question it raises of whether and how the storytellers will apply in their lives what

they have learned from their storytelling experience, evoke the unresolved concerns that Boccaccio as the principal storyteller raises about his audience in his unfinished story in the introduction to the fourth day. At the conclusion of his work, Lázaro, like Boccaccio and other frame-tale storytellers, has finished telling a story that nonetheless remains incomplete.

The open-endedness that is further suggested in frame-tales by the theme of rebirth is paralleled in the Lazarillo by the theme of rise and fall. Yet whereas frame-tales such as the Disciplina, or the Confessio amantis, end with a rebirth that implies a moral or spiritual rise, Lazarillo de Tormes concludes with the protagonist's moral demise and imminent downfall, as suggested by the narrator's final words: "Pues en este tiempo estaba en mi prosperidad y en la cumbre de toda buena fortuna" (135; tr. 7). Lázaro appears to herald his own impending fall in terms that are similar to those expressed by the Monk in the Canterbury Tales to introduce his tales of tragedy:

Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie,
As olde bookes maken us memorie,
Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
And is yfallen out of heigh degree
Into myserie, and endeth wrecchedly. (378-79; MkT 1973-77)

Tragedy means a certain kind of story
As ancient books remind us, of some man
Who was once living in prosperity,
And fell from high estate to misery,

And who came to a calamitous end. (177)

The Monk advises his audience to heed the warning offered by his examples, of which, we recall, there is a seemingly endless supply. Lazarillo de Tormes, introduced by the narrator in the prologue as an example of a virtuous rise, concludes by illustrating the opposite, and thus infers the inevitable and interminable revolution of Fortune's wheel.

Conclusion

The anonymous author of Lazarillo de Tormes drew from multiple and various traditions inherited from the past in the creation of both his work and, although unbeknownst to him, a new tradition: the picaresque novel. Many of the Lazarillo's literary ancestors have been studied in great detail and to no small benefit to scholars who follow them in studying the work. However it is my understanding that one precursor has been overlooked as a significant player in paving the way for the genesis of this novel. I have, therefore, endeavored in the present study to examine the *frametale* in this capacity.

My impression is that the abovementioned oversight can be attributed to four principal causes, three of which I have addressed in the first two chapters: ambiguous terminology concerning tales, a too narrow focus on tales as a single unit, or on individual story collections, and either an unawareness or underestimation of the prevalence of *frametales* in Spain in the first half of the sixteenth century. I have attempted to rectify these issues by examining the use of certain terms to denote a story (as they pertain to the works I treat), by defining the *frametale* and illustrating this genre with eight collections whose authors I believe were consciously working within a tradition that guided their use (or deliberate misuse) of conventions, and by reviewing the transmission of *frametale* collections in order to depict this genre as an integral part of the literary atmosphere in which the Lazarillo came to light.

The fourth issue that I find has hindered gaining a better understanding of the *frametale*'s role in the creation of the first picaresque novel is a misunderstanding of the structural sophistication of *frametales*, particularly with respect to how internal and external devices work in conjunction to unify a collection of diverse material while simultaneously allowing for flexibility and inconclusiveness. The third chapter thus comprises a study of the structural and organizational features that characterize the *frametale*, as manifest in eight various representations of the genre.

A demonstration in the fourth chapter of how *Lazarillo de Tormes* adapts the structural features that are characteristic of the *frametale* has illuminated some interesting points. The *Lazarillo* is both a novel of education and a novel of corruption, or, in essence, a novel of miseducation. How does a naive boy become the complacent husband of the Archpriest's mistress and come to narrate his life story as the paradigm of a virtuous rise? The parallels and contrasts that the work draws with the *frametale* tradition I suggest help to answer this question.

Deyermond notes that the author's "careful structural and stylistic planning would have been pointless" if his only intention had been to write a funny book (Critical Guide 93). He points to the protagonist's moral evolution as a key attribute of this novel. The "depiction of his protagonist's corruption—not merely the final state, but the process of corruption" is something that the author wishes his readers to note and reflect on (Deyermond, Critical Guide 93). This transformation in the protagonist occurs in a way I see as a fulfillment of much of what the *frametale* tradition warns against. Not only do the genres treat many of

the same themes, such as hypocrisy, nobility, honor, and fortune, but these themes are played out in the picaresque in a demonstration of the negative consequences of what the *frametale* attempts to avoid: a bad upbringing in childhood and bad advising in adulthood. Central to the *frametale*'s didactic function is the necessity of good instruction (through good advice, example, and correction) and the importance of that instruction's being tested through experience. In the Lazarillo the first component is replaced with its antithesis, thus making the second all the worse.

The process of Lázaro's corruption begins early. Guillén notes that the pícaro figure of the genre in general is "first of all, an orphan. . . . He has not been adapted to ruling conventions or shaped into a social or moral person. The family, in this sense, has not fulfilled its primary functions. The beginnings of knowledge are forced upon the young boy by the shock of premature experience" ("Toward a Definition" 79). Lázaro's instruction with the Blind Man, as we have seen, conveys a practical ethics similar to that taught in *frametales*, but not with similar intentions nor toward positive ends. Thus the role of his parents and early teachers is in contrast to the figure of the father or instructor portrayed in *frametales* such as the Panchatantra, Disciplina clericalis, and Sindbad who aim to share with their audience the wisdom with which to negotiate the complex world of human affairs, with sincere concerns for one's own interests, yes, but not in the absence of virtue. Thus the resonance between the genres highlights the failure of Lázaro's edification process.

A comparison of the *frametale* and the Lazarillo with respect to storytelling yields further points of interest. *Frametale* collections both transmit wisdom through storytelling and depict the transmission of wisdom through storytelling. As such, one narrative level serves as a model for another, and the lessons taught in one are intended to apply to the other as well. This is the process of putting into practice the wisdom one has gained. In the Lazarillo, the protagonist's life is the substance of the stories themselves and as he lives these experiences they generally afford him harsh lessons. As Lázaro narrates these tales, they are portrayed as the lessons that guide him to his alleged peak of all good fortune, yet this purported rise is exposed through the course of the novel as devoid of moral grounding. If we are to learn from the Blind Man's mistake of trusting Lázaro when he has proven himself to be guided not by the interests of others but by his concerns alone, then we are left following the narration of the novel without reliable guidance for the interpretation of it. This is especially disturbing since the work is marked with ambiguity and inconclusiveness. Each reader will have his own reaction and must draw his own conclusions depending in large part on his personal experiences, as well as on his level of discretion as a reader.

Differences in interpretation are a certainty, and this brings us to a final coincidence between the picaresque novel and the *frametale*. As we have observed, one of the most prominent features of the *frametale* is its diversity of meaning. Gittes notes with respect to the Decameron, "The open-endedness in the structure is reflected by the thematic ambiguity: themes and issues are presented, questions are asked, but solid, definite answers are never provided" (89-90). This

ambiguity is typical of many *frametales*, she observes, “for each one tends to give an overview of a variety of topics, issues, and problems, never drawing final conclusions or providing clear-cut solutions and answers” (90). The *frametale* and the Lazarillo share this characteristic of multiplicity of meaning. Not only are the tales themselves diverse in content and form, but they may also serve a variety of functions on different narrative levels and elicit reactions as diverse as their readers. This is an idea with which both the narrator and the author of Lazarillo de Tormes are familiar: “. . . mayormente que los gustos no son todos unos, mas lo que uno no come, otro se pierde por ello, y así vemos cosas tenidas en poco de algunos que de otros no lo son” (4, Prologue).

Notes

¹ Deyermond excludes from this vague use of genre terminology “the restricted spheres of rhetoric and versification,” and notes that Middle English terminology may have distinguished genres more consistently than the vernacular in medieval Spain (“Juan Ruiz’s Attitude” 114).

² Citations of the Decameron in Italian are from Vittore Branca’s edition. I rely on G. H. McWilliam for the English translation.

³ Deyermond acknowledges Anthony N. Zahareas’s attempt to differentiate various types of compositions as labeled by Juan Ruiz, but warns, “. . . the terms quoted by Zahareas mostly refer to content, and he does not attempt to distinguish between, e.g., rima and troba” (116).

⁴ All of my textual references to the Conde Lucanor will be from Guillermo Serés’s edition, unless otherwise noted.

⁵ I concur with Serés, Alberto Blecua, José Manuel Blecua, and Francisco Rico, among others, that Juan Manuel is not the author of the anteprologue to the Conde Lucanor (qtd. in Serés 7).

⁶ Many of the terms used to signify story during the Middle Ages are enumerated in the introduction to this chapter.

⁷ Gittes believes that Petrus Alfonsi first composed the Disciplina in Arabic then translated it into Latin (57). Deyermond ponders the possibility of Alfonsi’s having written it first in Hebrew. He claims, however, that the original language is uncertain since Alfonsi’s words in the prologue are ambiguous. Deyermond also suggests that Alfonsi may have been “referring to the task of

assembling the material from different sources and then writing the book as a whole in Latin” (Literary History 97). Tolan proposes that Alfonsi “composed and translated at the same time” (76).

⁸ All of my references to Lazarillo de Tomes will be from Rico’s edition, unless otherwise noted.

⁹ Francisco Ayala and A. Rumeau both published their observations on this point in 1965, a year after the publication of Lida de Malkiel’s study.

¹⁰ Further examples are evident in the very works I cite by Chevalier, Lida de Malkiel, and Camarena.

¹¹ Bienvenido C. Morros discusses this and other structural analyses of the Lazarillo in his bibliographical appendix to Rico’s edition of the Lazarillo (162-64).

¹² Dundes warns, “The English title Morphology of the Folktale is misleading. Propp limits his analysis to only one kind of folktale, that is, to fairy tales or Aarne-Thompson tale types 300-749” (xiv). He raises the question “to what extent is Propp’s analysis applicable to forms of the folktale other than the fairy tale?” and offers some examples that suggest it can be aptly applied to other forms as well (xiv). I would point out that the Spanish title Morfología del cuento is somewhat deceptive as well since cuento does not mean exclusively fairy tale. As Lacarra has pointed out, cuento is an all-encompassing term for a great variety of tales (“Panorama” 27). As indicated above, it is under a broad notion of folktale that Lázaro Carreter conducts his analysis.

¹³ Chapter 3 is dedicated to this topic.

¹⁴ Gittes offers an opposing view concerning the last of these points. See my treatment of debate as a framing technique in chapter 3.

¹⁵ Cooper summarizes the arguments against recognizing the Decameron as a source for or influence on the Canterbury Tales (8), yet offers a strong argument in favor of such a recognition (8-13). See her relevant bibliographical notes (8-9).

¹⁶ My assertion runs contrary to claims such as that made by Jones and Keller with respect to Hilka and Söderhjelm's edition of the Disciplina clericalis: "Since these editors studied sixty-two additional manuscripts of the Disciplina so as to include all the materials from these manuscripts, their edition must be regarded as a monument of medieval Latin scholarship and definitive" (23). A monument it undoubtedly is, but not definitive. In 1993 Tolan lists and describes thirteen manuscripts beyond the sixty-three reviewed by Hilka and Söderhjelm, three of which, incidentally, are in libraries in Spain: Córdoba, El Escorial, and Tarragona (199-204).

¹⁷ Except where noted otherwise, I rely on Chandra Rajan's English translation of the Panchatantra, which is based on a 1199 Sanskrit recension by Purnabhadra. Contemporary studies of the Panchatantra are based principally on either or both the 1199 recension (in 1925 Arthur Ryder published an English translation of this recension, based on Johannes Hertel's 1915 edition) and Franklin Edgerton's reconstruction of the Panchatantra based on a variety of

sources. In comparing Ryder's translation and Edgerton's reconstruction, Gittes observes that "both structures are nearly identical," even if some of the tales differ (19). With respect to dating the original text, both Rajan (liii) and Ryder (v) cite Hertel as the source of the 200 BC estimate. Rajan mentions that he may have later revised his approximation by a few centuries (liii). Lacarra puts the date of composition between the third and fourth centuries AD without stating how she arrives at that estimate (Cuenta y novela corta 56). Barry Taylor follows Edgerton in citing the estimated range from 100 BC to AD 500 (198).

¹⁸ This idea of a collective authorship under one name is associated also with Aesop and his fables. D. L. Ashliman notes that Aesop's existence as a real man is questionable and that "most modern scholars believe that Aesop was instead a name invented, already in antiquity, to provide attribution for a body of oral tales whose true authors were a number of anonymous storytellers" (xiii). Due to the mutual cultural exchange between India and the Mediterranean, it is no wonder that a dozen or so of the same tales appear in both Aesop's Fables and the Panchatantra (Ashliman xxii).

¹⁹ Taylor recognizes the Panchatantra as an "ancestor" of the Kalila and Dimna (198); Irving refers to the former as the "nucleus" of the latter (ix); Rajan views the Kalila as an "adaptation" of the Panchatantra (xxiii); Tolan recognizes that the two have "various legends" in common (232); and Gittes states that the Panchatantra was "revised and renamed" (51). I consider the Panchatantra and the Kalila and Dimna to be closely related but distinct works. For the purposes of

my present investigation, I consider the Kalila and Dimna to originate with Burzoë's now lost Pahlavi version of AD 570, on which Ibn al-Muqaffa's mid-eighth-century Arabic version is based. With respect to titles, I use the English title Kalila and Dimna, or its abbreviated form Kalila, to refer to the work in any version. When referring to a specific version, I use that version's title, if known, or its shortened form (i.e., Calila e Digna or Calila to refer to the Spanish version). To avoid ambiguity in certain cases, I refer to the language in which a version was written, or to its author.

²⁰ Rajan cautions that extra-Indian versions of the Panchatantra are more accurately described as adaptations rather than translations due to the alterations made (xxiii).

²¹ See Rajan xvi; Irving x; Tolan 79; and Keller and Keating, Book of Count Lucanor 18.

²² It is not clear whether certain changes were introduced by Ibn al-Muqaffa or originated with the Pahlavi version and were then transmitted to the Arabic.

²³ Taylor notes that Ibn al-Muqaffa's introduction appears in Spanish MS B of the Calila, but not in MS A, both of the fifteenth century (189).

²⁴ See Rajan xviii-xix, xxiv-xxv; Irving ix-x; Tolan 79; and Taylor 189, 197.

²⁵ Atil (57, 59) and Taylor (197) attribute the addition of Dimna's trial to Ibn al-Muqaffa, whereas Rajan (xxv) and Irving (195) believe it was introduced earlier in the Pahlavi version, on which the Arabic version is based.

²⁶ Taylor notes the Christianization of the episode of Dimna's trial in Raimundus de Biterris's Liber Kalile et Dimne, a Latin version c. 1303 based on the Spanish Calila and Capua's Directorium. In this early-fourteenth-century Latin text the author has Dimna confess and receive absolution (197).

²⁷ Irving offers the following explanation for the name of the collection: "The name Bidpai is merely the Arabic (via the Old Persian) transliteration of Vidyapati, which in Sanskrit means 'chief sage' or 'scholar.' Thus the second phrase of the opening sentence of [the Kalila and Dimna]: 'Bidpai his chief philosopher' is really a redundant expression. Such sages were typically tutors of the young princes at an Indian court, and the tales are their lesson material, just as Patronio served Count Lucanor" (ix). Rajan suggests another possibility: ". . . it might just as well be the odd transformation of Vajapeyi, an honorific title assumed by Brahmanas who had successfully performed the great vajapeya sacrifice of the Vedas" (xx).

²⁸ Irving warns that neither the original Alfonsine Calila e Digna, nor the Arabic text used as its source, are extant. He states that the reconstruction of both is the motive of his edition of the Kalila and Dimna, which he titles Kalilah and Dimnah (xii). He does so "from as many sources . . . as possible" (xiv), noting carefully where the differences among these occur. For this principal reason I use

Irving's text when citing the Kalila and Dimna. For a list and explanation of his sources, see xii-xiv.

²⁹ As noted above, Taylor estimates the date of Raimundus de Biteris's Liber Kalile et Dimne at 1303. Irving, referring to the author as Raymond de Béziers, cites 1315 (xi).

³⁰ Taylor explains that both manuscripts (SpA and SpB) "are generally agreed to descend from a common Romance archetype, with SpA the earlier redaction . . ." (186).

³¹ Lacarra, however, estimates the date of Capua's translation to fall between 1273 and 1305 (Cuento y novela corta 59).

³² Simón Díaz indicates that the four editions printed in Seville (between 1534 and 1546) were identified as such: Libro llamado exemplario: en el qual se contiene muy buena dotrina y graves sentencias debaxo de graciosas fábulas: nuevamente corregido" (3.166). In his bibliography Fable-Books Printed in the Low Countries, John Landwehr records an undated Antwerp publication titled Exemplario contra los engaños con la vida de y fábulas de Ysopo (14). I have not been able to consult his source, J. F. Peeters-Fontainas's Bibliographie des impressions espagnoles des Pays Bas (1488) and do not know whether this is the late sixteenth-century edition of the Ejemplario to which Lacarra refers.

³³ See Cooper, "The Frame" 6; Irving xi; and Rajan xvi-xvii.

³⁴ For more information on the transmission of the Kalila, see Isidoro Montiel.

³⁵ For information on the traditions of the Book of Sindbad and Seven Sages of Rome see Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xi-xvi; and Epstein 3-11, 329-39.

³⁶ Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell claim that the earliest extant mention of the work dates from the tenth century AD (xiii), whereas Epstein notes a reference by an Arabic writer in AD 880 (4). For more information on early textual allusions to the Book of Sindbad, see Epstein 4-5.

³⁷ José Fradejas Lebrero explains the title of the work: “Don José Amador de los Ríos lo tituló Libro de los engaños e los asayamientos de las mugeres, deduciéndolo del prólogo, y así ha seguido publicándose hasta que Keller lo denominó Libro de los Engaños y en virtud de la claridad nosotros lo denominamos: Libro de los engaños de las mujeres” (7). The work is also known generally as the Sendebar in Spanish. I will use the abbreviated form proposed by Keller.

³⁸ The fifteenth-century “Puñonrostro” manuscript owned by the Real Academia Española contains the Libro de los engaños, the Conde Lucanor and an incomplete version of the Lucidario, among others works (Sturcken 138; Devoto 291; Keller, Libro de los engaños 65). The Libro de los engaños manuscript is described by Fradejas Lebrero as “defectuosísimo” (7). He finds it necessary at times to rely on the sixteenth-century emendations to understand the manuscript, and suggests that another manuscript, “menos deturpado,” may have been used in correcting the “Puñonrostro” manuscript (7).

³⁹ Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell summarize the transmission theories and their proponents (xiii).

⁴⁰ For the sources of these and the following estimated dates pertaining to the Western Seven Sages of Rome branch, see Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii-xiv and Epstein 333-34.

⁴¹ See previous note.

⁴² This is identified as Version S (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 137). It is of note that a Latin Version S was printed in Seville in 1496, in addition to several other incunabula printed elsewhere in Europe (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 143).

⁴³ For bibliographical information on Spanish Version S, see Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 155.

⁴⁴ This is Version H, labeled so because it derives from the Latin Historia septem sapientum (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 137). For bibliographical information, see Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 150-54.

⁴⁵ The 1510 edition is titled Libro de los siete sabios de Roma nuevamente emendado y por capitulos diuidido, implying an earlier version, either in manuscript or printed form. In their bibliography, Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell list six sixteenth-century printed editions of Spanish Version H (150-51). Lacarra, however, says there were seven ("Pervivencia" 261) and specifies a 1550 Burgos edition that is not mentioned by Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell ("Pervivencia" 264).

⁴⁶ Classified as Version I, the work's complete title reads: Historia lastimera d'el principe Erasto, hijo del Emperador Diocletiano, en la qual se

contienen muchos exemplos notables, y discursos no menos recreativos, que provechosos y necesarios, traduzida de Italiano en Español (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 154). For bibliographical information, see Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 154-55.

⁴⁷ See Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell 128-29, 131-34 for a bibliography of the Italian Erasto.

⁴⁸ The Dolopathos and the Book of Sindbad share only one tale (canis), but the two are alike in that the prince has only one teacher instead of seven (Runte, Wikeley, and Farrell xiii).

⁴⁹ Lacarra notes many of these changes in “Panorama” 37; “Pervivencia” 264-65; Cuentos de la Edad Media 55; and Cuento y novela corta 80-81.

⁵⁰ My principal sources for background information on the biography of Petrus Alfonsi are Tolan 3-11; Jones and Keller, Scholar’s Guide 13-16; Quarrie 35-43, 63-83; and Lacarra, Disciplina 14-16. Where there is a difference of opinion or inconsistencies in interpretation, I follow Tolan.

⁵¹ Tolan, identifying a thirteenth-century manuscript that appears to be the sole source for this piece of Alfonsi’s biography, is rightly skeptical about its veracity since no mention of Alfonsi’s role as physician to Henry I has been discovered elsewhere (213-14).

⁵² My citations from the Disciplina clericalis are from Jones and Keller’s translation, which is based on Hilka and Söderhjelm’s 1911 Helsinki edition. It should be noted that Tolan, translating excerpts from the same edition, has a

somewhat different reading of the passage just cited. He translates the Latin “partim ex proverbiis et castigationis Arabicis et fabulis et versibus” as “partly from Arabic proverbs, castigations, fables, and verses,” implying that the tales and verses are Arabic (76). Since many of Alfonsi’s tales are Eastern in origin, Tolan’s translation may be the more precise in this instance.

⁵³ Tolan points out that the apparent overlap between philosophers and Arabs may be because “he took some of his proverbs from Arab authors whom he did not consider philosophers” (79).

⁵⁴ Keller and Keating claim that the Spanish Ysopet was a translation of D’Arezzo’s Latin version (Aesop’s Fables 4), whereas Whinnom states that the Spanish translations were initially based on Lorenzo Valla’s Latin text (194). He numbers five different translations that produced at least forty editions (194).

⁵⁵ For information on the life and times of Don Juan Manuel, see Keller and Keating, Book of Count Lucanor 1-10; Germán Orduna IX-XXIX; and Sturcken 11-56.

⁵⁶ Serés recognizes the following familial relations of Juan Manuel: “nieto de Fernando III y de Amadeo IV de Saboya, sobrino de Alfonso X, primo de Sancho IV, yerno de Juan II de Mallorca y de Jaime II de Aragón, tío de Fernando IV, suegro de Pedro IV de Portugal, cuñado de don Juan de Aragón—arzobispo de Toledo y patriarca de Alejandría—y abuelo póstumo de Juan I de Castilla” (XXXIV).

⁵⁷ For a discussion of Don Juan Manuel's works, see Sturcken 57-62; Serés XXXIII-XLVIII; and Keller and Keating, Book of Count Lucanor 11-14.

⁵⁸ See Devoto for bibliographical information on source studies of the Conde Lucanor.

⁵⁹ For information on Dominican sermon and exemplum collections that may have influenced Juan Manuel, see María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, "Tres notas sobre don Juan Manuel."

⁶⁰ In his "discurso al curioso lector," Argote states, "Solamente me daua alguna pena ver que el libro que yo tenia estuuiesse estragado en muchas partes . . . pero esto se remedio facilmente confiriendolo con otros dos: el vno de que me hizo merced el señor Ieronimo de Çurita . . . y otro del señor doctor Oretano, maestro del excelentissimo duque de Medina Sidonia . . ." (qtd. in Palma Chaguaceda 56).

⁶¹ For a textual history of the Conde Lucanor see Serés XCIII-CV; Devoto 291-334; and Sturcken 138. Sturcken identifies four MS from the fifteenth century and one from the sixteenth (138), whereas Serés attributes MS 6376 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid to the late fourteenth century. I follow here Serés's estimates.

⁶² As a result of Ramón Menéndez Pidal's article "Título que el Arcipreste de Hita dio al libro de sus poesías," the collection is known today as Libro de buen amor (Willis xix; Lida de Malkiel, Two Spanish Masterpieces 25).

However, early explicit references to the work are with respect to the author, Archpriest of Hita or, simply, Archpriest (Moffatt 36-44; Willis xix).

⁶³ Even some of this biographical data is contested. Lucius G. Moffatt expresses reservations about the veracity of the author's name: "In two places he refers to himself as 'Juan Ruiz, Archpriest of Hita,' but the second of these is in a quite possibly spurious verse, and the first one is highly suspect" (41). As these questionable references are the only two indications of the author's name as Juan Ruiz (excluding the also dubious colophon of MS S), Moffatt considers the possibility that the scribe of MS G (1389), who wrote about forty-five years after the revised version of the Libro de buen amor was completed in 1343, assigned the unknown author the name Juan Ruiz, which is akin to John Doe in English (41). Moffatt is more certain about the author's occupation as Archpriest of Hita, a reference he finds on eight unambiguous occasions in the text of the Libro de buen amor (34, 41). See also Deyermond, Literary History 110, 131.

⁶⁴ Although the framing of stories within a story is also characteristic of the *frametale* genre, Lida de Malkiel argues instead, "The Book of Good Love belongs to the literary genre of the Semitic maqāmāt" (Two Spanish Masterpieces 25).

⁶⁵ Willis notes that the "pristine version" of the Libro de buen amor contained five love affairs (xxviii), while the expanded 1343 version had fourteen (xliii).

⁶⁶ Among other *frametale* authors, Boccaccio and Chaucer play the role of first-person narrator of the collection. Chaucer's integral role as a pilgrim/storyteller in the framing story is also significant, although he is not the central focus of the Canterbury Tales. A further example is John Gower's Confessio amantis (1390), a *frametale* narrated in the first person by the protagonist of the framing story, Amans, who is identified in book 8 as the author Gower. For information on this topic, see Gittes 96, 99 and Cooper, "The Frame" 5.

⁶⁷ For studies on Juan Ruiz's analogues and sources, see Lecoy; Gybbon-Monypenny, "Libro de buen amor" Studies; Willis xlviii-l; Deyermond and Walker; and Lida de Malkiel, "Nuevas notas."

⁶⁸ For an independent and more thorough review of evidence concerning the Libro de buen amor's readership (direct and indirect) through the sixteenth century, see chapter 6 of Dagenais, The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro de buen amor.

⁶⁹ MS G offers for the date of its completion Thursday, 23 July 1389 (Moffatt 35). Simón Díaz indicates that the handwriting of MS T dates to the fourteenth century, while that of MS S is of the early fifteenth century (3.225-26). Jeremy Lawrance suggests the more precise range of 1417 to 1437 for MS S (226).

⁷⁰ Thomas Jay Garbáty claims that Chaucer might have known the Libro de buen amor from the library of Pedro of Castile's daughter Constance, who

married John of Gaunt (463). “However,” he states, “. . . it seems more likely that the poet [Chaucer] would have heard it in oral presentation,” perhaps on his 1366 trip to Spain (462-63). Due in part to his familiarity with the Pamphilus tradition, he would have been able to follow the narrative even in a language he may not have understood well (463). See note 81.

⁷¹ In “Juglar’s Repertoire,” Deyermond outlines the history of the argument that the fragments represent a juglar cazurro’s repertoire, including several of the erroneous conclusions that have derived from it (218-24). Deyermond defends his position: “There is, in fact, no basis whatever for associating this material with a cazurro, and there is strong evidence against such an association. It may be that some other, more reputable, type of juglar was involved, but in any case the theories of a prompt-book and a direct record of the performance must . . . be discarded” (224). He argues instead that the fragments are either “notes for popular sermons, perhaps by a friar of one of the mendicant orders” (225), or “a rough kind of florilegium” (226).

⁷² Moffatt argues, “Apparently the Marqués knew Juan Ruiz and his work only under the caption he cites—‘El libro del Archypreste de Hita’” (39). However, Moffatt seems to contradict this statement when he subsequently suggests that the Marqués was familiar with the Archpriest’s poetry by expressing “surprise at the skillful use of meter in a poem so popular, so unlearned (in his mind) and so unacquainted with the new ‘itálico modo’” (39).

⁷³ Armistead acknowledges that in citing the pseudo-Cato Disticha Catonis in his prologue, “García de Salazar followed a well established literary tradition,” yet Armistead insists, “. . . his immediate source was, of course, quatrain 44 of the Libro de buen amor” (“Unnoticed” 89). In a later publication, Armistead recognizes in one passage of the Libro de las bienandanzas e fortunas “a very free rendering of quatrain 71” and “an interpolation based on v. 73b” of the Archpriest’s collection, while another passage is “closer to the poetic original” of Juan Ruiz’s quatrain 105 (“Two Further Citations” 75).

⁷⁴ Speaking of this final reference, Deyermond notes, “. . . it adds to the evidence that the Archpriest’s work was preserved in private libraries at a time when its literary influence had almost died away . . .” (“Early Allusions” 317).

⁷⁵ Lawrance identifies these citations with the late fifteenth-century Poetria nouella by Gualfridus Anglicus (226).

⁷⁶ Despite acknowledging Gómez de Castro’s close citation of the Archpriest’s text, Moffatt surprisingly infers that the author did not know of Juan Ruiz or his work (39, 43). This claim appears to be based simply on the idea that Gómez de Castro mentions neither explicitly by name (39).

⁷⁷ Agustín Millares Carlo bases his partial inventory of Argote de Molina’s library on MS 5938 of the BNM called Códice de varios copiado del de la Biblioteca del Escorial que fué de Ambrosio de Morales. Although the manuscript is not dated, Millares Carlo suspects that it was written either before 1575 or after 1588 (141). Another work cited in this inventory draws my

curiosity: Liber incerti authoris Arabici de Virtutibus Animalium (146). Could this be a version of the Kalila and Dimna?

⁷⁸ I find perplexing that Moffatt would propose that Argote de Molina copied the serrana verses from his manuscript of the “Cancionero del Arcipreste” and then almost immediately assert, “Argote’s knowledge of the Libro de Buen Amor or its author must have been nil, for besides this incident, he makes no mention of either in his Discurso sobre la Poesía Castellana which precedes his edition of the Conde Lucanor” (40).

⁷⁹ It appears Deyermund belongs to the Moffatt-Lida de Malkiel camp on this issue. See note 74.

⁸⁰ Unless otherwise noted, information on the life and times of Boccaccio is from McWilliam’s preface to the second edition and his translator’s introduction.

⁸¹ Boccaccio’s Teseida is recognized as a source of Chaucer’s Knight’s Tale in the Canterbury Tales, while his Filostrato was “the ultimate source” for Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde (McWilliam xxxv). While far from denying an influence between these authors, Garbáty argues that in many instances Chaucer’s Troilus appears closer to the Pamphilus and the Libro de buen amor than to the Filostrato: “The independent parallels between the Libro of Ruiz and the Troilus, which supplement those between the Troilus and the Pamphilus, strengthen the theory that the Spanish work had an influence on Chaucer separate and additional to that of the Pamphilus. But of much greater interest is the list of incidents,

several of them quite central to the story of the Troilus, which can be found in the Pamphilus and the Libro, but which are entirely missing in Boccaccio's Filostrato, the acknowledged chief source of Chaucer's work" (466).

⁸² McWilliam conceives of the Disciplina as a collection of exempla and recognizes it in his work as a source of narrative material for Boccaccio. He does not, however, identify it along with other frame tales as a structural antecedent of the Decameron, perhaps because he did not recognize it as a framed story collection, or maybe because it had not "originated in the East" (lviii-lix).

⁸³ For the date and a detailed description of the Catalan manuscript, see Caroline Brown Bourland 25-32; for the Castilian manuscript, see 11, 32-43.

⁸⁴ Bourland offers a somewhat different account of the printed Spanish editions of the Decameron: Seville, 1496; Toledo, 1524; Valladolid, 1539; Medina del Campo, 1543; and Valladolid, 1550. For descriptions of these editions, see 43-67. Regarding Medina del Campo, recall that one of four 1554 editions of the Lazarillo was published there, the others in Burgos, Alcalá de Henares, and Antwerp. Ruffinatto notes, ". . . Medina del Campo fue el centro más importante del comercio internacional de libros en España durante el siglo XVI, con dos ferias—una en mayo y otra en octubre—y mercaderes de todo tipo. Lo cual fue causa de que se establecieron en Medina libreros muy importantes, españoles, y extranjeros, algunos de ellos vinculados con las grandes casas de Amberes, de Lyon y de Italia" (Dos Caras 101).

⁸⁵ Bourland notes that the Decameron appeared on the Index of Paul IV in January 1559, and later that year on the Spanish Index of Inquisitor General Valdés (59).

⁸⁶ Rikapito's use of the term frame novel appears to be restricted to framed collections belonging to the Italian novella tradition.

⁸⁷ In "Lazarillo de Tormes (Chap. V) and Masuccio's Fourth Novella," Rikapito aims to demonstrate "significant and challenging points of contact" between the two (307), among them "the burla of the relic, . . . the realism—or mimesis— of the treatment, and the basic purpose behind the deceit: to present a subterfuge from which no human being could escape" (308). He concludes, "The author of L. de T., then, did not imitate M. . . . but rather adopted the tale on its own artistic and ideological premises and extended them . . . with a basis in a particular Spanish social situation" (311).

⁸⁸ To my knowledge, Chandler refers specifically to Boccaccio or his work on only three other occasions: twice with respect to specific tales in the Decameron that have counterparts in certain picaresque novels that postdate the Lazarillo (69, 340), and once in drawing a general distinction between Boccaccio's work and Cervantes's Novelas ejemplares (347).

⁸⁹ Here Rikapito cites another of his related works, "El contorno picaresco de El Conde Lucanor."

⁹⁰ That is not to say that I avoid discussion of these topics altogether. My consideration of roguery, for example, is within the larger context of the wisdom theme, which I treat as an external organizing device.

⁹¹ For a discussion of Boccaccio's works that have been identified or suggested as a source or analogue of the Canterbury Tales, see Cooper, Oxford Guides and Robert M. Correale.

⁹² Cooper describes Chaucer's prosody thus: "The line he uses for the Tales is assimilable to the French or Italian decasyllable, and so is the direct ancestor of the iambic pentameter" (Oxford Guides 23).

⁹³ Citations of the Canterbury Tales in Middle English are from Halverson; the modern English translations are from Wright.

⁹⁴ In some versions of the Canterbury Tales, when the pilgrims draw lots to determine who will tell the first tale, "were it by aventure or sort or cas" (31; GP 844) ("whether it was luck, or chance, or fate"; 22), the lot falls to the Knight, the pilgrim with the highest social rank (Wright 465).

⁹⁵ For information on the "commercial considerations," "political motives," and cultural programs behind the production and supplementation of Chaucerian manuscripts in the fifteenth century, see Bowers's general introduction.

⁹⁶ I have mentioned above just a few examples, but there are many others. For instance, Alfonsi was included in numerous collections of Aesop's Life and Fables (those that also contain fables of Avianus and Poggio). In the Netherlands

alone, at least fifteen Latin editions of this version were printed before the publication of the Lazarillo (Landwehr 3-5), and one in French (Landwehr 10). At least three Spanish versions of Aesop were printed there before 1554 (Landwehr 13), but I am unsure whether these three included Alfonsi.

⁹⁷ Cf. Gittes 2-3.

⁹⁸ Gittes concurs with B. E. Perry in his theory of an Arabic or Near Eastern (as opposed to Indian) origin of the framing story as an organizing device (9, 19). She argues that the boxing of tales, however, is an Indian structural technique. As both structural devices are characteristic of the medieval European *frametale*, the question of their origin is not within the scope of my present study. For bibliographical information on opposing views concerning this issue, see Gittes 19.

⁹⁹ This scheme is adapted from a similar illustration offered by Rajan (xlviil-ii).

¹⁰⁰ The framing stories are as follows: book 1, Lively and Tawny; book 2, The Crow, the Mole, the Deer, and the Tortoise; book 3, Of Crows and Owls; book 4, The Ape and the Crocodile; and book 5, The Barber Who Slaughtered the Monks.

¹⁰¹ Four out of the five books are titled according to the principal theme of each. However, in both Rajan's and Ryder's English translations, the title of book 3 refers to the characters of that book's framing story: "Crows and Owls." War

and peace are the central themes of that story as well as of the majority of the tales enclosed within book 3.

¹⁰² Gittes observes this characteristic in Sindbad 72-73; Ameto 76; Decameron 85, 87-90; Conde Lucanor 94; Confessio amantis 97-99, 102; Canterbury Tales 110-11, 117-19; and Book of the City of Ladies 142.

¹⁰³ Gittes dedicates her third chapter, “Greek and Arabic Outlooks,” to an analysis of these diverse conceptions of the world and how they relate to the organizing principles of science, art, and literature. Here she remarks, “The tenth- and eleventh-century Arabic picaresque, or maqamat (assemblies), bears an even stronger resemblance than the histories, biographies, and geographies to the frame narrative. The typical hero of these works, a rogue of exceptionally versatile talent, travels to different towns, often playing different roles (teacher, doctor, lawyer) and living entirely by his wits” (44). Irving notes, “To be sure Menéndez y Pelayo and González Palencia both pointed out the affinity of the Maqāmāt or Arabic baroque picaresque narrative to the pícaro, but no detailed study has yet been completed in this field” (xii).

¹⁰⁴ In scholarship that examines the structure and organization of frame tales, there are precedents that stress these techniques. For example, the bulk of Andersen’s article, “An Analysis of the Framework Structure of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales,” centers on two themes: “the rôle and the functions of the narrator of the frame” and “the relationship between the framework and the pilgrims’ narratives” (179). “The continuing presence of the speaker” and the

framing story are likewise among the predominant external organizing devices of the *frametale* genre identified by Gittes (143). She also recognizes the wisdom theme and the travel motif (143), both of which are common to Lazarillo de Tormes. The former I address in this chapter while the latter must be left for future investigation.

¹⁰⁵ Presently I focus on the frame's supportive role in strengthening the internal structure of the *frametale*, while later in this chapter I examine its role in generating the storytelling and providing a context for the interpretation of the enclosed tales.

¹⁰⁶ McWilliam observes that despite the lack of a prescribed theme for the first day of storytelling, all the tales told on that day nonetheless "have certain unifying elements" (810). He explains: "All depend for their effect on a display of eloquence or quick-wittedness on the part of the main character. All involve the reversal of the outcome that characters (and readers) have been led to anticipate" (810).

¹⁰⁷ For more information on this subject, see Cooper, The Structure of the Canterbury Tales 108-207.

¹⁰⁸ Citations of the Disciplina clericalis are from Quarrie's translation.

¹⁰⁹ Maso del Saggio is first mentioned on the sixth day of storytelling (6.10), but he does not play a role until the eighth (8.3).

¹¹⁰ Also worthy of note is the source of the word text is the Latin word texere, meaning "to weave" ("Text").

¹¹¹ I refer to the 1199 Sanskrit recension by Purnabhadra on which Rajan bases her English translation.

¹¹² Panchatantra, in one sense, means “five books” (Ryder xi).

¹¹³ Erroneous citations of this sort were common during the Middle Ages. Tolan observes, for example, that the legends of Enoch/Edris (Idris), Balaam/Lukaman (Luqman), Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle are all associated with apocryphal texts (76-78). Deyermond observes that there was a “flourishing medieval tradition of pseudo-Cato literature” (Literary History 69). Moreover, Le Goff notes that pseudo-Cicero (Rhetorica ad Herennium) had an even greater impact on the medieval understanding of the exemplum than did Cicero himself (De inventione) (250).

¹¹⁴ McWilliam further observes, “. . . the three young men are introduced merely as being agreeable and gently bred (assai piacevole e costumato ciascuno)” (lx).

¹¹⁵ Chaucer, for example, mentions Alfonsi by name five times in the Tale of Melibee of the Canterbury Tales (Tolan 138).

¹¹⁶ The narrator’s formula of validation appears in several close variations of the one cited here from exemplo 19 (81).

¹¹⁷ This is the title of her fourth chapter.

¹¹⁸ Although many of the links are not the work of Chaucer himself, they nonetheless form part of the Canterbury Tales in various versions in which the

work circulated beyond the author's death, and are therefore integral to a medieval and early modern reading of the collection.

¹¹⁹ For Juan Manuel's concerns regarding the dangers of inadvertent or careless alterations during the process of transmission, see his general prologue, especially his tale of the Shoemaker.

¹²⁰ My identification of narrative frame structures derives in part from Deyermond (Literary History 98) and in part from Dunn ("Framing the Story" 98), who, in turn, relies on Viktor Shklovsky (65-67).

¹²¹ The dialogue also effectively links the five books of the collection and their various material: part 1 (exempla), parts 2-4 (proverbs), and part 5 (doctrine). As occurs in the Kalila, in the dialogue between Patronio and Count Lucanor that surfaces at the beginning of each book, the previous book or books are recalled, thus tightening the work's overall structure.

¹²² For example, tale 29, "The Prudent Son of the Royal Wazir," is recounted by a father to his son (157-58). Immediately following is the section titled "The World to Come." It begins, "Another man gave the following advice to his son . . ." (emphasis added). The subsequent sentence begins, "Another said . . ." (emphasis added), and is followed by the son's request that his father tell what happened. This dialogue introduces tale 30, "The Thief Who Wanted to Take Too Much" (158). Thus from one tale to the next, there are three dialogues, each constituting a different father-son combination.

¹²³ I classify as separate, but related, types of frame structure that which Deyermond identifies as one, namely “the use of tales by a master to answer his pupil’s questions, or in an argument” (Literary History 98).

¹²⁴ When citing the Libro de buen amor, I use Willis’s bilateral translation. References following citations in Spanish are to the stanza number(s), those following translations in English are to the page number(s).

¹²⁵ See also Shklovsky 65-66.

¹²⁶ Here Lacarra notes this is true also of the Thousand and One Nights.

¹²⁷ Cf. Shklovsky 66. Additionally, Deyermond classifies this type of frame structure as storytelling “to while away a journey or a tedious period of waiting,” and includes both the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales in this category (Literary History 98).

¹²⁸ See note 103.

¹²⁹ The version to which Gittes refers is a Middle English work of the fourteenth century.

¹³⁰ Cf. Gittes 87-91.

¹³¹ In making the case against his critics, Boccaccio addresses their lack of knowledge or understanding of other issues as well. He states, for example, “E quegli che contro alla mia età parlando vanno, mostra mal che conoscano che, perché el porro abbia il capo bianco, che la coda sia verde” (264; 4, Introduction) (“As for those who keep harping on my age, they are clearly unaware of the fact that although the leek’s head is white, it has a green tail”; 288). He continues by

arguing that the history books are filled with examples “d’antichi uomini e valorosi, ne’ loro più maturi anni sommamente avere studiato di compiacere alle donne: il che se essi non fanno, vadano e sì l’apparino” (265; 4, Introduction) (“of outstanding men, who, in their declining years, strove with might and main to give pleasure to the ladies. If my critics are ignorant of this, let them go and repair the gaps in their knowledge”; 288-89).

¹³² Claudio Guillén makes a similar, though less elaborate, observation of the genre’s structure: “The novel is loosely episodic, strung together like a freight train and apparently with no other common link than the hero” (“Toward a Definition” 84).

¹³³ Deyermond suggests that this feature may be a result of La Celestina’s influence (Critical Guide 34).

¹³⁴ This may be indicated in the frame, either by the character himself, as in the Kalila and Dimna (“King Dabshalim said to Bidpai the philosopher: ‘I have heard your story . . .’”; 2.48); or by the narrator, as in the Conde Lucanor (“El conde tovo por buen consejo lo que Patronio le consejava. Et fizolo assí et fallóse ende bien”; 1.27); or in the prologue or epilogue by the principal storyteller, as in the Panchatantra (“With the aid of these tales, he instructed the princes”; Preamble, 5). The Sindbad indicates how the storytelling influences the listener, yet with minimal detail (“And the King ordered that his son not be killed”; Epstein 111; “And the King commanded that his son be killed”; Epstein 115).

¹³⁵ Cf. Brian Dutton's "'Buen amor': Its Meaning and Uses in Some Medieval Texts," especially 109-21 where he discusses the various and ambiguous use of this term (and of bueno within other expressions) with respect to the Libro de buen amor.

¹³⁶ Although Lázaro, too, is in a hurry to get out of the rain, as narrator his focus here is on the discomfort of the Blind Man: "el triste se mojaba."

¹³⁷ See Serés 335 and 338-89 concerning the concepts of trust and love (friendship) in the Conde Lucanor, Kalila, Panchatantra, Disciplina, and other works.

¹³⁸ Cf. Deyermond, Critical Guide 67-68.

¹³⁹ For structural schemes concerning the episodes of Lázaro and the Blind Man that differ somewhat from what follows, see Deyermond, Critical Guide 37 and Rico, Spanish Picaresque Novel 7-10.

¹⁴⁰ See Tarr's study concerning these and other techniques that the anonymous author uses to unify his novel. Although I disagree with several of his conclusions, I find his work one of the most enlightening studies on the structural unity of the Lazarillo.

¹⁴¹ Cf. the Squire's comment concerning his hypothetical role as hypocritical advisor to a titled gentleman: ". . . nunca decirle cosa con que le pesase, aunque mucho le cumpliese . . ." (105; tr. 3).

¹⁴² Cf. Deyermond, Critical Guide 78.

¹⁴³ Significantly, in both of these episodes the issue of the illegality of the actions (the notion of immorality is not even addressed) is balanced by an expression of the unfortunate discovery of these actions (“el desastre ya dicho”, 14; tr. 1; “Quiso nuestra fortuna”, 18). It must be remembered that the deceitful actions of Lázaro’s parents were the means to his survival and that of his family. While this may be only implied in the case of Lázaro’s father as head of his household, it is made explicit in Zaide’s case when Lázaro first admits, “. . . vi que su venida mejoraba el comer . . . porque siempre traía pan, pedazos de carne y en el invierno leños, a que nos calentábamos” (17; tr. 1), and later, “con todo esto acudía a mi madre para criar a mi hermanico” (19).

¹⁴⁴ Deyermond cites three from the second tratado, and one from each of the third and fourth tratados (Critical Guide 41).

¹⁴⁵ Although Lázaro is explicit in crediting God with the arrival of the tinker, he also hints that chance has played a role: “. . . llegóse acaso . . .” (54; tr. 2). This incident is similar to an episode in tratado 3 in which Lázaro states, “Pues estando en esta afligada y hambrienta persecución, un día, no sé por cuál dicha o ventura, en el pobre poder de mi amo entró un real . . .” (95; tr. 3). See also the episode of Doña Endrina in the Libro de buen amor: “quísome Dios bien guiar e la ventura mía. / Cuidados muchos me quexan a que non fallo consejo;” (687-88) (“God, and my good luck too, deigned to guide me straight. Great worries afflict me for which I can find no counsel”; 186).

¹⁴⁶ See R. W. Truman for a study on Lazarillo de Tormes as a parody of the homo novus, or virtuous self-made man, tradition. See also Deyermond, Critical Guide 86.

¹⁴⁷ See Rico 14 for bibliographical information concerning this passage as a parody of Amadís de Gaula.

¹⁴⁸ This does not imply that the narrator and the author are identical. Bonnie D. Irwin notes, “In the Decameron, the overall narrator is clearly an ironic persona, even though he has much in common with Boccaccio himself” (25). The same may also be said of Chaucer, for example.

¹⁴⁹ There is a particular resonance with Alfonsi’s statement, “. . . in order that the light given to me should not be hid under a bushel . . .” (103).

¹⁵⁰ We have already been told that the Blind Man enjoys physically mistreating Lázaro while teaching him a lesson, first in the incident of the stone bull: “—Necio, aprende, que el mozo del ciego un punto ha de saber más que el diablo. Y rió mucho la burla” (23; tr. 1). This is demonstrated again in the episode of the wine jug: “. . . bien vi que se había holgado del cruel castigo. . . . Lavóme con vino . . . y, sonriéndose, decía: —¿Qué te parece, Lázaro? Lo que te enfermó te sana y da salud. Y otros donaires, que a mi gusto no lo eran” (33; tr. 1).

¹⁵¹ For trickery and roguery as a link between story collections and the picaresque novel, see Chandler, Bayliss, and Rikapito, as well as my treatment of them in chapter 2.

¹⁵² The Kalila and Sindbad repeat the expression “How was that?” whereas the Disciplina uses a variety of expressions, such as “What happened . . . ?”, “Tell me . . .” and “Explain to me. . . .”

¹⁵³ Andersen also uses this excerpt to illustrate a parody of the demand for authenticity. He notes, “. . . J. M. Manly refers to Hinckley’s statement that the author of the Launcelot novel was not taken seriously by his contemporaries, and that his work was not regarded as trustworthy” (181).

¹⁵⁴ Deyermond nonetheless appears committed on this point: “. . . the scandal of ‘el caso’ led Vuestra Merced to make the enquiries to which Lázaro’s narrative is a reply” (Critical Guide 79).

¹⁵⁵ For an example of Juan Ruiz’s treatment of the influences of Fortune, the Fates, and God on man, see 687-94.

¹⁵⁶ See Shklovsky 42-43.

Works Cited

- Aesop's Fables: With a Life of Aesop. Trans. John E. Keller and L. Clark Keating. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993.
- Andersen, Jens Kr. "An Analysis of the Framework Structure of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales." Orbis Litterarum 27 (1972): 179-201.
- Armistead, Samuel G. "An Unnoticed Fifteenth-Century Citation of the Libro de buen amor." Hispanic Review 41:1 (1973: Winter): 88-91.
- . "Two Further Citations of the Libro de buen amor in Lope García de Salazar's Bienandanzas e fortunas." La Corónica 5 (1976-77): 75-77.
- Ashliman, D. L. Introduction. Aesop's Fables. Trans. V. S. Vernon Jones. New York: Barnes, 2003. xiii-xxxiv.
- Atil, Esin. Kalila wa Dimna: Fables from a Fourteenth-Century Arabic Manuscript. Washington DC: Smithsonian, 1981.
- Bayliss, Robert E. "The Decameron in Spain." Approaches to Teaching Boccaccio's Decameron. Ed. James H. McGregor. New York: MLA, 2000. 134-141.
- Blackham, H[arold] J[ohn]. The Fable as Literature. London: Antelope, 1985.
- Blake, N. F. The Textual Tradition of the Canterbury Tales. London: Arnold, 1985.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. The Decameron. Trans. G. H. McWilliam. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1995.
- . L'Ameto. Trans. Judith Serafini-Sauli. New York: Garland, 1985.

- Bourland, C[aroline] B[rown]. Boccaccio and the Decameron in Castillian and Catalan Literature. New York: Revue Hispanique, 1905.
- Bowers, John M. ed. The Canterbury Tales: Fifteenth-Century Continuations and Additions. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan, 1999.
- Branca, Vittore, ed. Decameron. Firenze [Florence]: Accademia Della Crusca, 1976.
- Brownlee, Marina Scordilis. The Status of the Reading Subject in the Libro de buen amor. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1985.
- Camarena Laucirica, Julio. "El cuento de tradición oral y la novela picaresca." Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares 43 (1988): 67-82.
- Carnes, Pack. Fable Scholarship: An Annotated Bibliography. Ed. Alan Dundes. New York: Garland, 1985.
- Chandler, Frank Wadleigh. Romances of Roguery: An Episode in the History of the Novel The Picaresque Novel in Spain. New York: Franklin. 1961.
- Chevalier, Maxime. "Des contes au roman: l'éducation de Lazarille." Bulletin Hispanique 81 (1979): 189-99.
- . Folklore y literature: El cuento oral en el siglo de oro. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1978.
- Cooper, Helen. "The Frame." Sources and Analogues of The Canterbury Tales. Ed. Robert M. Correale. Vol. 1. Chaucer Studies 28. Cambridge: Brewer, 2002. 1-22.
- . Oxford Guides to Chaucer: The Canterbury Tales. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

- . The Structure of the Canterbury Tales. London: Duckworth, 1983.
- Correale, Robert M., ed. Sources and Analogues of The Canterbury Tales. Vol. 1. Chaucer Studies 28. Cambridge: Brewer, 2002.
- Cuddon, J. A. A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Rev. ed. London: Penguin, 1979.
- Dagenais, John. The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Devoto, Daniel. Introducción al estudio de Don Juan Manuel y en particular el conde lucanor. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1971.
- Deyermond, Alan D. "Early Allusions to the Libro de buen amor – a postscript to Moffatt." Modern Language Notes 88 (1973): 317-21.
- . "Juan Ruiz's Attitude to Literature." Medieval, Renaissance and Folklore Studies: In Honor of John Esten Keller. Ed. Joseph R. Jones. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 1980. 113-26.
- . "Juglar's Repertoire or Sermon Notebook?—The Libro de buen amor and a Manuscript Miscellany." Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 51 (1974): 217-27.
- . Lazarillo de Tormes: A Critical Guide. 2nd Ed. Critical Guides to Spanish Texts 15. Valencia: Grant, 1993.
- . A Literary History of Spain: The Middle Ages. Ed. R. O. Jones. London: Ernest Benn Ltd, 1971.
- Deyermond, A. D. and Roger M. Walker. "A Further Vernacular Source for the Libro de buen amor." Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 46 (1969): 193-200.
- Donaldson, E. Talbot. "Chaucer and the Pilgrim." PMLA 69 (1954): 928-36.

- Dundes, Alan, ed. Preface. Fable Scholarship: An Annotated Bibliography. By Pack Carnes. New York: Garland, 1985. ix-xi.
- . Introduction. Morphology of the Folktale. By V[ladimr] Propp. Trans. Laurence Scott. Ed. Louis A. Wagner. 2nd ed. Austin: U of Texas P, 1973. xi-xvii.
- Dunn, Peter N. "Framing the Story, Framing the Reader: Two Spanish Masters." Modern Language Review 91 (1996): 94-106.
- Dutton, Brian. "Buen amor: Its Meaning and Uses in Some Medieval Texts." Libro de Buen Amor Studies. Ed. G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny. London: Tamesis, 1970. 95-122.
- Edgerton, Franklin, ed. and trans. The Panchatantra Reconstructed. 2 vols. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1924. Vol. 2.
- Epstein, Morris. Tales of Sendebār: An Edition and Translation of the Seven Sages. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1967.
- Faulhaber, Charles B. "The Date of Stanzas 553 and 1450 of the Libro de buen amor in MS 9589 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid." Romance Philology 28 (1974): 31-34.
- Fradejas Lebrero, José. Sendebār: Libro de los engaños de las mujeres. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, S. A., 1990.
- Garbáty, Thomas Jay. "The Pamphilus Tradition in Ruiz and Chaucer." Philological Quarterly 46.4 (1967): 457-70.

- García de la Concha, Víctor. Nueva lectura del Lazarillo: El deleite de la perspectiva. Madrid: Castalia, 1981.
- Gilman, Stephen. "The Death of Lazarillo de Tormes." PMLA 81 (1966): 149-66.
- Gittes, Katharine S. Framing the Canterbury Tales: Chaucer and the Medieval Frame Narrative Tradition. New York: Greenwood, 1991.
- Goldhammer, Arthur, trans. The Medieval Imagination. By Jacques Le Goff. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Le Goff, Jacques. The Medieval Imagination. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Guillén, Claudio. "Toward a Definition of the Picaresque." Actes du IIIe congrès de l'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée. (1962): 252-66. Rpt. in Literature as System. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971. 71-106.
- Halverson, John, ed. Geoffrey Chaucer: The Canterbury Tales. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.
- Hart, Thomas R. "Exemplary Storytellers: Trotaconventos and Doña Garoza." The Medieval Mind: Hispanic Studies in Honour of Alan Deyermond. Suffolk, U.K.: Woodbridge. 165-75.
- The Holy Bible: King James Version. Nashville: Nelson P, 1984.
- Irving, Thomas Ballantine. Kalilah and Dimnah. Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta – Hispanic Monographs, 1980.

- Irwin, Bonnie D. "Narrative in the Decameron and the Thousand and One Nights." Approaches to Teaching Boccaccio's Decameron. Ed. James H, McGregor. New York: MLA, 2000. 21-30.
- Jones, Joseph Ramon, and John Esten Keller. The Scholar's Guide: A Translation of the Disciplina Clericalis of Pedro Alfonso. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1969.
- Keller, John Esten. El libro de los engaños. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1959.
- Keller, John E., and L. Clark Keating, trans. Aesop's Fables: With a Life of Aesop. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993.
- , trans. The Book of Count Lucanor and Patronio: A Translation of Don Juan Manuel's El Conde Lucanor. By Juan Manuel. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1977.
- Koff, Leonard Michael. Chaucer and the Art of Storytelling. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Lacarra, María J. Cuento y novela corta en España. Vol. 1. Barcelona: Crítica, 1999.
- . Cuentos de la edad media. Madrid: Castalia, 1986.
- . Panorama del cuento en la España medieval. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993.
- . "Pervivencia y transmisión del cuento medieval en al edad de oro." La edición de textos: Actas del I congreso internacional de hispanistas del siglo de

- oro. Ed. Pablo Jauralde, Dolores Noguera, and Alfonso Rey. London: Tamesis, n.d. 261-69.
- Landwehr, John. Fable-Books Printed in the Low Countries: A Concise Bibliography until 1800. The Hague: Nieuwkoop, 1963.
- Lawrence, Jeremy. "The Rubrics in MS 'S' of the Libro de buen amor." The Medieval Mind: Hispanic Studies in Honour of Alan Deyermond. Suffolk, U.K.: Woodbridge. 223-52.
- Lázaro Carreter, Fernando. Lazarillo del Tormes en la picaresca. Madrid: Ariel, 1972.
- Lecoy, Félix. Recherches sur le Libro de buen amor de Juan Ruiz. Farnborough: Gregg, 1974.
- Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa. Estudios de literatura española y comparada. Buenos Aires: U de Buenos Aires, 1966.
- . "Función del cuento popular en el Lazarillo de Tormes." Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Hispanistas. Oxford: Dolphin, 1964. 349-59.
- . "Nuevas notas para la interpretación del Libro de buen amor." Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica XIII (1959): 17-82. Rpt. in Estudios de literatura española y comparada. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 1966.
- . "Tres notas sobre don Juan Manuel." Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica XIII (1959): 92-133. Rpt. in Estudios de literatura española y comparada. Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 1966.

- . Two Spanish Masterpieces: The Book of Good Love and The Celestina. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 49. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1961.
- Manuel, Juan. El Conde Lucanor. Ed. Guillermo Serés. Barcelona: Crítica, 1994.
- . Obras Completas. Ed. José Manuel Blecua. Madrid: Gredos, 1982.
- Massano, Giulio. "Influenze italiane sulle genesi e struttura del romanzo picaresco spagnolo." Italo-Hispanic Literary Relations. Ed. J. Helí Hernández. Potomac: Scripta Humanistica, 1989. 82-94.
- McWilliam, G. H., trans. The Decameron. By Giovanni Boccaccio. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Michael, Ian. "The Function of the Popular Tale in the Libro de buen amor." Libro de Buen Amor Studies. Ed. G. B. Gybbon-Monypenny. London: Tamesis, 1970. 177-218.
- Millares Carlo, Agustín. "La biblioteca de Gonzalo Argote de Molina." Revista de filología española 10 (1923): 136-52.
- Moffatt, Lucius G. "The Evidence of Early Mentions of the Archpriest of Hita or of His Work." Modern Language Notes 75 (1960): 33-44.
- Montiel, Isidoro. Historia y bibliographía del Libro de Calila y Dimna. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1975.
- Morros, Bienvenido C. Bibliographical Appendix. Lazarillo de Tormes. 13th Ed. Francisco Rico. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998. 149-68.

- Orduna, Germán. Estudio Preliminar. El Conde Lucanor. By Don Juan Manuel. Barcelona: Crítica, 1994. ix-xxix.
- Owen, Charles A., Jr. Pilgrimage and Storytelling in the Canterbury Tales: The Dialect of “Ernest” and “Game”. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1977.
- Palma Chaguaceda, Antonio. El historiador Gonzalo Argote de Molina. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1949.
- The Panchatantra. Trans. Arthur W. Ryder. New York: Macy, 1972.
- Pearsall, Derek. The Canterbury Tales. Ed. Claude Rawson. London: Unwin, 1985.
- Peeters-Fontainas, J. F. Bibliographie des impressions espagnoles des Pays Bas. Antwerp: De Gulden Passer, 1933.
- Pratt, Robert A. and Karl Young. “The Literary Framework of the Canterbury Tales.” Sources and Analogues of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales. Ed. W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster. New York: Humanities P, 1958. 1-81.
- Propp, V[ladimir]. Morphology of the Folktale. Trans. Laurence Scott. Ed. Louis A. Wagner. 2nd ed. Austin: U of Texas P, 1973.
- Provost, William. “The Boethian Unity of the Tales.” Approaches to Teaching Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales. Ed. Joseph Gibaldi. New York: MLA, 1980. 89-91.
- Quarrie, P. R., English trans. The Disciplina Clericalis of Petrus Alfonsi. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1977. English translation of the Disciplina from Hilka and Söderhjelm’s Helsinki edition, along with a

- translation of Eberhard Hermes's German introduction to his German translation of the Disciplina.
- Rajan, Chandra. Forward and Introduction. The Pancatantra. By Visnu Sarma. Trans. Rajan. London: Penguin, 1995. xi-lv.
- Reynolds, John J. Juan Timoneda. Twayne's World Authors Ser. 367. Ed. Sylvia Bowman. Boston: Twayne, 1975.
- Ricapito, Joesph V. "Boccaccio and the Picaresque Tradition." The Two Hesperias: Literary Studies in Honor of Joseph G. Fucilla on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday. Ed. Americo Bugliani. Madrid: José Porrúa Turanzas, (1977): 309-28.
- . "El contorno picaresco de El Conde Lucanor." Romanische Forschungen. (1972): 97-107.
- . "Lazarillo de Tormes (Chap. V) and Masuccio's Fourth Novella." Romance Philology 23.3 (1970): 305-11.
- Rico, Francisco Lazarillo de Tormes. 13th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- . The Spanish Picaresque Novel and the Point of View. Trans. Charles Davis. London: Cambridge UP, 1969.
- Ruffinatto, Aldo. Las dos caras del Lazarillo: Texto y mensaje. Madrid: Castalia, 2000.
- Ruiz, Juan. Libro de buen amor. Trans. Raymond S. Willis. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.

- Runte, Hans R., J. Keith Wikeley, and Anthony J. Farrell. The Seven Sages of Rome and the Book of Sinbad: An Analytical Biography. New York: Garland, 1984.
- Ryder, Arthur A., trans. The Panchatantra. By Visnu Sarma. New York: Macy, 1972.
- Sarma, Visnu. The Pancatantra. Trans. Chandra Rajan. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Serafini-Sauli, Judith, trans. L'Ameto. By Giovanni Boccaccio. New York: Garland, 1985.
- Serés, Guillermo, ed. El Conde Lucanor. By Don Juan Manuel. Barcelona: Crítica, 1994.
- Serrano Reyes, Jesús L. "Didactismo y Moralismo en Geoffrey Chaucer y Don Juan Manuel: Un Estudio Comparativo Textual." Trans. Joe Monda. U. de Córdoba. 1996<<http://www.arrakis.es/~jlserrano/INTRUDUCTION.htm>>.
- Shklovsky, Viktor. Theory of Prose. Trans. Benjamin Sher. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive P, 1998.
- Sicroff, Albert A. "Clandestine Judaism in the Hieronymite Monastery of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe." Studies in Honor of M. J. Benardete: Essays in Hispanic and Sephardic Culture. Eds. Izaak A. Langnas and Barton Sholod. New York: Las Americas, 1965. 89-125.
- Simón Díaz, José. Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica. T. III, Vol. 1. Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1963.

- Sturcken, H. Tracy. Don Juan Manuel. Twayne's World Authors Ser. 303. Ed. Sylvia Bowman. New York: Twayne, 1974.
- Tarr, F. Courtney. "Literary and Artistic Unity in the Lazarillo de Tormes." PMLA 42 (1927): 404-21.
- Taylor, Barry. "Raimundus de Biterris's 'Liber Kalileet Dimne': Notes on the Western Reception of an Eastern Exemplum-Book." Cultures in Contact in Medieval Spain: Historical and Literary Essays Presented to L. P. Harvey. Eds. David Hook and Barry Taylor. Exeter: Short Run P, 1990. 183-203.
- "Text." The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Thompson, Stith. The Folktale. New York: Dryden, 1951.
- . Introduction. Motif-Index of Folk-Literature: A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Medieval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends. Rev. ed. Vol. 1. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1955. 11.
- Tolan, John. Petrus Alfonsi and His Medieval Readers. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1993.
- Truman, R. W. "Lázaro de Tormes and the 'Homo Novus' Tradition." Modern Language Review 64 (1969): 62-67.
- Wallace, David. Decameron. Landmarks of World Literature. Ed. J. P. Stern. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, n.d.

- Welter, J[ean] –Th[ié]baut]. L'exemplum dans la littérature religieuse et didactique du Moyen âge. Paris: Occitania, 1927.
- Whinnom, Keith. "The Problem of the 'Best-Seller' in Spanish Golden-Age Literature." Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 57 (1980): 189-98.
- Willis, Raymond S. Introduction. Libro de buen amor. By Juan Ruiz. Trans. Willis. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. xix-xci.
- Wright, David. Geoffrey Chaucer: The Canterbury Tales. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

Vita

Anna Coons Pyeatt was born Anna Wilder Coons in Galveston, Texas on 25 July 1969, the daughter of Richard Edmunds Coons and Willie Ann Newbury Coons. Upon graduating from Stephen F. Austin High School, Austin, Texas, in 1987, she entered The University of Texas at Austin. She studied in Alcalá de Henares (Madrid), Spain in 1989-90 on Bowling Green State University's Academic Year Abroad Program. In December 1991 she earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in the Plan II Honors Program from The University of Texas at Austin. She entered the Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin in fall 1994, earning a Master of Arts degree in Spanish in August 1997. While pursuing her doctoral degree at The University of Texas at Austin she attended the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain, for the 1998-99 academic year. During her graduate studies she was employed as a Spanish instructor at The University of Texas at Austin, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, and Austin Community College. In 2003 she co-founded Austin Language Academy, LLC.

Permanent address: #5 Niles Road, Austin, Texas 78703

This dissertation was typed by the author.