Title
Notes on the Images of the Book of Good Love

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3758508p

Journal
Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 18(1)

ISSN
0069-6412

Author
Morrás, María

Publication Date
1987-10-01

Peer reviewed

NOTES ON THE IMAGES OF THE
BOOK OF GOOD LOVE

María Morrás

Research on iconography seems to be increasingly popular within and outside Hispanism. A quick glance at the most important periodicals on the Middle Ages is enough to perceive it.[1] Three kinds of studies can be discerned: the ones which deal with the imagery of one particular work, those that study the meaning of certain images, and those in which the central concern is the relationship between text and illustrations. The first two could be described as an attempt to fix the symbolism of the images by locating them within a given tradition. At the same time such works try to disclose the role that images play in the structure of particular medieval texts.[2] The third group consists of publications that examine a medieval text as a whole made up of both words and illustrations, which are equally essential elements for a complete understanding of any text. Sometimes the first are viewed as subordinated to the latter, in other cases pictures could be a visual translation of the written text. Due in great part to the excellent condition and quality of its illustrations, Alfonso X's *Cantigas de Santa María* have been an especially favorite subject for this kind of research.[3]

In spite of the limited amount of well-preserved illuminated codices scholars have not been discouraged. Pictures and sculptures offer a wide range of iconographic motives that have proved useful for the study of medieval literature. The knowledge of visual arts as a hermeneutic tool for interpretation[4] and to elucidate textual difficulties[5] or for both tasks at the same time[6] has already rendered positive results. The number of articles which have appeared in the last years is a testimony to the interest in the subject, as well as a consequence of real necessity.[7]

In the urge to reach immediate conclusions, however, important theoretical aspects have often been neglected. As a result, some of the works published seem to be handfuls of notes derived from individual intuition rather than from accuracy in observation and reliable knowledge. For instance, the term "image" is used for all the figures related to comparison and visual representation by words. Before focusing on the study of a text

or an image in its most specialized meaning it would be necessary to begin by defining the concepts so as to avoid anachronism. That is to say, the actual meaning of "image" in the Middle Ages cannot be overlooked.[8] In this task the research done previously in different countries should be taken into account without forgetting what the experts on art have said. They are far ahead of literary critics, who have been quite reluctant in the past to collaborate with their colleagues in the field of art when studying medieval illustrations.[9] Thus, the work of the most outstanding scholars such as E. Panofsky, E. Wind, M. Schapiro, and E. H. Gombrich offer remarkable examples of how a better understanding of pictures, drawings, and sculptures can be achieved through the knowledge of medieval literature.[10]

This situation is already changing. There is an increasing interest among literary critics to recover iconographical tradition as a means to better understand medieval texts, and to be able to approach their structure from a historical point of view. Still, the very first task will be to establish a link between medieval texts and art that goes beyond a mere simultaneity in time or in space. Starting from the assumption that the relationship between words and images is intentional, the most convenient method to arrive at proper guidelines of approach to the subject would be to turn to philosophical and rhetorical treatises to understand how medieval people must have conceived this relationship.[11] This is what V.A. Kolve does in *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative*.[12] He calls attention to the very close relationship of the pictoral images in illustrations and paintings to those created in literature in order to provoke visual images in the mind of medieval audiences. In this way Kolve desires to encourage further research inviting the reader to draw conclusions relevant to the study of medieval literature, and it should be interesting to raise again the study of the imagery in the *Book of Good Love* in light of his observations.

Imagery has been a neglected aspect within the bibliography on Juan Ruiz. The unity of his book, its sources, its autobiographical frame, and a discussion of its supposed didactic intention have held the interest of most critics. The first remarks, however, about the importance and use of images in the *Book of Good Love* were aroused in relationship to the controversy around Juan Ruiz's ultimate purpose: Hart drew attention to the images of frogs; Roger Walker has shown the link established by images between love and death; S. Gilman has mentioned the "children's atmosphere" derived from the use of some images.[13] This is to say, images—or at least some of them—have been studied not for their own sake but as far as they could be used as arguments in support of previous interpretations of the *Book of Good Love*.

On the other hand, stylistic studies either have focused on other sides of the question[14] or have referred only incidentally to it.[15] Thus some excellent studies have been done on how images are worded: there is an article by M. Morreale about the use of comparisons that expands and elaborates the list of rhetorical devices supplied by F. Weis to examine the vivacity and immediacy which the reader gathers from reading Juan Ruiz's book.[16] Other works have been written from a semantic point of view concerning themselves primarily with individual words and not with more complex images created through whole passages. Among them, L. O. Vasvari's articles stand out for their boldness. Vasvari deals with what she calls "polysemy of connotation" and shows how under many images based on puns there are hidden erotic references.[17] This same line of research on symbolism is followed by partial studies on animalistic imagery.[18]

From this survey the lack of a global work on the imagery of *Book of Good Love* becomes clear. Two recent books have tried to fill in the gap. I refer to *The Imagery of the "Libro de Buen Amor"* by Gail Phillips and to *The Allegory of Good Love* by Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez.[19] The former is chiefly a compilation of material arranged in two sections: in the first one images used in Doña Endrina and Don Melón's episode are analyzed in relationship to their source, the *Pamphilus de amore*; the second part includes a list of images associated with the various characters, allegorical figures (Love, Death, Sins, Virtues), and subjects (money, wine, etc.). There is no final conclusion in which the author could have summarized the main points and articulated a critical view in light of all the material collected. Instead, images are considered in isolation from the context in which they occur so that we miss the role they play in the episodes. To this we may add the vagueness in the use of the term "image." The author herself points out that "image is used as an umbrella term for the whole spectrum of suggestive language" (p. 5). Consequently, the book becomes a semantic study[20] that tries to prove the didactic value of the *Book of Good Love*. Once again the study *per se* of imagery has been subordinated to a prejudged interpretation of Juan Ruiz's book.

In the case of *The Allegory of Good Love* we find something similar. The title itself points out the main concern of its author. Seidenspinner-Núñez studies the images in so far as they result from the use of allegory, which consists in involving the audience in the act of visualizing abstract concepts. In dealing with the visual side of allegory, Seidenspinner-Núñez touches aspects related to iconography but she does not focus on them.[21] She limits herself to the contemplation of allegory according to Agustinian theory.[22] However, she differs from other critics and defends an open reading of the *Book of Good Love*. According to her viewpoint, one-sided

interpretations that have read the work either as a religious didactic text or as a parody of courtly love should be rejected. Instead, she proposes that the ambiguity is a conscious device on Juan Ruiz's part; he would superimpose images derived from three different currents—literary, religious, comic-realistic—in order to parody them. In her work Seidenspinner-Núñez stresses the procedure, which basically consists in taking symbols, expressions and images shared by the three currents and relocating them in new contexts so that there is an incongruity between context and image.

Again the episode of Don Melón and Doña Endrina is the major point of the study. Seidenspinner-Núñez analyzes the process of degradation undergone by the characters revealed through the use of animal imagery. Don Melón and Doña Endrina—and with them the conventional figures of courtly lovers—are reduced to the level of "homo animalis." The motive of the *erotic hunt*, one of the most characteristic in the courtly tradition, is associated with images of animals as well. The author's intention is obviously to unveil the carnal desire that lies under the cover of a courtly rhetoric. But the image of the Hunter is polysemous and is also related to the figure of the Devil, the eternal hunter stalking souls. Hence, hunt images functions as an axis which articulates all the various interpretations. Seidenspinner-Núñez comes to two important conclusions:

1) Hunt images have an essential role in the structure because they provide the love episodes with a thematic coherence.

2) Hunt images and the themes associated with them attain a didactic and humorous goal by evoking, and therefore parodying the traditions in which they originate.

In light of the doctrines of Saint Augustine, Seidenspinner-Núñez emphasizes the way Juan Ruiz offers his book to the intellectual understanding of his audience, who would have been encouraged to read the images and the entire book on various levels. When read literally, in accordance with the comic-realistic tradition, images may have a humorous effect that contrasts with the didactic content they acquired when interpreted in a figurative way, as done in allegorical commentaries.

There is little doubt regarding the value and importance of the two books here examined. They are indeed essential starting points for further studies. Gail Phillip's *The Imagery of the "Libro de Buen Amor"* and *The Allegory of Good Love* offer two complementary visions. Subsequent research should necessarily take into account the detailed information provided by the former and the suggestions implied in the latter. Nevertheless, neither supplies the ultimate keys which could satisfactorily explain the presence and uses of imagery in Juan Ruiz's book. The characteristics

of the images, their meaning and their function need to be examined rhetorically (as visual elements that help to adorn the *elocutio*) and narratively (as meaningful nuclei that capture the reader's imagination and as motifs that structure the narrative material while they imply a progression in it).

The scope of Phillip's two studies is limited in large part by their lack of clear methodological criteria. They overlook theoretical implications that ought to be posed when considering images in a medieval work. The study of the relationship set around the concept of "image" in visual arts and in literature during the Middle Ages ought to antecede any analysis of a particular text. It must be remembered that the term "image"—taken in a strict sense—originates with reference to the purely visual arts, and therefore to understand its relation to medieval literature we must look to the epistemological doctrines of the period.[23]

The main purpose of these pages is to call attention to the wealth of potential subject matter still open to scholars interested in the study of images in the *Book of Good Love*. Also, in order to indicate a possible approach to further studies in reference to Kolve's work, I will examine the role of image in one particular case. It lies outside the bounds of my intention to indiscriminately apply his conclusions to a work and an author outside the English literary tradition.[24] Rather, I would like to use the appealing perspective of Kolve and the abundance of material he offers as a means of facilitating a more profitable reading of the *Book of Good Love*.

Kolve starts by setting apart the term "image" from those of metaphor and simile. His study focuses on

> those large images created by the narrative action itself
> which invite us to imagine and hold in mind as we ex-
> perience the poem, and which later serve as memorial
> centers around which we are able to reconstruct the story
> and think appropriately about its meaning (p. 2).

These images are characterized as being "iconographically loaded," that is to say, they have a meaning independent of the context in which they appear. The term "iconography"[25] is used here with a very specific meaning, and it should not lead one to think that the critic has in mind a stylistic or a structural comparison[26] between visual arts and literature. Previous to the study of image in literature one must reject the parallel of what are two distinct media, the visual arts and verbal expression.[27] Art and literature, however, did influence each other very much during the Middle Ages. The reasons are well-known: visual arts were used as a means of

teaching illiterates.[28] This happened to the extent that even during the
Renaissance painting was conceived of basically as subordinated to word.
As will be seen below, the knowledge of iconography contributes effec-
tively to our understanding of medieval literature because imagery was part
of the literary competence of the medieval person.

It seems then necessary to inquire about the place assigned to visual im-
agination in the philosophy of the period, and what role it played in the
creation of literature. Many authors have left us testimony that reading,
considering or contemplating, and visualizing were synonymous
processes,[29] but it will serve the matter at hand to cite one in particular.
In 1330, the proposed date of the first surviving version of the *Book of
Good Love*, Guillaume de Deguileville wrote in his *Pilgrimage of Human
Life*[30]

> En veillant avoie leu
> consideré et bien veu
> le biau roumans de la Rose

In other words to read effectively the *Romance of the Rose* one must also
consider and "see" it well. In the *Book of Good Love*, Juan Ruiz repeats
this idea when he says that painting, writing and images were first disco-
vered because man's memory is feeble: "Otrosi fueron la pintura e la scrip-
tura e las imágenes primeramente falladas por razón que la memoria del
omne deleznadera es."[31]

It is striking in this sentence that painting (*pintura*), writing (*escrip-
tura*),[32] and images (*imágenes*) appear in a sequence joined by copulative
conjunctions which place them on the same semantic level. In fact, the idea
reflected in the *Book of Good Love*'s prologue does not differ substan-
tially from that of Richard de Fournival, who maintains that memory has
two doors, the sight and the ear.[33] In effect, both authors are declaring that
painting and writing share the same epistemological status inasmuch as the
final outcome of seeing and reading (or watching a representation)[34] is the
same, namely, the storage of images in the memory.[35]

Memory was considered to be the faculty to which mental images ac-
quired by the understanding (*intellectum*) were entrusted. Its mission was
to make them available to reason and will. Art was thought of as a means
to reinforce the ephemeral memory of man: painting and writing alike
served, as the Archpriest mentions, to strengthen the faculties of the
memory conducive to understanding. Bearing this in mind, the figure of
an Archpriest unable to perceive the world beyond his senses should be dis-
missed. There must be another reason to explain why there is such abun-
dance of images in his book.[36]

In the Middle Ages literal memory was seen as less necessary than conceptual memory. The origin of this idea grounded in the belief that the appropriate words would spring out from the image without effort. This meant that once the image was in the mind the words should flow smoothly: "rem tene, verba sequuntur."[37]

In order to achieve this effect, it was believed that images ought to move and be imprinted in the mind of the reader as they were verbally expressed. The consequence can be immediately drawn: some images were more effective than others, and therefore not all of them have the same value in the narration. Some are mere rhetorical ornaments, confined to figurative importance at a specific point of the narration, while others experience more recurring use and hence become equally important as keys of narrative interpretation in the text. They cause the action to progress in a nonlinear fashion, and simultaneously their symbolism contributes significantly to the global meaning.

The next step after having set down the relative importance of the images will be to choose from the more central images those which would have most captured the medieval imagination. In this process critics run the risk of partiality or arbitrariness by selecting those images especially striking for a contemporary reader, or taking into account only those images that can be used as one more argument toward a previous thesis. The text itself must reveal the relative importance of certain images. The critic should approach the text open-mindedly and ask both what the author, in this case Juan Ruiz, wishes the audience to "see," and how this is achieved. The second touchstone to isolate the relevant images could be to seize upon those that had a place in the literary competence of the medieval audience. That is to say, images recognizable because they belonged to already existing iconographic and literary traditions should be discerned and set in a group. Only after knowing their customary meaning can the critic proceed to establish their originality in the text under examination.[38] A third possible guideline consists in weighing the productivity of each image. In other words, there are some images that work as nuclear centers by articulating others. In a sense, they are the red yarn which runs through the text and serves to unify its various points. But let us go step by step.

Multiple elements inviting one to "see" and to shape in one's mind images of what has been read and listened to can be found in Juan Ruiz's work. This explains why such vivid impressions of life are still gathered from the reading of the *Book of Good Love*. Juan Ruiz, like Chaucer, puts into practice the advice of rhetorical treatises when he sets events and objects before the reader's eyes, "ante oculos ponere."[39]

The *descriptio* was among the most recommended rhetorical devices. Thus, Quintilianus proposed the phrasing of words such that one could not just hear but "see" what was being told, "ita expressa verbi, ut cerni potius videatur quam audiri."[40] Description thus promoted the visualization of what is heard or read, "praesentans oculis quod demonstrat."[41]

A description from the *Book of Good Love* has been selected to exemplify what has been said up to this point. It is a mostly pictorial description of the months of the year represented on Don Amor's tent (st. 1210–1300).[42] The description, which precedes the triumphal parade of Don Carnal and Don Amor, is not original. Its source is the *Libro de Alexandre*.[43] Nevertheless, there are still some particulars that are worth looking at more closely. First of all, the fashion in which the images of the figures of the months are introduced:

> Right at the entrance, on the right-hand side,
> was a table, very fine and well-made;
> before it was a big fire, it gave out a great heat;
> there were eating at the table, each one was spying on the other.
>
> (st. 1270)

The months appear in groups of three, corresponding to the seasons, and each group is personified by a social class: summer is personified by knights, fall by gentlemen (*hidalgos*), winter by the low nobility (*ricos omnes*), and spring by peasants. Each season of the year is connected to these allegorical figures through the activity displayed by each one. Juan Ruiz thereby conveys the impression of an image in movement instead of drawing a picture of motionless figures. The result has been described as a "visual trope" (*retruécano visual*).[44] The temporal relations of the seasons is not expressed chronologically. This is done in various ways. One of them consists in turning events and objects usually conceived in terms of time into actions. The other method used for the same purpose is to substitute the chronological sequence by the illusion of a series of overlapping spacial planes. The audience is thus forced to forget the linear organization typical of linguistic signs in favor of an immediate intuition of the image. All through his book Juan Ruiz introduces temporal realities and expresses them in terms that belong to a spacial world. This device allows the Archpriest to transform abstract concepts directed to the mind into physical objects, easily seizable by the "eye of the mind." Consequently, the length of the months in winter becomes the length of a long pole ("luengo madero," 1271c) while the time of the months in spring could be portrayed as "Gallic staffs" or "beams of a wine press" (vigas de gaula, 1278c).

At first sight it could seem that the entire passage is only rhetorical ornamentation. Its inclusion could even be ascribed to the desire to please an audience who very likely would have remembered its source, the *Libro de Alexandre*. A didactic intention could be adduced as well. It is a fact that some texts were used to teach readers to understand iconographic representations whose sense would be difficult to capture otherwise.[45] Similarly, the contrary occurred when illustrations were created to explain literary texts.[46] Thus, a careful examination of the visual tradition will be useful to clarify why this *estoria*[47] was introduced in the book.

Visual representations of the months of the year were an established method to convey various allegorical ideas.[48] When Juan Ruiz associates the months with chores done in the fields, he is simply following a long and consolidated tradition in allegory.[49] Now, upon a careful reading the frequent use of the verb "to eat" (*comer*) becomes apparent, and one may ask what is the reason for this new insistence on characterizing the months through what they eat. It does not seem unlikely that Juan Ruiz introduces this in order to establish an intentional link with the amorous "task" of the main character.[50] Eating, as an image in reference to sexual activity, and the appetite as an equivalent of sexual desire are recurrent motifs in the *Book of Good Love*. This image plays an important structural role because it links the amorous adventures of the protagonist to the episodes of the book.[51] It seems that the image is introduced into the pictorial description of the months precisely for this reason—to unify it to the work as a whole.

It is also significant that the description of Don Amor's tent occurs as part of his representation as victor because this introduces a second allegorical idea. It relates first of all directly to Alexander and his prowess in battle, and to epic heroes in general. In this way, the author evokes another image constantly associated with love in the *Book of Good Love*: love as war and conquest.[52]

There is still another image linked with the description of the months on Don Amor's tent. Cathedrals were customary places for allegorical representations of the months.[53] These appeared as part of the universe, painted surrounding the figure of the triumphant Christ.[54] Could it not, therefore, be possible to think that this description is a parody of the *Pantocrator*'s figure?[55] This interpretation rests upon the audience's general familiarity with related traditions, but is by no means an untenable assumption.

Kolve was able to isolate in his study one or two main images for each one of the first *The Canterbury Tales*.[56] Unfortunately the same does not seem possible in the case of *Book of Good Love*. Images associated with

hunting, war activities, agricultural tasks, and other domestic chores are piled up in almost every episode. Studies on the subject agree about the way the Archpriest uses images: in general, images from different traditions are superimposed rather than connected in a sequence.[57] Their mission is to confer a structural, aesthetic, and semantic unity to the diverse episodes that integrate the book. The matter at issue is therefore to discern which images are central and which ones are subordinated. Seidenspinner-Núñez has put forth the hunt as the image that organizes and illuminates the reception and understanding of the content; Phillips tends to see deception and destructiveness as the common denominators of all the images; Hart has read the entire book as an image of life as pilgrimage. All three, however, arrive at these conclusions by basing their studies on single episodes. Much more preferable would be a comprehensive approach which took into account and integrated the two central episodes of the *Book of Good Love*. These are the episode of Don Melón and Doña Endrina and that of Don Carnal and Doña Cuaresma, generally accepted as the structural pillars of the text. Let us take a close look at the two.

A very noticeable peculiarity in both quickly calls one's attention. The images of the first belong mainly to the vegetal world, while the images found in the second are related to animals. These two kinds of images may have easily stuck in the mind of the audience because they also appear in other parts of the book. It can be added that the second's relate to the motif of the erotic hunt, which is associated with a long tradition in literature and art. The Archpriest undoubtedly turned to it, and it does not seem unreasonable to think that such a motif was familiar to all sorts of audiences in the Middle Ages. The same can be assumed with regard to images that identify agricultural tasks, physical hunger (result of the necessity to survive, "aver mantenimiento") and sexual desire (that leads to the union with a desirable female, "ayuntamiento con fembra plazentera"), all important elements in the two episodes. Images associated with both hunting and agricultural tasks are to be found in the episodes that constitute the autobiographical narrative and in the fables.[58] They have in common their dynamic nature. In fact, the main feature of images in the *Book of Good Love* is their capacity to express a behavior rather than an attitude. This behavior must follow certain rules: to hunt, to harvest (to love) are codified activities. Furthermore, all of them imply 1) three participants: a hunter, a farmer, or a lover that plays an active role; 2) a means such as a weapon, a tool, or a go-between, and 3) a passive element that can be the prey, the fruit, or the woman. The women is thus degraded till she

becomes an object, but on the other hand she is represented as innocent. Juan Ruiz conveys a picture of women far from that transmitted by the misogynist tradition, according to which women are the primary instigators of all the evil that can be imagined. At the bottom of the *Book of Good Love* there is a parody of both courtly love and the misogynist tradition. After all, the man becomes a victim of his own *ars amandi* and not of the tricks of any woman. To summarize, it can be concluded that both the vegetal and the animalistic imagery are used with two principal aims: from the point of view of the subject they disclose the carnal side of love and deprive the characters of their human nature; from the point of view of the structure they supply the book with a certain degree of unity.

These remarks are not meant as conclusions, but rather to offer a possible point of departure for further studies. Indeed, the images are highly complex and much work is still left to be done. Peculiarities in the images must be explained, so that their sense becomes clear. For instance, one may ask why Venus appears as Love's wife instead of being his mother as is established in classical mythology. Is there by chance a similar case in literature or art? Or, is there any reason that explains why Don Amor is characterized in two different and contradictory ways, first when he converses with the main character, and later in the episode of Don Carnal?

A serious study must be undertaken in order to answer these and other unsolved questions. It is of utmost importance, as I have attempted to show, to realize that such research demands a thorough knowledge of literary and artistic iconography, and their reciprocal influences. Also, the critic must first establish a precise methodology that will prevent him or her from falling all too easily into comparisons and generalizations. That it is possible to do this has been proved by Kolve's monumental study. His proposal for working on what he calls the "imagery of narrative" offers to scholars the possibility of avoiding the kind of excesses committed by certain critics who have applied almost mechanically exegetical commentaries as guides for the reading of medieval literature. In light of medieval epistemology, imagery appears as an aid for memory, and a mode of knowledge. At the same time imagery has a relevant place in the artistic activity. The preceding pages have been a modest beginning to call the attention of scholars towards this interesting field that deserves more serious research. I only have left to ask, like the Archpriest, that

> Whoever hears it, if he knows how they compose poetry,
> may add more to it and mend whatever he wishes to.
>
> (st. 1629)[59]

María Morrás has studied Hispanic Literature at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid. She completed a Master's degree in 1985 under the direction of Professor Francisco López Estrada with a thesis on Alfonso X's *General Estoria*. She is currently a graduate student in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of California, Berkeley where she holds a Regents Intern Fellowship.

NOTES

1. See Colbert I. Nepaulsingh, *Towards a History of Literary Composition in Spanish Medieval Literature*, University of Toronto Romance Series 54 (Toronto, 1986), 15–40.

2. I will mention some recent publications as an indication of how much has been written. The following list does not pretend to be an exhaustive bibliography. George Shipley, *Functions of Imagery in "La Celestina"* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968) and " 'Non erat hic locus': the Disconcerted Reader in Melibea's Garden," *Romanic Philology* 27 (1973–74): 286–303; Raymond E. Barbera, who studied the subject in his dissertation, has published some articles on it as "Medieval Iconography in the *Celestina*," *Romance Review*, 61 (1970): 5–13, and Alan D. Deyermond, "Hilado-cordón-cadena: Symbolic Equivalence in *La Celestina*," *Celestinesca* 1 (1977): 6–12. The *Poem of Mío Cid* has also been the subject of many such studies: Jan A. Nelson, "Initial Imagery in the *Cantar de Mío Cid*," *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 74 (1972): 382–86; Alan D. Deyermond and David Hook, "Doors and Cloaks: Two Image Patterns in the *Cantar de Mío Cid*," *Modern Language Review* 94 (1979): 366–77, and Patrice E. Grieve: "Shelter as an Image-Pattern in the *Cantar de Mío Cid*," *Corónica* 8 (1979): 44–49. Perhaps the most popular topic of iconographical studies have been the works of Berceo: Richard T. Mount, *Berceo: a Study of Imagery in His Works* (Lexington, 1975) and Simina M. Farcasiu, "The Exegesis and Iconography of Vision in Berceo's *Vida de Santa Oria*," *Speculum* 61 (1986): 305–29, and others that will be mentioned. Research about particular images is more abundant. A few include: K. Burt, "A Partial Iconography of the Shoes (*capatas*) in Medieval Spanish Literature," *Romance Notes* 20 (1979–80): 281–85; Joseph Gwara, Jr. "Equine Imagery," *Corónica* 12 (1983): 9–20.

3. Besides the chapter dedicated by John E. Keller and Richard Kinkade in their *Iconography in Medieval Spanish Literature* (Lexington, 1984), several other articles by them should be taken into account, as "Iconography and Literature: Alfonso Himself in *Cantiga 209*," *Hispania* 66 (1983): 348–52. Some other publications on this matter are: Luis Beltrán, "Texto verbal y texto pictórico: las cantigas 1 y 10 del Códice Rico," *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 9 (1985):

329–43, and Charles L. Nelson, *Literary and Pictorical Treatment of the Devil in the "Cantigas de Santa María"* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1964). The dissertation by Connie L. Scarborough, *Visualization vs. Verbalization in Ms. T.J.1 of the "Cantigas de Santa María"* (University of Wisconsin, 1983), offers particular interest. It attempts to explain the divergences between verbal text and illustrations giving three reasons: because of the existence of various versions of a given miracle, because of aesthetical considerations, and because in this way the meaning of the miniatures would have been more clear. A model of her analysis is to be found in "Novel Iconographic Devices in the *Cantigas de Santa María*: Cantiga 113," in *Selected Proceedings: 32nd Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Conference*, ed. Gregorio C. Martín (Wisconsin-Salem, 1984), 185–191. Sometimes illustrations are used as an argument that reinforces a particular interpretation of a text. That is what Reinaldo Ayerbe-Chaux does in "Las *Islas Dotadas*: Texto y manuscrito de París, clave para su interpretación," in *Hispanic Studies in Honor of Alan Deyermond. A North American Tribute*, ed. J. Miletich (Madison, 1986), 31–50. Still more fruitful is the study of those texts of which there are several editions with different illustrations, a fact that allows one to adopt a comparative perspective. It is the case of the important book of Hugo Buchthal, *"Historia Trioana." Studies in the History of Medieval Secular Illustration*, Studies of the Warburg Institute 32 (London, 1971), which stresses the importance of the Spanish version. The same line is followed by Manuel Abad, "La ilustración de portadas de *La Celestina* en siete ediciones del siglo XVI," *Revista de ideas estéticas* 35 (1977): 229–235; J. R. Thome, "Sur des éditions illustrées de *La Celestina* (du XVe au XVIIIe siècle)," *Le livre et ses amis* 2 (1946): 31–36; "Hans Weidtz (Johannes Giudictius): primer ilustrador dramático de *La Celestina*," *Cuadernos de bibliofilia* (1979): 41–50, and José María Díez-Broque, "Edición e ilustración de las novelas de caballerías castellanas en el siglo XVI," *Synthesis* 8 (1981): 21–58. Unfortunately we do not have a catalogue of Spanish medieval illustrated manuscripts, although there are already some partial compilations: John Williams, *Early Spanish Manuscript Illumination* (New York, 1977), and Jesús Domínguez Bordona, *Manuscritos con pinturas; notas para un inventario de los conservados en colecciones públicas y particulares de España* (Madrid, 1933).

4. T. Anthony Perry, *Art and Meaning in Berceo's "Vida de Santa Oria,"* Yale Romanic Studies, 2nd series, 8 (New Haven, 1968); Manuel Alvar, "De arte y literatura. Nuevas apostillas a la *Vida de Santa María Egipciaca*," in *Homenaje a José Manuel Blecua* (Madrid, 1983), 73–84; James A. Parr, "*La Celestina: ut pictura poesis*," (Paper delivered at the Modern Language Association Seminar, New York, 28 December 1974), and "Correspondencias formales entre *La Celestina* y la pintura contemporánea," in *Estudios sobre el Siglo de Oro en homenaje a Raymond R. MacCurdy* (Alburquerque, 1983), 313–326, where the author tries to show how the grouping of characters and the symbolism of the book are related to contemporary painting; María Embeita, "*La Celestina*, obra del renacimiento," "*La Celestina*" y su entorno social. Actas del I Congreso Internacional sobre "La Celes-

tina," under the direction of Manuel Criado del Val, Colección Summa 2 (Barcelona, 1977), 125–134, and Armando Zárate, "La poesía y el ojo en *La Celestina*," *Cuadernos Americanos* 164 (1969): 119–136. The study of the visual aspects is especially appealing in plays or books with dramatic features and in mystic texts. See Julian Weiss, "A Note in Imagery in the *Dança general de la muerte*," *Corónica* 1 (1979): 35–37, and about the second matter Fernando R. de la Flor, "La literatura espiritual del Siglo de Oro y la organización retórica de la memoria," *Revista de Literatura* XLV: 90 (1983): 39–187, and Colin P. Thompson, " 'En la Ascensión.' Artistic Tradition and Poetic Imagination in Fray Luis de León," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Spain and Portugal in Honor of P. E. Russell*, ed. F. W. Hodcroft et al. (Oxford, 1981), 109–120.

5. A. Deyermond and J. Connolly, "La matanza de los inocentes en el *Libre dels tres reys d'Orient*," *El Crotalón* 1 (1984): 733–38, base their reading "espaldas" (I.65) while Alvar prefers to read "espadas"; D. J. A. Ross, "A Funny Name for a Horse: Bucephalus in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages in Literature and Visual Art," *Alexander the Great in the Middle Ages: Ten Studies in the Last Days of Alexander in Literary and Historical Writing. Symposium Interfacultaire Werkgroep Mediaevistik, Groningen, 12–15 October, 1977*, Medievalia Groningana 1 (Nijmega, 1978), 302–303; Margherita Morreale, "Reflejos literarios de la moda del siglo quince," *Filología* VI (1960), 103–109, especially p. 103, n. 14 p. 105, and n. 6 p. 107. She uses pictures of the period to clarify difficult terms in the *Corbacho*.

6. Dorothy Clotelle Clarke, "Juan Ruiz as 'Don Polo,' " *Hispanic Review* 40 (1972): 245–59, is an outstanding example of the usefulness of employing the iconographical tradition to read obscure passages that also present textual difficulties.

7. See Joseph T. Snow, "The Iconography of the Early *Celestinas*: The French Translations (1527)," *Celestinesca* 8 (1984): 25–40. He points out that the illustrations are responsible for the reception and interpretation of the book in France.

8. A useful introduction is T. Garnier, *Le Langue de l'image au Moyen Age. Signification et symbolique* (Paris, 1982). I have not been able to get a copy of R. E. Kaske, *Sources and Methodology for the Interpretation of Medieval Imagery*, Medieval Bibliographical Series 36 (Toronto, 1986).

9. A very representative example of this attitude was Ernst Curtius, whose influence in the field of romance philology is still noticeable. See *Literature europea y Edad Media Latina*, trans. Antonio Alatorre and Margit Frenk Alatorre (México, 1984), 33–35. He was answered by Frederick Pickering, "On Coming to Terms with Curtius," *German Life and Letters* 11 (1958): 335–45, and in *Literature and Art in the Middle Ages* (London, 1970), 61–64.

10. Erwin Panofsky, *The Iconography of Corregio's Camera di San Paolo* (London, 1961); Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (London, 1967); Meyer Schapiro, *Words and Pictures: on the Literal and the Symbolic in the Illustration of a Text*, Approaches to Semiotics, Paperback Series III (The Hague, 1973); E. H. Gombrich, *Symbolic Images: Studies in the Art of Renaissance*,

Studies in the Art of Renaissance 2 (Oxford, 1978). More recent are William S. Heckscher, *Art and Literature. Studies in Relationship*, ed. Egon Verheyen, Saecvla Spiritalia 17 (Durham, North Carolina, 1985) and Linda B. Berenhaum, *Gothic Imagination: Expansion in Gothic Literature and Art* (Rutherford, New Jersey, 1982).

11. Cf. the review by B. W. Fe on Bruno Damiani, *Montemayor's Diana, Music and the Visual Arts*, Spanish Series 9 (Madison, 1983) in *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 62 (1985), 391–392.

12. V.A. Kolve, *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative. The First Five "Canterbury Tales"* (Stanford, 1984).

13. Thomas Hart, *La alegoría en el "Libro de Buen Amor"* Madrid, 1959); cf. the review by Lida de Malkiel, *Romance Philology* 14 (1960-61): 140–43; Roger Walker, " 'Con miedo de la muerte la miel non es sabrose': Love, Sin and Death in the *Libro de Buen Amor*," "*Libro de Buen Amor' Studies*, ed. G. Gybbon-Monypenny (London, 1972), 231–52; Stephen Gilman, "The Juvenile Intuition of Juan Ruiz," *Symposium* 4 (1950): 290–303. Walter Holzinger, "Imagery, Iconography, and Thematic Exposition in the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Iberoromania* 6 (1980): 1–34, can be included in this group. In spite of its promising title, the author maintains that the imagery is subordinated to a didactic intention.

14. Ulrich Leo, *Zur dichterischen Originalität des Arcipreste de Hita* (Frankfurt, 1958); Anthony Zahareas, *The Art of Juan Ruiz* (Madrid, 1965).

15. As a proof I will restrict myself to quote from Carmelo Gariano, *El mundo poético de Juan Ruiz* (Madrid, 1968), 163 and 179, who comments on the importance of the images by saying that they give "a plastic and objective shape to the abstract entities," and concludes that "they contribute effectively to inject warmth and color into the inert clay—be it called form or content."

16. Margherita Morreale, "Esquema para el estudio de la comparación en el *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Studies in Honor of Tatiana Fotitch*, ed. Josep M. Sola-Solé et al. (Washington, 1973), 279–301; F. Weis, "Sprachliche Kunstmittel des Erzpriesters von Hita," *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen* 7 (1934): 164–243, 281–348.

17. See L. O. Vasvari, "La semiología de la connotación. Lectura polisémica de 'Cruz cruzada panadera,' " *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 33 (1983): 299–324; "An Example of 'parodia sacra' in the *Libro de Buen Amor: 'quoniam,' " Corónica* XII (1984): 195–203; "Vegetal-Genital Onomastics in the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Romance Philology* in press. I would like to thank professor Ch. Faulhaber for his kindness in giving me a photocopy of this article.

18. Among the most important works are the following: An L. Grace, "Multiple Symbolism in the *Libro de Buen Amor*: The Erotic Forces of Don Carnal," *Hispanic Review*, 43 (1975): 371–80; Néstor Lugones, "Algo más sobre la viuda tortolica," *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos* 80 (1977): 99–111; Mary-Ann Vetterling, *Animals as Images for Love in the "Libro de Buen Amor" by Juan Ruiz* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1977), and "Animals and Juan Ruiz's Celebration of Women," in *Essays in Honor of Jorge Guillén on the Occassion of His 85th*

Year (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1977), 133–140. The study of the animalistic imagery in other texts has rendered interesting results. See Alan D. Deyermond, *"Lazarillo de Tormes": a Critical Guide* (London, 1975), pp. 63–70.

19. Gail Phillips, *The Imagery of the "Libro de Buen Amor"* (Madison, 1983) and Dayle Seidenspinner-Núñez, *The Allegory of Love: Parodic Perspectivism in the "Libro de Buen Amor,"* University of California Publications in Modern Philology 112 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981).

20. On the other hand, some important aspects on the matter have been overlooked as Louise O. Vasvari points out in her review in *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 9 (1984): 78–82.

21. Cf. Rosemund Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery: Some Medieval Books and Their Posterity* (Princeton, 1977), focused on Spenser's *The Faery Queen*, and John Fleming, *The "Roman de la Rose": a Study in Allegory and Iconography* (Princeton, 1969).

22. Saint Augustine has been often used as a guide to interpret the *Book of Good Love*. His doctrine has become either a means to propose a definition of "good love" based on the distinction between *caritas* and *cupiditas*, or to argue for an open reading. Among the ones who do the first are Colbert I. Nepaulsingh, "The structure of the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Neophilologus* 61 (1977): 58–73; Richard Kinkade, " 'Intellectum tibi dabo': The Function of Free will in the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 47 (1970): 296–315. André Michalski, "La parodia hagiográfica y el dualismo Eros-Tanatos en el *Libro de Buen Amor*," in *El Arcipreste de Hita: el libro, el autor, la tierra, la época. Actas del primer Congreso Internacional sobre el Arcipreste de Hita*, ed. Manuel Criado del Val (Barcelona, 1973), 57–77; Michael Gerli, *"Recta voluntas est bonus amor*, Saint Augustine and the Didactic Structure of the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Romance Philology* 35 (1982–1983): 500–508. Marina Scordilis Brownlee argues for an open reading in *The Status of the Reading Subject in the "Libro de Buen Amor,"* North Caroline Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures 224 (Chapel Hill, 1985). All these base their interpretations on the prologue in prose, added only to the second version of the book. John K. Walsh has pointed out in his review of Brownlee that the ideas there expressed follow rather Saint Bernard's reformulation of Saint Augustine's doctrine. See *Corónica* 15 (1986): 321–26. D. W. Robertson's *A preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives* (Princeton, 1962) has had the greatest influence in the current tendency to use augustinian doctrine as a guide for the reading of medieval texts. The overplus of this kind of criticism has been reported by Frances L. Utley, "Robertsoniasim redivivus," *Romance Philology* 19 (1965): 250–60, and "Must We Abandon the Concept of Courtly Love?" *Medievalia et Humanistica*, new series, 3 (1972): 299–324. A discussion can be found in Charles Donahue, "Patristic Exegesis in the Criticism of Medieval Literature: Summation," in *Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature*, ed. D. Bethurum (New York, 1969), 61–82.

23. Cf. Phillip N. Furbank, "Do We Need the Terms Image and Imagery?" *Critical Quarterly* 9 (1967): 335–45, and *Reflections on the Word 'Image'* (London, 1970).

24. Chaucer and Juan Ruiz have been compared frequently. See M. Hoddap, *Two Fourteenth Century Poets: Geoffrey Chaucer and the Archiprest of Hita* (Boulder, Colorado, 1968), and "Algunas analogías entre el Arcipreste de Hita y Geoffrey Chaucer," in *El Arcipreste de Hita: el libro*, 285–308. Hoddap insists that they share a common cultural heritage, and they make use of the same themes. See also Carol A. Marshall, *Love, Salvation, and Order in the "Libro de Buen Amor" and the "Canterbury Tales"* (Saint Louis, 1973), and Carmelo Gariano, *Juan Ruiz, Boccaccio, Chaucer*, Explicación de textos literarios XII-2 (Sacramento, California, 1983). This assumption is adopted in many works on *Book of Good Love*. Further on some more precise remarks will be made on this matter.

25. Cf. the definition of iconography provided by *The Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford, 1965): "a pictorial representation, a drawing, a plan; any book in which it is done; also a branch of knowledge which deals with representative art in general." This last definition is the one that will be used here.

26. The conclusions reached in these studies are usually too vague. An exception is the comparison between the characters of the *Chanson de Roland* and the stained glasses of a gothic cathedral done by Singleton G. Nichols, *Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography* (Yale, 1983). On the contrary, Mario Praz, *Mnemosine: The Parallel Between Literature and the Visual Arts* (Princeton, 1970), designs an impressionistic parallel between the architecture of gothic cathedrals and the structure of Shakespeare's sonnets. A classical work on the structural approach is due to Frank Farnham, "Romanesque Design in the *Chanson de Roland*," *Romance Philology* 18 (1964): 143–6, who sees a similarity between certain stropes and the polyptych found in the altars of churches, and Theodor Ziokowski, *Disenchanted Images: A Literary Iconology* (Princeton, 1977). In Hispanism the best known example is Helmut Hatzfeld, "El estilo románico en literatura," in *Estudios de estilística* (Barcelona, 1975), 213–29. The best survey on the different critical approaches to the study of the relationship between art and literature is due to Elisabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall, "Pictorial Illustration of Late Medieval Poetic Texts," in *Medieval Iconography and Narrative. Proceedings of the Fourth Symposium Organized by the Centre of the Study of Vernacular Literature in the Middle Ages*, ed. Fleming G. Andersen et al. (Odense, 1980), 100–103. For more bibliography consult this last work.

27. Some critics have reacted against this levelling. In regard to this point, look up Lilian H. Hornstein, "Analysis of Imagery. A Critique of Literary Method," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 57 (1942): 638–53; E. Salter and Derek Pearsall, "Pictorial Illustration," 103; R. Cohen, *Art of Discrimination: Thomson's "The Seasons" and the Language of Criticism* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964), 247 and James Merriman, "The Parallels of the Arts: Some Misgivings and a Faint Affirmation," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 31 (1972–1973): 153–164 and 309–22. Some studies lack in accuracy and limit themselves to general remarks. See Salvatore Battaglia, "Motivi d'arte nel *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Cultura*, 10 (1931): 14–33; Helmut Hatzfeld, "Literatura y arte," *Insula* 6: 65 (1951): 1–2 and 6; Gariano, *Mundo Juan Luiz*; Gisela Tadlock, "La imagen

gráfica en el *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 11 (1977): 365–379; Isabel Mateo, "El Arcipreste y el arte de su tiempo," in *El Arcipreste de Hita: el hombre* 483–487.

28. On this aspect a fundamental study is that of Franz Bäuml, "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy," *Speculum* 55 (1980): 237–65.

29. An article that refers to this question, but with a different purpose is Margit Frenk Alatorre, "Ver, oír, leer," in *Homenaje a Ana María Barrenechea*, ed. Lía Schwartz Lerner and Isaías Lerner (Madrid, 1984), 235–240.

30. Quoted by Kolve, *Chaucer*, 9. Cf. also 10–12 and 31. Other examples are in Douglas Kelly, *Medieval Imagination. Rhetoric and the Poetry of Courtly Love* (Madison, 1978), 35.

31. All the quotations are taken from the translation by Raymond S. Willis, *El Libro de Buen Amor* (Princeton, 1972). In this case, p. 8. Textual problems will not be considered in this paper. However, it must be remembered that the study of Juan Ruiz's book in contrast with Chaucer's works, implies special problems: almost nothing is known about the author, there is more than one versions of the book, the manuscripts are quite defective, it has not yet been determined for sure the type of audience the work was intended for, etc.

32. This reading discards the correction proposed by Giorgio Chiarini, who reads "Esc[ul]ptura" in his critical edition (Milano-Napoli, 1964), 6.

33. Quoted by Kolve, *Chaucer*, n. 27 p. 38.

34. For the moment I lay aside the debate about the oral or written transmission of the *Book of Good Love*. G. Gybbon-Monypenny, "The Spanish *Mester de clerecía* and its Intended Public: Concerning the Validity as Evidence of Passages of Direct Address to the Audience," in *Medieval Miscellany Presented to Eugène Vinaver*, ed. F. Whitehead et al., (Manchester, 1965), 230–44, has defended that the book was actually read; while John K. Walsh, "The Genesis of the *Libro de Buen Amor*, From Performance Text to *libro* or *cancionero*" (Paper delivered at the Modern Language Association Conference, San Francisco, 29 December 1979), thinks that it was represented. The different types of reception have some repercussions in the understanding of the images. In regard to this point, see Kolve, *Chaucer*, 11–18.

35. On memory, see Murray Wright Bundry, *The Theory of Imagination in the Classical and Medieval Thought*, Illinois Studies in Literature and Language 2 and 3 (Urbana, Illinois, 1927); Paolo Rossi, *Arti mnemoniche e logica combinatorio da Lullo a Leibniz* (Milano-Napoli, 1960), 1–19; Frances Yates, "Medieval Memory and the Formation of Imagery," *The Art of Memory* (Chicago, 1977), 82–104 and "The art of Ramón Lull," *Journal of Warburg and Courtald Institute* 17 (1954): 115–117 and Harry Caplan, "Memoria: Treasure. House of eloquence," in *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric*, ed. Anne King and Helen North (Ithaca, 1970).

36. There is still a study to be done on *ars memorativa* in Spain. John K. Walsh has pointed out the existence of a *Rules of Memory* (*Reglas de la Memoria*) written at the beginning of the fifteenth century. A copy of it is in the Library of the

University of Salamanca. For more information about this, see Walsh, *El coloquio de la memoria, la voluntad y el entendimiento (Biblioteca Universitaria de Salamanca MS. 1.763) y sus manifestaciones en la literatura española*, Pliegos Hispánicos 3 (New York, 1986). Other Spanish texts on memory are Pedro Mejía, *Silva de varia lección, 1540*, Segunda serie 11 (Madrid, 1933), cap. VIII "On How Memory Can Suffer Partial Damage and in Particular Things" ("De cómo la memoria se puede dañar en parte y en cosas señaladas"). It is a summary of the theories about memory known in the period. Mejía takes his ideas from Aristotle, Avicena, Cicero, Saint Thomas, etc. About the Renaissance, see Fernando R. de la Flor, "Literatura espiritual."

37. This is Cicero's advice to speakers. Quoted by H. Caplan, "Memory: Treasure," 232.

38. The centuries that separate us and the intended audience constitutes a real barrier to proper understanding. In the case of parody, it is especially important to consider a text within its cultural context. Regarding the case at hand the parody of contemporary literary conventions necessitates a sound knowledge of them (genres, topics, intertextual influences, etc.). Similarly, the scholar must attempt to recover all those cultural, linguistic, and nonlinguistical elements (folklore, biblical and legal knowledge, iconography) that compounded the socio-cultural and aesthetic background shared by the Archpriest and his audience.

39. Annotated bibliogrpahy in Kolve, *Chaucer*, n. 1 pp. 395–96.

40. Quintiliano, *Instituto Oratoria*, 9, II, 40. Quoted by Heinrich Lausberg, *Manual de retórica literaria* (Madrid, 1968), vol. 2, 225.

41. Quoted by Edmund Faral, *Les artes poétiques de XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*, 1924, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes 238 (Paris, 1982), 74. See also Harriet Goldberg, "Personal Descriptions in Medieval Texts: Decorative or Functional?" *Hispanófila* 87 (1986): 1–12. She suggests that portraits in Spanish medieval literature were more visually designed than those found in other literatures.

42. About this type of descriptions related to a large amount of murals, tapestries, and ornamental bas-reliefs, see Elisabeth Lee Harris, *The Mural as a Decorative Device in Medieval Literature* (Nashville, 1935).

43. There are a number of studies on this episode. See: Edmundo Forastieri, "La descripción de los meses en el *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Revista de Filología Española* 55 (1972): 213–32; N. E. Alvarez, "El recibimiento en la tienda de D. Amor en el *Libro de Buen Amor* a la luz del *Libro de Alexandre*," *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 53 (1976): 1–15; H. S. Martínez, "La tienda de amor, espejo de la vida humana," *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 26 (1977): 56–95, Mary-Ann Lee Vetterling, "Juan Ruiz's Version of Alexander the Great," *Corónica* 7 (1978–79): 23–28; Barbara Kurtz, "De la obra de la tienda de Don Amor: facetas de la alegoría del *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Romance Notes* 33 (1986): 181–89.

44. B. Kurtz, "Tienda de Don Amor," 189.

45. The subsidiary position of pictures in regard to texts in the Middle Ages has been frequently mentioned: A. L. Harris, *Mural,* 56; R. Tuve, *Allegorical Imagery,*

114; E. H. Gombrich, "The Evidence of Images," in *Interpretation: Theory and Practice*, ed. Charles S. Singleton, John Hopkins Humanities Seminar 9 (Baltimore, 1969), 97; Siton Ringborm, "Some Pictoral Conventions for the Recounting of Thoughts and Experiences in Late Medieval Art," in *Medieval Iconography and Narrative*, 69.

46. I will not try to point to a particular picture as direct source for this passage as has been done in regard with the *Libro de Alexandre*. See Pilar Liria, "El *Libro de Alexandre* and the Paintings in San Isidoro de León," *Corónica* 10 (1981): 83 and For the *Book of Good Love* see T. M. Rossi, "Para una lectura de las estrofas 1270–1300," *Medievum Romanicum* (1979): 363–71.

47. I prefer to use the term in the original Spanish. See note 49.

48. About its presence in other medieval texts, see L. Biadene, "*Carmina de Mensibus* di Bonvesin de la Riva," *Studi di Filologia Romanza*, 4 (1903): 1–30 and Eugenio Asensio, "El *Auto dos quatro tempos* de Gil Vicente," *Revista de Filología Española* 33 (1949), 350–370.

49. "Estoria," literally "story," means both "sequence of illustrations that narrates a story" and "narration." In this case the word keeps both meanings. About the senses and uses of this term in Spanish literature one must consult José Amador de los Ríos, *Historia crítica de la literatura española*, 1863, vol. 4 (Madrid, 1969), 613–14 and José Manuel Blecua, in his edition of the *Conde Lucanor*, Clásicos Castalia 9 (Madrid, 1969), 61 n. 100. See also Francisco Marcos Marín, "*Estoria* como representación secuencial: nota sobre el *Libro de Buen Amor*, desde Alfonso X, el *Libro de Alexandre*, el *Conde Lucanor* y otras referencias," *Archivum* 27–28 (1977–78): 523–28; J. Pircusi, "The Meaning of 'estoria' in Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor*," *Hispania* 61 (1978): 459–65 and S. Kirby, " 'Escripto con estoria' (*Libro de Buen Amor*, est. 1571c)," *Romance Notes* 14 (1972–73): 631–35.

50. B. Kurtz, "Tienda de Don Amor," 189, connects these stanzas with the next episode.

51. Cf. the images listed by G. Phillips, *Imagery*, under the headings of"Food," "Plant," "Fruit," "Farming," and "Domestic." See also the remarks by James Burke, "Imagery of Swallowing and Associated Themes in the *Libro de Buen Amor*," *Corónica* 5 (1975): 125. For the same matter in other works, see A. D. Deyermond " 'El que quiere comer el ave.' Melibea como artículo de consumo," in *Estudios románicos dedicados al profesor Andrés Soria Ortega en XXV aniversario de la Cátedra de Literaturas Románicas*, ed. Jesús Montoya Martínez and Juan Paredes Núñez (Granada, 1985), vol. I, 291–300.

52. Cf. also "Battle," "Capture," "Destruction," "Wound," and "Weapon" at the index of G. Phillips, *Imagery*.

53. See Emile Mâle, *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Dora Nussey (New York, 1973).

54. Cf. Forastieri, "Descripción de los meses," 220.

55. In iconography during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the image of Love is associated on one hand with the devil and on the other with the figure of

Christ. This fact backs the interpretation given above. In the *Book of Good Love* the images of Don Amor and the Devil are linked by their stature. Both are big, contrasting with the traditional picture of Cupid portrayed as a child, and both are said to be handsome. It was not infrequent in painting to find Cupid with attributes taken either from Christ or from the Devil. There is no reason to reject the possibility that attributes of the two figures could be simultaneously present in this case. For illustrations see Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* (London, 1961), n. 22 p. 76, p. 103, n. 98 p. 105, p. 273. M. Gerli, "Love and the Seven Deadly Sins in the *Libro de Buen Amor,*" *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 16 (1982): 67–80, has pointed to several sermons in which this identification also occurred.

56. Caps. III-V. The images are those of the prison of love, animalistic images, the Flood, of a runaway horse, and of a ship adrift.

57. Cf. Seidenspinner-Núñez, *Allegory of Love*, 46–48 and G. Phillips, *Imagery*, 32, 34, 55, 88, 125, etc.

58. Cf. n. 34.

59. Willis, *Libro de Buen Amor*, 436.