

### ***Rhetoric in the Estoria de Espanna of Alfonso el Sabio***

**Abstract:** The redactors of the two Alfonsine histories are perhaps more grammatical than rhetorical; the free Castilian versions of their Latin originals are more notable for their clarity than for their eloquence. The editors do, however, apply two figures of rhetoric routinely throughout their text, *transitio* and *aetiologia*. A few passages on the *Estoria de Espanna* go much further. Two narratives there feature dramatic application of two Quintilianesque figures of amplification, *comparatio* and *ratiocinatio*. Other sections display a sort of quasi-classical prose, notable for its artful *isocola* and antitheses, and marked by a fine concern for prose rhythm. This last feature might suggest that the compilers had some knowledge of the *ars dictaminis*.

**Keywords:** Alfonso el Sabio, *Primera Crónica General*, *Estoria de España*, historiography, rhetoric.

Nearly three centuries after Alfonso X and his collaborators composed the *Estoria de Espanna* (henceforth *EE*), Giovanni Antonio Viperano (1569) wrote a treatise on the art of history entitled *De scribenda historia*. Many of the themes in this short work have a familiar ring, others perhaps less so. In the first chapter we are told that history should be at once true and edifying, and that there should be no incompatibility between the two. *Prodesse et delectare* should also be the rule; however earnest and truthful the historian may be, he writes in vain if he does not please his audience. In chapter V Viperano explicitly assimilates the historian to the orator. Echoing a passage in Cicero's *De inventione* he says that public speakers were the first teachers of humankind, and that historians, given their high calling, are the heirs of those early heroes. Successive chapters pursue in detail this merging of orator and historian by proposing a rhetoric of history, a historian's *inventio*, a historian's *dispositio*, a historian's *elocutio*. In chapter XII, *De cura verborum*, Viperano addresses the matter of

*delectatio* openly; the historian's style should be pleasant and flowing, neither too eloquent nor too plain; his prose should be *numerosa*, that is to say, rhythmic. In chapter XIV, *De narratione*, the author follows the agenda of the classic handbooks. The historian's narration must be succinct but clear. Oddly enough, Viperano seems to be not greatly interested in verisimilitude; if the historian's narrative is true, as it should be, it should have no difficulty seeming to be true. But significantly, he asks that the historian address the feelings of his readers, and that he decorate his narrative with plentiful *enargeia*, vivid description.

*De scribenda historia* is a modest enough essay on its subject; many details of its argument are barely relevant to the actual practice of Alfonso and his collaborators. Viperano is interesting to us for one reason above all; he gives a very fair account of what many persons of letters over the centuries thought was the close link between rhetoric and history. As we begin our discussion of rhetoric in Alfonso's great history of Spain, his text will give us a very fair idea of what we are looking for. I say this without prejudice; our search may find its object or it may not. There are in fact many ways that the *Estoria de Espanna* does not seem to be very rhetorical, at least in the informal sense of the word. Its prose, for example, is over long stretches very unclassical. There are, for example, sentences with endless independent clauses joined together by the conjunction *e*, the whole interrupted occasionally by some sort of explanatory remark; or inversely, the text could give us successions of parallel dependent clauses, a pattern which sometimes produces a mild bewilderment in the reader. The very genre of the *Estoria*, a historical compilation in the vernacular, would not seem to leave much room for the invention and elaboration Viperano envisages. Ironically, his proposition that the truth of history obviates the need to strive for verisimilitude is part of the conception of history of the Alfonsine compilers; the Latin sources of the *EE* are *auctoritates* whose message is being transmitted to an audience of latter days, and tautologically, it is the authority of the *auctor* that guarantees the truth of the text at hand. That authority is all that the reader/listener needs in order to be convinced that he is hearing the truth, and the editor therefore has no need to tease him/her into credulity.

Francisco Rico, writing about Alfonso's *General estoria* (RICO 1972: 167-188) has proposed an elegant hypothesis to account for the design and pattern of the typical Alfonsine historical text. The editors of the *Estoria* are not simply translators of their *auctoritates*, they are

grammarians-explicators of those older texts. Surviving Late Antique and medieval glosses and commentaries on poets and others gives us a fair idea of what grammarians were supposed to do as they faced their students. The master explained the text at hand at every level; he unraveled questions of lexicon, grammar and syntax, he explicated figures of rhetoric and reduced them to their plain sense, he identified the historical figures mentioned in the text, he explicated mythological allusions, he expanded place-names, and if the poet broached philosophical questions, as Virgil does in *Aeneid* VI, he could identify the type of philosophy being expounded. The aim of the grammarian's *lectio* was clarity; the student should be left in no doubt about the meaning or meanings of his text. Now the editors of the *EE* in fact expand on their Latin sources heavily, and they do not do so in vain. They are indeed virtual grammarians. Unfamiliar terms are explained; the compilers inherit from their sources the word *teatro* (chapter 78) and *legion* (chapter 77); both words are given lengthy explanations. Figures of rhetoric are pointed out and in some cases explicated. Names of places and of historical persons are identified. The resulting Castilian text is clarity itself; the reader/listener has before him everything he needs to make sense of the matter at hand. The assimilation of compiler and grammarian is nearly complete.

Alfonso's treatment of rhetorical figures deserves special attention. The key source here is Lucan. In the pages of the *EE* on the struggle between Pompey and Julius Caesar, the great Roman civil war, one of the principal *auctoritates* is Lucan's *Pharsalia*. How such an extravagantly baroque and Shakespearean poem could be adapted to the bloodless prose of the *Estoria* is not a small question. I need not comment on the success of the undertaking except to say that some of the most striking passages in Alfonso's account are those based on the great Latin poem. In Alfonso's text, in any case, the figures of rhetoric in the *Pharsalia* are an object of special attention. The editors mark them in several ways. First, the primary narrator attributes them directly to their Latin source with a formula such as "dize Lucano en aqueste lugar". The redactor here plainly takes on the voice of the grammarian; the introductory clause marks the boundary between his simple transmission of the authoritative text and his explication of it. One must explain. Frequently when an *auctor* quoted in Alfonso abandons narrative for something else, *sententiae*, perhaps, or moralizing comments of some sort, the redactor heads the passage with a clause like "segund cuentan las estorias" or "aqui dize Orosio". In these cases the editor-glossator is calling attention to his source-text

and pointing out to the reader the boundaries between the different kinds of discourse there, most obviously between the narrative, which is the main business of the historical text, and something secondary. Lucan's figures of rhetoric plainly fall into that second class and are grouped with the other non-narrative elements in the sources. What else does the editor-commentator do with Lucan's turns of rhetoric once they have been identified? Several things. Here are some examples. Julius Caesar, contemptuous of all right, crosses the Rubicon and begins his invasion of Italy. The *EE* says, "dize aqui Lucano que andaua alli Julio Cesar como el leon contral caçador, que desde se assanna non dubda en ninguna cosa de meterse por ell arma." (Alfonso, p. 67b). This comes from the first book of the *Pharsalia*, verses 205-212: "So on the untilled fields of sultry Libya, when the lion sees his foe at hand, he crouches down at first uncertain till he gathers all his rage; but soon, when he has maddened himself with the cruel lash of his tail, and made his mane stand up", once wounded, "he passes on along the length of the weapon, careless of so sore a wound" (Lucan, Duff's translation). One could say, minimally, that the vernacular version loses much of the flavor of the original. In our second example the *EE* is rather more faithful to Lucan's text. In the battle before Lérída the opposing Roman armies begin to fraternize, but tragically, Petreius harangues the men on Pompey's side, and the battle is rejoined. Lucan has: "So, when wild beasts have lost the habit of the woods and grown tame in a narrow prison, they lose their grim aspect and learn to submit to man; but, if a drop of blood finds its way to their thirsty mouths, their rage and fury return" &c. (IV, vv. 237-240; Duff's translation). The Alfonsine version of these lines is not inaccurate, but the heading supplied by the editors is significant: "onde aduze aqui la estoria una *semeiança* sobreste ferir et dize assi"(p. 74a); the emphasis is mine. The "*semeiança*" is of course new; in this case the redactor does not explicate the simile (as a grammarian might), but he does identify it.

In our next example, by contrast, the grammarian exercises all of his authority. Let us begin with Lucan; the *Pharsalia* tells us that when Julius Caesar was about to cross the Rubicon, he saw in a vision Rome herself personified. Duff's translation runs: "When he reached the little river Rubicon, the general saw a vision of his distressed country" ("ingens visa duci patriae trepidantis imago") (I, 186). After a few verses describing the distraught face of the personified nation, Rome is represented as addressing Caesar, imploring him not to invade Italy. The *EE* gives us a full interpretation of the passage: "E segund lo que

dend dize aqui Lucano, mostros le en figura de muger (Rome), et que era aquello cuemo en semeiança de la magestad dell imperio de Roma” (p. 67a). There follows a description of the unhappy face of the personified nation. The lines quoted rationalize Lucan’s account by turning the object of Caesar’s horrifying experience into allegory; the figure that Caesar sees and hears symbolizes an abstraction, the majesty of Rome. Is this explication legitimate? Let us consider for a moment what the poet might have intended here. I am not a specialist in Latin poetry, but it seems to me that for the purposes of the moment Lucan imagines that Rome had an entelechy, a sort of collective soul, and that it was this entity which was supposed to have appeared to Caesar to dissuade him from his evil plans. But whatever Lucan meant, it is clear that the Alfonsines have destroyed completely any possibility of poetic illusion. Something is missing. Personified abstractions do not terrify great generals. The editors’ attempts to clear up obscurities go astray, and what is worse, the *Pharsalia*’s striking figure loses much of its force in the vernacular text.

I offer a final example. In Lucan’s account of the battle before Lérida there is a brief bit of *enargeia*, a fine description of the natural setting (IV 11-23). The *EE* translates these lines faithfully, but the editors introduce them with a prosaic explanation: “et Lucano por mostrar el lugar fasta o auia uenido Julio Cesar en Espanna, quando la primera contienda fallo y de aquella uez, diz assy” (p. 70a). What was decorative, or perhaps evocative in Lucan becomes prosaic and referential in Alfonso. For the editors of the *EE* Caesar’s progress across Spain is vastly more important than the imposing scenery around Lérida, and so the integrity and logic of the narrative is maintained at the expense of an elegant bit of description. I would add that the *EE*’s lines on Lérida make up one of the few pieces of vivid description in the whole work. So also is the Alfonsines’ translation of Lucan in the passage I have quoted on the distraught appearance of personified Rome.

I return to two earlier observations of mine. First, in the Alfonsine histories the authority of the *auctor* guarantees the truth of the vernacular text, and so, in a sense, rhetorical elaboration is not necessary. Second, the Alfonsine editor, like a grammarian, does everything he can to make the authoritative text clear; he explains obscure details, expands, links things together logically, all so that the reader/listener can be in no doubt about what the *auctor* is supposed to have said.

Generally speaking, then, the *EE*'s presentations are often elaborate, but are neither decorative nor evocative; they do not address the affects and imaginations of their audience. We must qualify this picture somewhat. First of all, we must understand that the compilers of both of Alfonso's histories take great initiatives with respect to their inherited material. Rhetorical or not, there is much that is new and distinctively Alfonsine in both works, both with respect to structure and design and to subject matter. In parts of the Roman section of the *EE*, for example, there are stretches of narrative that are coherent, strong, logical and thematically weighty way beyond the plain sense of their sources. We will return to this whole matter presently. Second, high style, with all its works and pomps, is not completely absent from the *EE*; it is, to be sure, unevenly distributed, and it could be said that the rhetorical devices that appear in the text are applied in some places in a perfectly routine way, but in others with fine effect.

In considering rhetoric in the *EE* then, we must look in turn at routine matters and at weighty. First, there is what could irreverently be called kitchen rhetoric, figures in particular, which are applied in a perfectly routine way and which do not contribute greatly to the substance or design of the whole text. The Alfonsines like transitions. Here are some. At the end of chapter 83 we have: "Estas razones diximos de Ponpeyo por las Espannas dond era sennor el; et agora contaremos de los fechos de Julio Cesar et deste Ponpeyo el grand." (pp. 61b-62a). At the end of chapter 92 the text runs: "Mas agora dexaremos de fablar del [Pompey], et contaremos de las gentes que uinieron en su ayuda" (p. 68a). Here is a more complicated example; one which occurs in mid-chapter: "Estando Ponpeyo en esto, llegal mandado cuemo era muerto aquel rey Mitridates de Armenia que daua tanta contienda a los romanos. Onde diremos agora aqui deste rey en su muert esto poco." (p. 60b). Formulae like these appear everywhere in the *EE*. *Transitio* is of course one of the figures of diction listed in Book IV of the *Ad Herennium*. This figure "briefly recalls what has been said, and likewise briefly sets forth what is to follow next." (*Ad herennium* IV 35; Caplan's translation); None of the *transitiones* in the *EE* that I know of correspond to anything in the prevailing source; they are added by the editors.

The compilers of the *EE* like to give reasons. Whenever the *auctor* of the moment fails to specify a cause, the compilers are quick to supply one. Now the figure *aetiologia* does not appear in the list in the fourth book of the *Ad Herennium*, but it does in Isidore's *De arte*

*rhetorica* (Isidore 2. 21. 39). Here is his description: “Aetiologia est, cum proponimus aliquid eiusque causam et rationem reddimus”. Isidore’s work is not an obscure text; his list of figures appears in at least one important handbook of *dictamen*, the *Introductiones dictandi* of Transmundus (Transmundus, p. 14). *Aetiologia* and its definition aside, the idea that a narrative text might include explanations would hardly have seemed strange in Alfonso’s time. Virtually every ancient text on *narratio* says that the verisimilitude of a story is enhanced, if the motives of the characters are specified. As we shall see presently, the *EE* exceptionally does indeed tell one very lively story, one in which the etiologies do indeed contribute to the verisimilitude of the account. This is the passage about Dido and the Phoenicians. But by a vast margin most of the Alfonsine etiologies have little to do with making stories lifelike. Once again, what is at issue is clarity and strong narrative logic. The explanatory bits are in great part deductions on the pattern *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. The source narrates event A and then event B, and the Alfonsine version says that event B happened because of event A. Or more broadly, the situation described by the *auctor* is read by the compiler as explaining the event or events that follow. Chapter 81 has the following: “E pues que Mitridaes uio los de la çibdat tan esforçados, et que se tenien tan bien, et cuemol yazien los romanos dell otra part, et cuemo se le yuan parando mal las sus yentes, ouosse a leuantar dalli, et fue” (p. 59a). All but the final clause is new. The lines in chapter 81 immediately preceding the above are based on Orosius VI 2: 14-15; they tell the following. Cyzicum, a city loyal to Rome, is besieged by Mithridates. Lucullus, heading a large Roman army, is unable to reach the city; geography is against him. He is, however, able to inflict considerable damage on Mithridates and his army. However, the Roman general wishes to send a messenger to Cyzicum to urge the citizens to stand firm, “que esforçassen et se touiessen bien” (p.59a). In time the courier materializes, a hardy swimmer, and word gets through. The Alfonsine composer of the etiology assumes that the besieged really did stand firm as Lucullus wished. The “esforçassen et se touiessen bien” of the presumed message is of course echoed almost exactly in the etiology. The resolve of the city’s defenders is deduced, and the plain fact that Lucullus’ forces were superior make up, not unreasonably, Mithridates’ motive for lifting the siege and moving on.

Our next example is much simpler. At the beginning of chapter 86 we have the following: “pues que Julio Cesar uio a Ponpeyo en la uenida de sus conquistas recebido en la corte de Roma tan

onradamiente cuemo auemos dicho, ouo ende tan grand enuidia, que segund cuentan las estorias, aqui se començo a assannar et a descubrir se contra el” (p. 62a). Pompey’s clamorous reception in Rome is the subject of the preceding chapter, and the account of his brilliant campaigns fills up many pages before. Caesar, as one might say, has a great deal to be envious about, but in the lines quoted, for a fact, the compilers, completely on their own, tell us why he is jealous of Pompey. Once again, this passage is completely typical of many of the etiologies in the *EE*. We should note, by the way, that Caesar’s envy is itself explanatory and etiological; it explains why he himself undertook his major military campaigns, in Spain and Gaul and in Italy itself. The “estorias” mentioned in our text are actually singular; it is chapter 10 of the *Historia romanorum* of Rodrigo Toledano. The lines in this text on the envy of Caesar become a sort of topic in the *EE*’s Civil War episode and is, in fact one of the elements that hold this extraordinary narrative together. As Pompey’s military successes multiply and he is the more admired, so is Caesar’s envy the more aroused, until he actually takes to the field himself. What for the Alfonsines is interesting in Caesar’s passion is of course not psychology, but statecraft, the threats to the well-being of the commonwealth; when Fortune assigns high place to more than one great man at a time the state is in grave danger.

Nature abhors a vacuum, and sometimes so also does Alfonso’s history. Orosius, VI 8:19-22, tells us that in Aquitania Publius Crassus is faced with an open rebellion against Rome. But what was Crassus doing in Aquitania in the first place? Orosius does not tell us. But in chapter 88 the *EE* does: “enuiaron los romanos a Espanna sos mandaderos a recabdar los derechos de la tierra como solien” (p. 63b). The Spaniards, for years knowing nothing but peace, tired of paying tribute, saying that they were getting nothing in return (p. 63b). The Senate therefore sends Crassus to Aquitania, equated to Gascony and presumably considered part of Spain. The ‘recabdar los derechos de la tierra’ fills the bill; it explains what Crassus was doing on the scene in Aquitania. The “recabdar los derechos” &c. and what follows is not original; it is a broad allusion to a narrative in Caesar’s *De bello gallico* III:7, parallel to the one in Orosius.

There are dozens of etiologies in the *EE* like those we have examined. Barely any of them have a basis in the sources of the texts in which they appear. What they bring to the discourse of the *EE* are, of course, continuity and logic. *Transitio* and *aetiologia*, then, are rhetoric’s two great gifts to the *EE*; does that great art ever bring

anything more interesting to Alfonso's masterpiece? Does, for example, the *EE* ever make the great compromises with its audience that Viperano considered so essential to historical writing? Are Alfonso's narratives ever convincing, addressing not only the minds of its readers, but also their sensibilities and imaginations? The answer is yes; drama and eloquence are not completely lacking in our *Estoria*. I must supply some background. In 1955 Menéndez Pidal showed convincingly that the first 108 chapters of the *Primera crónica general* – equivalent to *EE* – formed a virtually independent unit within the larger work; according to him, it is almost certain that Alfonso himself had a hand in the redaction of these pages (Alfonso 1955, pp. XXII-XXIV). I myself am convinced that generally this set of chapters is put together with great care and forethought. There are, as I think, three narratives within these chapters which rank among the best-formed in the whole *EE*. These are the Civil War episode, to which I have alluded, the passage about the Phoenicians, Dido and Carthage, and the string of chapters about Scipio Africanus. One must say that the first of these, the Civil War passage, is in great part written in the normal Alfonsine style, devoid of fine phrases and evocation. It is, however, remarkable for its strong thematic focus and for its coherence and inner logic. The other two narratives offer quite a bit more, a modest show of artistic prose and the conspicuous application of a few tropes and figures of speech and thought. The last of these texts, the one on Scipio, is marked also by an application of two of Quintilian's figures of amplification, *comparatio* and *ratiocinatio*; the use of figures that are distinctively Quintilianesque is, as I would think, remarkable in itself.

Let us begin with the lines on Tyre, Dido and Carthage. The Alfonsines put this episode in an odd place, just after the fall of Numancia and just before Rome's definitive triumph over the Carthaginians. The story thus carries us far back; after telling us of the three great wars between Rome and her greatest enemy, the *EE* tells of the origin and rise of that great rival. The Alfonsines' principal source for the Dido episode is Justin's *Epitome of the Phillipic Histories of Pompeius Trogus* (Justin 1972). The editors of the *EE* do draw from Justin elsewhere in the history, but only fragments, single narrative motifs. The Dido-Carthage passage is the only one in the *EE* based on a long, continuous stretch of the *Epitome*. Justin's text here is by any standards very unlike most of the other narrative sources of the *EE*. The narrative smacks more of legend than history, but this is not the difficulty; Alfonso's histories are full of legendary material. What

is remarkable about the Dido story is that line by line it has the character of romance; there is family melodrama, a hidden treasure, the loves and hates of individuals, elaborate ruses, murders and the like, and relatively little that could be called public or historical. Justin's story runs as follows. The Phoenicians, beset by unfriendly neighbors and moving from site to site, eventually settle in Tyre, where they prosper and overcome the Persians, who are their bitterest enemies. But good fortune turns to bad; there is a bloody uprising of slaves against their masters, and scarcely any free person is left alive. One kindly slave, however, does spare his master, and he in turn instructs the former slave in a ruse that in time wins him the crown; the freedman becomes king and the founder of a dynasty. One of his successors --Justin calls him Mutto, and the *EE*, Carthon-- has two children, Pygmalion and Dido/Elissa. The young man becomes king, and his sister, having reached a certain age, is married to her father's brother Acherba, a priest in the temple of Hercules. Acherba is a person of great wealth, but, being suspicious of the king, he keeps the treasure hidden. Pygmalion indeed hopes to acquire Acherba's goods and has him murdered. But all is in vain; he cannot find the treasure. Dido, accompanied by some of the great in the kingdom, flees Tyre; she takes the treasure with her. To assure her possession of it she devises the following ruse. She sends word to Pygmalion that she plans to rejoin him. On the presumed trip home her ships and those of Pygmalion are sailing together, and at one point she manages to have some sacks full of sand fall into the sea, as it were, by accident. She wails piteously, declaring that the bags contained Acherba's treasure. From that point on Dido has nothing to fear from her brother. She founds Carthage, a city which in time becomes famous for its wealth and feared for its power. The queen's death is dramatic. A powerful prince wishes to marry her and tricks her into a virtual acceptance. Dido realizes her mistake, and faithful to the ashes of Acherba and, as a woman of honor unwilling to go back on her word, she commits suicide.

One could well ask how the Alfonsine editors could possibly recount a set of adventures like this one in the factual, strictly referential, non-evocative prose they seem to favor. The short answer is that they do not. Here is the *EE*'s transitional passage which leads us from the victory over the Persians to the days of the bloody insurrection: "Uentura, que non dexa las cosas ficar en un estado, aguiso assi, que los de Tiro maguer se sabien guardar de los enemigos de fuera, non se sopieron guardar de los de dentro" (p. 32a). These

elegant lines have no parallel in Justin. The passage is of course a sustained personification decorated with an antithesis –“los de fuera...los de dentro”. The bloody uprising of course lends itself to drama, and in fact within a few lines of the Uentura piece there are two more short stretches of prose which could surely be called eloquent. The first, once again, has no analogue in Justin. It highlights the horror of the moment: “mataron los todos en un dia [the masters], assi que no fico uaron ni pequenno ni grand que todos no fuessen muertos; e de las mugieres las enfermas e las uieias que no eran pora casamiento” (p. 32a). The whole list of the victims makes up an effective *accumulatio*, and the “ni pequenno ni grand”—neither the base-born nor the great--makes up a fine antithesis; the last two phrases, “de las mugieres.....” and “las uieias”, make a fair isocolon. A few lines further along we are told of the slave that saves his master. The latter is a kindly man who treats his servant well. The *EE* says of the slave: “E por ende quando el uio que los otros matauan sos sennores, ouo muy grand duelo de los sos: dell uno por que era muy uieio, e dell otro por que era ninno; e por end no los quiso matar, mas escondiolos en un lugar much apartado, e siruielos, e fazeles mucho dalgo” (p. 32a). This is by any standards a well turned sentence “quando el uio” &c. is balanced by “ouo grand duelo” &c., and “escondiolos.....” is set off by “siruielos...”. The last pair is an acceptable isocolon. What is more, the sentence has two antitheses: “sos sennores” contrasts with “los sos”, and “dell uno” with “dell otro”. These lines are a free rendering of Justin XVIII 3:8, but the sentence structure of the Castilian version is completely different from that of the Latin and none of the features of the *EE*'s text that I have spoken of appear in the original.

Dido, as we know, marries Acherba –Acerba in the *EE*. He, fearing that Pygmalion will steal his great wealth, buries it. In time, word comes to the king of Acerba's act, and the older man ends being murdered; obviously, the king is in one way or another responsible. The narrator says: “Assi que por so conseio o por so consentimiento fue Acerua muerto, cuydando que aurie todo lo que el tenie condesado” (p. 33b). The antithesis “ por so conseio o por so consentimiento” is in every way remarkable. It is a great deal more than an elegant turn in a fairly long sentence. It dramatizes the voice of the narrator. He is, as it were, a witness to the events he narrates, taking full responsibility for his story: “I cannot be sure whether the king actually planned the murder or simply approved of it once committed, but one way or another the responsibility was surely his”.

None of this is in Justin. He simply says “Pygmalion oblitus iuris humani avunculum suum eundemque generum sine respectu pietatis occidit” (XVIII 4:8).

Dido, as we recall, uses an elaborate trick to keep Acerba’s treasure out of the hands of her brother. The *EE* tells the story in some detail. She is pretending to return home; her fleet and Pygmalion’s are sailing together. She has in fact hidden the treasure very carefully, but she has also had made some small leather bags and had them filled with sand. The sacks are by no means simply functional; the queen has taken pains to have them elegant and decorative, as though they were meant to carry things of great value. Finally, she has them ride very conspicuously on top of the other goods traveling with her, suggesting that the presumed precious goods were hers and no one’s else. The king’s men, who witness all this, are completely taken in, convinced that they were looking at Acerba’s treasure: “Todas estas cosas ueyen los omnes del rey, e parauan y muy bien mientes, e cuydauan que era todo uerdat lo que ella fazie por enganno” (p. 34a). This sentence with its concluding antithesis conveys very well the totality and abjectness of their credulity and constitutes a dramatic conclusion for this stretch of text.

Dido, as we know, founds Carthage, and Carthage prospers. The queen’s heroic achievements are recounted at the beginning of chapter 55:

Despues que la reyna Dido ouo poblada la grand cibdat de Cartago en Affrica, assi cuemo ya oystes, fizo la cercar toda de muy grandes torres e muy fuertes muros, e de grandes carcauas e fondas, e todas las otras cosas por que ella entendio que mas fuerte serie, e basteciola darmas e de nauios, y enriqueciola tanto que todas las otras tierras que eran en Affrica tremien antel so nombre, e aun las dAsia e de Europa que eran sobrel mar Mediterraneo; y esto fue por el grand nauio que ella y fizo fazer con que los apremiaua a todos; en manera que los unos le pechauan, e los otros la ayudauan; assi que muy pocos eran aquellos que contra ella senfestauan (p. 36a-b).

As far as I know, these lines have no analogue in any source. This long sentence is in many ways typically Alfonsine; the endless paratactic *orationes infinitae* are everywhere in the *EE*. But the unit is plainly meant to be more than simply informative. It is in the first place an impressive *frequentatio*, an accumulation of details meant to convince us of the prodigious power and wealth of the city. What is more, the text opens broad perspectives, Africa, Asia, Europe, all in the shadow of Carthage’s power. Finally there is the metaphor, “todas las otras tierras ... tremien antel so nombre”, and the antithesis, “los

unos le pechauan, e los otros la ayudauan” gives the sentence yet more force.

In my treatment of the Dido-Carthage episode I have not hesitated to play the critic; I have commented freely on the elegance or effectiveness of the text at hand. In this mode my eye has of course been focused on the devices of rhetoric and on the settings in which they appear. In the narrower term, needless to say, my purpose has been to point out rhetorical figures that appear here and to assert, dogmatically, that the number of passages in the *EE* that display even this minimal repertory of figures and tropes is very small. But it seems to me important to take a further step and show plainly that even these simple devices are applied with skill, that they are appropriate to their setting and that they bring color and significance to the subject at hand. This Dido passage surely is one of the most literary, or in the informal sense, most rhetorical in the whole *EE*, and it is important to point out that the antitheses, the contrasting cola and the rest all contribute to this general character.

A word now about the etiologies in the passage. As I have said, nearly every treatment of *narratio* in the ancient rhetorics says that the verisimilitude of the narrative gains, if the orator specifies the motives of his characters. As we have seen, this rule does not seem to hold for many of the narratives in the *EE*, but it may well be so in this one. Since the range of action in Justin’s narrative is rather narrow, since his plot is more like that of domestic melodrama than of history, the explanatory bits added by the *EE*’s editors do lend plausibility. The play of love, hate, greed and malice aforethought are the more believable for the additions. Now rather than survey a number of etiologies in these pages I will concentrate on one, which I believe is especially powerful. Justin tells us why Dido left Tyre; it was out of hatred for her brother. But why did she pretend to want to come back? According to the *EE* it was because she and her followers were afraid that Pygmalion would bring them back by force: “por miedo que auien que lo sabrie el rey e que los farie prender” (p. 33b). This short phrase, which has no analogue in Justin, explains everything that happens in the rest of the chapter: Dido’s false declaration that she wishes to rejoin Pygmalion, her pathetic message to him, and most important of all, her supposed loss of all of Acerba’s treasure, the ruse that frees her once for all from Pygmalion’s power. All these motifs are of course inherited from Justin (XVIII 4:10-14), but in the *EE* the logic behind these events is made explicit.

We turn now from Dido to Scipio Africanus. As we compare the two narratives in the *EE* we are confronted with a paradox. The two episodes could not be more unlike. The Dido-Phoenicia account, as we have seen, is a sort of romance, a rehearsal of the actions and passions of individuals, whereas the Scipio narrative is an entirely public and heroic story, fully historical; it is about a major war and its single great hero. But in spite of these differences in content the literary treatment of the two episodes in the *EE* is oddly similar. The pages on Scipio do indeed feature typical Alfonsine sentences --long but clear, stronger on reference than on affect--, but as in the pages on Dido, there are also stretches where the prose is nicely tailored, designed to convey more than simply information. What is more, there is the same deployment of a few figures of rhetoric here, as there is in the Dido passage. One way, however, that the two passages part company is in the lines on Scipio; the editors make special efforts to shape their story and carry it beyond what the sources imply. At the very end, for example, the story finds Scipio exiled by an ungrateful nation. The editors turn this motif into a medieval tragedy, the story of a great man brought down, victim of a vengeful Fortune.

As concerns rhetoric, what is most striking about the Scipio passage is the editors' long excursions beyond the limits of the list of figures in the *Ad Herennium*; in their effort to decorate their text they turn to Quintilian. In a sense Quintilian in the Middle Ages is always news. The *Institutio* is far from unknown in those years, but it is hardly a common item. I will have more to say about this presently.

The Scipio story in Alfonso begins with a striking bit of *evidentia*. After the humiliating defeat at Cannae, Rome is completely demoralized. But in a moment everything changes. A very young Publius Scipio comes on the scene, harangues the multitude, threatening naysayers, and offering himself as leader. His words are electrifying, and in a moment the crisis in morale is past. The first moment of the sequence in the *EE* is dramatic. The Romans are desperate, even to the point of abandoning the whole of Italy to the enemy. But “ellos estando en este acuerdo, leuantos Cipion el mancebo, fijo de Cornel Cipion el consul, e saco ell espada que tenie, e dixo a grandes bozes” &c. (p. 20a). The two motifs together, the sword-brandishing and the shouting, make up a memorable sensible moment. The lines are remarkable especially if we remember that in the *EE* appeals to the imagination --i. e. instances of *enargeia*/*evidentia*-- are very uncommon. The “grandes bozes” is original; the sword is not. The prevailing source here is Orosius IV 16:6, and the bit about

the sword corresponds to the absolute construction “destricto gladio” in the Latin. It is in the first place significant that the Alfonsine editor preserves the phrase from Orosius. Given the Alfonsine distaste for figures of description it would not have been remarkable if he had suppressed the motif. What is more, the compiler does not head his expression with a formula such as “dize aqui Orosio” as he does in rendering rhetorical figures in Lucan; it is as if the editor took full responsibility for his version. What is more, Alfonso’s text does nothing to weaken the effect of the figure as it does in its versions of the *Pharsalia*; on the contrary, the visual detail is enhanced by the addition of the “grandes bozes”. First and last, then, it is plain that the person who redacted chapter 28 meant the long Scipio story to get off to an impressive start.

What happens in the *EE*’s Scipio story after this spectacular beginning? Among other things there are several instances of Quintilianesque *amplificatio*. *Comparatio* is one species in this large genus; “Let me tell you in detail how boring book X is, and then I will state it as a fact that book Y is still more boring”. In Quevedo’s *Sueño del infierno*. Judas Iscariot says in effect; “I am a great sinner, surely one of the greatest, but Luther is worse: my sin brought about the salvation of humankind, but his caused the certain damnation of thousands”. Scipio, now in Spain, has taken the great Carthaginian stronghold Cartagena and sent Mago, the defending general, to Rome in chains. Elsewhere in Spain, Scipio has defeated Hasdrubal in a major battle. Finally, the great Roman has won over many Spaniards to the Roman side by his generous treatment of them. Hannibal, master of Italy, reflects: “Cuemo quier que muy poco auie aun que uenciera a Claudio Marcelo en batalla yl matara e destruyera toda la hueste de los romanos, e otrossi al consul Senpronio e a los otros dos consules Marcel e Crispino; mas con tod aquello, tan grand era el pesar que auie de so hermano Magon quel enuiaran catiuo a Roma e de Asdrubal que fincara en Espanna cuemo sennero e auie perdudo lo mas de la tierra, que toda la otra bien andança tenie por nada (pp. 22b-23a; cf. FRAKER 1996: 31-32). These are strong words; Hannibal’s reflections sum up the whole of Scipio’s campaign up to this point. *Comparatio* is, of course, a paradoxical comparison of unequals: it “seeks to rise from the less to the greater, since by raising what is below it must necessarily exalt that which is above” (Quintilian VIII iv 9, Butler’s translation). In the Alfonsine passage the greater term is, obviously, the Carthaginian losses in Spain, which outweigh the triumphs of Hannibal in Italy. Menéndez Pidal, listing

the sources for this passage, names Orosius IV 18:6-7, “muy ampliado”. (As we shall see, Pidal’s *amplificación* has nothing to do with Quintilian). Orosius IV 18:6 says, “Sequenti anno in Italia Claudius Marcellus consul ab Hannibale cum exercitu occisus est”, and 18:8 has “Hannibal utrumque consulem Marcellum et Crispinum insidiis circumuentos interfecit”. As we can see, the Latin source says not a word about Hannibal’s sadness or of any personal reaction on his part; the great general’s reflections are all the initiative of the Alfonsine compiler.

For Quintilian *comparatio* is a figure of *amplificatio*. So also is *ratiocinatio*. In Quintilian (VIII iv 15-26) *ratiocinatio* expresses the greatness of something by indirection. The orator might, for example, state some plain facts about a matter and leave it to his audience to judge that he had alluded to something very important. *Ratiocinatio* is a broad category, and it is important to note that although the figure is by no means limited to narrative texts, it is in fact completely at home there. Caesar speaks at length of the shrewdness and daring of Orgetorix, but only briefly of his own victory over him. Quintilian (VIII iv 20) does not hesitate to call this *ratiocinatio*. He makes the same judgment about a passage in the *Aeneid*. In Book I Aeneas and the Trojan fleet are in sight of Italy. Juno, their relentless enemy, wishes to frustrate their landing there and calls on Aeolus for help. Aeolus complies: he “turned his spear and smote the mountain’s caverned side, and forth the winds rushed in a throng” –“agmine facto ruunt” (*Aeneid* I 81-83). According to Quintilian, “the poet shows what a mighty tempest will ensue”, the tempest that will carry the Trojans across the Mediterranean to Carthage (Butler’s translation). In my study of 1996 (FRAKER 1996: 28-33) I examine several *ratiocinationes* which the editors introduce into their Scipio narrative; I would now like to revisit one of these. In the all-important chapter 34 of the *EE* we are told about the great general’s last battle in Spain. As Pidal tells us, this passage is based on the following lines in Eutropius: “Tertio anno postquam Scipio ad Hispanias profectus fuerat, rursus res inclitas gerit, regem Hispaniarum, magno proelio uictum, in amicitiam accepit et primus omnium a uicto obsides non poposcit” (III 17). Chapter 34 of the *EE* begins by saying that Scipio and his brother Lucius (Cornelius Scipio) won many battles in Spain and took over large pieces of territory. Scipio (Publius Cornelius) crowned his achievement by establishing friendly relations with the princes he had overcome. But one more task lay before him: “Pero fincara un rey en la tierra, que non dize en ell estoria so nombre, y este non quiso

obedecer a Cipion; antes saco grandes huestes e fue lidiar con el, e la batalla fue muy grand; pero uencio Cipion” &c. The king becomes Scipio’s ally; the Roman for his part refuses to accept hostages from his former enemy. The text goes on, “E segund cuentan las estorias, este Cipion fue el primero princep que se fio en la palaura de sos enemigos sin tomar arrahenes dellos” (p. 24a). The short chapter concludes with an expanded version of a bit from Orosius (IV 18: 17) saying that Scipio’s conquest of Spain was complete, from the Pyrenees to the Atlantic, that he brought peace to the land, established Roman rule and Roman ways, and that he himself then returned to Rome. Nearly every motif in the lines I have quoted is traceable to Eutropius. Most obviously, his lines on the battle with the Spanish king are the source of the *EE*’s account. The first part of the chapter, the lines about the pacification of Spain, is almost certainly an expansion of “res inclitas gerit”, and the fulsome statement that Scipio was the first to trust his enemies without taking hostages is a rendering of Eutropius’ plainer statement “primus omnium “ &c. But the Latin text does not say plainly that this was Scipio’s last battle in Spain; Eutropius in fact mentions no others, but he does not in any way call attention to the fact. What is more, Eutropius has nothing like the celebratory lines about Scipio’s clean sweep of the Peninsula, the bit that implies that after the last battle his work in Spain was done. Finally, the account of the battle in the Latin seems to be apposite to the “res inclitas gerit”; there is no hint of opposition or contrast. But in the *EE* the sentence about the battle begins with “pero”; *pero*, as we recall, is tonic in Alfonso’s time and means “nevertheless”, “sin embargo”. These two elements together, the focus on the fact that all but one bit of Spain had been won and the “pero”, highlight the contrast between the general peace and the sole dissenter; this in turn suggests that the belligerent prince is not a mere cipher, but a formidable enemy. The editors plainly meant to turn a colorless statement in Eutropius into something else, a fine *ratiocinatio* honoring Scipio.

Not far back I pointed to some lines in the *EE* in which the editors showed an interest in Hannibal’s feelings. That passage is not unique. In chapter 37 the great enemy of Rome is called home to Carthage to aid his beleaguered countrymen. The text goes on: “El, cuando lo oyo, ouo muy grand pesar” (p. 25a). This is tactful. Orosius (IV 19:1) has Hannibal leaving Italy in tears, “flens”. The Alfonsine Hannibal feels “pesar” on another occasion. Earlier, in chapter 33, we read that his brother Hasdrubal is beaten in a major battle, is himself killed, and

what is worse, his head is left at the entrance of Hannibal's camp. One could say that at this point Hannibal has a great deal to be sorrowful about. This "pesar" is in fact an Alfonsine invention; neither Orosius, Eutropius nor Paul the Deacon says a word about his earlier sorrow. But there is more to the story. In both cases the *EE* tells us explicitly why Hannibal felt *pesar*. In the earlier case the text says of Hannibal, "quando uio la cabeça de Asdrubal e la connocio, ouo muy grand pesar, ca bien entendio que malandantes eran los suyos dAffrica e los que con el touieran dEspanna" (p. 23b). In the latter case, when Hannibal is informed that he is needed in Africa the *EE* says "quando lo oyo, ouo muy grand pesar, lo uno por el grand danno que recibien en Affrica, lo al por ques parte daquel logar o tenie maltrechos a los romanos que eran los mayores enemigos que el auie" (p. 25a). Two things need explaining here. First, the logic of the situation aside, why did the Alfonsine editor say on his own that Hannibal felt sorrow at the defeat of Hasdrubal? Second, why did the compiler give the same reason for the two *pesares*, to wit, the desperate situation of the forces in Africa? A possible answer to both questions may be found in chapter 9 of the very brief *Historia romanorum* of Rodrigo Toledano. Rodrigo, who almost certainly has before him the same sources as Alfonso, nevertheless goes his own way and encapsulates the two moments in history; in his version Hannibal decides to go to Africa to aid his countrymen immediately after the defeat of Hasdrubal. What is more, Rodrigo, like Orosius, has Hannibal leave Italy in tears: "eiulans et inuitus", "weeping and unwilling". He goes home for two reasons, because of Hasdrubal's defeat and because he is informed of the sorry state of his homeland, "Poenorum cognita tempestate". The *EE*, which keeps the two moments separate, nevertheless associates the *pesar* with both —*pesar* being the equivalent of Rodrigo's "eiulans"—; the Spanish text also gives us Hannibal's reasons for returning to Africa at two different moments in the story, in each case turning them into reasons for his sorrow. All in all, then, the two *pesares* and their motives are pretty much the invention of the Alfonsine editors; the initiative belongs to them. Hannibal's unhappiness and the reasons for it are of course a witness to the great success of the Romans and especially of Scipio. And so the two *pesares* certainly pass as legitimate *ratiocinationes*.

I will set aside the Scipio episode and turn to two more Quintilianesque *amplificationes* from other parts of the *EE*. Pompey, as we may recall, is at one point informed of the death of Mithridates.

At that point the editor interrupts his narrative to offer us the following lines in praise of the great Armenian king:

Este rey Mitridates, assi cuemo cuentan las estorias, fue omne de grand saber e de grand conseio, et desque sopo et regno, siempre ouo consigo philosophos et omnes sabios. E fue rey de muy grand coraçon et muy esforçado; et uisco setaenta et dos annos, et regno los sessaenta, e en los quaraenta dellos mantouo siempre guerra contral imperio de Roma, lo que no fallamos que fiziessen los de Affrica que es la quarta parte del mundo, nin los de Grecia, nin los dEspanna, nin de otra tierra ninguna, que tantos annos la mantouiesse cuemo este rey. Et en tod esto nil pudieron los romanos matar, ni prender, nil conquirieron su tierra. Et murio ell en Bosphoro. E estas pocas razones, de muchas que y a deste rey, contamos aqui del por razon de Ponpeyo sennor de las Espannas, que auie la contienda con el; e otrossi por el saber et la fortaleza et ell esfuerço deste rey Mitridates, por mostrar exiemplo en el, que tanto tiempo uisco en guerras et en batallas, et siempre contra los romanos que eran de tan grand poder et tan uenturados; et pero con tod esto, rey murio et en so regno (pp. 60b-61a).

Menéndez Pidal identifies three sources for this passage, Orosius, Eutropius and Paul the Deacon (Alfonso 1955, p. LXXXII), but all of this material put together does not add up to more than five or six lines. All three authors have very unpleasant things to say about Mithridates, of which the Alfonsines repeat not a single word. Orosius (VI 5:7) does mention the philosophers that accompanied the king, but in context this detail is far from flattering, and in general this historian is of the three the most hostile to the great Armenian.

The message conveyed by these lines is that even the greatest power has its limits. The praise of Mithridates is plainly a *comparatio*. The lesser terms are Pompey, one of Rome's greatest heroes, subject of many chapters of the *Estoria*, and the majesty of Rome herself, a major theme in the whole chronicle. And of course the greater term is the great Mithridates, undefeated to the last.

Rome's final and definitive victory over Carthage is by any standards one of the greatest moments in the history of that city. The editors of the *EE* decorate their account of that great moment with another fine *comparatio*. The whole figure and its development takes up the greater part of the brief chapter 65. The middle portion of this text is a description of the defenses of Carthage, both natural and man-made. These lines are a fairly accurate rendition of Orosius IV 22:5-6. Not many pages later the Latin historian gives an account of the definitive destruction of the city by the Romans. In the *EE* and the source alike, the description of Carthage is a prelude to the story

of its destruction, but in Alfonso the lines on the city's defenses have a significance undreamed of by Orosius. In Alfonso's version the city's situation, its inaccessibility from the sea, the massive walls around the citadel and around the whole town itself, become for the Carthaginians the grounds for a wholly misplaced confidence in their security. Scipio (grandson of the conqueror of Spain) is at the gates of Carthage. The Carthaginians cannot believe their eyes. The Romans had been defeated before, and to all appearances their resolve had seemed to have failed, and more important, the walls of the city were so high that a successful attack on them was for them unimaginable. The description of the city follows, and this in turn leads to lines on the surest signs of imminent disaster, the Carthaginians' failure to make any serious preparations for the coming assault. The whole passage ends with a piece of grim moralizing: "la muy grand segurança aduze a los omnes muchas uezes a muerte o a muy grand danno, por que no meten en si mientes, ni se guardan cuemo deuen" (p. 48b). The editors' strategy is clear. Their two additions to Orosius, the reasons given for the defenders' overconfidence and the lines on their unpreparedness turn the (inherited) description of the city's defenses into a powerful lesser term in a fine *comparatio*.

I conclude this study with a few remarks about Alfonso's sources, the texts on rhetoric that might underlie the actual practice of the editors of the *EE*. If we overlook for a moment the problems posed by Quintilian's figures of amplification, there is really little to explain. In the passages we have examined the figures and tropes used are few and hardly obscure, antithesis, metaphor, simile and the rest. For their part, the articulated sentences of the sort we have found in the Dido episode depend on figures related to sentence-structure, membrum, isocolon and the like. *Ad Herennium* IV has descriptions and examples of all these devices. For *aetiologia* we need only turn to the not dissimilar list of figures in Isidore's *De arte rhetorica*. This work is of course part of his *Etymologiae*. That text and the *Ad Herennium* are both medieval best-sellers (REYNOLDS 1986: 99 and 195). What is more, the list in the *Ad herennium* is reproduced more or less completely in accessible medieval texts, in several *poetriae* (FARAL 1962: 49-54) and in handbooks of *dictamen* (FAULHABER 1978: 105, and BERTOLUCCI 1967: 35). And as we have seen, Isidore's list of figures also appears in at least one *dictamen*, that of Transmundus (TRANSMUNDUS 1995: 14).

The *Ad Herennium* and the *Etymologiae* are not rare items but Quintilian's *Institutio* is, at least comparatively. The mutilated version

of the work did have a certain currency in the Middle Ages ( see, for example, MURPHY 1974: 123-130), but its circulation could not have been very large. In Manitius' list of classical authors in medieval library catalogues the entries for Quintilian fill up scarcely more than two pages (1935: 131-134), and Faulhaber in his bibliography of rhetorical texts in Castilian libraries can name only one copy of the *Institutio* which dates from before the fourteenth century (FAULHABER 1973: 182-184). As I have said, *comparatio* and *ratiocinatio* are distinctively Quintilian's; Lausberg's entries on these figures mention no other authorities (LAUSBERG 1975: entries 404 and 405). What is puzzling here is that the editors of the *EE* should turn to such a relatively rare text to introduce barely more than a half-dozen examples of these figures in the hundreds of pages of the *Estoria*. The only explanation I can think of is that descriptions of *comparatio* and *ratiocinatio* might have been copied into some sort of medieval handbook, perhaps a manual of *dictamen*.

Scaglione, in a well-known paper on Dante, brings together some important truths (SCAGLIONE 1978: 265-266). Surveying precept and practice in rhetoric from Antiquity to the Renaissance, he distinguishes three types of sentence-structure used and recommended in those years, the circular or periodic, the symmetrical and the loose. The second of these is based, as he says, on schemes such as *isocolon*, *parison* and *paromoion*. Medievals showed little interest in the periodic style, but they did favor the symmetrical; indeed, they identified this as the noblest of the three styles. Now as we would expect, the legislators in these matters were the *dictatores*, the authors of the manuals of *dictamen*. As they recommend, the well-turned sentence is a harmonious, neatly balanced succession of *cola*, some of which make sense by themselves and some which do not (v., for example, the beginning of the chapter *de stilaribus cadenciis* in the treatise of Geoffrey of Everseley; this chapter is transcribed entire in BERTOLUCCI 1967: 73-88) It is not, as I think, a far reach to assert that the editors of the Dido episode in the *EE* understood very well the rules for Scaglione's symmetrical style; the sentence-patterns in the passages we have examined are surely not far removed from what he describes. The later *dictatores* lay down a further requirement for the high style. Sentences should have a pleasing rhythmic flow; indeed, the handbooks make very specific recommendations on this subject (v. MURPHY 1974: 251). As we have seen, the well-turned sentences in the Dido passage are rhythmically very elegant, but it would in fact be difficult to match fully the practice of the editors with the

recommendations of the *dictatores*. *Cursus* (plural) are, of course, the rhythmic patterns the handbooks recommend for the various parts of the sentence. And as we know, one function of *cursus* is to mark the end of a cola (MURPHY 1974: 250-253). How do the rules for this species of *cursus* fare in Alfonso? Here is a sentence we have met before: “Todas estas cosas ueyen los omnes del rey, y parauan y muy bien mientes, e cuydauan que era todo uerdat lo que ella fazie por enganno” (p. 34a). We must remember here that “fazie” is a bisyllable stressed on the final, “fazié”. This is certainly an artfully executed sentence, but with respect to *cursus* it scores only fifty per cent; the second and fourth cola do end in acceptable *cursus plani*. -’-/-’-, but the other two, which end in a stressed syllable are completely lawless (I am here depending on the description of *cursus* in TOYNBEE (1923: 360-362); reproduced in MURPHY 1974: 251-253). We may generalize. I believe that any survey of the sentences in the Dido passage in the *EE* would show that the distribution of legitimate *cursus* patterns at the end of cola is very random and irregular. The mastery of good rhythmic flow and disposition on the part of the editors is certainly solid, but the rules for the composition of good Latin prose do not always suit Alfonso’s Castilian, and so the king’s men are often forced to go their own way.

\*\*\*\*\*

In this study all of the examples from the *EE* come from the first 108 chapters. Some of the devices I have discussed are of course distinctive to these pages, but in long stretches of this section the types of sentence-structure are generally of a piece with those that appear in later chapters. CATALÁN (1962: 21-24) has shown that the Escorial manuscript Y-i-2, which contains the first 565 chapters, was indeed put together at the court of Alfonso. Catalan’s remarks combined with Menéndez Pidal’s argument cited above together assure us that the texts I have discussed are genuinely Alfonsine, that they do not belong to portions of the *Primera crónica* that were compiled after the Learned King’s death. My references to the sources of the *EE* are in great part based on the index of sources in Menéndez Pidal’s edition of the *Primera cronica* 1955, pp. LXXVII-LXXXVI.

**Charles F. Fraker**

## References

ALFONSO EL SABIO (1955), *Primera crónica general de España*. Ed. Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Madrid: Gredos.

BERTOLUCCI PIZZORUSSO, VALERIA (1967), “Un trattato di *ars dictandi* dedicato ad Alfonso X”. In *Studi mediolatini e volgari*, XV, pp. 9-88.

CATALÁN, DIEGO (1962) *De Alfonso X al Conde de Barcelos*. Madrid: Gredos.

EUTROPIUS (2002), (Eutrope), *Abrégé d'histoire romaine*. Texte établi et traduit par Joseph Hellegouarc'h. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. References are by book and chapter.

FARAL, EDMOND (1962), *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

FAULHABER, CHARLES (1973), “Retóricas clásicas y medievales en bibliotecas castellanas”. In *Ábaco*, IV, pp.151-300.

\_\_\_\_ (1978), “The *Summa dictaminis* of Guido Faba”. In Murphy, 1978, pp. 85-111.

FRAKER, CHARLES F. (1996), *The Scope of History, Studies in the Historiography of Alfonso el Sabio*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

ISIDORE, SAINT (1863), *De arte rhetorica*. In C. Halm. *Rhetores latini minores*. Leipzig: Teubner, pp. 505-522.

\_\_\_\_ (1911), *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*. Edited by W.M. Lindsay. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

JULIUS CAESAR (1961), *Bellum gallicum*. Edited by Otto Seel. Leipzig: Teubner. Reference by book and chapter.

JUSTIN (1972), *M. Iuviani Iustini Epitoma historiarum philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. Edited by Otto Seel. Stuttgart: Teubner. References are by book and chapter.

LAUSBERG, HEINRICH (1975), *Manual de retórica literaria*. Translated by José Pérez Riesco. Madrid: Gredos.

LUCAN (1959), *The Civil War*. Translated by J. D. Duff. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Wm. Heinemann. References are by book and verse.

MANITIUS, MAX. (1935) [1965], *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books.

MURPHY, JAMES J., ed. (1978), *Medieval Eloquence*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1974), *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

OROSIUS (2003), (Orose), *Histoires (contre les païens)*. Texte établi et traduit par Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet. Three volumes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. References are by book, chapter and paragraph.

QUINTILIAN (1920-1922), *Institutio oratoria*. English translation by H.E. Butler. Four volumes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Wm. Heinemann. References are by book, chapter and paragraph.

REYNOLDS, L. D., ed. (1983), *Texts and Transmission, a Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford: Clarendon.

*Rhetorica ad herennium*. (1954). With a translation by H. Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Wm. Heinemann. References are by book and chapter.

RICO, FRANCISCO (1972), *Alfonso el Sabio y la "General estoria": tres lecciones*. Barcelona: Ediciones Ariel.

RODRIGO TOLEDANO (1793), *PP. toletanorum quotquot extant opera. Tomus tertius: Roderici Ximenii de Rada, Toletanae ecclesiae praesulis, opera praecipua complectens*. Madrid: apud viduam Ioachimi Ibarra. References are by chapter.

SCAGLIONE, ALDO (1978), "Dante and the Rhetorical Theory of Sentence Structure". In Murphy 1978, pp. 252-69.

TOYNBEE, PAGET (1923), "The Bearing of the *Cursus* on the Text of Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia*". *Proceedings of the British Academy* 10, pp. 359-377.

TRANSMUNDUS (1995), *Introductiones dictandi*. Text edited and translated by Ann Dalzell. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

VIPERANO (1569), *Io. Antonii Viperani de scribenda historia liber*. Antverpiae: Christophori Plantini.