"Entre él y mí grandes cosas pasaron": Secretary– Lord Friendship in *Cárcel de amor*

Chenyun Li

Hispanic Review, Volume 91, Number 2, Spring 2023, pp. 273-296 (Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/hir.2023.0018*

"Entre él y mí grandes cosas pasaron": Secretary–Lord Friendship in *Cárcel de amor*

Chenyun Li
Cornell University

ABSTRACT Medieval male friendship, at the intersection of sociopolitics, rhetoric, and philosophy, is both a *habitus* of affect and a possibility for unification. In Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor* (1483–1492), the bonding between *el auctor* and Leriano represents an Iberian late-medieval secretary–lord friendship that both constitutes *el auctor*'s persona and persists throughout the story as the only certainty against passionate love, courtly enmity, and injustice. This article studies this friendship from the perspective of "virtue" and "unification," or "becoming one," the two principle dimensions of *amiçiçia* discussed by fifteenth-century moral philosophers—especially Alfonso Fernández de Madrigal and Ferrán Núñez. It argues that *Cárcel* incorporates these philosophical thoughts into its narrative-rhetorical design. By reading the paratexts of *Cárcel*, this article further contends that the pervasiveness of friendship creates a space of boundary-crossing in which the author, *el auctor*, and Leriano all mirror each other and produce a conflated literary subjectivity.

The early-modern secretary is vividly depicted in the emblem displayed at the opening of Gabriel Pérez del Barrio Angulo's *Dirección de secretarios de*

My sincere thanks go to my professors, Simone Pinet, Irina R. Troconis, and Erik Born, for their consistent inspiration and support, and to the anonymous reviewers for their meticulous reading and constructive suggestions.

señores (1613): a minotaur making a gesture of silence by putting its right index finger to its lips, and carrying a piece of paper in its left hand. The emblem's Latin motto reads "*Labore et silentio fortuna vincit*" (Fortune wins by work and silence). Writing and discretion are fundamental characteristics of secretaries in this era. Diego de Saavedra Fajardo's *Idea de un príncipe político cristiano: representada en cien empresas* (1640) shows another example: the 56th emblem, titled "Y los secretarios el compás del príncipe," presents a hand holding a compass, and the Latin motto reads "*Qui a secretis ab omnibus*" (Who has the secrets of everything). Both Pérez del Barrio Angulo and Saavedra Fajardo captured the essence of the secretarial profession because, as the latter says, "la parte más esencial en el secretario es el secreto; de quien se le dió por esto el nombre, para que en sus oídos le sonase a todas horas su obligación" (48). Saavedra Fajardo explains the role of secretaries: "su pluma es también compás; porque no sólo ha de escribir, sino medir y ajustar las resoluciones, compasar las ocasiones y los tiempos, para que ni lleguen antes ni después las ejecuciones" (44). Such an explanation perfectly illustrates *el auctor* in Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor,* composed between 1483 and 1492. This fifteenth-century sentimental fiction, written more than a century before the two seventeenth-century works mentioned above, depicts the image of what later became an institutionalized profession in a well-formed bureaucratic system. Yet, in contrast to the early-modern instructions, what distinguishes the figure of the secretary in *Cárcel* are his affective ties with his lord.

Cárcel has attracted generations of readers for its rhetorical perfection, sociopolitical allegory, and sentimental intensity. It tells the story of *el auctor*—the first-person narrator and a character in his own right—and his mediation between a nobleman, Leriano, and the princess of Macedonia, Laureola. *El auctor* negotiates for Laureola's love on Leriano's behalf, entering a foreign court and sending letters to the princess; as a consultant and negotiator, he assists Leriano in fighting against the noble Persio's false accusation and convincing the king of Laureola's innocence; and as a loyal servant, he accompanies Leriano and suffers with him until the end of Leriano's life. *El auctor* represents the multitasking secretary, a profession combining scribe, messenger, diplomat, and on some occasions advisor (Gómez-Bravo 34–35).

In the story of *Cárcel*, the fictive space of Macedonia, where the main story takes place, is bracketed by the real settings of Sierra Morena, where *el auctor* first appears on his way back home "después de hecha la guerra del año pasado," and Peñafiel, where *el auctor* ends his sentimental adventure "besando

las manos de vuestra merced" (4; 79).[1] The story is further framed by a prologue in the voice of the author, San Pedro, who served the Count of Ureña, Juan Téllez-Girón, for twenty-nine years. San Pedro dedicates *Cárcel* to don Diego Hernández de Córdoba, husband of Juana Pacheco, who was the daughter of Juan Pacheco and a cousin of Juan Téllez-Girón. Another historical figure mentioned in San Pedro's prologue, doña Marina Manuel, was an important lady in Isabel's court and came from the same family as Juan Téllez-Girón's wife, Leonor de la Vega y Velasco.[2]

Many scholars have discussed *el auctor*'s pivotal role as character, diegetic narrator, and extradiegetic author—a combination that allows him to move between fiction and reality.[3] As Peter N. Dunn suggests, *el auctor* transcends his status as go-between for Leriano and Laureola to personify attempts at "mediation and integration in a world deeply segmented and irreconcilable"—namely, fifteenth-century Iberia, when the nobility and the monarchy vied for power (196). The autobiographical channel that leads *el auctor* back to the author, San Pedro, indicates a special connection between San Pedro's life and his writing. The image of a courtly secretary, both real and ideal, emerges when San Pedro "searches in the act of writing for the necessary persona" and "recreate[s] that part of himself which remains absorbed in the work" (198). In this article, I will extend this discussion of *el auctor's* persona, delving deeper into the manner in which he portrays and enacts himself by carefully interweaving friendship into a plot of love and conflict, two of the foremost activities of the nobility.

The ties between *el auctor* and Leriano form the framework of the story in *Cárcel*, which starts with their encounter and the latter's self-disclosure to the former. When he finally liberates Leriano from the prison of Love with the letter from Laureola, and before Leriano sets off for the court, *el auctor* reports: "entre él y mí grandes cosas pasaron" (30). The allusive reference of "grandes cosas" underlines the secretary–lord bond and marks the beginning of the second phase of the story, caused by Persio's false accusation. *El auctor* shares Leriano's secret love for Laureola, which, as it turns out, has the potential to cause a political scandal. As emphasized in the seventeenth-century secretarial emblems, *el auctor* views keeping Leriano's secret as one of his main

1. All quotes from *Cárcel de amor* are from Carmen Parrilla García's edition.
2. For more detailed biographical information on San Pedro, see Keith Whinnom's introduction to the author's *Obras completas*.
3. See Bruce W. Wardropper, James Mandrell, Robert Folger, and Peter N. Dunn.

responsibilities. When he receives the letter from Laureola in prison, he decides not to send it to Leriano "porque nuestro secreto se ponía a peligro en fiarla de nadie" (43). However, *el auctor* is more than a competent secretary, according to the standards of the profession. By entrusting his secret to *el auctor*, Leriano places his servant in the special condition of friendship, in which *el auctor* shares both Leriano's political risks and his sentimental suffering.

Although scholars have commented on the motif of friendship in *Cárcel* in particular[4] and on the role of male homosociality in sentimental fiction in general,[5] they have primarily focused on another work of the genre, Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Siervo libre del amor*.[6] Recently, two monographs on sentimental fiction and *Cárcel*—Sol Miguel-Prendes's *Narrating Desire* and Emily Francomano's *The Prison of Love*—have touched on the topic of friendship in different but complementary ways. Miguel-Prendes remaps the genre of sentimental fiction into the consolationary tradition and argues that the former transfers the penitential fictional mechanisms to the courtly environment. Although she demonstrates that both penitential consolation and sentimental fiction are "articulated around male friendship" (187), she does not explain whether or how "the rhetoric of rationality" represented by male friendship differs between the two genres (249). Francomano investigates the networks of *Cárcel*'s translations and remediations during the sixteenth century and shows how *el auctor* becomes an exemplary figure, one that can be assessed and imitated by those secretaries and courtiers who possess similar status and experience to San Pedro. While Francomano, in her own words, writes about "the romance's long afterlives," what Miguel-Prendes presents could

4. In her edition of *Cárcel*, Parrilla comments that "el valor y la repercusión del tema de la amistad se hace elemento esencial y caracterizador en la *Cárcel* de una figura rectora como es la del *auctor*" (San Pedro 127–28, n5.7).

5. In Antonio Cortijo Ocaña's monograph on sentimental fiction, he points out the presence of the motif in various works of the genre: thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Catalan *històrias de amore* (*La evolución* 47–49), Fernando de la Torre's *Tratado e despido a una dama de religión, en la qual la amonesta* (107–08), *Triste deleytación* (119), and the *Tratado notable de amor* (267).

6. Javier Jiménez Belmonte argues that male friendship in *Siervo* came to predominate the social relations that shape the sentimentality of the genre. Cortijo Ocaña ("*De amicitia*") compares *Siervo* with Boncompagno da Signa's rhetorical works and concludes that the meaning of friendship in Padrón's work accords with that developed in the rhetorician's *De amicitia*. Sol Miguel-Prendes, though categorizing *Siervo* as a penitential fiction, also argues that "the reciprocal affection between its narrator and the Mondoñedo judge . . . motivates the writing of a consolation as a shield against uncontrolled imaginings" (246–47).

be seen as the previous lives of the sentimental genre (5). This article shifts the focus back to *Cárcel* and discusses its secretary–lord bonding.

In his general judgment of sentimental fiction, Antonio Cortijo Ocaña contends that the genre is not solely an expression of the nobility's values because "las nuevas clases que ascienden al poder (burguesía mercantil, estamento burocrático, funcionariado urbano y cortesano, nueva clase de letrados) necesitan una ideología que sustente su nuevo puesto social" (*La evolución* 3). He anchors the new ideology in the concept of equality, suggesting the revolutionary potential of its love discourse (3–4). In agreement with Cortijo Ocaña's observation, this article interprets the new ideology in the light of friendship, taking into consideration the socioprofessional contiguity of the nobility and the lettered class, as investigated by Ana Gómez-Bravo. Focusing on the interactions between *el auctor* and Leriano, and paying special attention to the rhetorical performance of *Cárcel*,[7] I argue that the secretary–lord friendship both constitutes *el auctor*'s persona and persists throughout the story, creating a space of blurred intersubjective boundaries. I read this friendship as arising from "virtue" and "unification" (or "becoming one"), the two principal dimensions of *amiçiçia* discussed by fifteenth-century moral philosophers—especially Alfonso Fernández de Madrigal and Ferrán Núñez. *Cárcel* vividly brings these philosophical concepts into its narrative-rhetorical design.

Critical Framework

The rubric of friendship embraced a wider variety of ideas and practices in the Middle Ages than it does today. Friendship discourse pervaded different social networks, organizing both horizontal and vertical relations. Friendship between unequals has been discussed since Aristotle, who contended that "in unequal friendships a proportion must be maintained" (8.1158b11–1159a14). Madrigal continues Aristotle's thoughts on this point, arguing that "the friendship between fathers and sons, old and young, husband and wife, and lords and servants must only be equal in proportion to the dignity

7. Francomano attends to the "rhetorical performances" of various agents within the story and the networks of translation and adaptation; however, I use "rhetorical performance" to refer to the capacity of language, particularly the intersubjective exchange encapsulated by the balanced style of *Cárcel*.

of each friend" (Berlin 52–53).[8] Meanwhile, ideals of friendly love cut across moral philosophy, theology, and political theories. I argue that an understanding of medieval male friendship should be approached from the intersection of socioprofessional networks, rhetorical culture, and moral philosophy. If sociopolitical reality anchors friendship in concrete relations and rhetoric unfolds its affective intensities in linguistic expressions, philosophy demonstrates how friendship is defined and regulated, especially from an ethical stance.

Epistolary literature was essential to medieval rhetorical culture and equally to the genesis of sentimental fiction. According to Cortijo Ocaña, *ars dictaminis*—not only the art of letter-writing but the construction of discourses in general—is highly relevant to the genre. As he contends, "al estudio del *ars dictaminis* subyace el ímpetu comunicativo y contractual de la sociedad tardomedieval que disputa y reflexiona y que basa dicha 'comunicación' en el discurso escrito en prosa" ("*De amicitia*" 27). Such a communicative and contractual impulse also motivates the medieval writing of friendship. Rhetoric should thus be viewed as both a discursive regulation and an exploration of social—here mainly courtly—relations. From this perspective, sentimental fictions are rhetorical performances that release strong affective energy while acting upon their audiences with the intention to move or motivate (*movere*).

Both the various social relations that friendships helped to facilitate and the pervasive rhetorical culture contributed to the "interstitial" nature of medieval male friendship (Halperin 75; qtd. in González-Casanovas 164). Related to its interstitial presence, friendship as a topic drew much attention from medieval scholars and moral philosophers. In fifteenth-century Iberia, translations of and commentaries on classical writers motivated lettered men's and many noblemen's interests in human affect. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, whose Latin translation by the humanist Leonardo Bruni at the beginning of the fifteenth century promoted its diffusion, was fundamental for the discipline of moral philosophy in universities; Seneca's *Epistulae ad Lucilium*, which contains pithy sentences about friendship, was widely read and partially translated into Spanish (Parrilla, *De amor* 25–28). Cicero's in-

8. One idea common in works by scholars on courtly love and friendship, even those from different contexts, such as C. Stephen Jaeger, Dale Kent, and Alan Bray, is that institutionalized public relationships involving power dynamics are not necessarily exclusive of sentimental authenticity.

fluence consists not only in his *De amicitia* and *De officiis* but also in the "language of regulation, justice, and economy" that informed fifteenth-century Iberian ethical thought (Berlin 15).[9]

The philosophical grounding established by Aristotle opens two paths for future discussions on friendship: first, as a virtue that leads to human perfection; second, as a space of living together that unifies participants. These two threads can be perceived in medieval moral philosophy, which absorbed resources from Stoicism (Cicero and Seneca) and monasticism (Augustine and Aquinas). By imagining a universal community, the theological discussions on friendship—both Christian love of humankind and mystical love—shift the Aristotelian focus on *polis* to *caritas*. In Iberia, the most representative result of combining Aristotelian thought and monasticism is Alfonso X's *Partida IV*, which becomes an essential source for late medieval political and intellectual understandings of friendship. C. Stephen Jaeger contends that during the Middle Ages, friendship was more of "a communal ideal" than the elite "intense personal attachments" explored by Greco-Latin philosophers (31). However, as Henry Berlin recently pointed out, the communal ideals also "involved personal cultivation of strong emotions" (28). Virtue and unification are intertwined dimensions of friendship. Focusing on fifteenth-century Iberia, these two dimensions continued in not only moral philosophy but also sentimental literature, as we will see in *Cárcel*.

Fifteenth-century Iberia witnessed the publication of original treatises centered on the topic of friendship, including Madrigal's *Brevyloquyo de amor e amiçiçia* and Ferrán Núñez's *Tractado de amiçiçia*. Madrigal (1410–1455) was a Professor of Theology and Poetics and ran the Chairs of Arts and Moral Philosophy at the University of Salamanca. He became the Bishop of Ávila one year before his death. His *Brevyloquyo* is the Spanish version of his Latin *Breviloquium de amore et amicitia*. Madrigal produced the translation between 1437 and 1441 at the request of King Juan II and dedicated it to the king. It is a reflection on friendship with its different degrees and categories, ranging from the love of one's country to filial and carnal love, *amicitia*, and the love of God. Beginning with a saying from Plato, "quando tuvieres amigo, cunple que seas amigo del amigo del mismo, mas, por esto

9. The Bishop of Burgos Alfonso de Cartagena translated from Latin to Spanish three of Cicero's works. Although we do not know any Spanish translation of *De amicitia* in the fifteenth century, its manuscripts in Latin, Italian, and Aragonese were kept in the Marquis of Santillana's library (Morrás Ruiz-Falcó 59–60).

non cunple que seas enemigo de su enemigo" (81), the treatise glosses books 8 and 9 of *Nicomachean Ethics* but "imports an Augustinian model of subjectivity into an explicitly Aristotelian ethical framework" (Berlin 227, n4). In his studies of Madrigal's thoughts on friendship with God, Berlin argues that the idea of communication—both in the sense of sharing and of verbal exchange—pervades Madrigal's ethical reasoning and literary practice (46).

Although Núñez's identity is indeterminate, it is almost certain that his *Tractado de amiçiçia* was dedicated to Íñigo de Mendoza, the second Duke of Infantado, grandson of the Marquis of Santillana (Parrilla, *De amor* 15–23). Núñez composed his treatise in the 1480s (contemporary with San Pedro's *Cárcel*) and presented it as a token of gratitude to his lord with the hope that "por esta amiçiçia vuestro exçelente e magnífico estado mucho más se ahumentará cada día" (Parrilla, *De amor* 55). He exalted the virtue of friendship of his lord, who "remunera los serviçios passados e dura este amor por luengos tiempos, e ha ofresçido su grandísimo estado a la deliberación de aquéllos que ama" (94). After a long prologue, Núñez talks about *amiçiçia* in six parts, often digressing on legal questions such as the properties of *judíos* and *moros* (78) and bastards' rights of inheritance (83). Although this treatise is an irregular accumulation of quotations from various sources,[10] the logic of fair exchange underlies the text, and the distribution of *amiçiçia* often translates into the legal distribution of property. Núñez presents himself as a jurist, and his *Tractado* shows that the era's interest in friendship was intertwined with legal issues (30–32). The problem of judgment and justice is also a major concern in *Cárcel* (see Gerli). The connection between friendship and law demonstrates, on the one hand, the fluidity of topics that inquire into human relations and, on the other, the *letrados*' professional position.

While Madrigal's treatise is a scholarly gloss oriented toward courtly elites, Núñez's work addresses the noble lord and stresses legal management of affect. However different the two treatises are, together they suggest how friendly love was understood and elaborated in Spanish during the fifteenth century. In this article, corresponding to philosophical explorations of virtue and community, I define friendship as both a *habitus* of affect that orga-

10. Núñez mentioned his sources in the first part of "Qué cosa es amiçiçia": Books 8–9 of Aristotle's *Ethics*, Cicero's *De amicitia* and *De officiis*, the second book of Thomas Aquinas's *Summa teologica*, the Alfonsine *Partida IV*, and the *Book of Proverbs* (Parrilla, *De amor* 61). Other important references are the Italian civil law jurists Bartolo da Sassoferrato and Baldo degli Ubaldi.

nizes the self, and a relationship that opens the possibility for intersubjective identification. I use the term "affect" with an eye toward current affect theory, which, by turning to "thresholds and tensions, blends and blurs," aims to replace enclosed subjectivity with "resonant wordings and diffusions of feelings/passions," as well as to describe momentary and interstitial movements that cannot all be reduced to social/cultural institutions (Seigworth and Gregg 4, 8). However, I agree with Holly A. Crocker's distinction between "emotions" and "affect" in the medieval context: while the former are "movements of the sensitive soul," the latter is "a function of the intellectual soul"; emotions "respond to immediate sensation" and "have a definite object," while affects "are formed over time" and "re-orient the self toward certain ethical, identity-forming categories" (83, 95 n3).[11] Crocker's definition diverges from current affect theory's emphasis on the presocial or prelinguistic nature of affect, but it is worth noting that the former does not necessarily exclude the embodied experience and emotive intensities that preoccupy affect theory.

Considering the bonding between *el auctor* and Leriano with Madrigal and Núñez, my textual analysis of *Cárcel* revolves around virtue and unification, the two main concerns of moral philosophy on friendship. San Pedro deploys friendship as moral virtue to portray his characters, especially *el auctor*, against the courtly world full of uncertainty. Moreover, by demonstrating a gradually blurred boundary between *el auctor* and Leriano, *Cárcel* creates a rhetorical space for becoming one.[12]

Friendship as Virtue against Uncertainty

The first chapters of *Cárcel* not only present an allegory of Leriano's love for Laureola, but also reveal the character of *el auctor*. The story begins with their

11. Although Barbara H. Rosenwein points out the lack of consensus on the difference between the two terms, both historically and at present (7, 15 n24), I tend to follow Crocker's definition of affect and consider both courtly love and friendship as affects that relate to *habitus* and organize the self (93–94). It is also in this sense that we should understand Aristotle's *philia* and Cicero's *amicitia* as "states of character" (Hutter 105–06) and medieval friendship as *virtud*.

12. For the interplay between sentimental literature and moral philosophy, Parrilla argues that in *Cárcel*, "abunda la utilización de fuentes morales que, no solo bosquejan sino que fundamentan la conducta de ciertos personajes en cuestiones relativas al ejercicio de virtudes cardinales, así como trazan el grado de los vínculos afectivos y sociales" ("Qui scit" 380 n25); however, Berlin's recent book argues that the authors of sentimental literature "elaborate their own political and ethical systems of collective emotion" against the Stoic and monastic traditions (15).

first encounter, when Leriano, captured by Desire on his way to the prison of Love, asks for *el auctor*'s help: "Caminante, por Dios te pido que me sigas y me ayudes en tan grand cuita" (San Pedro 4). *El auctor* has doubts, but finally he decides to help Leriano because he feels obliged to honor his own virtue:

> Yo, que en aquella sazón tenía más causa para temer que razón para responder, puestos los ojos en la estraña visión, estove quedo, trastornando en el coracón diversas consideraciones; dexar el camino que levava parecíame desvarío; no hazer el ruego de aquel que assí padecía figurávaseme inhumanidad; en siguille havía peligro y en dexalle flaqueza; con la turbación no sabía escoger lo mejor. Pero ya que el espanto dexó mi alteración en algund sosiego, *vi quánto era más obligado a la virtud que a la vida*; y enpachado de mí mesmo por la dubda en que estuve, seguí la vía de aquel que quiso ayudarse de mí. (5; emphasis added)

The indecisive moment of weighing his own interest against another's—debating whether he should choose diversion or inhumanity, danger or weakness—sets the tone of *el auctor*'s personality, and soon reappears. When night falls, *el auctor* loses sight of Leriano and gets lost himself in the dark forest. Although lamenting his bad fortune, he never regrets his choice: "Allí comencé a maldezir mi ventura; allí desesperava de toda esperanca; allí esperava mi perdimiento; allí en medio de mi tribulación nunca me pesó de lo hecho, *porque es mejor perder haziendo virtud que ganar dexándola de hacer*" (6; emphasis added). It is thanks to virtue that *el auctor* decides to follow Leriano and enter the allegorical space of his interiority; and it is thanks to Leriano's virtue that *el auctor* promises to act on his behalf.

Aristotle considers friendship based on virtue to be true love and thus supreme in his three categories of *philia* (utility, pleasure, and virtue). Madrigal defines friendship by distinguishing it from passionate love and desire in the first chapter of his *Brevyloquio*, "La entençion del autor de la diferençia de amiçiçia e amaçion, segund Aristotiles":

> [L]a amaçion es semejante a las pasionaes e nasce de pasión e la amiçiçia es semejante a hábito. De esto dize Aristotiles en el othavo de las Eticas. Es semejante la amaçion a la pasión. E la amiçiçia al hábito por actos engendrado. E la amaçion no es menos e las cosas yrrazonables que a las rrazo-

> nables. E amar al amante fazese con eleçtion es engendrada del ábito e quiere bien para los que aman, non según deseo pasional mas segund el abito engendrado. (82)

Friendship here is akin to a *habit* engendered by acts; to love a friend implies a rational *selection*. Núñez expresses a similar idea, defining friendship as virtue in his *Tractado*: "nunca la amistad ha de çessar de obrar e tenerse, pues es virtud" (Parrilla, *De amor* 65).

In these philosophical discussions, the virtue of friendship arises through a deliberate choice regulated by will. Núñez puts it explicitly: "amor [here friendly love] requiere deliberaçión del coraçón e voluntad de obra" (62). The jurist then anchors the genesis of friendship in the will: "la substançia de la virtud que ha de ser en el amiçiçia o amor, que ha de proçeder *ex animo* e de voluntad" (63). Later, Núñez also defines friendly love as a *habit* that dresses the will: "el amiçiçia e amor, porque es virtud, lo qual es hábito e acto firme de que se viste la voluntad, acatando en el juyzio de la razón" (74).[13]

El auctor pledges to negotiate for Laureola's love on Leriano's behalf after listing many possible obstacles that have fed his doubts. His only resource in overcoming these obstacles is his own will:

> Mándasme, señor, que haga saber a Laureola quál te vi, para lo qual hallo grandes inconvenientes, porque un onbre de nación estraña ¿qué forma se podrá dar para negociación semejante? Y no solamente hay esta dubda, pero otras muchas: la rudeza de mi engenio, la diferencia de la lengua, la grandeza de Laureola, la graveza del negocio; *assí que en otra cosa no hallo aparejo sino en sola mi voluntad*, la qual vence todos los inconvenientes dichos, que para tu servicio la tengo tan ofrecida como si oviese seído tuyo después que nascí. (San Pedro 12; emphasis added)

When *el auctor* makes his decision and promises to help Leriano, according to Carmen Parrilla, "la amistad entre los dos hombres se construye en un momento de tribulación y no de bienestar," and it is "una muestra de afecto limpio y desinteresado" (San Pedro 134, n12.8). In his treatise, Núñez adopts

13. The terms *virtud* (used 54 times) and *voluntad* (used 42 times) constitute the core moral values of *Cárcel*.

Cicero's phrase *amicus certus in re incerta cernitur* (*De amicitia*, book 17, 64): "Sy quieres provar al amigo, ponte en neçesidad e miseria" (Parrilla, *De amor* 68). *El auctor*'s nature as a true friend is thus enacted in an uncertain situation full of difficulties.

Not only in the beginning but throughout the work, *el auctor* faces the difficulty of deciding, a quandary reinforced by the rhetorical style of *Cárcel*. According to Ivy A. Corfis, one important aspect of this work's literary style is "bimembration," the use of symmetrical syntax and antithetical semantics (7).[14] This term perfectly captures the textual configuration and affective motion of *Cárcel*: phrases are split into "two members," emphasizing the theme of weighing and wavering. Any situation implies two possibilities; any action embraces two potential consequences. The characters of *Cárcel* continually face dilemmas, moving back and forth between two choices. For instance, *el auctor* often finds himself "en grandes dubdas y confusión" (San Pedro 5, 7); Laureola writes to Leriano that "por hazerte creer esto querría estenderme, y por no ponerte otra sospecha acabo" (28); the king "estovo dudoso y pensativo sin luego determinarse a responder" after hearing Persio's accusation (31). These vacillations create flickers of movement that form the sentimental basis of the whole work.

Friendship counterbalances this pervasive feeling of uncertainty with stability. Leon Battista Alberti, a humanist active in fifteenth-century Florence, wrote about the need for friendship in the fourth book of *I Libri della famiglia* (1434):

> The world is so full of human variety, differences of opinion, changes of heart, perversity of customs, ambiguity, diversity, and obscurity of values. The world is amply supplied with fraudulent, false, perfidious, bold, audacious, and rapacious men. Everything in the world is profoundly unsure. One has to be far-seeing, alert, and careful in the face of fraud, traps, and betrayals. To deal with human wickedness in all its boldness, daring, and greed one must be able to remain constant, temperate, and full of inner strength. These are the qualities I would like to see actually practiced by a man whose friendship I hope to gain and enjoy. (266–67)

14. Cortijo Ocaña attributes this balanced style to the incorporation of *cursus* in the prose ("*De amicitia*" 30–32).

Though Alberti wrote in a social context quite different from fifteenth-century Iberia, his view of friendship as a strong support for survival applies with equal aptness to *Cárcel*. The story takes place in a similar world of "differences of opinion" and "changes of heart." Amid "ambiguity, diversity, and obscurity of values," *el auctor* tries to read Laureola's feelings, negotiates with the king, and suffers from frustration when he fails to hit upon the correct interpretation. Persio's treacherous deeds exemplify the "fraud, traps and betrayals" that endanger Leriano. In fact, as Dunn observes, *Cárcel* presents "a complex interplay of tensions, a succession of dilemmas," which places its characters in "a process of one stark either/or situation leading inexorably to the next" (191). Against the backdrop of this unsure world, the friendship uniting *el auctor* and Leriano—a lettered servant and his lord, reflecting the relationship between Diego de San Pedro and don Diego Hernández de Córdoba—becomes a political and ethical need that binds its two subjects in affection.

The moral need of virtuous friendship was stimulated by the dramatic changes that Iberia underwent during the last decades of the fifteenth century. The reign of King Enrique IV saw the peak of the conflicts between the monarchy and the nobility: the king frequently had to offer concessions in order to gain support from noble families (Ciudad Ruiz 322), and among these endlessly changing alliances, the ideal of friendship was highly valued and manifested in many different forms of art, including architecture. One significant example was a sepulcher in the chapel of the Order of Calatrava, created by Pedro Girón, the father of Juan Téllez-Girón (lord of Diego de San Pedro) and Master of the Order of Calatrava from 1455 to 1466. On the four panels of this sepulcher appear those comrades of the order who, out of friendship, chose to support Pedro Girón's son, Rodrigo Téllez-Girón, as the next Master (Valera 381, n1). Both don Rodrigo and don Juan sided with Princess Juana during the War of Succession, before reconciling with Isabel and Fernando in 1477. For noble families like the Téllez-Giróns, the discourse of friendship covered pressing political concerns: chivalric loyalty was highly esteemed in times of war because it guaranteed firmer alliances, while its moral values heightened constancy and reliability and diminished the risk of betrayal. At the same time, for lettered professionals who depended on the nobility, like San Pedro, the virtue of friendship was an idealizing framework of reference that they both shared with the nobility and used to facilitate relationships with their patrons.

Friendship as "Unification"

The syntactic and semantic balance characteristic of *Cárcel* translates into an intimate interchange, commensurate with the mutual affection between *el auctor* and Leriano. After visiting Leriano's allegorical prison and listening to his explanation, *el auctor* expresses his gratitude for Leriano's openness, saying, "Por proveer en mi fatiga forçaste tu voluntad" (San Pedro 11-12). When *el auctor* promises to seek the princess's love for Leriano, he consoles his lord by saying, "Deves tenplar tu sentimiento con mi esperança" (12–13).[15] The intertwining of "my tribulation" and "your will," "your sorrow" and "my hope," creates a strong emotive blend that functions with the same intensity upon both subjects, blurring their sentimental boundaries. Later, when *el auctor* tries to persuade Laureola to accept Leriano's first letter, he stresses that Leriano's fate is tied to his own: "Si por ventura, siendo yo tan disdichado, pierde por mi intercesión lo que él merece por fe" (20). Leriano's loss because of *el auctor*'s intercession will turn out to be *el auctor*'s misfortune too. Leriano similarly articulates the emotional cooperation between *el auctor* and himself: "Tu venida fue por remediarme; mi habla será darte consuelo" (9). He asks *el auctor*'s support in the same manner: "Para que pueda sofrir mi mal, como dizes, dame tú la fuerza y yo porné la voluntad" (24). The two need to cooperate in order for one to suffer the pain. Shortly after this, the nobleman expresses his gratitude for *el auctor*'s service: "El trabajo que *por mí has* recebido y el deseo que *te he* visto me obligavan a ofrecer por ti la vida todas las vezes que fuera menester" (24; emphasis added). Here the rhetorical figures—the syntactic symmetry and the chiasmus of pronouns—perform and confirm the sentimental bond between the two characters, bringing to light their already entwined subjectivity.

Toward the end of the work, the mutuality of their friendship is further emphasized, with the boundaries nearly disappearing between the two men. When Laureola finally rejects Leriano's pursuit, it is *el auctor* who first succumbs to failure and suggests the idea of death:

15. Compare this with Leriano's words in his second letter to Laureola, when she is a captive in the prison: "Esfuerça con mi esperança tu flaqueza" (41). The rhetorical similarity between Leriano's words and *el auctor's*, as I will argue later, testifies to the common position they share in relation to the monarchy.

> [Q]uando llegué a Leriano dile la carta, y como acabó de leella díxele que ni se esforzase, ni se alegrase, ni recibiese consuelo, pues tanta razón avía para que deviese morir; *el qual me respondió que más que hasta allí me tenía por suyo, porque le aconsejava lo propio*; y con boz y color mortal comenzó a condolerse. (63; emphasis added)

The suggestion of death, as Parrilla comments, constitutes "uno de los rasgos que confieren al vínculo amistoso entre los dos hombres la categoría más noble de los afectos" (San Pedro 150, n63.2). Leriano takes *el auctor* as *suyo*, "his," because *el auctor* understands him so well that he proposes *lo propio*—"the proper" advice—which is, at the same time, "his own." This passage recalls the moment when *el auctor* promises to take on the mission entrusted by Leriano: "para tu servicio la [voluntad] tengo tan ofrecida como si oviese seído tuyo después que nascí" (12). These two possessive pronouns, *suyo* and *tuyo*, encapsulate the friendship between *el auctor* and Leriano, whose interactions testify to a shared interior world and the indefinite limits between them, making the locus of their shared subjectivity ambiguous.

The blurred boundary between *el auctor* and Leriano leads us to the definition of friend as *alter ego*, which traces back to the ancient philosophers.[16] Madrigal echoes this point when discussing friendship with God in *Brevyloquyo*: "Testigo çiçeron en el libro que fizo de la verdadera amyçiçia por virtud de la qual el amigo non se dize otro del todo apartado de su amigo, mas otro que es el mismo su amigo" (Escorial manuscript, h.II.15, 64r, qtd. in Berlin 54). Similarly, Núñez writes in the *Tractado*: "En los amigos ha de ser un estudio, una voluntad, un tener, en manera que cada uno sea el otro, e cada uno aya la mesma delectación e plazer honesto del otro, e sea el uno e el otro su amigo mesmo" (Parrilla, *De amor* 66). Built upon virtue, trust, and reciprocal recognition, friendship as a spiritual or subjective union exalts male bonding as an established sociopolitical association.

When *el auctor* plays the role of Leriano's agent, he both embraces the mission of winning Laureola's favor and, at the same time, takes over the anguish and desperation felt by the noble lover. *El auctor* appears pathetic on many occasions, and this can be explained at first by sympathy. However, *el auctor*'s sympathy gradually evolves into deeper and more urgent emotions.

16. Aristotle 9.4, 1166a32; 9.9, 1169b7; 9.10, 1170b6. Cicero, *De amicitia* 21, 80–81.

As Robert Folger observes, there is "a progression from initial pity to sharing experiences and intimate feelings" (119). From the moment he promises to help Leriano, *el auctor* begins to internalize the latter's emotions, and when *el auctor* confronts Laureola, he feels frustrated *in place of* the lover. His status as Leriano's friend explains why *el auctor* experiences such desperation and laments his misfortune in the lover's own language: as Leriano's *alter ego*, he feels what Leriano feels; as his messenger, he conveys Leriano's feelings to Laureola by means of speeches and gestures that mirror Leriano's own. As a secretary, *el auctor* is able to write Leriano's four letters, and, in doing so, he embodies and performs the lover's affect and emotions.

Thus, *el auctor*, the suffering secretary, mirrors the *persona* of the lachrymose lover. When *el auctor* hears Laureola blame him from prison—"Cataquí el gualardón que recibo de la piedad que tuve"—he expresses his anguish in an explicit manner: "Tanto me lastimó aquella razón que me dixo, que si fuera buscado, por el rastro de mis lágrimas pudieran hallarme" (San Pedro 42). Parrilla identifies in the "trace of tears" a "falacia emotiva" (San Pedro 42, n3), but *el auctor's* tears serve as a key expression of the shared sentiment of the two friends. In Leriano's words: "en mi respuesta oviere más lágrimas que concierto, las quales, porque Laureola las saca del coraçón, son dulce manjar de mi voluntad" (24). Many times, when *el auctor* parts from his friend, Leriano sinks into sadness, "satisfaciendo los ojos por las palabras con muchas lágrimas" (26). When *el auctor* realizes that he has failed to fulfill Leriano's commission, he experiences such a great sorrow that he considers ending his own life rather than suffering the pain:

> [P]ues vista su determinada voluntad, pareciéndome que de mi trabajo sacava pena para mí y no remedio para Leriano, despedíme della con más lágrimas que palabras . . . salíme de palacio con un nudo en la garganta, que pensé ahogarme por encobrir la pasión que sacava; y salido de la cibdad, como me vi solo, tan fuertemente comencé a llorar que de dar bozes no me podía contener. (63)

El auctor's radical and almost violent sadness culminates with Leriano's death; when his noble friend dies, *el auctor*'s affliction is such that even to write of it becomes cruelty: "Lo que yo sentí y hize, ligero está de juzgar; los lloros que por él se hizieron son de tanta lástima que me parece crueldad

escrivillos" (79). The story of *Cárcel* thus begins with *el auctor*'s entrance into Leriano's allegorical prison of Love and ends with *el auctor*'s exit from the palace and the city, having become himself the sufferer. This substitution, recalling *el auctor*'s words when he first informs Laureola of Leriano's love—"dexé el camino de mi reposo por tomar el de su trabajo" (12)—testifies to the two men's ever deeper interchange and their ultimately entwined selves.

The nature of a friend as *alter ego* accounts for the mirrored images of *el auctor* and Leriano. Javier Jiménez Belmonte contends that narrators of sentimental fiction appreciate and explore "el carácter especular de la *amicitia*" (470). The Ciceronian maxim "He who looks upon a true friend looks, as it were, upon a sort of image of himself" (*De amicitia* book 7, 23) gained sentimental weight in the genre. Meanwhile, following Aristotelian theory that the essence of friendship is living together (9.12), in fifteenth-century moral philosophy, friendship was often understood as a figurative space in which friends could participate in activities together and so become similar to each other. Fernando de la Torre, for example, wrote a letter to one Íñigo de Mendoza (probably the Marquis of Santillana) and asked whether his own affection for a young man he had never met was love or friendship. Íñigo responded that the major element distinguishing friendship from love is the sharing of activities:

> [L]a amistad consiste en comunicaçión, e por quanto los amigos entre sý mesmos comunican en el convenir e usar e conuerssar . . . segúnd trata e procura o quiere assý o para sý que en el grado mesmo trate, procure e quiera a su amigo, e aquello es a él delectable fazer egual de sý al otro, e esto se faze en convenir e converssar e partiçipar, ca por las obras que veyen en sý mesmos les aplaze ser vnos, pues síguese que los amigos desean entre sý mesmos participar . . . los onbres quieren con sus amigos, segúnd el ábito, tratar de consuno en los fechos . . . las tales cosas fazen a los amigos convenir a ser vnos[.] (Díez Garretas 120–21)

The ties of unification are portrayed in *Cárcel* not only through the closeness and likeness of *el auctor* and Leriano but also through the rhetorical stand that they both take before authority. *El auctor*, after Leriano's first letter to Laureola is rejected, decides to give it another try, explaining the rhetorical convention in a very explicit way:

> [A]guardé tienpo convenible y hízele otra habla, mostrando miedo, puesto que no lo tuviese, porque en tal negociación y con semejantes personas conviene fengir turbación, porque en tales partes el desenpacho es havido por desacatamiento, y parece que no se estima ni acata la grandeza y autoridad de quien oye con la desvergüença de quien dize; y por salvarme deste yerro hablé con ella no segund desenpachado mas segund temeroso. (San Pedro 17)

Though this passage is *el auctor*'s reflection on his own manners in front of Laureola, it is worth remembering that *Cárcel* was dedicated to the *alcalde de los donceles:* San Pedro might well have considered it safe, and even necessary, to share his concerns with readers like don Diego Hernández. The instructive tone of this passage suggests a belief that his readers should keep proper manners in mind.

El auctor, conflating the identities of character, narrator, and author, carries all of these subjective folds and reflections when he moves back and forth across the blurred borders of the diegetic and extradiegetic worlds. Just as he crosses the boundary between allegorical space and the verisimilar court in the story, *el auctor* enters the fictive Macedonia through the real Sierra Morena and Peñafiel in which San Pedro was writing. Marina S. Brownlee reads a discursive tension in this "geographical alienation" that "reinforces the intensity of the verbal estrangement" (18–19). What interests me more, however, are these worlds' reflections of each other as the "I" embodied by *el auctor* gradually unfolds. This lettered servant's affection and affinity for a noble lord stay constant along the continuum of worlds, interlacing fiction with reality. Friendship marks the subjectivity of *el auctor* on multiple narrative levels, ultimately creating a narrative transgression that reveals a closeness between the extradiegetic author, San Pedro, and his noble character Leriano.

Just as *el auctor* mirrors Leriano in the story and shares traits with San Pedro, the external author, so the *persona* of Leriano is reflected in the extradiegetic "I" of San Pedro, who appears in the prologue and establishes the rhetorical tone for *Cárcel*. In this prologue, San Pedro explains that don Diego Hernández commissioned a work in the same style as *Sermón* because it pleased doña Marina Manuel more than the author's earlier *Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda*. San Pedro describes his vacillation over whether or not to compose a new work: "estuve en grandes dubdas: vista vuestra discreción,

temía; mirada vuestra virtud, osava; en lo uno hallava el miedo, y en lo otro buscava la seguridad" (3). The phrasing is nearly the same as what Leriano puts in his first letter to Laureola: "mi fe dezía que osase; tu grandeza que temiese; en lo uno hallava esperança y por lo otro desesperava" (18). This patent similarity may be partly attributable to the patterned language of courtly culture, or to rhetorical conventions regulated by the hierarchical order, but regardless of its cause, its effect on readers is to construct an echo chamber in which author and character proclaim the same ethical ideals and perform the same affective gestures. Such echoes add yet another layer of subjectivity to the male intimacy demonstrated in the work, suggesting a "unification" in the discursive sense.

In fact, San Pedro's prologue uses several rhetorical dichotomies—audacity and shame, humility and respect, service and boons, silence and saying—that apply to lord–servant relationships and reappear in Leriano's interactions with Laureola. For instance, San Pedro asks for a "boon" from don Diego Hernández: "porque reciba el pago no segund mi razón mas segund mi deseo" (4). In a similar way, Leriano asks for Laureola's "reward": "te pido galardón sin haverte hecho servicio" (18). Both author and character also weigh the options of saying and unsaying. San Pedro begins his prologue by explicitly putting forward this dilemma: "Aunque me falta sofrimiento para callar, no me fallesce conoscimiento para ver quánto me estaría mejor preciarme de lo que callase que arrepentirme de lo que dixiese" (3). While sending Leriano's first letter to Laureola, *el auctor* describes the same difficulty, which has entrapped the desperate lover: "si su voluntad por no enojarte desea sufrir, su alma por no padecer querría quexar; lo uno le dize que calle, y lo otro le haze dar bozes" (20). By presenting Leriano and himself in such a similar way, San Pedro heightens the theme of friendship as unification. The mutual echoing between author and character, far from placing them at two extremes of obedience and authority, as James Mandrell has suggested (119–20), instead unites them in the same situation, both of them needing to respond to and deal with an authority figure who is at the same time an object of love.

Leriano is both the most privileged character in the work and the one closest to the narrator, *el auctor*. Significantly, *el auctor* allows him to speak in direct speech on many occasions. Yet, remarkably, the extradiegetic author, San Pedro, intrudes on Leriano's last speech, taking it as his own. At the end of the story, Leriano extols women's virtues, and the voice of the external author can be perceived in Leriano's words. After praising chaste gentiles, Jews,

and early Christians, Leriano presents three "modernas de la castellana nación":

> De las antiguas cristianas más podría traer que escrevir, pero por la brevedad alegaré algunas modernas de la castellana nación. Doña María Cornel, en quien se comencé el linaje de los Corneles . . . Doña Isabel, madre que fue del maestre de Calatrava don Rodrigo Téllez-Girón y de los dos condes de Hurueña, don Alonso y don Juan . . . Doña Mari García, la beata, siendo nacida en Toledo del mayor linaje de toda la cibdad[.] (75)

Here, Leriano voices San Pedro's own thoughts, as revealed by the latter's extant biographical information. The author's penetration into this discourse is most evident with the mention of doña Isabel, lover of don Pedro Girón and mother of don Juan, whom San Pedro served for three decades.

Since Leriano's last speech is only loosely related to the narrative, it can be viewed as digressive or extradiegetic discourse, reflecting "la tradición de polémicas pro- y anti-feministas que florecen desde la época de Juan II de Castilla," with models like Boccaccio's *De claris mulieribus* and Christine de Pisan's *Cité des dames* (Cortijo Ocaña, *La evolución* 175). As Nicholas G. Round's comparison demonstrates, San Pedro adapted this speech from Mosén Diego de Valera's *Tratado en defenssa de virtuossas mugeres* (published before 1445).[17] The verb "escribir" in the phrase "De las antiguas cristianas más podría traer que escrevir" shows that "San Pedro was sharply conscious . . . of his own activity in adapting Valera" (149). Moreover, the chapter immediately following the speech is titled "Buelve el auctor a la estoria" (San Pedro 76). It seems as if *el auctor*—or San Pedro—has paused his telling of the story in order to conduct the didactic task of lauding exemplary women.

The interpenetration of the author's and characters' voices demonstrates how porous the membranes separating author, narrator, and character have become at this stage in the story. Leriano's final speech and San Pedro's pres-

17. Round suggests that Valera's diplomatic career and expertise on protocol are similar to those of *el auctor* (144–46). Leriano's response to his friend Tefeo's criticism of women also echoes Valera's text. In his prologue to doña María, Queen of Castilla and León, Valera makes it clear that he imagined speaking with a friend: "a mi imaginación previno el tal tratado, como quiera fingiese en él fablar con un mi amigo, devía ser dado a la más virtuosa de las mugeres" (Penna and Rubio 55).

ence within it not only blur the boundaries between the different figures but complicate the nature of the "I" in the work. The sentimental intimacy and subjective mirroring between the friends within the story become, in this speech, the closeness and crossing of narrative roles. *Cárcel* thus shows that friendship is not merely a fixed relation regulating social life but a shared space of wavering and vacillation, and a process of encountering and becoming. Indeed, *el auctor* carries this process across all the boundaries that separate the story's discursive worlds: friendship serves as a thread sewing together episodes and dimensions within the work.

Echoing fifteenth-century moral philosophy, *Cárcel* demonstrates that friendship, a *habitus* of affect and moral virtue, opens up an interactive space, fosters complex personalities, and bridges differing experiences of identity. Part of *el auctor*'s subjectivity is attributed to Leriano, while what happens to Leriano is mediated by *el auctor*'s speeches and actions. In this way the prison of Love confines not only the lord, suffering from his desperate love for Laureola, but also the secretary, who, when telling the story, conflates Leriano's experience with his own. Heightening these effects, friendship in *Cárcel* is framed against a pervasive uncertainty, which clouds every character's decision and influences *el auctor* throughout the story. Friendship and uncertainty intersect both rhetorically and emotionally, exemplifying the subjectivity of both characters and author in this transitional period of late-fifteenth-century Spain.

Male friendship constituted a vital dimension of sentimental fiction. It helped to facilitate sociopolitical networks and supported rhetorical practices, as well as being a much-discussed topic in moral philosophy. Fifteenth-century philosophical explorations of this concept revolved around virtue and unification. Today, using friendship as a critical perspective opens up the possibility of reading *Cárcel* as both social script and affective force. As one of the representative works of sentimental fiction, *Cárcel* demonstrates that the genre provided a discursive space for writer-secretaries to articulate their identities and express their position within the context of the social changes affecting the aristocracy and the monarchy. Friendship in *Cárcel* thus creates both a professional set of morals and a rhetorically based sentimental community.

Cárcel captures the political perspectives of lettered men who were beginning to reflect on their roles as *alter egos* for their lords and intermediaries between those lords and the world. The sentimental depiction of secretaries

at this time, as demonstrated by *Cárcel*, may also augur the prolonged involvement of secretaries in political activities and the significance of their relationships with authorities. One and a half centuries later, when Saavedra Fajardo wrote about the profession of secretaries, he illustrated their relationship with the prince "no como ministro de la voluntad ajena, sino como testigo de la propia" (44). The secretarial figure in this seventeenth-century manual, however, is the Secretary of State, and his identification with the monarch, having become institutionalized, has also been drained of affective intensities. What lies between "entre él y mí grandes cosas pasaron" and the silent minotaur or the rigorous compass is an increasingly organized bureaucratic system and a correspondingly compartmentalized understanding of friendship.

Works Cited

Alberti, Leon Battista. *The Family in Renaissance Florence*. Translated by Renée Neu Watkins, U of South Carolina P, 1969.

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Books 8 and 9, translated by David Ross, revised by Lesley Brown, Oxford UP, 2009.

Berlin, Henry. *Alone Together: Poetics of the Passions in Late Medieval Iberia*. U of Toronto P, 2021.

Bray, Alan. *The Friend*. U of Chicago P, 2003.

Brownlee, Marina S. *The Severed Word: Ovid's Heroides and the Novela Sentimental*. Princeton UP, 2014 [1990].

Cicero. *On Old Age; On Friendship; On Divination*. Translated by W. A. Falconer, Harvard UP, 1923.

Ciudad Ruiz, Manuel. "El maestrazgo de don Rodrigo Téllez Girón." *En la España Medieval*, vol. 23, 2000, pp. 321–65.

Corfis, Ivy A., editor. *Diego de San Pedro's* Cárcel de Amor*: A Critical Edition*. Diego de San Pedro, Tamesis, 1987.

Cortijo Ocaña, Antonio. "*De amicitia, amore et rationis discretione*: breves notas a propósito de Boncompagno da Signa y el *Siervo libre de amor*." *Revista de Poética Medieval*, no. 16, 2006, pp. 23–52.

———. *La evolucioń genérica de la ficción sentimental de los siglos XV y XVI: género literario y contexto social*. Tamesis, 2001.

Crocker, Holly A. "Medieval Affects Now." *Exemplaria*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2017, pp. 88–98.

Díez Garretas, María Jesús. *La obra literaria de Fernando de la Torre*. U de Valladolid, 1983.

Dunn, Peter N. "Narrator as Character in the *Cárcel de amor*." *MLN*, vol. 94, no. 2, 1979, pp. 187–99.

Folger, Robert. *Escape from the Prison of Love: Caloric Identities and Writing Subjects in Fifteenth-Century Spain*. U of North Carolina P, 2009.

Francomano, Emily. *The Prison of Love: Romance, Translation, and the Book in the Sixteenth Century*. U of Toronto P, 2018.

Gerli, E. Michael, "Conflictive Subjectivity and the Politics of Truth and Justice in *Cárcel de Amor*." *Queen Isabel I of Castile: Power, Patronage, Persona*, edited by Barbara F. Weissberger, Boydell & Brewer, 2008, pp. 149–68.

Gómez-Bravo, Ana M. *Textual Agency: Writing Culture and Social Networks in Fifteenth-Century Spain*. U of Toronto P, 2013.

González-Casanovas, Roberto J. "Male Bonding as Cultural Construction in Alfonso X, Ramon Llull, and Juan Manuel." *Queer Iberia: Sexualities, Cultures, and Crossings from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance*, edited by Josiah Blackmore and Gregory S. Hutcheson, Duke UP, 1999, pp. 157–92.

Hutter, Horst. *Politics as Friendship: The Origins of Classical Notions of Politics in the Theory and Practice of Friendship*. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1978.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *Ennobling Love: In Search of a Lost Sensibility*. U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.

Jiménez Belmonte, Javier. "Amistad y novela sentimental: 'bien amar' al amigo en *Siervo libre de amor*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 79, no. 4, 2002, pp. 461–76.

Kent, Dale. *Friendship, Love, and Trust in Renaissance Florence*. Harvard UP, 2009.

Madrigal, Alfonso Fernández de. *Brevyloquyo de amor e amiçiçia*. Edited by Nuria Belloso Martín, U de Navarra, 2001.

Mandrell, James. "Author and Authority in *Cárcel de amor*: The Role of El Auctor." *Journal of Hispanic Philology,* vol. 8, no. 2, 1984, pp. 99–122.

Miguel-Prendes, Sol. *Narrating Desire: Moral Consolation and Sentimental Fiction in Fifteenth-Century Spain*. U of North Carolina P, 2019.

Morrás Ruiz-Falcó, María. *Alonso de Cartagena: edición y estudio de sus traducciones de Cicerón*. U Autònoma de Barcelona, 1993.

Parrilla García, Carmen. *De amor y mecenazgo en el siglo XV español: el tractado* De amiçiçia *de Ferrán Núñez*. U de Coruña, 1996.

———. "Qui scit, docere debet: acerca de Alfonso de Madrigal el Tostado." *Archivum*, vol. 54–55, 2004–2005, pp. 367–90.

Penna, Mario, and P. Fernanda Rubio, editors. *Prosistas castellanos del siglo XV*. Atlas, 1959.

Pérez del Barrio Angulo, Gabriel. *Dirección de secretarios de señores*. Madrid, Alonso Martín de Balboa, 1613.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Generations of Feeling: A History of Emotions, 600–1700*. Cambridge UP, 2016.

Round, Nicholas G. "The Presence of Mosén Diego de Valera in *Cárcel de Amor*." *The Age of the Catholic Monarchs, 1474–1516: Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom*, special issue of *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, vol. 66, sup. 1, 1989, pp. 144–54.

Saavedra Fajardo, Diego de. *Idea de un príncipe político cristiano: representada en cien empresas*. Edited by Vicente García de Diego, Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1927, vol. 3.

San Pedro, Diego de. *Cárcel de amor*. Edited by Carmen Parrilla García, Crítica, 1995.

Seigworth, Gregory J., and Melissa Gregg. "An Inventory of Shimmers." *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, Duke UP, 2010, pp. 1–25.

Valera, José Luis. "Revisión de la novela sentimental." *Revista de Filología Española*, vol. 48, 1965, pp. 351–82.

Wardropper, Bruce W. "Allegory and the Role of 'el Autor' in the *Cárcel de amor*." *Philological Quarterly*, no. 31, 1952, 39–44.

Whinnom, Keith, editor. Introduction. *Obras completas*, vol. 1, Diego de San Pedro, Castalia, 1972, pp. 9–34.