



Representations of Alfonso II and Alfonso III in the Legend of Bernardo del Carpio

Katherine P. Oswald
University of Wisconsin-Madison

ABSTRACT:

In the present article, I analyze the depictions of Kings Alfonso II and Alfonso III of León in three thirteenth-century accounts of the legend of Bernardo del Carpio: Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi*, Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada's *De rebus Hispaniae*, and Alfonso X's *Estoria de España*. Through the episodes of the imprisonment and promised liberation of Bernardo's father, Sancho, due to his illicit union with Alfonso II's sister, Jimena, I discuss the distinct representations of the Kings, considering their portrayals in conjunction with the legend's origins and the particular concerns of the individual chroniclers. I then address the continued diffusion of Bernardo's legend in the *Romancero*, using two sixteenth-century versions of «Por las riberas de Arlanza» to consider the further development of the conflicts between Bernardo and Alfonso that resulted from the hero's illegitimacy.

KEYWORDS: Bernardo del Carpio, Alfonso II, Alfonso III, Spanish epic, chronicles, ballads

RESUMEN:

En el presente artículo, se analizan las distintas representaciones de Alfonso II y Alfonso III, reyes de León, que se encuentran en tres versiones del siglo XIII de la leyenda de Bernardo del Carpio: el *Chronicon mundi* de Lucas de Tuy, *De rebus Hispaniae* de Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada y la *Estoria de España* de Alfonso X. Mediante el estudio de los episodios del encarcelamiento y la posible liberación del padre de Bernardo, Sancho, debido a su unión clandestina con Jimena, hermana de Alfonso II, se comentan las distintas representaciones de los reyes, los orígenes de la leyenda y las posibles intencionalidades de los cronistas. Finalmente, se traza la difusión de la leyenda en el *Romancero* a través de dos versiones del siglo XVI de «Por las riberas de Arlanza», con el fin de analizar cómo se desarrolla en los romances el asunto de los conflictos entre Bernardo y Alfonso que resultaron de la ilegitimidad del héroe.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Bernardo del Carpio, Alfonso II, Alfonso III, épica, crónicas, *Romancero*

Introduction

Conflicts between vassal and king are prevalent among medieval Iberian epic legends. The Cid of the *Cantar de mio Cid* and his younger counterpart of *Sancho II* both find themselves at odds with Alfonso VI, while the immature Rodrigo Díaz of the *Mocedades de Rodrigo* has conflicts with Fernando I; Fernán González has altercations with Sancho Ordóñez;¹ and Bernardo del Carpio has disputes with Alfonso II and Alfonso III of León, while his father, Sancho (San Díaz), also clashes with Alfonso II. The majority of the above conflicts tend to work out on the side of the vassal, as he regains favor with his king (*Cantar de mio Cid*, lines 2013-39; *Mocedades de Rodrigo*, lines 838-54) or outsmarts him (*Libro de Fernán González*, stanzas 564-69). However, in the thirteenth-century versions of Bernardo del Carpio's tale, the hero is consistently thwarted by his monarchs; it is not until the legend's diffusion in the ballads that he is finally able to gain the upper hand.

The legend of Bernardo del Carpio, set during the reigns of Alfonso II, el Casto (791-842) and Alfonso III, el Magno (866-910), was first preserved in writing in Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi* (c. 1239).² It was subsequently recorded in Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada's *De rebus Hispaniae* (1243) and Alfonso X's *Estoria de España* (1270-89). The beginning of the *Libro de Fernán González* (c. 1250) also offers a brief account of the deeds of the hero. The legend is later the subject of over one hundred ballad poems, with the 1520 version of «Por las riberas de Arlanza» as the oldest surviving text and a 2009 recitation of «Bernardo se entrevista con el rey» as the most recent (Petersen). Among the many retellings, one of the hero's most salient characteristics is his illegitimacy, which leads to great tensions between him and his monarchs, due to Alfonso II's imprisonment of Bernardo's father, Sancho, a decision later upheld by Alfonso III.³ The representation of this animosity escalates throughout the retellings of the legend, as the figure of the King evolves from one who capably defuses the situation at hand to one in constant opposition with the hero, dishonest, spiteful, and inferior to his vassal.

In the present article, I analyze how the portrayals of Alfonso II and Alfonso III change among the three thirteenth-century chronicles and the *Romancero*. In my discussion of the *Chronicon mundi*, *De rebus Hispaniae*, and the *Estoria de España*, I focus on the representations of Alfonso II's imprisonment of Sancho and Alfonso III's initial continuation of the incarceration. In doing so, I take into account how Alfonso III's actions lead to Bernardo's rebellion and how the King eventually quells his vassal's uprising. Lastly, I turn to the ballad «Por las riberas de Arlanza,» which directly links Bernardo's illegitimacy with Alfonso II's cession of his kingdom to Charlemagne. As I consider the representations of the Kings, I analyze their portrayals in conjunction with the proposed roots of the legend, and examine how Lucas de Tuy, Jiménez de Rada, and the Alfonsine chroniclers adjust their presentations of the Kings to fit their specific purposes. I then

1.– The *Libro de Fernán González* reports the Count's conflicts with Sancho Ordóñez (stanzas 564-69, 715-19), while the *Estoria de España* recounts confrontations with Sancho I of León (409-10, 422).

2.– Although usually dated to 1236, I accept Emma Falque's suggestion that Lucas de Tuy would have completed his work on the *Chronicon mundi* between 1237 and 1239 (Falque XIX-XX).

3.– The Latin chroniclers call Bernardo's father «Sancius» (Lucas de Tuy 234; Jiménez de Rada 126), or Sancho. The Alfonsine staff, however, refers to him as San Díaz, Count of Saldaña (Alfonso X 2: 350). I use the generic «Sancho» to name Bernardo's father, unless I am referring specifically to the personage of the *Estoria de España*'s account.

address the continued diffusion of Bernardo's legend in the *Romancero* and consider factors that may have contributed to the sixteenth-century representation of Alfonso in «Por las riberas de Arlanza.»

The imprisonment of Sancho

In the three thirteenth-century chronistic accounts of Bernardo's legend, the backbone of the story of his birth remains constant: he is the product of the clandestine relationship between Jimena, the sister of Alfonso II, and Count Sancho.⁴ The characterization of the King, however, is inconsistent among the three retellings, vacillating between an enraged monarch and one who shows little emotion in his reaction.

In Lucas de Tuy's account of the hero's origins (234-35), Sancho secretly falls in love with Jimena, and from their union Bernardo is born. An irate Alfonso («nimium iratus») imprisons Sancho in Luna «sub iuramento perpetuo» and sends Jimena to a convent; however, despite his anger, the King raises his nephew. The version of Bernardo's birth in *De rebus Hispaniae* (Jiménez de Rada 126) does not deviate much from that of the *Chronicon mundi*, though Jiménez de Rada does add an important detail: in his version, Jimena secretly agrees to marry Sancho: «Semena soror eius comiti Sancio uiro nobili furtiuo connubio clam consensit» (126). Despite the marriage, Alfonso sends Jimena to a convent and imprisons Sancho in Luna. Again Jiménez de Rada diverts from Lucas de Tuy's account, this time omitting details, and does not reference Alfonso II's oath upon imprisoning Sancho. Instead, the King only declares that Sancho's death and the end of his imprisonment be the same, without including the detail of «sub iuramento perpetuo.» As in the *Chronicon mundi*, Bernardo is raised by Alfonso.

The above presentations of Alfonso, and particularly that of Lucas de Tuy, likely relate directly to the formation of Bernardo's legend, which, unlike many Spanish epic legends, appears not to be based in a historical Bernardo del Carpio. While there are some who argue in favor of the hero's possible historicity (González García 29), most agree that he is a fictitious personage (Menéndez Pidal 143). Consequently, multiple scholars have hypothesized figures and events on which different aspects of the legend may be based, with Mercedes Vaquero convincingly proposing that the reign of Alfonso IX of León and disenchantment among his vassals, particularly Pedro Fernández de Castro, served as inspiration for at least part of Bernardo's tale (479-81).⁵ According to Vaquero, the narration would have come about around the end of the twelfth century and the beginning of the thirteenth, and would have been linked to anti-Leonese revolts (476, 481). A tale that centered on the rule of Alfonso IX, an overwhelmingly weak monarch (Vaquero 479),

4.- The *Estoria de España* includes a second account of the hero's origins, in which he is the son of San Díaz and Timbor, sister of Charlemagne: «Et algunos dizen en sus cantares et en sus fablas que fue este Bernaldo fijo de donna Timbor hermana de Carlos rey de Francia, et que viniendo ella en romeria a Santiago, que la conuido el conde San Diaz et que la leuo pora Saldanna, et que ouo este fijo en ella, et quel reçibio el rey don Alfonso por fijo, pues que otro non auie que reynase en pos el» (Alfonso X 2: 351).

5.- Vaquero specifically links Pedro Fernández de Castro and Alfonso IX's rule to a now-lost *Cantar de Bernardo del Carpio* (479-81). However, for the purposes of this study, I refer rather to the legend itself, and not to the specific forms in which it may have been known. For other discussions regarding the origins of the legend, see Manuel Milá y Fontanals (193-240) and Albert Franklin (25-39).

and his vassals' unrest almost certainly would have painted a less-than-favorable portrait of the King. Lucas de Tuy's characterization of an infuriated Alfonso II who swears to punish the rebellious Sancho indefinitely is, therefore, likely consistent with the image of the King presented in his source materials for the legend.⁶ Along such lines, in his discussion of the Tudense's use of «popular, or epic, literary pieces,» Bernard Reilly proposes that Lucas de Tuy «accepted and repeated these earlier materials... [and] was docile to the lead of his sources, usually repeating their dialogue verbatim» (778-79). While he may not have repeated his sources in their entirety, as I will later address, his portrayal of the temperamental King was likely not his own invention.

Jiménez de Rada's depiction of Alfonso, however, does not entirely correspond to Lucas de Tuy's, as certain amendments made to *De rebus Hispaniae's* account of the legend subtly yet significantly alter the characterization of the King. The Toledano modifies the language used to describe Sancho's imprisonment, as his Alfonso II states only that the Count is to spend the remainder of his days in prison (126). While the pronouncements in the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae* are essentially the same, with both condemning the Count to a lifetime in Luna, Jiménez de Rada's omission of Alfonso II's oath causes the imprisonment of Sancho to lose some of its emotional charge, therein slightly mollifying the figure of the King. Jiménez de Rada depicts an Alfonso II who, upon learning that Sancho and Jimena had secretly married, imprisoned the nobleman for his actions, without demonstrating any emotional reaction to the relationship. This stands in stark contrast with Lucas de Tuy's hot-tempered Alfonso II, who, upon learning of the relationship between Sancho and Jimena, is noted to be irate and swears to keep Sancho imprisoned perpetually.

Moreover, the detail that Sancho and Jimena secretly married further implies that the King's imprisonment of the Count was not an emotional reaction, but rather a religious condemnation of the relationship. In his capacity as Archbishop of Toledo, Jiménez de Rada attended the Fourth Lateran Council (Kuttner and García y García 137; Gorosterratzu 165-69), during which clandestine marriages were canonically condemned (Bernal 45). Thus, *De rebus Hispaniae's* specification that Sancho and Jimena secretly married, after which Sancho was still incarcerated by Alfonso II, reflects the attitude of the Council that rendered such unions illegal (Bernal 37). Given the illegality of the union, Jiménez de Rada is, perhaps, indirectly offering justification for Alfonso's imprisonment of Sancho, again implying that the King's decision was not simply a result of his anger.

The above differences between Lucas de Tuy's and Jiménez de Rada's presentations of Alfonso II highlight the underlying intentions of *De rebus Hispaniae*. Geoffrey West has described Jiménez de Rada's overall motivation not just to record a «history of kings,» but rather to depict past monarchs in a positive manner: «*De rebus* records the achievements of the rulers of Spain in the Reconquest and these kings are the distant ancestors of Rodrigo's own monarchs, Alfonso VIII and Fernando III. There is evidence that Rodrigo wished to present these ancestors in as favourable light as possible» (526). Jiménez de Rada's representation of Alfonso II's response to Sancho and Jimena, one not tarnished by rash emotions, is therefore consistent with the Archbishop's desire to magnify

6.— While Vaquero proposes that Alfonso IX's reign inspired the legend of Bernardo del Carpio, the eventual association of the hero with Roncesvalles likely led to the legend's placement in the rule of Alfonso II.

the figure of the King throughout his chronicle, therein aggrandizing his own monarchs, Alfonso VIII and Fernando III (West 526).

The *ira regia* depicted by Lucas de Tuy, however, resurges in the *Estoria de España*. As it is told in Alfonso X's chronicle, Jimena secretly marries San Díaz, Count of Saldaña, and Bernardo is born (Alfonso X 2: 350). An upset Alfonso II holds court, and upon discovering that San Díaz is not present, he sends two noblemen to Saldaña to bring the Count to León (350). Once San Díaz has arrived, Alfonso orders his men to grab the Count; they hesitate and, after the King further presses them to seize him, they eventually oblige, tying San Díaz's hands together such that «le fizieron salir la sangre por las vnñas» (350). San Díaz is then imprisoned in Luna, Jimena sent to a convent, and Bernardo to Asturias (351). Alfonso II's oath is not mentioned, though it is later referenced when Bernardo asks Alfonso III to free his father.

Despite the omission of the oath, Alfonso's overall reaction is reminiscent of that in the *Chronicon mundi*. Unlike Jiménez de Rada's Alfonso II, who reacts accordingly to the crime committed, the Alfonso II of the *Estoria de España* is upset by the relationship («pesol' de coraçon» [Alfonso X 2: 350]), reminding us of Lucas de Tuy's description of the King as «nimium iratus» (234). He plots against the Count, ordering his men to seize him, which they do in such a way that blood seeps out from his fingernails. This vindictiveness of Alfonso II in the *Estoria de España*, which is not seen to the same extent in the *Chronicon mundi*, may stem from what Geraldine Coates understands to be Alfonso X's constant concern with treachery (79-80).⁷ Coates describes the secret union between Jimena and San Díaz as one that «shares some of the characteristics and harmfulness of treachery,» and consequently ties Alfonso's harsh reaction to the understanding of the marriage as treason (97). Alfonso's response is therefore a demonstration of his royal capability. The King's ruthlessness is captured by the image of the Count's bound, bleeding hands, which Coates believes to represent «the exaggeratedly obedient response of the group, which reinforces the authority, and possibly brutality, of the King» (97). While it is San Díaz who, in Alfonso's eye, is guilty of treason, it is *el rey Casto* who comes across as the antagonist through the harsh treatment of his subject. This notion is highlighted by the hesitation of Alfonso's vassals to seize the Count, which, for one brief moment, pits the King not only against San Díaz, but also against the whole of his vassals. The ensuing image, one of Alfonso at odds with his subjects, is reminiscent of the origins of Bernardo's legend: vassal-lord conflicts stemming from the rule of Alfonso IX of León.

Moreover, the new identification of Bernardo's father further opposes San Díaz and Alfonso II. While he is not linked to any particular locale in the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae*, San Díaz is Castilian in the *Estoria de España*, given his title «Count of Saldaña.»⁸ Therefore, the Alfonsine chroniclers present an episode in which it is a Castilian harshly treated and imprisoned by the Leonese King. This identification of the Count as Castilian and the violence of Alfonso II toward him further emphasizes late

7.– Describing the *Estoria de España*, Coates states, «Underhand behaviour, whether *traición* or analogous forms of disloyalty, rebellion, and lawlessness, is a constant source of tension in the chronicle precisely because of the direct associations with personal and communal decline. The *Partidas* support this opinion; *Partida* 7.2.1 indicates that Alfonso regarded treachery as an internally damaging offence» (79-80).

8.– Before the unification of Castile and León under Fernando III, Saldaña pertained to Castile (González 73).

twelfth- and early thirteenth-century hostilities between Castile and León, the time period in which Vaquero hypothesizes the composition of the *Cantar de Bernardo del Carpio*. Given the anti-Leonese nature of the legend that Vaquero proposes, the contrast between the Castilian vassal and the Leonese King is augmented to the point that, at least to some extent, Alfonso becomes the enemy.

The «liberation» of Sancho

The consequences of Alfonso II's imprisonment of Sancho continue into the reign of Alfonso III. In the *Chronicon mundi*, *De rebus Hispaniae*, and the *Estoria de España*, Bernardo establishes the fortress El Carpio and rebels against Alfonso III, ravaging the surrounding areas. In each case, the hero's rebellion is explicitly linked to his father's perpetual imprisonment.⁹ However, the ways in which Alfonso III addresses Bernardo's revolt differ greatly among the three chronicles, with Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada painting a much more flattering picture of the King than does the Alfonsine staff.

In each of the Latin chronicles, an intervention of Muslim troops prompts Alfonso to seek peace with Bernardo, enticing his vassal with the (possible) liberation of his father, Sancho. Afterwards, both Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada tell how Bernardo and Alfonso, at peace, turn their attention to defeating an invading Muslim army at Polvorosa (Lucas de Tuy 245; Jiménez de Rada 137). However, although an accord is reached in each version, *De rebus Hispaniae* is the only text in which Bernardo's father is explicitly freed, as Jiménez de Rada states that Alfonso reconciles with Bernardo through the liberation of Sancho: «Set rex Aldefonsus absolute patris Bernaldum concilians» (137). The *Chronicon mundi's* Alfonso III promises to free the Count, as he later does in the *Estoria de España*, but the Tudense never specifies whether that promise was kept: «Rex autem Adefonsus promittens Bernaldo se patrem eius a uinculis soluere, pacem cum eo fecit» (245). While in both cases Alfonso III remains a generally positive figure, as he is able to suppress Bernardo's rebellion and use their renewed alliance to defeat Muslim adversaries, Jiménez de Rada's presentation of Alfonso remains the most complimentary, as it is the King's actions, not his words, that bring peace.

De rebus Hispaniae's details of Sancho's liberation likely were the invention of the Toledano, given that his is the only text in which Alfonso III explicitly keeps his word and frees the Count. William Entwistle proposes that this particular detail is due to Jiménez de Rada's lack of interest in the «private affairs» of the legend (309). Considering this drastic change that, according to Entwistle, «would bring the whole fabric of the *cantar de gesta* to the ground» (309), his notion that the Archbishop was uninterested in the private affairs of Bernardo has merit. However, this alteration in all likelihood reveals more than just the Toledano's disinterest in Bernardo's family life, and instead

9.– «Predictus autem Bernaldus in territorio Salamanticensi castrum Carpium populauit. Et quia rex Adefonsus patrem eius tenebat comitem Sancium captum in castello, quod dicitur Luna, quem olim rex Castus ceperat Adefonsus, Bernaldus regi rebellare cepit» (Lucas de Tuy 245); «Verum quia pater eius, licet orbus et decrepitus, adhuc in uinculis tenebatur, Bernaldus extruxit castrum quod Carpium appellauit in territorio Salamantino, indeque federatus Arabibus cepit regni confinia infestare» (Jiménez de Rada 137); «Et dizen que yuro [Bernaldo] que nunca se partirie de guerrearle et de fazerle quanto mal pudiesse fasta quel diesse su padre» (Alfonso X 2: 373).

stems from his overall focus on Alfonso, which tends to overpower the attention given to Bernardo's legend.

In both the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae*, Bernardo's rebellion and the establishment of El Carpio fall between the chroniclers' accounts of Alfonso III's victories against the Muslims at Toledo and at Polvorosa. In these passages, Alfonso remains the central figure, with Bernardo filling a complementary role.¹⁰ While Bernardo at times has an active role in the battles, Alfonso is first and foremost the victor. Jiménez de Rada's description of Alfonso III's response to Bernardo's uprising is, therefore, consistent with his overarching emphasis on Alfonso's deeds. His portrayal of a king who deftly quells his vassal's rebellion, liberating Sancho in order to reconcile with Bernardo and continue his battles against Muslim foes, reflects his efforts to portray Alfonso «in as favourable light as possible» (West 526).

The *Estoria de España's* Alfonso III, however, does not handle Bernardo's rebellion as adroitly as the *Chronicon mundi's* and *De rebus Hispaniae's*. In the Castilian chronicle, Alfonso III exiles Bernardo after the latter's diatribe in which he confronts and challenges his monarch. Once exiled, Bernardo wages war against the King: «Et estando Bernaldo en Saldanna, corrio tierra de Leon, et guerreaua muy de rezio quanto el mas podie al rey don Alffonso; et duraron estas guerras II annos» (Alfonso X 2: 372). Later passages that surround the establishment and defense of El Carpio describe the battles between vassal and king in more detail, and in each case, Bernardo comes out on top (373-74). After two years of war, it is Alfonso's vassals, not the King, who recognize the need for peace and propose a solution: ««sennor, en fuerte punto et en fuerte ora uimos nos la prision del cuende San Diaz, ca toda uuestra tierra se pierde por ende, tanto es el mal que Bernaldo y faze. Et terniemos por bien quel sacassedes de la prision, et que ge le diessedes; ca si lo non fazedes, bien sabemos que nunca auremos paz con ell»» (374). At this point, the Alfonso III of the *Estoria de España* begins to resemble that of the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae*, as he agrees to free Bernardo's father; however, he does so on the condition that Bernardo hand over El Carpio (374). Bernardo agrees, and some of Alfonso's men are sent to retrieve the Count. Upon arriving, they discover that he has died in prison (375). Here the Alfonsine chroniclers mention now-unknown *romances* and *cantares*, and relate the King's course of action:

Et algunos dizen en sus romances et en sus cantares que el rey, quando lo sopo, que mando quel fiziessen bannos et quel bannassen en ellos porquel ablandesciese la carne, et quel uistiessen de buenos pannos, et quel pusiessen en un cauallito uestido de una capapiel de escarlata, et un escudero empos el quel touiesse que non cayesse; et que ge lo enuiassen dezir quando fuesen acerca de la cibdad do ell era, et quel saldrie a recibir. Et ellos fizieronlo assi. (375)

As the hero then greets his father, he kisses his cold hand and realizes San Díaz is a corpse, to which he reacts loudly, «[faziendo] el mayor duelo del mundo» (375). This

10.– The reports of Alfonso III's battle near Toledo are prime examples. Neither chronicler includes Bernardo in the description of the battle itself, only mentioning his presence after noting Alfonso's victory: «Habebat secum famosissimum militem Bernaldum...» (Lucas de Tuy 245); «... et in hiis bellis Berinaldo fortissimo milite sibi strenue assistente» (Jiménez de Rada 137).

lamentation leads to Alfonso's ultimate banishment of the hero: ««Don Bernaldo, non es tiempo de mucho hablar; mas digouos que me salgades luego de toda mi tierra»» (375).

The Alfonso III of the *Estoria de España* differs from those of the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae* in two significant respects. First, he, or more precisely his troops, engages in battle with Bernardo and loses. Neither Lucas de Tuy nor Jiménez de Rada mentions that Alfonso's army had any sort of confrontation with Bernardo, but the Alfonsine chroniclers state that his men were defeated twice. Such is Bernardo's military success that Alfonso's vassals, concerned over the destruction endured throughout the kingdom, persuade the King to liberate San Díaz as a peace offering to Bernardo. The hero's victories over Alfonso's men suggest that Bernardo's military skills are superior to those of his King—an implication never made in either the *Chronicon mundi* or *De rebus Hispaniae*, but suggested on other occasions in the *Estoria de España*.¹¹

Given that the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae* do not include the defeats suffered by Alfonso III at the hands of Bernardo, it could be the case that the Alfonsine account was the result of the chroniclers' ingenuity, with some basis, perhaps, in source materials not known by the Tudense or the Toledano. However, in light of Vaquero's hypothesis that Bernardo's legend centered on the relationship between a rebellious vassal and his monarch (476), it is likely that Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada knew a version that contained a more detailed account of Bernardo's rebellion than those of their respective chronicles. If the tale of Bernardo's uprising against Alfonso III had been known by the Latin chroniclers in a form that presented his insurrection in such limited terms as those they used, a significant facet of the rebellious vassal would be lost. Other than Bernardo's challenge of Alfonso III after the episode of the *tablado* (Alfonso X 2: 372), the principal incident that defines Bernardo as a rebellious vassal is his uprising against the King, coupled with his establishment and defense of El Carpio. Diminishing the latter episode to the degree that it is presented in the Latin chronicles greatly minimizes the characterization of Bernardo as a rebel, especially considering that his uprising quickly disintegrates with the promise of Sancho's freedom. However, considering that Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada's principal concern was to present the deeds of the past monarchs «on a national scale» (Entwistle 310; see also Reilly 772), they likely omitted details of Bernardo's rebellion in their attempt «to write a national history which mentioned only those parts of the national story that it suited [them] to include» (Linehan 354). The *Estoria de España's* chroniclers, on the other hand, did not gloss over Alfonso's initial

11.— The chroniclers relate that Alfonso, finding himself with few troops, summoned for help in his battle against Alchaman at Zamora (Alfonso X 2: 370). Bernardo heeded the call, arrived with his «grand hueste,» and personally defeated Alchaman: «Et Bernaldo ueno luego y con muy grand hueste, et en llegando fue ferir en ellos, et uenciolos et mato y a aquel so sennor dellos et a muchos de los otros» (370). This contradicts earlier accounts of the battle, which report the victory in more ambiguous terms: «Sed cum exercitu Christianorum properante Bernaldo diuina clemencia deleuit eos usque ad internicionem, et Alchamam, qui eorum propheta uidebantur, ibidem mortuus est.» (Lucas de Tuy 246); «... et Berinaldo solliciter instigante exercitus adunatus Arabes exterminio concassauit, Alchamam eorum propheta gladio interfecto» (Jiménez de Rada 138). In a later passage, Bernardo himself implies that Alfonso is militarily weak, reminding him of numerous cases in which he came to the King's aid: «... «ca bien sabedes uos de quam bien uos yo acorri con el mio cauallo en Benauent, quando uos mataron el uuestro en la batalla que ouiestes con el rey moro Ores... Otrossi quando fuestes dessa uez lidiar con el moro que yazie sobre Çamora, que auie nombre Alchaman, bien sabedes lo que yo y fiz por el uuestro amor... Ca, sennor, membraruos deuedes otrossi de como uos acorri yo cercal rio Oruego, quando estauedes cercado et uos tenien los moros en essa cerca en cueyta de muerte» (372).

defeats at the hands of Bernardo. Instead, their quest to include the deeds «tan bien de los locos cuemo de los sabios, ... tan bien de los que fizieron mal cuemo de los que fizieron bien» likely prompted them to record the legend as they knew it, in the most complete form possible (Alfonso X 1: 3).¹²

The second difference refers to Alfonso's treatment of Bernardo upon the delivery of San Díaz's corpse. While Lucas de Tuy, unlike Jiménez de Rada, does not explicitly report the liberation of Bernardo's father, stating only that the King promises such freedom, he also does not give the impression that a deceased Sancho was restored to Bernardo. Given Alfonso III's immediate reconciliation with his vassal, it is doubtful that the Tudense envisioned such an outcome in his account of the King's promise to Bernardo. The *Estoria de España's* chroniclers, on the other hand, present a much different Alfonso. He mocks Bernardo with his father's death, prepares the corpse as though it were alive and presents it to Bernardo, divests the hero of El Carpio, and banishes him.

The fact that Bernardo's final confrontation with Alfonso III does not appear in either the *Chronicon mundi* or *De rebus Hispaniae* is perhaps a result of such details entering the legend between the composition of the Latin chronicles and that of the *Estoria de España*. The *cantares* and *romances* mentioned were conceivably later compositions that were unknown by Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada. However, even if an account of the delivery of San Díaz's corpse had entered the legend before the *Chronicon mundi* and *De rebus Hispaniae*, the chroniclers very likely would have elected to omit the incident, given its rather dismal portrayal of Alfonso III. Instead, they (and especially Jiménez de Rada) present a magnanimous Alfonso who is willing to reconcile with Bernardo, despite the hero's rebellion. The *Estoria de España's* chroniclers, on the other hand, do not shy away from episodes centered on Bernardo, as evidenced by their inclusion of the defeats suffered by Alfonso III at the hands of his vassal. At the same time, if they did have any preoccupation with presenting past kings favorably, it is Alfonso who ultimately reigns victorious: he strips his vassal of El Carpio, mocks him with his father's corpse, and banishes him.

Bernardo and Alfonso's conflicts in the chronicles and the *Romancero*

When considering the legend of Bernardo del Carpio, one tends to focus exclusively on the hero's deeds, such as his numerous military successes and constant mistreatment by his monarchs. However, the earliest documentation of his tale maintains an overall focus on his two rulers, Alfonso II and Alfonso III of León, and not on the hero himself. Lucas de Tuy's *Chronicon mundi* and Jiménez de Rada's *De rebus Hispaniae* report Bernardo's exploits, but they do so under the overarching purpose of recording the two Kings' deeds. Both insert Bernardo into their accounts of Alfonso II's and Alfonso III's reigns, but Bernardo plays a secondary role. This is most evident in their reports of his uprising: each records that Bernardo begins to rebel, which prompts Alfonso to promise to free Sancho, leading to an immediate peace between the two. Although only Jiménez de Rada

12.— Further suggesting that the Alfonsine task force intended to present a comprehensive version of Bernardo's tale is its inclusion of contradicting information, such as the double account of Bernardo's origins (Alfonso X 2: 350-51).

reports that Alfonso III keeps his word and frees Sancho, an accord is reached in both and attention immediately returns to the King and his battles against Muslim foes.

Despite the overarching focus on Alfonso II and Alfonso III, it is only Jiménez de Rada who consistently ameliorates the representation of the Kings, be it through Alfonso III's explicit liberation of Sancho or Alfonso II's level-headed response to Sancho and Jimena's relationship. Unlike Lucas de Tuy, who describes an enraged Alfonso II, Jiménez de Rada offers justification for the King's actions: he is responding to the canonically condemned secret marriage. This consistent refinement of the representations of Alfonso II and Alfonso III stems from the Archbishop's desire to magnify the figures of Alfonso VIII and Fernando III through his portrayal of their ancestors (West 526). On the other hand, the Tudense's «history of kings» (Reilly 772) presented an account that was likely more consistent with a legend centered on the conflicts between a vassal and his monarchs. By portraying an irate Alfonso II, who swears to keep Sancho imprisoned perpetually, Lucas de Tuy nods to the legend's origins, which, from the beginning, pitted the hero against a hostile ruler.

Later versions of the legend brought Bernardo to the foreground and denigrated the figure of the Kings. The *Estoria de España's* chroniclers portray an Alfonso II who reacts harshly to what he sees as San Díaz's betrayal, binding his hands so blood seeps through his fingernails, reflecting the Tudense's irate King. Later, they depict an Alfonso III who consistently needs Bernardo's help in battle, promises to free his father, and then goes back on his word. Furthermore, they report that the King's troops are defeated twice by Bernardo and his men. Then, after Alfonso's vassals have urged him to seek peace, he taunts Bernardo with his father's corpse, strips him of El Carpio, and exiles him. The *Estoria de España's* portrayal of Alfonso II and Alfonso III, one that is not moderated as it is in both the *Chronicon mundi* or *De rebus Hispaniae*, is likely due to the chroniclers' close adherence to a legend that highlighted the perpetual conflicts between a Castilian vassal and his Leonese king. By compiling a comprehensive account of the legend, the Alfonsine staff furthers its goal of presenting a history of Spain that includes the deeds «tan bien de los locos cuemo de los sabios, ... tan bien de los que fizieron mal cuemo de los que fizieron bien» (Alfonso X 1: 3). Furthermore, the expansion of the *Estoria de España's* account of the legend, including such incidents as the delivery of San Díaz's corpse, is likely due to the chroniclers' reliance on materials unknown to Lucas de Tuy and Jiménez de Rada, such as the *cantares* and *romances* mentioned in conjunction with the treatment of San Díaz's body (Alfonso X 2: 375).

The attention given to Bernardo and Alfonso's conflicts continued into the *Romancero*, leading to even further deprecation of the King. In the ballad «Por las riberas de Arlanza,» Bernardo confronts Alfonso's attitude regarding the supposedly illicit relationship between his parents. The altercation in the *romance* is reminiscent of that in the *Estoria de España*, in which Bernardo requests his father's freedom, humiliates and challenges the King, and is ultimately banished (Alfonso X 2: 371-72). In the case of the ballad, however, the hero has the advantage:

1520: *Cancionero manuscrito da Biblioteca Publica Hortênsia da Elvas:*

Por las riberas de Arlança el gran Bernardo cavalga,
hijo del conde Saldaña, que del Carpio se llamava.
En un cavallo venía, que más qu'el viento bolava,
una lança con dos hierros, ante pecho una adarga.
Toda la ciudad de Burgos con intención lo mirava;
mirávalo el rey Alfonso, cuan hermoso cavalgaba.
Desde que el rey venir lo vido, con tal gracia qual mostrava,
pescudando quién sería, contra los suyos hablava:
—Uno de dos cavalleros es éste que acá somava,
o es Bernardo del Carpio o es Murcia de Granada—
Desde que Bernardo vido el rey, en el cavallo se parava,
Hincó la lança en tierra, desta manera hablava:
—Bastardo me llaman, rey, siendo hijo de tu hermana,
quien quiera que tal dixiere es de condición villana,
que mi padre no fue traidor en casar con tu hermana,
que la mereció mejor que ninguno en todo España
aslo metido en hierros, a ella en ordem santa:
mal lo pudieras hazer, si no fuera por tal maña;
castellanos y leoneses morirán en la demanda
esse rey de Saragoça nos embiará su compañía
y si la verdad venciere, yo seré señor d' España,
y se mal me sucediere, muerto, bivrá mi fama.—
(Petersen)

1573: Juan de Timoneda's *Rosa española:*

Por las riberas de Arlanza Bernardo del Carpio cabalga
con un caballo morcillo enjaezado de grana,
gruesa lanza en la su mano, armado de todas armas.
Toda la gente de Burgos le mira como espantada,
porque no se suele armar sino a cosa señalada.
También lo miraba el rey, que fuera vuela una garza;
diciendo estaba a los suyos: —Esta es una buena lanza:
si no es Bernardo del Carpio, éste es Muza el de Granada.—
Ellos estando en aquesto, Bernardo que allí llegaba,
Ya sosegado el caballo, no quiso dejar la lanza;
Mas puesta encima del hombro al rey de ésta suerte hablava:
—Bastardo me llaman, rey, siendo hijo de tu hermana
y del noble Sancho Díaz, ese conde de Saldaña
dicen que ha sido traidor, y mala mujer tu hermana.
Tú y los tuyos lo habéis dicho, que otro ninguno no osara:
mas quien quiera que lo ha dicho miente por medio la barba;
mi padre no fue traidor, ni mi madre mujer mala,
porque cuando fui engendrado ya mi madre era casada.
Pusiste a mi padre en hierros, y a mi madre en orden santa,
y por que no herede yo quieres dar tu reino a Francia.
Morirán los castellanos antes de ver tal jornada:
montañeses, y leoneses, y esa gente esturiana,
y ese re de Zaragoza me prestará su compañía
para salir contra Francia y darle cruda batalla;
y si buena me saliere, será el bien de toda España;
si mala, por la república moriré yo en tal demanda.
Mi padre mando que sueltes pues me diste la palabra;
Si no, en campo, como quiera te será bien demandada.
(Petersen)

The Alfonso of the ballad is an overwhelmingly passive presence. In neither case does he speak to Bernardo, and the only time he is given a voice is to contemplate the identification of the approaching knight. The 1573 version takes this image even further, as the King ponders not the hero himself, but rather the sight of his «gruesa lanza.» Other than his personal glorification of the hero, Alfonso does little to represent himself. However, Bernardo offers his own description, implying that Alfonso «es de condición villana» or stating outright that he is lying: «mas quien quiera que lo ha dicho miente por medio la barba.» He later portrays the King as spiteful and cowardly, linking his own supposed illegitimacy to the cession of the kingdom to France: «y por que no herede yo quieres dar tu reino a Francia» (1573).¹³ In each case, Alfonso, silent, is not given the opportunity to respond to such accusation, and only listens as Bernardo claims to fight for the good of Spain. Bernardo then gets the final word and demands his father's freedom, all but threatening Alfonso if he refuses to comply: «Mi padre mando que sueltes pues me diste la palabra; / Si no, en campo, como quiera te será bien demandada» (1573).

13.— He only explicitly connects Alfonso's decision to his illegitimacy in the 1573 version. However, he alludes to said issue in the earlier ballad: «y si la verdad venciere, yo seré señor d' España.»

While the *Estoria de España's* presentation of Alfonso was not as restricted as those of the *Chronicon mundi* or *De rebus Hispaniae*, the *Romancero's* is even less limited. The oral diffusion of the ballads (Catalán 87-88; Díaz-Mas 10), free from any bindings of imperially-backed chronicles, likely contributed to the new focus on Bernardo, leading to the glorification of a hero ready to free all of Spain from the French threat. The denigration of Alfonso, who is left only to marvel at «la buena lanza,» may be due less to an intentional defamation of the monarch, and more to a magnification of the hero that resulted from the «capacidad recreadora de la transmisión oral» (Catalán 88), which happened to occur at Alfonso's expense. Considering that the legend has a base in a rebellious vassal's turbulent relationship with his monarch, it is fitting that its later transmission zeroes in on episodes in which Alfonso and Bernardo face off, establishing a clear dichotomy between the heroic vassal and his vindictive king.

Works cited

- ALFONSO X, el Sabio. *Estoria de España*. Ed. Ramón Menéndez Pidal (*Primera crónica general de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289*). 2 vols. Madrid: Gredos, 1955.
- BERNAL, José Sánchez-Arcilla. «La formación del vínculo y los matrimonios clandestinos en la Baja Edad Media.» *Cuadernos de Historia del Derecho* 17 (2010): 7-47.
- Cantar de mio Cid*. Ed. Alberto Montaner. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, Círculo de Lectores, 2011.
- CATALÁN, Diego. *Arte poética del romancero oral. Parte 1ª: Los textos abiertos de creación colectiva*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1997. Arte poética.
- COATES, Geraldine. *Treacherous Foundations: Betrayal and Collective Identity in Early Spanish Epic, Chronicle and Drama*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Tamesis, 2009.
- DÍAZ-MAS, Paloma, ed. *Romancero*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2006.
- ENTWISTLE, William J. «The 'Cantar de Gesta' of Bernardo del Carpio. I-II.» *The Modern Language Review* 23.3 (1928): 307-22
- FALQUE, Emma. Introduction. *Lucae Tudensis Chronicon mundi*. By Lucas de Tuy. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- FRANKLIN, III, Albert B. *The Origins of the Legend and Romancero of Bernardo del Carpio*. Diss. Harvard University, 1938.
- GONZÁLEZ, Julio. *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*. Vol 1. Madrid: Escuela de Estudios Medievales, 1960.
- GONZÁLEZ GARCÍA, Vicente José. *Bernardo del Carpio y la batalla de Roncesvalles*. Oviedo: Fundación Gustavo Bueno, 2007.
- GOROSTERRATZU, Javier. *Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, gran estadista, escritor y prelado: Estudio documentado de su vida, de los cuarenta años de su Primacía en la Iglesia de España y de su Cancillerato en Castilla; y en particular, la prueba de sus asistencia al Concilio IV de Letrán, tan debatida en la controversia de la venida de Santiago a España*. Pamplona: Imp. y Lib. De Viuda de T. Besansa, 1925.
- JIMÉNEZ DE RADA, Rodrigo. *Historia de rebus Hispaniae sive Historia gothica. Roderici Ximenii de Rada Opera Omnia, Pars I*. Ed. Juan Fernández Valverde. Turnhout: Brepols, 1987.
- KUTTNER, Stephan, and Antonio García y García. «A New Eyewitness Account of the Fourth Lateran Council.» *Traditio* 20 (1964): 115-78.
- LUCAS DE TUY. *Chronicon mundi*. Ed. Emma Falque. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Libro de Fernán González*. Ed. Itziar López Guil. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2001.
- LINEHAN, Peter. *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, Ramón. *Romancero tradicional*. Vol. I. Madrid: Gredos, 1957.
- MILÁ Y FONTANALS, Manuel. *Obras de Manuel Milá y Fontanals I. De la poesía heroico-popular castellana*. Eds. Martín de Riquer and Joaquín Molas. Barcelona: Graphic Andros, 1959.
- Las Mocedades de Rodrigo*. Ed. Leonardo Funes with Felipe Tenenbaum. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer (Colección Tamesis), 2004.
- PETERSEN, Suzanne H., ed. *Pan-Hispanic Ballad Project*. n.d. n.p. Web. March 21, 2015. <<https://depts.washington.edu/hisprom>>
- REILLY, Bernard F. «Bishop Lucas of Túy and the Latin Chronicle Tradition in Iberia.» *The Catholic Historical Review* 93.4 (2007): 767-88.
- VAQUERO, Mercedes. «Relaciones feudo-vasalláticas y problemas territoriales en el *Cantar de Bernardo del Carpio*.» *Charlemagne in the North. Proceedings of the Twelfth International Con-*

- ference of the Société Rencesvals*. Eds. Philip E. Bennett, Anne Elizabeth Cobby, and Graham A. Runnals. London: Grant and Cutler, 1993. 475-84.
- WEST, Geoffrey. «Treatment of Legendary Material in Rodrigo of Toledo's *De rebus Hispaniae*.» *The Medieval Mind: Hispanic Studies in Honour of Alan Deyermond*. Eds. Ian Macpherson and Ralph Penny. London: Tamesis, 1997. 517-33.