

---

O'Callaghan, J. F. 2022. "Fray Juan Gil de Zamora, Infante Sancho, and Alfonso el Sabio" [in English]. *Filosofiya. Zhurnal Vysshey shkoly ekonomiki [Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics]* 6 (4), 127–152.

---

JOSEPH F. O'CALLAGHAN\*

## FRAY JUAN GIL DE ZAMORA, INFANTE SANCHO, AND ALFONSO EL SABIO\*\*

Submitted: Oct. 02, 2022. Reviewed: Oct. 27, 2022. Accepted: Nov. 15, 2022.

**Abstract:** In his *De preconiiis Hispanie*, Fray Juan Gil de Zamora endeavored to inculcate in Infante Sancho, Alfonso X's second son and heir, an understanding of the history of Spain and to cite examples of rulers who used their authority well and those who abused it. He reminded the young prince that he would be accountable to God and that he should not pursue his own interests to the detriment of his people. He specifically denounced royal avarice and argued that a king should not impoverish his people with unaccustomed levies of taxation. Moreover, he stressed the king's duty to rule in accordance with the approved laws and customs established with the consent of the people. Although he did not criticize Alfonso X by name, he was aware of popular complaints of excessive taxation and innovations in the law. While providing Infante Sancho with a manual for good government, he also conveyed a tacit critique of El Rey Sabio.

**Keywords:** *De preconiiis Hispanie*, Castigos, Digna vox, Lucas of Tuy, Vincentius Hispanus, Visigoths, King Rodrigo, Count Julian, Reconquest, Royal Virtues.

DOI: 10.17323/2587-8719-2022-4-127-152.

Much has been written about medieval kings and emperors who were endowed with and exercised power and authority over their subjects. In doing so they usually depended upon the counsel of bishops, nobles, and professional officials who constituted their court. Many of them derived their concept of power and authority not only from the law books, especially Justinian's Code, but also from their study of ancient philosophers such as Aristotle and the writings of contemporary scholars such as Thomas Aquinas's treatise on kingship. In the kingdom of Castile the Franciscan Fray Juan Gil de Zamora dedicated to Infante Sancho, Alfonso X's second son, a notable Latin treatise, *De preconiiis Hispanie* (DPH). Drawing on a wide array of biblical sources, classical and medieval authors, and historians of Spain, he discoursed on Roman emperors and kings of Spain who had exercised power and authority in earlier centuries (Barrio Vega, 2012). My study will focus on the lessons that he endeavored to inculcate

\*Joseph F. O'Callaghan, PhD in Medieval History, Professor Emeritus at the Fordham University (New York, USA), [c1onmeen@optonline.net](mailto:c1onmeen@optonline.net).

\*\*© Joseph F. O'Callaghan. © Philosophy. Journal of the Higher School of Economics.

in the young prince who became heir to the throne after the death of his older brother Fernando de la Cerda in 1275.<sup>1</sup> No doubt Fray Juan believed that Sancho would wield royal power and authority wisely if he understood the history of Spain and learned from the example of those rulers who used their authority well and those who abused it. Although he was well aware of the presence of the reigning monarch, Alfonso X, Fray Juan also knew that the king, especially in his later years, had to face several major crises, including poor health and a hostile nobility, yet he did not criticize him overtly. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that some of his remarks convey a tacit critique of the king.

Fray Juan's fellow Franciscan Manuel de Castro suggested that he was born about 1241, that he entered the Order in 1266 at the age of twenty-five, that he was eventually sent to study at the University of Paris and that he died about 1318, but all that is approximate (Gil de Zamora, 1955: XXV–CXXVI; Ferrero Hernández, 2010: 19–33). After returning from Paris to Castile, his learning was such that he attracted the attention of Alfonso X, who asked him to compose a liturgical office in honor of the Virgin Mary. Fray Juan, describing himself as *humillimus scriptor* and *doctor insufficiens*, expressed the wish that his most serene Lord Alfonso, king of Castile, León, and Vandalia [his term for Andalucía], would enjoy “regni terreni gubernaculum meritorium, et aeterni bravium remuneratorium” (“a worthy government of an earthly kingdom and the reward of eternal recompense”) (Fita, 1885: 379–409; esp. 379–380). A prolific writer on a wide range of secular and religious themes, Fray Juan, the king's *scriptor*, does not seem to have been employed as a scribe in the royal chancery. His *Liber Marie*, a collection of miracle stories of the Virgin Mary, however, is believed to have contributed to the king's *Cantigas de Santa María* (Cantigas De Santa Maria, 1981). In his incomplete biography of Alfonso X, he characterized that young prince in these words (Fita, 1884: 308–328; esp. 319, cap. 16):

acer ingenio, pervigil studio, memoria luculentus; quoad exteriora vero discretus eloquencia, procerus elegancia, modestus in risu, honestus in visu, planus in incessu, sobrius in convictu. Adeo nihilominus extitit liberalis, quod ipsius liberalitas prodigalitatis speciem induebat ([A man of] sharp intellect, attentive in study, with an excellent memory, discreet in speech, distinguished by his elegance,

<sup>1</sup>In *Cantigas De Santa Maria*, 1959-1974: 166, Cap. 15. 22, Sancho IV explained that he had inherited his father's kingdoms after the death of his older brother Fernando, who had been married and left children, the so-called Infantes de la Cerda.

moderate in laughter, honest in his gaze, easy in his gait, and temperate in eating. Although he was open-handed, his liberality clothed a sort of prodigality.)

Internal references to 1277,<sup>2</sup> 1278,<sup>3</sup> and 1281<sup>4</sup> indicate that Fray Juan was writing his *Liber de preconiiis Hispanie* in those years, if not before. In 1278 Infante Sancho was twenty years of age and already actively involved in the political life of the kingdom. That being so, he had likely received the fundamentals of his education from others before the Franciscan's return from Paris. In the *Siete Partidas* (2,7,4–10) Alfonso X described the functions and responsibilities of the tutors assigned to his sons (O'Callaghan, 2019: 30–34). However, we do not know the names of the tutors who provided Sancho's basic education. Nor do we know whether Alfonso X appointed Fray Juan as Sancho's tutor, or whether Fray Juan, on his own initiative, decided to write the *De preconiiis Hispanie* for Sancho's instruction, or whether someone else prompted him to do so. Perhaps King Alfonso suggested that a book of this sort would be advantageous for the young prince. The description of Fray Juan as Sancho's tutor ought to be understood with those caveats.

As part of his education, Sancho learned the Latin language and Fray Juan, by dedicating the *De preconiiis* to him, obviously expected that he would be able to read it. In the prologue he addressed Sancho as “maiori filio et heredi” (“the oldest son and heir”) of Alfonso X. That was an acknowledgment of the fact, that, after the sudden death of the king's oldest son, Fernando de la Cerda, in 1275, the king recognized Sancho as the heir to the throne in the Cortes of Burgos in 1276. The description of Sancho as “Biscaye potentifico adeptori” (“the powerful conqueror of Viscaya”), is an interpolation in the prologue inserted after Sancho became king and refers to his overthrow of Lope Díaz de Haro and his subjugation of Lope's lordship of Vizcaya in 1287.<sup>5</sup> Identifying himself as *doctor indignus*, Fray Juan expressed the hope that his book would encourage Sancho to accomplish difficult and noble things. He explained that his book was divided into twelve tractates or treatises and that he had written them “propter mores

<sup>2</sup>DPH. 8. 6. 51: “usque ad regem Allefonsum in Regem Romanorum electum et illustrem Sancium filium eius, qui iam eidem inceptit corregnare sub anno Domini MLXXVII.”

<sup>3</sup>DPH. 1. 3. 29: “VI mixta usque hodiernum diem sub era MCCCXVI sub anno Domini. MCCLXXVIII.”

<sup>4</sup>DPH. 5. 28. 135: “Cumque omnia supradicta fere infra quadringentos septuaginta annos minus septem ab era DCCCXXV usque ad eram MCCCXIX, usque ad annum Domini MCCLXXXI”.

<sup>5</sup>That phrase does not appear in the Castilian translation, DPH. 51; Gaibrois de Ballesteros, 1922–1928; Nieto Soria, 1994: 860–96.

et non propter historias.” His purpose, therefore, was not to recount history, which one could read in other books, but rather to present moral examples that the infante could follow (Rojo Alique, 2014: 297–318; esp. 306–311).

The *De preconiis Hispanie* ought to be read in the context of the last decade of Alfonso X's reign, his most difficult years troubled by an increasingly debilitating cancer. Over time, his erratic behavior led many to believe that he was no longer capable of governing. In the Cortes of Burgos in 1272, for example, the king, because of his innovations in the law and imposition of extraordinary taxes, encountered opposition from the nobility and the townsmen. The magnates repudiated their allegiance to him and took service with the emir of Granada. After persuading them to return, he travelled to the papal court in the futile hope of securing recognition as Holy Roman emperor. In his absence, the Marinids of Morocco invaded Castile, his oldest son Fernando de la Cerda died suddenly enroute to the frontier, and Infante Sancho halted the Marinid advance. Upon returning home, King Alfonso recognized Sancho as heir to the throne in the Cortes of Burgos in 1276, but thereafter had to contend with the counterclaims of his grandson Alfonso de la Cerda who was recognized by his maternal grandfather Philip III of France. These woes were compounded by the treachery of his brother Infante Fadrique whom he arbitrarily executed in 1277, and his abandonment by Queen Violante. When the Marinids invaded again in 1277, the king attempted to deny them access to the peninsula by unsuccessfully besieging Algeciras. Then, under French pressure, he decided to partition his realm for the benefit of his grandson Alfonso de la Cerda. Infuriated, Infante Sancho, after exchanging harsh words with his father during the Cortes of Seville in 1281, summoned the estates of the realm to Valladolid. The assembly transferred all royal authority to Sancho, leaving his father with the empty title of king. Worn out by disease, the old king disinherited Sancho and appealed for help to his erstwhile enemies, the Marinids. When he died at Seville in April 1284, Sancho succeeded him (O'Callaghan, 1993: 236–269; González Jiménez, 2004: ef239–371).

#### IN PRAISE OF HISPANIA

There are two principal themes to Fray Juan's book, namely, *Hispania*, and his conception of kingship. The title of his book, *De preconiis Hispanie*, informs us that the focus of his attention was the entire Iberian Peninsula. His understanding was based upon the Hispania of the Romans, divided into the two great provinces, Hispania Citerior and Hispania Ulterior. He was also aware of the five ecclesiastical provinces that embraced the entire

peninsula, namely, Tarraconensis, Cartaginensis, Baetica, Lusitania, and Gallaetia (DPH. 2. 1. 9). He repeated the legend that the name Hispania was derived from Hispan, the *primus rex hispanorum* (DPH. 1. 3). As he described the early settlement of Spain, he drew upon the legends recorded by Isidore of Seville, Lucas, bishop of Túy, and Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada, archbishop of Toledo (DPH. 1. 2. 1–3; Isidore of Seville, 1894b and Isidore of Seville, 1894a: 267–303; 424–481; Lucas de Túy, 2003; Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada, 1987). Inspired probably by Isidore, he praised Spain’s fertility and the wealth of the countryside (DPH. 2. 1).

In his description of the most notable places in Spain, he identified the individual kingdoms of León, Castile, Aragón, Portugal, and Navarre, but he recognized that they belonged to the broader entity of *Hispania* (DPH. 8. 1–6). Given his knowledge of peninsular history, it is possible that he believed that they might all be united as one kingdom of Spain.

After mentioning Spain’s distinguished philosophers, historians, and poets, he proclaimed these words of praise (DPH. 7. 3. 17):

Prefulget etiam Hispania omnimoda libertate, cum in agendis causis civilibus propriis utatur legibus, et reges Hispanie nulli subdantur imperio temporali (Spain shines forth in full liberty for she uses her own laws in adjudicating civil suits and the kings of Spain are subject to no temporal empire).

He borrowed that statement from Bishop Lucas of Túy (1239–1249) (Lucas de Túy, 2003: 3). His purpose was to affirm the autonomy of the kings of Spain and to emphasize that they were not subject to the Holy Roman emperor who claimed universal dominion in Western Europe. The canonist Vincentius Hispanus (d. 1248), who also conceived of Hispania as one, repudiated imperial claims to Spain by asserting that Charlemagne failed to subjugate the peninsula. Ruling over “Beata domina Yspania” (“Blessed Lady Spain”), the Spaniards were creating their own empire and had their own laws and had no need of imperial laws (Post, 1964: 482–493 (Vincentius Hispanus and Spanish Nationalism); esp. 490, n. 190; O’Callaghan, 1993: 22–24). Fray Juan also noted that Charlemagne was unable to occupy Spain and that, indeed, he was defeated by the men of Spain (DPH. 5. 28. 135). Despite that rejection of imperial dominance over Spain, he usually referred to Alfonso X as *rex Romanorum electus*, the elected king of the Romans, the title borne by the Holy Roman emperor before being crowned by the pope. Fray Juan’s failure to discuss *el Sabio’s* pursuit of the imperial crown prompted Manuel de Castro to wonder whether Fray Juan was among those who tried to

dissuade the king from that quest. That is possible because he never explicitly criticized any action taken by the king (Castro, 1962: 507–541; esp. 508).

The ancient glories and the unity of Hispania were destroyed by the Muslim invasion in 711, to which Fray Juan alluded many times (O'Callaghan, 1975: 51–54). For example, he commented that

supervenit dominium gothorum et duravit usque ad regem Rodericum qui fuit ultimus rex gotorum; sub quo tota Hispania fuit ab arabibus occupata et disipata in era septingentissima LII (Gothic rule came to pass and lasted until King Rodrigo, the last king of the Goths, under whom all of Spain was occupied and destroyed by the Arabs in the era 752),

except for the northern mountainous regions (DPH. 8. 6. 49). The equivalence of the date he cited was 714AD, though the actual date was 711. He also pointed out that at the time of King Witiza and his successor Rodrigo, the kingdom of Spain was extensive, stretching from Tangier in Africa as far as the Rhone River. Nevertheless, the kingdom was troubled by arrogance, religious indifference, discord, excessive luxury, and cowardice. As a consequence of the malice of kings and prelates, the kingdom of the Christians was crushed between the seas so that Muḥammad might reign in Spain (DPH. 8. 7. 55–56).

Fray Juan Gil recounted the fable foreshadowing the Muslim conquest of Spain. King Rodrigo, thinking that a locked chest in the palace in Toledo might be full of treasure, opened it and discovered a cloth with a Latin inscription saying that when the chest was opened the Arab warriors depicted on the cloth would invade Spain and destroy it. The villain who facilitated the Arab invasion was Count Julián whose daughter King Rodrigo raped. In revenge, Julián introduced the Muslims into Spain and they quickly defeated Rodrigo, the *ultimus rex gothorum* (DPH. 5. 12–15). In scathing language Fray Juan Gil denounced Count Julián, saying “Memoria eius in omni ore amarescit, et nomen eius in eternum putrescit” (“May his memory be bitter in every mouth and may his name putrefy forever”) (DPH. 5. 15. 64). He continued, exclaiming, “Proh dolor. Hic finitur gloria gothice ac hispanice maiestatis [...] Hispania filios suos plorat, et consolari non potuit” (“The glory of the Goths and of Hispanic majesty ended here [...] Spain weeps for her children and cannot be consoled”) (DPH. 5. 16. 65). In a lengthy lamentation, he mourned, “Quis dabit capiti meo aquas, et fontem oculis lacrimarum ut plorem excidium hispanorum, et miseriam gentis gothorum?” (“Who will give water for my head and a fountain of tears for my eyes so that I might weep for the destruction of the people of Spain and the misery

of the Gothic people?") (DPH. 5. 16. 66). Reflecting his mentor's example, Sancho IV, in the prologue to his *Castigos*, denounced Rodrigo, the last king of the Goths, who lost Spain "por la maldat e traycion abominable del malo del conde don Jullian" ("through the wickedness and abominable treason of the evil Count don Julián") (*Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, 2001: prol. 11; caps. 10. 27, 40. 38).

As he recounted the triumphant march of the Muslim armies after routing Rodrigo, Fray Juan commented that the Jews betrayed Toledo, the *civitas regia*, to the Saracens. He added that in his own time there were 70,000 Jews, not counting women, children, and the poor, paying tribute in Toledo, an obvious exaggeration (DPH. 8. 2. 17). At that time, in the era 752, "Tota Hispania fuit ab arabibus occupata et disipata" ("All of Spain was occupied and destroyed by the Arabs"), except for the northern mountainous regions. Over a long time, by God's grace, "recuperata fuit" ("it was recovered") by Pelayo and Alfonso el Casto. Indeed, Fray Juan remarked: "Recuperata fuit nihilominus Hispania per multos reges nobiles" ("Nevertheless Spain was recovered by many noble kings") until the time of Alfonso X and his son Sancho (DPH. 8. 6. 49–51).

The passages cited above indicate that Fray Juan conceived of the Iberian Peninsula as one entity that included several kingdoms and provinces. He often spoke of *Hispania misera* (DPH. 8. 12. 139–140; 9. 11. 121), and the *reges Hispanie* (DPH. 8. 1. 2), and noted that Emperor Trajan was a native Spaniard, *natione hispanus* (DPH. 8. 1. 4). Although he mentioned the election of Alfonso VI as *rex Hispanie* (DPH. 8. 11), and referred to him casually as *imperator*, he did not record that Alfonso VII was crowned as emperor of Spain. As I suggested, he may have expected that by conquest or intermarriage those kingdoms would be united in one kingdom of Spain.

However, he cited the tendency of the eleventh- and twelfth-century kings of Castile-León to divide their realms among their sons, a process that impeded unification until Fernando III reunited them in 1230 (DPH. 8. 10). Fray Juan did not speak of Alfonso X's plan to divide his realms between Infante Sancho and Alfonso de la Cerda, nor the final partition in his last will benefiting his younger sons Juan and Jaime. Whatever deterred Fray Juan from speaking of this matter, his pupil Infante Sancho had a good reason for objecting to the division. In the Cortes of Seville in 1281 when the king proposed giving Alfonso de la Cerda a share of the inheritance that Sancho rightly believed to be his, he protested loudly and apparently decided that it was time to deprive his father of royal authority. In his *Castigos* (*ibid.*: 11. 104), in a catalogue of actions that a king ought not to do, he stated

“Non cae al rey de menguar su regno, nin [partirlo] entre sus hijos para depués de sus días, nin le cae bien enajenar nin de malparar los bienes del su regno. El regno que es partido e menguado conviene que sea desollado por raiz, segund que dixo Ihesu Christo en el Evangelio” (“The king ought not to diminish his kingdom nor divide it among his sons after his days, nor ought he to alienate or abuse the goods of his kingdom. The kingdom that is divided and diminished would be uprooted as Jesus Christ said in the gospel” (Matt. 12:25)).

He also pointed to the discord, wars, deaths, and other evils that occurred when a king divided his realms among his sons (Cantigas De Santa Maria, 1959-1974: 15. 16). Although it is likely that the majority of the population were descended from the Iberians and the Romans, Fray Juan accepted the idea that they were now the Gothic people. Pelayo and his successors were identified as the heirs of the Visigoths and the people who survived the collapse of the Visigothic kingdom were the Goths. This is a persistent theme reflected in the historiography of the Middle Ages (O’Callaghan, 2003: 6–7).

Fray Juan also used the language of reconquest. Although he spoke of the occupation and destruction of the kingdom of Spain by the Arabs, and denounced the treachery of Count Julián and King Rodrigo, he was moved by the knowledge that the lands once seized by the enemy were being recovered. That process had reached a climax in his own time with Fernando III’s conquest of Córdoba, Jaén, and Seville, and Infante Alfonso’s occupation of the kingdom of Murcia. Moreover, the emir of Granada was reduced to tributary vassalage. At the same time the kings of Portugal and Aragón subjugated Muslim territory on the western and eastern frontiers. In describing the recovery of Spain, Fray Juan surely hoped to inspire Infante Sancho to continue the work until the last vestige of Muslim rule in Spain would be extinguished. In tractates 11 and 12 of the *De preconiis* he explicated the *De re militari* of the Roman author Vegetius and offered it to Infante Sancho as a guide for the conduct of war against the Moors (Vegetius, Milner, 1993).

#### THE QUALITIES OF A GOOD KING

Now, let me direct attention to Fray Juan’s second great theme, the several qualities or virtues that a king ought to possess (Castro, 1962: 507–541). After delineating each virtue in general terms, he offered several examples, usually persons from the ancient world, that Infante Sancho might emulate (Dacosta, 2006: 99–121). His discussion of the virtue of largesse (*largitas*) and the vice of (*auaritia*) as reflected in the behavior



of rulers is best understood in the context of his own time. Commenting on the liberality of the rulers of Spain, he remarked (DPH. 3. 1. 1): “Immo, tanta est principum largitas, quod prodigalitatē speciem induit” (Indeed, so great is the largesse of princes as to clothe a type of prodigality). In his biography of Alfonso X cited above, he described the king in similar language (Fita, 1884: 319; cap. 16): “Adeo nihilominus extitit liberalis, quod ipsius liberalitas prodigalitatē speciem induebat”. Although *largitas* or generosity was a necessity for a king at times, especially when a favor was required, he ought also to be temperate in giving. Fray Juan urged Sancho to commit to memory this principle (DPH. 3. 1. 6):

Qui largus est sibi et parcus suis, est destructor regni, et similiter qui est parcus sibi et largus suis, tamen melior est iste aliquantulum (The one who is generous to himself but sparing to his people is a destroyer of the kingdom; similarly, the one who is sparing to himself and generous to his people is so much better).

Kings ought to freely do well (*benefacere*) to others so that they would willingly serve them. The word *benefacere* referred to the benefices that lords were accustomed to give to their vassals in return for their service. Fray Juan continued, saying,

Ut ergo reges virtutem possideant largitatis, non accipiant maiorem partem de pecuniis subditorum quam ius exposcit vel natura dictavit, nec leges exarent ut populum opprimant et marsupia auriant (Therefore, so that kings may possess the virtue of generosity, they ought not to accept a greater part of the money of their subjects than the law requires or nature dictates, so that they do not undercut the laws and oppress the people and empty their purses) (DPH. 3.2.13).

He underscored this principle by quoting from the prophet Isaiah (10, 1–2) and Aristotle’s admonition to Alexander the Great in the *Secretum Secretorum* (Bizzarri, 2014: 131–137; esp 135; *Secreto de los secretos...*, 2010: 135).

In the same vein, he commented,

Siquidem principes antiqui non affectabant dominari propter pecuniam, sed propter gloriam et reipublice custodiam, et ideo non solum sua, propter rempublicam exponebant, sed etiam semetipsos (Indeed, ancient princes did not desire to rule for money, but for the glory and protection of the republic, and so their actions not only served the republic but themselves as well) (DPH. 3. 3. 15).

After citing examples of ancient rulers who conducted themselves according to these principles, he added (DPH. 3.3.19):

non enim dominari propter lucra temporalia intendebant, set magis propter utilitatem reipublice, et sui honestatem et gloriam intendebant (They did not aim to rule on account of temporal riches, but they intended rather the utility of the republic and its honor and glory).

Juan Gil's consistent use of the term *respublica* expresses the contemporary conception of the state as a corporate entity, a juridical person, with its own reason for being and its own public law. A fundamental responsibility of a king was to further the utility of the republic, in other words the good estate of the realm (Post, 1964: 494–561; Strayer, 1970; Ferrari, 1934; O'Callaghan, 1993: 17–21).

In reading these lines, one must ask whether Fray Juan, consciously or not, was describing the conduct of his master Alfonso X. We know that he was aware of the king's prodigality. Such was *el Sabio's* fame that great nobles and townsmen (*burgenses*) flocked to his court from nearly all parts of the world. Scholars too came to contribute their knowledge to the great works of history, science, poetry, and literature that the king commissioned. As Fray Juan remarked, whether seeking refuge from enemies, or counsel or solace, or relief from poverty and penury, they all shared in King Alfonso's generous munificence (Fita, 1884: 321, cap. 21).

The antithesis of largesse is avarice. Recalling the biblical passage "the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Tim 6:10), Fray Juan warned Infante Sancho (DPH. 3.4.37): "Advertatis, Domine, quod avaritia multum est in principibus detestanda" ("Be aware, O Lord, that avarice in princes is very much to be detested"). Condemning the pursuit of earthly wealth as akin to idolatry, he argued that the avaricious monarch would never be content with what he could rightfully claim but would always seek greater riches. In doing so he would turn away from his creator and be thrust into hell. The demon of avarice causes kings to be lost, to lie, to violate alliances, to break friendships, and to alter kingdoms. In a long disquisition on all the evils of avarice, drawn in part from the *Secretum Secretorum*, he exhorted kings to be satisfied with what was necessary for good government, to restrain their tax collectors, and not to take from others what they needed to live. Fray Juan continued (DPH. 3.4.44):

Attendite, tamen, reges, quod ipse vobis dedit regnum et gentes, non tamen ut ipsos depauperetis ex avaritia sine causa set ut eas ditaretis vestro consilio et auxilio [...] Ut autem hec omnia prudenter rex faciat, et exactionibus insuetis

pauperes, viduas, et orphanos et pupillos non opprimat, et subvertat usque ad solum (Now understand, kings, that he [God] gave you a kingdom and people, not, however, that you might impoverish them through avarice without cause, but rather that you might enrich them with your counsel and assistance [...] So that the king may do all these things prudently, let him not oppress the poor, widows, orphans, and children with unaccustomed exactions and drive them into the ground).

As an apt pupil, Infante Sancho took that lesson to heart and in his *Castigos*, a book of counsel dedicated to his own son, the future Fernando IV, he recorded a catalogue of miseries brought on by greed (*cobdiçia*) (*Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, 2001: 207–211, 319–320; caps. 22. 49). When Fray Juan was writing his diatribe against avarice, King Alfonso was immersed in the most critical period of his reign. Not only was he suffering from a serious illness that exacerbated his relationships with his family and his courtiers, but he was also attempting to cope with the repeated intervention of the Marinids of Morocco, and ever intensifying financial problems. At the beginning of his reign, he was confronted with a serious inflation which he attempted to control by regulating prices and wages in several sessions of the Cortes. At the same time, he required money to pursue his crusade in Africa and his quest for the title of Holy Roman Emperor. In 1278, a date recorded by Fray Juan, the king was attempting to capture Algeciras in order to prevent Marinid incursions from Morocco. In 1281, another date mentioned by Fray Juan, he was waging war against Granada. As his ordinary revenues were insufficient for these purposes, he resorted to extraordinary taxation such as the *servicios* authorized by the Cortes, the imposition of customs duties, the *servicio de los ganados*, a tax on migratory sheep, and the determined collection of fines for violations of the law. Fray Juan must certainly have heard that the nobles and the townsmen in the Cortes of Burgos in 1272 protested the burden of taxes and the king's innovations in the law. Dissatisfied with the king's response to their demands, the magnates repudiated their vassalage and went into exile to serve the emir of Granada, though they were induced to return early in 1273 after the king promised concessions (O'Callaghan, 1985; González Jiménez, 2004: 239–327). In upbraiding the avaricious king in such strong language, Fray Juan surely had the example of *el rey sabio* before him.

Continuing his exposition of the virtues, Juan Gil extolled the fortitude and prowess of the knights of Spain. Kings, who were responsible for the protection of the *patria*, the fatherland, had need of the fortitude of their *cavallería*. Without it they could not defend the people against

the incursions of the enemy. Fortitude, however, entailed much more than physical bravery. It was also a matter of personal character, especially desirable in kings. If a king wished to be loved by his people, he should not be cruel without reason, nor should he tolerate cruelty on the part of his ministers. Nor should a wise man sanction barbarous mutilations of the body. Rather, in punishing malefactors, the king ought always to act in a spirit of clemency. Yet, just as one prunes a tree so that it might flourish, so the wicked should be removed in order that good men might increase and be preserved for the republic (DPH. 4.1-2; Castro, 1962: 540-541). This passage prompts several reflections. First, when Fray Juan insisted that kings need the services of their nobility, one wonders whether he was thinking of the impasse created when the nobles repudiated their vassalage in the Cortes of Burgos in 1272 and went into exile to Granada. Secondly, while urging kings not to act with wanton cruelty, a sign of tyranny, and to shun barbarous penalties, was he thinking of municipal *fueros* and even the Alfonsine law codes that imposed such punishments for certain crimes (O'Callaghan, 2019: Ch. 13; Crime and Punishment)? Thirdly, although he acknowledged the necessity for the king to act firmly, but mercifully, and to remove from the community persons who would subvert the republic, did he have in mind the king's execution, for some unspecified reason, of his own brother Fadrique in 1277? Fadrique was hanged and his ally in treachery, Simón de los Cameros, was burned to death (O'Callaghan, 1993: 241-243; O'Callaghan, 1998: 144-151). When writing these lines, it seems unlikely that Fray Juan was unaware of the political upheavals roiling the kingdom.

After commenting briefly on the virtues of magnificence and faithfulness, Fray Juan dwelt at greater length on patience and perseverance. All four were aspects of fortitude. Magnificence referred to an elevated spirit that endeavored to do great things and to avoid activities that were vile or common. Faithfulness was a habit of mind that encouraged one to act with honesty. Patience often required that one suffer bodily harm in order to achieve one's purpose and that one discipline the wicked so that the republic would not be destroyed. Perseverance was the persistent pursuit of an objective (DPH. 4. 3-6). In his discussion of perseverance, Fray Juan cited the example of Xenophon, the Greek warrior and philosopher, who, on hearing of the death of his oldest son who fell in battle, removed his crown; but when he learned that his son died while fighting bravely, he took it up again and publicly lauded his son's courage (DPH. 4.6.28; Castro, 1962: 513-515). One might ask, was this an allusion to the death of Fernando de la Cerda, the king's eldest son, who died suddenly in 1275 as he prepared to oppose

the marauding Marinids? Is it possible that Alfonso X, returning, “angry and ill,” from his disappointing visit to Pope Gregory X, mourning the death of his daughter Leonor, and pained by this accumulation of sorrows, threw down his crown in exasperation? Did Fray Juan and others try to assuage his sorrow by emphasizing the bravery of his son, not yet twenty years of age (Desclot, 1949: 10–13; cap. 66; O’Callaghan, 1993: 234–236)?

Echoing the *Siete Partidas* (2,15,2), Sancho IV admonished his son to love all his children, but above all the oldest son who, by divine ordinance, would inherit his kingdom. He went on to explain that after the death of his oldest brother Fernando de la Cerda, who was married and had children, he, Sancho, rightfully inherited his father’s dominions (Castigos del rey don Sancho IV, 2001: 15.19–22).

In order to illustrate the virtues described above, Fray Juan drew on his *Liber illustrium personarum* for examples of Roman emperors, Visigothic kings, and the kings of Asturias, León, and Castile (DPH. 5.1–37). After reviewing their exploits, he urged kings to cultivate three noble qualities, namely, fear of God’s power, knowledge of God’s truth, and love of God’s goodness. As the king received his authority from God and would be answerable to God for his exercise of it, he would do well to fear God. “Timete igitur ut timeamini” (“Fear, therefore, so that you might be feared”) (DPH. 6.2.1.26). A king who was known to fear God would inspire fear among his people, who would be more likely to obey him. Fray Juan insisted that because the kings of the Moors did not have a true fear of God, they perished at the hands of their vassals (DPH. 6.2.1.39). The second stage of royal nobility was knowledge of divine truth, which would inspire the king to be a lover of truth. In order to maintain a stable kingdom, the king ought not to lie or engage in duplicitous or indiscreet talk. Otherwise, he would be seen as a foolish liar who would appear reprehensible, not only before God, but also before men. A king who was a liar would never have faithful friends or vassals. So that he might always speak the truth, the king should choose his words carefully, not saying too much or too little, “quia ex ore regis super populum vita et mors” (“because life and death fall upon the people from the mouth of the king”) (DPH. 6.2.2). In return for the gifts of God, kings ought also to love and serve God’s goodness so that they might enjoy those gifts more abundantly (DPH. 6.2.3; Castro, 1962: 521–526). Those passages, drawn in part from the Bible and the Pseudo-Aristotle, recall the depiction of the character of a king set down in the *Siete Partidas* (2, 2–5) (O’Callaghan, 2019: 45–47). In words reminiscent of his mentor’s teaching, Sancho IV remarked that the king who has true and loyal vassals and people

holds his kingdom firmly and peacefully. He quoted Solomon who said “verdat e justiçia guardan al rey e a su estado” (“truth and justice protect the king and his estate”) (*Castigos del rey don Sancho IV*, 2001: 33. 11,35).

After considering the king's relationship with God, Fray Juan discoursed at length on the bonds between king and people. Proclaiming that Spain was honored by so many personages worthy of praise, including the best knights in the world, he commented that the prince who would rule over such strong and wise people should be cautious. “Beatus et gloriosus erit princeps qui populos huiusmodi habet regere, dummodo et ipse sapientia gubernetur et suorum consilio perfruatur” (“Blessed and glorious will that prince be who rules these people, provided that he governs himself with wisdom and enjoys their counsel”). Kings ought to learn to rule their kingdoms with wisdom and mercy and not merely with a strong hand. If the king relies more on equity than power to rule his people, justice will be served (DPH. 7.4). The king ought to curb his appetite for honors, riches, and pleasures. By seeking undue honors so as to exalt himself over others, his status will be shown to be mere pretense. By curbing his appetite for riches and guarding against avarice he will not seize what rightfully belongs to others. The king would be well advised to choose his words carefully, not engaging in hyperbole, not minimizing what he needs to say, not distorting his meaning, not indulging in self-praise, scurrility, vituperation, blasphemy, or cursing, not lying, or falling into perjury. Moreover, he ought to avoid the sins of gluttony, drunkenness, and adultery, because they deprive a man of the ultimate perfection of his soul; they corrupt his body, and they cause his death before its natural course is ended. While condemning incest and sodomy, Fray Juan also remarked that adultery caused manifest injury and made it difficult to determine the certain paternity of children (DPH. 7.4. 1. 1–3; Castro, 1962: 515–516).

Attentive to the wisdom of his master, Sancho IV touched on similar themes in his *Castigos*, admonishing his son Fernando to be truthful (caps. 11,33,41), sparing in his language (cap. 26), restrained in his intake of food and drink (cap. 11), and avoiding illicit relations with women (caps. 11,19–20, 28). Fray Juan's comments about royal adultery reflect the *Siete Partidas* (2, 2, 5). The *Partidas* (2, 14, 1) expressly declared that if the queen should have an affair, she would offend the king's honor, dishonor herself, and bring into question the legitimacy of her children. While we have no evidence that Queen Violante betrayed her husband, we know that Alfonso X's promiscuous relations with at least three women produced at least five illegitimate children. We also know that Sancho

fathered four children out of wedlock by three women. Fray Juan surely knew that. In speaking of adultery, was he exhorting the king and his son to curb their sexual appetites?

After considering the king's personal character and conduct, Fray Juan directed attention to his relationships with his people. He focused on justice and mercy, the king's education, and the virtues of prudence and counsel. Emphasizing that the king had need of justice and mercy, he urged him to rule in accordance with "iura et leges," that is, law in general and enacted laws, so that others may imitate his example (DPH. 7. 4. 1).

According to Saint Bernard, who quoted the Roman jurist Ulpian (without mentioning his name), "iustitia est constans et perpetua voluntas ius suum cuique tribuendi" ("justice is the constant and perpetual desire to render his right to each one") (DI. 1. 10 pr. Ulp. 2 reg.). Justice served superiors and inferiors and one's equals without distinction. Fray Juan remarked that

"dixerunt indi quod maior utilitas est in iustitia regni quam in fertilitate, et rex iustus est utilior quam pluvia. Et dixerunt quod rex et iustitia sunt duo gemelli quorum alterum sine altero impossibile est durare" ("The Hindus declared that there is greater utility in the justice of a kingdom than in fertility and a just king is more useful than rain. They also said that the king and justice are twins that cannot exist without one another").

Concluding this exposition, Fray Juan added "Debet etiam rex esse populo liberalis et largus, beneficia sua communicans quibus expedit et quantum expedit" ("The king ought to be liberal and generous to his people, conferring his benefits upon those in need insofar as they need them") (DPH. 7. 4. 2. 1–2; *ibid.*: 512–513).

In discussing the *scientia regis*, Fray Juan pointed out that a king ought to be endowed with counsel and prudence. On that account, he had need of the seven liberal arts, namely, grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Standing between God and men, between heaven and earth, a king, knowing both celestial and terrestrial things, should govern the latter by the former. As a king ought to be well-educated, Fray Juan cited a purported letter of the *rex Romanorum* urging the king of France to instruct his sons in the liberal arts "quia rex illiteratus est quasi asinus coronatus" ("because an illiterate king is like a crowned ass") (DPH. 7. 4. 2. 2).<sup>6</sup> Although the identity of the *rex Romanorum* and of the king of France

<sup>6</sup>Fray Juan did not mention his source, John of Salisbury, 1993: lib. 4, cap. 6; Castro, 1962: 517–521.

is unknown, Alfonso el sabio, a *rex Romanorum*, would certainly agree with that comment.

Prudence guided a king's thoughts to noble ends so that he would know those things necessary and beautiful for a gracious life (DPH. 7.4.2.3). A prudent king assured an orderly regimen and saved his rule from collapse. In order to achieve that goal, he should always take counsel before acting (ibid.: 511–512). Giving counsel to the king was the basic obligation of his vassals. With that in mind, Fray Juan offered this bit of advice (DPH. 7.4.2.4):

Et hec doctrina perutilis est ut rex nunquam consulat clericos et laicos simul, nec sciant isti de illis, ne illi de isti, nisi post concordiam utrorumque (This teaching is very useful that the king should never take counsel with the clergy and laity together, so that neither side would know what the other was thinking until they had all come to agreement).

One wonders whether that was a common practice when the king summoned the Cortes.

As further guidance for the young prince, Fray Juan reviewed the lives of ancient rulers, including the Roman emperors and their successors in the east and west. Although they were obliged to rule the world rightly, they destroyed it and, on that account, suffered divine punishment (DPH. 9.1–9). Of particular interest were the seditions and divisions among the Goths. After recording the many Visigothic kings who were assassinated, he mentioned Witiza whose eyes were cut out by Rodrigo, the last Gothic king. Rodrigo himself was reportedly killed by Count Julián, who was blamed for the conquest of all of Spain. In Fray Juan's mind the sufferings of Spain equaled or surpassed those of ancient Babylon, Rome, Carthage, and Jerusalem. Through fratricide and parricide, the Gothic kings, failing to observe the legitimate succession, usurped the power of the kingdom. In turn, the Arabs devastated Spain and Gallia Gothica (DPH. 9.10–11).

Concluding his remarks on the recovery of Spain, Fray Juan noted that in the year of our Lord 1277, Infante Sancho began to reign with his father (DPH. 8.6.51). The *De preconiiis numantine* gives the correct date 1278 (Liber de preconiiis..., 1884: 131–200; esp. 146, cap. 18). The background of that statement is as follows. In April of that year, according to Cantiga 235, King Alfonso was on the verge of death, but he recovered on Easter Sunday (17 April) (Cantigas De Santa Maria, 1981: 723–724 no. 235; O'Callaghan, 1998: 156–158). Given the imminent possibility of his demise, he summoned the Cortes to Segovia sometime in June in order to ensure the stability of his



kingdom by conferring greater responsibility on Infante Sancho, whom he had recognized as heir to the throne in the Cortes of Burgos two years before. Not only did he confirm that commitment, but he now entrusted Sancho with a major share of royal duties (Jofré de Loaysa, García Martínez, 1982: 90–92; cap. 219. 19 21; Crónica de Alfonso X, 1998: 189–194; caps. 67–68; O’Callaghan, 1993: 246–247).

As Fray Juan put it,

Recuperata fuit nihilominus Hispania per multos reges nobiles [...] usque ad regem Allefonsum in regem Romanorum electum et illustrem Sancium filium eius, qui iam eidem incepit corregnare sub anno Domini MCCLXXVII (Nevertheless Spain was recovered by many noble kings [...] until King Alfonso, elected king of the Romans, and his illustrious son Sancho, who began to rule with him in the year of our Lord 1277) (DPH. 8.6.51).

What did it mean to say that he began to *corregnare*, to reign together with his father? Clearly, he was not given the title of king, so one might say that Fray Juan indulged in a bit of hyperbole. Even so, it is apparent that Sancho was entrusted with greater responsibility, especially for the management of the war against Granada. Accusing Alfonso X of “perfidy and infidelity” because he dismissed the claims of the Infantes de la Cerda, the French chronicler Guillaume de Nangis confirmed the substance of Fray Juan’s remarks. He continued,

et quasi se curis regni et occupationibus detrahens, utpote paralytici morbi contagio jam corruptus, eum in pare regni praesentialiter introduxit (Inasmuch as he was already deteriorating from the infection of a paralytic illness, he withdrew himself as it were from the cares and concerns of the kingdom and introduced Sancho into the kingdom as an equal) (Guillaume de Nangis, 1894: 497–498).

Both Fray Juan and Guillaume agreed that something exceptional occurred during the Cortes of Segovia in 1278. Sancho was not given the title of king, but Fray Juan was emphatic in saying that he now reigned together with his father and Guillaume insisted that he was elevated to equal status with his father. In his first will of November 1282, Alfonso el Sabio confirmed Infante Sancho’s new status when he declared that he had given him “greater power than any king’s son had in his father’s lifetime” (Testamento otorgado..., 1851). One may assume with confidence that the king made some explicit statement in the Cortes indicating that he was sharing his responsibilities with his son, who was to be obeyed as king even though he was not given that title. The king acted, knowing that Sancho had reached the age of twenty in May 1278. As such, he had attained his majority,

according to the original version of the *Partidas* (2, 15, 3), and would be fully capable of ruling without a regency, should his father die.

These events, I believe, provoked an attempt on Alfonso el Sabio's life at Segovia, as reported by Fray Juan. In his lengthy review of murderous and tyrannical kings, he obviously intended to caution Infante Sancho against such behavior and to be aware of the need for constant security against sedition. After citing examples of treasonable activities by the nobility since the time of King Rodrigo, he commented that the counts of Castile frequently rebelled against Fernando III, "although he was their natural lord." Remarking that their descendants were still impatient against their lords, he went on to say (DPH. 9. 11)<sup>7</sup>:

In regem Aldefonsum filium prefati regis Fernandi apud Secobiam tres sagittas proditiosi homines emiserunt, ut ipsum et vita et regno privarent. Set sagitte in partem aliam, voluntate deifica declinarunt, regem intactum declinantes; et ut vulgariter dicebatur, de nobilium consilio factum quorum sanguis quiescere nunquam novit (Traacherous men fired three arrows at King Alfonso, the son of the aforesaid King Fernando, at Segovia, to deprive him of his life and kingdom, but the arrows, by the will of God, went awry, leaving the king unharmed. And as it is commonly said, this was done with the counsel of the nobles whose blood is never known to be at rest).

That account is also found in his *De preconiis civitatis numantine* (Liber de preconiis..., 1884: 199; bk.7, cap. 31) and in his biography of Alfonso X. In the latter text he noted that no one knew who shot the arrows or the one who counselled the attack (Fita, 1884: 323; cap. 23). The attempted assassination occurred in Segovia on an unspecified date. The king was in that city on several occasions, but I suspect that some nobles, outraged by the execution of Infante Fadrique and Simón de los Cameros, and disgruntled by the king's failure to declare Alfonso de la Cerda as heir to the throne, attempted the assassination sometime in June or July 1278 when the king convened the Cortes of Segovia.<sup>8</sup>

Even though he admitted that the blood of the nobility was never at rest, Fray Juan Gil reminded Infante Sancho that to rule successfully he had to maintain good relationships with the magnates, who had certain rights and obligations. In the first instance, they had to obey the divine commandments

<sup>7</sup>See: Gil de Zamora, 1955: 330–331. The assault is omitted in the Costas Rodríguez and Pérez Rosado edition of *Alabaņas*.

<sup>8</sup>The royal itinerary places the king in Segovia from 8 June to 30 July 1278; González Jiménez y Carmona Ruiz, 2012: 540–542.

and were not required to observe anything to the contrary. Secondly, they were not bound to obey the commands of their lords unless they consented to them. They had to abide by the laws, statutes, and approved customs that the people established to limit the cupidity and vexations of princes and magnates, who committed rapine and extortion. As Fray Juan was aware, kings had consistently condemned *asonadas* or plundering raids carried out by the nobility. He summed up this passage, saying that “secundum iura et leges et laudabiles terrarum consuetudines debent subiectos suos regere principes” (“Princes should rule their subjects according to rights and laws and the praiseworthy customs of the realm”) (DPH. 10. 1. 2–3).

These considerations are noteworthy for three reasons. First, subjects and vassals were not obliged to obey the *imperia dominorum* unless they promised to do so by opening their lips, that is, by giving oral consent. Secondly, Fray Juan stressed that the people had established laws and customs to restrain the abuses of magnates and princes. Thirdly, he declared that princes ought to rule according to approved laws and customs. All of that was a rejection of arbitrary government.

Lest there be any doubt, he quoted the Roman law principle that states,

Digna vox maiestate regnantis legibus alligatum se principem profiteri: adeo de auctoritate iuris nostra pendet auctoritas (It is a statement worthy of the majesty of a reigning prince for him to profess to be subject to the law; for our authority is dependent upon the authority of the law) (DPH. 10. 1. 4).

Recognizing the hypocrisy of exempting the prince from obeying the laws, while requiring everyone else to do so, that statement acknowledged that the laws would be more effective if the prince as well as the people submitted to them.<sup>9</sup>

Continuing his exposition of the rights and obligations of the nobility, Fray Juan pointed out that, just as the subject owed allegiance to his lord, so the lord owed allegiance to his subject. If the subject wronged his lord, without doubt he would be a traitor (*proditor*). Moreover, if the lord demanded something unjust from his subjects, he would commit

<sup>9</sup>Codex Iustinianus, 1877a; Codex Iustinianus, 1877b; ; Codex Iustinianus, 1877c: . The law was enacted in 429 by Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian. The text adds “Et re vera maius imperio submittere legibus principatum. Et oraculo praesentis edicti quod nobis licere non patimur indicamus” (“And, indeed, it is the greatest attribute of imperial power for the sovereign to be subject to the laws. By this present edict we forbid others to do what we do not permit ourselves”). In support of his argument, Fray Juan cited Gratian’s *Decretum* (part 1, dist. 95, cap. 7) and Gregory IX’s *Decretals*, bk. 2, tit. 24, cap. 3.

the crime of treason (*crimen proditiōnis*). The *fueros*, laws, and customs of the kingdom required lords to render certain things to their vassals, just as their vassals owed them tributes and services (DPH. 10. 1). That passage emphasized the mutual dependence of lords and vassals, or more precisely, of the king and his nobility. It seems to reflect the nobles' complaints that the king did not exhibit proper regard for their rights.

In the very next section, Fray Juan made that point explicit (DPH. 10. 2):

Set hodie, peccatis exigentibus, non petunt principes a vassallis debitum, set indebitum, non quod iustum est et consuetum, set quod iniustum et penitus insuetum et ad que vassalli nullatenus obligantur [...] Sic et homines populares a presidentibus continue devorantur, quamquam ipsi populares principibus et prelatibus fidelius et utilius obsequantur.

Today, however, because of our sins, princes do not ask of their vassals what is due, but what is undue, not what is just and customary, but what is unjust and scarcely customary, and to which the vassals are never obliged [...] Thus, the people are continually devoured by their leaders, although the people serve the princes and prelates more faithfully and more advantageously.

Those remarks clearly point to the contemporary protest against Alfonso X's imposition of extraordinary taxation.

Fray Juan went on to say "this is nothing to wonder at because the princes and prelates of our times" despise good people and love bad people. Decrying their failings, he condemned them for robbing the poor who were reduced to starvation. He commented that the only book they read is the book of exactions and extortions that they read a thousand times a day so that they can oppress and kill others. Bemoaning "Hispania misera," tortured by oppression, he concluded this indictment by appealing to the king of glory to relieve his people (DPH. 10. 2. 10–17).

#### THE MEANING OF THE NAME SANCHO

As he brought the *De preconiiis Hispanie* to a conclusion, Fray Juan addressed Infante Sancho in the expectation that he would amend abuses. Prompted by Sancho's courtesy and kindness, and by the cries of the poor, he was emboldened to write his book. As a true Franciscan concerned for the plight of the poor, he lamented that there was no one to hear them.<sup>10</sup> In a sweeping condemnation, he dismissed false kings, false leaders, false

<sup>10</sup>Jofré de Loaysa, García Martínez, 1982: 146, cap. 57, related that Sancho IV, before being interred in the cathedral of Toledo, had taken the Franciscan habit. I have not seen Castro, 1997: 327–349.

bishops, false religious, and false judges who ruled in the courts. They were robbers rather than rulers, Pilates rather than prelates, dissipators rather than dispensers, oppressors of the poor rather than defenders, enriched at the expense of the poor. Speaking directly to Infante Sancho, he urged him to be mindful of the status to which God had called him, namely, to be a shepherd for his people, an industrious ruler, and a determined advocate. In blunt language, he told the young prince: “Vos estis propter populum et per populum, non autem populus propter vos vel per vos” (“you are on account of the people and for the people; the people are not on account of you or for you”) (DPH. 10.3.20).

He reminded Sancho that God placed him in this state to punish tyranny, to console the afflicted, to teach the people, to overcome timidity, to liberate the clergy, to abase the haughty, and to protect the humble. He emphasized that a kingdom is unstable if it is not founded on mercy, secure in what is promised, strong in suffering, ready for peace, stern in punishment, lawful in judgment, temperate in speech, discreet in command, careful in spending, quick to help, faithful in counsel, circumspect in responding, The most high God called him to the height of such a dignity so that he might display devotion to the religious, kindness to the lowly, courtesy to equals, firmness to the proud, benevolence to the humble, mercy to penitents, and sternness to the obstinate. After a long quotation from Ecclesiasticus (50:6–11; 24:17–21), he expressed the hope that Sancho would preserve the people and the kingdom in justice, customs, and doctrine (DPH. 10.3.18–23).

Fray Juan then declared that the prince’s name reflected the virtues just cited. Explaining that the name had four meanings, he argued that Sancho was derived from the Latin *sancio*, meaning firm. Adding that “lex est sancio iustiniana” (“law is Justinian’s sanction”), he stressed Sancho’s obligation to do justice “que est virtus conferens ius suum unicuique” (“which is a virtue giving everyone his right”). Secondly, he stated that the name was equivalent to *satius*, that is, full of grace and truth. That should be understood as the virtue of temperance that constrained the illicit desires of the heart. The third meaning was *sanctus* or holy, characterized by the virtue of fortitude, manifested in his military, civil, and divine actions. Just as the saints who suffered the harshness of martyrdom were strong, so too was Sancho called to endure the hard and rough events of everyday life. The fourth meaning of his name was *sapidus* or *sapiens* or wise, marked by the virtue of prudence, that enabled him to distinguish the good from the bad. This was a virtue especially necessary for kings and prelates who

are ordained over others to rule the world. Those who lacked it could never rule a kingdom very well. Fray Juan concluded by telling Infante Sancho that his kingdom would be a virtuous realm if he practiced the four cardinal virtues, namely, justice, temperance, fortitude, and prudence. Should he do so, grace would lead him, like other good kings, to glory where the king of kings reigns for all time. Amen (DPH. 10. 3. 18–28).

With that, I believe that Fray Juan terminated his book. The last two tractates in which he summarized Vegetius's teaching about warfare were probably added as an afterthought.

This last section in which Fray Juan addressed Sancho directly was probably written in 1282 after the assembly of Valladolid transferred royal authority from King Alfonso to Sancho. Without identifying Sancho as king, he spoke to him as one possessing the fullness of royal power. There is nary a hint that Alfonso X still reigned or that Sancho reigned with him. Fray Juan's language assumes that there is now only one ruler. Like so many others, he seems to have recognized that *el Sabio's* reign was finished and a new reign was about to begin.

#### CONCLUSION

When Fray Juan dedicated his *De preconiiis Hispanie* to Infante Sancho, *maiori filio et heredi*, he knew that Alfonso X had formally recognized Sancho as his oldest son and heir in 1276 following the death of Fernando de la Cerda. Two years later when he declared that Sancho reigned together with his father (he used the word *corregnare*) he knew that the ailing king had entrusted his son with significant responsibilities for the government of the realm.

With every expectation that Sancho would soon be king in his own right, he set out to write a *speculum principum*, a mirror of princes, for the guidance of the young man. By lauding the fertility and beauty of Hispania, and praising the sanctity, wisdom, and bravery of the many men who brought distinction to their *patria*, he hoped that Sancho would understand that he was being given an extraordinary legacy and that it would be his responsibility to preserve it and defend it.

In order to do so, he reminded Sancho of his obligations to God and to the people that God entrusted to his care. Ruling by God's grace, he was admonished to love and fear God who would ultimately hold him accountable for his actions, good or bad. In straightforward language, Fray Juan told Sancho that he ruled for the people and not for himself. As he discussed honesty, justice, generosity, prudence, and the other virtues

appropriate to kingship, he warned the prince against pursuing his own interests rather than those of the people.

He focused on two issues that might damage the ruler's positive relationship with his people and thereby lead to the destruction of the kingdom. Denouncing avarice in a king as an especially detestable vice, he stated unequivocally that a king should be content with those taxes that the law allowed, and that he should not burden and impoverish his people with unaccustomed levies. Today, however, he lamented that princes ask of their vassals not what is due, but what is not due, not what is just and customary, but what is unjust and unaccustomed. And so the people are devoured by their rulers.

Secondly, Fray Juan stressed the king's duty to rule in accordance with law and justice. Citing the Roman legal principle *Digna vox*, he affirmed that, as the king's authority depended upon the law, so it was imperative that he should obey the law as well as everyone else. If the king ruled according to the approved laws and customs established with the consent of the people, justice would be served, and each person would be assured of his proper rights.

In writing these words, Fray Juan was not dwelling in an ethereal world, a world of abstraction. Rather, he was alive and writing during the ten or fifteen years of one of the most critical periods in Castilian history, marked by the unraveling of Alfonso X's reign. As a servant of the king and of his son, he witnessed the king's frailties, the growing tensions within the royal family, the rupture of the king's relations with his vassals, the Marinid threat, the failure of the king's imperial ambitions.

With those events in mind, it seems foolish to imagine that Fray Juan's work did not reflect the reality of the political turmoil surrounding him. Although he did not criticize Alfonso X by name, I believe that he intended not only to provide Infante Sancho with a manual for good government, but also to forewarn him against the malpractices of his father.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- DI Mommsen, T., ed. 1872. *Digesta Iustiniani* [in Latin]. Vol. I of *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- DPH Rodríguez, J. C., and M. P. Rosado. 2020. *Alabanzas de España: Una traducción anónima e inédita del De preconis Hispanie de Juan Gil de Zamora* [in Spanish and Latin]. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia.

## REFERENCES

- Barrio Vega, M. F. del. 2012. "Las fuentes clásicas en el De preconiis Hispanie de Gil de Zamora" [in Spanish]. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Latinos* 32 (1): 89–120.
- Bizzarri, H. O., ed. 2001. *Castigos del rey don Sancho IV* [in Spanish]. Vervuert: Iberoamericana.
- , ed. 2010. *Secreto de los secretos, Poridad de las poridades: Versiones castellanas del Pseudo-Aristóteles, Secretum Secretorum* [in Spanish]. Valencia: Universitat de València.
- . 2014. "Fray Juan Gil de Zamora y una versión del Secretum secretorum" [in Spanish]. *Studia Zamorensia* 13:131–137.
- Castro, M. de. 1962. "Las ideas políticas y la formación del Príncipe en el 'De preconiis Hispaniae' de Fr Juan Gil de Zamora" [in Spanish]. *Hispania* 22:507–541.
- . 1997. "Rey Don Sancho IV de Castilla ¿fué religioso franciscano?" [in Spanish]. *Verdad y vida: revista de las ciencias del espíritu* 55:327–349.
- Dacosta, A. 2006. "El rey virtuoso: Un ideal político del siglo XIII de la mano de Fray Juan Gil de Zamora" [in Spanish]. *Historia Instituciones Documentos* 33:99–121.
- Desclot, B. 1949. [in Spanish]. Vol. 3 of *Crònica*, ed. by M. Coll i Alentorn. 5 vols. Barcelona: Barcino.
- Ferrari, Á. 1934. "La secularización de la teoría del estado en las Partidas" [in Spanish]. *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español* 11:449–456.
- Ferrero Hernández, C. 2010. "Nuevas perspectivas sobre Juan Gil de Zamora" [in Spanish]. *Studia Zamorensia* 9:19–33.
- Fita, F. 1884a. "Biografías de San Fernando y de Alfonso el Sabio por Juan Gil de Zamora" [in Latin]. *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 5:308–328.
- , ed. 1884b. "Liber de preconiis civitatis numantine" [in Spanish]. *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 5:131–200.
- . 1885. "Poesías inéditas de Gil de Zamora" [in Latin]. *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 6:379–409.
- Flavius Vegetius Renatus. 1993. *Epítome of Military Science [De re militari]*. Ed. and trans. from the Latin by N. P. Milner. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gaibrois de Ballesteros, M. 1922–1928. *Historia del reinado de Sancho IV* [in Spanish]. 3 vols. Madrid: Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos.
- Gil de Zamora, J. 1955. *Liber de preconiis Hispaniae* [in Latin]. Ed. by M. Castro y Castro. Madrid: Universidad de Madrid.
- González Jiménez, M., ed. 1998. *Crónica de Alfonso X según el Ms. II/2777 de la Biblioteca del Palacio Real, Madrid* [in Spanish]. Murcia: Real Academia Alfonso X el Sabio.
- . 2004. *Alfonso X el Sabio* [in Spanish]. Barcelona: Ariel.
- González Jiménez, M., and M. A. Carmona Ruiz. 2012. *Documentación e itinerario de Alfonso X el Sabio* [in Spanish]. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla.



- Guillaume de Nangis. 1894. *Gesta Philippi tertii Francorum regum* [in Latin]. Vol. 20 of *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. by M. Bouquet and L. V. Delisle. 24 vols. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres.
- Isidore of Seville. 1894a. “Chronicon” [in Latin]. In *Chronica minora : Saec. IV. v. VI. VII*, ed. by Th. Mommsen, 2:424–481. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 11. Munchen: Weidmann.
- . 1894b. “Historia de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum” [in Latin]. In *Chronica minora : Saec. IV. v. VI. VII*, ed. by Th. Mommsen, 2:267–303. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 11. Munchen: Weidmann.
- Jofré de Loaysa. 1982. *Crónica de los reyes de Castilla Fernando III, Alfonso X, Sancho IV y Fernando IV, 1248–1305* [in Spanish]. Ed. and trans. by A. García Martínez. Murcia: Academia Alfonso X el Sabio.
- John of Salisbury. 1993. *Policraticus* [in Latin]. Ed. by K. S. B. Keats-Rohan. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Krueger, P., ed. 1877a. [in Latin]. Vol. 1 of *Codex Iustinianus*. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
- , ed. 1877b. [in Latin]. Vol. 2 of *Codex Iustinianus*. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
- , ed. 1877c. [in Latin]. Vol. 3 of *Codex Iustinianus*. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Lucas de Túy. 2003. *Chronicon Mundi* [in Latin]. Ed. by E. Falque. Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 74. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Mettmann, W., ed. 1959–1974. *Cantigas De Santa Maria* [in Spanish]. 4 vols. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.
- , ed. 1981. [in Spanish]. Vol. 1 of *Cantigas De Santa Maria*. 2 vols. Vigo: Edicions Xerais de Galicia.
- Mommsen, Th., ed. 1894. *Chronica minora: Saec. IV. v. VI. VII* [in Latin]. Vol. 2. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi 11. Munchen: Weidmann.
- Nieto Soria, J. M. 1994. *Sancho IV, 1284–1295* [in Spanish]. Palencia: Diputación provincial de Palencia.
- O’Callaghan, J. F. 1975. *A History of Medieval Spain*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1985. “Paths to Ruin: The Economic and Financial Policies of Alfonso the Learned.” In *The Worlds of Alfonso the Learned and James the Conqueror : Intellect and Force in the Middle Ages*, ed. by R. I. Burns, 41–67. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1993. *The Learned King: The Reign of Alfonso X of Castile*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1998. *Alfonso X and the Cantigas de Santa Maria: A Poetic Biography*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2003. *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2019. *Alfonso X, The Justinian of his Age: Law and Justice in Thirteenth-Century Castile*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Post, G. 1964. *Studies in Medieval Legal Thought: Public Law and the State, 1100–1322*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rodrigo Jimenez de Rada. 1987. *Historia de rebus Hispanie sive Historia Gothica* [in Latin]. Ed. by J.F. Valverde. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Rojo Alique, F.J. 2014. “Intelectuales franciscanos y monarquía en la Castilla medieval” [in Spanish]. *Semata* 26:297–318.
- Strayer, J.R. 1970. *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- Testamento otorgado en Sevilla por el Rey D. Alfonso X a 21 de enero de 1284* [in Spanish]. 1851. Vol. 2 of *Memorial histórico español*, 122–134. Madrid.

---

O'Callaghan, J.F. [О'Кэллэген, Дж. Ф.] Fray Juan Gil de Zamora, Infante Sancho, and Alfonso el Sabio [Хуан Хиль де Самора, инфант Санчо и Альфонсо X Мудрый] // Философия. Журнал Высшей школы экономики. — 2022. — Т. 6, № 4. — С. 127–152.

---

ДЖОЗЕФ О'КЭЛЛЭГЕН

PHD, ПРОФЕССОР

ФОРДХЕМСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ (НЬЮ-ЙОРК, США)

## ХУАН ХИЛЬ ДЕ САМОРА, ИНФАНТ САНЧО И АЛЬФОНСО X МУДРЫЙ

Получено: 02.10.2022. Рецензировано: 27.10.2022. Принято: 15.11.2022.

**Аннотация:** В своем трактате «Хвала Испании» брат Хуан Хиль де Самора попытался привить инфанту Санчо, второму сыну и наследнику Альфонсо X, правильное понимание истории Испании и привести примеры тех правителей, которые хорошо использовали свою власть, и тех, которые злоупотребляли ею. Он напоминал молодому принцу, что тот не должен следовать личным интересам в ущерб своему народу, ведь он будет ответственен перед Богом. Особенно брат Хуан Хиль де Самора осуждал королевскую алчность и утверждал, что правитель не должен обеднять свой народ чрезвычайными налоговыми сборами. Более того, он подчеркивал обязанность короля править в согласии с утвержденными законами и обычаями, установленными с согласия народа. Хотя он не выражал несогласие с политическими решениями Альфонсо X напрямую, он знал о популярных жалобах на чрезмерное налогообложение и нововведения в праве. Предоставляя инфанту Санчо руководство для хорошего правления, он также озвучивал молчаливую критику политики Мудрого короля.

**Ключевые слова:** De preconiis Hispanie, Castigos, Digna vox, Лука Туйский, Викентий Испанский, вестготы, король Родриго, граф Юлиан, реконкиста, королевские добродетели.

DOI: 10.17323/2587-8719-2022-4-127-152.