

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

Faculty of Humanities

David Alejandro De Pablo

**The Symbolical Construction of the Enemy in the Alphonine Chronicles and
Niketas Choniates' Chronicle**

Master's Thesis

Prague, 2021

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

Faculty of Humanities

Department of Historical Sociology

David Alejandro De Pablo Aguilar

**The Symbolical Construction of the Enemy in the Alphonine Chronicles and
Niketas Choniates' Chronicle**

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Martin Švantner, PhD

Prague, 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
Chapter I. Methodological and theoretical framework	9
Methodology	9
Theoretical Framework.	16
Chapter II. Historical context.....	25
The kingdom of Castile.	25
The Castilian Chronicle.	33
Byzantine historical context.....	37
The Fourth Crusade.....	42
Chapter III. Representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour.	50
The representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour in the Alphonsine chronicles.....	50
The representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour in the Niketas Koniates' chronicle.....	58
Chapter IV. Similarities and differences in the representations of the enemy.	67
Conclusion.....	81
Bibliography.	82

Introduction

This research is a comparative study of the representations of the Enemy in Alphonsine chronicles and the chronicles of Niketas Koniates, written in the Kingdoms of Castile and the Byzantine Empire. It seeks to identify the representations of the enemy and to analyse the social and cultural frames which gave them meaning. It will always bear in mind the presence of other marginalized groups such as Jews, Arabs, Turkish, Berbers, Italians, Crusades as other Christian enemies. The reason why both places were encounter zones. Furthermore, the research seeks to explain how and why the producers of those discourses shaped and constructed their own identities and legitimated their dominance at the same time through those representations. In the same sense, it seeks to interpret: How were the representations of the enemies? what were their meanings? Why were they formed? And especially if these representations had structural elements that were shared in both peninsulas or not? and why were these elements developed or not? Moreover, it seeks to understand how these representations of Muslims were embedded in the daily lives of people, representing their bodies, sexuality and moral behaviour.

The time frame is the late 12th century and the 13th century, due to Niketas Choniates started to write his chronicle before the Fourth Crusade but finished during his exiled after the Crusade. The Alphonsine Chronicles were written during the second part of the 13th century, especially between 1260 and 1280. this period is important because, on one hand, the kingdom of Castile consolidated its power upon the Muslim territories, both conquering Muslim cities and dominating the whole peninsula. Thus, in this century Castile became the most powerful kingdom, in the Iberian Peninsula both in Christian and Muslim territories. On the other hand, during this moment the

Byzantine Empire's capital was taken by the Latin crusaders, likely one of the most dramatic events in Byzantine History up to that moment. The reason why the Byzantines ruled in Nicaea until 1261 when Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos retook Constantinople. In both cases, this period was an important moment when their strength either increased or decreased, facing several conflicts with enemies who did not belong to their religion or ethnic groups.

Naturally, the location of this research will be the Kingdom of Castile and the Byzantine Empire, Realms where the authors not only lived but had a prominent political role. Also, as it was mentioned, both places were multicultural realms, encounter spaces of different ethnic groups and cultures. Features that made these lands a particular point of interchange and coexistence with the other, but also, a place of the dispute, real and symbolically.

The book by the historian Ron Barkai with his book *El Enemigo en el Espejo* (2007), It is undoubtedly the main reference in the works on the image of Christians and Muslims in the Spanish Middle Ages. The author analyzes in a clear and organized way the image of both Muslims and Christians from the beginning of contact in the Iberian Peninsula until the 13th century, this analysis is carried out using the main chronicles of each period as sources. The author dedicates a whole chapter to the 13th century. Likewise, the author performs a complete analysis of the chronicles in sub-periods of the 13th century Castilian and relates the representations of the Muslim with the political interests.

Another work of great importance is Eloy Benito Ruano's speech, later published with the title *De la alteridad en la historia: Discurso leído en Mayo 22* (1988). This text, despite not being very extensive, initially develops in an exemplary way the concepts

of "image" and others that are closely related and that all research on the subject must take into account, such as identity and alterity. In addition to this, the author establishes the binary relationship in the representations of the Muslims and that of the Castilians themselves.

Continuing with the works on the subject, one of the historians who has worked the most in recent years is the historian J. Santiago Palacios Ontalva (2011 and 2012). In his research, two texts stand out. The first is his book on the time of Ferdinand III, in which he dedicates a section to the images of the other Muslims. This work highlights a large number of cited texts and extensive use of written sources consulted by the author.

Another author of great importance is Francisco García Fitz (2001, 2003a, 2003b and 2004). Now, he is not a cultural historian, nor does he focus his work in general on the subject of representations of the enemy, but rather focuses on the subject of political and military relations between the Christian kingdoms of the north and the Muslims of the south. His investigations, due to the proximity of the issues, have numerous sections on the construction of representations of Muslims as the main enemy.

Possibly the historian who has focused her attention the most on the moral and religious aspects of the representations of Islam is Inés Monteiro Arias (2006a and 2006b). This is done from an interesting interpretation of visual sources, many of them from architecture. Thus, in one of her articles she analyzes the figure of the archer centaur, and the symbolism that was included in this figure, always related to Islam. On the other hand, this academic, in another article on the forms of sin in Romanesque architecture, points out how these forms of sin are related to the Muslims, their

behaviour and the representations they had of them. So, she gives a broad overview of the representations and their religious and moral load.

María Florencia Mendizábal has also dealt with this issue (2014). It addresses one of the main problems and the one that has been discussed the most by specialists on the subject: the construction of otherness, that is, the identity of the different or of otherness. In this article, she not only deals with the interests and the socio-political context in which these discourses arise, but she also cares about the content. In this way, she points out elements such as the representations of certain behaviours and that of Muhammad, showing the importance of this figure for the construction of negative representations.

On the other hand, it is essential not to leave aside the work of Jean Flori (2003, 2004 and 2010), since this author is a specialist in the phenomenon of the Holy War, both on the Christian side with the idea of the crusade, and on the Muslim side with under the concept of Jihad. The concept is fundamental to understand the particular characteristics of the enemy's representations. Although his works have a general character (Medieval Western Europe), it is an important help to know the phenomenon, both at the level of representations and ideology, on a much larger scale. Since neither Castile nor Byzantium were the only spaces where the idea de Holy War played a decisive role.

The historiography that has dealt with the study of Byzantine history has not been little or recent, however, when the object of research becomes more concrete and tends to address cultural issues such as representations of the enemy or the other, the investigations are made harder to find. This does not mean that no author has touched

on the subject, but it does mean that the investigations that are exclusively dedicated to this subject are very few.

First of all, I want to highlight the work of the researcher Ioannis Stouraitis (2011 and 2014), who is undoubtedly a reference for this research. His arguments are not only critical and consistent but are based on period sources. Specifically, the historian focuses his attention on the concept of Holy War in Byzantine society and on that of identity, on how it was transformed during the end of the 12th century, and how this is recorded in the work of Niketas Koniates. By its very object of study, this research does not neglect the relationship of the Byzantine self with the other enemy.

Also, Ioannis Moraitis (2015), is another of the academics who with his interpretations have contributed to this research. In fact, his work is a reading of Byzantine history during the Second Crusade and how Niketas Koniates analyzed and interpreted those events. Obviously, his investigation is not only interested in the facts but in the interpretations, representations and motivations of the Byzantine chronicler.

Very similar to Ioannis Moraitis, Alicia Simpson (2006 and 2013) has devoted much of her intellectual effort to understanding the work of Niketas Koniates. Her research demonstrates high academic rigour and dedication. From my point of view, her work is fundamental to understanding the period around the Fourth Crusade, the historical events themselves and the complex political plots, but at the same time, he analyzes Koniates and his chronicle.

Another important source of academic inspiration is J. Harry (1984), who is not only the translator of the chronicle of Koniates, but in this translation he makes a critical analysis of the work as an introduction that, although briefly, does not stop aside the

representations that Koniates made of the Byzantine enemies and his own emperors. Definitively, J. Harry is known as an expert in byzantine studies.

I want to comment on my surprise at not having been able to find comparative works, during my research period I did not find a work that compared the Castilian case with the Byzantine in this period of high importance for the historical development of both spaces. The reason why I believe this thesis is a small but important step on a still highly unexplored path, but without a doubt, it has much to offer to understand the structures of Mediterranean culture.

The primary sources used in this thesis are evidently: the Alphonsine chronicles, *Primera Crónica General de España* and *General Estoria*, and the chronicle of Niketas Koniates: *Historia*. The three chronicles, all of them the most important of their time in each territory, have been edited, however, it should be noted that in the case of the Byzantine chronicle, the English translation was used, entitled *O City of Byzantium: Annals of Niketas*, while for the Castilian chronicles, the sources are in an unmodified edition, that is, in the original medieval Spanish. In order to make the thesis clear and easier, after any quotation of the sources, the reader will find a translation into English¹.

Finally, the research started working on the hypothesis that, on one hand, the enemy, in the byzantine case, was both the crusaders and the Muslims, because even though their main enemies in that century were the crusaders, the Muslims were a group that they had to combat along many centuries. On the other hand, for the Castilians, the other was the Muslims. Also, in both cases, the discourses represent the body, sexuality and moral behaviour of the enemy to create their own identity and legitimate

¹ The traslations of the sources in medieval Spanish were done by me.

their dominance. This means that the same representations and same functions regardless of the different traditions and historical contexts.

Obviously, this was the initial hypothesis, the reason why I expect the reader to be able to see how the thesis goes through this in the following chapters and to be able to determine if the results of the research confirm it or not.

Chapter I. Methodological and theoretical framework

Methodology

Taking into account the internal conditions and features of this research, I consider that the best methodological way to approach to the subject cannot be the use of only one method, but the combination of at least two or three procedural strategies, which allow the researcher to address a historical problem such the one is carried out in this thesis. Therefore, the methods that will be implemented are, namely, sources criticism, discourse analyses and comparative history.

These methods are not chosen in an aleatory way, it is the response of considering the features of the research, its objectives, and the connection with the theoretical structure. In this sense, the source's criticism was chosen because in my point of view is the base for any historical research and the best way to start to approach the primary sources.

The second method is discourse analysis, which provides, taking into account the nature and genre of the sources, rich and schematic elements to interpret the empirical material and to connect them with the theoretical framework. As it will be discussed in detail below.

Finally, the third method is Comparative History, since the research proposes a comparison between two writers, which means two different spaces, historical contexts, symbolic structures, etc., Thus, I consider that the comparative history provides adequate tools to make the analysis more profound and pertinent in relation to its own purposes. This method follows specifically the historiographic tradition; therefore, it does not represent only a linguistic comparison between two texts.

I do not pretend to deepen into the source criticism, as it is a basic tool of the historian labor² However, it is important to mention that this method consists of internal and external criticism. On one hand, the external criticism of the text refers to two elements, in Droysen's terms (1983), the criticism of authenticity and the criticism of the previous and the later. The first means the falsification of historical material. If the source that the historian has is trustable and functional for the objectives of the research. The second is if the historical material could undergo changes or have incorporated characteristics from other times, hence, it is necessary to know how to identify them in order to separate them physically or conceptually.

For example, in this thesis one writer who is analyzed has a book, which was written partially by himself, but the last part of it was written by his son. In this sense, the source is authentic and functional for the research, but only the part which is related to our author. On the other hand, the internal criticism is the analysis of the content-essence, the meanings, their relationships with the historical context, the use of the language, etc. The internal criticism may be supported by other methods, as in this research by discourse analysis.

Discourse Analysis is defined by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer as the method which deal with obscure and transparent "structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (2001, p. 2). It analyses critically different phenomena that are manifested by discourses. In synthesis,

² To get into this method I highly recommend observing the classic historians who established the foundations of the historical discipline and its method in the 19th century. With the proper criticism, it may be a very productive inspiration. Perhaps, regarding the methodology, Gustav Droysen and his work *Historik* (1983) might be the most notable of his time.

Discourse is an attempt to reveal the relationships of power (mediums of domination, legitimation of power, discrimination logics, ideological structures, etc.).

Discourse Analysis consists in taking distances to the data and its explicit content and, at the same time, embedding the data in the social and symbolic structure. Thus, for Wodak and Meyer, DA stresses three elements of the texts (written or oral): Ideology, Power and Knowledge. For the authors, the study of ideology consists in the research on “the ways in which meaning is constructed and conveyed by symbolic forms of various kinds” (2001, p. 11).

Furthermore, ideologies are part of a much wider belief system, which at the same time means, on one hand, that ideas do not have ideological practices or the social structures in a pure essence, but they are based on them (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 116). On the other hand, as Van Dijk comments, Ideas, languages, or ideologies are not private or personal, but “belief systems are socially shared by the members of a collectivity of social actors.” (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 116).

Following the same interpretative line, language is not separated from the social order, on the contrary, it is entwined in social power structures, “language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power” (Wodak and Meyer, p 11). Indeed, this part is fundamental for this thesis and one of the reasons why this methodology was chosen; therefore, power is highly related to the difference and its effects in social structures, which is extremely important when approaching to a topic such the symbolic construction of the enemy.

On the other hand, DA reminds that the discourses constitute knowledge. However, knowledge is not a pure objective and neutral actor, but it is connected to the ideologies and the power relations. Hence some questions are very relevant to

interpret it under a deeper approach and going into the implicit meaning, such as: What constitutes knowledge? How discourses are constructed? How social institutions are built? How ideology functions in social institutions? And how people get and maintain power? (Wodak and Meyer, pp,11-12)

Moreover, the historical sources are not only linguistic expressions, they are discourses and, as Foucault claims, the discourses do not only translate the struggles or domination systems, but rather than for which and through which one fights, the power that one wants to seize (Foucault, 2009, p. 15). In this sense, there are two elements that should be explained about the texts. On one hand, is the social dimension of the this. The texts are formed by social structures and social practices (and its actors, the people involved in social events.) (Fairclough. 2003, pp. 21-25). Social structures are, for example, the economy, social classes, kinship system or a language. They are a set of possibilities. The social practices are “articulations of different types of social elements which are associated with particular areas of social life. They articulate the discourse (hence the language) with other non-discoursal elements” (Fairclough. 2003, p. 25).

On the other hand, text are acts of speech, which means they have a locutionary level of a statement and an illocutionary force, or in other words, what is said and what is done when saying it, which gives the language a space for action and a performative process in the social and cultural environment in which it unfolds (Di Pasquale, 2011, pp. 88-89), Language is understood as an active object of study that can be modelled and interact with the social environment; the text becomes relevant in a specific context. Then, under this methodological approach, to understand a text is not enough to analyze what it is literally said (locutionary part), but rather, it is necessary to locate

the propositional content in the web of linguistic and cultural relations in which it is inserted into, in order to discover the intentionality (the illocutionary force), conscious or not.

Summarizing, Discourse Analysis is an approach, which allows to interpretate the connection between the historical texts and the social shared beliefs (ideology), power relationships, and the production of knowledge, emphasizing on representations of the social actors and social actions, which is highly important for this thesis, since the core of this research is how the enemy (social actors) and their (social) actions were represented under some specific ideologies, power relations and how this built a specific knowledge on the other, supported by institutions like the church and monarchy.

The last methodology is Comparative History, and it was chosen due to this research purposes a comparison between two writers and their symbolic world, reason why I consider this methodology would enhance the analysis process and enrich the interpretations.

The comparative history is as old as the academic History and Sociology. Indeed, this kind of research was highly carried out by the classical sociologist and historian, thus, renowned scholars were the pioneers in this field, such as Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Droysen, Langlois, Henri Pirenne, Block (Elliott, 2012 168), among others. Hence, it can be said that the comparative perspective was a fundamental part of the Historical Sociology since the 19th century (Grew, 1980, pp. 763-769). However, unfortunately, during the 20th century the researchers, especially historians, abandoned this practice (Elliott, 1999, pp. 20-21). Although in nowadays under a globalized context and with

the necessity of new interpretations and answers, the comparative researches are barely carried out.

Following the Marc Block's interpretations, comparative history consists in the analysis of at least two phenomena, identifying their similarities and differences through evolving circumstances to explain them. It means that it is not a simple contrast, but it means to understand and explain a phenomenon (Bloch, 1999, p. 115). Such a comparison might be, on one hand, a long space-time comparison, which includes evolving curves, structural process, etc. or, on the other hand, a parallel study of neighbours and contemporary (Block, 1999, pp. 116-117).

The advantages of this kind of approach are multiples and in various ways. First, it allows to find problems and conditions of possibility to understand those problems. Also, it might show unknown inter-relations that can lead the researchers to richer, stricter, and more precise conclusions (Block, 1999, p. 117-140). Secondly, taking into account, the scheme of national states is an artificial barrier and not constant historical fact or there is no something as a national consciousness (Block, 1999, pp. 141-144), the researcher may break those interpretative limitations and, at the same time, may take distances of her/his own object of study.

Now, as Jürgen Kocka reminds us, a research might be trans-national or trans-cultural and not being comparison at all. It is not just about interactions or transfers. Comparative history means a systematic comparison of different space-time locations, which may be synchronic or diachronic (Kocka, 2002, pp. 43-44) and it should lead the researchers as to see the Contrasts (differences), general relations (coincidences) and the different degrees in these as to identify problems, connections, issues and answers that normally cannot be seen (Kocka, 2002, p. 46).

Under this method, the research has two main stages: the descriptive and the interpretative stage (Block, 1999, pp. 118-122). Moreover, inside these two stages there are four substages that work out as methodological functions as well. They are, namely, during the descriptive stage, 1. the deep description, 2. to show unique cases and the differences among the similarity; and during the interpretative stage, 3. support for the explanations, or discarding others, and finally, 4. spacer effect over the research, helping to lose certainties, questioning the researcher own position (Kocka, 2002, pp. 46-49).

Obviously, as every method, Comparative History approach has its critics. Indeed, it has its danger and difficulties. Some of them are falling in a mere descriptive research without any analysis or interpretation, the inexistence of a common phenomenon which would make the research without academic and social interest, the risk of exaggerating the influences and connection between the subjects studied, etc. (Kocka, 2003, p. 41) However, one of the most important difficulties, and what is related to this thesis, is that the comparison of distant phenomenon may implicate not having access to original sources, or at least not in the original language.

Regarding this language issue, the historians and sociologists have found and used the tool of the translations to get over it. Obviously, the use of translations is not done in an innocent way, even since the time of Marc Block and even more after the linguistic turn, the historians know the implications of analysing the past through translations (Haupt and Kocka, 2009, p. 114). However, the scholars understand the importance of breaking the linguistic limits and taking the opportunity of carrying out these comparative researches with translations or even with secondary sources³.

³ Indeed, the classic sociologist and historians widely used translations or even just secondary sources. Just to cite one of them, Durkheim may be a good example (Durkheim, 1992)

Even historians as Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka point out that the use of translation brings good interpretative opportunities and with the proper use and criticism may enhance the researches and call to open up the academic structure for the translations (2009, pp. 114-115). Thus, in this thesis, the Nektas Choniates' work will be read and interpreted under the English translation.

Theoretical Framework.

It is important to mention that the concept of other is also found as alterity or otherness. Although some authors prefer to use one or other term, they are synonyms and refer the same meanings. The difference is because of the Author's interpretations rather than the chosen concept. The first important element that should be pointed out is that the otherness is related to the construction of the "same", the self-knowledge and the self-recognitions (Fenves, 1998).

It is precisely this figure and its binary relationship, of "identity" and "otherness", one of the centers of this research.⁴ In fact, the relationship between the other and the same is at the same time a historical constant, thus, making a historical analysis of this may be an interesting contribution to rethinking the problem in the present.

On the other hand, the concept of other under Lacan's theory has a third aspect since he differentiates three types of others (Johnston, 2018). The first other is pointed out

⁴ Eloy Benito Ruano argues it as below: "Identidad y alteridad son, pues, según, nuestra reflexión, calidades contrapuestas correspondiente a sujetos cuya relación dialéctica afirmamos seguidamente que constituye el radical *primum movens* de la historicidad. No hay Historia sin progreso (movimiento) y no es posible la dinamicidad de lo monolítico. El principio de igualdad esencial de todo hombre se complementa con el no menos esencial de su diversidad individual más absoluta. Y el del devenir histórico exige cuando menos la dualidad, un punto de referencia mutuo para cada uno de los dos sujetos mínimamente exigibles para entender la Historia. La existencia de *Uno* en el tiempo sería eternidad inmutable, tiempo de egosaurio, como se ha ducho en expresión afortunada; o, en otro aspecto, exclusivamente biografía. La Historia, que como sabemos en nuestro tiempo «es siempre Historia social», comienza con la creación del segunda y ya diferente ser humano: es decir, del *Otro*." (Ruano, 1988, p. 16.).

as part of the imaginary sphere in Lacan's concepts, which is the one that gathers the philosophical tradition as such. Regarding the two Others, with capital O, according to Lacan, they are within the register of the symbolic and real, and in under this interpretation the Other might be an entity as God or the unknown. Although the Lacan's interpretations is quite provocative and interesting, it does not apport theoretical knowledge for the purposes of this study, therefore it will not be considered in this research.

Another relevant feature of this of this concept is that the other is previously constructed, which means, the other is decided by a group even before it exists, to justify actions and apply certain beliefs. Thus, the other is a symbolic expression of material world, not the material world in itself. Hence, as the Roy Barkai mentions, "It is not an objective description of reality, but a reflection of the subjective conceptions of those who review it." (Barkai, 2007, p. 11.). However, this condition cannot be understood as a phenomenon which is completely separated from realm of the actions and the everyday life, as it will be developed later, the representations of the other provoked the decision making against those groups or individuals, actions that were usually difficult to revoke (Ruano, 1988, p. 16.).

Finally, in addition to the previous elements presented, the other is not only the opposite to the "same", the constructor of the same identity through the comparison – for example: if they are black we are white, if they are non-Christians we are Christians-, but at the same time, the other must share features, spaces, symbolic structures, etc. with the group which is identified as the same. In this sense, it is interesting that in Spanish language, the word other means different, but also the word

in some uses may mean something new or additional, and it is even used to point out the similarities between two people⁵.

Thus, the concept of other can be summarized, in Eloy Benito Ruano's words, as: "The multiple subject that appears in the eyes of a culture, a society, a state, a generation, any human group, or simply an individual, with someone or something belonging to their own nature, but at the same time radically different from himself. Our collective other is only similar to us, not identical: it shares our way of being" (Ruano, 1988, p. 16.).

However, the object of this thesis is not the other in his whole dimension. What will be studied here is a specific part of that category, the enemy. In this sense, every enemy may be conceptualised as other, nevertheless, being within the category of other does not mean that at the same time it is an enemy. Thus, Djordje Stojanovic, following the Schmitt's interpretations, says that humans have "an inherent need for political identity that can be achieved solely through the identification of some otherness as the enemy of one's own self. Ergo, the peak point of politics (and not of the political) is materialized in the act of recognising the enemy as the enemy." (Stojanovic, 2015, p. 63).

According to the paragraph above, we can see that there are some elements in common as the relations enemy-sameness. However, there are two other aspects worth to mention. The first one is that the enemy is a political issue in the more common use of the word. The enemy is in disputing against the groups which consider them as an enemy, and they must take actions against the enemy. The second aspect consists in the recognition. The enemy must be recognized as such for the other group.

⁵ See Real Academia Española, "Otro", "otredad", "Alteridad", *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*, 23^a ed., [version 23.3 online] <https://dle.rae.es/otro> [Access Date: March 09, 2020.]

It is very interesting to note that the recognition is a double process. While I recognize my enemy (what it is a political-power act in itself), I assume that I have the authority and legitimacy to do it and when I am recognized as an opponent for the other group, reaffirm my own self-identification and self-legitimization.

Now, assuming that the problem of the enemy is related to the power relationships (what I mentioned as political issue) opens the possibility to have a wider view of it. Thus, in a complex social context, both the enemy identity and allied identity are not rigid, rather it is fluid and redefinable (Stojanovic, 2015, p. 64). Since, for example, in spaces like Iberian Peninsula, the kingdom of Castile faced militarily different Muslims groups but also other Christian power, or in the case of the byzantine empire, which faced Turkic powers but also Latin and Serbian forces. Thus, on many occasions, the alliances game -the everyday experience- forced to redefine over the time the criteria who is the enemy or the allied, or even to modify the symbolic construction of the enemy to have space for certain kind of mutual understanding. Moreover, it is important to make clear that the enemy as a theoretical concept does not refer unique and exclusively to states or political aggrupation, but to any other human sphere, namely, moral, religious, economic, etc.

On the other hand, Djordje, again following Schmitt's ideas, differentiates private and public enemies. However, according to him, only public enemies are enemies worth to be studied as a historical or social phenomenon. Since in private enemies, neither the self-identification nor the political elements are presented. Therefore, only groups can be understood as enemies, since "hostility exists only when one collective, even potentially, enters into confrontation with a similar collective" (Stojanovic, 2015, Japan, pp. 65-66)

Finally, the same author differentiates between two types of enemies depending on the hostility degree. Hence, on one hand, the “respectable” or normal enemy is that with whom peace may be made regardless of the fight. On the other hand, it is the absolute enemy, who, due to its radical confrontation, needs to be defeated and destroyed or punished and humiliate (Stojanovic, 2015, Japan, p. 67).

The other -or the enemy in this case- is a phenomenon that, although it has effects in the quotidian life of the people and the communities, is fundamentally a cognitive and symbolic matter. Thus, no history of the other can be done without thinking the symbolic universe and representations issue.

Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann interpretate that the symbolic universe “locates all collective events in a cohesive unity that includes past, present and future” (Berger and Luckmann, 1991, p. 77). Regarding the past, the symbolic universe establishes a collective shared history by the members of the community. Regarding the future, it stablishes common goals and frame of reference for the collective and individual actions. (Berger and Luckmann, 1991, p. 78).

In this sense, the symbolic universe not only orders the history, but also it connects the individuals with their predecessors and their successors and gives them meaning. Thus, a single existence is transcended becoming part of group, which has high meaning after and before him or her. The symbolic universe is a pre-existing network of meaning where individuals are placed, in order to belong to the community, where they gain a transcendental meaning of their own existence (Berger and Luckmann, 1991, pp. 120-121). Furthermore, it is a structure of meanings that attempt to explain why the world (the social constructed reality) is the way it is.

Now, the social dynamics are much more complex, since there are not isolated symbolic universes. As the authors point out, within a shared space may be deviant versions of the symbolic universe (Berger and Luckmann, 1991, p. 81.), or even other universes. The presence of those meaning structures challenges the reality and the status of the symbolic universe as originally constituted and, in this sense, it challenges its own legitimacy. Obviously, the challenge must be faced to maintain its functionality and legitimacy. However, this process may involve the transformation of the dominant universe as well. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann comment that “In other words, the symbolic universe is not only legitimated but also modified by the conceptual machineries constructed to ward off the challenge of heretical groups within a society. A major occasion for the development of universe maintaining conceptualization arises when a society is confronted with another society having a greatly different history” (1991. P. 82).

On the other hand, there is a significant difference between the deviant universes and the completely alternative one, because in the first case, both share a broad group of logics and there is a clear hierarchy, the core universe and the deviants. Meanwhile, the alternative universes have their own official logic and traditions, they are objectified and legitimated in equal level as the other universe. This is a clash between two different symbolic and mental structures of understanding, interpreting and explaining the world. Indeed, one good historical example is the encounter between Muslims, Christians in the Middle Age.

Where two different symbolic universes crash in the same place for long time, they inevitably go into a cognitive and symbolic struggle (or even a military struggle), which requires a conceptual machinery to “maintain symbolic universes always entail the systematization of cognitive and normative legitimations, which were already

presented in the society in a naiver mode, and which crystallized in the symbolic universe in question” (Berger and Luckmann, 1991, pp. 124-125). One element of this conceptual machinery is precisely the symbolic construction of the enemy, which is carried out through representations. Since, they delegitimize the alternative one; legitimate, objectify and consolidated their own universe; and spread its internal logics and new features across the community members through these representations.

Regarding the representations, one of the pioneers of its study was the sociologist Emile Durkheim, who defines it as following:

“The collective representations are the product of an immense cooperation that extends not only in space but also in time; to make them a multitude of diverse spirits has associated, mixed, combined their ideas and their feelings; long series of generations have accumulated in them an experience and their knowledge. A very particular intelligentsia, infinitely richer and more complex than that of the individual, has been concentrated there. Since then, it is understood how reason has the power to exceed the scope of empirical knowledge.” (Durkheim, 1992, p. 47)

As it can be seen in the paragraph above, representations are closely linked to the symbolic universe. Indeed, as Thomas Caddesio (1995, pp. 135-136) suggests the representations are coded inside of specific universes, their meaning, symbolic web, and so on. They only can be understood fully by the people who share this cognitive and symbolic structure.

On the other hand, the roll of the representations in a society goes much further than only being part of the conceptual machinery against the alternative symbolic universe. As the social psychology has discovered, they have at least four main functions within

the communities, namely: 1. Knowledge, which allow to understand and explain. because they allow people to get an idea about something, it is called popular knowledge as well. 2. Identification, since they define the identity and allows the safeguarding of the specificity of the groups. Thus, at the same time the representation also segregates, removes what does not fit within the characteristics of the group. 3. Guidance, they drive behaviours and practices, And 4. Justify, they allow postures and behaviours to be justified afterwards (Abric, 2001, pp, 15-17).

On the other hand, although from Durkheim's time to nowadays many scholars have addressed the representations, I consider Theo Van Leeuwen's ideas very relevant, especially for the purposes of this research. As the ideas presented above, Van Leeuwen also recognizes the importance of 1. the social practices in the representation building process 2. Function of the legitimation and 3. The capacity to generate identity and to segregate the different (Van Leeuwen, 2008, pp. 4-20).

But, on the other hand, the author identifies and goes deeper in two crucial aspects: how social actors and social actions are represented. Thus, he distinguishes how the social actor are represented and the symbolic meanings of those strategies. Van Leeuwen conceptualises it through categories as: passive and active roles; genericization and Specification; association and disassociation; in-determination and differentiation; de-agentialized and agentialized: physical identification; spatialization; symbolizations existentialization; naturalization and so on (Van Leeuwen, 2008, pp. 32-71). In themselves those categories are quite interesting, and they have an enormous interpretative and explicative potential, and without doubts it is expected that the reader can find them within the following chapters.

Nevertheless, there is an aspect of the representations interpretation that is important to mention here, which is: most of those categories display that the representations mainly lie on the bodies, the sexuality and the moral of the enemy and the “allies”. Indeed, this interpretation reminds Foucault’s ideas about the relations between power, discourses, and the individuals’ body, what he called microphysics of power (Foucault, 1993, 1995, 2004). This means that the construction of the enemy runs through their bodies, their sexuality and their moral fundamentally. All the conceptual machinery, the power relationships, the legitimation, and identification games lie on the most private apart of the social actors. Undoubtedly, this research will attempt to deal specially with this aspect.

Now we can see that the methodology was also chosen in relation to the conceptual bases of the research, since, for example, DCA has been used for the analysis of the representations and to reveal the mechanisms of exclusion of the representations of the other and the enemy. While the historiographic tradition, with the criticism of sources and comparative history, supports the historical dimension of research in temporal and spatial analyzes.

Choosing an appropriate methodology and clarifying the theoretical and conceptual basis has been the first step in this research. One that lays the foundation, the steps to follow, and the structure. Now, the next step in this research is the understanding of both historical contexts, their peculiarities, and their encounters, in order to move on to the next steps, the presentation of the data (sources) and their interpretation.

Chapter II. Historical context.

The kingdom of Castile.

Since the 11th century, the peninsula experienced various phenomena that matured and intensified until the 13th century. These phenomena are what the historian Ron Barkai calls "the Spanish conscience" and "the crusade mentality" (Barkai, 2007, p. 206).

The first is linked to the Spanish identity itself, and the military confrontation against Islam, because since the 11th century there was an accelerated advance of the Christian kingdoms of the north over the southern territories of the peninsula, and it is precisely the century here studied in which the war against Islam was not only waged more intensely but also more successfully.

In fact, at this time, military activity in border areas was constant, although not always in the form of battles between two great armies, but rather as rapid raids of destruction and pillage. Thus, the feeling of danger and violence themselves were an element present in the reality of the Castilian XIII century (García Fitz, 2001, pp. 162-177). This means that there was a significant impact on people's lives and their daily activities and even "la manera de concebir el acercamiento a sus vecinos musulmanes o de imaginar el carácter de las fronteras frente al islam" ("the way of conceiving the approach to their Muslim neighbours or of imagining the character of the borders against Islam") (García Fitz, 2001, pp. 176-177).

On the other hand, "the crusade mentality" was fostered by the strengthening of relations between the Castilian monarchy with both the Papacy and the Abbey of Cluny (Monteira Arias, 2006a, pp. 150-151.), Which ended up substituting the Mozarabic rite for the Roman one. Regarding this point, although it is clear that Cluny

had great importance and there was an effort both from Cluny and from the papacy to replace the Mozarabic rite (which was finally put aside in the kingdom of Castile), and thus, to establish the mentality of Crusade; its role as organizer of the logic of both the *Reconquista* and the enemy's images must be nuanced since the Spanish campaign long ago had taken religious and sacred elements in its discourse, and the birth of "the Spanish conscience" allowed the permanence of those particular aspects of holy war.

The Medieval Primer and specifically that of the 13th century was a "society organized for war" (García Fitz, 2004, pp. 242-244), where political, economic and even social life was linked to the practice of war. The Iberian Peninsula was established as a border point between Islam and Christianity, a border of contact, but also of separation and conflict, where the constant was life in the middle of military actions. Thus, the *Reconquista* is also part of the experience of the Holy War in the West, which as a common characteristic demonized the enemy, at the same time giving its campaigns the category of sacred. Which happened through ideological propaganda, which in most cases were due to intentionally constructed ideas, and were not given by chance or mere ignorance⁶.

However, in the world of the late Middle Ages, the war had to be legitimized, since the good war was differentiated from the bad. In this way, there were three legal justifications to legitimized attacking the Muslims. The first was the defensive war itself; the second: the preventive war against a possible future attack; and the third, Attacking offensively without the need for a possible attack, since the Muslims occupied formerly Christian lands (Morin, 2010, p. 56), so that, under this discourse, every act ends up being a defence against the invader.

⁶ On the Holy War in the Christian world and its ideological basis see Flori, 2003, p. 231.

Thus, the spirit of the crusade and the symbolism it had was used, not only to combat the Muslims but at the same time it sought to exalt the monarchy. In this sense, the historian Manuel Alejandro Rodríguez points out that the position adopted by the 13th century Castilian ruling elite was “Castilianist”, “secularist” and “monarchical” (Rodríguez de la Peña, 2001, pp. 35-36.), that is to say, under the discourse of the crusades, presented in general throughout the Iberian territory, what was in the background was the consolidation of the political objectives of this particular elite.

Now, this “Castilianist” sentiment began to develop especially after the Christian victory of 1212 in Las Navas de Tolosa, a moment of political, military and representational change. In this sense, Ron Barkai interprets that it is only until the first decades of the 13th century that the “patriotic” value of dying for the faith and the fatherland appears as the highest value, in contrast to the image of the Muslim as an invader and a foreigner. Although this seems to be true, it cannot be considered that this process was born spontaneously as a result of the victory in the battle of 1212. Indeed, some important elements of this phenomenon had already been brewing previously. Thus, in the *Najerense* Chronicle, although not so forcefully or markedly, there are clear comments related to this “Castilianist” logic, such as Muslims identified with the barbarians, while on the other hand, it is related to the Castilian monarchy with the Visigothic kingdom. The text states it like this: “Y así, muerto Rodrigo, rey de los godos, no hubo reyes godos en esta tierra durante cuatro años” (“And so, Rodrigo, king of the Goths, died, there were no Goth kings in this land for four years”) (Estévez Sola, 2003, p.113)⁷. This refers to the fact that only for four years there was no Visigothic king in Spain, until, after this short time, Pelayo a goth was proclaimed king.

⁷ Also, for comments that identify Muslims with barbarians see pp. 124-126. And if you want to follow the origin of this type of discourse a little more in detail, see Francisco García Fitz, 2003b, p. 195. Where

Thus, the Hispanic monarchies were interested in creating and disseminating images of their Muslim enemy to justify, promote and increase their dominance. Indeed, the objective of controlling this process “estaba orientado hacia el mantenimiento de un orden rígidamente jerarquizado en el que un grupo reducido contaba con la legitimidad para ejercer un liderazgo político, militar, espiritual o económico sobre el resto de la población” (“was oriented towards maintaining a rigidly hierarchical order in which a small group had the legitimacy to exercise political, military, spiritual or economic leadership over the rest of the population”) (Palacios Ontalva, Madrid, 2011, p. 310.). This effort was organized directly by the kings, but it is worth noting the role played in particular by Alfonso X, the Wise, who strove to develop a group of images in relation to Muslims and of the Castilian monarchy, compact, coherent and powerful. In this way, in the writings ordered to compose by the wise king, the legitimacy of possessing the entire peninsula by Christians is indicated at the cost of taking away their controlled territories from the Muslims. A good example is when he states the following: “Et despues de la muerte de Abenhut, partiose aquella tierra en muchos pequennos reys, et apartada de los moros almohades, que fue pro et bien a lo que los cristianos tenien en los coraçones: esto es, ganar dellos la tierra; et esto cumplido es ya oy, loado sea el nombre de Nuestro Sennor Dios, que lo dio a los cristianos, et benditos los nuestros reyes que lo ganaron” (“After the death of Abenhut, that land was divided into many small kings, and separated from the Almohad Moors, which was for the good to what Christians had in their hearts: this is, to win the land from them; and this completed is already heard, praised be the name of Our Lord God, who

the author interprets that the Visigoth-Barbarian duality arises in the 11th century and has a long development process until the 15th century. An idea that does not prevent it from being from the thirteenth century when it is presented in a more decisive way and with new characteristics.

gave it to the Christians, and be blessed are our kings who won it”)(Menéndez Pidal (Ed.), 1906, p. 722).

The above leads to consider something important, this is the idea of high tolerance between Muslims, Christians and Jews in Medieval Spain. Although in some moments, personal interests made respect for certain characters or customs, cultural and religious tolerance was minimal and always considering the “Other” as inferior (García Fitz, 2003, p. 27)⁸. Thus, en tiempos de Alfonso X imágenes infames de todo tipo, tendentes básicamente a construir un muro de separación, física y moral, ente comunidades” (“in the times of Alfonso X infamous images of all kinds, basically tending to build a wall of separation, physical and moral, between communities”) (Francisco García Fitz, 2003b, P. 44). This is exemplified because Alfonso X allowed Muslims to live in Christian spaces, but without being able to make public demonstrations or found new mosques (Alfonso X, 1972, pp. 676-677). Which shows his inferior condition.

Even though in the thirteenth century Christianity continued to be a closed society, which sought to convert non-Christians by force, at the same time that it excluded them; It also shows a real and reinforced interest in leaving the natural borders and opening up to voluntary conversion, beginning to change the idea of the crusade for the mission (Le Goff, 1999, p. 126). The foundations of this process are found in the eleventh century with the mendicant orders, especially Cluny, which promoted the

⁸ Also the analysis of Santiago Palacios, who says: “en todo caso una convivencia forzosa en la que no hubo situaciones de absoluta igualdad entre ambos grupos, ni esta cohabitación resultó armoniosa o sin resquicio de conflictividad. En todo momento alguna sociedad dominó a la otra, y una élite política, religiosa y cultural asentada en la cúspide del poder tendió a controlar a las comunidades diferentes y/o minoritarias” (“in any case a forced coexistence in which there were no situations of absolute equality between the two groups, nor was this cohabitation harmonious or without a trace of conflict. At all times one society dominated the other, and a political, religious and cultural elite settled at the top of power tended to control different and/or minority communities”) Palacios Ontalva, 2012, pp. 246-247.

papal policy of independence from the civil power, and in that sense, the fight against heresies through the commissars who had authority, without geographical limits (Martín Rodríguez, 2008, p. 891). However, they not only sought to punish heresy, but to convince heretics or pagans.

Christians, convinced of the logic of their faith, were confident that they would also have a peaceful spiritual victory through the conversion of their enemy. Alfonso X The Wise, perfectly exemplifies the Castilian idea of the disillusionment of the Muslims when they understand the falsehood and impotence of Muhammad and, as a consequence of this, the acceptance of the Christian faith. He says:

aquel sultán creyó,
ciertamente, que por magia
lo querían engañar
los suyos y a Mahoma,
el falso declarado,
comenzó a llamar
para que los viniese a ayudar;
pero quedó decepcionado.
aquel Sultán pagano
se dirigió hacia San Germán
y le dijo: “Señor, hoy
quiero hacerme cristiano
por mano vuestra
y convertirme
y dejar a Mahoma
el falso cobarde. (Alfonso X, 1972, p. 113)

(that sultan believed,
certainly, that by magic
they wanted to cheat
his own and Muhammad,
the false declared,
he started calling
so that he would come to help them;
but he was disappointed.
that pagan sultan
He went to San German
and said to him: "Lord, today
I want to become a Christian
by your hand
and become
and leave Muhammad
the false coward.)

Thus, multiple spaces for coexistence and coexistence were opened in the 13th century outside the context of the war, in which there was an interesting cultural, intellectual and commercial exchange that nurtured both sides, which led the Castilians to high adoption of Arabic elements such as food, clothing, fabrics, architecture, literature, etc⁹. Even the monarchy, especially Fernando III and Alfonso X, considered integrating Muslims into Castilian power through vassal pacts, which

⁹ This did not necessarily imply that the culture of the "Other" was seen as superior or worthy of respect, on the contrary, they were always considered inferior in relation to the Christian and his culture. Only a practical use was made of Muslim knowledge.

implied the survival of many of the social, political and religious structures of the followers of Islam (García Fitz, 2004, p. 233)¹⁰.

As for the coexistence and contact that Christians and Muslims had, it is very important to point out the role of the *Mudejar*. This phenomenon began in Castilla with the conquest of Toledo in 1085 (Hinojosa Montalvo, 2004, p. 335). Now, unlike the Crown of Aragon¹¹, the Mudejar presence in Castile is difficult to track, their number is significantly lower and their social weight is also much weaker; which has made it difficult for researchers to be able to give precise answers to questions such as how many were there? And how much impact did it have on Christian society? However, what is known today in this regard is that by the end of the 15th century in all of Castile there were between 20 and 25 thousand Mudejars, that is, only 0.5% of the total population (Ladero Quesada, 1978, p. 260).

Now, although the data for the thirteenth century is even less accurate, several important things are known. First of all, we know that the Mudejars of this century are mobile and move to cities where there were none before, as in the case of Ávila, where they arrived in search of better opportunities. This was due to a hardening of conditions in the 12th century, so some of them moved north and others to Al-Andalus (Ladero Quesada, 1978, pp. 262; 267). In this way, while some Mudejars came to the north of Castile, the south, the Andalusian area, experienced a decline in this population, which led to the fact that, in the 13th century, on the one hand, the Guadalquivir valley was

¹⁰ On the other hand, it must be taken into account that these peaceful initiatives of domination, as well as the daily coexistence between Christians and Muslims, were abandoned by the total conquest and expulsion of the Muslims centuries later, which surely must have an implication in the representations of those centuries specifically and that it would be very interesting to deepen, but because it is not the object of this research, it has been left aside.

¹¹ The Mudejar phenomenon in Aragon was different due to demographic proportions, for example, in the 13th century in Valencia they were the majority of the population, so their perception as an enemy was greater and led to more frequent acts of violence against this population. See: Hinojosa Montalvo, 2004, p. 341 and Hinojosa Montalvo, 2008, pp. 299-354.

it would be left without Mudejars and, on the other hand, that in Murcia the presence of Mudejars almost disappeared at the end of the same century; many of whom possibly migrated to Valencia (Ladero Quesada, 1978, pp. 271-276.). Thus, in general terms, in the 13th century, the Mudejar zone was finally configured, especially in the period between 1225 and 1265.

The Castilian Chronicle.

The chronicle in its most general form can be described as a historical account, which implies, on the one hand, that, unlike other historical writings, although it could present chronologies, its structure was more complex and contained more details. At the same time, the fact of being written indicates that it was prepared by and for the dominant elite, secular or ecclesiastical since these were the only ones who could read and write at the time. On the other hand, the fact of being a historical account indicates that it was precisely inscribed in an intellectual tradition that followed certain parameters depending on the time, and that it operated with claims of objectivity, even if it was not at all.

There are two references for medieval historiography and in the same sense the chronicle, which are the works of the priests and thinkers St. Augustine and Paulus Orosius. The historical writings date back to Herodotus and Thucydides in ancient Greece, however, it was these two characters that gave the hallmark of all the historiography to come in western Europe, that is, its enduring traits of universalism. Providencialism and theology (Funes, 2010, p. 2). At this time, historians abandoned the human scale, to adopt a divine perspective, which is reflected in the abandonment of the stories about their life trajectory or the memory of their community, to write in their replacement long-term history that is connected with divine events.

For this reason, the narrations should have a more transcendental meaning, they did not only teach the good path of the Christian, but they also clarified how God's plan was being fulfilled, each fact was part of his design. In this global, totalizing, ecumenical perspective, of course, the historian cannot be a direct witness, since his dimension is finite, and the history is connected to the infinity of God and his plans. At this time, and perhaps forever since even today, this tradition is preserved, historians ceased to be witnesses and writers of the events, to write mainly through sources.

The foregoing is not a small change, but rather implies a tremendous transformation of the discipline in its practice and its epistemology (Funes, 2010, 2), since, on the one hand, as was said, the way of research went from travelling paths, participate in an event and then write what happened, to go-to books, old documents, etc. and, in this way, telling the facts of past generations. On the other hand, at the epistemological level, the sense of truth completely changed, because before the differences in stories could be considered as differences of versions, but now, and more to be connected with the absolute truth of God, the differences were modifications of the past, distortions or simply falsehoods.

Now, as for the historian of this time, or more exactly the chronicler, we must clarify that they were not men who were trained as such and exercised this as the only profession, but were intellectuals linked to power, whether political or religious, who in their multiple types of works could write chronicles. That is, an author could write chronicles, theological treatises, poems, etc. without any problem. However, we can define the medieval historian as the enunciator of a narrative discourse that attributes a value of absolute historical truth. Also, they acted and wrote within more or less specific characteristics and knowledge, with clear ideological, political and literary boundaries.

Already in the Castilian field, it is interesting to note that the Castilian, Galician and Portuguese traditions, within these political, ideological and stylistic limits, were highly related and in many cases overlapping. This was mainly due to the constant flow of ideas in these three territories, in which Aragon also participated partially. In fact, from the twelfth century and especially the thirteenth century, the translation of the chronicles in these three languages was almost immediate (Lorenzo, 2002, pp. 93-123).

On the other hand, the basis of this type of historical texts in the Iberian Peninsula is the work of *Isidore of Seville* in the 6th century. Undoubtedly, his work, which was characterized by a brief style, synthetic informative content, few characters, political, war and ecclesiastical themes, constituted the reference for all future generations until the rebirth of the twelfth century. It took six centuries for new references and models to reach the chronicles. This was due precisely to the economic and social rebirth of this time, which in turn brought a new cultural peak, which was reflected in new excellence in medieval Latin writing, both at the rhetorical level and in doctrinal complexity (Funes, 2010, p. 3).

Although the most important works of the highest aesthetic and intellectual level were produced until the 13th century, in the 12th century some works worthy of comment were written. One of them is the *Najerense Chronicle*. The *Najerense Chronicle* is Castilian and pro-Castilian, which implies that it was built in Castile and that at the same time it is interested in emphasizing the history of the kingdom of Castile, which it considers to be the kingdom that leads the peninsular leadership, above the kingdom of Leon, reflecting that this kingdom is already past and that Castilla is the future, the dominating monarchy that marks history (Pérez Rodríguez, 1993, 203). Thus, Castilla is presented as the heir to the kings Fernando I and Alfonso VI, as in its time the

kingdom of León was of Asturias and the Visigoths (Estévez Sola (edit.), P. 2003). According to this chronicle, it is the kingdom that receives historical legitimacy, leaving aside its neighbouring Christian kingdoms.

The castilianism and against other Christian kingdoms is constant in the chronicle writings of the twelfth century, due to the tense relations that the Castilians had with the Leonese and Navarrese during this period. In fact, along with anti-Leonism, there was a strong anti-Navarrese movement, which was highly motivated by the natural need felt by the Castilian Cluniac to support their monarchy (Pérez Rodríguez, 1993, p. 211). Besides, in the north, in La Rioja to be more exact, the political tensions that ended in this anti-Navarrismo of the chronicles were palpable, because since 1076 Castille had claimed this area as its own, however, the Navarrese did not allow to claim it as their own. Thus, for example, it is common to see that the chronicles wash the hands of Castilian kings when they commit immoral deeds, such as Fernando I, who had killed Bermudo, his brother-in-law, and his brother, García, the king of Pamplona.

Although it was in the twelfth century when these changes in the style of the chronicles began, in their intellectual and artistic base, we will have to wait another century, until Lucas de Tuy, to observe that rebirth definitively, the flourishing of the historical writing of the thirteenth century.

Although Lucas de Tuy was the first relevant chronicler, who definitively broke with the ties of the canon of San Isidoro de Sevilla, undoubtedly the name that shone the most, for surpassing all previous writing and for showing a mastery that reached the excellence of the chronic discourse in the Iberian area, it was the Archbishop of Toledo, Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. This man was a great scholar in every sense of the word, intelligent and studious. He was one of the most brilliant figures in the

Castilian culture of his century. At the same time, he was a tremendously influential figure in the field of religion and politics.

On the other hand, in relation to writing style and especially to the position of the self, the chroniclers supported by the Alphonsine workshop, who were more translators in the full sense, were forced to transcribe the verb in the first person plural, and thus, within their narrative, they were also forced to explain this untimely appearance of a self that could jeopardize the objectivity and authority of the historical narrative. Sense of neutrality and objectivity that for this time was still fundamental. Precisely the Alphonsine work, which is the centre of interpretation in this research, introduced another fundamental change in the Castilian chronicle tradition: the abandonment of Latin by Spanish.

Byzantine historical context.

To understand the history of the Byzantine empire from the late 12th century to the early 13th century, three important elements date back even before the arrival of the Komnenos dynasty. The first was the division in 1054 between the Church of Rome, led by the Pope, and the Orthodox Church, led by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The power struggle between both centres of power unleashed in liturgical and dogma differences, such as putting yeast on bread or the role of the emperor as a source of religious authority, which became irreconcilable (Le Goff, 2016, p. 9). At this moment, they not only got divided, but hatred and friction increased.

Another important event was when the Normans declared war on them and completely conquered the kingdom of Sicily, eradicating forever the last territory that the Byzantines had in Italy. This enmity with the Normans was not limited to the Italian peninsula, as the Normans settled in borderlands, lands claimed by the Byzantines.

The rivalry with the Normans, triggered the Byzantines, having to ally with the Venetians, granting them a lot of space within the empire, to be able to stop the Norman advance (Le Goff, 2016, p. 140 and Cabrera, 1998, p. 213). This ended up weakening the position of the Byzantines in relation to the Venetians.

The last important event, prior to the Komnenos dynasty, was the arrival and settlement of the Seljuks in Anatolia (Cabrera, 1998, p. 211). This region was a very important space for the finances and food of the Empire, which put pressure on both finance and imperial politics.

In the Komnenos period, Byzantine society was famous for containing people from different regions. On the streets of Constantinople, there were Venetians, Genoese, Catalans and Slavs, Germanic, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Armenian and Georgian. Also, there were Muslims from the Arab, Turkish, Persian, Mesopotamian and Egyptian areas (Herrin, 2010, pp. 319-310). Indeed, Jews, unlike in Western Europe, were not only not forced to live in specific neighbourhoods, but were also highly integrated into Byzantine society. They were accepted mainly as merchants, moneylenders and silk workers throughout the Byzantine Empire (Herrin, 2010, p. 322.).

On a cultural level, the Byzantines were much more open than the Latins, and in the same sense than the Castilians. Their worldview of immigration and their hospitality with the newcomer favoured the migration of skilled labour that greatly benefited their economy (Herrin, 2010, pp. 323-329). A Byzantine inhabitant was not only one who was born there, but one who paid taxes and benefited from its laws and protection. The visitors ranged from men seeking luck and pilgrims on their way to the Holy Land, to wealthy Italian merchants and great Scandinavian kings. Constantinople had a

strong economy, centred on silk and olive oil. It had hospitals and public baths, also taverns and hostels. And, above all, a dazzling lifestyle (Herrin, 2010, pp. 328-330). It was a world where knowledge was perfectly blended with luxuries and the satisfaction of the senses.

The Komnenoi (1081-1185) sought to re-establish the cultural power, but above all the political and economic power that had been lost during the previous period. In fact, the data confirm that until the 13th century, the Byzantine population did not stop growing (Harvey, 1990, p-52). In this same sense, the imperial policy of the 12th century under the Komnenoi emperors sought to improve relations with the other Christian kingdoms and with Rome, which was done by all means, from the rapprochement between churches, the translation of Greek texts into Latin, the export of Byzantine techniques such as silk weaving and mosaics, as well as increment of the number of Western officials in Byzantium, the adoption of the jousting sport, the marriage of the imperial family with Western princesses and the introduction of the Western fashion of wearing pants (Le Goff, 2016, p. 12. And Herrin, 2010, pp. 339-340).

Now, it should not be thought that the Komnenoi, even Manuel, the one who took the most measures to bring both parties closer together, were pro-Latin, clearly, they were pro-Byzantine and their actions were focused on seeking Byzantine supremacy (Harris, 2014, p. . 100). The difference is that at this time, how it was done was attempting to avoid unnecessary inconvenience with the Latin rulers of the crusader states and the papacy.

In this sense, Manuel achieved imperial prestige, without the need for a costly campaign. Indeed, the kings of Jerusalem recognized the role of the emperor as protector of the Holy Places. (Harris, 2014, p116). This was not just any simple or easy

thing to achieve. On the one hand, it implied recognizing him as Roman emperor, and on the other, protector of Christendom against the unfaithful enemy. Paradoxically, the Byzantines since 1027 had generally been on good terms with the Fatimid rulers of Egypt, enjoying concessions regarding Jerusalem and allowing Friday prayers in the Constantinople Mosque to be said on behalf of their caliph.

Despite Byzantine efforts at this time, Christendom never achieved a real rapprochement, largely because of the actions of the emperors of the following dynasty (the Angelos) and because of the inability of the Western feudal lords to understand the Byzantine thought, like its diplomatic and intelligence tradition to avoid wars against Muslims, which brought both groups to an irreconcilable distance. Even the Catholic kings and nobles pointed out that the Byzantines had betrayed Christianity by dialoguing with their enemies (Herrin, 2010, pp. 340-341) and in that way justified the attack on Constantinople during the fourth crusade.

The Renaissance of the 12th century led to the Byzantine empire being the most powerful Christian kingdom (Lau, 2016, p. 87). However, this does not mean that they did not have to face serious threats beyond the Norman presence in Sicily and Latinos in the holy land. From 1150 until almost the fourth crusade, in the Balkans the Serbs, Hungarians and Bulgarians were highly conflictive zones, requiring all the efforts of the emperors. Thus, during 1150 and 1160 the Hungarians increased their presence and influence in the Balkans, decidedly seeking the instability of the Empire (Haldon, 2003, p. 25). In the same way, the Bulgarian revolts added elements to the institutional collapse due to the dynastic struggle, which ended with the rise of the Angelos dynasty, which led to a weakening of the empire during the 1180s and 1190s (Haldon, 2003, p. 27).

In Asia Minor, although the Byzantine emperor had suffered a setback at the hands of the Seljuk Turks of Ikonion at the Battle of Myriokephalon in 1176, and Saladin seized power in Egypt, things seemed a bit more stable since the Byzantines did not have bad relations with Saladin and the Turkish emirates were quite divided among them.

Another of the great issues that Byzantium had to face at this time was precisely the relationship with the Italian city-states. The Venetians had enjoyed the greatest privileges; however, Michael Komnenos began to reduce the influence of the Venetians within the empire, promoting Genoa, Amalfi and Pisa, even the 4 cities had neighbourhoods in the city of Constantinople. The city-states brought their problems and disputes to the empire, to the point that in 1171, the Venetians attacked the Genoese within the imperial borders, for which the Venetians were arrested to be liberated in 1179, precisely to support the Byzantine army in the battle of Myriokephalon (M. brand, 1968, p. 196). The situation did not improve, on the contrary, since the reign of Andronikos, the anti-Catholic sensation increased to such an extent that in 1182 anti-Catholic groups massacred the Latinos within the city. Although in 1187 the Byzantines and Venetians reached an agreement¹² to maintain good relations, the new imperial dynasty, the Angelos, did not know how to handle the Venetian presence -the Latin one in general- and its economic and military influence, so in the following years, until the Fourth Crusade, the indirect and direct confrontations only increased along with mutual hatred.

¹² The deal included 1. Venetians could not have any alliances with Byzantine enemies. 2. Venetians would give defensive support with galleys and men, 3. The Men would be loyal to the emperor, but they would be paid. 4. In case of war both commanders, Venetian and Byzantine, were equal. 5. The Emperor could send back or recall them if needed. 6. if venetians could not go, the emperor could conscript venetian living in Byzantium, and 7. No other alliance might be over this one. (Charles M. brand, 1968, p. 197-198).

The Fourth Crusade.

The Fourth Crusade was a watershed event in the eastern Mediterranean world, and it is central to the Niketas Choniates' chronicle. The first relevant figure in this campaign was Pope Innocent III. He was born in a family of the high nobility of northern Italy, he was educated at the University of Paris and Bologna. He was a respected and outstanding man, who firmly believed that the Roman Church should be sovereign over all Christendom and rule over all, including emperors and kings. This thought led him to confront the Holy Roman-Germanic Empire and to negotiate with the Emperors of the Eastern Roman Empire, Byzantium (Runciman, 1999, pp. 109-111), so that they, and the Orthodox Church as a whole, would recognize his authority.

Other highly relevant characters were Isaac II Angelos, Emperor of Byzantium, and Henry VI, Emperor of the Holy Empire, and especially the strong rivalry between them. This confrontation, between the two empires that claimed to be the continuators of the ancient Roman Empire, had important consequences, because, on the one hand, the House of Angelos sought strategic alliances to avoid any attack by the Holy Empire, which resulted in dialogues with the same papacy and the idea of reunifying the churches (Runciman, 1999, pp. 109-111). On the other hand, Henry VI kept the idea of seizing Byzantium until he died, but his descendants were no less hostile to the eastern Empire, and it is not surprising that Boniface of Montferrat, head of the crusade, was a close friend of Philip. of Swabia, the successor of Henry VI.

Among the factors that influenced the fourth crusade, there is also the relationship between Venice and Byzantium. As mentioned, the Venetians had maintained great privileges in the trade and trade routes of Byzantium, but in 1171 Emperor Manuel I Komnenos, cut off these relations, and it was not until Andrioco Komnenos, that they were reopened, but at the same time, Byzantium was allied with Genoa and Pisa,

favouring trade with rival cities of the Venetians; which increased the quarrels of the Venetians against the Byzantines.

At first, Bonifacio and the other leaders of the crusade decided that the main point of attack would be Egypt, and then going to the holy land. The crusaders immediately began negotiations with the Venetians to obtain transport to Muslim lands. An agreement was finally reached that the Venetians would transport 33,500 men plus 4,500 horses for 85,000 marks of silver.

Despite this agreement, in 1202, when leaving for Egypt, the Franks had to admit that they had not managed to collect all the money agreed, so they were forced to spend the summer on the island of Saint Nicholas, while Bonifacio maintained negotiations with the Venetians, in Cabeza del Enrico Dandolo. In the end, Dandolo proposed to the crusaders that if they supported them in the attack and conquest of Zadar, they would allow the debt to be later paid off (Runciman, 1999, pp. 111-120).

Zadar was a key port in Venetian commercial interests and had belonged to them until Emeric of Hungary, in his expansion into Dalmatia, had taken them away. Thus, Boniface accepted the conditions, even though Pope Innocent III did not agree, and on November 8 1202, the Crusader and Venetian fleet sailed for Dalmatia. At that moment a message came from Young Alexios, who offered the crusaders to pay the debt they had contracted with the Venetians, to contribute 10,000 men for the crusade in Egypt, more food and support in such an undertaking of the crusade, in exchange that they first helped him regain the imperial throne in Constantinople.

For the Venetian Doge, who despite his advanced age was a dynamic and greedy man, the proposal could not have sounded better, not only would he obtain payment and take revenge on Byzantium, but it would delay the arrival of the crusaders in Egypt,

where They had just signed a commercial treaty in which the Ayyubis guaranteed the Venetians access to the ports of the Nile Delta, Alexandria and Damietta, and offered them all the necessary protection and assistance, in exchange for not supporting any Western expedition against Egypt (Maalouf, 2009, p. 147). On the crusader side, Bonifacio was also happy and accepted the terms, allowing himself to be seduced by the arguments of the Doge who pointed out the advantages of controlling Constantinople and then attacking the Muslims. He added to the fact that the Franks viewed the Byzantines with distrust and suspicion for not submitting to the church of Rome (Maalouf, 2009, p. 148). Indeed, one of the men on the Expedition, Robert de Clari, comments that the crusaders considered that not only the Byzantine emperor was disloyal and illegitimate, but that even the Byzantines were worse, in Latin eyes than the Jews (Clari, 1996, p. 64). On the other hand, a group of nobles, arguing that they had not taken up the cross to fight against Christians but against Muslims, left the camp and left for Acre on their own.

On June 24, 1203, the Crusaders reached the Bosphorus, where they began their attacks on Chalcedon and Chrysopolis, although neither of these were successful. Later, around July 5 or 6, the joint forces attacked Galata and seized the tower, which allowed them to cut the great chain that went from Galata to Constantinople. In this way, the Venetian ships and men were able to enter the Golden Horn and attack the wall in its weakest part, which was favoured by the knowledge that the Venetians had of the city since they were still nominally part of the Eastern Roman Empire (Nicolle, 2011, p. 11). Although the first attempts to take the city failed, by July 17 the Venetian army managed to breach the wall and enter.

Alexios III, who had usurped the throne of his brother employing a palace plot and therefore did not have broad support or much legitimacy, decided to escape to Thrace

along with his daughter and a bag of precious stones. Facing this situation, the Byzantine nobility took a quick decision, took Isaac out of the dungeons, who had been blinded by his brother, proclaimed him Emperor and reported this to the crusaders. Because of this, the crusaders stopped the attacks and with no other option decided to negotiate for Alexios to be crowned emperor. In the end, it was agreed that both son and father would be co-emperors, so Alexios was named Alexios IV in the church of Hagia Sophia.

From the moment Alexios assumed power, he realized that the royal treasury was not enough to pay the Venetians, so he insisted on taking drastic measures to comply with both the Venetians and the Crusaders. Thus, he raised taxes and tried the Orthodox Church to accept the command of Rome. While he was doing this, he was trying to compliment and cater to his foreign guests. However, both the crusaders and the Venetians grew impatient, demanded the payments, and the quarrels in the streets between Latinos and Greeks became more and more frequent. Likewise, on the Byzantine side, the people were upset about the taxes and the church leaders put up fierce resistance to the idea of joining Rome.

The tensions were increasing, to the point that the Doge of Venice, who already at that time stood out for his ambitions and for being the one who dominated the actions from the shadows, intervened so that the atmosphere in the streets was more agitated. At the same time, Alexios Dukous, a renowned nobleman, who had excelled in the defence of the city, put together a plot against the emperors and was crowned in Hagia Sophia as Alexios V Dukous.

While Alexios IV was assassinated and his father was taken to the dungeons to let him die shortly after, Alexios V warned the crusaders that he would not pay the debt.

In this context, the Venetian and Crusader leaders met, agreed to invade the city and leave it under Latin command. The combined forces managed to take over the city, causing tremendous destruction within the walls (Nicolle, 2011, pp. 29-31). Niketas Choniates describes the taking of Constantinople as follows

they set fire to the buildings. The flames rose unbelievably high above the ground throughout that night, the next day, and the following evening as they spread everywhere. It was a novel sight, defying the power of description. While in the past many conflagrations had taken place in the City-no one could cite how many and of what sort they had been-the fires ignited at this time proved all the others to be but sparks. The flames divided, took many different directions and then came together again, meandering like a river of fire. Porticoes collapsed, the elegant structures of the agorae toppled, and huge columns went up in smoke like so much brushwood. Nothing could stand before those flames. Even more extraordinary was the fact that burning embers detached themselves from this roaring and raging fire and consumed buildings at a great distance. (Choniates, 1984, p. 304)

After the fire, and with the city already in Latin hands, looting and robbery were authorized in the city for three days. In this way, the Frankish soldiers dedicated to looting what they could incessantly, killing and raping whoever they were. They took both the sacred objects from the great Orthodox churches and what they could find in the streets. The Venetians who knew about art and its value kept some pieces, however, the Franks unaccustomed to art or luxury destroyed what was in their path. The great places, such as Hagia Sophia, the Church of the Seven Apostles, the great palace of Boukoleon and the palace of Blachernae, and the great treasures that the city had built and guarded for centuries, were taken (Robert, 1996, pp. 101 -114). These were taken to a church where they were divided: a quarter for the future emperor, three-eighths for the Venetians, and another three-eighths for the Franks.

Just as the wealth of the city was divided, so did the Empire. On the one hand, Boniface was compensated for not having given him the Empire, granting him the region of Thessalonica, forming the Kingdom of Thessalonica, but remaining as a vassal of the Latin emperor. Thus, also lands were distributed to the Venetian and Frankish nobles depending on their rank. However, the reality that the Franks encountered was more difficult than expected, since, although the Byzantines had lost their capital, managed to stay in some areas. In this sense, the battle of Adrianople was fundamental, as the Latin forces, that were in search of consolidating their dominion throughout the territory of the Empire, faced the forces of the Tsar of Bulgaria who, even though in the past had been enemy of the Byzantines, on this occasion he allied with them to face the Latin advance. The Byzantine resistance was located in the Despotate of Epirus in the Balkans under a branch of the Angelos, the Empire of Trebizond in Pontus, ruled by the Komnenos family, and the Empire of Nicaea that took control of all the Byzantine territory of Western Asia Minor, which would end up reconquering and reunifying the Byzantine empire. Region in which Niketas stayed after leaving Constantinople. (John Haldon, 2003, p, 87).

This was the socio-political context in which Niketas lived and wrote. Niketas was born around 1150 and although he was born in Chonae, he was educated in Constantinople with his brother Michael, who was a noted writer and ecclesiastic. In Constantinople, Niketas was educated in letters and made a political career. His rise during the Angelos rule was rapid and he was appointed Grand Logothete, President of the Chamber, accountant of public finances, among others (Moraitis, 2015, pp. 3-4). Although in the end he was removed from his job by imperial order. After the fall of Constantinople, Niketas took refuge in Nicaea, where he finished his Great work, *Historia*, later translated into English as *O City of Constantinople*.

In this sense, it is important to keep two things in mind when analyzing the texts of Niketas Choniates, in the first place that he was an intellectual of his time. In the second place that he was limited by the logic of the Byzantine chronicles (A. Simpson, 2013, p. 265), which is reflected in two important aspects, the absence of the logic of Holy War, very present in the Christian Chronicle, and the very high degree of refinement in his writing and rhetoric, which in many cases not only makes their reading difficult, but this also allowed them certain licenses in relation to the facts, if that license was to exalt the emperor or even to himself (Lau, 2016 p. 96).

On the other hand, Niketas, although he is considered one of the most important chroniclers of his time, was above all a politician and wrote for the elite. When he finished his chronicle he was already in Nicaea and his political debt was not with the emperors of the Komneno or Angelos Dynasty, however, *Historia* was written at various moments, and much during the reign of the Angelos, and that is why those fragments omitted or softened many aspects, since an inappropriate comment to a Byzantine chronicler could easily cost him his life, without forgetting that pleasing the men in power was beneficial to his own political career. However, in part, Niketas modified the fragments written in Constantinople, once under the new ruling dynasty in Nicaea, showing a more critical stance of the actions of previous emperors (Simpson, 2006, pp. 195-201).

Thus, to understand that although there was a multiethnic coexistence in both places, with those who were in conflict, the Kingdom of Castile was in a successful process of consolidation of its power in the peninsula, while the Byzantine Empire was a consolidated, legitimized, and recognized empire, but that at the end of this period was defeated, even losing the imperial capital. On the other hand, while the main Castilian

enemy was the Muslims, in the Byzantine case the Muslim threat was secondary compared to the war against the Crusaders and the Venetians.

Finally, it should be mentioned that in both cases, the style and narrative traditions of the chronicles were fully established, although the Byzantine chronicles had a much longer and more refined tradition than the Castilian one.

Chapter III. Representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour.

The representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour in the Alphonsine chronicles.

The chronicles of the court of King Alfonso X, *El sabio*, present a very clear enemy, the Muslims. Although there are other Christian kingdoms in the peninsula, Aragon, Portugal and Navarra, in these chronicles the representations of the enemy focus on the more radical other, the Muslims, without making major distinctions between Arab, Berber or Iberian communities.

In the Castilian chronicles, it is very striking that an important part of the images, that were built on the Muslims, was directly related to the body and the human figure. In this way, an aesthetic charge was added to the social, political and religious rejection and contempt that already existed from the followers of Muhammad, an aesthetic charge that has symbolic implications, as it will be discussed later.

The first striking and repetitive feature that can be observed in these chronicles is the association of Muslims with black beings. In fact, *La Primera Crónica General* not only describes them as black, but in some passages, it suggests that they were in a condition of bestiality, the text says like this: “arribo el rey Bucar a terreno; et traye consigo tan grant poder que era marauilla, Et venien con el treynta eg seys reyes de moros, et traye consigo una mora negra que traye trezientas moras negras consigo, et todas eran trasquiladas”. (“King Bucar arrived in the land; and he brought with him such great power that it was marvellous, and he came with the thirty-six kings of the

Moors, and he brought with him a blackberry that brought three hundred blackberries with him, and they were all sheared") (Menendez, 1906, p. 636)

The monstrosity or bestiality in the chronicle is not limited to skin colour but was constructed in various ways. Thus, it was related and compared with animals such as hyenas, snakes, etc., at the same time that they are given mythical or fantastic traits. Both elements dehumanize the Muslims, place them on the plane of the fantastic, but not in a positive way, but always pointing to them belonging to the demonic world. According to this discourse, Muslims carry the Muslim heresy in their physique¹³ (Monteira, 2006a).

Although both the black colour and the monstrosity in various parts of the work appear separately, which could suggest that being black did not imply being monstrous per se, there are many paragraphs where both characteristics are present at the same time. One of these is the interesting Alphonsine narrative of the Muslim victory over the Goths, which says:

Los moros de la hueste todos uestidos de sirgo et de los panno de color que ganaran, las riendas de sus caualllos tales eran como de fuego, las sus caras dellos negras como de pez, el mas fremoso dellos era negro como la olla, assi luzien sus oios como candelas; el su cauello dellos ligerocomo leopardo, e el su cauallero mucho mas cruel et mas dannoso que el lobo en la grey de los ouias en la noche. (The Moors of the host all dressed in sirgo and the colored cloths that they won, the reins of their horses such were like fire, their faces were black like fish, the most beautiful of them was black

¹³ In fact, another Alphonsine text, the *Cantigas*, relates the Muslim beard with their ugliness, which, as has been pointed out, does not correspond to a purely aesthetic element, but refers to their moral condition. The comment is as follows: "y murieron muchos aquellos hombre feos y barbudos." (and many those ugly and bearded men died.) In fact, the negative charge of the beard is reinforced when it is observed that Christians sought to significantly differentiate themselves in this regard and, in the 13th century, the custom in Castile was either not to wear it or, rather, to wear a slight beard. (Alfonso X, 2011, p. 428.)

as the pot, this is how their eyes look like candles; his hair was light leopard-colored, and crueller and more harmful than the wolf in the flock of sheep at night.) (Menendez, 1906, p. 312)

Now, the narratives of the Alphonsine chronicles not only stop at physical appearance but there are a lot of moments in which the narrative stops to describe the sexuality of his enemies the Muslims in detail. In this way, the chronicles present Islam itself as a religion where lust is a deep part of its essence, in which uncontrolled sex is almost a goal. This is pointed out at length, for example, in *La Primera Crónica General de España*, in which there is a description of the paradise of Islam, but what is most pointed out is the excessive use of pleasures, especially in relation to food and sex. The chronicle says the following: “el parayso era logar muy sabroso et muy delectoso de comer et beuer, et que corrien por y tres rios: vno de uino, otro de miel, e otro de leche; e que auran los los que y fueren mugeres escosas [virgenes], non destrás que son agora en este mundo, mas dotrras que uernan despues, e auran otrossi complidamente todas las cosas que cobdiciaren en sus coraçones.” (paradise was a very tasty and very delicious place to eat and drink, and where three rivers ran: one of wine, another of honey, and another of milk; and that there were virgin women, not of these that are now in this world, but of others that come later, and there will be others who fulfil all the things that they covet in their hearts.) (Menendez, 1906, p. 266)

In this way, the texts present an image of Islam as a perversion and limitless sexual debauchery, in which divorce, incest, polygamy and other customs considered as sinful for Christianity, were not only accepted but part of religion itself. Furthermore, Muhammad's lustful condition was constantly pointed out. The sources describe him as an adulterer and fornicator in the extreme, which sought to distort the validity of the religion from its very beginning. In this sense, *La Primera Crónica General de España*

comments that “tomo Mahomat otras mugieres, et caso con ellas; e fueron por cuenta todas las mugieres que ell ouo en adulterio et en fornicio diezecho” (Mahomat took other women, and married them; and all the women he had in adultery and fornication were eighteen on his account) (Menendez, 1906, p. 267)¹⁴.

In fact, it seems that the representation of Muslim sexuality linked to lust, sin and especially homosexuality. But this was not a unique characteristic of the Castilian chronicles but was a shared representation in the world of Western and Catholic Europe¹⁵.

Thus, Muslim sexuality was demonized, becoming an important part of the representation of the Muslim enemy. This led to an attempt to distance Christian sexuality from Muslims, and not only in the narrative field, since the legislation against sexual unions between people of different religions in the 13th century in Castile was very clear.

On the other hand, the sources not only carefully described the body of the Muslim enemy and his sexuality, but at the same time pointed out over and over again how

¹⁴ This same sense other anti-Muslim writers wrote things in relation to Muhammad's lust as that “así que en un hora podía jazer con onze mugieres” and “fiço e dixo e escriptos en los lobros de los moros, que mahomad vestía de pórpora, e untábase con unguentosde buen olor porque oliese bien, teñía los labros e los ojos, así como fazen oy en día los alcaldes de los morros e otros mucho e muchas” (He did and said and wrote in the books of the Moors, that Mohammed wore purple, and anointed himself with good smelling ointments because he smelled good, stained the lips and eyes, just as the mayors of the hills and many others do today). Where Muhammad is shown as a vain being and given to the pleasures of the flesh. (Pascual, 2011, p. 102).

¹⁵ And to see the dynamics in the European context see: Flori, 2003, p. 229. On the prohibition of having sexual relations between Muslims and Christians see: Tolan, 2007, p. 225. Another interesting text, since it shows how this prohibition was often not taken into account in everyday life, is Hinojosa, 2004, p. 3. 4. 5). On the other hand, in relation to the reasons that could trigger a marriage and the role of the Muslim, *Las Siete Partidas* says: “non se puede puede desatar que matrimonio non sea, maguer que alguno dellos se haga herege, ó judío, ó moro ó feciese adulterio. Et como quier que esta fortaleza haya el casamiento, departirse puede por juicio de santa iglesia por qualquier destas quatro cosas sobredichas”. (no se puede desatar que matrimonio, a no ser que alguno de ellos se haga hereje, o judío, ó moro ó hiciese adulterio. y como quiera que esta fortaleza tenga el casamiento, separarse puede por juicio de la santa iglesia por cualquier de estos quatro cosas antes dichas.) Y “Eso mesmo serie del que feciese fornicio espiritualmente tornándose herege, ó moro ó judio, si non quisiese facer emienda de su maldat.” (Eso mismo seria del que hiciese fornicacion espiritualmente tornándose hereje, ó moro ó judio, si no quiciere hacer enmienda de su maldad.) (Alfonso X, 1972, p. 15).

the Muslims had morally reprehensible behaviours and practices. For example, it is described how Muslims repeatedly used deceptions to achieve their military objectives against the Christian kingdoms of the peninsula. Thus, *La Primera Crónica General de España* when it is narrating the moment in which the Muslims tried to kill the infant Don Alfonso, describes that this could not be otherwise except through deception and betrayal, as the Islamic custom was. The text specifies it like this: “En la era de mil et dozientos et ochenta et seys, quando andaua la Encarnacion del Sennor en mil et dozientos et quarenta et ocho, con en´ganno et trayçion, que es senaladamiente entre los moros cabida et vsada,” (In the era of one thousand two hundred and eighty-six, when the incarnation of the Lord was walking in one thousand two hundred and forty-eight, with deception and betrayal, which is indicated by the Moors, fitted and used) (Menendez, 1906, p. 765).

In fact, in the chronicles and poems that narrate the Muslim conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, the entry of the Almoravids or Almohads, the question of the lack of honour and loyalty of the Muslims is an ever-present element. This occurred because in this way the entry of Islam to Spain was delegitimized, showing how it had been achieved through fraud and not because of its merits or values.

Continuing with the negative attributes with which the image of the Muslim was charged in the context of the war against Christians, it is interesting that the sources constantly repeat comments such as “el moro, pues que gano la fortaleza daquel castiello de Saluatierra, tornosse con grand soberuia pora su tierra” (The Moor, since he won the fortress of that castle of Saluatierra, turns with great arogancy for his land) (Menendez, 1906, p. 687), where there is a great emphasis on pride. This takes away from valuing Muslim military actions, that is, in the face of the victory of a battle or the successful defence of a town, the immediate action of the Muslim, in the Christian

imagination, was to boast unjustifiably, to presume more than is fair about what happened.

An interesting element of the Castilian source is the question of cannibalism, since for example the author comments that “Los cristianos de la tierra quando ayeron que tal yente era uenita et tan mucha que uenciera et crebantara el poder de los godos, et demas que dizien comien a los omnes –pero que non era uerdad, ca los moros se fazlien aquellas nuevas para espantar las yentes” (The Christians of the land when they heard that such people came and so many that they conquered and broke the power of the Goths, and also that they said they ate men - but that was not true, because the Moors make that news to scare the people) (Menendez, 1906, p. 314-315)¹⁶. This, on the one hand, shows that the narrative does not go to the point of showing them as cannibals, but, on the other hand, that this idea of the enemy as a cannibal could be extended.

In relation to this Muslim moral condition, the *General Estoria* chronicle presents a very interesting vision, since it shows the biblical origin of the Arab people, which does not mean that they were considered as part of the people of God, or in some sense on the side of good. In fact, it endeavours to point out the wickedness of Ishmael as the first Arab and thus to all his descendants. In the first place, pointing out Hagar's condition of servant, inferior and woman with questionable morals, the text, for

¹⁶ He is certainly not the only one to point this out, which at the same time confirms that the idea did exist and was widespread. Another author says something very interesting about it, because, while on the one hand he points out that this was not true, on the other hand, he uses it to show that it was used as a Muslim deception, more in line with their condition of deceiver. The comment says: “comenzar de usar una arteria falsa, ca los christianos que matavan, los unos coçian, los otros asavan, e fazianlos poner ante sí quando querían comer, e comoquier que los non comían, fazían semejança que los comían” (begin to use a false artery, because the Christians who killed, some cooked, others roasted, and made them put before them when they wanted to eat, and since they did not eat them, they made the appearance that they ate them) (Pascual, 2011, p. 120).

example, says: “su madre Agar, que fuera manceba del faraón” (his mother Hagar, who was Pharaoh's manceba) (Alfonso X, 2009, p. 274).

Already questioned Hagar, the discourse focuses on developing a body of ideas that highlighted Ismael's natural evil from his early years. In this way, Abraham's eldest son was shown to be selfish and envious of Isaac, who even tried to harm his brother.

One of the most striking elements in terms of Ishmael's natural evil is that the discourse is emphatic in commenting that, also, since he was a child, he made clay idols and tried to get his brother Isaac to do it, which they describe as follows: “e Ismael, que era mayor, soberviava al otro Isaac, que era menor, e firiél. [...] el mayor de días soberviaré por ventura al menor e querrié seer señor sobr'él. E aún dizen los judíos que Ismael fazié imágenes de barro” (and Ishmael, who was older, was proud over the other Isaac, who was younger, and faithful. [...] The oldest of days I will overpower the minor and wanted to be lord over him. And the Jews still say that Ishmael made images of clay) (Alfonso X, 2009, p. 270). This represents Ishmael and his descendants as idolatry, it is immediately given a spiritually deviant character, in addition to establishing a natural warlike relationship between Christians, the sons of good and therefore related to Isaac, and the Muslims, descendants of Ishmael, idolized, evil and who sought to harm his brother.

On the other hand, in the construction of Ismael's identity, it is interesting when *General Estoria* says:

E aquello ál que cuenta de Ismael moisés en el XVI capítulo del Génesis en que dize así en latín: *hic erit ferus homo*. Fascas éste será fiero omne, o aun salvaje, departe jeremíaaas aud le llaman otros rústico, que es por aldeano o campesino fasca de campo, o salvage otrossí. E dize jerónimo e maestre Pedro que le llaman en el ebraico

fara, e *fara* quiere dezir tanto en el nuestro latín como *onager*; e *onager* dezimos nós que es en la nuestra lengua por asno montés o por enzebro.

(that which tells of Ismael, Moses in the 16th chapter of Genesis says thus in Latin hic erit ferus homo. This will be a fierce man, or even savage, on the part of Jeremiah, others still call him a rustic, which is for a villager or a country peasant, or another savage. and Jerónimo says the teacher Pedro that they call him in Hebrew *fara*, and *fara* means in our Latin as *onager*; e *onager* we say in our language for wild ass or for enzebro) (Alfonso X, 2009, p. 273)

What it shows is the intention to give the image of Ishmael a wild, rustic, barbarous shape, which to the same extent was transmitted to all the Muslims in general. Even the animalization that is done is very expressive, since it is linked to the animal and monstrous figure of the Muslims. In fact, the text emphasizes much more in this aspect and directly establishes the relationship between the animalization of Ishmael and the cruelty of the Muslims saying that: “los asnos monteses o ezebros e las corças que vernan del desierto sobran con la su cruelez a las cruelezas de otras bestias, e esto es que la cruelez d’estos será mayor que la de las otras yentes” (Like the wild asses or enzebros and the things that winter in the desert, their cruelty will exceed the cruelty of other beasts, and this is that the cruelty of these will be greater than that of other peoples) (Alfonso X, 2009, p. 273).

It is precisely these representations of the Muslim, with their sinful physique, sexuality and morality, which explain that when peninsular Christian armies conquered a city or town, a purification and blessing ceremony was held in public spaces such as streets, buildings and, especially, in mosques, which after the rite became pure places and could be converted into churches. Of course, these purification rites are described in the Alphonsine chronicles when the conquests are narrated, thus, in the case of the

taking of Murcia they say: “Onde ganada Murçia et las oras uillas et los castiellos todos de cerca Murçia, descabeço el todos los almohades que auer pudo; et dando por suzias, ante lo alhomades, todas las sus mesquitas, fizolas alinpiar a los sus saçerdotes et lauarlascon agua” (having won Murcia and the other towns and castles all near Murcia, he beheaded all the Almohads that he could; And considering all his mosques unclean before the alhomades, he had his priests clean them and wash them with water.) (Menendez, 1906, p. 721)¹⁷.

The representations of the body, sexuality, and moral behaviour in the Niketas Koniates’ chronicle.

Identifying a main enemy in the Niketas Koniates chronicle is more complex. Clearly, the Muslim communities represent a threat, since they were practitioners of another non-Christian religion. It is important to remember that, at that time, the Muslim threat in Anatolia was above all the Turkic sultanates and governors, rather than the Arabs or Berbers as in the Iberian case. However, it is worth mentioning that in the Byzantine tradition the Christian-Muslim opposition was not nearly as strong as it was in Western Europe. On the other hand, also there were the northern neighbours, Hungarians, Serbs and Bulgarians, who have an important presence especially in the first part of the Chronicle *Historia*, although the comments on those groups are quickly fading.

Finally, the Latinos, a highly generic grouping that includes Italians, especially Venetians, Franks, Normans and Germans. From my point of view, although all the

¹⁷ Clearly, an infinity of similar comments could be cited, but we limit myself to reproduce what Alfonso X says in relation to the purification of the city of Córdoba “a que la estoria llama patriçia de las otras çiudades, esto es padrona et enexemplo de las otras pueblas del Andaluzia, fue aquel dia alimpiada de las suziedades de Mahomad, et fue dada al rey don Fernando, et el entregado della; er el re don Fernando mando luego poner la cruz en la mayor torre o el nonbre del falso Mahomed solie ser llamado et alabado”. (which history calls patricia of the other cities, this is the patron and example of the other towns of Andalusia, was that day cleaned of the dirtiness of Mahomad, and was given to King Don Fernando, and he was given to her; and King Don Fernando then ordered to put the cross on the highest tower where the name of the false Mahomed used to be called and praised) (Menendez, 1906, p. 733)

previously mentioned groups can be considered as enemies, due to the emphasis of the narrative and due to the very force of events, Latinos are the most radical other-enemy. In the next chapter, it will be discussed whether the Latinos for the Byzantine case can be equated with the Muslims in the case of the Alphonine chronicles.

The first thing that is evident in the representations that Niketas describes is the category of barbarians. This concept is used as a general category for non-Byzantines (or non-Romans in the author's terms) regardless of whether they are Muslim, Slavic, or Latino. The relationship between enemy and barbarians is evident in comments such as "When battle was joined, the Roman forces retreated before the great courage of the enemy and a portion of the vanguard was pursued for some distance, unable to resist the maniacal passion and savage onrush of the barbarians." (Harry (Tr.), 1984, pp14-15).

In fact, the representation of the others as barbarians is quite interesting, since it is in opposition, putting the other in the place of the barbarian and the Byzantines in the place of the Romans. The barbarian of course is inferior, and the Roman is superior, especially in cultural matters. This is evident in comments like:

As the emperor was departing from Shaizar, his rear guard was attacked by the forces of Zengi and the Turkish troops of certain other eminent chiefs, who were very conceited because of their horses, almost as swift as the wind, and extremely contemptuous of the Romans in their stupid barbarian arrogance. When they performed no brave deeds, their hopes were dashed. In retribution for their boasting and vaunting, they were punished by Divine Justice, and two of their chiefs taken alive: these were the sons of the atabeg and the brother of Amir Samuch" (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 18)

Although in the Koniates text there are some descriptions of the other physical appearance, these are scarce, not as detailed as one might expect. Thus, from my point of view, the central point of the representations is of the enemy in these chronicles is the barbarian-Roman counter position, a concept that is repeated over and over again throughout the text, since as I will deepen in the next chapter, the accent is not placed above all on the other, but on the self. that is, the action of and the course of history is determined more by the actions of the Byzantines themselves than by the Byzantine enemies or external factors.

This does not mean that there are not descriptions or representations of the physical appearance, there are. In this way is the paragraphs below, here the author describes the Germans like this:

while the emperor governed the empire in this fashion, a cloud of enemies, a dreadful and death-dealing pestilence, fell upon the Roman borders: I speak of the campaign of the Germans, joined by other kindred nations. Females were numbered among them, riding horseback in the manner of men, not on coverlets sidesaddle but unashamedly astride, and bearing lances and weapons as men do; dressed in masculine garb, they conveyed a wholly martial appearance, more mannish than the Amazons. One stood out from the rest as another Penthesilea and from the embroidered gold which ran around the hem and fringes of her garment was called Goldfoot. (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 35)

In which Niketas represents them as a cloud of pestilence, where men and women are mixed, women who in any case have a masculine appearance and behaviour, which is a representation with an eminently negative charge. However, paradoxically, not all the representations of the Latins, or in this particular case of the Germans, are

negative since in another passage describing a German warrior who fought against Turks, the author says the following:

It is said that during this expedition inland, a certain German, huge in size and invincible, was left far behind by his countrymen. As he made his way on foot and at a slow pace, leading his exhausted horse by the reins, more than fifty Ismaelites collected around him, all mighty men who had also distanced their own ranks [...] The remaining Turks, terrified at the sight, no longer had the boldness to challenge him to single combat. The German, confident as a lion in his own strength, did not hurry on his way but walked at a steady pace to join his countrymen in their camp late that evening. (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 228)

Even though the positive descriptions of particular and individual enemies are not at all strange in the chronicles (De Pablo, 2018), the representations of the enemy on the Byzantine side are more subtle. In this sense, for example, Niketas Koniates reproves the attitude of Emperor Andronikos, who made fun of the physical deformities of the Turkic Sultan Arslan, instead of participating in the commentaries about the deformity of Arslan and showing it as evidence of his evil or sinful character.

On the other hand, it is interesting to see how there are descriptions of the beard in the text, but in the Byzantine context it is not used to differentiate the enemy from the own group, but to calculate the age of the man being talked about regardless of whether he is Byzantine or Latin. This is clear when speaking of Latinos he says: “these men were tall in stature and sported their first growth of beard and blond hair tinged with red.” (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 79) and “[Renier] of the Count of Montferrat [February 1180 (1179?)], who was fair of face and pleasant to look upon; his well-groomed hair shone like the sun and he was too young to grow a beard,” (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 97). However, in the same way, he describes a Byzantine like this: “John

Vatatzes, a vigorous commander in time of need, and Constantine Doukas, a youth growing his first beard and who, like luxuriant plants, promised to bear fruit prematurely, as well as Michael Aspietes.” (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 109)

Possibly, the most marked representations and with a much stronger tone are those that fall on the Italians. A group with whom the Byzantines had difficult relationships for centuries and with those who lived in the same imperial capital, since they had commercial neighbourhoods there. In this sense, Koniates says: “At the same time he reproved and heaped abuse on the defenders for being ignoble in warfare, especially on Chalouphes, whom he called more effeminate than a woman whose only skill was to spin wool in the women’s apartments.” (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 45) and he adds “But their barbarous nature could not be confined; they did not lay down their weapons after their defeat, but, like those beasts which are difficult to kill and when endangered jump up and spring forth, they could not accept the fact that they had not overpowered the Romans. No longer able to fight on land, they weighed anchor and sailed to a certain sea-girt island” (Harry (Tr.), 1984, pp. 50-51). A passage in which he not only describes them as barbarians but goes further and also characterizes them as effeminate and beasts. In fact, this narrative continues, and the author becomes much more aggressive against the Venetian way of acting.

Moving on to the representations of the enemy's sexuality, the text is surprising, since the descriptions or comments of the enemy's sexuality is an absent element. The author does not stop on this matter, neither negatively nor positively. Now, it is even more interesting to see that Niketas does talk about sexuality, but in relation to the Byzantines, and in fact he categorically rejects and condemns the sexual promiscuity characteristic of the Komneno emperors. In which he reproaches especially incest and adultery, that the Komneno also openly commit (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 53). Undoubtedly,

lust, although not exclusive to the Byzantines, is much more related to them. A relation that for the author is eminently negative.

Moral conduct is central to the author, not a matter without importance in his discourse.

In fact, he makes it explicit from the beginning when comments:

Men who value the attribute of virtue and eschew shameless conduct and corrupt habitude, although born mortal and subject to death, are immortalized and brought back to life by the writing of history. The same is true for those who, on the contrary, have led depraved lives. It is most fitting that the actions of the virtuous and the shameless be known to posterity. The soul moves on to Hades while the body returns to those elements from which it was constituted. (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 13)

This implies that the reason why he writes history, and not only as an individual but the entire historiographic tradition of his time, was to immortalize great men, and to condemn morally reprehensible acts and the people who committed them.

In this sense, there are several characteristics that are relevant and repetitive in the narrative. The first point is the image of arrogance, so for example the text comments: "he had no faith in the drivelling of the Latins and in their arrogance" (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 22). Arrogance is an interesting characteristic, as it discredits the value of the other's victory. That is, in the enemy victory or a moment of superiority, that arrogance detracts from their actions in a discursive way. This strategy is much clearer when it is narrated when the Patzinaks attacked Thrace, a paragraph that says:

In the fifth year of John's reign, the Patzinaks crossed the Istros [Danube] and plundered Thrace, destroying everything under foot more absolutely than a host of locusts. John gathered the Roman forces, equipping them with the best arms possible, and marched against them, not only because of their great numbers, but also because of the arrogant behavior and grating boastfulness of these barbarians, who, it appears,

recalled their former accomplishments when during the reign of Alexios Komnenos they had occupied Thrace and laid waste most of Macedonia (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 10)

In which the barbaric is related to arrogance, but also an overwhelming victory that cannot be considered other than a plague.

Arrogance is not the only behaviour that discursively detracts from the enemy's victories, another important element is the excessive use of violence and savagery. In fact, the discourse becomes more detailed when the Latinos are described and even more when it comes to the Venetians. In this representation the crusaders exceeded the limit of what is morally allowed, they were more violent than what is expected, their savage impulse leads them to destroy the places and ornaments consecrated to God, a Shocking aspect if we take into account that, in this case, both groups were Christians. This excess is seen when the text says:

What did they not seize? What evil did they not perpetrate? They razed buildings, carried off the riches inside, searched through the holy monasteries, removed sacred furniture, desecrated holy vessels, showed no reverence for the venerable gray hair of the monks, disregarded virtue which even the enemy knew how to honor, and, to make a long story short, they ill-treated those they attacked in every way. Many who grumbled because their homes had been stripped were punished with death. (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 215)

In this sense, it is extremely interesting when the author writes: "All the cities which resolved not to do battle with the Latins were treated in the same way, even though it was an evil thing to serve a Latin whose discourses differed from that of the Hellenes, who was money-loving by nature, with an indiscriminating eye, an insatiable belly, a wrathful and violent soul, and a hand forever reaching out for the sword." (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 331) It connects the violent character of Latinos with love for money. In short,

people moved by savage passions, since at the same time it emphasizes that Latinos hate beauty, culture, art (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 358), which indirectly refers to the opposition of barbarian (savagery) against Romano-Byzantine (culture)

In relation to these negative representations, when talking about Italians more details are revealed. Thus, for example, the text says: "His eyes of him were the judge of the games played on the field for the ever high-spirited and insolent Italians could in no way tolerate the Romans prevailing in the tournament." (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 63) Venetians are depicted as jealous, to the point of hating Byzantines, not only collectively, but also individually, their leaders represent this characteristic. The text emphasizes this and shows how Enrico Dandolo, the Venetian leader, was the embodiment of this hatred and envy, saying that: "The doge of Venice, Enrico Dandolo, was not the least of horrors; a man maimed in sight and along in years, a creature most treacherous and extremely jealous of the Romans, a sly cheat who called himself wiser than the wise and madly thirsting after glory as no other, he preferred death to allowing the Romans to escape the penalty for their insulting treatment of his nation." (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 295). In this sense, the label given to the Doge of Venice is definitive: the "most ancient and pernicious evil and chief cause of the horrors that befell the Romans, Dandolo, the doge of Venice." (Harry (Tr.), 1984, p. 337)

Finally, it is important to recognize that there are some neutral and even positive representations of whom Niketas calls barbarians, not just Germans, but also Turks and Italians. However, during the research process, it was not possible to find such representations when the author describes or narrates actions involving Venetians.

As can be seen in this chapter, representations of the enemy's body, sexuality, and behaviour play a central role in both discourses. However, the clarity and intensity are notably different in the Castilian case, where not only the Alphonsine Chronicles have a more defined enemy, but also their body, sexuality and their behaviour are condemned to the point of taking his image outside the margins of the human. Meanwhile, on the other hand, the Byzantine discourse is more subtle, it costs it identifies an absolute enemy, although the Venetians could have that position more than any other. Also, the byzantine discourse is interesting, because negative representations may even fall on Byzantine sexuality.

Chapter IV. Similarities and differences in the representations of the enemy.

After a comparative reading of the Alphonine chronicles and the chronicle of Niketas Koniates, it is clear to the reader who is aware of both historical contexts that these works have several similar points, but also several notable differences. The discourses on both sides, although they present obvious stylistic differences, in which Niketas stands out for his refined style (Simpson, A., 2013), at the same time they share profound logics that are worth highlighting.

Although it seems obvious at this point in the investigation, it is interesting to see that two discourses, in two different geographical spaces, temporarily separated, with different ideologies (some Orthodox Christians and other followers of the Roman rite), facing different enemies and without transference of knowledge among themselves in an important way, they used representations as a mechanism of exclusion and repudiation of the other. Not only this, but the bodies, the behaviour, the sex of the individuals were traversed by these power relations, which was reflected in these chronicles. It would be easy to miss the fact of the existence of this type of representation, however, the fact of the presence itself already has a relative value, since their existence in either of the two cases was not guaranteed and its absence would have represented a huge research problem, which would lead us to think about the reason for this.

In both discourses, the functions of the representations of the other, and in this case of the enemy in particular, fulfil specific functions in terms of identification, legitimation, knowledge and as a director of actions¹⁸. In this sense, it can be said that the

¹⁸ Functions already discussed in more detail in Chapter I.

discourses about the enemy fabricated and moulded that individual, their bodies and their personality, but in this relationship of power, the representations function as a type of mirror in which the self sees itself in the opposition to the other. This is totally evident and very marked in the case of the Kingdom of Castile, while it is much more subtle in that of the Byzantine Empire, where more than a creation of the self, one could speak more of a re-creation of the self. So, it is not only that in both discourses there are representations that cross the body, but that they fulfil very similar functions.

This is evidenced by the weight of the Barbarian-Visigoth opposition, on the Castilian side, and Barbarian-Roman, on the Byzantine side. This is a tremendously important opposition in which the identification of both parties is necessary for its symbolic mechanism to work, and it is a strategy used in both discourses repeatedly.

Now, on the other hand, with a careful reading of both discourses it becomes evident that once the similarities in the deep logics of the representations are passed, the narratives present notable differences in forms, means and other details that undoubtedly affect the meanings of these. That is because they share logic does not mean that they use the same symbols or that they symbolize the same thing.

As for the differences in the representations of the body in both discourses, it can be said that they are both quantitatively and qualitatively. I am referring to quantitative differences in the sense that descriptions of the enemy's body are much more abundant in the Alphonsine chronicles than in the Byzantine Niketas Koniates' chronicle. What follows a greater interest in highlighting or emphasizing these characteristics of the enemy.

On the other hand, as it was said, there is also a qualitative difference, since the question is not only of quantity but also of the content itself. Thus, the representations

of the enemy's body (Latins), in Byzantine discourse are vaguer, while in Castilian discourse these representations (of Muslims) are much more detailed and specific.

Obviously in the chronicle of Koniates, as seen in the previous chapter, there are certain descriptions of the beard, and of the height, but these descriptions do not have the symbolic weight of the representation of the enemy. In fact, it can be said that much of the negative image of the enemy is built with the femininity of the warriors' bodies and the masculinity of the women who accompanied them. While this is important and highly symbolic, it remains vague. For example, the text does not give us the details of why these feminine or masculine characteristics. In this same sense, from my point of view, the centre of the representation of the enemy is the figure of the barbarian, which, although it is powerful and has a great symbolic charge in the Byzantine context, does not offer details of the body itself.

As already mentioned, the figure of the barbarian is not unique, but in the Castilian discourse, it also has great importance. However, the representations of the Alphonsine chronicles do not stop there, they go to the details of the body, describing the black colour of the skin, the use of the beard, etc. In fact, there is a transcendental difference in both discourses, which is the attempt to dehumanize the enemy in the Castilian discourse, which is completely absent in the Byzantine case. The Castilian narratives did not represent the Muslim as black because of his real physical features, but because of the meaning they had in that context¹⁹. In the same way, the bestialization of the Muslims, representing them as real or mythological animals, with a negative symbolic charge that associated them with satanic powers, is a very

¹⁹ In fact, it is very striking that the word nigger in English, which has a racist and exclusive connotation, comes from the word black in Spanish, which was used to describe Muslims in a negative way, also as a mechanism of exclusion and to justify actions against them.

present element in the Castilian discourse that has no place in the Byzantine one. As much as the Latins are called barbarian or effeminate, the text does not suggest that they were close to beasts or demons, their humanity is not questioned. This does not happen neither in the case of Latins who, in my point of view, may be considered as "the enemy", nor in the case of Muslims who without being that great enemy they were a different, an "other" belonging to another religion²⁰.

Possibly the most radical difference between the two discourses is found in the representations of sexuality. On the one hand, the Castilian discourse spares no effort in condemning the sexuality of its enemy, it represents it as overflowing and extremely sinful. Without a doubt, it is in one of the points where he makes the most emphasis. It is not limited to describing sexuality in their present but, it establishes lines of connection with the sexuality of the prophet Muhammad, which gives him a much deeper burden, since his sinfulness is not limited to the present, but is an inherent trait of the Being, the Muslim itself is a founding trait that remains in these beings. On the other hand, as already commented in the previous chapter, the Niketas Koniates does not stop at the sexuality of the Latins, but on the contrary, he details that of the Byzantine emperors, but to condemn them. This is a very important change, in which the representation of sexuality and condemnation are put on the side of the self, rather than the other. In this sense, there is no game of opposition in which the sexuality of the other forms that of the self, but rather goes directly to the self. This discursive strategy is not random but responds to the logic of the operation of representations in the Byzantine context, as will be analyzed later.

²⁰ For the Orthodox tradition, the separation between Muslims and Christians in was not as important as in the case of the western European kingdoms. The Byzantines maintained commercial and political relations with the Muslims.

Finally, in relation to the differences and similarities in the subject of the enemy's behaviour and morale, this is the aspect in which they are most alike since both coincide in representing their respective enemies as excessively violent and arrogant, which is a very useful strategy to delegitimize their victories, and as betrayals with whom it is difficult to establish alliance relationships due to their unpredictable, disloyal and without honour. On the other hand, there is a deference, and it is that of idolaters in the case of Muslims in the Castilian discourse. In this specific case, I consider, on one hand, that the nature of the enemy is what generates this difference since discursively it was much more difficult, and at the same time more serious, to label a co-religionist, even outside the Roman rite and not orthodox, heretical or idolatrous, at least for this context. On the other hand, this is also related to the non-adoption of the idea of holy war.

Once the differences and similarities have been analyzed, the next step is to try to interpret the reason for these and delve into these structures. Thus, the elements that explain the aforementioned are three followings: the process of construction of the identity of each other, the integration of the concept of Holy War in the imaginary of each cultural context, and the need to justify their actions and legitimize their own actions in relation to the enemy represented in each of the discourses.

Regarding the Castilian identity, it is important to point out that it was in a formative period. In fact, the Alphonsine chronicles are the first Iberian chronicles written in Castilian (medieval Spanish), so the comparison between Muslims and Castilians, in which the identity of Castilians is created from the image of the other as in a mirror game (Barkai, 2007), is very present in the discourse.

In this sense, it is not only that the Muslim enemy is black, with abnormal or deviant sexuality, idolizes and who should be mistrusted, but, at the same time, the Castilian is presented as white, with normal sexuality, religious and trustworthy (Palacios Ontalva, 2012). Thus, the normality of the Christian was constructed as the opposite of the abnormal, of the enemy and established as a strategy of political control²¹ (Ruano, 1988). Even to the point of imposing beard-wearing fashions, or rather non-use, depending on Muslim traditions (Menéndez, 2003).

The representations of the enemy in the Castilian discourse functioned as a mechanism of self-recognition and self-affirmation, because it builds a Castilian identity and elevates its qualities to a level of virtue. On the other hand, it is a segregation strategy, it differs based on its contrary characteristics from Christian Castilian Spanish. Thus, this identity game included all aspects of life, always with positive-negative charges, since both the colour of the skin and the clothing used had a moral symbolism.

On the other hand, in the Byzantine discourse on its enemy, there is no need to create an identity, as in the Castilian case. This becomes visible when comparing the use of the opposition Barbarian-Visigoths, in the Castilian discourse, and Barbarian-Roman, in the Byzantine. Although these descriptions seem very similar and contain some profound differences, since, in a Castilian context, the word barbarian designated, above all, a “foreign man, the stranger, the foreigner” (Ruano, 1988, pp. 28-30), that is the otherness. This is important since Muslims lived in the same lands for centuries, and by identifying them as foreigners, they symbolically banished them from the Iberian Peninsula. As for the opposition of the barbarian in the Castilian discourse, it

²¹ To see more about these ideas at a theoretical level, the work of Foucault (1998 and 2003) is essential.

is the Visigoth. However, the Castilians no longer had a Visigoth identity, so this way of identifying themselves (even if only among the elite) was extremely forced and without weight in the real identity of the people. As will be discussed later, this was a legitimization strategy, but at the identity level, it shows the embryonic state in which the Castilian identity was found.

Returning to the case of the Niketas Koniates discourse, the question of the barbarian-Roman is much more complex and was much more embedded in identity, or rather, in Byzantine identities. Although Castilians, Jews and Muslims coexisted in Castile, the Byzantine Empire was a great multi-ethnic empire, in which the elite identified themselves as Roman, as part of the great Eastern Roman Empire. However, the average Byzantines, outside the central elite, identified themselves from the local ethnic groups and depending on their political, religious and educational ties, although the local elites could identify with the Roman and with the local at the same time (Stouraitis, 2014).

It cannot be forgotten that there was a clear line of continuity between the Eastern Roman Empire and what contemporary historiography calls the Byzantine Empire. However, the Hellenic influence is at the same time very marked. In fact, the Niketas Koniates chronicle shows a very high influence from both Lucianus and Homer (Moraitis, 2015). This tension between local and Roman ethnic identities of the central elite; of the peripheral Hellenic and the popular classes against the educated Romans; and a large number of groups with intermediate identities, made the barbarian-Roman representation widely used before Niketas, but with the addition of one more part, the semi-barbarian. So, in the Byzantine chronicles, including the important work of Anna Komenna in the 12th century, the barbarian was everyone who was not Roman, a stranger; while the Roman was the one who was part of the elite and identified with

that deep and long history that linked the elite with the great Roman Empire, at the same time, it also referred to a high level of education. The third group, the semi-barbarians, were those who, without being foreigners, belonged to the empire, but did not have a high cultural level, and felt more identified with their local ethnic groups, even if they were Hellenics (Stouraitis, 2014).

Now, in the story of Koniates, the figure of the semi-barbarian does not exist, this discourse is a change in this aspect. What he proposes in this discourse is a reconstruction of the Byzantine identity in which the semi-barbarian is integrated with the Roman (Stouraitis, 2014), in order to face a greater threat, the Latin barbarians, who conquered the imperial capital. The Niketas Koniates' chronicle is the culmination of the process of change of the form of the Roman-Byzantine identity, while the Alphonsine chronicle is the beginning of the creation of the Castilian identity.

Due to this process of identification, there is something very interesting in the Castilian form of construction, since it seems to emphasize the other in order to reach the self, through their reflection. While, in the Byzantine case, the role of the self is preponderant over that of the other, that is, although there are binary relationships in which the two are opposed, the dependence of Byzantine identity and actions does not seem to be so determined by the other-enemy as in the Castilian case. In fact, the depth of Byzantine culture and tradition at that time cannot be forgotten.

In this sense, the representations of the enemy's body, sexuality and behaviour in the case of the Koniates chronicles were vaguer as the Byzantine identity for the time was much more concrete; while these types of representations in the Castilian chronicles are more specific and detailed because the Castilian identity was much vaguer and still under construction.

The second important aspect is the adoption or not of the idea of Holy War. Since this could favour the generation of representation, they demonized the enemy and, in that same sense, that they bestialized him.

In this sense, in the Castilian discourse the crusade mentality is implicit (Barkai, 2007), especially considering that military activity in the Iberian Peninsula in border areas was constant, although not always in the form of battles between two great armies, instead it was common as rapid raids of destruction and pillage. Thus, the feeling of danger and violence themselves were an element present in the reality of the Castilian 13th century (García Fitz, 2001). This means that there was a significant impact on people's lives and their daily activities and even "the way of conceiving the approach to their Muslim neighbours or of imagining the nature of the borders against Islam." (García Fitz, 2001, p. 162).

For its part, the crusade mentality was fostered by the strengthening of relations between the Castilian monarchy both with the Papacy and with the Abbey of Cluny (Monteira Arias, 2006), which ended up replacing the Mozarabic rite with the Roman, used by the Castilian church in the previous centuries. Regarding this point, although it is clear that Cluny had great importance and there was an effort both from Cluny and from the papacy to replace the Mozarabic rite (which was finally put aside), and thus establish the crusade mentality; his role as organizer of the logic of both the *Reconquista* and the images of the Muslims, must be qualified and rethink, since the Spanish campaign long ago had taken religious and sacred elements in its discourse²².

²² To deepen the debate on the influence of the Abbey of Cluny on religiosity and mentality in Castile, on the side of historians who argue that the influence was not significant in terms of the cross mentality and the adoption of the idea of War Santa is the work of Monteiro Arias (2006a), while on the side of

Under these logics, of a military encounter with the other and the formation of one's own political and religious identity, the conscious and structured interest in generating representations of the Muslim increased, not only from contact and daily sociabilities but from discourses such as the of the Alphonsine chronicles.

Medieval Spain, and specifically that of the 13th century, was a society organized for war, where political, economic and even social life was linked to the practice of war.²³ In fact, the Iberian Peninsula was established as a border point between Islam and Christianity, a border of contact, but also of separation and conflict, where the constant was life in the midst of military actions. From this point of view, Islam was presented as the other radical, so that the war against this enemy was desirable, meritorious, pious and, importantly, sanctified.

Thus, the *Reconquista* was a movement that sought the recovery of the kingdom, that is, political control over the Iberian Peninsula and the restoration of the western Christian church (González Jiménez, 2003). Now, the *Reconquista* was not the simple Hispanic expression of the Crusades, in fact, the Spanish experience originated before these, and even in the early period they were inspired by Old Testament narratives and the Spanish Christian fighters assumed identification with the people chosen by God (González Jiménez, 2003). This shows that the sacralization of the struggle, the idea of Holy War, in the *Reconquista* was already an element present before the Crusades. Although it is also true, with the appearance of the second phenomenon in the eleventh century, the Hispanic experience did intensify.²⁴ At the same time, they

the academics who maintain that the Abbey was fundamental for the development of these ideas in the Iberian terrarium is Flori (2003).

²³ On the question of the warlike context of late medieval Spain, see the work of Francisco García Fitz (García Fitz, 2001, and 2004)

²⁴ On the context of the Crusades and their common elements with the *Reconquista* see Flori, (2010)

shared significant elements, among which the formation of a negative image of the other-enemy, of the Muslim, stands out.

Thus, the *Reconquista* is also part of the experience of the Holy War in the West, which as a common characteristic demonized the enemy, at the same time giving his project the category of Saint. What happened through ideological propaganda, which in most cases were due to intentionally constructed ideas and were not given by chance or mere ignorance (Flori, 2003). The idea of Holy War plants a dichotomous world, of the struggle of good against evil, in which the Castilians, in this particular case, obtained redemption and guaranteed their place in paradise.

On the side of the Eastern Roman Empire, the Byzantines, although they had known the idea of Holy War long before the Latins themselves, since this concept had its first appearance with the Muslims and their idea of Jihad, since then this form interpreting the war was not assimilated by Byzantine society (Storaitis, 2011). The idea of holy war was reintroduced to Byzantine society with the Crusades, this time from a religiously closer group. However, it must be remembered that at the same time, since 1054 with the Eastern schism, Byzantine history is characterized by growing opposition to the Western Roman tradition, a time that has its highest point in the events of the Fourth Crusade in 1204 (Kazhdan, 2001).

Unlike the reception of the Idea of jihad, the idea of the crusade was not totally discarded, by the most important Byzantine authors of the 12th century, such as Anna Komnena and Ioannis Kinnamus and Niketas Koniates himself (Storaitis, 2011), however, This did not imply the adoption of the idea of holy war in its entire dimension, since when they speak of the crusades they emphasize more on their political aspect, which also went against Byzantine political interests. That is, these authors focused

their analysis emphasizing the political and cultural differences between the Byzantines and the Latins, but they did not object to the central objective of the Crusades, in this sense, they agreed with the idea of a military campaign for the protection or liberation of Christians and their lands against Muslims (Storaitis, 2011).

In this sense, it can be concluded that in Byzantium there was a firm rejection of the idea of holy war from its beginnings, but, after the Crusades, the concept was not completely discarded, although never with the transcendental dimension it had in Western Europe and, in this case, specifically in the Kingdom of Castile, but was limited to considering the Crusades as a war of *Reconquista* under political interests (Storaitis, 2011). Clearly, any kind of sympathetic approach to the idea of Crusade was removed from the Byzantine context after the events of 1204 (Haldon, 2003).

This difference again shows how the discourses about the enemy are highly influenced by the other, even in this case by the Other, in terms of Lacan (Johnston, 2018), and not by the self. While the role of me in the Byzantine has a much stronger imprint. That is, while the Alphonsine chronicles explain the events centred on the Muslims, their monstrosity, closeness to the devil. etc., and by the desire of the great other, of God, to fight this battle in which divine forces intervene and the Castilians risk their salvation; in the chronicle of Niketas Koniates the events are explained more by the inability of the Komnenoi emperors to carry out their work, than by the confrontation of heavenly and demonic armies, or by the barbaric nature of the enemy himself. In fact, in the History of Niketas Koniates, Latins only have the role of providing punishment for an immoral and vicious Empire corrupted by the decline of its elite (Pontani, 2018). This explains the absence of references to the sexual depravity of the enemy while emphasizing the sexual vices of the Byzantine emperors and the elite. The centre of discourse is the Byzantine elites (and for Koniates, especially Emperors Manuel I and

Andronikos), they were responsible for the imperial decadence and crisis, which is shown when he condemns how Manuel I treated the Latins unjustly (Kazhdan, 2001). And although, as said, he emphasizes the Komnenoi dynasty, he also condemns the cruelty and errors of the Angelos dynasty (Deluigi, 2015), a period in which the author had an important political role.

The last factor, which is obviously highly connected with identity and with the idea of Holy War, is the need for the legitimation of both the ruling regime and the war against the enemy. In the chronicles of Niketas Koniates, there is no legitimizing element of either of these two aspects, while in the Alphonsine chronicle this element is a basic part of the functions of the Muslim representations.

The absence of legitimizing elements in the Byzantine case is because it was totally unnecessary. In the first place, as for the legitimacy of the empire itself, this was given in advance by its antiquity, its connection with the Roman Empire and the recognition of the other Christian and Muslim powers. On the other hand, they also did not need to legitimize the war against the Latins because in the specific context in which Koniates lived, the empire was in a defensive war against the crusaders, the war had reached the gates of the capital Constantinople itself.

On the other hand, the Castilian case is totally different. In the first place, there is a strong need to legitimize the Castilian crown, which for that very moment had just positioned itself as the most important kingdom in the peninsula, but which had not yet been definitive. Second, there is a need to legitimize their military campaigns, since under the medieval Castilian logic the war had to be justified, either as a defensive or preventive war or to recover territory (Morin, 2010).

The above is reflected again in the barbarian-Roman and barbarian-Visigothic relationship, since in the case of the Romans there was a direct line between the Roman Empire and the Eastern Roman Empire (it is worth remembering the continuity of the imperial capital until 1204), while the continuity between Castilian and Visigoths only existed in imaginary terms, which did not prevent it from having great symbolic force. By identifying themselves as Visigoths, the Castilian elite not only justified their own power, but at the same time pointed out that it was legitimate to attack the Muslims, to recover the lands taken from the Visigoths, and, in that logic, the Castilian elite.

Finally, it is necessary to make explicit that these three factors are highly connected, since as exemplified with the question of the Visigoth and the Roman, identity was an element of legitimation, and thus also the discourse of the holy war was, because of In this way, the attack on the enemy was also justified, not from earthly logic but more transcendental, such as the confrontation between good, the armies of God, against evil²⁵. Likewise, an identity based on the opposition of the good self and the bad other favours the configuration of a concept such as that of holy war.

On the other hand, the analysis presented on identity, the adoption of the concept of holy war and that of legitimacy, from my point of view, confirms what was mentioned previously about the position of the self in discourses, the Castilian with more emphasis on the other, and the Byzantine with a much more relevant self.

²⁵ In this sense, it is interesting to see that jihad arose in the formative moment of Islam and reappeared in moments of reconfiguration of Islamic powers as in the case of Atabeg of Mosul, Zengi. Times in which there is a high need to unify identities and legitimize domains. To go deeper in Zengi's case see (Maalouf, 2009)

Conclusion.

After analysing the sources, and relating the text to the context, this research found that both the Alphonsine chronicles, written in Castile throughout the second part of the 13th century, and the Niketas Koniates chronicle, written in Byzantium at the end of the 12th century, they represent the body, sexuality and behaviour as an important strategy to shape the other in their individuality, but at the same time to shape themselves.

In both discourses, it was found that the authors regarded their own group as superior, both culturally and politically. Regardless of the differences in historiographic traditions, time and space, the representations of the other-enemy in the chronicles, consciously or unconsciously, functioned as an exclusion mechanism by directing actions against the represented groups, of identification (both the self and the of the other) and legitimation, although this more in the Castilian case.

On the other hand, it was also found that the representations varied in their details due to the position of the self in these discourses. Thus, the Byzantine chronicles show a much more concrete and central self in the discourse, than in the Castilian case. Obviously, this difference is due to the particular historical contexts of each one, namely: the identification process of each one, the adoption or not of the concept of holy war and the need to legitimize their dominance.

Bibliography.

Abate, Mark T., (Editor), 2003, *History in Dispute, The Crusades, 1095-1291*, Vol 10, St. James Press, London

Abric, Jean-Claude (dir.), 2010, *Práctica sociales y representaciones*, Ediciones Coyoacan, México, 2001.

Alfonso X, 2009, *General Estoria, Primera parte*, Tomo I, Predro Sanchez-Prieto (editor), Fundación José Antonio de Castro, Madrid.

Alfonso X, 2011, *Las Cantigas de Santa María, V 1, Códice Rico, Ms T-I-1, Real biblioteca del Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial*, Madrid, Testimonio compañía Editorial.

Alfonso X, 1972, *Las Siete Partidas del rey don Alfonso el Sabio, cotejadas con varios códices antiguos por la Real Academia de la Historia, vol. 3*, Atlas, Madrid.

Altan, E., 2004, "Anatolia after the Fourth Crusade", *The society of the Crusades and the Latin*, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

Barkai, Ron, 2007, *El enemigo en el espejo, cristianos y musulmanes en le España medieval*, RIALP S.A, Madrid.

Berger, Peter L. and Luckmann, Thomas, 1991, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Penguin books, Great Britain.

Brand, Charles M., 1968, *Byzantium confronts the west: 1180-1204*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Cabrera, E., 1998, *Historia de Bizancio*, Ariel, Barcelona.

Cisney, Vernon W., "Differential Ontology", *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.iep.utm.edu/diff-ont/>

Chrissis, Nikolaos G., and Carr, Mike, 2016, *Contact and Conflict in Frankish Greece and the Aegean, 1204–1453 Crusade, Religion and Trade between Latins, Greeks and Turks*, Routledge, Surrey.

- Daddesio, Thomas C., 1995, *On minds and Symbols, the Relevance of cognitive sciences for semiotics*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Deluigi, Humberto, 2015, *Winter In the Land of Rum: Komnenian Defenses Against the Turks In Western Anatolia*, İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Ankara.
- De Pablo, David, 2018, *İspanyolca Kaynaklara göre 13. Yüzyılda Kastilya'da Müslüman İmaji*, Istanbul University, Istanbul.
- Di Pasquale, Mariano A., 2011, "De la historia de las ideas a la nueva historia intelectual: Retrospectivas y perspectivas. Un mapeo de la cuestión". *UNIVERSUM*, N° 26, Vol. 1, University of Talca, pp. 79-92
- Droysen, Johann Gustav. 1983. *Histórica. Lecciones sobre la Enciclopedia y metodología de la historia*. Barcelona, Editorial Alfa, 392
- Durkheim, Emile, 1992, *Las formas elementales de la Vida Religiosa*, Akal, Madrid.
- Efthymiadis, Stephanos, 2008, "Niketas Choniates and Ioannes Kinnamos: The Poisoning of sthephen IV of Hunfary (13 APRIL, 1165)", *Byzantinische Zeintschrift*, Einhunderterster Band, Berlin.
- Ellemers, Naomi, 2019, "Social identity theory", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, inc., January 04. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-identity-theory>
- Elliott, John, 1999, "Historia nacional y Comparada", *Historia y Sociedad*, 6, Medellín, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, p. p. 11-36.
- Elliott, John, 2012 "Comparative History", *History in the making*, New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. 168-195.
- Estévez Sola, Juan A. (edit.), 2003, *Crónica Najerense*, Akal S.A, Madrid.
- Fairclough, N., 2006, "Doing Discourse Analysis", *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge, Polity press.
- Fairclough, N., 2003, *Texts, Social events and Social practices. Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, London, Routledge
- Farieta, G., 2009, *Edad Media: Diez siglos de Historia*, Grupo Editorial Educar, Bogotá.

Fenves, Peter, 1998, "Alterity and Identity, Postmodern Theories of", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vol. 1, Routledge, London, pp. 187-192.
<https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/alterity-and-identity-postmodern-theories-of/v-1>

Flori, Jean, 2010, *El Islam y el fin de los tiempos. La interpretación profética de las invasiones musulmanas en la Cristiandad medieval*, Ed. Akal, Madrid.

Flori, Jean, 2003, *La guerra santa: la formación de la idea de cruzada en el Occidente cristiano*, Trotta, Madrid.

Flori, Jean, 2004, *La guerra santa, yihad, cruzada. Violencia y religión en el cristianismo y el islam*, Universidad de Granada y Universidad de Valencia, España.

Foucault, M. 2009. *El orden del discurso*. Fábula Tusquets, México.

Foucault, M., 1998, *Historia de la locura en la época clásica I*, FCE, Bogota.

Foucault, M., 1995, *Historia de la sexualidad: Vol. 1 la voluntad de saber*, Siglo XXI, México,

Foucault, M., 1993, *Historia de la sexualidad vol. II, El uso de los placeres*, Siglo XXI, México.

Foucault, M., 2004, *Historia de la sexualidad III: La inquietud de sí*, Siglo XXI, Buenos Aires.

Foucault, M., 2003, *Vigilar y castigar: el Nacimiento de la Prisión*, Siglo XXI, Buenos Aires.

Funes, L. 2010, "De la crónica medieval a la crónica de Indias algunas reflexiones sobre la escritura de la historia en los umbrales de la Modernidad". *IX Congreso Argentino de Hispanistas, 27 al 30 de abril de 2010*, La Plata.
http://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/trab_eventos/ev.1079/ev.1079.pdf

García Fitz, Francisco, 2001, "Una frontera caliente, La guerra en las fronteras castellano-musulmanas (siglo XI-XIII), C. de Ayala, P. Buresi y Ph. Josserand (eds.) *Identidad y representación de la frontera en la España medieval (siglos XI-XIV)*, Colección de la Casa de Velázquez, Madrid, pp. 159-179.

García-Serrano, Francisco, 2009, "La creación de identidad en la frontera medieval hispana y la visión del otro: mudéjares y judíos", Manuel Alejandro Rodríguez de la Peña (dir.), *Hacedores de Frontera. Estudios sobre el contexto social de la Frontera en la España medieval*, CEU, Madrid.

García Fitz, Francisco, 2003a, *La Edad Media guerra e ideología: justificaciones jurídicas y religiosas*, Silex Ediciones, Madrid,

García Fitz, Francisco, 2003b, "Las minorías religiosas y la tolerancia en la Edad Media hispánica: ¿mito o realidad?", *Tolerancia y convivencia étnico-religiosa en la Península Ibérica durante la Edad Media. III Jornadas de Cultura Islámica*, A. García Sanjuán (coord.), Huelva, pp. 13-56.

García Fitz, Francisco, 2004, "¿Una España musulmana, sometida y tributaria? La España que no fue." *Historia*. Instituciones Documentos, 31, pp. 227-248.

Grew, Raymond, 1980, "The Case for Comparing Histories", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 85, No. 4, pp. 763-778 : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1868871> accessed 17-07-2020

González Jiménez, Manuel, 2003, "Sobre la ideología de la Reconquista: realidades y tópicos", *Memoria, mito y realidad en la historia medieval. XII Semana de Estudios Medievales*, De la Iglesia Duarte, Nájera,

Haldon, John, 2003, *Byzantium at war ad 600-1453*, Routledge, London

Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard and Kocka, Jürgen, 2009, "Lost in Translation, Transcending Boundaries in Comparative History", *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, Oxford, Berhahn Books, 105-130

Harvey, Alan, 1989, *Economic expansion in the Byzantine empire, 900-1200*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Harry, J. (Tr.), 1984, *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit.

Herrin, J., 2010, *Bizancio: El Imperio que hizo posible la Europa moderna*, Random House Mondadori, Barcelona.

Herrin, J., 2004, *Women in Purple: Rulers of Medieval Byzantium*, Nueva Jersey, Princeton University Press.

Hinojosa Montalvo, José, 2004, "Cristianos contra musulmanes: la situación de los mudéjares". *Conflictos sociales, políticos e intelectuales en la España de los siglos XIV y XV / XIV Semana de Estudios Medievales, Nájera, del 4 al 8 de agosto de 2003*. Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, pp. 335-392.

Hinojosa Montalvo, José, 2008, "Musulmanes en los reinos cristianos: una desconfianza permanente", *Cristiandad e Islam en la Edad Media Hispana, XVIII Semana de Estudios Medievales de Nájera*, Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, Logroño, pp. 299-354.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth, 2019, "A 12th-century perspective on Byzantium's Western neighbours: The witness of Manganeios Prodromos", Nikolaos G. et. Al. (Editors) *Byzantium and the West Perception and Reality (11th–15th c.)*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Johnston, Adrian, "Jacques Lacan", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta Edi., Jul 10, 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/lacan/>

Kaldellis, Anthony, 2015, *The Byzantine Republic, People and Power in new Rome*, Harvard University press, London

Kaldellis, Anthony, 2019, *Romandland Ethnicity and empire in Byzantium*, Harvard University press, London

Kazhdan, Alexander, 2001, "Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the eleventh to the Twelfth Century", Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Editors) *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

Korfmacher, Carsten, "personal Theory", *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://www.iep.utm.edu/person-i/>

Korobeinikov, Dimitri, 2015, "The Byzantine-seljuk border in times of trouble: Laodikeia in 1174-1204", Alicia Simpson, (editor), *Byzantium, 1180-1204: 'The Sad Quarter of a Century'?* National Hellenic Research Foundation Institute of Historical Research, Athens

- Lau, Jonathan, 2014, *Byzantium and the Crusades*, Bloomsbury, London.
- Lau, Maximilian, 2016, *Rewriting the 1120s: Chronology and Crisis under John II Komnenos Making and Remaking of Byzantium*, Limes, Belgrade
- Ladero Quesada, Miguel Ángel, 1978, “Los mudéjares de Castilla en la Baja Edad Media”, *Historia. Instituciones. Documentos*, 5, p. 260.
- Le Goff, Jacques, 1999, *La Civilización del Occidente Medieval*, Paidós, Barcelona.
- Le Goff, J., 2016, *La Baja Edad Media*, Siglo XXI, Madrid.
- Lorenzo, Ramón, 2002, “La interconexión de Castilla, Galicia y Portugal en la confección de las crónicas medievales y en la transmisión de textos literarios”, *Revista de Filología Románica*, vol 19.
- Maalouf, A., 2009, *Las Cruzadas vistas por los árabes*, Alianza Editorial, Madrid.
- Marin Riveros, José, 2019, “La Historia y el Historiador. Introducción a la Historiografía Bizantina a través de sus Prólogos (s. IV-VII)”, *STUDI MEDIEVALI*, Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo.
- Martín Rodríguez, José Luis, 2008, “Baja Edad Media (siglos XIII-XV)”, *Historia de España*, José María Prats (coord.), Océano, Barcelona.
- Menéndez Pidal, Gonzalo, 2003, *La España del siglo XIII leída en imágenes*, ALSTOM, Madrid.
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón (Ed.), 1906, *Primera Crónica General de España, Primera Crónica General de España que mandó a componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1239*, Bailly-Bailliere, Madrid.
- Merianos, Gerasimos, 2015, “literary allusions to trade and merchants: the ‘great merchant’ in late twelfth-century Byzantium”, Alicia Simpson (editor), *National Hellenic Research Foundation Institute of Historical Research Section of Byzantine Research International Symposium, 22 Byzantium, 1180–1204: ‘The Sad Quarter of a Century?’* Athens.
- Meško, M., 2014, “Anna Komnene’s narrative of the war against the Scythians”, *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 19, 2.

Minogue, K. R., 1981, "Method in Intellectual History: Quentin Skinner's Foundations", *Philosophy*, Oct., Vol. 56, No. 218, pp. 533-552

Monteira Arias, Inés, 2006a, "Escenas de lucha contra el Islam en la iconografía románica: el centauro arquero. Su estudio a través de los cantares de gesta", *Codex Aquilarensis. Cuadernos de investigación del Monasterio de Santa María la Real*, 22.

Monteira Arias, Inés, 2006b "Las formas del pecado en la escultura románica castellana: una interpretación contextualizada en relación con el islam", *Codex Aquilarensis. Cuadernos de investigación del Monasterio de Santa M. la Real*, 21

Moraitis, Ioannis, 2015, *The Second Crusade Through the Narrative of Niketas Choniates*, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens.

Morin, Alejandro, 2010, "¿Cynocephalus in comentario? El carácter monstruoso o salvaje de los infieles como argumento jurídico", *Mirabilia: Electronic Journal of Antiquity, Middle & Modern Ages*, n. 10.

Nicolle, D., 2011, *The fourth crusade 1202-04: the betrayal of Byzantium*, Osprey Publishing, Oxford.

Nilsson, Ingela, 2014, "Komnenian Literature, Byzantine Culture", Dean Sakel (editor) *Byzantine Days of Istanbul' held on the occasion of Istanbul being European Cultural Capital 2010*, Turk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

Noonan, Harold and Curtis, Ben, "Identity", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta Edi., May 25, 2018, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/identity/>

Of Clari, Robert, 1996, *The conquest of Constantinople*, Universidad de Toronto Press, Toronto.

Palacios Ontalva, J. Santiago, "Cultura visual e iconografía de la reconquista. Imágenes de poder y cruzada", *Revista de Historia Medieval, Anales de la Universidad de Alicante*, N. 1, Universidad de Alicante, Madrid, 2011.

Palacios Ontalva, J. Santiago, 2012, *Fernando III, Tiempo de Cruzada*, Madrid.

Pérez Rodríguez, Antonio M., 1993, "Castilla, Cluny y la Crónica Najerense", *III Semana de Estudios Medievales de Nájera*, Logroño, Instituto de Estudios Riojanos.

Pascual, Pseudo Pedro, 2011, *Sobre la se(c)ta mahometana*, González Muñoz, Fernando (Editor), Publicaciones Universidad de Valencia, Valencia.

Perner, Josef, 1994, "introducción", *Comprender la mente representacional*, Paidós, Paidós,

Pontani, Filippomaria, 2018, "Cavafy and Niketas Choniates: a possible source for 'Waiting for the barbarians'", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 42 (2), pp. 275-286

Prior, Paul A. and Hengst, Julie A. (editors) 2010, *Exploring Semiotic Remediation as Discourse Practice*, Palgrave Macmillan, Great Britain.

Real Academia Española, "Identidad", *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*, 23ª ed., [version 23.3 online] <https://dle.rae.es/?w=identidad>

Real Academia Española, "Otro", "otredad", "Alteridad", *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*, 23ª ed., version online 23.3 <https://dle.rae.es/otro>

Reisigl, Martin and Wodak, Ruth, 2005, *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetoric of racism and Antisemitism*, Routledge, London.

Rodríguez de la Peña, Manuel Alejandro, 2000-2001, "La cruzada como discurso político en la crónica alfonsí" *Alcanate: Revista de estudios alfonsíes* 2, Universidad de Sevilla, pp. 35-36.

Rodríguez Suarez, Alex, 2016, "Interacción entre latinos y bizantinos en vísperas de la Cuarta Cruzada (1204): el testimonio de Teodoro Balsamón", *Estudios bizantinos* 4 (2016) 95-105

Ruano, Eloy Benito, 1988, *De la alteridad en la historia: discurso leído el día 22 de mayo de 1988*, Real Academia de la historia, Madrid.

Runciman, S., 1999, *Historia de las Cruzadas, El Reino de Jerusalén y el Oriente Franco 1100-1187*, Vol. III, Alianza Editorial, Madrid.

Shawcross, Teresa, 2011, "The Lost Generation (1204-1222) Political Allegiance and Local Interests under the Impact of the Fourth Crusade , Identities and Allegiances in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204", Judith Herrin and Guillaume Saint-Guillain (editors), ASHGATE, UK.

Shukurov, Rustam, 2016, "The Byzantine Concepts of Iran: Cultural Memory and Its Reactualization, Durak, Koray and Jevtic, Ivana (editors), Identity and the other in Byzantium papers for the fourth international sevgi gonul Byzantine Studies Symposium, Istanbul.

Shukurov, Rustam, 2016, *The Byzantine Turks 1204–1461*, Leiden, Brill.

Simpson, Alicia, 2006, Before and After 1204: The Versions of Niketas Choniates' Historia, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 60, pp. 189-221

Simpson, Alicia, 2013, "From the Workshop of Niketas Choniates: The Authority of Tradition and Literary Mimesis", Pamela Armstrong, ed., *Authority in Byzantium*, Ashgate, Farnham,

Stojanovic, Djordje, 2015, *The Symbolic Construction of the Enemy: The Case of Serbia and Japan*, CALE, Centre for Asian Legal Exchange Nagoya University, Japan,

Stouraitis, Ioannis, 2011, "Jihād and Crusade: Byzantine Positions Towards the Notions of 'Holy War'", *BYZANTINA SYMMEIKTA*, 21.

Stouraitis, Ioannis, 2014, "Roman identity in Byzantium: a critical approach", *De Gruyter*, 107 (1).

Tolan, John V., 2007, *Sarracenos. El Islam en la imaginación medieval europea*, Universidad de Valencia, Valencia.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2009, "Ideology and discourse analysis", *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11 (2), pp. 115-140.

van Leeuwen, Theo, 2008, *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*, Oxford University press, Oxford.

Vasiliev, A., 1945, *Historia del Imperio Bizantino, T. II, De las Cruzadas a la Caída de Constantinopla (1081-1453)*, Editorial Iberia, Barcelona. In: http://orthodoxmadrid.com/wpcontent/uploads/2011/03/3.historia_bizancio_vasiliev_2.pdf (04/02/2021).

Welskopp, Thomas, 2010, "Comparative History", *European History online*, Mainz, the Institute of European History. <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/theories-and-methods/comparative-history> [2020-07-10].

Williamson, Timothy, 1998, "Identity", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 4, Routledge, London, pp. 675-678.

<https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/identity/v-1>

Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael, 2001, *Methods of Discourse analysis*, SAGE Publications, London.

Wolin, Richard, 2019, "Emmanuel Lévinas", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, inc, December 21, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Emmanuel-Levinas>.