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Pedro (Pero) Carrillo de Huete was the head falconer (halconero mayor) of King Juan II of Castilla (1405-54) and also one of the two authors of the Crónica del halconero de Juan II (hereafter Halconero).¹ Carrillo’s segment of the chronicle narrates the activities of King Juan and his court from 1420-41, several of which include the author in a prominent role. The renowned Spanish scholar and critic Juan de Mata Carriazo edited the first print edition of the Halconero in 1946. According to Carriazo, Pedro Carrillo’s prose lacks “intención artística”, although it does manage to convey to readers the emotion of events in which he participates (Carrillo de Huete xii). For Carriazo, this author was an “hombre sencillo y sin ambición” who wrote “sin aliños retóricos de ninguna clase” (Barrientos xvi; xxxviii). He also declares, “Ciertamente, el autor no es persona de cultura clásica, nibiblica o eclesiástica, ni de cualquier otra forma de cultura literaria. Ni un solo libro se cita especificadamente…” (xciii) (emphasis added). The latter sentence indicates that Carriazo considered only learned authors to have “cultura literaria”. This article will contest the italicized part of Carrillo’s statement.

Although Carrillo’s Halconero does not dazzle the reader with its rhetorical effects, it does display definite literary techniques— at times even low-key rhetorical figures— which make the head falconer’s appearance in it not only more vivid and noteworthy, but also that of an epic hero similar to those of Castilian oral tradition. Also, while it is true that Carrillo’s self-portrayals are reasonable, he is at the same time a person who longs for recognition. Rafael Beltrán observes that Carrillo, like several other fifteenth-century Spanish chroniclers, inclines toward the “auto-alabanza de sus virtudes bélicas” in an effort to acquire at least a meaningful portion of the fama accorded to those of higher rank (2006 l-li). Pedro Carrillo may not have had significant political ambition, but he did seek distinction through his chronicle.

The Halconero was written in the mid-fifteenth century. Critics have been disdainful of Pedro Carrillo’s literary style ever since the beginning of the sixteenth century and possibly even during the head falconer’s lifetime. Some of the remarks made about unsuitable chroniclers by Carrillo’s contemporary Fernán Pérez de Guzmán in the Introduction to his Generaciones y semblanzas might have been
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¹ According to Juan de Mata Carriazo the other author is Bishop Lope de Barrientos; however, Carrillo is the only author credited on the title pages of both the 1946 and 2006 editions. Carriazo discusses each author’s section in his “Estudio preliminar” to the Refundición de la crónica del halconero, (hereafter Refundición), xxxvii-xliv.
directed at this author (Lawrance 96). Today’s Spanish scholars agree that the head falconer fits very well the description of inept and ill-prepared chroniclers made by another contemporary of Carrillo’s, Enrique de Villena (Beltrán 2006 xlviii; González Jiménez vii). Three generations after the *Halconero* was written, Lorenzo Galíndez Carvajal, editor of the royal *Crónica del Rey don Juan el Segundo* published in 1517 (hereafter *CDJ II*), complained in his “Prefación” that Pedro Carrillo had written more of a summary than a history or chronicle (273).

The deficiencies of Carrillo’s technique have continued to be a topic of discussion several decades after Carriazo’s mid-twentieth century study. In his 1993 article “The Style of the *Crónica del Halconero*”, Charles F. Fraker remarks that the work is uneven, full of gaps and lacks needed explanations (83). More recently, Manuel González Jiménez agrees with his former professor Carriazo that Carrillo struggled with his writing: “No era Carrillo de Huete un escritor nato” (vii). However, Fernando Gómez Redondo, author of the impressive four-volume *Historia de la prosa medieval castellana*, is more forgiving, “Es cierto, en fin, que Carrillo debía de carecer de una formación letrada, pero ello no significa que su registro cronístico fuera un simple reportorio de fuentes documentales; aquello que vive y piensa el Halconero es lo que describe con mayor empeño y fuerza, si no retórica, si al menos emotiva” (2293-94). It is possible to agree with some of these more recent critical observations, especially those of Fraker and Gómez Redondo, yet still propose a reassessment of Pedro Carrillo’s technique. In order to present another view of his effective yet heretofore undervalued style, this study will focus upon his narration of an event of historical importance.

The king’s head falconer enters his own chronicle as a chivalric militant knight who plays a key role in the 1420 escape of fifteen-year-old King Juan II from the custody of his cousin the Infante Enrique of Aragón. The escape and its aftermath are referred to as “el movimiento de Tordesillas” by Alvar García de Santa María, the principal royal chronicler of the reign of King Juan II and upon whose chronicle the Galíndez edition –years 1406-34– is based. This was the literary Pedro Carrillo’s first and perhaps most outstanding performance in the service of his king and he is careful to portray his courage, loyalty and foresight in colorful detail. Even Carriazo admits that in this particular instance the head falconer “acierta a componer páginas bellísimas” (Barrientos xvii), though he does not pause to explain this somewhat

---

2 Guzmán was outraged that his friend the royal chronicler Alvar García de Santa María had been dismissed after 1434, and as a result “la estoria le fue tomada e pasada a otras manos” (Generaciones y semblanzas 3). Parts of the royal chronicle edited by Galíndez are based upon Carrillo’s text. Worth noting is that Carrillo, on the king’s orders, arrested Guzmán in 1432.

3 Robert B. Tate discusses Villena’s remarks that appear in the “Proemio” to Villena’s *Eneida Romanzada*. (“El cronista real castellano durante el siglo quince”, 663-64). As Villena died in 1434 and Carrillo was still writing his chronicle over twenty years later, it is debatable as to whether Villena had Carrillo in mind. However, the head falconer apparently did not know Latin and did not have a learned background, two specific complaints of Villena’s. See also, Jeremy Lawrance, “Memory and Invention in Fifteenth-Century Iberian Historiography” 102-04.
paradoxical statement nor does he examine the passage in detail. Beltrán agrees with Carriazo’s assessment, but goes on to state that the remainder of the Halconero does not live up to its “inicio prometedor” (2006 xxx). These remarks suggest that Pedro Carrillo has been considered to be a competent author in at least one section of his chronicle and that what makes that passage notable should be studied more closely. Just how he managed to convey the turmoil of the royal escape while simultaneously promoting himself will be examined along with the differences between his account and those of other chroniclers.

A brief historical background. When King Juan II assumed the throne of Castilla, political factions were struggling to be the power behind the throne. Juan’s father King Enrique III had died in 1406, leaving his twenty-two-month-old son as heir to the throne. King Juan’s uncle Fernando was co-regent of Castilla during the king’s minority and did not relinquish this power base after he became King of Aragón in 1412. Unlike his brother King Enrique, who fathered two daughters and one son, King Fernando sired two daughters and five sons and provided for their livelihoods and futures in great part from his Castilian position of influence (Nader 45-47). These Infantes of Aragón, as they came to be known, grew up in an environment of what today would be called a certain “entitlement” to direct Castilian affairs of state. Some expected to continue influencing Castilian politics after the deaths of King Fernando in 1416 and of co-regent Queen Catherine of Lancaster, widow of King Enrique III, in 1418. A struggle for control of Castilla soon began between King Fernando’s second son Juan and his third son Enrique.

In July of 1420, Juan of Aragón departed from the court of Castilla to wed the royal heiress of Navarra. Taking advantage of this absence, his brother Enrique and his advisers successfully carried out a golpe de estado in the Castilian town of Tordesillas. Entering the palace under the pretext of making a ritual departure from court, Enrique and his men placed King Juan II and his principal counselors under guard. They then situated themselves at the head of the Castilian government, ejected political opponents and kept King Juan under house arrest. The Aragonese party later moved with the king to the town of Talavera, but they made two serious errors of judgment: they did not dismiss Álvaro de Luna, the king’s favorite, and they allowed King Juan to go hunting under supervision.

Evidently neither Enrique nor his advisers knew of or had paid attention to Castilian history, for they would have recalled that in the year 1354, in a similar situation, King Pedro I of Castilla had escaped from his captors during a “hunting expedition” that took place in a dense fog (Ayala 459). It is possible that Álvaro de Luna, who is given credit by most chroniclers for planning King Juan’s escape, did read (or pay close attention to accounts of) fourteenth-century Castilian history. In later life he owned copies of chronicles of the kingdom (Montero 154). Luna also may have heard of the 1347 flight of Count Louis de Male of Flanders. The teen-aged Count had been pressured to marry an English princess and feigned agreement. In the weeks before the planned wedding date Louis went hawking every day, watched
carefully by his Flemish guardians. One day he galloped his horse across the border into France and bachelor freedom (Tuchman 93).

The *Crónica de don Álvaro de Luna* (hereafter *CDAL*), adds some intriguing and rare intimate details about the planning of the escape:

> E porque el infante don Enrique nunca se partía del Rey, desde grand mañana que se levantaba, fasta que lo dexaba acostado, ordenó don Álvaro un sabio avisamiento, es a saber, tovo manera como el infante se casase allí [Talavera] con la infanta doña Catalina, con quien estaba desposado; el infante lo agradeció mucho a don Álvaro. [Enrique up to this point had pursued this marriage in vain. He wanted the large territories that Catalina had inherited, but as she did not wish to marry him, his efforts had been stonewalled by court officials]. E aquello façía don Álvaro por aver mejor lugar para facer lo que quería, e adereçar como el Rey se fuese después que el infante fuese casado; porque con la nueva muger tardaría más las mañanas en la cama, e él podría mejor en aquel tiempo aver lugar para sacar al Rey de allí, segúnd tenía ordenado. (41)

Further details about the planning are found in the *Refundición*: King Juan’s supporters convince him to go hunting as often as possible. He does just that and as a result “la gente de cavallo que le salía a guardar quando cavalgaua se enojaron de salir con él; y ya quando a caça yua no salía con él otro ninguno saluo sus donzeles y Álvaro de Luna, y los otros criados y oficiales de su casa, y no salía ninguna gente de la guarnición que estaua puesta para le guardar” (38). In contrast, the *Halconero*’s account of the planning is rendered in an elegant concatenation: “E tanto fué el seguir de la caça, que los doscientos hombres que heran de armas tornáronse en çiento, e de çiento en çinquenta, e de çinquenta en non ninguno; tanto que fué a caça el Rey bien çinco o seys días e no fué guarda ninguna con él” (1). The stage was being carefully set for action.

Then, on Friday morning of November 29, 1420, King Juan II and a small group of his most loyal and trustworthy supporters leave their lodgings on what appears to be a customary hunting expedition. The *CDAL* describes the start of the escape: “E cabalgó don Álvaro con el Rey, e el conde don Fadrique, e Pero Carrillo de Huete, los falcones en las manos, diciendo que tenían una garça concertada” (42). Then, according to the *CDJ II*, when the king’s group is three miles away from Talavera, King Juan, Luna and Pedro Carrillo exchange the mules they had been riding for horses (390). By the time Enrique and his men realize what has happened, the “hunting party” is several miles away, en route to the castle of Villalba. But Villalba is not well fortified, so the king and his followers make a perilous crossing of the river Tajo in order to go to the fortress of Montalbán where they will be more secure. King Juan selects his page Diego López de Ayala and Pedro Carrillo de Huete to ride on ahead to prepare the castle for his visit so that he will not be in the vulnerable position...
of having to wait for the castle gate to be opened. The two set off at a gallop and arrive at the strong but poorly guarded fortress. The castle is commandeered by these two men, and when the king and his group arrive they all move inside. Later, Enrique of Aragón and his followers (which include Castilians) arrive and begin a siege of the Montalbán fortress. For one week they use both starvation tactics and subtle arguments in unsuccessful attempts to regain control of the king. Pedro Carrillo is one of the messengers sent by the king to negotiate with Enrique of Aragón. Eight days after prolonged discussions, a meeting between the king and his procuradores and the approach of the Infante Juan with his troops, Enrique lifts the siege and withdraws (391-96). Beltrán remarks that it is the imminent arrival of his brother that really determines the Infante Enrique’s departure (1997 713; n. 159).

The *Halconero*’s version of the same series of actions focuses upon its author’s role in the escape. It captures the tension and excitement of the royal party’s experiences while still managing to foreground Pedro Carrillo’s contribution. In this episode he portrays himself, in Beltrán’s words, “de manera magnificada” (2006 xxx). In his first self-reference the author places his own name immediately after those of the King and Luna: “E los que con el Rey llegaron a Villalba primero fué don Álbaro de Luna, condestable de Castilla que fué después, e Pero Carrillo, su falconero mayor, e Diego López de Ayala” (2). En route to Montalbán, Carrillo, portraying himself as the only member of the group thinking ahead at this crucial moment, asks the king, “–Señor, el alcayde de Montalbán es sabidor deste hecho?” As the answer is “no”, Pedro Carrillo asks for permission to ride ahead to secure the castle, “–Señor, pídovos por merçed que me dedes liçençia que me adelante al castillo, que yo terné manera, con el ayuda de Dios, cómo vos entreguen el castillo, o moriré por vuestro seruiçio como cavallero” (3).

The king gives his permission and the *Halconero* relates that Pedro Carrillo and Diego López de Ayala gallop on ahead to Montalbán. Diego López falls behind because his horse becomes tired,

E Pero Carrillo continuó su camino, e llegó al castillo, e falló la puerta abierta, que abía a la sazón salido vn hombre con dos acémilas a dar agua a vn poço que estaba ay fuera del castillo. E descabalgó del cavallo, e estando asy a la puerta bino el ombre que abía salido con las acémillas [sic], e bínose para Pero Carrillo con vn puñal en la mano. E Pero Carrillo hechó mano por su espada, e dióle vn golpe de llano en la cabeza, e cayó en el suelo. E estando en ésto, llegó Diego López de Ayala, e dixo Pero Carrillo:

–Diego López, catad aquí la puerta primera del castillo. Guardadla, que yo yré a tomar la torre del omenaje, a mi aventura. E entrando por el castillo adelante, salieron a él tres hombres e vna dueña, e dos fijas suyas, e dos mastines. E desque los vido, fué para ellos con vna lança en la mano, deziendo:
–¡E aquí el rey don Johan do bien!
E en ésto los mastines asfincábano mucho. E él defendióse dellos, e llegó fasta el pie del escalera de la torre del omenaje. (3)

After fighting off the dogs, Pedro Carrillo climbs a large number of stairs, arrives at the top of the castle tower and sees that there is no one inside. He notices that the alcaide of Montalbán is hunting in the far distance and then descends in order to prepare the castle to receive his king. Following this, he gives “muchas gracias a Dios” (4). This acknowledges that his indirect request for divine assistance has been answered and also echoes the pious thanksgivings of the Cid after his victories. Thanks to Carrillo’s foresight and heroic efforts, the king and his supporters soon arrive at a well-secured base.

The CDJ II lists Pedro Carrillo’s name last at the start of the “hunting expedition”; it follows the names of seven others who accompanied the king and Luna: “E iba ende Pero Carrillo de Huete, Halconero mayor del Rey, e con él sus halconeros, el qual ninguna cosa supo del secreto hasta en el camino” (390). As the royal chronicle states that Pedro Carrillo was not in on the planning, he evidently chose to enter his own chronicle after the flight had begun and he was a principal actor in the escape. According to Carriazo, the post of halconero mayor was the least important one in the court hierarchy (Barrientos lxxv). The order of names on lists in chronicles usually indicated rank and status. In several of them, however, the arrangement of names often reveals an author’s effort to promote, in more than one sense, his biographical subject. (For example, the author of the CDAL managed to insert Luna’s name even before that of the king in the aforementioned sentence “E cabalgó don Álvaro con el Rey”). Although in his own chronicle Pedro Carrillo lists himself immediately after the king and Luna, the CDJ II places him at the end of two lists, not only shortly after the flight from Talavera has begun, but also when the group has to cross the river Tajo in order to get to Montalbán. A little later the royal chronicle even places Pedro Carrillo’s name after that of the king’s page Diego López de Ayala,

E el Rey mandó á Diego López de Ayala e á Pero Carrillo de Huete ir delante al castillo de Montalvan para tomar la puerta, porque el Rey no se hubiese de detener en la entrada quando llegase; los quales fueron á muy gran priesa, e llegaron al castillo en tal punto, que entonce salía un mozo del Alcayde con un asno á le dar agua, é como vido á estos Caballeros quisiera cerrar la puerta, é Pero Carrillo que llegó primero puso mano al espada, é dió un gran golpe de llano al mozo sobre la cabeza, y él desamparó la puerta, é Pero Carrillo la tomó; é Diego López llegó entonce, é ambos á dos subieron á la torre del omenage, e apoderáronse della. (391)

As the CDJ II narrative unfolds, other noteworthy discrepancies from Pedro Carrillo’s account become evident. Apart from the head falconer’s name appearing
last on the lists of the king’s group, it is King Juan II—not Pedro Carrillo—who apparently initiates the plan to send the two knights to secure the fortress of Montalbán. There is no mention of how this decision came about. At this moment Carrillo’s question addressed to the king in the 

_Halconero_ is illogical because Montalbán is a last-minute Plan B for the royal party. Asking the king if the _alcaide_ of Montalbán knew of his plan to go there makes sense only if it were a very tactful way of manipulating the king into making the decision to send someone ahead to secure the Montalbán fortress. The _Halconero_’s reported question portrays Carrillo as the sole strategist of the king’s party and gives him an opportunity to volunteer for heroic action.

Another difference from the _Halconero_ occurs in the account of the hapless _mozo_—the _alcaide’s_ servant—at Montalbán. He carries no weapon and tries only to close the castle gate, a logical response to the sudden appearance of strangers. Pedro Carrillo’s reaction in the _Halconero_ belongs more to an epic contest between equally matched knights rather than to this situation. This episode is a puzzling one, for the head falconer’s challenger at the gate of the castle of Montalbán is a Protean figure who metamorphs in the chronicles from an _hombre_ (Halconero, _Abreviación del halconero_ [hereafter _Abreviación_] and the _Crónica de don Juan II_ of Alvar García de Santa María) to an _azemilero_ (_Refundición_), to a _mozo del alcayde_ (CDJ II), to a _doncella_ (!) (CDAL), to no one at all (_El Victorial_). It is possible that Carrillo exaggerated his challenger’s condition, for the _hombre_ of the _Halconero_ is a more formidable—and worthy—opponent for a mature knight with battle experience than an _azemilero_ or _mozo_. On the other hand, later chroniclers may not have been convinced of the head falconer’s version or may have decided to put their own “spin” on this episode.⁴

The _Halconero_ avoids mentioning any negative consequences of the attack on the servant of the _alcaide_. However, the _Refundición_ states that Pedro Carrillo, upon being confronted by an _azemilero_ who threatens him with a knife, “sacó su espada, y dióle con ella de manera que lo mató” (40). Alvar García, whose account presumably was written close in time to this event, simply states that Pedro Carrillo “sacó su espada é ferió al home del Alcaide de lo llano, é desamparó la puerta.” (155). The knife appears only in the _Halconero_ and in the texts based upon it, the _Refundición_ and the _Abreviación_.

There are even further discrepancies between Pedro Carrillo’s narrative and the Galíndez CDJ II. In the _Halconero_ Pedro Carrillo climbs up to the castle tower alone, yet the _CDJ II_ states that Pedro Carrillo and Diego López “ambos á dos subieron á la torre de omenage, é apoderarónse della. . .” (391). Although Carrillo is careful to give Diego López de Ayala’s full title (señor de Villalba y de Çebolla), lineage and the fact that he is a _donzel del rey_, the head falconer lists himself ahead of the king’s page
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⁴ Converting Pedro Carrillo’s antagonist to a _doncella_ in the CDAL prevents special attention to someone other than Álvaro de Luna. Carriazo points out that Luna’s biographer silences Carrillo’s role in negotiating with Enrique at Montalbán (Barrientos Ivii). Nor would Pedro Niño’s biographer want his biographical subject to be upstaged in _El Victorial_.
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twice in his account of the first part of the escape. Later, at Montalbán, he gives orders to Diego López to stay and guard the entrance while he goes ahead to reconnoiter. These placements and his command given to the king’s page suggest that Pedro Carrillo has the higher status; however, this is refuted by the CDJ II, which lists the head falconer after Diego López de Ayala three times during the flight.

Lastly, and perhaps the most noteworthy difference between Pedro Carrillo’s chronicle and the other accounts, there is no mention of three men and guard dogs in the CDJ II, or indeed in most of the additional texts consulted (the exceptions are the Refundición and the Abreviación, which repeat the Halconero’s version). The most detailed listing of the castle’s inhabitants is found in Alvar García’s chronicle. They are: the alcaide, (who was out hunting when Pedro Carrillo arrived), his wife, their two children and “dos mozos de soldada” (154). The term “mozo de soldada” referred to juvenile hired help (Vassberg 69). As one servant was struck down by Pedro Carrillo at the gate, presumably there was only one youth inside the castle when Pedro Carrillo entered it, not the three men described in his own account. In the Halconero, Carrillo plans and acts alone in the traditional heroic manner, often against obstacles that do not exist in other chronicles.

The narration of Pedro Carrillo’s commandeering of the castle of Montalbán is vivid and fast moving. In spite of the many critical remarks about the insufficiency of his style, the head falconer did use literary models to place himself as close as possible to being the second hero after Luna in the king’s escape. As noted by Carriazo, these are neither classical, Biblical nor ecclesiastical. However, they are definitely based upon a specific “cultura literaria”, that of the epic tradition, especially as found in Castilian poetry and prose. Carriazo himself touches upon this in passing when he remarks upon the “fuerte sabor popular” of Carrillo’s style (Barrientos xxxviii). Fraker develops the topic further by suggesting similarities between Carrillo’s style and that of oral narrative (84-86). Carrillo probably heard many performances of epics and romances. Although these could also appear in written form, their fundamental orality could explain why Carrillo “ni un solo libro se cita especificadamente”. In addition, cartas de relación contained echoes of epic topoi and the Halconero includes several, including one by Rodrigo Manrique, subject of the late fifteenth-century poem “Coplas por la muerte de su padre”. Knights were urged “to read histories of great deeds of arms” (O’Callaghan 66). Nader states that caballeros who later became writers had been educated in noble courts where “models were found in the lives and deeds of individual heroes” (31). Pedro Carrillo was raised in the royal household (Carrillo de Huete 3) and it appears that he absorbed quite well the literary building blocks of the epic.

In the Halconero’s account of the king’s escape the chivalrous details are the most obvious: Pedro Carrillo emphasizes his loyalty to his king and his solo heroic deeds. Noteworthy is Carrillo’s request for God’s help before beginning the presumed perilous enterprise of taking possession of Montalbán. After he is successful he shows gratitude for this divine favor. Other epic elements are also evident: clever strategic
planning, travel under dangerous conditions, the overcoming of great obstacles, hand-to-hand combat and successful outcomes of engagements with savage beasts. With regard to this last, Carrillo’s struggle with the *dos mastines* is not of the same degree as the Cid’s lion encounter or Alonso Pérez de Guzmán’s thirteenth-century adventure with both a *sierpe* (crocodile?) and a lion simultaneously. However, the result is the same: the head falconer is able to face and eliminate threats from ferocious animals as well as those from humans.

In her discussion of the education of knights, Nader states that young nobles learned to compose lyric poetry “and they were trained in rhetoric...” (78). Although Pedro Carrillo avoids the rhetorical embellishments of certain other fifteenth-century chroniclers, subtle figures do appear in his account of the “movimiento de Tordesillas”. Alliteration occurs at the moment in the narrative when the king begins to go hunting so often that his guards stop accompanying him: “E porque las guardas cabalgaban cadaldía, que eran bien doçientos hombres dарmas, tratóse con el Rey que caldaldía saliese a caça dos vezes” (Carrillo de Huete 1). As seen above, concatenation (climax) is used to describe the diminishing number of guards that accompany the king on his hunting expeditions. A few lines later, the start of the escape is again alliterative, “E desque ésto vieron los que el trató tenían fecho, que estaba seguro el ynfante e su valía, viernes víspera de Sant Andrés, por la mañana, partió el Rey para Montalván, e fué primero a comer a Villalua, no muy bien guisado” (1).

The epithet as an identifying element lingers in almost all of the chronicles of the times and the *Halconero* is no exception. During his narration of the king’s escape and its immediate aftermath, Carrillo identifies his personages by title, rank or other defining characteristic such as “Johan Yañes el Tuerto” (editor’s italics). Although a few of these are repeated, he describes himself four times, as “Pero Carrillo, su [the king’s] falconero mayor”. At one point he also identifies himself as having been raised at court: “asy como criança de su padre [King Enrique III] e suya [King Juan II]” (3).

Anaphora is highly visible in the *Halconero*: the conjunction “e” is used to introduce complete sentences and to link phrases and clauses. Walter J. Ong describes this additive characteristic as one that appears in texts written in cultures that retain a “high oral residue”. He demonstrates how the Douay (1610) version of Genesis “keeps close in many ways to the additive Hebrew original” by the use of nine introductory “ands” (37-38). Although the use of “e” is quite common in Castilian medieval texts, in the *Halconero* both anaphora and polysyndeton are greatly exaggerated at the most intense moments of the narrative. These repetitions, whether deliberate or an example of Pedro Carrillo’s lack of literary sophistication, help to create an effect of constant movement and a breathlessness which support the frantic and urgent character of the royal escape.

There is more than a suggestion of hyperbole. Dennis Sennif remarks upon the “almost comic” aspect of the head falconer’s taking of the castle, noting that Pedro Carrillo’s shouted chivalric announcement to the king that the castle was now secure and safe to enter, “¡Andad, señor, que vuestra es la fortaleza!”’, actually referred to a
relatively unguarded site (202). Other colorful details of the episode—the hombre at
the castle gate, the knife, the three men and two guard dogs in the castle—may also be
exaggerations.

The head falconer also uses an ancient rhetorical device to create drama and
plausibility: dialogue. Like that of classical historians, some or all of the dialogue may
have been invented. It is organized in an unusual way, for Carrillo is the only person
who speaks directly. Those to whom he speaks respond indirectly (the king) or not at
all (Diego López; the inhabitants of Montalbán castle). This technique gives Pedro
Carrillo autonomy and supports his self-portrayal as one who initiates action and
carries it out alone in the traditional heroic manner.

Antithesis of situation appears in the subtext of Pedro Carrillo’s loyalty to his king
in contrast to the traitorous activities of Enrique of Aragón and his group. This is
reminiscent of the contrast between the Cid and the Counts of Carrión. Just as the Cid
showed himself to be more noble in character than those who outranked him, Carrillo
is morally superior to the disloyal infante and his high-ranking followers even though
he is, in Carriazo’s words, “de rango no superior” (Barrientos xxxvii).

Finally, there is a telescoping of time by Pedro Carrillo that creates a significant
chiasmus. Gómez Redondo notes that in the Halconero there is a juxtaposition of the
“movimiento de Tordesillas” and a related event which were actually almost two years
apart: “Hay lagunas temporales que permiten vincular la liberación del rey con la
prisión de su captor” (2288). After being held captive for four months, King Juan II of
Castilla gains his freedom at last in November of 1420. In June of 1422 Enrique of
Aragón loses his freedom when he is arrested by his former prisoner. In the Halconero
these two events are separated by only one short paragraph. Another chiasmus is
hinted at indirectly: the rise in status of the heroic and loyal caballero Pedro Carrillo
contrasted with the fall of the traitorous Enrique of Aragón. The Sumario de los reyes
de Castilla states that as a reward for his services at Montalbán Pedro Carrillo
received two mercedes from King Juan II: he could approach the king at any time
(except when he was with the queen) and he was to receive a new cloak every year at
Christmas (89).

Overall, Pedro Carrillo’s self-constructed image in this episode of the Halconero is
that of the perfect vassal—always loyal, reliable and trustworthy—who can rise to epic
heroism when the occasion demands that he do so. In spite of the disdain of critics
over the centuries it is evident that Pedro Carrillo knew enough about literary
techniques to craft a well-constructed passage that fulfills, in the words of historian
Donald Lateiner, “the epic tradition for highly charged, dramatic incidents” (24).
Though he lacked the learned literary background of some of his fellow fifteenth-
century chroniclers, Pedro Carrillo did indeed understand very well how to portray his
successful participation in the “movimiento de Tordesillas”.
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