The Gendered Gaze: Torrellas’ Sadistic “Martyrdom” in Grisel y Mirabella

La escena del “martirio” antropófago de Torrellas en Grisel y Mirabella está cargada de significado simbólico que los críticos han interpretado de diferentes maneras. Sin embargo, se ha ignorado el papel que desempeñan las teorías visuales para establecer sistemas de poder en la interacción óptica entre las ejecutoras y el ejecutado. Este estudio sostiene que la reina y sus damas usurpan la mirada masculina y convierten a Torrellas en un(a) “mártir” virginizada que recuerda las narraciones martiriológicas y cristiológicas, transformándolo en un fetiche erótico para satisfacer su placer voyeurístico.
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The scene of Torrellas’ cannibalistic “martyrdom” in Flores’s Grisel y Mirabella is fraught with symbolic meaning, which scholars have interpreted in sundry ways. Critics have neglected the role visual theories play in establishing systems of power in the optic interaction between the executrixes and the victim. This analysis aims at showing the role-inversion of the male, objectifying gaze. This essay argues that the queen and her ladies usurp the male gaze and turn Torrellas into a virgin-like “martyr” in a way that resembles martyrological and Christological narratives, turning him into an erotic fetish for the sake of their voyeuristic pleasure.
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Con amor para mis padres, Manuel y Graciela.

Y [Torrellas], después de arrebatado, atáronle de pies y de manos, que ninguna defensa de valerse tuvo. Y fue luego despojado de sus vestidos y atáronle la boca porque quejar no se pudiese; y, desnudo, fue a un pilar bien atado; y allí cada una traía nueva invención para le dar tormentos; y tales hobo que, con tenazas ardientes y otras con uñas y dientes, rabiosamente le despedazaron.
This fragment, which introduces the last paragraph of Juan de Flores’ fifteenth-century *novela sentimental*, *Grisel y Mirabella*, offers the reader an imagery of religious representations staged by the merciless gaze of the executors. The image of Torrellas’ hands and feet being pinned to a pillar references both Christ being nailed to the cross and the martyrdom of female virgins. The victim’s nudity reinforces the connection between his torture and that of Christian saints. Involuntary nudity, combined with the wide range of torturing instruments, was an inherent component of martyrdom and of Christ’s scourging and crucifixion. Noting the feminization of Christ in medieval pictographic representations, Caviness compares Christ’s nudity while being beaten and crucified to Old Testament figures, such as the Sponsa in the “Song of Songs” who is disrobed and assaulted by the guards (120). In hagiographical representations, nudity had a built-in potential for provoking erotic, sadistic and voyeuristic responses in viewers (Easton 85). The interplay between violence and sadism, then, staged by the deviant gaze of the perpetrators, brings Torrellas’ mutilation close to those represented in narratives of Christian martyrs and of Christ. It is, however, an inverted dramatization of the Christian martyr, victim of the dehumanizing violence and the transgressive “phallic” gaze.

Without attempting to enter deeply into psychoanalytical discourses, I will use the term “phallus” as a symbolic signifier of gender preeminence and control over the Other. Marina S. Brownlee used the concept to explain the sexual symbolism of the “tower” in which Mirabella was confined by her father: the tower “is an emblem of Mirabella’s imprisonment by her father’s architectural, metaphorical phallus” (200). Deyermond points out that Flores’ spatial description lacks specificity, and that Mirabella’s prison may not actually be a tower. Hence, if the tower is a phantom, “the phallus is a phantom” (Walde Moheno 65). The “phallic gaze,” then, represents an active desire to dominate and penetrate the object it beholds. Besides the phallic*ity* of the gaze, the phallus’ symbol will be applied to the pillar to which the sadistic ladies tie Torrellas.

From a semiological standpoint, the scene of Torrellas’ mutilation is the most complex of *Grisel*. The great wealth of symbols has led critics to interpret it in a wide range of meanings that conflate in a dialectic manner. An accepted hypothesis is that it represents Flores’ criticism toward worldly love and the idealization of women (Deyermond 40). In 1913, Rudolph Schevill interpreted the scene as a “colorless imitation of the death of Orpheus” in Ovid’s *Metamorphosis*, XI, 1 (132). Deyermond proposes a reading based on the leitmotif of the Wild Man and the ritualistic death of Pentheus in Euripides’ *Bacchae* (30). The British
Hispanist also observes subverted religious motifs, which Brownlee identifies as two codified elements of Christological theology: Martyrdom and the Last Supper, asserting that “Torrellas is a love-martyr in malo” (207). As Brownlee asserts, Torrellas is a negative figure of the love-martyr, a character foil to Grisel’s sincere love-martyrdom. Through a similar anagogical process, Flores represents Torrellas as a hypostatic union “in malo.” Like Christ, Torrellas is disrobed and scourged for the sake of others. They both suffer physical and psychological torture. But unlike Christ, who embodied the highest ideals of spiritual purity and perfection, Torrellas is represented as a demon-like character, a symbolic merging of his humanity and the demonic. His death purports to be a warning to all (misogynist) men. Whereas Jesus’ words exuded love and saved lives and souls, Torrellas’ tongue oozes hatred and strives to bring about Mirabella’s (and women’s) death. Although he suffers pain and humiliation comparable to what Jesus experienced, Torrellas represents a Christ-like figure in malo.

Biblical references are prevalent in novelas sentimentales, particularly those allusions to Christ. Christ’s boundless grief and sacrificial death offered courtly poets and writers an apposite imagery to portray themselves and their characters as deeply wounded by unrequited love. Leriano’s self-sacrifice, in San Pedro’s Cárcel de amor, whose stoic death has been interpreted in Christological codes, embodies the Christ-like archetype. Although less evident, Torrellas’ sacrifice follows parallel processes. Medieval readers, as Whinnom notes, picked up on these literary cues: “Early readers may have looked for analogies no further afield than the literature of the Passion” (“Carmona” 213). Aware of his readers’ acuity with religious symbols, Flores may have known that an informed reader would make the association. In her study on sacro-profane hyperboles in fifteenth-century poetic texts, Dorothy S. Severin refers to Torrellas’ scatological dismemberment as “The Awful Last Supper” (182). Patricia Grieve, on the other hand, notes an “inversion of the communal banquet” (57), and making the exegetical connection between the ladies’ willingness to wear Torrellas’ relics, as we will see later, she compares Torrellas’ torture to those of Christian martyrs. These interpretations have contributed to the hermeneutics of Flores’ highly symbolic scene, but they have eschewed the preeminent role that visual codes play in the articulation of hierarchical relations of power both mediated and established through the female gaze. This study, then, aims at filling this epistemological gap by offering an analysis of the ladies torturing of Torrellas through the lens of the phenomenology of optic theories and the reversal of the gendered male gaze, where I argue that the
usurpation of the male gaze and the feminization of Torrellas highlights the instability of gender roles in Flores’ narrative. Interpreting Torrellas’ fatality, Jorge Checa argues that the queen and her ladies sought to obliterate Torrellas’ memory from the face of the earth. Along with this mnemonic obliteration, they also seek to efface all symbols of his masculinity by mutilating and emasculating him.

Before examining the anagogical symbolism in Torrellas’ “martyrdom,” it is necessary to establish a theoretical framework. Influenced by Freud and Lacan’s psychoanalytical studies on scopophilia and the gaze, Laura Mulvey develops a cinematographic theory of the “active” male gaze and its relation to its “passive” and sexualized female object. Mulvey delineates an asymmetric association between the woman as an icon “displayed [on the screen] for the gaze and enjoyment of men” (21). Whereas female characters were objectivized and fetishized as mere sexual symbols displayed to be consumed and controlled by the male gaze, men were active agents. Men wielded both power and the gaze. Since women were not allowed to look, men exerted power and control through their active male glance. Following Freud, Mulvey argues that if taken to the extreme, male voyeuristic drives could evolve into a sexual perversion (17-19). For Mulvey, scopophilia and sadism are symbiotic terms dovetailed by the desire to objectivize the Other: “This sadistic side [of scopophilic pleasure] fits in well with narrative. Sadism demands a story, depends on making something happen, forcing a change in another person, a battle of will and strength, victory/defeat, all occurring in a linear time with a beginning and an end” (22). Sadistic voyeurism is asserted “by the devaluation of women, manifested in fantasies of punishing (or saving) them” (Caviness 26). All of these elements delineated by Mulvey are present in Flores’ final scene. Torrellas’ body becomes the locus of a love-hate violence that seeks to elicit change in gender discourses. The ladies’ act attempts to undermine oppressive patriarchal systems of values that enable misogyny. Their “battle,” then, is not against an individual (Torrellas). Rather, it is against male-made institutions that allow men to be “alcaldes y parte” (78). Torrellas is a mere scapegoat that will serve as a warning to those who oppress and slander women. The sadistic satisfaction the ladies derive from looking and touching his naked body represents an important component on their overarching goal of overhauling the oppressive patriarchal system that abuses and kills women.

In Flores’ Grisel y Mirabella, gender anxieties regarding the female gaze play a preeminent role in the interaction between male and female characters. And Torrellas’ cannibalistic “martyrdom” unfolds those deep-
rooted concerns regarding the dangers of the female gaze. Because they are uninhibited by male intrusion during the mutilation, women invert the power relations, thus usurping the male gaze by means of objectifying and feminizing Torrellas, who is the only symbol of manhood within that spatial economy. Garb notes a similar process in her analysis of the unrestrained gaze of the women studying male models who were pretending to be blind: "It is through a woman's usurpation of a culturally forbidden look that the gaze, which embodies power and polices vision, is momentarily threatened" (Caviness 19). In Torrellas' scene, therefore, the queen and her ladies temporarily usurp the male gaze in order to overhaul and suspend the patriarchal order represented by the arch-misogynist poet. Flores reverses the roles of the binomials male/active, female/passive and male/controlling, female/controlled, which was a tacit sociocultural norm in the Spanish Middle Ages.

The pinning of Torrellas' hands and feet onto a pillar offers the reader anagogical echoes of Biblical accounts of Roman soldiers scourging and mocking Jesus before the crucifixion. Matthew 27: 27-31 portrays a vivid image of Jesus' scornful humiliation, enhanced by the tautological emphasis on his disrobing ("exuentes eum" and "exuerunt eum"). In a fifteenth-century pictorial depiction of the tormenting scene, included in a Book of Hours (Burke, Desire Against 66), the resemblance between Jesus being pinned to a pillar surrounded by tormenting Roman soldiers and Flores' representation of Torrellas is revealing. We cannot prove that Flores was inspired by this (or by any other) sacred depiction, but the reader can note how Flores redeploy religious imagery to heighten the dramatic effect of his final scene. It was not uncommon for writers to draw inspiration from religious representations. Commenting upon Flores' Grimalte y Gradissa -- Grimalte ends with a scene in which Fiometa, who committed suicide after her lover Pánfilo abandoned her, is punished by demons --, Pamela Waley argues that Flores uses images from religious paintings to describe Fiometa's harrowing punishments in hell (xli). If Waley is right, it is likely that Flores also draws from sacred portraits to contrive the last scene of Grisel.

Jesus and Torrellas' torture while pinned to a pillar is not the only textual analogy. During her first intervention in the infamous debate, Brazaida had already used a simile to equate Jesus' crucifixion and redemption of mankind to Torrellas' ironic and prophetic death: "Y como Dios [Christ] padesció por los buenos, vos venistes a padecer y pagar por los malos" (70). Despite the buenos-malos dichotomy, Brazaida posits Christ's Passion and Torrellas' sacrifice in the same plane of anagogical significations. The polarity of the two terms could be interpreted as Christ
and Torrellas being (demonic) doubles because whereas Jesus died to save mankind, Torrellas dies to atone for the misogynists (Núñez Rivera 137). This antithetic parallelism is a deliberate connection to Jesus. Brazaida refers to Torrellas’ death, but his life, as Brazaida knows, is not at stake in the trial. It is Grisel’s (or Mirabella’s) life that is at stake. Brazaida’s foretelling of Torrellas’ sacrificial passion and redemptive death represents an authorial transgression upon his diegetic world, and it merely serves the function of prolepsis for Torrellas’ own patio.

After the angry mob of courtly ladies besieges Torrellas, he is fastened to a pillar. The reader is not informed of the illumination in the room, but since the scene takes place during (and through) the night, we can imagine a dark room, possibly illuminated by candlelight, which would render it macabre and demonic. We do not know the layout of the room either, but we are told that it has at least one pillar, to which Torrellas is bound. There is also a banquet table, on which maidservants arrange a variety of foods, which Torrellas can see but cannot taste or touch. Within that spatial context, Torrellas has become food and observer of the women watching and eating him. The ladies’ methodical procedures show the premeditated perversion of their actions. They cover Torrellas’ mouth – the most visible symbol of discourse and the consumption of nourishment –, but they leave his eyes open so he can witness and apprehend visually every move and touch performed upon him. As Mikhail Bakhtin notes in Rabelais and His World, verbal discourse constitutes an inherent element of communal banquets (283), but Torrellas cannot actively participate in the dialectic banquet either. He is an unheeded invitee to his own feast; he is, in Tirso de Molina’s words, a convidado de piedra (stone guest), who can see but not touch, eat or speak. He is a non-present presence who exists in time and space but merely as a passive object being acted upon. After he has observed every move, every bite and every gaze of their sadistic violence, the ladies take a moment to have supper:

Estando así medio muerto, por crecer más pena en su pena, no lo quisieron de una vez matar; porque las crudas y fieras llagas se le resfriasen y otras de nuevo viniesen; y después que fueron así cansadas de atormentarle, de gran reposo la Reina y sus damas a cenar se fueron allí cerca dél porque las viese. (93)

Flores, as we can see throughout the novel, is a master of tragic irony. This banquet scene, in which his flesh will constitute the daintiest delicacy, harks back to the welcoming banquets with which the noblemen receive the poet and the “grandes fiestas a Brazaida que ellas, por sí, fueron dignas de escripturas memoradas” (64). In her study of vision and the grotesque
in *Libro de Buen Amor*, Louise M. Haywood points out the inextricability of memory and sight (*Sex, Scandal* 8). *Species* from the viewed objects carry an imprint of the original into the viewers' eyes, which are called “first intentions,” and through a complex process, these *species* of the original object pass from the eyes into the mind, which then are placed in memory as “second intentions” (*Burke, Vision* 29). The ladies, then, possess “memorias” of Torrellas that insinuate an active knowledge inscribed within their consciousness. Memory, Haywood notes, is also closely linked to the act of reading. Hence, the visual images and the images formed by active reading that the ladies have inscribed in their memories are informed by their love-hate obsession with Torrellas and their discerning reading of his poetic works. Through mnemonic means, the ladies have assimilated and incorporated distinctive images of Torrellas into their psyches that condition their affective responses in the presence of the poet before, during and after the torture. Since Torrellas has only lived a short period of time in Scotland, the ladies' collective memories of Torrella are (in)formed mainly (but not exclusively) by his own self-fashioning in his poetry and his infamous intervention in the debate against Brazaida, where “la Reina con infantas y damas y otras doncellas que, para ver y oír, fueron juntadas allí” (65).

The debate during the trial and Torrellas’ punishment present us with a disjunctive in female agency. Whereas in the debate the role of the ladies is merely symbolic, and their “ver y oír” was the extent of their active participation, during the torture scene, they are functional agents in the ritualistic ceremony. The “ver,” however, is an important component in both passages. During the trial, women are passive agents, but active viewers. Visually they are actants, but physically and dialectically, save for Brazaida, they are not. Even grammatically, they are passive. The narrator does not tell us that the women went to the trial. Rather, they were gathered (“fueron juntadas allí”). Female agency is reversed during the mutilating scene. Likewise, we can trace similar polarities between the welcoming banquets in honor of the misogynist and his death. The most salient contrast is related to his body. Whereas the welcoming banquets enlarged his body as he ingested the meat of the animals sacrificed to satisfy his pleasure, during his last supper the bodies of the voracious ladies expand at the expense of Torrellas’ body shrinking. Each bit of human flesh eaten by the ladies represents a gain for the *eater* and a loss for the *eaten*. The misogynist’s role inverts in relation to his welcoming receptions. He goes from being the (eater) subject of the feast to being the (eaten) object, from being the emitter of misogynist discourse to being the
passive object of vituperation by women. This role-inversion attests to the shift of gender agency overarching the entire novela.

The ladies situate Torrellas directly facing the banquet table with the firm intention of tormenting him by means of his own sight, which exhibits masochistic elements. In his analysis of the “Batalla de Don Carnal and Doña Cuaresma” in Libro de Buen Amor, Márquez Villanueva points out the sexual undercurrents of the dichotomy table-bed and the association between “comer-fornicar” (182). These elements that Márquez Villanueva notes in Juan Ruiz’s account and their sexual symbolism are essential in the mutilation scene. The reader should not disregard violence’s potentiality for sexual titillation and sadomasochism. According to Johan Galtung, sadomasochism is closely linked to the interplay between violence and sex. In the asymmetrical interaction of looks between the ladies and Torrellas, violence and pleasure can trace their etiology back to the very place and time where the complexity of gazes collide. This hypothesis helps us understand the linkage between Torrellas’ torture and his denudation, a sadomasochist element that Flores implies through erotic imagery but never overtly avows. Galtung asserts that during tortures, “both torturer and victim experience some sexual arousal, even without any explicitly sexual element in the torture” (42). The inclusion of two notable elements – food and the table – refers us to sexual metaphors, explicit in the seventeenth-century adaptation of Grisel into English drama, Swetnam the Women Hater. Weissberger also sees “sexual overtones of the punishment, which includes tying him naked to a stake” (Isabel Rules 182). Galtung adds that since sex and violence are (re)produced in neighboring areas of the brain, hangmen and their “clients” are reported to have erections (45). Since Torrellas has been deprived of his voice and his will, the reader never hears his voice or sees any signs that may indicate arousal. But the proximity of his nude body to the banquet table does suggest sexual excitement on the part of the queen and her ladies.

The queen and her ladies place Torrellas near the banquet table where they are having his last supper. They dine near him “porque las viese,” but the reader has to wonder why it is that the ladies want him to witness their feast, which features his own flesh. The word “martyr” comes from the Greek “μάρτυς” (mártys), which means “witness” (Bowersock 3). Saint Isidore of Seville defines its etymology: “Martyrs, called martyres, are called testes, witnesses, in Latin. Whence also testimonia, testimonies, are called martyría in Greek. They are testes because they sustained suffering for bearing witness, testimonium, about Christ. They struggled for truth, even unto death” (VII.10.5). A martyr, then, is one who witnesses and sustains suffering for the sake of salvation. The ladies coerce Torrellas into
being a martyr – in the etymological sense – of his own martyrdom, which, paradoxically, places him in a continuum of eternal punishment.

The narrator fetishizes Torrellas’ eyes by fixing the ladies’ and his reader’s attention to them, allowing us to see in his eyes the profound physical and psychological pain that he endures. By doing this, the reader’s voyeuristic gaze is forced to encounter the ladies’ sadistic pleasure through the spectral eyes of the courtly martyr, thus inviting us to feel pathos and to identify with him. But the narrator also compels us to see the naked body of Torrellas through the ladies’ usurped phallic gaze. Like the Roman ladies who went to the amphitheatres to see and to be seen (“Spectatum veniunt, veniunt spectentur ut ipsae” [Ovid, Ars amatoria I, 99]), the queen and her ladies long to see and to be seen by Torrellas. They want to watch him suffer, from which they derive sensual pleasure by observing both his penis and a priapic symbol on the pillar that binds him. Torrellas’ gaze vacillates between the salacious looks of the ladies and the meats that are being displayed and consumed on the banquet table. Critics have been puzzled by one dish that the ladies scornfully poured onto Torrellas’ maimed body after their supper: “Y después que fueron alzadas las mesas, fueron a dar amarga cena a Torrellas, y tanto fue de todas servido con potajes y aves y maestresala que no sé cómo escribir las diferencias de las injurias y ofensas que le hacía” (93). The “potajes y aves y maestresala” represent the only reference to the victuals displayed on the banquet table and consumed by the ladies. After the ladies had satiated their appetite, they hurl these scraps of food onto his lacerated body.

Whereas the consumption of “aves” has sexual implications, the word “maestresala” is ambiguous and problematic. Of course, it brings to mind the king’s steward (maestresala), the person who denounced the lovers’ sexual transgression. Emily C. Francomano proposes the “maestresala” dish as an insinuation of cannibalism, but if it alludes to anthropophagical practices, the “maestresala” has to have a deeper signification than a mere allusion to an anthropomorphic violence that overarches the entire scene. One hypothesis is that Flores is playing with literary conceits that only an inner circle would understand. Waley uses textual evidence to suggest that Pere Torrellas was still alive when Flores wrote Grisel (xi), and Charles V. Aubrun proposes that Flores was playing an inside joke on his friend Torrellas.9 Francomano points out that the historical Pere Torrellas served as a “maestresala” in the Neapolitan court. If the real Pere Torrellas was a “maestresala,” and the ladies throw the fictional misogynist a dish called “maestresala,” Flores might be alluding to a macabre double entendre that signifies that the ladies hurl pieces of his own flesh back at Torrellas, which he “ate”: “Fueron a dar amarga cena.” Did Torrellas eat his own flesh? The
“amarga cena” is metaphorical, rather than literal. Hence if the “maestresala” represents a masked reference to Pere Torrellas, the fictional misogynist is metaphorically eating himself.

Flores’ emphasis on visual topoi is preponderant throughout Grisel, and his use of optical descriptions in this complex interaction of gazes is informed by Flores’ fascination with making his characters experience their deaths through their own eyes. Torrellas’ dramatic gaze, observing the ladies eat his own body resembles Mirabella’s fixed look upon the fire, which will, like the ladies with Torrellas, consume her body. When Mirabella is before the flaming pyre, exposed in nightgown to the scopophilic gaze, the princess does not only see the fire. For most observers, when they look at the flames, they see flames. But when Mirabella looks at the pyre, she sees her own death: “Luego, por mandado del Rey, fue por fuerza quitada Mirabella de los brazos de su madre, la cual en una rica camisa despojaron para recibir la muerte, veyendo arder ante sí las encendidas llamas del fuego que la esperaban” (83). Death is both observed and experienced through ocular means (“veyendo arder ante sí”). Like Mirabella, Torrellas does not see food beautifully arranged on a banquet table. He literally sees his own death and his own flesh being consumed. When Bakhtin studies the symbolism of banquets in his analysis on Rabelais, he reiterates the importance of discourse (283), but vision plays a more preeminent role in communal banquets. Food and people are positioned within a preconceived hierarchical structure for aesthetic purposes, and the eyebeams touch the food and objects before any other sense. Bakhtin sees drinking and eating at banquets a manifestation of the grotesque body, and he argues that when men consume food, it signifies a victory of men over the world (285). When men eat worldly foods, they both eat and conquer the world. Regarding the ladies’ supper, the literal eating of Torrellas’ flesh symbolizes their ultimate victory over him and, by extension, over misogyny. Their bodies fatten as his wanes. As Torrellas literally sees the ladies ingest his own flesh, he is both observing and experiencing his physical loss. His body, as well as his mental perception of the physical world, vanishes at the same speed as his flesh disappears into the ladies’ mouths. The narrator avers that among the torturing tools, they used “tenazas ardiendo,” which signals the cooking of his flesh. Along with the image of roasting meat – associated with Saint Lawrence’s martyrdom in the Middle Ages (“Assum est,’ inquit, ‘versa et manduca”) –, the use of “tenazas ardiendo” (“atenacear”) represented one of the most painful and shameful deaths in medieval Spain.
The “Diccionario de Autoridades” defines the verb “atenacear” as an act of merciless carving of human flesh:

“Atenacear”: v.a. Sacar pedazos de carne á uno con tenázas ardiendo. Es género de muerte que se dá en castigo de delitos enormes y mui atróces, y de que usaron, y usan los infiéles contra los Christianos. Es formado de la partícula A, y del nombre Tenáza, por lo que algunos escriben Atenazar. (Diccionario de la lengua castellana 463)

We can see the parallels between Flores’ description and the Diccionario’s definition. Flores describes the “tenazas ardiendo” as an instrument capable of slicing flesh and cooking it, and the Diccionario defines the verb atenacear as carving of flesh with “tenázas ardiendo.” The Diccionario says that this was a form of punishment that “infiéles” applied to Christians. We should not think that Flores is equating the queen and her ladies to infidels and Torrellas to a Christian martyr. This form of torture, Laura Vivanco posits, was meted out in capital punishments, and it was applied to Juan de Cañamas after attempting to kill King Fernando in 1492. The chronicler narrates that after cutting Cañamas’ hand, with which he hit the king:

Con tenazas de hierro ardiendo le sacaron una teta, y después le sacaron un ojo, y después le cortaron la otra mano, y luego le sacaron el otro ojo, y luego la otra teta, y luego las narices, y todo el cuerpo le abocadaron los herreros con tenazas ardiendo, e fuéronle cortando los pies, y después que todos los miembros le fueron cortados, sacaronle el corazón por las espaldas y echaronlo fuera de la ciudad, lo apedrearon, e lo quemaron en fuego e aventaron la ceniza al viento. (Vivanco 78)

Minus the pillar and the ashes, the ladies follow a similar methodological process, but the ladies also use their nails and teeth to cut his flesh. Flores wrote his novela sentimental at least a decade before Cañamas’ execution, so, unless this scene was added later, he was likely not influenced by the chronicler’s graphic and grotesque descriptions. But beyond the use of burning tongs in capital punishments, “tenazas ardiendo” were also associated with martyrlogical narratives, such as that of Saint Agatha, which is the undercurrent in Flores’ representation of Torrellas’ torture.

Brownlee notes the importance of vision in Torrellas’ death, and she links his gaze with the enjoyment of the ladies: “The banquet takes place in close proximity to the mutilated Torrellas so that he can witness their enjoyment” (206). The “enjoyment” and “witnessing” that Brownlee perceives represent the most salient element in Torrellas’ martyrdom, but the enjoyment is a transgressive pleasure, a perverse enjoyment that
subverts social, cultural and religious conventions. As Caviness notes, women’s naked bodies being tortured were acceptably displayed in public and religious loci. Mutilated and naked male bodies were not displayed until the Renaissance (120). Torrellas’ nude and mutilated body – and the pleasure derived from it – represents an axiological aberrance that underscores an unavowed sexual perversion.

During her defense in the trial, Brazaida adduces the torture of Christian virgins for chastity’s sake. She takes this point further. Echoing Manrique, “dejemos a los Troyanos/ que sus males no los vinos,” Brazaida claims to have seen women being tortured in order to protect their chastity: “Dejemos las antiguas, de quien hoy sus famas viven, mas aun vivas, yo conozco alguna ver” (75; emphasis added). Brazaida, who is the only interfictional character in the novel and straddles past and present, fiction and history, seems to have inscribed in her memory martyrological images that she will redeploy in Torrellas’ death. During the trial, however, Torrellas objects to her argument of past (fictional) chaste women on the basis of disbelief. Torrellas is a visiocentric at heart: “Pues mayor fe daremos a lo que la vista nos certifica que a lo que oímos. Yo no sabría juzgar de virtudes pasadas que no vi, salvo de vicios presentes que agora veo” (75; emphasis added). The irony is that Torrellas will both see and experience martyrdom simultaneously in himself.

If the queen and her entourage are trying to stage a martyrdom, it is a reversed and subversive one. Though not always, in hagiographical narratives, the torturers are male and the victim is a female virgin. Weissberger argues that Flores intentionally inverts the sex roles as a ludic transgression of patriarchal authority (“Role-Reversal” 201). Regarding Torrellas’ feminization, Flores inverts the sex roles in order to decenter and undercut established patriarchal authorities. In Flores’ fictional works, sex roles are never fixed codes of signification, as critics also note when commenting on Fiometa’s sexual attitude toward Pánfilo (Cvitanovic 278). In Torrellas’ scene, the torturers are women and the victim is a man. (Torrellas is not any man. He is a Man, as Matulka and Pérez-Romero note, who stands metonymically for all men, the conqueror of vice: women). Flores exploits the idea of a redemptive scapegoat in his other novela sentimental, Triunfo de Amor, which stages a trial of Cupid for all the pain he has inflicted on unrequited lovers. After losing the trial, Cupid is condemned to the stake, and like Christ’s, his death will serve the purpose of redeeming all lovers (Triunfo 132). Both cases represent an inversion of axiological systems. Women sacrifice men in a ritualistic spectacle in order to purge men’s sins. Though not a god, Torrellas is perceived as a
preponderant male figure, given his role as the defender of man and male hegemony.

The ladies see Torrellas as an infected limb of the social fabric, one that ought to be extirpated to avoid contagion of the social body. But even if he is viewed as a contaminated member of the community, his execution still represents a sexual perversion. Like Torrellas, Mirabella was perceived as an infected member of the social fabric due to her sexual transgression, and she was not stripped completely naked. Torrellas’ nakedness takes us to other dimensions of hermeneutics and gender violence. Indeed, Torrellas’ nudity represents an act of sedition and deviance from the ladies because noble ladies were not supposed to look (Caviness 19), and Lot’s wife embodies the fatal consequences of the transgressive female gaze. Torrellas’ naked body pinned to the priapic pillar, with his bare buttocks attached to it and his penis toward the ladies (they placed him facing them “porque las viese”) straddles visual and symbolic rape: “Una violación llevada al límite” (Checa 377). Checa’s observation, later echoed by Robert Folger (101), harks back to the scopophilic pleasure and the phallic gaze that penetrates, dominates and possesses. Torrellas is not physically “raped,” but he is violated through the sadistic usurpation of the male gaze, which castrates him and feminizes his naked body, subjecting him to the power of the ladies’ phallic gaze. The ladies’ haptic gaze penetrates the unmanned victim through the orifice of his eyes, a symbol of his foisted metaphoric vagina.

In commenting on the torturing episode, Rodríguez Puértolas referred to Torrellas’ orgiastic murder as a “sádica venganza” (21). As Rodríguez Puértolas and Lacarra (“Sobre” 36) point out, sadism is the overtone pervading the entire “martyrdom.” Looking at another as an object for erotic satisfaction represents a sexual perversion. Freud (and later critics of visual epistemology) demarcated scopophilic perversion as an act of deriving pleasure from looking. In other words, looking (like touching) to enhance desire, then moving to the sexual act was an acceptable form of seeing. But when the pleasure hinged solely on the act of looking, then it was considered to be a perversion. The ladies’ act constitutes a sexual perversion because, as Brownlee noted, they derive their pleasure by the sheer act of gazing, and it is the interplay between violence and their pleasure that renders their action both sadistic and aberrant.

In Torrellas’ execution, the macabre and the sexual interact and repel each other. As Cvitanovic notes, this mutilation “revela esa delectación por lo macabro” (204), which is in full display in Fiometa’s hellish punishment at the end of Flores’ other novela sentimental, Grimalte. However, unlike the scene represented in Fiometa’s horrific punishment, the macabre in
Torrellas’ torment provokes a different psychoaffective perception in the viewers. Torrellas’ patio is a type of morbidity that seems to elicit erotic pleasure and a sense of cathartic relief for punishing the man they blame for Mirabella’s death. As the Auctor asserted in the first sentence of the torture scene, the ladies find sundry ways to torment their victim. They inflict as much pain when they gaze at his naked body as when they bite and pierce him. As Tertullian notes: “Seeing and being seen belong to the self-same lust ... every public exposure of a virgin is [to her] a suffering rape” (Easton 98). Easton adds that “for female martyrs involuntary nudity was a humiliating and painful part of the torture” (99). Feeling exposed and objectivized by the Other’s piercing gaze represents an integral part of torture. Their gaze hurts Torrellas as much as their burning tongs, nails and teeth. Their eyes become another piercing instrument of torture.

As the ladies eat, they gaze at him in order to exert their dominance over him. They simultaneously see him and speak, both of which are essential elements of communal banquets: “Y allí platicando las maldades dél y trayendo a la memoria sus maliciosas obras, cada una decía a la Reina que no les parecía que cuantas muertes a aquel mal hombre se pudiesen dar, porque pasasen largos años, no cumpliría aunque cada noche de aquellas penas hiciese” (93). The ladies are talking amongst themselves, but they situate themselves within the same choric visual field as him. They place his disembodied eyes in a strategic place where he can see them, but the more plausible interpretation is that they position him within their field of vision in order for them to penetrate him with their visual “phallus.”

“Muerte” is amply noted as a euphemism for “orgasm” in Cancionero poetry, and the multiplicity of “muertes” that the ladies want to apply “cada noche” underscores the suppressed sexuality of the orgy as well as the female sexual capacity for multiple orgasms. Brazaida and the queen in particular, avid readers of the Catalan poet, exhibit traits of mimetic desire, which is the matrix of death and violence in Grisel. Brazaida and the queen, however, desire Torrellas for egotistical reasons. Brazaida’s desire stems both from Torrellas’ poetry and from his erotic letter, which have elicited sexual desire that she suppresses through discursive misandry and violent drives. For the queen, Torrellas represents an eroticized scapegoat for the death of her daughter and a sexual surrogate for her old husband, who is the real culprit of Mirabella’s death. The queen and her ladies are merely scapegoating Torrellas, sacrificing him in order to placate both their fury and alleviating social unrest. Torrellas is a man, like Christ, who represents all men and who will die as a surrogate victim to re-establish social order: The ladies’ “rage is essentially against the whole male gender” (Pérez-
In Swetnam, the recast of Flores’ *Grisel*, the character who plays the role of Torrellas, Misogynos (Joseph Swetnam), makes the connection clearer. After defeating Atlanta (Brazaida) in the trial, Misogynos adopts a Christ-like discourse, arguing that he represents all men in the world: “I speake not for my self, in my owne quarrels/ But the generall good of all men in the world” (Act III).

The act of active watching during extreme physical punishment is paramount in Flores’ narrative. Flores and his characters understand the power of vision and the control exerted through it. After the *combat de générositet*, where the king imposes his dominant gaze upon the tortured couple, the narrator describes another gaze beneath the powerful gaze of the king. Mirabella is seeing Grisel being tortured: “Y así como aquella doncella via atormentar a su amante, con muchas lágrimas de gran piedad, comienza a decir” (61). The text says Mirabella *viá* (was watching) Grisel’s body being tormented, but she also saw her father looking at them. There is a complex interaction between looks that evokes a given sentiment in each participant in the act of seeing and being seen. The king’s overpowering look expects to wring a confession out of the lovers. Grisel’s look is represented as passive and stoic, withstanding the sacrificial blows. Mirabella’s eyes, however, are fixed upon Grisel and possibly upon the torturers. Her pitiful gaze impels her to speak and to act. The interaction of gazes in Torrellas’ scene is simplified because the queen and her ladies are fused into one. Despite the multiplicity of looks centering upon Torrellas’ body, there is a simple exchange of looks between Torrellas and an amorphous group of rapt ladies – which Girard associates with monstrous doubling after the loss of all differences –, lusting after his disembodied eyes. Mirabella’s “desonesto mirar” (60), which caused the death of the knights in the kingdom, could be applied to the titillating gaze of the ladies fixed upon Torrellas’ naked body.

Torrellas’ mutilation presents us with a dovetailing of erotic and martyrological symbols. In examining Saint Agatha’s martyrdom through the lens of visual economies, Easton points out the voyeuristic elements of her death, both within the diegetic representations and the extradiegetic voyeurs of the paintings. Alluding to a pictorial representation of Saint Agatha, where the rejected lover, Quintianus, gazes attentively upon her seminude body, Easton asserts: “The scene is perhaps sadistically titillating to him; Agatha has rejected him sexually, and therefore he tortures her by focusing on her most visible symbol of sexuality” (97). In Torrellas’ scene, the gender role is subverted and reversed. Torrellas becomes the emasculated victim of the women’s phallic gaze. In essence, it stages an inverted paradox: women go from being oppressed by a male-made social
system to incarnating the very oppressive system they try to obliterate. The paradox of their action, however, is that in their scene, women do not dominate a man. Instead, masculinized-phallic ladies cruciate and deface a feminized symbol of a naked (wo)man. Folger notes the feminization of Torrellas, stating that his patio “amounts to nothing less than the systematic annihilation of the male subject” through the “scornful female gazes” (101).

In Mexican paremiology, there is an expression that stems from the daintiness of attractive people and the sexuality of vision. When an eye-catching woman (or man) passes by and the voyeuristic man gawks upon her, it is said: “Se la está comiendo con los ojos” (literally, he is eating her with his eyes). This expression, of course, plays upon the Aristotelian theory of intromission, which posits the idea that the gazer’s eyes literally introject the objects in a kind of inverted pyramid. A. C. Spearing explores the cannibalistic aspect of vision, asserting, in a description that could be applied to the queen and her ladies’ insatiable looks: “Their cannibalism brings out the voracious nature of the looks they direct upon her ‘dainty flesh’; they literally wish to devour her, and ‘Some with their eyes the daintiest morsels chose’” (45). Alluding to the passionate fire that turns into the sacrificial pyre in which Mirabella was to be burned, Grieve and Deyermond note the conversion of image into reality. This represents another conversion from image to reality. The ladies’ eyes intromissively eat Torrellas’ body as they look at him.

After tormenting him until dawn with scornful words, haptic sight and vicious deeds, Torrellas’ fleshless body is incinerated: “Y después que no dejaron ninguna carne en los huesos, fueron quemados; de su ceniza, guardando cada cual una bujeta por reliquias de su enemigo; y algunas hobo que por joyel [cultre] en el cuello lo traían, porque trayendo más a su memoria su venganza, mayor placer hobiesen” (93). The most obvious association with optics is the night’s darkness. The ritualistic death takes place throughout the night. Nighttime and darkness are also associated with evil spirits, crime and witchcraft (Walde Moheno, Amor 238-243; Grieve 65-66). Some critics have linked this mutilation with the Witches’ Sabbath and demonic rites. Another accepted hypothesis, which is closer to vision, is that Torrellas’ anthropophagic dismemberment evokes the scene of Mirabella being eaten by the lions, which the queen and her ladies witnessed (86). And this act of seeing Mirabella’s death allows the queen and her female entourage to devise a murder that would resemble Mirabella’s, which would make Torrellas’ torn and eaten flesh by the lion-like ladies an example of Dantean contrapasso or: “The poetry of Dante put into laws” (Foucault 34). Commenting upon Torrellas’ murder, critics
note the combination of Grisel’s and Mirabella’s death into Torrellas’. The ladies lacerate his body like the lions do to Mirabella’s and cremate his remains like the pyre reduces Grisel to ashes (Folger 100). The bottom of the night, as Northrop Frye notes, is also evocative of a “cannibal feast, serving up of a child or lover as food” (Cull 419). Frye’s observation of the serving of the lover as victual, together with the narrator’s assertion that the ladies carry Torrellas’ ashes for the sake of “mayor placer,” only reinforce the sadistic aspect of his death and the ladies’ erotic repression.

After incinerating his remains, the narrator tells the reader that some ladies carried his ashes inside a “cultre” as a relic. The word “cultre,” however, was only used in the earlier editions of Grisel. Later editions change the word to “joyel” (jewelry box), which had more colloquial currency. The meaning of the word “cultre” has anagogical undertones. In commenting upon the ladies’ resolution to wear Torrellas’ ashes as a relic, Grieve makes the connection between Torrellas’ dismemberment and incineration to that of saints: “By the mention of the remains of Torrellas as a relic, this final scene takes the additional ironic parallel of a saint’s martyrdom” (66). This parallel that Grieve points out, however, represents only an additional element of the overarching imagery deployed by Flores to liken Torrellas’ torture to those of martyrs and Christ. Joseph Gwara showed that the word “cultre” (culter) was closely related to Christ’s Passion. Although he admits that his research is not conclusive, Gwara asserts: “Ruiz García, in fact, observes that a popular devotion associated with the Arma Christi... begins “Cultur qui circumcidiste sacrosanctam carnem Christi” (9). This devotional prayer, Gwara notes, was known through the Books of Hours. A Book of Hours, as we pointed out earlier, also includes a depiction of Christ’s scourging in ways that mirror that of Torrellas.

Torrellas’ ashes deposited in a religious container (“cultre”) to be seen on the ladies’ chest adds yet another visual element of martyrdom. Caviness notes that during the Middle Ages (martyrs’) tortures went beyond death, asserting that dismembered body parts of saints were placed in precious containers, and these human remains were re-encoded as signs (137). Hence, the display of Torrellas’ ashes in a religious-codified chest in order to be seen serves both as repellant to slanderers and as a symbol of their triumph over their enemy. The ladies carry it (him) “en el cuello” and “por reliquia” as remembrance (“por memoria”) and for “mayor placer” (93). Memory, as Burke and Haywood noted, is a mental mechanism enabled and enhanced through sight. The very act of retrieving a pleasant memory may produce even more pleasure than when the moment itself occurred. The disingenuous ladies, then, purposefully decide
to wear Torrellas’ ashes between their neck and their breasts, two of the most eroticized female body parts.

Visual perception of eroticism (or lack thereof) in religious representations became the subject of a scholarly debate between Leo Steinberg and Carline W. Bynum. Steinberg argued that pictorial depictions of Jesus’ genitalia were designed to depict his humanity through his sexuality. Bynum countered that Christ’s genitals were read as portending to the agony and sorrow of the Crucifixion. Although Flores encodes Torrellas’ torture in highly religious symbolism, Steinberg and Bynum’s debate does not resolve how medieval laymen perceived erotological zones. Bynum, however, states that like modern readers, medieval people would have likely perceived breasts and genitals as erotic (85). Caviness is more assertive in concluding that medieval men perceived female breasts as erotogenic and sexual.17 The queen and the ladies, then, display Torrellas’ remains in a religiously encoded “cultre,” and wear it/him on their necks and near their breasts. Although dead, Torrellas has tactile contact with erotogenic zones that, save for their husbands, no other man does. The ladies carry the relic (Torrellas) in a sensual place where both other people and they themselves have visual access. And it is this experience of touching and seeing that provokes “mayor placer” in the bearer. Since the pleasure is awoken through mnemonic means, the gratification is both enhanced and deferred. Their pleasure is a heightened form of enjoyment, which arose from the uroboric circularity of their looking at him look at them with erotic desire. In this last sentence, Flores deliberately uses sacro-profane terms in order to evoke titillation inside and outside the narrative in his (fe)male readership, including himself. Torrellas’ ashes are re-codified as an object both of (erotic) veneration and as symbol for power of women over men. Torrellas, like Lot’s wife, is turned into a visual thingness whose main punishment is to become the object of people’s (and our) gaze.

In conclusion, visual theories provide Flores’ contemporaneous readers with epistemological tools to interpret and understand Torrellas’ highly symbolic “martyrdom” by decoding the gendered gaze. The reversal of gender roles during his torture can be articulated through the functional dialectics of the “phallic” gaze. The ladies usurp and undermine the patriarchal gaze while unmanning Torrellas’ gaze, turning him into an object to be (ab)used and consumed. The gaze-reversal is symbolic but also factual. Symbolically, the misappropriated male gaze overpowers and penetrates Torrellas through the orifice of his eyes, effectively reconfiguring their eyes into instruments of torture. At the same time, they subvert patriarchal authorities by establishing a new hierarchical order.
through their dominating male gaze over the feminized Torrellas, who is introduced as “defensor y parte de los hombres” (63). Factually, the ladies adopt the role typically occupied by (ruthless) men, that of executioners of virgin martyrs. They eat him both through their mouths and their voracious eyes. In Grisel, Torrellas is both a man and a symbol. He is one man and all men; he is cast as a virgin-martyr and a virgin-lover; he is a slanderer of women and a courtly lover; in sum, Torrellas is a (wo)man castrated by and through the male-usurping gaze. It is his subdued and feminized gaze that gives the dramatic depth and tragedy to his doleful death by and under the furies’ sadistic glance.

Harvard University

NOTES

1 Juan de Flores, Grisel y Mirabella (92-3). All quotes come from this edition.
2 See the “Introducción” to Flores’ Grisel by Alcázar López and González Núñez.
3 For an analysis of the last scene in Flores’ Grisel and the myths of the deaths of Pentheo and Orpheus, see Crespo Martín 75-87. Crespo Martín argues that Torrellas’ sacrificial death has the double purpose of appeasing the rejected god (of desire), echoing the Bacchantes’ quartering of Pentheus, and of an act of rebellion against the misogynist code of courtly love.
4 During the debate between Torrellas and Brazaida, the latter maliciously compares all men to devils: “Y creo que los atormentadores del infierno no podrían más facer en su oficio que vosotros facéis en el vuestro” (69). The anonymous playwright of the seventeenth-century Swetnam the Women Hater, which is a recast of Flores’ Grisel y Mirabella, marshals that Swetnam [Torrellas] is a succubus: “[Queen] Aurelia: ‘Hast thou ne’er a Mother?’ Swash: ‘No, forsooth, he is a Succubus, begot/betwixt a Deuill and a Witch’ (Act III).
5 Later we will see a more apparent parallel between Jesus and Torrellas, but this idea of Torrellas being a scapegoat is explicitly mentioned multiple times in Flores’ Grisel. After Brazaida baits Torrellas with her courtly letter and just before the queen and her ladies attack him, Brazaida warns him: “Porque la muerte vuestra ponga a los tales castigo, la habemos buscado tan cruel a que yo en pensar vuestros tormentos me espanto” (92).
6 See for example Cristerno’s last words before dying: “Ysiana, en tus manos me encomiendo” (Brandenberger 342), which are similar to those Christ utters in the Cross: “Pater, in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum” (Luc. 23:46). For other parallels, see Whinnom (“Cardona, the Crucifixion” 207-213) and Severin (175-188).
7 See López González “Voyeurism and Shame.”
8 The anonymous author makes Misogynos’ servant, Swash, interpret the banquet as a preliminary act before the sexual act between his master Misogynos (Torrellas) and Atlanta/Lorenzo (Brazaida). After seeing the banquet table beautifully arranged, Swash provocatively tells his master that the food is “but prococitiue,/ To make you strong and lustie for the incounter” (Scene III).
9 Aubrun xlii: “Tout porte á croire que Juan de Flores a voulu monter une bonne farce á f’aní Torrellas.”
10 Brazaida forcefully confronts Torrellas: “Y si quisiese poner en ejemplo cuántas son muertas por la defensión de la limpie castidad, las historias son llenas de la su noble e inmortal memoria; pues como la muerte sea la más fuerte cosa de sofrir, quien aquella desprecia y quiere ante morir que ser caída en torpeza, bien menospreciará a todas otras tentaciones por fuertes que sean” (74).
11 See Rohland de Langbehn 125-144.
12 Barbara Matulka, who is one the first critics of Flores’ novelas sentimentales to propose the thesis of Grisel’s feminism, notes that Torrellas was killed by the ladies because “he was the archenemy of all womankind” (158) while Pérez-Romero avers: “such cruelty is also evident in the killing of Torrellas, a major character representing all men” (72).
13 As we read in San Pedro’s Cárcel de amor, mudslingers like Persio and misogynists like Tefeo have the power to undermine social and political structures and bring about political unrest and destruction. Torrellas plays a similar role in Grisel. During the trial, Brazaida accuses both slanderers and misogynists – surely she refers to the likes of Torrellas – of representing a looming threat to the sociopolitical and cultural systems, male-made systems that place a great onus on the chastity and honorability of noble ladies, such as Mirabella. Brazaida marshals: “Y muchas veces, por temor de vuestras lenguas y difamias, complimos vuestros deseos y más queremos errar secreto … que ser publicadas por malas aunque no lo seamos” (72).
14 Cf. Laura Mulvey: “There are circumstances in which looking itself is a source of pleasure, just as, in the reverse formation, there is pleasure in being looked at” (16-17).
15 In Alcázar López and González Núñez’s edition, they use the word “joyel,” but Matulka’s and later Gwara’s edition employ the word “cultre.” For the purpose of this study, I will use Matulka’s and Gwara’s word “cultre,” which was Flores’ first choice, as it appeared in the first editions of Grisel.
16 In this instance the reader can see another example of tragic irony, for during the staged trial, trying to reduce women to bare animality by comparing him to animals, Torrellas had likened them to wolves: “Y por esto, como ya otras
veces dije en alguna obra mía, sois lobas en escoger" (77), and "en comer," he could have added. Grieve, Checa, Weissberger, Brownlee and Walde Moheno have noted the symmetry between the lions that eat Mirabella and the women who eat Torrellas.

17 Caviness: “Despite clerical attempts to form cultural attitudes to breasts that repressed sensuality, displacing it with ideas of nourishment, it seems clear that adult medieval people, in common with ancients and moderns, had a powerful sexual response to female breasts” (98).
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