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General Works:

1 Since this work brings together both the sources and the bibliography relevant to the principal Spanish biblical writers of the 16th century, we shall make reference to it in the different sections of this article in order to avoid unnecessary repetition. On occasion, we cite works in the Bibelkommentare where we feel the information is of especial value.
1. THE EARLY HUMANIST INTERPRETERS.

Sources and Studies: K. Reinhardt - H. Santiago-Otero, Biblioteca bíblica ibérica medieval (Madrid: CSIC 1986) 240-249 (Pablo de Burgos); 64-79 (Fernández de Madrigal); 213-219 (Juan de Torquemada); 172-179 (Pérez de Valencia).


The humanist interpretation of the Scriptures in Spain brought together two specific phenomena which were to determine both the content and the form: the Christian coexistence in the Middle Ages with the Jewish communities and the contribution of the ‘conversos’ (converts), who gave access to the interpretations of the Spanish Rabbis, in particular Mosé Maimónides, Abraham ibn Ezra and Mosé Nahmánides2 as well as the Rabbinic Bibles of Felix Pratensis (1517) and Jacob Ben Hayim (1525). At another level, several translations from the original Hebrew and Latin into the vernacular Castillian, Catalan and Valencian, appeared in the Iberian Peninsula at a very early period. The best example of both phenomena is to be found in the work known as the Biblia de Alba translated from the Hebrew

---

to Castillian by Mosés Arragel de Guadalajara (1422-1433?)\(^3\). However, it is not until the 16th century that the interpretation of the Scriptures in Spain will have recourse to the original languages. That said, there are a few authors in the previous century who attempt an approach to the original texts and as such can be considered as precursors of Humanism.

- Pablo de Burgos or de Santamaría, a name he adopted after his conversion to Christianity (ca. 1355-1435), came from a noble Jewish family from Burgos. In his *Additiones ad postillam Nicolai de Lira* (1429-1431), he tried to get close to the *hebraica veritas*. The work comprises one thousand one hundred glosses, of different lengths, on passages from the Old Testament and reached such renown that the *Postillae* of Nicolás de Lira\(^4\) were scarcely reprinted without the *Additiones* of Pablo de Burgos. He agreed with the use that Nicolás de Lira had made of the Jewish exegesis to arrive at a literal interpretation of the Bible in the Christian sense. Pablo de Burgos was to take this method to its limit since his knowledge of Hebrew and Rabbinic writings were far superior to those of the author of the *Postillae*. In his *Scrutinium scripturarum contra perfidiam iudaicorum* (1434) he presents, in the form of a dialogue, the truths of the Christian faith, based on the literal sense of the Scriptures and with reference to the Talmud and other Jewish sources.

- Alfonso Fernández de Madrigal (1410-1455), also called the Tostado, was probably the most prolific of the Spanish interpreters in the 15th century. His works, which included the *Postillae* to the historical books of the Old Testament and the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, took up thirteen volumes in folio in the *editio princeps*; he was not, however, able to

\(^3\) Cf. M. Morreale, "Vernacular Scriptures in Spain".

\(^4\) Cf. chapter 2 of this volume.
complete his task of glossing the whole (!) Bible. Despite his scholastic ties to the four senses of the Scriptures (the literal, the allegorical, the moral and the anagogic), he showed a leaning towards the literal interpretation, considering that it was the only immediate sense of the holy books without, however, neglecting the spiritual and metaphoric meanings. He distinguished, as Nicolás de Lira did, a double literal meaning in the prophecies: that coeval to the writings themselves and that applicable to the New Testament which could only be experienced on the basis of the faith in Jesus Christ. His Postillae were considered to be the response of Spanish exegesis to the works of Nicolás de Lira.

- Juan de Torquemada (ca. 1388-1468), in his *Expositio brevis et utilis super toto psalterio* (1463), followed the traditional exegesis gathering together quotations from the Fathers, in the style of the *catenae*, and applied the meaning of the Psalms to Christ and to the Church.

- Jaime Pérez de Valencia (ca. 1408-1490) attempted to renew biblical exegesis, as is apparent in his most important work: *Commentum in psalmos David* (Centum et quinquaginta psalmi davidici cum...expositione), which was completed around 1478 and was so successful that thirty-two editions were printed in the 16th century. The introduction to this commentary constituted a synthesis of medieval biblical hermeneutics. His starting point were the four senses of the Scriptures, but he concentrated mainly on the literal as well as the spiritual or allegorical, thus acting as a forerunner for the model of interpretation to be used later by the humanists such as Erasmus of Rotterdam and Lefèvre d'Étaples. Although he used his knowledge of Jewish exegesis (albeit to a lesser extent than Pablo de Burgos or Alfonso de Madrigal) he had to justify his Christian interpretation of the Psalms in his *Tractatus contra iudaeos*. To go beyond the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament he had to have recourse to the allegorical sense following the
Christological exegesis of the Psalms based on the Patristic tradition.

With all justification we can talk of the Early Humanist Interpreters. These authors used a much greater knowledge of the Hebrew language and Rabbinic exegesis than did Nicolás de Lira, and without their legacy the 16th century in Spain would not have reached such brilliant heights of biblical science.

2. THE SPANISH SIXTEENTH CENTURY: HERMENEUTICS AND PHILOLOGY

The major themes at the centre of biblical debate in the 16th century were the following: one was philological --the search for the authentic text of the Scriptures, given that there were discrepancies in the Hebrew and Greek texts as well as in the Latin of the Vulgate; the accuracy of the different versions in relation to the original; the value of the Vulgate itself as a translation and the authority of Jerome as a translator--; another was hermeneutic --the plurality of the meanings of the Scriptures and their hierarchy for the practice of exegesis--.

Interest in the first, brought about the philological renaissance, the study of the original languages and a return to the sources, and found its most important exponent in the Polyglot Bibles. The response to the second, led to the introductions and annotations or keys to the reading of the Holy Scriptures.

2.1 Introductions to the Scriptures

Sources and Studies: K. Reinhardt, Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700) I-II (Madrid: CSIC, 1990 and 1999); I, 68-72 (Pedro Antonio Beuter); II 51-55 (Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra).

The introductions to the Scriptures had a long history in the Christian tradition, dating back to the Liber Regularum Tyconii (380 CE). During the 16th century in Spain several books
in this vein were edited: in 1546 Francisco Ruiz published Regulae intelligendi Scripturas sacras; a Praeludia in universam Sacram doctrinam et Scripturam⁵ is attributed to Pedro Irurrozqui; Ignacio Fermín de Ibero, first editor of Cipriano de la Huerga, makes reference the lost work of this author, Isagogue in totam divinam scripturam⁶. We shall concentrate here on just two of the most important introductions in chronological order of their publication: those of Pedro Antonio Beuter and Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra.

- Pedro Antonio Beuter (1490/95- ca. 1555) published his Annotationes decem in Sacram Scripturam⁷ in Valencia in 1547. In the hermeneutic tradition of Jaime Pérez de Valencia, he approached the principal themes of biblical introduction on a philological level, and defended the recourse to the original Hebrew and Greek when the Latin text presented certain doubts. He distinguished three senses of the Scriptures: the literal, the mystical and the allegorical, although he maintained that the latter was not always to be followed systematically. The principal issues in his Annotationes are: the order of the books in the church and the synagogue; the canonical and apocryphal books; lost books; authorship and chronology; the various meanings of the Scriptures and keys for their comprehension; the principal translations of the Bible and in particular that of St


⁶ Cipriano de la Huerga. Obras completas. VI. I (León: Universidad de León 1990) 106.

Jerome. For each treatise he adduces the testimonies of the Holy Fathers, of councils, ancient and modern authors; the name of Erasmus takes pride of place together with those of Pico de la Mirándola and Cardenal Cisneros— one of the few references of the age to the Polyglot of Alcalá which passed virtually unnoticed by the theologians of the time—. He also cites Alfonso de Zamora, whose legacy was to have a very strong influence on the later Spanish Hebrew scholars⁸, and also J. Reuchlin with whom he shared the cabalistic Christian interpretation.

- Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra (1518-1579) published his work *Libri decem hypotyposeon theologicarum, sive regularum ad intelligendum scripturas divinas*⁹ in 1565, one year before Sixto de Siena was to edit his *Bibliotheca Sancta*, and two years before Matías Flacius Illiricus was to publish his *Clavis Scripturae Sacrae*. The first part of the *Libri decem* comprises eight books and is a systematic reflection on biblical and extra-biblical texts: reasons for the obscure nature of the Scriptures, literary figures, the benefits of the knowledge of ancient languages, the importance of geography, history and the humanities, names of God, symbolyc and allegorical theology, the Psalms, the figures of prophetic language and hebraisms. In the second part (books IX and X) he sets out one hundred rules to help theologians to interpret the Bible. The *Index* of sacred and profane writers, which appears at the beginning of the book, is a proof of the erudition of this Hebrew scholar from Salamanca.

The work was denounced to the Inquisition¹⁰ and placed on the


¹⁰ M. de la Pinta Llorente, *Proceso criminal contra el*
index of prohibited books in 1583. The passages censured by the Inquisition had already been removed from the second edition (1582), these were texts concerning Christology, angelology, anthropology, certain discrepancies with the doctrines of St Thomas and the attacks on the scholastics and the dialecticals. This probably explains why the work of Sixto de Siena reached further into the catholic field. The Libri decem of Cantalapiedra was not reedited until 1771.

2.2 Philological Exegesis

Sources and Studies: Cf. K. Reinhardt, *Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700)* I-II (Madrid: CSIC, 1990-1999); I, 214-217 (Huerga); I, 193-194 (Grajal); I, 243-261 (Luis de León); I, 29-42 (Arias Montano).

From the middle of the 15th century Lorenzo Valla\footnote{In *Novum Testamentum ex diversorum utriusque linguae codicum collatione adnotationes* (1449?); cf. chapter 7 of this volume.} began to attack the New Testament text of the Vulgate which had been adopted by the Church as a *textus receptus*. The proliferation of medieval bibles including glosses, historical and moralising annotations, became so monotonous that it pushed the 16th century humanists to propose a return to the original sources. Valla's attacks were followed by those of Erasmus\footnote{Cf. chapter 8 of this volume.}. The major innovation in his bilingual edition of the New Testament (1516) was his new translation of the Greek text into Latin. Any innovation in the canonical terminology used by ecclesiastics during a millenium, any attempt to replace the translation of the Vulgate by a new version, became not only a theological problem but also a political trouble which threatened the very hebraísta salmantino Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra (Madrid: CSIC 1946).
basis of society\textsuperscript{13}. In Spain, Pedro Martínez de Osma (ca. 1430-1480) had already begun a correction of the text of the Vulgate based on codices in the Cathedral of Salamanca. We also know that the main reason for Nebrija being removed from the project of the Polyglot of Alcalá was his discrepancies with Cardenal Cisneros over the critical treatment with regard to the Latin version.

The return to the original sources began, in Spain, with the founding of the Trilingual College of St Idelfonso (University of Alcalá), the creation of Chairs of Biblical Studies in the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá\textsuperscript{14} and, its most important manifestation, the publication, in the same century, of two Polyglot Bibles, the Complutensian (1514-1517) and the Regia or Antwerp Polyglot (1569-1573)\textsuperscript{15}.

It must be stressed here, that, apart from the philological importance and the interest in the text of the Polyglots, the preliminary works demanded a great deal of effort at the level of interpretation; the prologues --which affect both the form and the content of the work--, the interlinear translations, the grammars, the lexica and the treatises which complement them\textsuperscript{16}.


\textsuperscript{14} V. Beltrán de Heredia, «Catedráticos de Sagrada Escritura en la Universidad de Alcalá durante el siglo XVI», Ciencia Tomista 18 (1918) 140-155; 19 (1919) 45-55; 144-156; J. Juan García, Los estudios bíblicos en el siglo de oro de la universidad salmantina (Salamanca 1921).

\textsuperscript{15} For further comments on the history and content of these Polyglots refer to the article by A. Schenker in this volume.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. A. Sáenz-Badillos, La Filologia bíblica en los primeros helenistas de Alcalá (Estella 1990); ---, Anejo a la
Moreover, these Polyglots were not a mere elitist display of knowledge of the sources, or a superb demonstration of typography, there existed a definite pedagogical objective in making known the original texts, making them understandable with interlinear Latin translations, the aforementioned grammars and lexica and notes in the margins of the originals showing the Hebrew roots.

As for the plurality in the senses of the biblical text, there was also a change in the hermeneutics. Compared to the four classical senses of medieval exegesis (the literal, the allegorical, the moral and the anagogic\(^17\)), followed by the theologians, in the Renaissance the literal sense, that of the philologists, was preferred.

The humanists were especially critical of the exaggerated use of the allegory. In the words of Erasmus: «Can you imagine their [the theologians] delight as they mould and re-mould at whim the most obscure passages of the Scriptures as if they were wax, expecting that their conclusions... be taken more seriously than the laws of Solon...»\(^18\).

Many are the Spaniards who are representative of this type of exegesis during the Golden Age. We shall mention here just the four most significant who use principally the literal interpretation based on the scrutiny of the original texts\(^19\).


\(^{19}\) We shall leave aside the representatives of Theology in...
- Cipriano de la Huerga


(ca. 1509-1560)²⁰, professor of Biblical Studies in Alcalá and rector of the Cistercian College in the same city. He was part of that privileged age of Spanish Humanism, and could be considered, for Spanish biblical scholars in the 16th century, as a «hinge» astride two generations of philologists: those collaborating on the Polyglot of Alcalá and those working on the Biblia Regia. His biographers stress his new form of explaining the Scripture, not using the routine method of the traditional four senses, but researching in the original texts; this can be seen in his biblical commentaries which are extant, notably those concerning the Song of Songs, the book of Job, the prophet Nahum and the Psalms 38 and 130²¹.

His exegesis was moved by two intellectual wheels, two sources of wisdom: the arcanae litterae and the prophana philosophia. The search for the literal sense led him to investigate the secrets of the Hebrew, and compare them to the Greek, Latin and Aramaic versions, rather than repeat the trite options put forward by his predecessors: «We must be very

the polemic between the theologians and the philologists; among the former we find León de Castro and Bartolomé de Medina. For León de Castro cf. K. Reinhardt, Bibelkommentare, I, 110-114; for Bartolomé de Medina, cf. G. Fraile, DHEE, vol. III, 1453.

²⁰ Cf. N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y humanismo, 47-82.

²¹ Comentario al Cantar de los Cantares, vols. V y VI; Comentarios al libro de Job, vols. II y III; Comentario al Profeta Nahum, vol. VII; Comentario a los Salmos XXVIII y CXXX, vol IV.
cautious and have a critical mind when interpreting the Holy Scriptures, otherwise, as do other commentators, we shall, like beasts of burden, always follow in the tracks of others»\(^2^2\). His remarks on the Hebrew language, the wealth of its meanings and the symbolism in the figures of speech were a precursor of Arias de Montano's treatise on Hebrew idioms. One translation alone cannot do justice to all the meanings of the original; it is essential to recover them all. In the words of Cipriano de la Huerga, «we must be very familiar with the Hebrew language, pregnant with parables and with sentences full of curls»\(^2^3\).

The list of Greco-Latin authors which appears in the commentaries to the book of Job and the Song of Songs is so wide that it aroused the admiration of E. Asensio\(^2^4\). It makes mention of the pre-Socratic philosophers, Homer and Hesiod, Plato, Orpheus, the Chaldean Oracles, Hermes Trismegistos, the ancient Egyptian theologians and the ancient Cabala. Cipriano de la Huerga, as well as his contemporaries, had an imprecise understanding of the Cabala, but it was as if this profane knowledge emerged at times as a revelation similar to that found in the Old and New Testaments. At other times it manifests itself as a trail of wisdom going right back to Moses from which both the Egyptian and Greek prisci theologi had been inspired. The leading thread between these two approaches to the interpretation of the biblical text is that, in the fundamental issues concerning God, man, the spirits or the world, there is a basic concordance between the Scriptures and those philosophies considered to be of fabulous antiquity. Cipriano de la Huerga believed that there were secret traditions handed down from God

\(^{2^2}\) Comentario al Cantar V, p. 267.

\(^{2^3}\) Comentario a Nahum, VII, 254.

to Moses in the Sinai and which was subsequently passed on by oral tradition to an unbroken chain of chosen men. One of these men was Esdras; Huerga identified these traditions with the apocryphal books edited at the time of Esdras and referred to in IV Esdras\textsuperscript{25}.

The passion for the tradition of wisdom in antiquity was shared by all the humanists. We should not forget that M. Ficino\textsuperscript{26} made the wisdom of Hermes Trismegistos popular in the Florentine Academy when he translated the work of this author from the original Greek into Latin, a work which had been brought to the West by a Byzantine monk\textsuperscript{27}.

The mention of the ancient Cabalists brings together Cipriano de la Huerga and Luis de León. According to Cipriano de la Huerga, the etymology and the true form of proper names in relation to their meaning were respected in the whole of the Old Testament up to the coming of Christ; this was reflected in the ancient Cabala, given that one of the main features of the cabalistic tradition was the respect of the etymology of names, in particular, those which made reference to God. The Platonists, the Pythagorists and Dionysius the Aereopagite\textsuperscript{28},

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} IV Esdras 14,26: «Quaedam palam facies, quaedam sapientibus absconse trades... Novissimos autem LXX conservabis, ut tradas eos sapientibus de populo tuo»; cf. Cipriano de la Huerga, \textit{Comentario a Nahum}, VII, 22.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Cf. chapter 5 of this volume.
\item \textsuperscript{27} E. Asensio, "Cipriano de la Huerga", 67, and G. Morocho, «Cipriano de la Huerga, maestro de humanistas», 178-181.
\item \textsuperscript{28} \textit{Comentario al Cantar}, VI, 222: «Kabalaei, qui inter hebraeos principes habentur theologi, inter reliquas partes artis kabalisticæ hanc unam praecipuam magisque illustrem statuunt, quae circa vocum etymologias versatur; quorum libris et platonici et pythagorici, quicquid de nominum etymologiis literis commissere, accepere mutuo. Divus etiam Dionisius totam
were all influenced by the teaching of the cabalists.

- Gaspar de Grajal


(ca. 1530-1575) a convert, educated in Salamanca, Paris and Louvain, he gave lessons on Bible in Salamanca. Together with Luis de León and Martínez de Cantalapiedra he was part of the group of Hebraists who insisted on the literal exegesis of the Scriptures in opposition to the conservative theologians who defended the allegorical interpretation and the supremacy of the Vulgate and the Septuagint over the Hebrew text. In 1572, he was imprisoned by the Inquisition; in 1577, following a trial, the court of Valladolid found in his favour; unfortunately, he had died two years earlier in prison.

He took part in the commission which had been named to correct the Vatablus’ Bible. This was the name given to the edition printed in Paris by Robert d'Estienne and published in 1545 with a double translation from the Hebrew to the Latin — one being the Vulgate, and another new version incorporating notes from the teaching of Vatablus—. In 1569, the Salamanca printer, Gaspar de Portonariis, wanted to reprint the work with the appropriate corrections, since it had been included in the Spanish index of prohibited works in 1559. When the deliberations of the commission came to an end, three of its members (Grajal, Martínez de Cantalapiedra and Luis de León) were denounced to the Inquisition by several of their colleagues²⁹.

²⁹ D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, rationem theologiae ab ipsis nominibus divinis conquisivit, quasi arcana quaedam eximia divinis appellationibus lateant». 
The only published work of Grajal is his *In Michaeam prophetam commentaria* (Salamanca 1570); there are also some handwritten pieces of his commentaries on Hosea, Amos and Jeremiah as well as some writings on the authority of the Vulgate and some letters from his prison cell.

He was an accomplished philologist, a true representative of the literal exegesis based on the Hebrew text; he was also well acquainted with the Targum and other ancient versions. He explained some of the differences in the text of the Septuagint with respect to the Hebrew as a confusion among similar Hebrew consonants; he accepted differing readings of the codices without blaming them on Jewish manipulations; he followed Jerome on his commentary on Miqueas, but had constant recourse to Pagninus and Vatablus translations for his interpretations, and to the commentaries of Jewish authors such as Quimhî and Ibn Ezra, and to other humanists such as Pérez de Valencia, Beuter, Reuchlin and Petrus Galatinus. His good knowledge of Hebrew meant that he was able to appreciate the plays on words, the alliterations and other forms of figures of speech which were beyond the reach of those who did not know the original language of the Bible. In his commentary on Jeremiah and in line with other humanists, he would switch from the Latin to the vernacular --in this case, Castillian--. The linguistic interest of these testimonies is undeniable: they are hidden translations spread through the commentaries, published during a period and in an environment in which vernacular renderings were under suspicion.

- Luis de León


(1527-1591). He studied theology in the universities of Salamanca and Alcalá and held various chairs in the former (that of St Thomas, 1561, and that of Durando, 1565); but his main interest was always concentrated on the Bible, whose texts he commented in all his lessons. After his trial and imprisonment by the Inquisition in Valladolid (1572-1577), he finally returned to teaching in Salamanca, and in 1579 his dream came true when he was awarded the chair of Bible, after a tight contest with the Dominican Domingo de Guzmán.

Several commentaries on the Holy Scriptures among the writings of Luis de León are worth mentioning (in Spanish, on

---

30 As E. Asensio points out, «Fray Luis de León y la Biblia», Edad de Oro 4 (1985) 5-13, these chairs, which were awarded for life, were decided by votes of students, doctors and academics, and provoked heated debates among the colleges, or in the most powerful convents, if the chairs in question were of theology.
the Book of Job, the Song of Songs, on the Names of Christ; and in Latin, the commentary on the first three chapters of Genesis, on Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, various Psalms, the prophet Obadiah and a number of Paul’s letters). The principles behind the exegesis which made up the work of Luis de León were: the recourse to the original texts --Hebrew and Greek-- in order to achieve a more comprehensive interpretation of the Scriptures because, in his opinion, there were passages in the Vulgate which were not well translated, and failed to transmit the real meaning of the Hebrew; the plurality of the senses of the original, which were not fully reflected in the Vulgate, meanings which could not be disregarded. Consequently, his first approach to the biblical text were the Hebrew and the Greek texts. The Bible, as a work inspired by God, includes passages which contain arcane and hidden senses associated to the meaning and signification of the original Hebrew; these go further than the literal sense and point to future events which could be applied to the coming of Christ, the history of the world or the history of the Church.

He made a clear distinction between philology and exegesis, a methodology which was already used by Jewish writers such as Ibn Ezra who, like Luis de León did in his Latin Explanationes, structures his interpretation of the Song of Songs into three sections: the literal interpretation, the external plot, and the spiritual sense. In the Preface to his Spanish translation of the Song of Songs, Luis de León clearly explains his aims and his methodology: to declare “la corteza de la letra” (the bark of the word) and to leave the spiritual interpretation to “those great books written by holy and learned people”.

In a first instance, he criticised the text of the Vulgate, to the point that the Inquisitorial process was to accuse him of advocating that certain of the biblical texts could be translated melius, aptius, clarius, significantius; he also maintained that the Jewish interpretations could be right, since

---

31 F. García, Obras completas castellanas, 61-66.
their texts had neither been corrupted or falsified; that there could be other interpretations, not opposite to, but certainly with a broader significance than those of the Fathers of the Church; that the Scriptures could be understood from the point of view of grammar, without taking theology into account. However, like Arias Montano did, he was against the correction of the Vulgate because: «We could get it right once, but we could be mistaken in our understanding of the interpreter who, as we know, often read the Hebrew text in a different form we read it now; at other times, he followed the Greek translators, rather than the original Hebrew; in our attempt to render a more accurate Vulgate, we may, in fact, produce an even more corrupt version than we have at present»\textsuperscript{32}.

There is no doubt that the methodology followed by Luis de León in his biblical exegesis was positive or philological, based on the knowledge of the biblical languages, in particular the Hebrew, as well as other fields of learning and related sciences («it is important to know everything»\textsuperscript{33}), taking into account both, the classical and the Christian authors. For Luis de León, all the sciences are at the service of hermeneutics. This position is confirmed in his writings: in the second and third Explanationes of the Song of Songs, in the Exposición del libro de Job, in the treatise De los nombres de Cristo, in his commentaries on certain Psalms (in particular Psalms 28, 57 and 67), and more especially in his Commentaria in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas.

\textsuperscript{32} E. Fernández Tejero, «Luis de León, hebraísta», in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y Humanismo, 101-118.

\textsuperscript{33} «Dije que para el entero entendimiento de la Escritura era menester saberlo todo, y principalmente tres cosas: la theologia escolástica: lo que escribieron los sanctos: las lenguas griega y hebreá» (M. Salvá and P. Sáinz de Baranda, Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España (Madrid 1847) X, 361.
It is also interesting to note the sober use that Luis de León made of the Christian Cabala and the Jewish exegetic techniques such as the notarigon (system of abbreviations), the gematria (numeric value of the letters), and the temurah (permutation of the letters). The allusions to the Cabala are scarce, but he does retain, at least, one of the typical lucubrations of the Christian Cabala concerning the name of Jesus, in Hebrew Iehosuach. This is the same ineffable name for God or Tetragrammaton, which becomes pronounced with the addition of two letters\textsuperscript{34}.

The Spanish humanists lived with their time and were not insensitive to such important events as the discovery of America. Given that the Scripture was an inspired text, that all truths could be found there, and that God was the architect of the world, it was natural to believe that the New World must be announced therein in one form or another. Guided by the opinions of many Rabbis, the Targum and Arias Montano in his commentary on the Twelve Prophets, Luis de León interpreted the passage of Obadiah 20\textsuperscript{35} as referring to Spain (Sefarad). It would be the third preaching of the Gospel: the first, directed to the Jews; the second, to the gentiles of the Roman Empire; and the third, to the people of the New World. The Bible was also studied as a source for toponyms found in the New World (Perú was identified as the Parwayim in II Chronicles 3,6; Yucatán as the Yoqtan in

\textsuperscript{34} N. Fernández Marcos, «De los nombres de Cristo», in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y Humanismo, 133-152.

\textsuperscript{35} «Transmigratio Hierusalem quae in Bosforo [Hebrew, יבשופו] est, possidebit civitates Austri». Cf. Magistri Luysii Legionensis, Tomus III (Salamanca 1892) 172-173. The original Hebrew probably refers to Sardes in Asia Minor, and not to Spain as in the Targum Jonathan, or to the Bosphorus, as it is translated in the Vulgate.
Genesis 10,26)36.

Luis de León was not a biblical scholar in the strict sense of the term, to the extent that he has not been studied by the historians of biblical exegesis37. E. Asensio quite rightly reserves that title for Arias Montano and some of his disciples who based their work on the Hebrew text with practically no reference to the Christian tradition of the Holy Fathers. On the contrary, Luis de León, although making use of the original texts, incorporated into his commentaries all the Christian tradition: the Fathers of the Church, the scholastic theology, and the medieval commentaries, as well as those of his time. In the words of Asensio, «Fray Luis de León personifies, better than any other writer in the Castillian language, the confluence of Bible and Greco-Roman culture, of Poetry and Theology» 38.

- Benito Arias Montano


36 Treatise «Phaleg, sive de gentium sedibvs primis...» and the map joined to the volume of Apparatus in the Biblia Regia; cf. N. Fernández Marcos, «El nuevo mundo en la exégesis española del siglo XVI», in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y Humanismo, 35-44.


38 E. Asensio, «Fray Luis de León», 6 and 18.

(1527-1598) He studied in the universities of Sevilla and Alcalá where he graduated in Arts in 1549. From 1550 to 1552 he studied theology in Alcalá and began to study oriental languages. One of his teachers was Cipriano de la Huerga. In 1560, he professed in the order of Santiago in the convent of St Marcos of León; he took part in the Council of Trent in 1562-1563, as an adviser to bishop Martín Pérez de Ayala. In 1566 he was appointed Royal Chaplain by Philip II; in 1568 he was entrusted with the edition of the Antwerp Polyglot or Biblia Regia, and in 1571 he set out an Index expurgatorius librorum which brought him much praise for his capacity of judgement and tolerance. Interestingly enough, his works were included in the index of prohibited books drawn up by Juan de Pineda in 1607. Arias Montano was also active on the political scene of his time³⁹ as an adviser to the Duke of Alba, governor in the Netherlands, and on a diplomatic

³⁹ L. Morales Oliver, Arias Montano y la política de Felipe II en Flandes (Madrid: Volvntad 1927).
mission to Portugal for the King of Spain. He assembled a collection of books and manuscripts for the library of El Escorial and was its first librarian. He spent the last years of his life between the retreat of La Peña de Aracena and the convent of Santiago de Sevilla, where he was Prior until his death.

The most important work of Arias Montano was the edition of the Biblia sacra hebraice, chaldaice, graece, latine (Biblia Poyglotta Regia) in eight volumes (Antwerp 1569-1573), published by Plantin. As for the history of interpretation, we are particularly interested in the volume of the Apparatus—in which he sets out in several treatises his philological and hermeneutic conception of the biblical text—and also in his commentaries, especially the following: De optimo Imperio sive in librum Iosuae commentarium, De varia Republica sive commentaria in librum Iudicum, In XXXI Davidis psalmos priores commentaria, Commentaria in Isaiae Prophetae sermones, Commentaria in duodecim prophetas, Elucidationes in quatuor Evangelia...Quibus accedunt eiusdem Elucidationes in Acta Apostolorum, Elucidationes in omnia sanctorum apostolorum scripta.

He systematized his principles of biblical hermeneutics in three of the treatises in the Apparatus: Communes et familiares hebraice linguae idiotismi, Liber Ioseph sive de arcano sermone and Liber Ieremiae sive de actione. The first is given over to the description of the major semitisms or idiomatic features of the Hebrew language, with occasional references to comparisons with the figures of classical rhetoric; the second is a treatise on biblical semantics, while the third deals with body language.

40 Cf. G. Morocho Gayo, «Trayectoria humanística» I-II.

41 Cf. chapter 12 of this volume.

42 E. Fernández Tejero and N. Fernández Marcos, «De Hebraicis Idiotismis».
Arias Montano was a fervent defender of the need to know biblical languages, and in particular Hebrew, for the right understanding of the Scriptures. Hebrew was the primordial language, born with the creation of the world, the sacred language of Paradise, inspired by God to the first humans on earth, and consequently, in which the minimal detail is replete with meanings. That is how it is expressed in his Preface to the Biblia Regia, *De divinae scripturae dignitate, linguarum usu et Catholici regis consilio*, and in the *Praefatio ad Christianae doctrinae studiosos*, which head his edition of the Hebrew Bible with the interlinear version by Sanctes Pagninus, corrected by Arias Montano and other of his collaborators. From then on, Arias Montano will not hesitate to make use of the Hebrew in his exegetical commentaries. He in fact goes further, and when trying to explain a passage from the book of Judges, he affirms that it would be more worthwhile to learn the holy language than to try to disentangle the interminable controversies surrounding the interpretations of the different versions\(^4\).

Arias Montano was more than a Hebraist, he was also one of the most accomplished Orientalists of his time. His knowledge of Hebrew was so deep, that he was able to include in the *Apparatus* a treatise in defence of its value and authenticity, and even to analyse specific masoretic features such as the description and listings of ketib/qerê/yattir readings\(^4\). He was certainly at

\(^4\) *quam quidem ob rem longe minore labore linguam sacram discere consulerem, quam de huiusmodi versionum varietate quotidie controversias ad invidiam vsque et inimicitias persequi*; *De varia Repvblica, sive commentaria in librvm Ivdicvm*, (Antverpiae: Ex officina Plantiniana, Apud Viduam, & Ioannem Moretum 1592) 680.

The treatise De arcano semone deals with semantics, and refers to the symbolic sense of the Hebrew Scripture. It is the longest treatise of the Apparatus, 122 pages in folio, and is given over to the explanation of several thousand passages of the Bible. If we go by the typographer’s view on the cover page, this volume together with the next, De Actione, would make up a complete commentary on the Scriptures. The arcane meaning is not accessible to everyone as is the literal; it embraces a whole range of nuances from the poetic and stylistic dimensions of the Scripture to the symbolic, oneiric, mystical and secret or cabalistic significance. For this reason it is also known as the Liber Ioseph, after this biblical hero famous for his skill in the interpretation of dreams. These meanings are hidden in enigmatic passages and prophecies of the Old Testament, in particular in books as Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Kings or Revelation. Arias Montano would envisage several levels of comprehension and mentions both an arcane and even more arcane (magis arcanum) significance, reserving the latter, more secret and profound, for the events and types of the Old Testament which point to the person of Jesus or the mysteries of the New Testament. As he was a partisan of the literal sense, he could use this arcane sense to bridge the constellations of meaning between the Old and New Testaments. The third treatise of the Apparatus, entitled Liber Ieremiae sive de actione, is dedicated to the rhetorical uses of action and gesture. Arias Montano was convinced of the importance of body language both in profane literature and the Holy books. Languages can be and, de facto, are different, while the language of gesture is more universal (quasi corporis sermonem universo fere hominum generi communem). The treatise

for Masoretic Studies, (SBLMS 7, 1992) 71-84.

45 Cf. chapter 11 of this volume.

46 Liber Ieremiae sive de actione, Praefatio, a2b.
is named after Jeremiah, since no other book makes such wide use of the so-called «prophetic actions», or techniques of non-verbal communication, in which the image and the action play a fundamental role in the transmission of the message.  

The wealth of encyclopaedic knowledge (biblical commentaries, treatises, dictionaries, lexica and translations) were developed by Arias Montano in the context of the Biblia Regia and more especially in the volume of the Apparatus, where all the auxiliary sciences are treated: philology, hermeneutics, geography, history, archaeology, numismatics... Even his commentaries not included in the Polyglot constantly refer back to the Apparatus.

This Biblia Regia, however, was a source of problems and misfortunes: Arias Montano had to struggle in Rome for Papal approval, while in Spain, his Bible was a battleground for the two factions that had already appeared during the trial of the Hebraists of Salamanca, in particular with reference to the novelties it included, compared to the Complutensian Polyglot. Not even the printer Plantin could make up for all the costs the edition had brought on him, although he was more than compensated by the privilege conferred on him by the Crown for the printing of liturgical books (missals and breviaries).

Although Arias Montano never went to prison, the trial brought against him for the denunciations against the Biblia Regia lasted until 1577, when finally, Juan de Mariana, who had been entrusted by the Inquisition to make a report, gave a favourable verdict. We know of the principal accusations with regard to the Biblia Regia from a letter given to Arias Montano by his friend Luis de Estrada, the Cistercian abbot of Santa María de Huerta; these were: the use in the Polyglot of Hebrew

47 N. Fernández Marcos, «Lenguaje arcano y lenguaje del cuerpo» [in press].


49 E. Fernández Tejero and N. Fernández Marcos, «Luis de
and Aramaic originals that were full of errors and corrupted; the inclusion of Pagninus's Latin version; the publication of an Aramaic version of the Prophets and Writings plagued with mistakes; the inclusion of the Syriac version of the New Testament; and, the correction of the Latin version of the Vulgate in the New Testament. There were also certain cautions about some of the treatises in the Apparatus; the Papal commission was, in particular, suspicious of the treatise De arcano sermone, which it considered to be cabalistic.

The polemic which surrounded the Biblia Regia continued after the 16th century and the death of Arias Montano in 1598. The wrangling is documented in two large dossiers in the National Library in Madrid\(^5\). Some of the works of Arias Montano were included in the expurgatory indices of 1607 (Rome) and 1612 (Madrid)\(^5\). In the latter it was ordered that the annotation _caute legatur_ appear next to the Chaldean paraphrase.

Arias Montano was undoubtedly the foremost Biblical and Oriental scholar in Spanish 16th century; a Spain which, at that time included all the territories ruled over by Philip II, that is, other parts of Europe and reaching out to the New World.

As we have seen, it is the literal sense which dominates the interpretation of the great biblical scholars in 16th century Spain. The most frequent accusations made against the Hebraists of Salamanca to be found in the Inquisitorial trials

---

Estrada y Arias Montano», in _Biblia y Humanismo_, 193-206.

\(^5\) E. Fernández Tejero and N. Fernández Marcos, «La polémica en torno a la Biblia Regia de Arias Montano», in _Biblia y Humanismo_, 229-238.

were\textsuperscript{52}: the use of Hebrew and Jewish commentaries in their exegesis; the preference for Vatablus, Pagninus, and the Rabbis at the expense of the translation of the Vulgate and the interpretations of the Holy Fathers and the doctors of the Church, who were accused by the Hebraists of an arbitrary and formalistic use of the Scriptures; the depreciation of the authority and veracity of the Vulgate, affirming that it contained many errors and could have been better translated; the defence that Christian interpretations of the Old Testament and those of the Jews could have the same value while carrying a different meaning; the criticism brought against the Septuagint translators, and the accusation that their knowledge of Hebrew was deficient\textsuperscript{53}; the acceptance of the divulgation of translations into vernacular languages; the affirmation that the allegorical sense of the Scriptures was not the only or principal one; the belief that scholastic doctrine was prejudicial to the understanding of the Holy Text, and that the Old Testament did not promise eternal life.

But, with the passing of time, these humanists will begin to regret the plenitude lost through their critical stance, which led them to cut off other approaches to the Scriptures, less scientific in their eyes. They will come to recognise the unifying role of hermeneutics which allowed them to apply the message of the Old Testament to the New: Valdés will achieve this by moving from the consideration of the Scripture as an alphabet to that of the Scripture as a conversation; Cipriano de la Huerga, Luis de León and Arias Montano will take the route of


\textsuperscript{53} D. Barthélemy, \textit{Critique textuelle}, *37-*38.
the arcane sense$^{54}$.

3. THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN SPAIN: MYSTICISM AND REFORMATION

The Golden Age in Spain is full of writers who, from different points of view, considered the Scriptures to be their source of inspiration, the object of their commentaries and even their lifelong preoccupation. Until now we have focused on the most significant authors, those who really contributed to scientific knowledge in the history of biblical interpretation$^{55}$.

Below, we set out as a guide, two areas which are worthy of a more detailed study but go beyond the scope of this work: The Bible and mysticism, and the exegesis of the Spanish reformers. Nor can we ignore the contribution brought to the exegesis in 16th century Spain by the commentators who came after the Council of Trent; but these authors will also have their place in another chapter of the collection$^{56}$.

3.1 Bible and Mysticism

Sources and Studies: K. Reinhardt, Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700) I-II (Madrid: CSIC, 1990-1999); II, 153-155 (Francisco de Osuna); II, 337-339 (Teresa de Jesús); I, 131-132 (Juan de la Cruz).

Other Publications: M. Andrés, Historia de la mística de la edad de oro en España y América (Madrid: BAC 1994); M. Andrés, Los Recogidos. Nueva visión de la mística española (Madrid: FUE 1976); P. M. Catedra (et al.), Místicos

$^{54}$ N. Fernández Marcos, «La exégesis bíblica de Cipriano de la Huerga», in N. Fernández Marcos and E. Fernández Tejero, Biblia y Humanismo, 65-82.

$^{55}$ We know from personal experience that such significant writers as Luis de León and Arias Montano, mentioned in the previous section, are practically unknown outside of Spain, even in the prestigious circles of biblical scholars and humanists.

$^{56}$ Cf. chapter 25 of this volume.

Francisco de Osuna (ca. 1492 - ca. 1540) was born in Sevilla where he studied, and in 1513 entered the Franciscan order. He studied philosophy in Torrelaguna and then theology for four years in the convent of Alcalá and in the university as an extra-mural student. He was a disciple of Pedro Ciruelo, Alfonso de Castro and Antonio de Nebrija. In 1523 he was sent to the hermitage of La Salceda (Guadalajara), the centre of affective mysticism. Between 1532 and 1536 he travelled through Europe. He wrote several biblical commentaries, but his most significant work was the *Abecedario espiritual* (1527) which went to several editions; he even became the most widely read spiritual author in Spain between 1527 and 1559. He was the first to set out the path of devotion (‘recogimiento’) and was the forerunner of the major traits of the Spanish mysticism in the Golden Age. Osuna defended the doctrine of ‘recogimiento’ in the belief that it was possible to enter into communication with God57, and this, in contrast to the doctrine of the ‘Alumbrados’, originally devout laymen, who were to become a heretical sect, attacked from different quarters because they did not formulate a definite system of their thinking.

---

57 For further information on his life and works as well as his notion of ‘recogimiento’, cf. S. López Santidrián, *Tercer abecedario espiritual*, 5-78.
The `recogimiento´ was rather a method of prayer than a method of exegesis; it was a mystical theology which took the negative path rather than the positive path used by the scholastics. The exegetic methodology used in the work of Osuna is the symbolic, but his recourse to the biblical quotations is constant\textsuperscript{58}.

- Teresa de Jesús (1515-1582) was born in Ávila and died in Alba de Tormes (Salamanca). She entered the Carmelite Convent of the Incarnation of Ávila in 1535. In her youth she read the Tercer abecedario of Francisco de Osuna which was to have a considerable influence on her life: «holguéme mucho con él y determinéme a seguir aquel camino con todas mis fuerzas... tiniendo aquel libro por maestro»\textsuperscript{59}. After great difficulties, many of which came from her own order, she founded the first Reform Convent of the Discalced of San José in 1562. There she wrote El camino de perfección, she rewrote her Vida, and composed the Meditaciones sobre los Cantares. Over a period of time she founded numerous convents throughout Spain. Her reform also reached the male branch of the Carmelites. She also wrote the Moradas del castillo interior. Her works are among the most representative of the Spanish mysticism, but from the point of view of biblical interpretation, the critics only concentrate on her Meditaciones sobre los Cantares or Conceptos del amor de Dios \textsuperscript{60}. Around 1580, she burned all the copies of this work, on the advice of her confessor; some, however, survived and were

\textsuperscript{58} Some significant examples can be found in S. López Sanchidrián, Tercer abecedario, 168 (on Ezekiel 10,16), 169 (on Judges 15,5), 412 (on Judges 18,27-28).

\textsuperscript{59} «I was entranced by it and decided that it was the path to follow with all my might... with that book to guide me», Obras completas, 42-43.

\textsuperscript{60} Obras completas, 421-468.
edited by her friend and spiritual adviser Jerónimo Gracián de la Madre de Dios, in Brussels in 1611. The Meditaciones are not a commentary on the Song of Songs, but personal, pious thoughts, destined for her nuns, and based on the text of the Vulgate as it was used in the liturgy of the hours, according to the Roman Breviary. The commentaries only cover the Songs of Songs 1,1 to 2,5. Specialists in the work seem more interested in the fact that it is the first commentary of the Song of Songs written by a woman than in its exegetic value; from a philological point of view the work has nothing to offer. Her interpretation is purely spiritual; the text of the Song of Songs finds its meaning in an intimate relationship of the soul with God, in the path towards mystical union. Critics have underlined the audacity of her language, since she addresses God in the first person as a beloved and friend: “¿qué mejor cosa podemos pedir que lo que yo os pido, Señor mío, que me deis esta paz con beso de vuestra boca?”; “... que me beséis con el beso de la boca, que sin Vos ¿qué soy yo?”61. The spiritual freedom with which she affronts the biblical text is that of the renaissance period, a similar freedom to that which we shall find in Juan de la Cruz, but the poetry of the latter attained the sublime. Teresa de Jesús was much more interested in the spiritual interpretation which she believed that God had destined to the uneducated woman, than in the intellectual exegesis of the theologians62.

- Juan de la Cruz (1542-1591) was born in Fontiveros (Ávila) and

61 «What better can I ask than that I plead thee, my Lord, That thou give me peace with a kiss from thy lips?»; «...that thee give me a kiss from thy lips, for without thee, What am I?» Obras completas, 428 and 453.

died in Úbeda (Jaén). He studied Arts and Holy Sciences in Salamanca, and founded the first Discalced Carmelite convent in Duruelo (Ávila), on the inspiration of Teresa de Jesús. Between 1572 and 1577 he was the confessor, vicar and reformer of the Convent of the Incarnation in Ávila where Teresa de Jesús was the prioress. Due to conflicts with his superiors in the Calced order, he was imprisoned in Toledo from November 1577 to August 1578 where he wrote Las Noches. Other of his works are Subida al monte Carmelo, Llama de amor viva, and more especially the Cántico espiritual, inspired by the Song of Songs. In the words of L. Ruano63, he had «a very strong imagination, a sensitivity beyond bounds, a prodigious memory at all levels, a wonderful intuition and talent for synthesis, a creative genius, a perfect command of the Holy Scriptures, of their vocabulary and their subject matter, and an excellent knowledge of humanistic culture». In Juan de la Cruz converge reality and spiritual experience of the Bible in a poetic sensitivity. In Salamanca, he was a pupil of Gaspar de Grajal, a remarkable exponent of the literal exegesis of the Scriptures. He would, at times, call on this literal sense to help demonstrate the spiritual sense, but most of his explanations do not contribute to clarify the literal meaning. His use of the Bible is pure adaptation and allegory; he is no an exegete, but rather a spiritual writer. He makes great use of the characters of the Old Testament, frequently citing texts from Job, Jeremiah and the Psalms to describe the tribulations the soul has to undergo in her itinerary towards the union with God. He also took a broad view of the texts of the New Testament to give them an extreme and Christ-centred interpretation which would be in line with his spiritual doctrine64. The relationship between the Old and New

63 «Juan de la Cruz», in DHEE, vol. II (Madrid 1972) 1246-1248.

64 Cf. J. Vilnet, Bible et Mystique chez S. Jean de la Croix (Burges: Desclée de Brouwer 1949); B. M. Ahern, «The Use of Scripture in the Spiritual Theology of St. John of the Cross»,
Testaments presented no problem for Juan de la Cruz; the New Testament was the fulfilment of the Old, and the Scripture was a process centred on the historical Christ.\textsuperscript{65} 

The exegesis of the mystical writers is quite different to that of the Hebraists mentioned in the previous section. Just one example to prove the point; the Song of Songs was the object of all sorts of commentaries, yet it was only with the translation and Spanish commentary by Luis de León that it managed to open the doors to a modern interpretation as a profane song (poetic philology). Juan de la Cruz converted it into a poetic mysticism. Teresa de Jesús gave it in her short and pious pages a free and spiritual interpretation as a result of her mystical experience.

The Hebraists based their philological and literal exegesis on the ancient languages, while, on the contrary, the mystical writers had no interest in, nor, indeed had any knowledge of, these languages and were to use the allegorical and devout sense to express their spirituality. We have included them here because of the repercussion their works had and continue to have to this day.

3.2 The Exegesis of the Spanish Reformers

Sources and Studies: K. Reinhardt, \textit{Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700)} I-II (Madrid: CSIC, 1990-1999); II, 365-367 (Juan de Valdés); I, 144-146 (Francisco de Enzinas); II, 233-234 (Casiodoro de Reina); II, 374-375 (Cipriano de Valera).

\textit{CBQ} XIV (1952) 6-17; A. Colunga, «San Juan de la Cruz, intérprete de la Sagrada Escritura», \textit{Ciencia Tomista} 63 (1942) 257-276.

The subject of the Reformation in Spain has been widely covered in the classical works of B. B. Wiffen and L. de Usoz y Río, Reformistas Antiguos Españoles\textsuperscript{66}, and the later work by E. Boehmer, Bibliotheca Wiffeniana: Spanish Reformers of Two Centuries from 1520\textsuperscript{67}. However, we feel that it is necessary to give over a few lines to these Reformers, not only for their importance as exegetes but also for the fact that any so-called dissidents should not be ignored by History whatever the dominant ideology may be. They all published their translations and their biblical commentaries outside the Iberian Peninsula for fear of the Spanish Inquisition.

- Juan de Valdés (ca. 1505-1541). He came from a family of converts. He was in Rome in the court of Pope Clement VII, in the service of Charles V. He soon came into contact with the theses of Luther and became familiar with the thinking of the Alumbrados and the ideas of Erasmus and the Erasmians. Although he was the object of two trials of the inquisitors and that certain of his disciples were considered to be heterodox, the orthodoxy of some of his writings is still the subject of controversy. His major works are the Diálogo de la Lengua (ca.1535) and the Alfabeto cristiano (1536). From the point of view of exegesis, there is of special interest his Diálogo de

\textsuperscript{66} (London/San Sebastián/Madrid, 1848-1870) 20 vols.

\textsuperscript{67} 3 vols. Strassburg: Karl Trubner 1874; New York: Burt Franklin 1962.
doctrina christianá (1529) which includes, in the final part, his Traducción de los capítulos quinto, sexto y séptimo del evangelio de sant Matheo de griego en nuestro romance castellano and also El Salterio traducido del hebreo en romance castellano and the Comentario a los Salmos (Psalms 1-41), both published in 1537⁶⁸. His translation of the Psalms is very literal, to the point that where he decides to add some words of his own, “á fin que la letra lleve más lustre, vaya más clara y más sabrosa”⁶⁹, he writes them in red ink so that they cannot be confused with the original. The purpose of his exegesis was to capture and understand the spirit and feelings that were at work in the redaction of the Hebrew originals. The same can be said for his commentaries on the New Testament⁷⁰, but in this case, in relation to the Greek text. He was the first to write biblical commentaries in Castillian, and despite his attachment to the original languages, his style is still unequalled in modern translations. His version of the Psalms is one of the jewels of Spanish literature. His exegesis is not limited to the literal sense, to the Scripture as an alphabet, which might satisfy the novices; the perfect Christian has to search for the spiritual sense which makes the Bible the path towards direct conversation with God⁷¹. Some critics consider his commentaries to be

---


⁶⁹ D. Ricart, Juan de Valdés, 135: “in order to give a bit more lustre to the words, to make them clearer and more attractive”.

⁷⁰ El evangelio según San Mateo (1539); Comentario... sobre la epístola de San Pablo a los Romanos... (1538-1539); Comentario... sobre la primera epístola de San Pablo apóstol a los Corinthios... (1538-1539).

⁷¹ J. C. Nieto, Juan de Valdes and the Origins of the
devotional or pious literature; but we must be mindful of Valdés's view: "devotion and piety were not divorced from learned scholarship, objectivity in method, or honest and sincere pursuit of truth, and that he did not attempt to fill the gaps with pious explanations. These are qualities which are not always present in the so-called devotional literature".\textsuperscript{72}

Other important Spanish translators were:
- Francisco de Enzinas (ca. 1520-1552), who translated the New Testament into Castillian in 1543, and Juan Pérez de Pineda (? -1566), who also translated the New Testament, published in 1556. It is said that Francisco de Enzinas had the intention to translate the whole Bible into Castillian\textsuperscript{73}, but his early death prevented him from doing so.
- Casiodoro de Reina (ca. 1520-1594) was to complete this task. He is the most representative of the circle of Sevillian reformers (such as Antonio del Corro and Cipriano de Valera, monks in the Hieronymite monastery of San Isidro del Campo), but also of other ecclesiastic groups (such as the priest and predicator of the Cathedral of Sevilla, Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, or Juan Gil (Egidio) high canon in the same cathedral\textsuperscript{74}).
  
  Casiodoro de Reina was of Morisco origin, he studied in the University of Sevilla and entered the Hieronymite order. Together with several members of his order, which were in favour

\textit{Spanish and Italian Reformation} (Genève: Droz 1970) 239-245.

\textsuperscript{72} J. C. Nieto, \textit{Juan de Valdes}, 195.

\textsuperscript{73} Cf. C. Gilly, \textit{Spanien und der Basler Buchdruck}, 326-353.

of the Reform, like him, he moved to Geneva in 1557 to flee the Inquisition; there he took up Calvinism. Reina next moved to Frankfurt and later to London where he was pastor to a small Spanish community of Reformers.

His most important work is the full translation of the Bible into Castillian, published in Basel in 1569, known as La Biblia del Oso, after his ex libris. This Bible was later revised by Cipriano de Valera and published in Amsterdam in 1602. Through its successive revisions it became the official Bible of the Spanish-speaking Protestants, and remains so to this day\(^\text{75}\). From the "Amonestacion del interprete de los sacros libros al lector...", we know some of the criteria that Casiodoro de Reina followed for his version: he consulted the Latin translation of the Vulgate, but also referred back to the Hebrew text whenever possible, «lo qual hezimos siguiendo comunmente la translacion de Santes Pagninus, que al voto de todos los doctos en la lengua Hebraica es tenida por la mas pura que hasta aora ay»\(^\text{76}\). When there were discrepancies in the translations he noted, in the margin, the interpretations he could not include in the text. He also had recourse to the Biblia de Ferrara (1553)\(^\text{77}\), «to give us the natural and original meaning of the Hebrew words as well as the differences in the

\(^{75}\) Reina's Bible was edited in a facsimile edition in 1986, published by the Sociedades Bibliicas Unidas; Valera's facsimile edition was published in 1990.

\(^{76}\) «thus we did, following the translation of Sanctes Pagninus, who in the opinion of Hebrew scholars is considered to be the most pure that exists».

tenses of the verbs as they were in the text itself». His search for the literal meaning is reflected in his method, as is his interest to bring together all the possible interpretations of the most difficult passages. As Juan de Valdés did, he made a point of differentiating, even in the typography, his explanatory additions from the original text, «because our additions are not additions to the text, but free commentaries, which will only have a value if they are conform with the text». He consulted «most of the extant versions and commentaries».

There is no detailed study of his methodology or of the sources he uses. His literal translation, his notes in the margins and final annotations on the most difficult passages to interpret, make up his most important contribution to the exegesis of the Bible.

4. A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW

The first Spanish humanists, the precursors of the Golden Age, built their exegesis on two pillars which were particular to the Iberian Peninsula: the Jewish tradition with its important cultural legacy of the Middle Ages, and the so-called «Biblias romanceadas», many of which were translations from the Hebrew into the vernacular. Those who wrote the commentaries of that period had some knowledge of Hebrew and the Rabbinical exegesis. But when we arrive in the 16th century, the fundamental factors which will determine the intellectual talent of the principal authors and their form of exegesis will be philology and the return to the original texts. The Polyglot Bibles are the best example of these tendencies: editions of texts in different ancient languages, interlineal versions, prologues and treatises with grammars and lexica included. From an exegetical point of view, the authors who based their interpretation on philology gave priority to the literal sense; as a result, they became aware of the failings of the Vulgate as a translation, and found themselves at odds with the Spanish Inquisition.
Together with these philological exegesis, we cannot ignore the strength of the mystical movements. But these writers for the most part did not know the original texts and their works moved towards a spiritual interpretation of the Bible, and in their writings they were trying to reach God through different methods of prayer. Their exegesis had nothing of the scientific, nor did they pretend that it had; but their spiritual works had a great repercussion at the time, an influence which has lasted up to the present day; for this reason Teresa de Jesús and Juan de la Cruz are far better known in academic circles today than Benito Arias Montano.

The Spanish reformers followed the original texts to the letter, but they also appreciated the Spirit which helped to interpret that letter. Thanks to the spiritual sense, authors such as Juan de Valdés, could bring together the Old and New Testaments and understand the Scriptures as a conversation with God. For a complete overview of the 16th century in Spain, we should include the writers of the Counter-Reformation, who, although their knowledge of philology was not lacking, preferred to keep to with the ecclesiastical orthodoxy that placed the Vulgate as the centre of the biblical commentaries.

Throughout the 16th century in Spain, we find both a multiple and varied approach to exegesis, philological on the one hand, mystical and spiritual on the other. Methodologies stood side by side, from the scientific analysis of texts in the different ancient languages to the most sublime biblical spirituality. In contrast to the authentic philologists of the century (above all, Arias Montano), the authors who used other forms of interpretation were to turn their writings towards a more personal spirituality and a direct relationship with God. But whether they were in one field or another, they all contributed with their works to the fact that the 16th century be rightly known as the Golden Age of Spanish exegesis.

78 Cf. chapter 25 of this volume.
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BAC Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos
CBQ Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CSIC Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
DHEE Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España
FUE Fundación Universitaria Española
RFE Revista de Filología Española
SPLMT Society of Biblical Literature. Masoretic Texts
TRE Theologische Realenzyklopädie