

AUTHORITY, FEAR, AND TOLERANCE IN SPANISH RELIGIOUS DIALOGUES

by

MITCHELL ALLEN MCCOY

(Under the Direction of Dana Bultman)

ABSTRACT

Sixteenth-century Spanish scholars engaged in the philological study of classical and biblical literature were inspired by both the content and structure of their readings. The patronage of scholars by the church, university, and aristocracy combined with the late fifteenth-century advent of the printing press to enable these scholars to respond by publishing their own literary expressions. The present study analyzes three distinct religious dialogues by Juan de Valdés, Miguel Servet, and Fray Luis de León that reflect their respective understandings of Christian doctrine and faith with a focus upon how the dialogues express the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance. While the dialogical form of these intellectuals' literary production mimicked the classical literary dialogues they were studying, the Christian doctrinal content reflected their personal values and pursuits as well as those of the society. Previous scholars of Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* have intensely focused on Erasmus of Rotterdam's influence upon early sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality to the neglect of other autochthonous spiritual influences, namely Fray Hernando de Talavera. Establishing Talavera as an inspirational influence upon Valdés recontextualizes the historical milieu and highlights how Valdés's vernacular Christian dialogue carries on the pedagogical and church reform efforts initiated by Talavera. With the refined historical context in mind, this study is augmented by

Paul Ricoeur's salient characterization of the concept of authority that is then employed to closely read Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Servet's *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, and Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo*. The readings of each dialogue demonstrate how these authors used the dialogue form, language, and characters to establish themselves as authorities of Christian doctrine by sanctioning the credibility of scripture, reaffirming their understanding of the doctrinal centrality of Christ, and showing how fear and tolerance play integral roles in the concept of authority.

INDEX WORDS: Spanish religious dialogue, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, humanism, *studia humanitatis*, authority, fear, tolerance, Juan de Valdés, Miguel Servet, Fray Luis de León, Hernando de Talavera, *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*

AUTHORITY, FEAR, AND TOLERANCE IN SPANISH RELIGIOUS DIALOGUES

by

MITCHELL ALLEN MCCOY

B.A., Samford University, 1992

J.D., Cumberland School of Law, 1995

M.A., The University of Georgia, 2004

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2010

© 2010

Mitchell Allen McCoy

All Rights Reserved

AUTHORITY, FEAR, AND TOLERANCE IN SPANISH RELIGIOUS DIALOGUES

by

MITCHELL ALLEN MCCOY

Major Professor:	Dana Bultman
Committee:	Luis Correa-Díaz
	Jan Pendergrass
	Elizabeth Wright

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
July 2010

DEDICATION

To my mother and father, Susan and Bob, who have loved me well and enabled me to pursue my heart's desire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In *The Call* by Os Guinness, he reflects upon the concept of vocation and in doing so, includes a chapter fittingly titled “Let All Your Thinks Be Thanks.” At the beginning of the chapter, he relates how upon accepting the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1921, Albert Einstein acknowledged his debt of gratitude to his predecessors without whose work he would never have achieved what he did. It is in that same vein of gratitude that I would like to take a few lines to express my thanks to just a few of the many people to whom I owe thanks for the roles they have played in support of my pursuing a Ph.D. in Romance Languages.

First and foremost to be thanked are my father and mother, Bob and Susan, two individuals to whom I owe multidimensional gratitude. Thank you for teaching, supporting, disciplining, and loving me so very well. Likewise, I recognize a deep debt of gratitude to my sister, Amanda, my brother-in-law, Allen, my nephew, Nicholas, and my niece, Claire. The holiday visits with you, phone calls, care packages, and comfortable feeling of being part of such a wonderful family has been and is brilliant.

Without the guidance of Dr. Dana Bultman, my major professor, this project would not have come to fruition. It is with deep, heartfelt thanks that I want to recognize and acknowledge you for your counsel, understanding, and consistent encouragement to me during my time at UGA. Because of your guidance, I have learned much about researching, writing, and teaching. Thank you, Dana! The other members of my committee, Dr. Luis Correa-Díaz, Dr. Jan Pendergrass, and Dr. Elizabeth Wright have been no less inspirational to me for the time they each spent with me in an effort to help me see this dissertation project to its end. Thank you to

each of you for reading and critiquing the dissertation, and for offering your professional advice and personal friendship. To Dr. Noel Fallows, I would also like to express gratitude for your participation as a member of my committee through the written examinations and for your invaluable advice while I was engaged in the job search. I would be remiss if I did not also extend my thanks to Dr. Jose C. Nieto who so kindly wrote me a letter a few years ago with suggestions about additional paths to investigate that helped further my understanding of Juan de Valdés and his writings.

Another integral part of my formation has been the opportunity to spend time abroad and for those experiences I want to say thanks to Dr. Betina Kaplan, Dr. José B. Alvarez IV, and Dr. John Ross. Each of you saw potential in my ability to teach, tutor, and mentor students and gave me priceless opportunities to travel in Argentina and Spain. For your confidence in me and for your friendship I am grateful.

To my undergraduate professors of Spanish, Dr. Sheri Spaine Long, Dr. Myralyn Allgood, Ms. Charlotte L. Coleman, Dr. Grace Ezell Marquez, and Ms. Stephanie Crider Turman, thank you for leading me toward such a satisfying profession. Were it not for the ways in which you engaged me as a student, it is likely I would have missed the distinct pleasure and responsibility I now enjoy – that of joining the academy.

With no less enthusiasm do I express my thanks to friends with whom I have shared these years at UGA. Amy Hernandez, you were my first friend here. Thanks for your acts of selflessness when I needed your help! I would not have finished this without you. Thank you, Dr. Diego del Pozo for listening, laughing, and sharing your friendship with me. To Dr. María Mizzi, I would like to say that I could not have survived this experience without the frequent sushi lunches with you. Carmen María Navarro Ferrer, though you are far away in Vinales, I

cherished spending time with you at UGA, learning much from you about Spain, and cannot wait to meet your son, Víctor. Dr. María del Puig Andrés Sebastiá, your commitment to teaching and personal discipline never ceases to astound me, and I count it a privilege to call you my friend. Thank you, Idoia Cebriá and Dr. Aurora Thorgerson for your friendship and kindnesses to me. To Carl Wise, it was great fun researching last summer with you in Madrid in the Biblioteca Nacional. Thanks for the birthday lunch. Anne Wesserling, thanks for being such a hospitable neighbor. What a great thing to live next to a budding literary critic like you. Dr. Deana Shuman, you have been a great friend and someone upon whom I relied for sage advice about finishing the dissertation in those moments when the path was less certain. Laura Shedenhelm, it was good to run into you in the library and to get your e-mails about newly arrived books that helped me in my research of Spanish religious dialogues.

To my lifelong friend Terri Potter, your visits were wonderful. Your generosity toward me and the longevity of our friendship is deeply satisfying. Jill Robinson, you have been a consistent friend and a great traveling companion. Jeff Goodman, your encouragement and sense of humor kept me rolling along. Mike and Lynn Luster, thanks for calling, listening, and joining me for an occasional slice of caramel cake here in Athens. Ron and Amy Luster, thanks for giving me a truck to drive to the grocery store. Every time I drive someplace, I am reminded of your generosity. Mark Bondi, thanks for interjecting on occasion to talk about the concept of entropy. Gary Baker, thanks for preparing and sharing a few meals with me during the long haul. Thanks also to my friends, Todd Lindley, Jim Hitson, Tim Smith, and Jason Phillips, whose interest in language and culture while we were students at Samford University inspired me to keep at the task of learning. Also, thanks to Mecole Springer, Brenda Hayes, and Shawn Johnson, my former work colleagues who still meet me for lunch around the winter holidays, and

who wished me well in this endeavor when I left Tennessee several years ago for Athens, Georgia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
1. STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP ON JUAN DE VALDÉS AND HIS <i>DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA</i>	1
2. ACCESS TO AUTHORITY: LEGACIES OF FRAY HERNANDO DE TALAVERA IN JUAN DE VALDÉS'S <i>DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA</i>	31
3. AUTHORITY, FEAR, AND TOLERANCE IN VALDÉS'S <i>DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA</i>	71
4. MID AND LATE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY DIALOGUES: MIGUEL SERVET AND FRAY LUIS DE LEÓN	119
5. CONCLUSION.....	170
WORKS CITED	176

CHAPTER 1

STATE OF SCHOLARSHIP ON JUAN DE VALDÉS AND HIS *DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA*

...cuando leemos en la Santa Escritura,
Dios habla con nosotros, así cuando oramos,
nosotros hablamos con Dios,
y así os acordaréis que,
leyendo en estos salmos habla Dios con vos,
y que orando con estos salmos habláis vos con Dios
Prólogo, *El Salterio* – Juan de Valdés

1.1 Valdés and his controversial *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*

Of the many ways that contemporary scholars of sixteenth-century Spanish literature might first encounter Juan de Valdés and the legacy of his writings, the most likely is through his *Diálogo de la lengua*, a dialogue between two Spaniards and two Italians who discuss the origins of vernacular Castilian Spanish. Though not published until the mid-eighteenth century, it has gained renown as a clever dialogue that includes literary criticism, discussions of lexical influences from Greek, Latin, and Arabic, and many examples of colloquialisms and refrains birthed by unique cultural circumstances throughout the Iberian Peninsula.¹ In the critical introduction to Valdés's *Diálogo de la lengua* Cristina Barbolani opines that the prose of Valdés, “no tiene siempre la misma altura, pero diríamos que no escribió ni una línea en la que notemos desatención a ninguno de estos tres puntos” (52). The three points to which Barbolani refers are clarity, personal tone, and stylistic norms, all qualities of writing that Juan de Valdés attempted to use as a guide for his own compositions (52). His training as a philologist at the Universidad de Alcalá de Henares doubtless influenced his taste for well written prose considering he had

¹ Cristina Barbolani points out in her critical introduction to *Diálogo de la lengua* that, “La primera edición es de 1737, cuando aparece como obra anónima, en los *Orígenes* de Mayans” (94).

studied it and the intricacies of language during his university career.² But the humanism and philology he studied are only a partial reflection of Valdés's varied intellectual and personal interests. As a result of his diverse interests, scholars of disciplines outside of Spanish literature or linguistics might encounter him from a very different angle.

Theologians and historians might come upon Valdés while investigating his integral role in Church reform movements in Spain or Italy during the first half of the sixteenth century, before the Council of Trent. In fact, the bulk of extant writings attributable to Valdés are works related to Christian doctrine and translations of Greek and Hebrew biblical scriptures with practical commentaries that he wrote while acting as the spiritual leader of a small group of Italian aristocrats in Naples, Italy. Valdés died in August 1541 and was not alive to become a target of the Roman Inquisition. Just over a decade before his death, he had left Spain and worked for a time in Rome and settled eventually in Naples.

Valdés departed from Spain for Italy because of growing concerns that he might be pursued by the Inquisition for his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, the only work he published during his lifetime, a work that was immediately banned. The controversy over the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is memorialized in the Inquisition records pertaining to the trial of Juan de Vergara, an acquaintance of Valdés who indicated to the tribunal during his testimony that he had recommended changes to the *Diálogo* because Valdés had been imprudent for having written about matters which he did not fully understand.³ As an orientation for the chapters that follow, this chapter will offer an evaluation of the scholarly research on the *Diálogo de doctrina*

² Records from the Universidad de Alcalá are not extant for Juan's biography, but Erasmus referred to his studies of the liberal arts in a letter he wrote to Juan, March 1, 1528 that Fermín Caballero reproduces in *Conquenses ilustres: Alonso y Juan de Valdés*. The relevant portion translated into Spanish reads, "Tengo entendido que te dedicas al studio de las ciencias liberales..." (353).

³ In *Religious Authority in the Spanish Renaissance*, Lu Ann Homza writes, "Vergara further underscored such social and intellectual distinctions when he relayed how Juan de Valdés had 'meddled in matters he had not studied' in the course of writing the *Doctrina cristiana* (36).

cristiana. Though the constraints of the present study do not allow for an exhaustive account, it will be possible to offer a summary of two of the most influential Valdesian scholars that have emphasized the role that the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* has played in defining the author's impact upon the spiritual and intellectual history of Spain. After looking at how Marcel Bataillon and Jose C. Nieto contributed to the analysis of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, it will also be appropriate to see how scholarship in the past two decades has continued to consider the importance of Valdés and his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* as a crucial work for understanding the dialogue genre and the varied currents of spirituality in early sixteenth-century Spain.

1.2 Bataillon awakens the sleeping *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*

Prior to French historian Marcel Bataillon's encounter with the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in 1925 in the National Library of Portugal, there were only unconfirmed references to its existence. Most notably it was included in the Index of Prohibited Books printed in Valladolid in 1551 and in every subsequent printing of the Index. Because Valdés had published the work substituting the title *un religioso* instead of attaching his own name, in the Index it was listed as, "*Diálogo de Doctrina Christiana, compuesto nuevamente por un cierto religioso, sin nombre de autor*" (Díaz 104). Upon finding the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the National Library of Portugal, Bataillon published a facsimile edition of it preceded by his critical introduction composed in French. In the section of the introduction entitled *Avant-propos*, Bataillon conveys a taste of his own excitement and surprise at coming across the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* after having searched in numerous libraries across Spain for what seemed to be a phantom book. He writes,

De patientes et infructueuses recherches à Madrid, à Séville, à Salamanque, à Valladolid, laissaient subsister peu d'espoir, quand, à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Lisbonne, dès ma première visite au riche dépôt des *Reservados*, on mit entre mes mains un volume de tous points conforme à ce que les archives avaient déjà révélé touchant la *Doctrina Cristiana* de Valdés, et l'examen du contenu ne devait pas, bien loin de là, démentir les signes extérieurs.

Sur la page de titre, on peut lire: "*Da livraria de S. V^{te}*". Et en effet, le *Diálogo* figure au *Catalogo dos libros da Livraria do Real Mosteiro de S. Vicente de Fora*, que la Bibliothèque Nationale de Lisbonne conserve en sa section de Manuscrits. On le voit, ce n'est pas dans une retraite clandestine que ce livre a dormi depuis le temps de Valdés jusqu'au nôtre. Mais par quelle chance exceptionnelle! (9)

It was a particularly exhilarating and unique find that offered a work of import for numerous reasons. Foremost, Bataillon confirmed Juan de Valdés as the author of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Establishing Valdés as author, based upon descriptions of the work confirmed by D. Antonio Paz y Mélia in 1914, evoked other questions regarding the dialogue (Avant-propos 8). For example, why the book was prohibited by the *Santo Oficio* of the Inquisition, how it contributed to the dialogical literature of the time, what the basic tenets of its theological content were, how it developed a canon of practical spiritual literature other than the Bible, how it commented upon Gonzalo Berceo's *Los milagros de nuestra señora*, and how it contributed to a growing body of religious literature in vernacular language rather than Latin.

Knowing the importance of the dialogue because of the historical research he had completed, Bataillon deemed the work worthy of publishing in a facsimile edition and did so in

1925 with an extensive and well-documented critical introduction. The uncovering of the work added a third dialogue to the already extant *Diálogo de la lengua* that had been published in 1737 by Gregorio Mayáns and *Alfabeto cristiano* published in 1545.⁴ Since Bataillon published the facsimile edition of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in 1925 it has been republished by six different editors in editions that make the work relatively accessible. The *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* as it appears in Valdés's *Obras completas I* (1997), with an introduction by Angel Alcalá, is preferable to the others because it offers the dialogue in a very readable form without modifying its lexicon nor its orthography, and it includes the marginal annotations that Valdés had originally incorporated.

1.3 Bataillon's Valdés and the influence of Erasmus

In search of useful ways to facilitate understanding of Juan de Valdés, his life, and his legacy of writings, historians, theologians, and literary critics have surveyed the literary landscape of Valdés's work, the biographical information of his youth, epistolary records, and primarily his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in their effort to define him. Looking at the available cumulative record, Bataillon characterized Valdés as strongly influenced by Erasmus because of similarities between Valdés's exposition of the Apostle's Creed and the laudatory recognition that the Spaniard pays to Erasmus in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. For example, in the dialogue when the Archbishop Alva responds to Eusebio's request that he reveal the source of the excellent exposition on the Apostle's Creed, he says, "Que me plaze de muy buena gana. Bien avéys oýdo nombrar un excelente doctor verdaderamente theólogo que agora bive, el qual se llama Erasmo Roterodamo" (30). In the critical introduction to his facsimile edition, Bataillon

⁴ Writing about the third dialogue of Valdés, *Alfabeto cristiano*, first published in 1545, Alcalá says in *Obras completas I*, "Este tercer diálogo de Juan de Valdés, una de sus piezas magistrales, representa el primer paso en lo que ya era su plena dedicación a la tarea espiritual y bíblica a la que se sentía interna y divinamente llamado" (XLVI).

recognizes Valdés's imitation of Erasmus's *Abbas et erudita*, particularly of the Apostle's Creed section that he deems, "Dessein profondément érasmien, sans doute" (100). He also sees the characters Eusebio and Antronio as signs of Valdés borrowing from Erasmus's *Colloquies* (96).

Bataillon's *Erasmus y España* (1938) also provided ample evidence to support his thesis regarding the prevailing influence of Erasmus among many scholars and theologians in early sixteenth-century Spain when Valdés composed the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Affirming Valdés's erasmianism Bataillon writes, "Veremos cómo Juan de Valdés, oyente de Alcaraz en Escalona, llega a ser en Alcalá el más típico representante del erasmismo español" (212). The Erasmian thesis of Bataillon prevailed in the analysis of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and subsequent scholars have perpetuated it to an exaggerated extent. In 1970, however, when Jose C. Nieto published *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*, he challenged the exclusivity of Erasmus's influence upon Valdés by researching, analyzing, and synthesizing the available corpus of historical documents of individuals and events that preceded and followed publication of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The fruit of Nieto's labor in short was recognition of the *Alumbrados* movement and Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz as influential factors in the formative development of Valdesian theological thought. More recently Lu Ann Homza has also begun to challenge the tendency toward an oversimplified characterization of Spanish humanists from the early sixteenth-century as Erasmian. She points out in her article, "Erasmus as hero, or heretic: Spanish Humanism and the Valladolid Assembly of 1527" that,

the crucial difficulty in many treatments of Spanish erasmianism is that they frequently sever Erasmus's pastoral reflections from his hermeneutics, and then handle the appearance of one as if it always connoted the presence of the other. In such readings, certain attitudes toward God and the Church become signs of

erasmianism, and then ones of Renaissance humanism, while any endorsement or even echo of Erasmus's notions implies the acceptance of all his ideas. (81)

The following chapters will deal more particularly with the evidence from the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* that indicate other important historical influences upon Valdés. Of primary importance among those historical influences is the person and legacy of Fray Hernando de Talavera. It is also wise to remain cognizant of the development of Valdés as an individual whose theological views eventually matured to a point that his own name would become a term used as an adjective to describe the small group of disciples with whom he regularly convened while living in Naples, Italy.

The success of Bataillon's work is evidenced in the nearly ubiquitous presence of Erasmus's name in conjunction with descriptions of Valdés's writing or theological ideas. It is warranted to a great extent because there are many indications in Valdés that demonstrate a strong influence of Erasmus's ideas. For example, John Longhurst in *Erasmus and the Spanish Inquisition: The Case of Juan de Valdés* says, "A brief perusal of the *Doctrina Christiana* indicates clearly Valdés' debt to Erasmus and especially to the *Colloquies*, on which he draws heavily for much of his material" (79). Also in *Investigaciones sobre Juan Alvarez Gato*, Francisco Márquez Villanueva says, "Resulta además profundamente lógico que durante el siglo XVI el grato recuerdo de Fr. Hernando fuera evocado a menudo por cuantos participaban en las corrientes renovadoras; erasmistas como los hermanos Valdés (77) y el arcediano del Alcor Alonso Fernández de Madrid..." (124). Or when Cristina Barbolani in "Los diálogos de Juan de Valdés, ¿Reflexión o improvisación?" affirms Valdés as Erasmian commenting, "Cuando Juan de Valdés escribe su *Doctrina christiana* tiene ya asimiladas las enseñanzas erasmistas, en las que se ha formado ya en su adolescencia (de paje en la pequeña corte de Escalona) y en sus

estudios universitarios en Alcalá” (320). The evidence is clearly present, but the long term, continued recognition by scholars over several generations has solidified to the point of fossilization the perception that Juan de Valdés was powerfully influenced in his intellectual formation by the writings of Erasmus.

However it must also be remembered that the influence of Erasmus did not extend to Valdés’s choice of language for conveying his message in the dialogue. Whereas Erasmus was a scholar of Latin and composed his *Colloquies* in Latin, Valdés opted for vernacular Castilian Spanish. As Bataillon has pointed out, Valdés’s section on the Apostle’s Creed does bear a strong resemblance to the explanation of the Christian faith that arises in Erasmus’s *Inquisitio de Fide*. Nonetheless, the Spaniard also draws upon his own more immediate historical circumstances for the decidedly pedagogical and pastoral efforts that are explicitly communicated in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The Archbishop Alva, disciple of Fray Hernando de Talavera, serves as a figure of authority in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Valdés situates the dialogue in the Hieronymite monastery outside of Granada. Other than the section on the Apostle’s Creed, Valdés only refers to Erasmus on two other occasions, once in the section on the *Pater Noster*, and again in the section *De las lecturas*. Notably, he does not affirm Erasmus’s interpretation of the *Pater Noster*. He additionally refers to many other sources as reliable for discerning how to live the Christian faith. Some of the works he cites are those of Patristic writers, of middle age mystics and even his own contemporaries. The epistolary works of Jerome, some of the writings of Augustine, the *Contemptus mundi* by Jean Gerson, and even the confessionary by his contemporary, Pedro Ciruelo are just a sampling of the works that he references. To categorize him as erasmian is too simplistic.

In “El erasmismo y las corrientes espirituales afines,” Eugenio Asensio reminded scholars of the danger of reducing the complexity of spirituality in sixteenth-century Spain when he wrote about Bataillon’s erasmian thesis, “Su tema era revelar y encarecer la influencia de Erasmo. El mío será volver a enredar la madeja, devolver a la vida religiosa su natural complicación. ¡Cuántas aguas venidas de otros manantiales se confundían con la corriente erasmiana” (44). Asensio, however, stops short of seeing the readily apparent impact of the historical circumstances upon Valdés’s composition of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. As stated before, those historical factors will be addressed in greater detail in the next chapter that shows the links between the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and what will be referred to as the pedagogical project of Fray Hernando de Talavera. Instead, Asensio also describes both Alfonso and Juan de Valdés as erasmian. Jose C. Nieto, however, was less convinced of the exclusivity of Erasmus as the sole source of influence upon Juan de Valdés’s theological ideas, and thus took up the task of researching to find other possibilities.

Nieto’s goal was not so much that of obliterating Bataillon’s thesis. Instead he points out that,

Bataillon’s religious interpretation of Valdés does not have the same value as his magnificent historical reconstruction because his broad criterion for determining the “religions of the Spirit” is not based, as is his historical knowledge, in a meticulous analysis of the facts. Rather his norm seems to be derived from the assu[m]ption that all the manifestations of the Spirit are of the same ontological type and are grounded in the same religious and metaphysical worldview. This is what remains questionable in Bataillon’s thesis. (31)

Having pointed out what he believes to be Bataillon's less than clear interpretation of Valdés's specific religious beliefs, Nieto begins to draw what he considers a more accurate portrait. He does so by building upon Bataillon's interpretation and refining it to include as a primary influence upon the theology of Juan de Valdés the anterior and autochthonous source of spirituality coming from the movement of the *Alumbrados*, in particular, Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz.

1.4 Nieto adds Alcaraz as a foundational spiritual influence

The *Alumbrados* movement according to Nieto is, "complex and does not offer a single pattern of common religious ideas" (56). The appeal of the *Alumbrados* for him was their simplicity and organic feel in that their movement was attributable to grassroots origins. The participants were simply meeting in homes with each other and interpreting scripture according to their own understanding. It is likely that they too were accessing the growing body of vernacular spiritual literature that was becoming increasingly available to those that could not read Latin.⁵ Nieto emphatically maintains that the *Alumbrados* fomented a spiritual movement anterior to and independent of the Reformation as it developed in various locations in Northern Europe.⁶ He states that, "the *Alumbrados*, as a spiritual movement at the dawn of the sixteenth century and prior to the Lutheran Reformation, were in their own ground a genuine fermentation of religious ideas independent of any other movement of the Europe of the sixteenth century" (59). If there is anything in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* that hints at Juan having been part of such a movement, it would be the section of his narrative introduction where he recalls that the *Marqués de Villena* is fond of gathering with others in Escalona and of casually talking about

⁵ See F.J. Norton for an Index of Books Printed in Spain 1501-1520 on pages 161-209. These books might have been available to those who were involved in the *Alumbrados* movement.

⁶ Nieto explains that Inquisitional testimony procured from Alcaraz while being tortured with water confirms Isabel de la Cruz as the one who introduced him to the *dexados* movement of the *Alumbrados*. Nieto shows that for Alcaraz the meaning of *dejamiento* was "absolute conviction that a Christian who lives in the love of God in its fullness is still a sinner and may sin, but is free from dogmatic errors and may read the Bible with certainty that the Holy Spirit guides him in biblical interpretation" (62, 64).

matters of Christian faith. Knowing the pleasure that the *marqués* derives from these discussions, Valdés resolves to offer him one in writing and justifies his writing the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* by the following recognition: “Pues deseando yo que V.S., a quien se aplazen tanto las cosas semejantes que jamás se cansa de leerlas, ni de platicarlas, supiesse lo que allí passamos y assí mismo lo supiesen todos los que tienen en esto el affecto que V.S., acordé de escrevirlo todo, según se me acordó en esta breve escriptura ...” (10). Valdés is fondly recalling the dialogues that he had had in Escalona under the direction of Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz whom the *marqués* had hired as a lay preacher. Revelatory for its insight into the personal experience of Valdés, the comment is a reflection of the experience aspect of the “letters and experience” upon which Valdés relies for his construction of the Christian faith that is the subject of his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

The arguments that Jose C. Nieto makes in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation* offer a very thorough critical review of not only Valdés’s biography, but also of his theological foundation. Nieto’s study also stands out for its significance as a source that consolidates and reviews the literature written about Valdés from the sixteenth century to the twentieth, showing how the image of Valdés had changed.⁷ Nieto recontextualized Valdés’s image by highlighting the formation of Valdés’s theological thought under the direction of the lay preacher and *Alumbrado*, Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz. Alcaraz was an autodidact of Latin and part of the *Alumbrado* grassroots movement of illuminated Christians influenced by the teachings of Isabel de la Cruz. For the *Alumbrados*, God’s love was demonstrated through Christ’s grace and an interior change that would be manifested itself in exterior works.

It is Nieto’s general position that the paradigm of Valdés’s Christian beliefs was founded upon the lessons he learned under Alcaraz, rather than on New Testament Pauline teachings

⁷ See Nieto’s *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation* pages 13-47.

introduced through Erasmus. And importantly for Nieto, the ideas of Alcaraz that were passed on to Valdés as a youth in Escalona were anterior to any possible influence from Erasmus. In other words, the structure of Valdés's belief was well established before his educational training as a philologist and that his study of the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin biblical texts. His studious endeavors in theological matters while at the Universidad de Alcalá de Henares only confirmed for Valdés what already was a solid basis of his experience. Nieto also dispenses with the argument that perhaps Erasmus influenced Alcaraz by including details of the Inquisition testimony drawn from Alcaraz while being water tortured in which he reveals the source of his ideas as coming from Isabel de la Cruz approximately fifteen years before the time of his *proceso inquisitorial*. Nieto conducts a simple mathematical operation and deduces that the ideas of Alcaraz as taught to him by Isabel de la Cruz were generated in 1509 or 1510, well in advance of possible influences from either Erasmus or Luther.

Adding further credibility to Nieto's argument is his pointing to the section of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* where Valdés does not sanction Erasmus's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. Nieto says that this is in fact because Valdés's thought is rooted in the profound understanding of sin and grace he learned from Alcaraz. Nieto maintains:

When the approach to Valdés' theology is made from the advantageous point of view gained from the study of Alcaraz' thought, the thought of Valdés himself receives the proper background which helps to illuminate the whole of his religious conception, ideas which cannot be understood when approached with Erasmian spirituality or mystical concepts as the clue to Valdés' interpretation.

Hence Valdés's position in that section of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* demonstrates an independence from Erasmus on an important issue.

One element of Nieto's argument that is less credible is his claim that Valdés used Erasmus simply as a mask to avoid pursuit by the Inquisition for his connection to the *Alumbrados*. In order to surmount the increasingly accepted thesis of Bataillon indicating an exclusive influence of Erasmus upon Valdés, Nieto must have felt compelled to provide an alternative explanation for Valdés having mentioned Erasmus explicitly in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. But taking the mask argument away does not diminish the strong historical evidence Nieto mounted to show Alcaraz's initial generative influence. Aside from its observations and analysis, Nieto's work methodically surveys the critical evaluations of other scholars of Valdés from the sixteenth century up to the time that he published *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation* in 1970. While there is no need to rewrite what is accessible in Nieto, it is pertinent to note those works that Nieto especially esteemed and, of course, those that relate specifically to Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* after it was reintroduced by Bataillon in 1925.

1.5 What Valdesian scholars does Nieto esteem? Some nineteenth-century scholarly contributions.

In the section on the nineteenth century, Nieto singles out the work of Eduard Boehmer both for his dispassionate treatment of Valdés's work, considering it a refreshing aberration among the earlier more polemic evaluations, and for his recognition of the distinction within the *Alumbrados* between the *recogidos* and the *dexados* (59). Regarding the tension between Catholics and Protestants, it is well known that debates over ideological differences were reinforced by a strong sense of conviction regarding matters believed to be of eternal

consequence. The respective differences in theological interpretations made for rather passionate reactions either in favor of or opposition to Valdesian theological ideas. But in Boehmer, Nieto found reasoned and deliberate consideration. He writes, “The sobriety of Boehmer’s judgment is almost unique in Valdesian interpretation, for everyone seems eager to find a proper niche for Valdés. Yet, there are very few Valdesian scholars who had known him so well or were so intimately acquainted with Valdés’ thought” (21). Boehmer’s work on Valdesian texts are transcriptions of Valdés’s biblical translations and accompanying commentaries that he encountered in the *Biblioteca Aulica de Viena*. Those texts arrived in Vienna more than likely via Italian disciples of Valdés fleeing the Roman Inquisition.⁸

From a primarily historical perspective, Fermín Caballero’s *Conquenses ilustres: Alonso y Juan de Valdés* of 1875 provided the first detailed account of the lives of Alfonso and Juan distinguishing them and resolving that they were not twins. Erasmus had alluded to their physical resemblance in one of his letters and some scholars had considered that the two were twins. A facsimile edition of Caballero’s work was published in 1995 and preceded by a detailed introduction about newly discovered archival documents that enabled Miguel Jiménez Monteserín to clarify certain aspects of the Valdés family genealogy. Juan de Valdés’s birth date, sometime around 1500 or 1502, still remains unconfirmed.⁹

The study by Caballero was also significant for its appendix of letters that included a few letters written by Erasmus to Juan de Valdés. Valdesian scholars lament that no letter from Valdés to Erasmus has yet been located. Though a thorough review of the extensive details of the archival information extends beyond the scope of this study, there is one interesting footnote that is worthy of mention because it proposes a possible connection between Juan de Valdés and

⁸ See “The Italian Reformation and Juan de Valdés” by Massimo Firpo for a brief overview of Valdés’s influence in Italy.

⁹ See Alcalá’s introduction to *Obras completas* I, page XII.

Bishop Diego Ramírez de Villaescusa. Montesión hypothesizes that Juan de Valdés might have worked as a page for Bishop Villaescusa. Despite not being directly confirmable by historical documentation, Montesión maintains that there is a hint of the relationship between Valdés and Villaescusa in the Inquisitional testimony of Juan de Huesca. The testimony that Montesión provides in his footnote is provided here because it offers possible confirmation of contact between Valdés as a young man with Bishop Villaescusa who had studied under the direction of Fray Hernando de Talavera. Montesión builds his case in the footnote as follows:

En la documentación aparece por aquellos años un Rodrigo de Valdés como secretario de Villaescusa, de quien no podemos afirmar categóricamente si era o no pariente de Hernando y sus hijos, pero que bien pudiera constituir otro nexo que ligara a éstos con el grupo afín a los “borgoñes” en la Corte...De cualquier modo, en el proceso inquisitorial de Juan de Huesca, aludiéndose a una negociación hecha por éste años atrás cerca de Villaescusa en tanto que presidente de la Chancillería vallisoletana, se dice lo siguiente, referido verosíblemente a Juan, que contaría entonces unos diez y ocho o veinte años: “xiiii, yten si saben, etc. que después como el dicho Juan de Huesca vido al dicho Miguel Conde presso tanto tiempo e tan mal tratado con grillos e más mal tratado que los otros, porque le veyá muy fatigado, el dicho Juan de Huesca le vesitaba muchas vezes, e fue al Reverendísimo señor Obispo de Cuenca e le suplycó, él y Valdés que era su paje estonces, que le mandase quitar los grillos y el dicho señor Obispo no quería, porque decía que su señoría no era juez de la cabsa, (...)” Cfr. A.D.C., Inq. leg. 107, exp. 1513, fol. 118 vto. (XLVIII)

This hypothesis of Montesión is relevant to the next chapter where other disciples of Talavera like Villaescusa will be shown to have had impact upon Juan de Valdés, the cumulative effect of which was to motivate Valdés to understand, adopt, and carry on Talavera's catechistic project and Church reform efforts. Montesión thinks such a connection between Valdés and Villaescusa was possible and thus he writes, "Aún así, faltos todavía de algún argumento documental concluyente, nos atreveríamos a sugerir que, o bien Juan se halló antes de llegar a Escalona en el entorno familiar y cortesano de los marqueses de Moya, o bien pudo haber acompañado a su hermano Diego en Valladolid, al menos desde que en 1518 tuvo Cuenca nuevo obispo, y haber estado al servicio de don Diego Ramírez de Villaescusa" (XLVIII). That Valdés could have been the page of Bishop Villaescusa lessens the degrees of separation between him and the Archbishop Talavera who figures prominently in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* for his admonitions to moral purity and to the importance of Christian indoctrination early in life. Perhaps Montesión or some other Valdesian scholar will solidify the connection that seems plausible.

1.6 Twentieth-century contributors

The twentieth century is the century in which Marcel Bataillon found the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the National Library of Portugal, and José F. Montesinos uncovered a corpus of epistolary literature written by Valdés during his time in Rome and Naples to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga. In relation to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, there is little to add because after Bataillon's introduction of the text and his thorough historical and textual analysis, few were inclined to recapitulate the themes with which he had already dealt. Neither are the letters published by Montesinos as important for the present study, because they are the product of

Valdés's friendship with Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga many years after Valdés had composed his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

The works reviewed by Nieto reveal widely differing interpretations of Valdés's religious orientation that, in their composite, form an impressive and variegated classificatory tapestry that includes qualifiers like mystic, reformer, protestant, adogmatic and enigmatic, just to name a few. The most intriguing observations tend to be some psychological analyses by Benedetto Croce, and finally the work of the Franciscan Friar Domingo de Santa Teresa who viewed Valdés as a Pre-Tridentine Catholic Reformer (41).

Apart from Nieto there is no other analytical work about Juan de Valdés that treats him or the literary and religious works he wrote with such thoroughness and reliable scholarship. For understanding Valdés, Nieto is essential. After the publication of *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation* in 1970 and its Spanish version in 1979, there had been no full length monographs written about Valdés until the 2008 publication of Daniel Crews's biography of Valdés, *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés*. Crews renews the scholarly dialogue with his full length book despite its focus upon the Spaniard's more politically motivated machinations during his time in Italy. Valdés spent the remaining eleven years of his life in Rome and Naples, that is from around 1530 until his death in 1541. Despite the lack of any full-length books on Valdés from 1979 until 2008, scholars did not lose track of Valdés nor did their interest wane. A corpus of articles has served to keep the dialogue vibrant over the past four decades, as authors other than Nieto addressed various issues ranging from the religious orientation of Valdés to his literary and linguistic contributions.¹⁰ Before approaching the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the second chapter, the task remains of looking

¹⁰ For linguistic analysis of Valdés's works see Kormi Anipa's *The Grammatical Thought and Linguistic Behaviour of Juan de Valdés* (2007).

at Carlos Gilly's claim that Luther was the true inspiration behind Valdés *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. In addition, the contributions of Daniel Crews's biography should also be considered as well as Angel Alcalá's critical introduction to the first volume of the *Obras completas* of Juan de Valdés.

1.7 Most recent studies of Valdés: Gilly, Nieto, Alcalá, Crews, and Herrero

After Nieto's publication of *Juan de Valdés: Origins of the Spanish and Italian Renaissance*, Carlos Gilly wrote an article arguing that Valdés had used Erasmus not as a mask to conceal the influence of the *Alumbrados*, but rather to conceal his latent Lutheranism. In *Juan de Valdés, traductor y adaptador de escritos de Lutero en su Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Gilly maintains that,

La insistencia sobre el influjo de Erasmo fue en realidad un subterfugio utilizado por el autor para impedir que los censores descubrieran sus verdaderas fuentes: Martín Lutero, *Decem Praecepta Wittenbergensi praedicata populo* de 1518; Lutero, *Explanatio dominicae orationis pro simplicioribus laicis* de 1520; J. Ecolampadio *In Isaiam Prophetam Hypomnemata* de 1525; y probablemente Ph. Melanchton, *Enchiridion elementorum puerilium* de 1524. (85-86)

Gilly proceeds through the article to support his thesis of Lutheran influence in the doctrinal message of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, by placing textual examples side by side to show their parallels.

However, Nieto responded with a very sound rebuttal to Gilly's article in his essay, "The Changing Image of Valdés in Recent Historiography (1970-1990)." In his rebuttal, Nieto defends his original analysis that posits Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz's teachings as the anterior influence upon the theological formation of Valdés. He then refutes Gilly's challenge by

pointing out that the parallel textual examples offered by Gilly to prove that Valdés was translating from Luther, and the other mentioned Reformers, to compose his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* are extrapolations from biblical texts that could and likely would produce not only very similar interpretations but also written expressions that bear significant resemblance to each other. In support of his refutation, Nieto cites the critique of Margherita Morreale who also finds a weakness in Gilly's methodology because the points that are common to both have been treated so many times by others and because the highlighted doctrines are not specifically Lutheran. ("Changing Image" 72). Nieto rigorously defends Valdés's status as a thinking theologian and remains skeptical of Gilly's hypothesis. He cannot imagine Valdés as an adaptor of texts when he writes, "The impression that we get is one of Valdesian pages spotted with so many Lutheran texts that we have a tightly packed mosaic of Lutheran texts which Valdés would have to 'cut' and 'paste' for the manuscript *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*" ("Changing Image" 77-78). Gilly's analysis is novel and gained some following while also pushing Nieto to admit, as he had in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Italian and Spanish Reformation*, the possibility of Valdés having drawn some inspiration for his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* from other reformers in Europe.

Notwithstanding the challenge, Nieto's own Alcarazian thesis is still strong because there is no conclusive proof of the anteriority or superiority of Luther as a primary influence upon Valdés while he composed his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Remaining confident in the position he took, Nieto reiterates in the essay how he came to his conclusion that Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz was the generative influence in Valdesian Christocentricity. It is a convincing and reasonable argument that spiritual affinities do not necessarily indicate translation or even

adaptation. And as long as no documentary proof exists to show that Valdés was translating or adapting Luther, the influence of Alcaraz remains particularly persuasive.

Nieto also addresses the criticism of his work from other scholars who claimed that he had wrapped Valdés in cellophane and sealed him off from Europe (100). Nieto explains that he is not naïve to the fact that Valdés very possibly did have access to theologians who were writing about the very doctrines that he includes in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, but maintains that the primary influence was the youthful one from Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz. Nieto never insisted that Valdés was completely isolated from the influences of those whose names are customarily associated with the Reformation. He simply reserved the *Alumbrados* interpretation as taught through Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz as the most trustworthy and verifiable explanation for Valdés's adherence to the theological themes that appear in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

As a testament to the importance of Juan de Valdés for his contribution to the literary and spiritual patrimony of Spain, the first of two volumes that will constitute Valdés's *Obras completas* was published in 1997 with Angel Alcalá's introductory review of the scholarship on Valdés. In addition, Alcalá composed short summaries of the works contained in the volume. His research and delivery in the introductory portion is not surprisingly thorough and balanced, but does not attempt to be exhaustive or comprehensive. With respect to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, he recognizes the continued importance of Bataillon's critical introduction to the 1925 facsimile version of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. At the same time, he also recognizes Nieto's contribution to an understanding of Valdesian theological views. Despite his complimentary attitude toward Nieto's scholarship and erudition on the *Alumbrados* influence and Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz, Alcalá seems to agree with Gilly regarding the possibility of Luther's influence upon Alcaraz and subsequently Valdés. He states that Nieto's

fallo fundamental consistió en dejarse obnubilar tanto por su genial descubrimiento de que el alumbradismo de Alcaraz contiene un germen pre-luterano de la doctrina básica de la justificación por la fe que le impidió investigar a fondo en cómo Valdés la corrobora con frases tomadas a la letra de escritos populares de Lutero. (XXXVI)

However, Alcalá does not specify which phrases those are, nor does he give the impression that he read Nieto's response to Gilly's essay. His final judgment is that despite Gilly's discovery of similarities in the texts, it does not make of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* a "primera compilación española de escritos de Lutero" (XXXVI). Despite their brevity, Alcalá's introductory remarks to the first volume of Juan de Valdés's *Obras completas* are useful not only for Alcalá's comments about the three sources of Valdesian scholarship that deserve most attention, but also for the bibliography that he includes at the end providing a good cross section of scholarly works that provide further insight into the historiographical, literary, and theological richness of Valdés.

The final two works that must be mentioned before moving into a more detailed analysis of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* are particularly recent publications. One is a biography of Valdés written by Daniel Crews and the other an introductory essay of David Estrada Herrero in a modernized, paperback version of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* edited by Emilio Monjo Bellido. The biography, *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés*, published in 2008 by Daniel Crews, treats its reader to a carefully researched and well-written biography of Valdés, although at times Crews offers personal characterizations with embellished language that jeopardizes the credibility of his judgment. For example Crews writes, "Juan clawed his way into Charles's personal service" (4). Nonetheless his analysis of

Valdés's political savvy is noteworthy because it offers a more realistic portrait of a man whose character may have too often been equated by previous scholars with the characters or demands of his writings on Christian faith. Crews is determined to remind his readers that despite writing a tremendous amount about the Christian faith and knowing quite well the principles and rudiments of the faith Valdés confessed, a review of his life would also reveal the frequent disparity between his writings of aspiration and his actual experiences.

Crews approaches the life of Juan de Valdés from a more politically oriented standpoint and evaluates the man's professional roles as Charles V's intermediary to Pope Clement VII in Rome and during the subsequent years that Valdés spent in Naples when he was acting on behalf of the Viceroy of Naples, Pedro de Toledo and also employed at times by Francisco de los Cobos, "Charles's most powerful secretary, who had ultimate responsibility for all Italian and Spanish affairs of state" (4). There are a few observations that Crews makes in the first chapter of his book that are worth pointing out here because they are evaluative statements about the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

His narrative summary of the content of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, given in the first chapter of the biography, is accurate and concise. Crews recognizes Lu Ann Homza's desire to reconsider the preeminence of Erasmus as an exclusive influence in the historical mise-en-scène. He writes, "With quasi-official sanction, Alcalá scholars felt free to blend together doctrines of the *Alumbrados*, Erasmus, and even Early Protestant reformers into a stimulating brew misleadingly labeled Erasmianism by modern historians. No work better expressed this intellectual hybrid than Juan de Valdés's *Dialogue on Christian Doctrine*" (27-28). He is referring to the environment at the Universidad de Alcalá in which Valdés composed his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. However, after recognizing the need to avoid repeating the totalizing

classification of Juan de Valdés as Erasmian, Crews seems to go on making statements that classify Valdés as erasmian, for example when he writes that, “Alfonso de Valdés was the undisputed leader of the Spanish Erasmian movement and Juan’s primary mentor” (29). Later Crews says, “The structure of Alcalá’s curriculum indicates the type of education Juan de Valdés would have acquired at Alcalá beyond Erasmian immersion” (31). The implication of such statements seems to point directly to Erasmus as the primary influence upon Valdés. In describing the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* Crews characterizes Valdés’s voice of authority, the Archbishop Alva as “a model Erasmian reformer, closely paralleling La[c]tancio’s comment in Alfonso’s *Dialogue on Events in Rome*” (35). These are characterizations that, on their face, do not take into account the historical influences of Archbishop Hernando de Talavera who is lauded in Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and is, as will be argued in the following chapter, a source of inspiration for the reform minded catechistic efforts that Valdés promotes.

Crews does correctly assess the intended audience of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* when he recognizes it as a work designed “to call on other bishops and archbishops to immediately begin reforming their dioceses” (38). But the inception of the diocesan reform has roots that extend farther back in the historical timeline that long antedate the critique of the church offered in Erasmian *Colloquies*. Thus, Erasmus cannot be seen as the sole originator or generative force behind Valdés’s call for church reform in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The reform that Valdés is advocating had been percolating for nearly five decades, and is rooted in the National Council of Seville of 1478, spearheaded by then *Prior del Prado*¹¹ Hernando de Talavera, Confessor of the *Reyes Católicos*.¹²

¹¹ Talavera served as prior of the monastery of the Hieronymite order outside the city wall of Valladolid until assuming the bishopric of Avila.

¹² See *BRAH Tomo XXII*, sections I and V pages 234, 239.

Crews's evaluation of the personal character of Juan de Valdés is candid and highlights the disparities between Valdés's aspirational writings and the sometimes bawdy personal anecdotes in which the Spanish authors apparently liked to revel at times. He points out contradictions between the admonitions of Valdés's writings and the historical evidence of Valdés's life to conclude that Valdés is best described as, "brilliant, spiritual, sensual, earnest, ambitious, deceptive, and egotistical" (160). Crews's judgment is well supported by the many footnotes referencing interactions between Valdés and his contemporaries. However, there are moments when it could be argued that Crews's evaluations of Juan's personal character extend beyond the limits of scholarly proof and decorum, such as when he writes of the young man's interest in the *Alumbrados*, "Thus his initial attraction to the *alumbrado* gatherings where young men and women had freer, and in the minds of inquisitors scandalous, association may well have stemmed from physical as well as spiritual inspiration" (21). At other times the choice of language and intimations used to characterize Valdés borders on the defamatory by implying possibly illicit sexual relationships that are speculative.

As a concluding comment of this section on recent studies there is one final work that should be referenced, namely the introductory comments written by David Estrada Herrero in Emilio Monjo Bellido's 2008 edition of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The paperback version of the text does not include the word *cristiana* on its cover, which may be an intentional or a grave editorial oversight, but the content of Herrero's introductory remarks are soundly researched and footnoted. The edition contains a summary of the historical and theological characterizations of Juan de Valdés, but it also characterizes the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* as, "el primer libro protestante español impreso en nuestro país en 1529" (8). While the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* does contain significant elements of ideas theologically similar to those of

other protestants, there is nothing in the work itself that implies protest. There is much in the dialogue that aims to reform the clergy and recontextualize Christian living that suffered, in the view of Valdés, when divorced from the spirit of Christian doctrine explained so poignantly in the Sermon on the Mount that he deemed essential to a pure understanding of Christian faith.

Regarding Gilly's article on the Lutheran influence in Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Herrero maintains the same reservations as Nieto and other scholars who are reluctant to see the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* as an explicit translation of sections of Luther's writings. Herrero, like others, agrees that because the scriptures analyzed are the source for both Valdés and Luther, it is not surprising that they would produce strikingly similar expressions on Christian faith:

Si se comparan idénticos versículos de la *Epístola a los Romanos* comentados por Lutero, Calvino, Philippi, Hodge y Murray – por citar sólo unos nombres importantes –, se apreciarán sorprendentes afinidades que únicamente se explican por la *fuentes común* de la que han bebido doctrinalmente y se han inspirado: el *pensamiento* y el *lenguaje* del apóstol Pablo. (Herrero 43)

Herrero does not shed any new light upon Juan de Valdés, but his summary of the life and work of Valdés is a good introduction to the work. The modernized spelling and changing of some of the lexicon of the dialogue makes the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* accessible to the reader who is not familiar with sixteenth-century Spanish. It is apparent that this edition is not designed with a scholarly audience in mind.

1.8 Recharacterizing the foundation and looking ahead

Having reviewed Valdesian scholarship as it currently stands, it is possible to make some final observations in a brief caesura before moving ahead to the following chapters that will

evaluate the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance in Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Miguel Servet's *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, and Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo*. The next chapter will recontextualize the historical view of sixteenth-century spirituality to include Fray Hernando de Talavera, showing how his reform efforts stemming back to the late 1470s and his tireless efforts to offer works of Christian doctrine in vernacular language were an important influence upon many who have long been considered rather exclusively as Erasmians. The intent is not to eliminate Erasmus as an influential factor, nor to erase the resounding impact he had upon Spain as it entered into the *Edad Moderna*, but rather to include, especially in relationship to Juan de Valdés, Archbishop Hernando de Talavera.

Two essays by Paul Ricoeur, "Autonomy and Vulnerability" and "The Paradox of Authority" will serve to establish a working definition of the concept of authority that will be used as the theoretical foundation for textual analysis of the dialogues evaluated in the third and fourth chapters. The definition and observations of Ricoeur will enable textual analysis of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* to show how Valdés constructed and revealed his ideas about authority in the dialogue. The final chapter will continue the analysis of the concept of authority using the Ricoeurian theoretical foundation to see how authority is recognized by Miguel Servet's *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, and Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo*. The ancillary concepts of fear and tolerance, though not as developed as the ideas about authority, are integral to the discussion of authority as imagined, written, and lived by each of these dialogue writers and are treated as corollary elements that cannot be excluded from the discussion.

To reset an entrenched characterization of historical influence after it is initially narrated by scholars who offer reliable and erudite justifications for their theses is a challenging and risky

task. The risk is manifest in the possibility of offending prior scholars, to whom one owes a debt of knowledge, by questioning the ways in which they conceived and composed their narratives. But the challenge is worth the risk, especially here where the intention of the present study is aimed less at proving prior scholars wrong than it is aimed at adjusting the scholarly perspective by drawing into consideration a wider array of historical figures that, though seemingly peripheral, are important for understanding the complexity of sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality.

To achieve the goal of recharacterization it is incumbent to make one final observation about the prevailing historical perspective of the two best-known Valdesian scholars, Marcel Bataillon and Jose C. Nieto. A review of the scholarly literature written about Juan de Valdés by Bataillon and Nieto does, on occasion, mention Fray Hernando de Talavera. However, both generally recognize him simply as an anecdotal example of stellar Christian morality that Valdés employed in his discussion of the commandment of the Church to pay tithes and offerings (*diezmos y primicias*). Bataillon and Nieto, barely treat the life and influence of Fray Hernando de Talavera. Instead, they both seem to found their respective approaches toward the early sixteenth-century historical setting with their critical eye fixed upon the person of Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros. Bataillon's first chapter of his *Erasmus y España* is headed by the title "Cisneros y la prerreforma española" (1). The dramatic effect of Bataillon's characterization of the historical moment in the first sentence of his book is palpable as he highlights the coincidence of Cisneros's death, Luther's posting of his theses on the door of the church in Wittenberg, and Charles V's ascension to the throne in Spain. Capturing the reader's imagination through his characterization of the moment by referring to Cisneros's death establishes the mood for the next forty-three pages as he goes on to construct the foundation and

structure that has been the predominant historical interpretation of sixteenth-century studies of Spanish spirituality since its publication in 1938. Bataillon heightens the dramatic effect of the convergence of these three historical figures; Cisneros, Luther, and Charles V, but he quickly sets Cisneros upon a dais establishing his crucial and preeminent role. He writes,

El movimiento espiritual que nos proponemos estudiar en este libro no nació del acto revolucionario de Lutero. Quizá sea en él donde Prerreforma, Reforma y Contrarreforma manifiestan mejor su unidad profunda. La España de Cisneros contiene en germen todo lo que desarrollará la de Carlos V y todo lo que se esforzará en salvar la de Felipe II. (1-2)

Dramatic and all encompassing is this “España de Cisneros,” and reflective of the extent of power that Cisneros wielded during his tenure as one of the most influential and commanding members of an ecclesiastical elite so intricately interwoven into Charles V’s monarchy. The portrait of sixteenth-century spirituality and power in Spain that Bataillon paints so convincingly and with such detail in *Erasmus y España* is framed by Fray Francisco de Cisneros.

The resounding effect of Bataillon’s privileged estimation of Cisneros are echoed by Jose C. Nieto in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Italian and Spanish Reformation* in the chapter, “Religious Fermentation in Spain at the Dawn of the Six[t]eenth Century” (51). Though he begins the chapter with a reference to Juan de Valdés, two paragraphs later he writes,

The dominant Spanish figure of this period, who lived in all his intensity the problems which Spain was facing at that time, and who outlived several of her kings and epochmaking personalities such as Gonzalo de Córdoba, the *Gran Capitán*, and Christopher Columbus, was Cardinal D. Fra. Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros. (51)

In the following five pages, Nieto also lauds Cisneros for his founding of the Universidad de Alcalá, for his encouragement of translating religious literature, and his efforts to reform corrupt clergy (52-53). Unlike Bataillon, Nieto makes no reference to Archbishop Hernando de Talavera, despite giving a rather detailed explanation of the content of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in which Valdés, through the voice of the Archbishop Alva, mentions Talavera several times.

While it is appropriate and necessary to concede the integral role that Fray Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros played in establishing the ecclesiastical and political tenor of spirituality in Spain's early sixteenth-century, particularly with the founding of the Universidad de Alcalá and the intellectual freedom that initially characterized the university and its press, it is time to recharacterize the influence of other important figures. To do so it is not necessary for the slate to be wiped clean but instead to invite different partners into the dialogue to help refine the understanding of the dialogues written by Valdés, Servet, and Fray Luis de León. The first new partner in the dialogue is Archbishop Hernando de Talavera and he is introduced best by Fray José de Sigüenza in his *Historia de la orden de San Jerónimo*. To explain the esteem in which Talavera was held Sigüenza writes,

Aunque he tocado alguna cosa en los Capítulos passados acerca de la escuela santa de este Apostolico Arçobispo y de la gente tan santamente disciplinada que se crio en su casa y a los pechos de su exemplo y doctrina, quiero, y como quien coge los frutos sazonados del árbol, hazer aquí vna breue suma de ellos, no de todos, sino de los mas granados, que seria esotro como cosa larga, y verase que tal fue el árbol, pues es la infalible regla del Euangelio que no ay mas cierta prueua para conocerlos. (319)

Despite the appearance of hagiographic hyperbole that one might believe drips from the pen of Fray Sigüenza as he wrote the preceding quote, his later biographer, the Arcediano de Alcor Alonso Fernández de Madrid assures us that the fame of Talavera's stellar moral character was warranted. Fernández de Madrid, acquaintance of Juan de Valdés, affirms in his biography of Talavera that he published in *Silva palentina* that, whereas some might fear exaggerating the virtuous works of the biographic subject, with Talavera the greater fear was cutting too short the innumerable good deeds done by the Archbishop. As Fernández de Madrid puts it, "temo más errar por echar corto, dexando olvidadas muchas cosas verdaderas" (6). The gravity of Talavera's character and his acts, particularly his efforts to reform the Church and to translate and offer evangelical Christian doctrine via *manuales*, *catecismos*, and *cartillas* to his diocese in Granada and beyond, are qualities that Valdés recognized, incorporated, and mentioned in his work. The following chapter will offer a closer look at how Talavera's legacy materialized in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

CHAPTER 2

ACCESS TO AUTHORITY: LEGACIES OF FRAY HERNANDO DE TALAVERA IN JUAN DE VALDES'S *DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA*

Pues con la continua conversación que yo tuve con este santo hombre, y con ver sus costumbres y santidad, aproveché mucho en aquellas cosas que mi padre y mi maestro me avían enseñado, y aun si al presente tuviéramos más tiempo, no holgara de cosa más que de contaros algunas cosas de aquel bienaventurado arzobispo, y ellas fueron tales y tan señaladas, que a qualquiera deste Arçobispado que las preguntéis os la dirá.

Diálogo de doctrina cristiana 130-131

2.1 Fray Hernando de Talavera: Another partner in the dialogue

Traditionally scholars of Juan de Valdés have characterized the historical period in which he lived as being dominated by the influence of the Cardinal of Spain Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros whose seminal role in the establishment of the Universidad de Alcalá de Henares left a particularly tangible imprint upon the Spanish ecclesiastical and intellectual landscape. Historiographers like Marcel Bataillon and Jose Nieto have seized upon Cisneros's influence to characterize the historical scene when Valdés wrote his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The other historical figure that looms large over the first half of the sixteenth century is Erasmus of Rotterdam whose name often precedes or follows Juan de Valdés's and ends up having a totalizing effect upon the person and work of Valdés.

However, the actors upon the stage of Spanish spirituality and the depth of the roots of Spanish Christian spirituality were more diverse than one cardinal and one Low Country theologian. While Cisneros's and Erasmus's influences are undeniable, this chapter postulates Archbishop Hernando de Talavera as an equally important contributor to the social, political and

spiritual milieu in which Valdés penned his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, and posits that Talavera's efforts in the printing and distribution of *doctrinas* and *cartillas* in vernacular Spanish, his political and ecclesiastical efforts at reform, and his translation of scripture paved the way for Valdés to write this doctrinal dialogue, one that took as its inspiration the Talaverian pedagogical project of disseminating printed doctrinal literature to the literate populations of Spain. Recognizing the Erasmian influence upon the theological writings of Valdés, but also the possible influence of Hernando de Talavera, Francisco Márquez Villanueva was correct to point out in *Investigaciones sobre Juan Álvarez Gato* that other influences upon the spiritual currents of early sixteenth-century intellectuals like Juan de Valdés must be taken into account for an accurate and more complete view: "Resulta además profundamente lógico que durante el siglo XVI el grato recuerdo de Fr. Hernando fuera evocado a menudo por cuantos participaban en las corrientes renovadoras; erasmistas como los hermanos Valdés (77) y el arcediano del Alcor Alonso Fernández de Madrid..." (124).

Valdés's selection of one of Talavera's spiritual progeny as his voice of authority in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, the Archbishop Pedro Ramírez de Alva,¹³ is a connection that has been mentioned before, but never fully emphasized, investigated, or considered by scholars. But upon deeper reflection, there are other textual hints in Valdés's *Diálogo* that show his esteem for Talavera. For example, his insertion of an anecdote about the honorable comportment of Talavera with respect to the doctrine of tithes and offerings and the stewardship of those *rentas* earned by all members of the clergy. In addition, there are other contemporaries or students of Talavera that may have had some impact upon the historical environment in which Valdés circulated, for example Luis Cabeza de Vaca and Diego Ramirez de Villaescusa. An

¹³ Archbishop Alva's name is alternatively spelled Alba. This study opts for Alva because the critical edition of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* used for all quotes opts for the "v" instead of the "b".

investigation of the historical setting and the similarities in pedagogical approaches of Talavera and Valdés have led to the ideas expressed in this chapter and the argument that Valdés's work in many ways can be seen as an evolved product of the pedagogical and reform-minded efforts begun by Talavera. By adding Talavera to the list of what other scholars have previously shown to be important influences upon Valdés, this chapter will expose a thread of autochthonous spiritual continuity between late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century Spanish thinkers. As Francisco Márquez Villanueva said in *Investigaciones sobre Juan Alvarez Gato*, “el gran legado de Fr. Hernando fue en realidad su fascinante y revolucionaria vida, impregnada de caridad cristiana y de clarividencia ante los grandes problemas de su tiempo” (110).

Paul Ricoeur's insightful analysis of authority, especially its paradoxical quality of being difficult to legitimate, drives the analysis of the concept of authority in the texts being studied here. Looking at authority, fear and tolerance as three inextricably linked themes within the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* I will begin my analysis of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in this chapter considering the avenues of possible Talaverian impact and inspiration upon Valdés who has traditionally been considered erasmian. This chapter will focus upon the historical legacy and inspiration of Hernando de Talavera in Valdés and his desire to provide access to authority through vernacular expression of Christian doctrine, and serve as a segue into the following chapters that offer a more detailed reading of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and the concepts of authority, fear and tolerance as fleshed out in Ricoeur's essays on autonomy and authority.

Paul Ricoeur's concise definition of authority is developed with specificity in the essay, “The Paradox of Authority” which will serve as a useful point of departure. Ricoeur simply states:

Nevertheless, as a first approximation, the notion of authority is relatively easy to define. The *Robert* dictionary says, ‘the right to command, the power (recognized or not) to impose obedience.’” Authority, therefore, is a species of power, the power to command. This immediately underscores the dissymmetrical, hierarchical aspect of a notion that brings face-to-face those who command and those who obey. (91)

Converting Ricoeur’s concise definition of authority into a question and using it to analyze the historical context of sixteenth-century Spain yields the following inquiries: Who is in command at the beginning of the sixteenth-century in Spain? This initial question might be followed by a corollary question regarding who confers that right to command. The short answer to both inquiries appears in the title, *los reyes católicos*, conferred upon Isabel and Ferdinand by Pope Alexander VI in 1494 and subsequently used in the historical narratives about them and their reign (Elliot 65). The *reyes* are in command or at least wield sufficient power over the subjects of Aragon and Castille to impose upon them some form of obedience. The adjective *católicos* answers the question of conferral of the right to command indicating that it comes from the Roman Catholic Church. The denomination is a self-contained testament to their authority because it recognizes both their temporal power to execute their reign (*reyes*), by imposing obedience upon their subjects, and acknowledges the source from which the conferred right to command proceeds, the Roman Catholic Church. The marital alliance of Isabel and Ferdinand that joined the two separate reigns of Castille and Aragon was paralleled by a tense union between the political and moral authorities of the monarchy and the Roman Catholic Church.

The legitimacy of Isabel and Ferdinand’s reign and of the Spanish manifestation of the Roman Catholic Church depended upon an ideal type of medieval Christendom. Though not

speaking specifically about Spain, Ricoeur describes the late medieval governing system well, pointing out that “the two powers and the two corresponding authorities mutually supported each other, the ecclesiastical one offering its unction to the monarch, while the political realm offered the sanction of the secular arm in return. Unction plus sanction could ensure the practical functioning of an internally divided theological politics” (100-101). Ricoeur is correct to point out the divided theological politics that have always been a characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church, chiefly because of differences in doctrinal opinion. Sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality is an excellent example of the tensions of internally divided theological politics. Antonio Luis Cortés Peña in his study of Granada’s incorporation into Christendom after 1492 alludes also to the fusion of the monarchical and ecclesiastical authorities stating,

la concesión pontificia del Patronato Real en 1486 – bula de Inocencio VIII – involucró de modo más profundo y directo a la propia Corona en la actuación eclesiástica. Se instauró una Iglesia íntimamente unida a la Monarquía, convertida así en su más firme protectora; en realidad, era la plasmación de una firme alianza entre los dos poderes que buscaron su fortaleza en el apoyo mutuo.
(24)

This fusion of monarchy with ecclesial authorities offered an avenue for Talavera and others an audience with the monarchy and more significantly a powerful role in determining policies to be implemented in the merged kingdoms.

In order to facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of sources of influence on Spanish spirituality outside those exposed by previous scholars, one must first address the question of what role Talavera played in the internally divided theological politics and then show how his role created a legacy of inspiration for Juan de Valdés. Looking at Talavera as an

influence upon Valdés, broadens the dialogue on his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, re-evaluating who he considered authoritative figures for understanding Christian doctrine and how those sources penetrated the intellectual climate in which Valdés was attempting to develop and pass on his own efforts to know God.

Recognizing that there are approaches to analyzing Talavera's influence upon Valdés, the present chapter will be limited to three readily discernable ways in which Talavera and Valdés exhibit similar approaches to indoctrination that are arguably parallel and that demonstrate how Valdés was inspired both implicitly and explicitly by the writing and life of Hernando de Talavera. The first theme is reform in both political and ecclesiastical realms. The second is access to doctrine in the vernacular through the publication and dissemination of catechistic manuals referred to as *cartillas* and *doctrinas*. And the final theme is that of translation of scripture. Before looking at the specifics of how Talavera's life and writings forged a loving pedagogical project that impacted Valdés and set the stage for him to write a catechism for the catechizers, a brief review of who Talavera was as a person and how historians have recorded and remembered him is in order.

2.2 Biographies of Fray Hernando de Talavera

Thorough biographical treatments of Archbishop Hernando de Talavera (1428-1507) are not as readily accessible as those of Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, but they nonetheless do exist and with some effort, a rather extensive bibliography of secondary literature also begins to appear. Most of the bibliography is decidedly historical as opposed to theological or literary in its focus. However, the most recent biographical treatment of Talavera is that of musicologist María Julieta Vega García-Ferrer who, in her analysis of Talavera's mass composed upon the conquest of Granada in 1492, includes significant background details

showing a thorough understanding of him and the trajectory of his career as an ecclesiastic and politically adept advisor to Queen Isabel. In the book *Fray Hernando de Talavera y Granada* García-Ferrer analyzes some older biographical sources written by Fray Alonso Fernández deMadrid, and the Hieronymite Historiographer José de Sigüenza, pointing out that Talavera's intellect was admired even as a youth and his connection to literature first came about through training in calligraphy in Barcelona (Domínguez Bordona 215).

Access to literature as a calligrapher was only enhanced later as he attended the Universidad de Salamanca, studied theology, and quickly earned the right to serve as a teacher of moral philosophy. García-Ferrer states, “Había estudiado Artes y Teología y parece que recibió las sagradas órdenes hacia 1460. Desde octubre de 1463, es profesor de Filosofía Moral hasta que renuncia a su cátedra en julio de 1466 para recluirse en el monasterio de San Leonardo en Alba de Tormes ‘siendo ya de 35 años’” (29). Later she characterizes Fray Hernando de Talavera as “un hombre culto, una personalidad renacentista, cuyo saber multidisciplinario le llevaría pronto a ser un excelente consejero real” (31). A review of the *intervivos*¹⁴ of Talavera gives us some insight into the list of works that Talavera read, including St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, and Gerson. It is pertinent to point out that every vernacular work, except those of Erasmus, that Juan de Valdés recommends in the section of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* entitled *De las lecturas*,¹⁵ was also to be found in the library of Hernando de Talavera (García-Ferrer 226-246). The only works missing from Talavera's library are those of Erasmus. The specific list from the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is given by the Archbishop in response

¹⁴ The *intervivos* is a list of personal belongings that Fray Hernando de Talavera gifted to various churches, monasteries, and convents before his death rather than by testamentary will. García-Ferrer includes the list in its entirety in her *Fray Hernando de Talavera y Granada* on pages 223-255.

¹⁵ Though Talavera did not have a copy of the *Cartuxanos*, also known as *Imitatio Christi* of Ludolphus of Saxony, he had translated from Catalan the *Vita Christi* of Fr. Francesc Eiximenis, O.F.M. See F.H. Norton's *Printing in Spain 1501-1520*, page 190, and Albert G. Hauf I Valls's, *Essays on Medieval Translation in the Iberian Peninsula* page 208.

to Antronio's question, "Y pues que assí es, dezidnos, por v̄ra. vida, en qué libros de romance tenéys por bueno que mande a mis feligreses que lean" (133). The Archbishop then mentions the following books: *Libro de las epístolas y sermones del año*, *Cartuxanos*, *Enquiridion*, *Declaración del Pater Noster*, *Sermoncico del niño Jesús*, *Colloquitos*, *Contemptus mundi*, *Epístolas de sant Hierónimo*, *Morales de sant Gregorio*, and "algunas cositas que hay de sant Agustín" (133). The shared reading habits of Valdés and Talavera would suggest that they held in esteem several of the same authors. Such circumstantial evidence is not per se proof of influence, but does imply that Valdés, like Talavera was an enthusiast of doctrinal works that focused upon practical application of correct doctrine and that had been rendered either originally in romance language or were faithfully translated by individuals in whom they felt they could place their trust.

Focusing upon the more politically oriented aspect of Fray Hernando de Talavera's life, José García Oro writes about the relationship between Talavera and Cisneros in his book *Cisneros: El cardenal de España*, describing Talavera as the quintessential advisor to the *Reyes católicos*:

En la escena política cortesana había un nombre que lo decía todo: rentas, concordias, consejos. Era Fray Hernando de Talavera, ahora Obispo de Ávila (1485-1492), un antiguo maestro universitario que Fray Francisco había conocido en Salamanca y nunca perdió de vista. Monje jerónimo, conocido en la Corte como "el prior de El Prado", su prelación vallisoletana en donde tenía de frecuentes contortulios a los Reyes, lo había hecho todo en la consolidación del reinado. En 1492, Hernando de Talavera era nombrado primer arzobispo de Granada y partía decidido, a crear en el nuevo Reino una nueva cristiandad. Ya no sería posible

que acompañara a la Reina Isabel y que asumiera personalmente los retos de la Monarquía. (50)

With access to the highest levels of power within the newly allied kingdoms of Aragon and Castille, and with his role as confessor to the Queen and the King, it is no surprise that Talavera's vision for consolidation of the two kingdoms and reform of the government and the clergy would hold a great deal of sway in the royal court. Coupled with this vision was his keen sense of moral uprightness inculcated by his Hieronymite training and tempered by a sense of compassion. Anecdotes of his compassion are sprinkled throughout Alonso Fernández de Madrid's account of Talavera's life testifying to an extremely long suffering and patient nature despite the demands of his job.

One particular story of interest for its connection to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is that of Talavera's reaction to his *hermanas donzellas*'s¹⁶ request that he use his benefices as Archbishop of Granada to assure that they marry well. Talavera cordially but firmly is reported to have rejected the request explaining that the monies paid him by the Church are not intended to procure good marriages for his relatives in order that they achieve social position and thus refuses to concede to their request.¹⁷ This is the same story related by Alonso Fernández de Madrid in *Vida de Hernando de Talavera*, which is included in the work "...para que se sepa la integridad de este perlado" (19). When Fernández de Madrid relates the story in the biography of Talavera, he writes that the Archbishop responded:

si mis sobrinas se quieren casar como hijas de Fulano de Herrera, su padre, y
como sobrinas de frai Hernando de Talavera, yo seré contento de casarlas con sus

¹⁶ Covarrubias defines *donzella* as: "La mujer moza y por casar, *quasi donicella* en lengua toscana, a *dona*; y en sinificación rigurosa la que no ha conocido varón" (727).

¹⁷ See Juan de Valdés, *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* page 101. Whereas Valdés uses the words *hermanas donzellas*, Alonso Fernández de Madrid refers to these relatives of Talavera as his nieces.

iguales, y bastarles hán para su dote cada 50 o 60 000 mrs.¹⁸ mas si quieren casarse como sobrinas del arzobispo de Granada, no plega a Dios que la hacienda de la igl.^a y de los pobres gaste yo en hacer más ricos a mis parientes, a los quales, puesto que soy obligado a mantener, no soy obligado, ni debo enriquecerlos. (20)

It is uncertain how Juan de Valdés learned of the. He may have read it in Fernández de Madrid's *Vida* and recounted it for its exemplary qualities, incorporating it into the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the section describing *Los cinco mandamientos de la iglesia* to affirm his own view of the need for moral reform among a corrupt Spanish clergy. He may have learned it directly from Alonso Fernández de Madrid, through correspondence or through their mutual acquaintance Diego Gracián de Alderete.¹⁹ Or, as Bataillon suggests but ultimately rejects, he may have met Archbishop Pedro de Alva who recounted the story to him, portraying it to the best of his recollection in the words of the Archbishop. Valdés's knowledge of the story and its similarity to the version expressed by Fernández de Madrid is striking:

Avréys de saber que tenía [Fray Hernando] unas hermanas donzellas, las quales, si él no fuera arzobispo, se casaran con algunos oficiales, pero ellas creyendo que su hermano haría como otros algunos hazen, levantaron sus pensamientos y pidieron a su hermano que las casasse con sendos caballeros, diciendo que así convenía a la honrra de su diginidad. El buen hombre, considerando que las rentas de la yglesia no son para mantener honrras mundanas, jamás quiso hazer con ellas más de requerirles que si se querían casar él les daría como a huérfanas cada treinta mil maravedís con que podrían escoger oficiales a su voluntad, pero

¹⁸ Abreviation for *maravedís*.

¹⁹ See Luis Antonio Arroyo's *Alonso Fernández de Madrid, Arcediano de Alcor y la "Silva Palentina"* for letters of correspondence between Gracián de Alderete and Alonso Fernández de Madrid where Valdés is mentioned frequently, page 256-258.

que si otra cosa querían, perdonasen que él en ninguna manera lo podía hazer.

¿Paréceos que este santo hombre tenía respeto a sostener con las rentas de la yglesia su honrra o la de sus parientes? (101)

Valdés's inclusion of this anecdote from the life of Talavera in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* indicates the impression and impact that Talavera's exemplary use of the *rentas* had. Valdés esteemed Talavera's use of the *rentas* for the charity of the poor rather than the honor of his family and accordingly chose to recognize him as a model for Antronio, and by extension, all Christians to imitate. If there is any doubt that Talavera's actions were too austere or too extreme, that doubt is erased post-haste when Antronio opines to the Archbishop Alva: "¿vos no veys también que esso era extremo?" to which Archbishop Alva replies: "Pluviese a Dios que el mismo extremo tomássemos todos los que tenemos rentas ecclesiásticas, pues sin dubda sería mucho mayor que no dexar mayoradgos de los bienes de los pobres" (101). The social stigma of corruption that plagued the church was a quotidian theme for discussion and literary representation, and particularly important for authors like Valdés who aimed to rectify the situation. Talavera as the paragon of virtue was the man whom Valdés selected to exemplify the correct way of handling the payment of *diezmos y primicias*. And he chose a disciple of Talavera, Archbishop Alva, to recall the story and admonish the behavior in others whose livelihood depended upon Church tithes.

A second story worthy of recounting for its demonstration of Talavera's sense of fairness and commitment to humble living is related again in Alonso Fernández de Madrid's *Vida de Fray Hernando de Talavera*. Fernández de Madrid relates how an impoverished *escudero* criticized the Archbishop for passing him by without giving him alms one day in Granada. The Archbishop became aware of the complaint against him, summoned the man to his

Archiepiscopal home, explained to him the appropriate penance for the sin of gossip and then laid upon the floor, taking the requisite punishment for the sin on behalf of the man. He then rose to his feet, gave the man the alms he needed and sent him on his way (Fernández de Madrid 16-17). Though the testimony of Alonso Fernández de Madrid is not an eyewitness account, the story seems to coincide with the general tenor of historical accounts that characterize Talavera as a man of outstanding moral virtue and fairness. Talavera seems to have been the counter image to the stereotypically corrupt clergyman whose unscrupulous behaviors so often found their way into the literature of the time for their usefulness as social critique.

2.3 Reform

2.3.1 Ecclesiastical

*Plega a Dios que viváis muchos años
para que reforméis esto y otras muchas cosas
en que ay tanta perdición
que es la mayor lástima del mundo*

Diálogo de doctrina cristiana 136

Reform within the Catholic Church is a perennial theme, but particularly foregrounded during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century in Spain and other European countries. Reform of government and church was particularly important to Hernando de Talavera as both an immediate need and a lasting legacy. Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* demonstrates the resounding effect of Talavera's efforts. Questions abound regarding what constitutes reform and a review and evaluation of Talavera's reformatory efforts will not only help establish a better idea of what reform really meant, but also show that his reform efforts were carried on by Juan de Valdés who included a section on reform in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

In *Renewing Christianity* Christopher Bellitto speaks of the difficulties of defining exactly what is meant by the concept of Catholic reformation. "The term 'Catholic Reformation'

when taken narrowly to refer to the mid-sixteenth century conveniently overlooks the reaction to Luther, while the term ‘Counter Reformation’ ignores Catholic reform efforts before the 95 *Theses*” (140). In Spain, reform within the Catholic Church and in the government of Isabel and Ferdinand was one of Talavera’s key goals,²⁰ and his efforts to effect changes based upon his understanding of the need for reform began well in advance of the Reformation associated most frequently with the Northern Theologians – Erasmus, Luther and Calvin.²¹

Granada, the locus for Juan de Valdés’s dialogue, became the epitome of Spanish reform in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century because of Talavera’s presence there. Two tangible efforts of Talavera were the establishment of the *Colegio-Seminario Eclesiástico de San Cecilio* just after the 1492 conquest of Granada at which students received “lecciones de canto, Artes, Teología y Gramática” (Calero Palacios 39), and the publication by Pedro de Alcalá at Talavera’s direction and expense of *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga* (1505) and *Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana* (1505) (Norton 163). Such activities characterize Talavera’s evangelistic responses toward the majority Muslim population that inhabited Granada when he was named archbishop. In *Fray Hernando de Talavera y Granada*, García-Ferrer writes that Talavera implemented “procedimientos absolutamente innovadores que pretendían la progresiva enculturación de la fe cristiana en las costumbres del Islam. Aprendió árabe e hizo editar una gramática y un diccionario de este idioma para acercarse a la población musulmana, mayortaria en Granada” (39). These were logical corollary activities that followed and were fueled by the weight of Talavera’s reformatory efforts extending back to the recent Council of Seville held in 1478. David Coleman speaks of the reform movement in Spain in *Creating*

²⁰ See acts published by Fidel Fita in *Concilios españoles inéditos: provincial de Braga en 1261 y nacional de Sevilla en 1478*, “Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia”, vol. XXII (1893), pages 209-257.

²¹ See Alister McGrath’s *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought*. He dates Erasmus’s greatest impact with the *Enchiridion militis Christiani* (1503), Luther’s Ninety-Five Theses (October 31, 1517), and Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536), pages 116, 159, and 7.

Christian Granada: Society and Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600, recognizing a

...peninsulawide [sic] tradition of reform synods and councils that by 1530 was already two generations old, dating back at least to the landmark 1473 Provincial Council of Aranda and 1478 National Council of Seville. Synods in nearly all of Spain's dioceses over the intervening decades had not only set up strong standards for the improvement of the educational quality of parish clergy and the elimination of rampant corruption and absenteeism, but also established firm expectations concerning the duties of all lay men and women to learn basic Christian doctrine, to attend mass every Sunday and festival day, and to confess and receive communion at least once each year. (127)

It was Fray Hernando de Talavera that had drafted the reforms of the Council of Seville in 1478 on behalf of the *Reyes católicos*. When he assumed his role as Archbishop of Granada, he had the authority and a population that he could serve and through which he could find out whether his reforms would, in fact, come to fruition.

If there is a polemic among historians regarding who to consider as the chief pioneer of Catholic reform in early sixteenth-century Spain, the most zealous and credible advocate on behalf of Talavera is Tarsicio Azcona. He contrasts the traditional historical evaluation of Cisneros as champion of reform and instead characterizes the reform as Talaverian, stating in *Isabel la católica*,

Desde 1485 entra la reforma religiosa en fase de incontenible despliegue. El hombre que la inspiró fue, indudablemente, el religioso jerónimo fray Fernando de Talavera; por eso con razón se podría hablar de una *reforma talaverana*.

Acostumbrados al tópico difundido por la historiografía de considerar al cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros como el adalid de la reforma de los religiosos, quizá resulte a muchos sorprendente que hablemos de esta etapa antecisneriana. (575)

Azcona is not the only historian to affirm Talavera's role in reform. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce also affirms Talaverian reform in his review of the critical edition of Talavera's *Católica impugnación*, a work that was prohibited from publication by the *Indices de Valdés* of 1551 and 1559 (Vílchez Díaz 101). In his review, Avalle-Arce points out that Talavera played a quintessential role in the drafting of clerical reforms of the Council of. "A los pocos años Talavera toma parte activísima en el concilio sevillano de 1478, y es el instrumento motor de las famosas Declaratorias de Toledo, el gran logro legislativo de los Reyes Católicos en las Cortes de 1480" (386). Cisneros was in Sigüenza in 1478 as García Oro points out in *Cisneros: El cardenal de España*, working as the "Capellan Mayor de la Catedral" (42). Despite knowing the secretary Diego de Muros II who attended the *Congregación del clero de Castilla, de 1478*, Cisneros did not participate in the drafting of those reforms (44).

The Talaverian approach to the ecclesiastical reform had implications that extended beyond the institution of the church and were generally known to be in support of establishing a strong and consolidated form of government under the rule of Ferdinand and Isabel. The recuperation of financial resources conceded to the churches under Enrique IV were being reappropriated based upon the National Council of Seville of 1478. J.H. Elliot in *Imperial Spain 1469-1716* refers to the Council of Seville as a seminal meeting for establishing the symbiotic relationship necessary between the monarchy and the Church in terms of Isabel's desire to gain the right to name its own archbishops instead of the Pope doing so.

If Ferdinand and Isabella were to challenge the Papacy successfully over the question of papal provisions, they needed the full support of the Castilian Church, and this led them in 1478 to summon an ecclesiastical council at Seville, which proved as important for the definition of the Crown's ecclesiastical policy as the Cortes of Toledo of 1480 were important for the definition of its administrative intentions. (89)

The relevant written record of the Council of Seville addresses what it considers the three states of the kingdom: military, ecclesiastical and popular. In Article XIII, there is recognition of the divine peace bestowed upon the kingdoms by God. And to maintain that peace, Talavera, writing on behalf of the council resolves to:

reformat el estado seglar en quanto pudiéremos, redusiéndolo á la buena é Antigua governación, que asy mismo se provea cómo el estado eclesiástico se reforme asy en la libertad é ynmunidad eclesiástica é veneración de las Iglesias como en las personas eclesiásticas é religiosas é honesto bevir dellas, é en todas las otras cosas al estado eclesiástico convenientes; ca nos para ello, en lo que neçesario fuere, daremos el favor é ayuda que convenga. (219)

The austerity of Talavera's approach toward the abolition of the *mercedes*²² of Enrique IV and holding members to the strict standards of honest living indicated in the Council of Seville of 1478 and the spirit of mutual cooperation intended to maintain the peace and prosperity of the country is later reflected in the voice of Archbishop Alva. The legacy of Talaverian reform is still embraced by Valdés's Archbishop Alva in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* five decades after Talavera began to shape it. Valdés believed that the reform, rooted in Talaverian measures of austerity were exemplary and authoritative representations of true Christian doctrine.

²² For a detailed account of the abolition of the *mercedes* consult Stephen Haliczzer's, "The Castilian Aristocracy and the Mercedes Reform of 1478-1482." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 55.3 (1975): 449-467.

2.3.2 Extending the legacy of reform

One of the most enduring legacies of the reformatory efforts of Hernando de Talavera and a key part of the circumstantial evidence that in the cumulative points to the importance of his influence on the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* of Juan de Valdés is the lasting impact he had upon several historical contemporaries that could be considered his spiritual progeny, some of whom are more explicitly linked to Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and others less so. Worthy of special mention are Archbishop of Granada Pedro Ramiro de Alva, Bishop of Salamanca Luis Cabeza de Vaca, and Bishop of Cuenca Diego de Villaescusa.

The primary figure influenced by Talavera, through having served and studied under the archbishop is one of his successors, the fifth Archbishop of Granada, Pedro de Alva. Juan de Valdés selects this name for his character that functions as the voice of authority in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The historical record of Alva is sparse but for a brief treatment of his life by the Hieronymite historian Fray José de Sigüenza in *Historia de la orden de San Gerónimo* (1605) and references made by ecclesiastical historiographers Bermúdez de Pedraza and Antolínez de Burgos, both of whom incorporated elements of Sigüenza's narrative of Alva's life into their own histories. The relevant section from *Historia eclesiástica de Granada* (1996) by Justino Antolínez de Burgos reads as follows:

Succedieron en la silla arzobispal de Granada dos criados suyos: Fray Pedro de Alva, que fue su paje y se ordenó en su cassa; llamóle Dios al estado de la religión y tomó el ábito en la cassa de Sanc Hierónimo de Granada; y, siendo prior en ella, le pressentó al arzobispado el emperador don Carlos. El último de sus criados, aunque a ninguno [120v] inferior en virtud, fue don Gaspar de Avalos; fue obispo de Guadix, arzobispo de Granada y de Sanctiago. (210)

And in his *Historia eclesiástica de Granada* (1638) Francisco Bermúdez de Pedraza points out the personal connection between Alva and Talavera: “Fue Pedro Ramiro natural de la villa de Alva de Tormes, a donde tuvo conocimiento con fray Fernando de Talavera, desde que fue conventual de San Leonardo de Alva, para que le recibiese en su casa después que fue Obispo de Avila” (fol 215 v).

Juan de Valdés employs the Archbishop Pedro de Alva as the voice of authority in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* perhaps paying homage therein to the archbishop Talavera, whose legacy in reform was most connected to the indoctrination and training of church leaders on all levels. Alva is used by Valdés in his role as the most learned interlocutor of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* where he takes the lead role in expounding upon the principles and rudiments of orthodox Catholic and Christian doctrine. The doctrine of Valdés is related through Alva’s personal testimony which serves to admonish against ambition and avarice.

Here Valdés brings into greater clarity the very reforms he advocated through Alva’s remembrance of an episode from Talavera’s life. In the words of Archbishop Alva, “Y porque más entendáys lo que en esto os quiero dezir, os contaré una cosa que hazía el primer arçobispo desta yglesia con quien yo bivi muchos años, que se llamava don fray Hernando de Talavera, de cuya dotrina y santidad bien creo avréys oydo hablar” (101). The recollection of Alva in the *Diálogo* mimics that of his real life, described by Hieronymite priest and historiographer José de Sigüenza when he writes of Alva’s service in the home of Archbishop Talavera: “El padre fray Pedro de Alva fue natural de la Villa de Alva de Tormes: creese tenia algun conocimiento con el santo Arçobispo, desde que fue alli Religioso, y que sus padres le embiaron a Granada, quando fue Arçobispo, y que se crio en su casa, siruiendo de paje, aunque se seruia poco dellos, y el les

seruia a ellos mucho” (333). Fray Pedro de Alva’s training in Archbishop Talavera’s archiepiscopal residence is described by Sigüenza:

En lugar de lo que en la Iglesias llaman moços de coro, que siruen en el altar de Acolitos, y en el coro de oficios menores, Versos y Chalendas, acordo de hazer vn Colegio, ó llamemosle seminario, donde puso treynta mancebos, vnos menores y otros mayores, pobres todos, y los mas habiles que pudo hallar; rapartiolos por sus semanas para que vnos siruiessen a la tarde, otros a la mañana, y todo el tiempo que de alli sobrasse le gastassen en oyr Gramatica, Logica, Canones y Theologia. Para esto buscó Buenos maestros, dandoles cumplidos salarios. Tenialos en su casa, y comian con el á su mesa, respetandolos para que todos les tuuiesen respeto. (302-303)

The echo of this indoctrination is discernable in Valdés’s dialogue as Archbishop Alva reminisces about his experience as a child living under Talavera’s tutelage. Having just related from memory a brief compendium of scripture, the archbishop is asked by Antronio how he learned the scriptures so well. His own father, as he relates, taught him daily and hired a teacher to instruct him with Christian doctrine. When his father discovered that he was inclined not only to the doctrine, but also to living it out through good works, he sent him to live in Archbishop Talavera’s home. Valdés’s Archbishop Alva fondly recalls how his own father saw his inclination toward good works and “procuró con mucha diligencia, desseando que éste mi desseo antes se acrecentasse que se perdiesse, de ponerme en casa de aquel bienaventurado arçobispo de quien denantes os dixe, el qual como sabéis era muy desseoso de instruir sanamente a los niños, según podéis ver por algunas cosas que dexó escritas” (130). The doctrine and exemplary life personified in Valdés’s Archbishop Alva bears strong resemblance to the teaching that went on

in the home of Archbishop Talavera. The legacy of Talavera seems to find new life in the discourse of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

If there were a connection between Luis Cabeza de Vaca and Talavera, it could be argued that some element of the reformatory and tolerant character of Talavera was at least communicated by Luis Cabeza de Vaca to the young Emperor Charles V who studied under Cabeza de Vaca's tutelage in Flanders before assuming the throne. Alonso Fernández de Madrid who was urged by Luis Cabeza de Vaca to publish a biography of Talavera describes Cabeza de Vaca as,

maestro del invictísimo César Don Carlos, nuestro Señor y estando en Flandes, siendo niño, le enseñó las primeras letras, por lo cual, y por su mucho merecimiento y honestidad de vida y perfecto exemplo, el mesmo emperador le proveyó del obispado de Canarias, y después le dio el de Salamanca, y agora este año de MDXXXVII le hizo merced del obispado de Palencia del cual tomó la posesión a XXX días del mes de Mayo del dicho año, y tomóla en su nombre Alonso Fernández de Madrid, Arcediano del Alcor, que fue el copilador de este memorial, su provisor. (200-201)

This description suggests that Cabeza de Vaca was as morally upright as Talavera. Cabeza de Vaca's character shaped by the lessons and legacy of Talavera, impressed the young Charles V. Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce in his review of Talavera's *Católica impugnación* points out Cabeza de Vaca's influence upon the young King as, "el mismo Luis Vaca que ya en 1508 estaba en Malinas, como maestro del futuro Carlos V en la escuela de Adriano de Utrecht" (388-389). The emphasis upon the tutoring relationship between Charles and his preceptor seemed to manifest itself some fourteen years later in Granada when, upon visiting the city Charles appointed a

group of men to carry out the project of building a school and to indoctrinate the youthful Muslim population with Christian doctrine. It is not difficult to imagine that the founding of the school and pedagogical plan for Granada was Talavera's legacy extended to Charles V through the influence of Luis Cabeza de Vaca.

Confirmation of the emperor's agreement with Talavera's commitment to the pedagogical project was realized when he granted an official imperial *cédula* to warrant the establishment of or reinvigoration of the old *Colegio de San Cecilio* upon his visit in 1526 to Granada.

Los orígenes del colegio de San Cecilio están en el decreto de erección de la catedral, dado por el cardenal Mendoza el 21 de mayo de 1492. Al morir el arzobispo, falto de recursos, se extinguió su colegio. Carlos V, por una real cédula de 7 de noviembre de 1526, dotó 32 becas y ordenó a fray Pedro Ramiro de Alva que recogiera a los colegiales en su antiguo domicilio, con lo que la institución renació. El emperador ordenó “que se guardase el reglamento establecido por el venerable arzobispo Talavera.” (García-Ferrer 85)

In “La enseñanza en Granada. Tradición e innovación” María del Carmen Calero Palacios describes how Granada received Emperor Charles V and his committee of churchmen to evaluate instruction in the diocese and the resulting plan to indoctrinate the children of Granada (35-36). In his *Historia eclesiástica de Granada* Bermúdez de Pedraza reproduces the entire *cédula* of December 7, 1526 directed to the Archbishop Pedro Ramiro de Alba, and the following section explains the goal of the pedagogical project:

...al presente no ay en el dicho reyno estudios e escuelas donde [los súbditos] puedan ser mostrados e enseñados e instruidos en las sciencias algunas buenas

personas para que prediquen e enseñen la doctrina evangélica, e para que informen a los fieles cristianos, mayormente a los nuevamente convertidos, lo que an de creer e obrar. E, assí mismo, viendo que no ay escuelas e lugares convenientes donde los hijos de los cristianos, especialmente de los nuevamente convertidos, desde su niñez e tierna hedad sean esenados e doctrinados en las cosas de la fe e otras loables costumbres. (225)

Valdés was certainly aware of the historic event as evidenced by the words his Archbishop Alva speaks on the work he is doing to build the school in the concluding section of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*:

Ora sus, los frayles tañen a cerrar, y no será razón que les hagamos tener la puerta abierta. Si ay más que preguntar sea luego, porque ni agora ay lugar para detenernos, ni mañana estaré yo tan desocupado como oy, porque tengo de entender en ciertos negocios del colegio que empieço a hazer. (137)

The *colegio* contributed immensely to the pedagogical aims of inculcating Christian doctrine in all parts of Spain, and with a sense of urgency in Granada because of it being the final stronghold of the Nazrid family and its Muslim spiritual allegiance. The reform needed was of major spiritual importance, and Talavera's emphasis upon the establishment of a seminary to indoctrinate and demonstrate by right practice or orthopraxy in hopes of inculcating the sense of obligation and duty to be morally without blemish. The project was seized upon later by Charles V in the reinvigorating act of appointing Pedro de Alva to carry out the establishment of the seminary that would later become the Universidad de Granada. Pedro de Alva's death would leave the work to be carried out by yet another of Talavera's spiritual progeny, Gaspar de Avalos.

Another bishop who may have had some influence in the formative years of Juan de Valdés is Don Diego Ramirez de Villaescusa from Villaescusa de Haro in La Mancha. Sara Nalle refers to Villaescusa in *God in La Mancha* as another individual with access to the highest circles of power in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century Spain connected to both Queen Isabel and her daughter Juana. Nalle says that in 1500 “he was a member of Archbishop Talavera’s innovative seminary house in Granada” (22). There is every reason to believe that the experiences he had and lessons learned during his time in Talavera’s presence had some effect upon the way he approached his own responsibilities as he was chosen by the Emperor Charles to carry out the pastoral, pedagogical and administrative responsibilities in the various charges given him, and finally as Bishop of Cuenca. It is the final appointment to the bishopric of Cuenca that bears mentioning because it is the diocese where Juan de Valdés was born and spent his childhood. Though Villaescusa’s presence as bishop is not per se evidence of personal contact between the two, it is relevant to point out that Charles V, who would ultimately tap Juan de Valdés’s brother Alfonso de Valdés as his personal secretary, did appoint Villaescusa to the post of bishop in 1518. He implemented the constitutions governing the instruction of children within the diocese of Cuenca in 1518, the time period in which a young Juan de Valdés would likely have been a proximate beneficiary of Villaescusa’s influence and by extension, that of Talavera.

Referring to Villaescusa’s constitutions, Sara Nalle in *God in La Mancha* points out how the bishop sought to ensure diocesan stability by shoring up the existing foundations of a doctrinal pedagogical project by establishing his constitutions for the diocese where Juan de Valdés was born:

Ramírez further stipulated at what ages children, both boys and girls, would be expected to know which prayers. Those under twelve had to know how to cross and bless themselves. The older children learned the four basic prayers of the church (*oraciones dominicales*), the Articles of Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Theological and Cardinal Virtues, and the General Confession. And if some children were ‘so stupid and incapable that they cannot learn it there [with the sacristan],’ the priests were to ‘warn their fathers and mothers to teach it to them.’

(107)

Juan de Valdés’s character, Archbishop Alva, advocates in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* a similar approach when Eusebio asks the Archbishop, “...cómo un christiano deve ser instruydo en la dotrina de Jesu Xpo., dizidnos qué es la primera cosa que se debe eneseñar al christiano” (14). In response Archbishop Alva says, “e lo mismo encomendaréis a sus padres, y esto no solamente quando los acabýs de baptizar, pero siempre que se ofresciere oportunidad” (14). It is apparent that Valdés has embraced the same spirit of charitable Christian doctrine as the one mandated within the diocese of his childhood and implemented by yet another of Talavera’s spiritual progeny, Diego Ramírez de Villaescusa. These are just a few of the connections and influences that, when seen as efforts to reform through a pedagogical project initiated by Talavera, demonstrate in the cumulative a definitive legacy of Talavera and how it might have touched Juan de Valdés.

2.4 *Cartillas y doctrinas* - Reform by indoctrination: Access to doctrine through the vernacular

The means by which Talavera communicated Christian doctrine took shape in both the way he interacted with other people and through his published writings. Making good use of the

newly introduced printing press to disseminate Christian doctrine, Archbishop Hernando de Talavera applied his training and discipline as a Hieronymite monk to have a tremendous impact in political, ecclesiastical and personal realms of early sixteenth-century Spain. The Archbishop's aim was to provide as much access as possible to those who sought guidance from scripture and to convert those who were not yet convinced of the truths of the Christian faith to which he dedicated his life.

Talavera's association with Isabel as her confessor from as early as 1474 put him in close contact with the first printing press on national territory in Segovia. García-Ferrer relates that also, under Talavera's influence as the *Prior del Prado* in the monastery located outside the city walls of Valladolid, a printing press was installed with the exclusive right to print papal bulls (87). From his experience with these presses he must have seen and decided to seize the opportunity later when serving as Archbishop of Granada to embark upon the ambitious task of printing *cartillas* and *doctrinas* that served as educational tools for the indoctrination of a population composed of *conversos*, *moriscos*, and *cristianos viejos*. His seminal role in the use of the printing press to publish doctrinal manuals primarily aimed at children played an integral part in carrying out the pedagogical project of inculcating Christian doctrine and reclaiming the ideological ground in Granada that had only recently been reconquered by the *reyes católicos* that Talavera served.

Sara T. Nalle's review of five inventories from sixteenth-century printers and booksellers in her article "Printing and Reading Popular Religious Texts" offers evidence to show that "the stocking strategies of printers and retailers indicate that they believed that the reading public was more interested in religious publications" (129). For assimilation purposes, explication of Christian doctrine was of utmost importance under the governing paradigm of the Catholic

monarchy in early sixteenth-century Spain. In addition to instructing and edifying those who already adhered to some brand of the Christian faith, there were significant Jewish and Muslim populations that remained scattered across the peninsula after the Catholic monarchs conquered the final Muslim stronghold of Granada in 1492. Jews and Muslims were understandably unfamiliar with the particulars of Christian belief and practices, and Christians also were often just as ignorant of the core rudiments and precepts of their own religion. Whether the authors of the doctrinal works were motivated by a desire to remedy rampant ignorance, to build up the faith of the faithful, to instruct the newly converted, or even perhaps to assure homogeneity and obedience among less than willing subjects of the burgeoning Spanish empire, their doctrinal writings were selling and the sales suggest their popularity.

The doctrinal texts were as much a catalyst for reform as a product of it and putting vernacular writings about Christian doctrine into the hands of the literate readership was a pleasure and passion for Fray Hernando de Talavera. A recent study by Isabella Ianuzzi, *Educar a los cristianos: Fray Hernando de Talavera y su labor catequética dentro de la estructura familiar para homogeneizar la sociedad de los Reyes Católicos*, postulates that the goal Talavera hoped to achieve through the dissemination of the *cartillas*, *doctrinas* and *manuales* was to build a society based upon ideological homogeneity (par. 1). Nalle lists Talavera as the first writer of the primer or *cartilla* stating that, “The first *cartilla* appears to have been Archbishop Hernando de Talavera’s eight-page “Primer and Catechism in Spanish to Teach Children How to Read,” printed in Granada and Salamanca around 1505. The idea of the catechism-primer caught on, and soon they were being produced everywhere” (133). The *cartilla* mentioned by Sara T. Nalle in her essay, “Printing and Reading Popular Religious Texts” in *Culture and the State in Spain*, was a document that supported reform efforts. “One of the more surprising aspects of this early

religious printing was the extent to which the church took advantage of the press to promote reforms...to bring out inexpensive books which were meant to improve the lower clergy's training" (132-133). It is the natural progression of the reform movement that the educated like Juan de Valdés would use what they had learned as children from the *cartillas y doctrinas* and the *tabla moral* that they had studied as a model ready for evolution into the *Diálogo* that represents the best of the rhetorical skill of *amplificatio*.

Víctor Infantes speaks of this class of writings in *De las primeras letras: Cartillas españolas para enseñar a leer de los siglos XV y XVI*:

Esta oleada bibliográfica de textos y autores se aleja de nuestras *cartillas y doctrinas* a medida que se bucea entre sus fondos y aunque hemos tenido que trasegar no pocas obras y de algunas nos hemos quedado con la tentación de una consideración más detenida, su extensión, que comienza casi siempre a partir de las 60 páginas, y su clara vocación instructiva superior las ha desvinculado de nuestra idea inicial. Queden, pues, ahí, los textos de Fray Alonso de Madrid, Juan de Valdés, Fernando de Contreras, Gutierre González, Gaspar Miguel de la Cueva, Alfonso Martín de Laguna, Juan Pérez de Pineda, etc., que son los más se aproximan hacia nuestra concepción o en América, los de Juan Cobo, Pedro de Córdoba, Maturino Gíblerti, Francisco Marroquín, Alonso de Molina, Bartolomé Roldán, etc. (42)

Both Nalle and Infantes comment on Talavera's role as the first publisher and distributor of the pedagogical doctrinal materials. Before his implementation of a conscientious program of indoctrination by putting these doctrinal manuals in the hands of the literate or those of the children who were learning in the new seminaries, such as San Cecilio in Granada, the reading

public accessed the *Tabla moral* posted at the church. The *Tabla moral* contained largely the same doctrinal material found in Talavera's *doctrinas*.

These efforts of the archbishop in publishing Christian doctrine preceded the appearance of Alonso Fernández de Madrid's vernacular translation of Erasmus's *Enquiridión* (1526) setting the stage for Juan de Valdés's publication of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The recognition of scripture as the guiding source of Christian doctrine is patent in Talavera's writings. The vernacular language in which Talaverian *doctrinas* and *cartillas* were written is mirrored in the vernacular of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The dialogic form of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* also harkens back to the *cartillas* and *doctrinas* initiated by Talavera. The didactic focus of Talavera in his *cartillas* and *doctrinas* is directed to the unconverted, the newly converted and the ignorant. The grass roots approach of making doctrine available in the vernacular and explaining the meanings of the religious rituals such as the mass and confession are also evident in Valdés though his prospective audience was probably more theologically sophisticated. Whereas Talavera focused in a pastoral way upon the least informed, Valdés took his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* a step further and sought to engage the teachers and intellectual elite who would commit themselves to teaching their subordinates. In both Talavera and Valdés, the ultimate evangelical message was consistent. Whereas Talavera sought to initiate the uninitiated, Valdés was seeking to reach the moderately informed as well as the superior ecclesiastics to engender in them a higher sense of the dignity and responsibility of the office to which they had been called.

The similarity in their approach is clearly discernable and to demonstrate it some examples are in order. Alonso Fernández de Madrid memorializes Talavera's commitment to

dissemination of the vernacular, relating as follows the archbishop's connection to the children of his diocese:

Iba también muchas veces entre semana a visitar las escuelas de los niños, y sentábase allí a oír y ver cómo les enseñaban, y él mesmo avisaba a los maestros cómo habían de dar las lecciones y examinaba a cada uno lo que sabía, y cómo aprendía. (14-15)

Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* echoes Talavera's practice as related by Fernández de Madrid. Right at the beginning of his work, Valdés sets a stage for the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* that bears a striking resemblance to Talavera's visits to the schools in his diocese. In the *Diálogo* the narrator, presumably Valdés, describes how he and Antronio, the ignorant priest, become acquainted and end up accompanying each other to the Hieronymite monastery outside Granada to converse with Archbishop Pedro de Alva about Christian doctrine. The scene unfolds almost as if Valdés were recalling the biography by Alonso Fernández de Madrid:

Passando un día muy illustre señor por una villa destos reynos, y sabiendo que por mandato del señor della, y aun a su costa, enseñavan los curas en sus yglesias a los niños los principios e rudimentos de la dotrina Christiana, lo qual muchos días antes yo desseava se hiziesse, me fuy a poner entre los niños de una yglesia, assí con intención de saber allí alguna buena cosa que introducir en mi monasterio. (9)

With respect to verifying the sufficiency of training and knowledge attained by these teachers of doctrine, which goes directly to the question of the legitimacy of authority, Alonso Fernández de Madrid emphasizes that Talavera himself was the examiner of the priests who were teaching the children doctrine. Valdés advocates the same practice when he explains, through the Archbishop

Pedro de Alva, how Christian doctrine must first be studied diligently and known by the priest in order to be accurately communicated to children.

All three interlocutors have discussed much about Christian doctrine by the time the theme of discussion turns to reform of the church. In the section titled *De la reforma de la yglesia* they engage in a back and forth exchange that highlights the necessity of studying and knowing doctrine. Eusebio points out Antronio's responsibility to teach doctrine and warns how doctrine cannot be learned without study and work. Antronio wonders how he will study in light of not knowing Latin, admitting that he arrived at his position as friar not because of his knowledge of doctrine, but for the pleasing tone of his voice as he said the mass, thus he never actually learned the substantive meanings and he was never examined by the bishop: "porque como sabéis, a los frayles no los examina el obispo, sino sus guardianes, y assí passé yo entre ellos" (135). The archbishop, disturbed by the lack of attention paid to verifying the doctrinal competency of teachers like Antronio laments the situation as a "cosa muy rezia" and goes on to explain how in his diocese he would not allow such a practice: "Aldemenos en mi arçobispado (siendo yo vivo) no se ordenará ninguno, sea quien se pagare, sin que yo mismo lo examine, y muy bien examinado" (135). But the crux of the problem is still the learning of the doctrine and, because Antronio is nearly fifty years of age, he has not the time to master Latin. The archbishop's solution for Antronio is to encourage him to seek out someone who has the appropriate panacea for this problem of access to understandable doctrine:

A vos no ay otra cosa que responderos, sino que pues ya no tenéis tiempo para aprender latín, estudiéys muy mucho en libros de romance, y que assimismo toméis en vuestra compañía alguna persona de buenas letras y buen espíritu, al qual vos deis la mitad de vuestra renta, porque él vos instruya a vos en lo que devéis

hazer, y no se os haga esto de mal, que yo os certifico si fuérades mi súbdito no librárades tan bien. (136)

Recognizing the continued importance of Latin, and also seeking to make the doctrine accessible to a larger segment of the population unschooled in Latin grammar, both Talavera and Valdés were persistent advocates for eliminating ignorance through the distribution of vernacular doctrinal materials. The *cartillas* and *doctrinas* of Talavera are unmistakable predecessors to the more explanatory catechism of Valdés.

As a final point on the doctrinal similarities, it is pertinent to identify the sources, other than scripture, that informed both Talavera and Valdés's understanding of the principles and rudiments of Christian doctrine. A review of F.J. Norton's *Printing in Spain 1501-1520* reveals that a plethora of doctrinally related works were published in Spain on the new printing presses of the early sixteenth century. And in relation to Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and Hernando de Talavera, there are two that call our attention. The first is a practical instruction on Christian living composed by Ludolphus of Saxony and it is pertinent for two reasons. Firstly it shares a portion of its title *Vita cristi cartuxano romançado por fray Ambrosio* with the *Vita Christi* composed by Francesc Eiximenis translated by Talavera. It is also the work that Valdés mentions in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the section where Archbishop Alva opines about what he considers a composite of authorities in vernacular that are reliable for acquiring an understanding of good Christian doctrine as well as for practical examples of living in accordance with those principles. Valdés's archbishop then comments, "Y también en los *Cartuxanos*, donde ay mucha dotrina de santo dotores" (133).

While Ambrosio Montesinos was translating the work of Ludolphus of Saxony, Talavera was busy translating the work of Francesc Eiximenis's *Vita Christi*. Though Valdés does not

mention Talavera's translation, it is still important to see that the spirit of providing the vernacular translation of such works like Ludolphus's and Eiximenis's, paraphrases of the life of Christ, served as a spiritual seed that later flourished into works like Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Albert G. Hauf i Valls explains in "*Fray Hernando de Talavera, O.S.H., y las traducciones castellanas de la Vita Christi de Fr. Francesc Eiximenis, O.F.M.*" how Talavera sought to indoctrinate the *pueblo* using Eiximenis's *Vita Christi*:

Talavera participa igualmente del criterio eiximeniano de la sencillez de expresión en la modulación de una retórica sagrada que permita al predicador llegar al pueblo llano. Como explica Eiximenis en el prólogo a su VCE,²³ al redactar su obra en vulgar, partía de la convicción de que si conocer a Cristo equivale a amarle, la única razón que explica que el pueblo no ame a Cristo es un grave desconocimiento, que él pretende paliar con su predicación escrita. (232)

Valdés follows the same spirit shown by Talavera of providing the scripture and the news of Christ in his vernacular *Dialogo de doctrina cristiana*. Arguably Valdés is following Talavera's lead more than Erasmus given that Talavera composed his pastoral writings in Castillian Spanish while Erasmus was still composing his works in Latin.

2.5 Translation

Talavera's attempt to facilitate the delivery of Christian doctrine by giving access to authoritative texts in the vernacular generated interest in Christian doctrine and liberated literate Spaniards who sought ways to understand for themselves and practice the Christian faith they claimed. A significant majority of the literate public did not enjoy the circumstances or a status in life that would enable them to access the sacred texts written in Latin. Talavera, confident in

²³ VCE in Hauf i Valls article is an abbreviation for *Vita Christi Eiximenis* simply to distinguish it from other works of the same title that abounded at the time.

the transcendence of the authority of his interpretations supported by a lifetime of experience and learning, embarked upon the very practical task of bringing Christian doctrine through his *cartillas*, *doctrinas* and *manuales*, but also, as pointed out, translated the devotional text of the Catalan Fray Francesc Ximienis, *Vita Cristi*. Talavera also encouraged women to read and at his urging Antonio Nebrija composed his *Introducciones* to make Latin texts accessible to women. Félix González Olmedo points this out in his biography of *Diego Ramírez Villaescusa*:

Por indicación de la Reina Católica y de fray Hernando de Talavera publicó Nebrija una edición especial de las *Introducciones* a dos columnas: en una, el latín, y en otra, el castellano, para que las religiosas y otras mujeres honestas pudiesen aprender el latín sin necesidad de maestros, y en todas las ediciones puso algo en romance, siguiendo el ejemplo de Pastrana, que había hecho lo mismo.

(10)

Those lacking special knowledge and training in Latin could with some effort and access to texts such as the *Introducciones* achieve some basic understanding of those literary or doctrinal works available to them.

Valdés, as a philologist recently trained at the Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, also embarked upon the project of translation and his first written and published work, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, is representative of the spirit and method of Talavera that sought to bring the text to the reader and the reader to the text through translation. Despite the challenge of expressing the gravity of scriptural meaning and the fear of conveying errors rather than truths the difficult task of translation dissuaded neither Talavera nor Valdés. Thus there is this final point of similarity that deserves highlighting, namely the project of translation in which both Talavera and Valdés were intimately engaged.

The pontifical prohibition on translating scripture was not enforced in Spain until Fernando de Valdés assumed the role of Inquisitor General in 1547 (Rawlings 22). Cristóbal de las Cuevas in his critical edition of Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo* points out that, "Aunque la prohibición de leer la Biblia en lengua vulgar proviene de antiguo, en España fue urgida severamente por el *Índice* de Valdés de 1559, lo que confirma y matiza en 1564 la regla IV del *Índice* tridentino" (141). The lax enforcement of this pontifical decree is evident in the prolific number of early sixteenth-century texts that in some way converted the officially sanctioned scriptural texts into the vernacular for those Spaniards who were literate but could not read Latin. Talavera heeded the prohibition by not directly translating scripture, but he did offer its sense in his writings. Valdés on the other hand challenged the prohibition by incorporating in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* a translation from Greek to Castillian Spanish of the Sermon on the Mount as recorded in the New Testament book of Matthew. His later projects of translating both Old and New Testament scriptures with relevant commentary were undertaken throughout his adult life, but never published until after his death. That chapter however is beyond the scope of this present study and merits further but separate treatment.

The ways in which Talavera practiced his translation of scriptural messages were primarily through the explication of scripture by oral sermons, through the *doctrinas* and *cartillas* that he published, through a short work titled *Breve e muy provechosa doctrina de lo que deve saber todo cristiano*, and through the translation of Francesc Eiximenis's *Vita Christi*. Hauf i Valls alludes to Talavera's frequent sermons emphasizing that Talavera sought to inform his listeners rather than confuse them:

En abierto contraste con los obispos corruptos y alejados de sus sedes, o de cuantos, como el primado de Toledo, creían que lo atractivo de la liturgia era el

misterio de lo incomprensible, Fray Hernando, al decir de sus biógrafos, predicaba hasta cinco y seis veces al día, y lo hacía de manera que ‘cualquier viejecilla pudiera entenderle.’ (232)

Valdés in similar fashion, but carrying it on to a greater extent through his direct translation of both Old and New Testament writings, seems to be following the example of Hernando de Talavera. So here, as a final point of parallelism between Talavera and Valdés, it will be enlightening to look at some passages from Talavera’s *Breve forma de confesar*, written in Castillian Spanish, and to see how they communicated some of the similarities between them and Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

In Valdés’s *Diálogo*, Antronio importunes the Archbishop Alva several times for reliable translations of the suggested scriptural passages that the Archbishop deems worthy of inclusion in the rudiments and principles of authoritative Christian doctrine. At the end of the explication of the Creed, which takes the form of a question and answer session primarily driven by Eusebio, Antronio admits his lack of understanding: “Mirad cuánto haze al caso la buena comunicación, pero ha de ser con esta condición, pues yo no entiendo esos latines, que me avéys de dar un traslado desse colloquio o como le llamáys” (31). Here Antronio asks for a good translation of the *Colloquios familiares* of Erasmus that the Archbishop has said are not only reliable but recommended reading for their concise and authoritative explanation of the articles of faith contained in the Creed. But his agreement to provide the translation is conditioned by an admonition to interiorize the meaning because of the futility of having the book without incorporating its meaning into one’s life. “Soy contento, yo hare que se os dé, pero mirad padre honrrado, las cosas semejantes más es menester que se tengan imprimidas y encaxadas en el

ánima que escritas en los libros. Dígooslo porque querría hiziéssedes más caso de tener lo dicho en vuestra ánima que en vuestra cámara” (31).

At the conclusion of the following section explicating the Ten Commandments, Antronio again importunes the archbishop for a “romance language” version. The interchange is an echo of the request and response that followed the Creed:

Antronio: Soy contento, pero con condición que vos señor me lo hagáis dar en romance.

Arçobispo: Eppo haré yo de buena voluntad, y aun luego, porque para hazer que en mi arçobispado se enseñen, he hecho que los pongan en romance. (63)

The weight of the Spanish synods and councils instructing the ecclesiastics of Spain to indoctrinate their parishes and the lasting influence of Talavera, who served as a first example and effected translations in his *cartillas*, *doctrinas* and *manuales*, is the likely reference to which Valdés’s archbishop refers when he states that he has romance translations of the Ten Commandments for the souls under his care.

Later when discussing the *Pater Noster* the archbishop again refers to the need for a romance language translation: “assí que para vos que lo entendéis esto os basta, para los demás hazedlas trasladar en romance, y hazed que en romance las apriendan, y esto también les bastará” (117). Here Valdés sanctions the learning of doctrinal principles of the *Pater Noster* by affirming the sufficiency of the vernacular translation from Latin. His method of sanction is, as throughout, in the guise of Archbishop Alva offering his comment to Antronio and assuring him that it is not necessary for him to know the Latin, but rather to understand the doctrine and pass the doctrinal message via the vernacular. After having listened to the archbishop narrate what he describes as a compendium of sacred scripture, Antronio promises to heed the archbishop’s

recommendation to memorize it by reciting it often, but only if the archbishop will allow him to transcribe a written copy of it in the vernacular. “Yos prometo de dezirlo de la mesma manera que lo avéys dicho a mis feligreses, porque según vos soys, bien sé que no se os hará de mal de mandármelo escrevir todo así como lo avéys dicho” (128).

The final reference to translation in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* comes just before Valdés reveals what his character, the archbishop Alva, has referred to as the Sermon on the Mount from the book of St. Matthew that are essential Mattfor understanding love for God and neighbor. He offers the chapters directly to the Marqués de Villena because he seeks to present for readers a reliable scriptural translation. Here Valdés is no longer operating under the guise of a character in the dialogue, but rather presents the translation Jesus’s Sermon on the Mount of Olives, from St. Matthew (140). He writes, “Y porque, en el *diálogo* están muchas vezes alabados los tres capítulos del Evangelio que escribió sant Matheo, los quales aquel Arçobispo de gloriosa memoria con mucha razón tenía en mucho, acorde de traduzirlos en nuestro romance castellano” (140). The content of the three chapters translated by Valdés include the Christological reference to the two most important commandments of the Decalogue. The emphasis in this final section upon love for God and love for neighbor is reminiscent of Talavera’s pedagogical project. For example in his introduction to the *Breve forma de confesar* he explicitly proposes to reduce the prolix confession to the Ten Commandments, pointing out the two most important that are love of God and of neighbor. He phrases the commandment as a warning, writing “aquello es pecado mortal que es contra el amor que á Dios y á nos y al prójimo devemos” (3). Valdés in similar spirit speaks of the Ten Commandments and shows, like Talavera, that love of God and of neighbor are the two most important. He expresses it through the mouth of the archbishop who says, “Antes que pasemos adelante, os quiero mostrar la

maravillosa orden que llevan estos mandamientos. Avéis de notar que los quatro passados, paresce que se endereçan a Dios e a sus vicarios, que son los padres de cada uno. Los seys que se siguen se endereçan al próximo” (45). Later in the same section, after having outlined the many ways in which one might break the Ten Commandments, Valdés recapitulates the central teaching when the archbishop says, “entre estos diez mandamientos no se pone a la letra el del amor de Dios y del próximo, pues vemos que en el Testamento Nuevo muchas vezes se ponen por primero y segundo” (55). This is the core of the Christian doctrine that is most important for Valdés in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in the same way that it was first expressed in Talavera’s *Breve forma de confesar*.

Though it cannot be said that Talavera’s focus is exactly mimicked by Valdés, there is another key element of similarity between Talavera and Valdés that should be mentioned, namely, the requirement that prelates personally perform the ordination examinations of those who serve in their diocese. The subject was mentioned earlier in this chapter when speaking about Antronio’s lack of understanding of doctrine because he did not read Latin, and yet, was successfully ordained because he had a pleasing reading voice. The archbishop replies that in his diocese he would ordain no one who was not personally examined by him and found to be of stellar moral character and knowledgeable about Christian doctrine. He says, “Aldemenos en mi arçobispado (siendo yo vivo) no se ordenará ninguno, sea quien se pagare, sin que yo mismo lo examine” (135). Valdés is referring to the sale of church offices and the problem that results from it, namely a deficit of adequately indoctrinated priests to serve the population in spiritual matters.

The language of Valdés’s Archbishop is similar to that of Talavera in his *Breve forma de confesar*, under the section entitled *Pecados de sacrilegio que se cometen en dar y en procurar los beneficios eclesiásticos no devidamente* (21). Talavera explains the lamentable ways in

which some prelates commit sacrilegious acts by extending ecclesiastical benefices to individuals who are unqualified to serve. His reasons circumscribe the gamut of corruption and vice attributable to many in sixteenth-century clerical positions. In particular, however, he underscores the travesty of prelates who do not personally examine a candidate or review his performance of duties: “Item, el que no sirve su beneficio en la manera que el beneficio requiere, ó á lo menos si no pone quien lo sirva convenientemente, lo cual él debe visitar y examinar personalmente” (22). This particular problem is one that Talavera had been working to resolve from the time of the National Council of Seville in 1478 as pointed out earlier. It is still unresolved by the time that Valdés publishes the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in 1529, and the words of Archbishop Alva in the dialogue sound like an echo of Talavera. His legacy of reform was still alive, and it was seized upon by Valdés who reiterated it in his *Diálogo*.

Though the examples offered here are not exhaustive, they suffice to show several aspects of affinity between the goals shared by Talavera and Valdés in their pedagogical projects. Both sought to increase access to authoritative Christian doctrine by making it available in translated form. Both sought to reform clerical abuses at all levels within the ecclesiastical polity beginning from the top. Both refrained from pursuing their goals through coercion, opting instead for engaging the wider audience of literate Spaniards to become informed about matters of Christian faith, confident that, though more tedious and less politically expedient, the results would serve to bolster the credibility of the faith in which they believed.

It is appropriate that the issue of credibility of doctrine and faith be raised here at the end of the chapter because it provides a convenient segue to the next chapter that will address credibility as it relates to the concept of authority in Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Valdés’s religious dialogue will be analyzed based upon two essays by Paul Ricoeur that will

help to explain the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance in Valdés's religious dialogue.

Instead of launching directly into the analysis of Valdés's dialogue, however, the next chapter will begin with a section that explains how the religious dialogue achieved its important status within sixteenth-century Spain.

CHAPTER 3

AUTHORITY, FEAR, AND TOLERANCE IN VALDÉS'S *DIALOGO DE DOCTRINA CRISTIANA*

*vos les des dotrina, y no se la podéis dar
si no la sabéis para vos,
y no la podéis saber bien,
sino con trabajo y estudio*

Diálogo de doctrina cristiana 135

3.1 Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*

The roots of Greek and Latin peripatetic literary dialogue served to feed, motivate and inspire some of the *letrados* of Spain, mostly men who formed part of an elite, educated group trained in reading Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, to write their own literary dialogues at the beginning of the sixteenth century in Spain. Language study or philology facilitated access to the ancient Western literary tradition and inspired scholars during the sixteenth century to publish translations as they composed their own vernacular literary contributions, often imitating or commenting upon the ancient literatures while adding their own innovative qualities.

By telling their own narratives using the dialogue genre that had been so important for the communication of philosophical ideas in Greek and Roman cultures, they left as their own cultural legacy a significant body of dialogical literature, much of which demonstrates the influence of Christian thought. The focus of this chapter is the work of the *letrado*, Juan de Valdés, who chose dialogue as the genre for his first published work, *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, which Miguel Eguía printed in Alcalá on January 14, 1529. As noted by Jose C. Nieto in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*, an historical and theological analysis of Juan de Valdés, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is the only work that

Valdés published during his lifetime (114). The Christian doctrine that it contains is its principal message, but the dialogue, when evaluated for what it explicitly and implicitly conveys about authority, fear, and tolerance reveals much about the intellectual and literary history of Valdés, as well as characteristics of the prevailing social milieu in which he lived. His status as a privileged intellectual is evident in the dialogue because its systematic structure conveys critical analysis through well-reasoned inquiries and responses to clarify the doctrines of Christianity, but its composition in vernacular Castilian Spanish made it accessible to a wider segment of the reading populace. In that sense, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* liberates and translates meaning formerly reserved for erudite readers of Latin. What and how authority is imagined and then transcribed into literary religious dialogue by Valdés is the subject of examination and explanation in what follows.

3.2 Ricoeurian orientation toward authority

A thorough analysis of authority in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* first requires establishing to some degree of certainty a definition of the concept of authority, both what it is and what it is not. Two essays from *Reflections on the Just*, a compilation of essays composed by philosopher and theologian, Paul Ricoeur, will serve as the theoretical foundation for authority. Based upon the ideas about authority expressed in Ricoeur's essays this chapter will offer a reading of authority, fear and tolerance in Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. "Autonomy and Fragility" and "The Paradox of Authority" in *Reflections on the Just* both comment on the concept of authority. To set the stage for this Ricoeurian reading of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* it is necessary to summarize Ricoeur's working definition of authority. In defining authority, Paul Ricoeur resorts to the *Robert* dictionary definition of authority as a point of departure writing: "The *Robert* dictionary says, 'the right to command, the power (recognized

or not) to impose obedience” (91). The dictionary entry for authority from the *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* by Sebastián de Covarrubias Horozco, gives a more extensive explanation:

Estimación, gravedad, eminencia. Autoridad, la razón escrita que alegamos para fundar algún propósito, y la firmísima es la que se trae de la Sagrada Escritura, de los santos concilios, de las tradiciones de los santos doctores y en su proporción de los demás que han escrito y escriben. (252)

So with authority there exists at individual and societal levels a hierarchical relationship where an institution or individual in a position of superiority claims the right to command or power to impose obedience upon one or more subordinates. The arrangement takes shape in explicit and implicit ways. Explicitly it is sometimes a written policy emanating from an institution or individual claiming the right to authority. At other times there develops an implicit tradition of interaction between the ones who command and those who obey which replicates and transforms over time. The stability of authority is relative because of the dynamic nature of the human beings who carry out their respective roles of superior and subordinate in the hierarchical structure.

Ricoeur’s evaluation of the historical manifestation of the occidental concept of authority offers a description of three qualities of authority and also demonstrates how authority is paradoxical, meaning when two opposing theses “equally resist being refuted and have therefore to be held in common or both be abandoned” (73). He succinctly states this paradox in the form of a question in the introduction of *Reflections on the Just* by asking, “whether the authority of a symbolic order is operative only when it has been recognized and acknowledged” (19). The correlative elements of fear and tolerance that accompany authority in Valdés’s *Diálogo de*

doctrina cristiana also deserve evaluation for the way in which they act as reciprocal partners in sometimes symbiotic and sometimes polemical interactions within the hierarchical structure of authority.

Because the interaction between the one who commands and the one who obeys is dynamic as opposed to static and in flux rather than at stasis, authority is, no matter how longstanding, always vulnerable to the possibility of a crisis of legitimacy, etymologically defined by the OED as, “a status which has been conferred or ratified by some authority”. That is to say, a problem arises for the commander (individual or institutional) when those who obey doubt the credibility of the commander’s right to impose obedience. The one who claims authority always does so in a *quid pro quo* relationship that forges an inextinguishable link between commander and obedient. The obedient recognize his authority through believing in his right to impose obedience upon them. However, when the obedient doubt the legitimacy of the authority, therein lays the paradox of which Ricoeur speaks, for to whom or what does the authority resort for this right to command or impose obedience? “The fundamentally fiduciary character of the relation between above and below then comes to the fore. It is in terms of belief that legitimacy henceforth poses the paradox of authority” (22). It is no accident that the root of the word fiduciary is the Latin *fides* with its attendant connections to religion.

Distinguishing between belief and faith, Hannah Arendt in “What is Authority” says, “Only belief, but not faith, has an inherent affinity with and is constantly exposed to doubt. But who can deny that faith too, for so many centuries securely protected by religion, its beliefs and its dogmas, has been gravely endangered through what is actually only a crisis of institutional religion” (94-95). This crisis in the authority of the institutional manifestation of Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church, is recognized by Alister McGrath in *The Foundations of Dialogue*

in Science and Religion as a particularly seminal point for the Reformation because it is a time of “sustained critique of the medieval church on a number of issues, including its structures, ethics and at least some of its beliefs” (18). The problem with the term Reformation is the facile tendency toward a totalizing categorization as the term is bandied about without a thorough review of the work or person who is characterized as reformed. Avoiding the complete polarity of the Reformation/Counter reformation dichotomy is best for the purpose of looking at Juan de Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* because Valdés’s perspective in his writing of this dialogue and what it says about authority is at the cusp of what is only later called the Reformation.

Ricoeur further describes authority with three adjectives: anterior, superior and exterior. In the following extensive quote, Ricoeur expounds upon the relationship of these terms to the concept of authority proposing that,

Authority implies several different characteristics. First of all is that of antecedence: order precedes us, each of us taken one by one. Next is superiority we place it or rather find it ‘above’ us, at the head of our preferences. Here we touch a sense of the “better” that makes desires and interests, in short, one’s own preferences, withdraw to a lower rank. Third, authority appears external to us, in the sense that, even if given a Platonic concept of reminiscence, it requires someone like Socrates to awaken it, a real stingray, or a teacher of justice as severe as the prophets of Israel, to enjoin us, in short, a wise teacher. You will recall that the big question in early Socratic dialogues is whether virtue can be taught. (84)

Applying Ricoeur's three characteristics of anteriority, superiority, and exteriority to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* will show the depth of the literary and religious qualities contained within it.

These adjectives, anterior, superior, and exterior, will be used as interpretative lenses, not unlike a magnifying glass, to enable a close, analytical reading of the dialogue with particular focus upon Valdés's use of words, to construct, affirm, and sanction the dialogue's authority. The exercise of focusing upon the words "authority" and "fear" in the dialogue will show how Valdés's reiteration and clarification of these concepts through the voices of his characters exhibit the authoritative qualities of anteriority, superiority and exteriority. A further step will show how Valdés merges or conflates the literary with the religious in what might be considered a composite authority with a unique, cohesive, and unifying nature. It is not surprising that Valdés would produce this literary religious dialogue given that educational methods during his lifetime were steeped in Christian doctrine. As Víctor Infantes has pointed out in his introduction to *De las primeras letras: cartillas españolas para enseñar a leer de los siglos XV y XVI*, there was in sixteenth-century pedagogical method an "...íntima relación entre el aprendizaje de la lectura y la asimilación de la Doctrina Cristiana como actividad básica del inicio al conocimiento" (38). The early learning in which Valdés is likely to have participated would have followed the pattern of the catechism expressed in the *Tabla moral* that Infantes mentions in this study. It is thus not difficult to imagine how Valdés would later conflate his training as a philologist and rhetorician at the University of Alcalá de Henares with his personal conviction and interest in Christian doctrine stemming from his childhood education and his translation of biblical texts. Cristina Barbolani saliently highlights the connection in her introduction to *Diálogo de la lengua*:

...el problema de la lengua está muy fuertemente vinculado al religioso. Así es en toda la Reforma: en ésta las Escrituras ya no son textos inasequibles que llegan a los fieles sólo mediatamente, a través de la interpretación admitida, sino palabra viva de Dios dirigida directamente a todos, a la cual conviene acercarse de un modo directo, traduciéndola e interpretándola. (46)

Whereas Valdés's dialogue analytically divides Christian doctrine into its various parts, the dialogue's parts are, as a whole, a synthesis of essential doctrinal elements reflecting Valdés's understanding of the heart, mouth (or what comes from it), and works/behaviors of a person who is "verdadera y puramente christiano" (137). Valdés's dialogue expresses his understanding of authority as an interwoven moral and civil problematic directed toward teachers of doctrine to help them understand what is right opinion and right practice regarding themes of authority, fear, and tolerance in early sixteenth-century Spain. Engaging this literary and religious dialogue as readers who analyze and synthesize its meanings is, in effect, to dialogue with the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and possibly to reactualize in a mental exercise the critically reflective development of Juan de Valdés's reading of Christian doctrine. It is in the midst of this reading and reactualizing exercise that Valdés's training as a philologist and as a lay theologian become apparent.

The following pages will highlight how authority, fear, and tolerance are explained in Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* using Ricoeur's essay on authority as an analytical lens to see the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* in its literary and religious fullness. The moral norm established by the biblical narrative is preeminent in Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, but there is also the need to interact with other people on the civil plane, and Valdés's *Diálogo* is, he hopes, the guide to help Christians understand in whom they believe and how they should carry

out daily living. Again, the question of the accreditation of the authority is raised and Valdés accredits his view of authority through his characters, what they say, and the sources they find authoritative. Valdés is essentially asking and answering the question, of whether the obedient believe that the authority he places before them in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* has the right to command or impose obedience upon them.

3.3 Summary of the dialogue

The oldest known extant copy of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* resides in Lisbon, Portugal where the French historian Marcel Bataillon found it in 1925. In that same year Bataillon reintroduced readers of sixteenth-century Spanish to the work with a well researched and carefully documented critical introduction composed in French. His research was seminal for Valdesian studies because it helped to distinguish between the dialogue written by Juan versus those dialogues written by his brother Alfonso de Valdés, secretary of the Emperor Charles V.²⁴

The *Diálogo's* title page and table of contents introduce the reader to the form and content of the written work demonstrating in the title alone that the form will be a dialogue and the content Christian doctrine. The *Tabla* that follows outlines ten separate sections in the dialogue, each with a brief statement summarily indicating the particular themes to be treated in that section. Following the *Tabla* is a brief narration in which Valdés as *autor/religioso* establishes the contextual scene for the dialogue. His ambiguous transition from his role as author into the scene setting narrative leaves the reader wondering whether the dialogue recounts a true experience of its author, Valdés, or if it is a completely fictional invention. Most probably it lies somewhere in between.

²⁴ See Alfonso de Valdés's *Diálogo de las cosas ocurridas en Roma* (1527) and *El diálogo de Mercurio y Carón* (1523).

The dedication also is where Valdés explains his motive for composing the dialogue and introduces his readers to the three characters, Eusebio, Antronio, and Archbishop Alva. These three will engage each other in a back and forth question and answer session. The “yo” of the introductory narrative is the character Eusebio who describes himself as knowing “mediamente bien” (10) the Christian doctrine necessary for the instruction of children. Bataillon and most subsequent Valdesian scholars trace the name back to a similar character in Desiderius Erasmus’s *Colloquios familiares*. However, it should also be pointed out that the name Eusebius has much deeper roots in Christian history in both Eusebius of Pamphilus, a contemporary of the Roman Emperor Constantine and writer of *The Ecclesiastical History*.²⁵ Though perhaps a stretch to consider this Eusebius the namesake of Valdés’s character, the association is nonetheless pertinent to mention for the foundational role he played in preserving in written narrative form a testimony of the early church (Lake xi). Another Eusebius that should also be mentioned is one to whom St. Jerome refers in his seventh letter (Jerome 41). Valdés includes “*las Epístolas de sant Hierónimo*” in his section of the dialogue entitled *De las lecturas* as suggested readings in romance language (133). And furthermore, even Saint Jerome was himself named Eusebius after his father. Though speculative, it is not an impossibility that Valdés might have had more than one Eusebius in mind when he selected that name to represent the character in the dialogue that has been interpreted as the role assumed by Valdés. Taking on the name Eusebius lends to Valdés’s character a weightiness of Christian tradition that extends much deeper than simply to Erasmus’s *Colloquios familiares*.

Referring to the less informed priest of the *Diálogo*, Antronio, Valdés writes that the priest, “que esenava era ydiota, y no estaba tan fundado en las cosas que dezía como fuera

²⁵ Eusebius, Kirsopp Lake, John Ernest Leonard Oulton, and Hugh Jackson Lawlor. *The Ecclesiastical History*. London: W. Heinemann, 1926.

menester” (9). Angel Alcalá in his critical introduction to *Obras completas I*, the first in a two volume series of all extant works of Valdés, indicates that “Antronio es el alegre abad del coloquio erasmista *Abbas et erudita*” (XXXIII).²⁶ Craig R. Thompson also finds echoes of Erasmus’s *Confabulatio pia* in Valdés particularly, “...its ideas on confession, fasting, and prayer...” (90). Lastly, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* has one historically identifiable character in the archbishop Pedro de Alva who is key in the communication of Christian doctrine.

Eusebio has been walking through the *villa* when he happens upon Antronio, who despite his ignorance of doctrine is a well-meaning priest teaching Christian doctrine to a group of young boys. Eusebio stops to see whether he might learn some good things to introduce in his own monastery. Antronio notices Eusebio because of his religious garb and approaches him after the lesson is finished, seeking his opinion about what he heard. While praising Antronio for his effort and his noble and good intentions, Eusebio suggests that they both seek out the archbishop of Granada, Pedro de Alva, in the Hieronymite monastery. Eusebio is certain that they will not only leave personally edified, but that they will understand those things that must be understood in order to instruct others. Though it is not named by Valdés, the city must be Granada for that was the city in which Pedro de Alva served as archbishop.

The time is June on the celebration of Saint John and, after a meal, the Archbishop grasps both Eusebio and Antronio’s hands to lead them to a fountain in a garden of the monastery. His leading them by the hand demonstrates pastoral affection that precedes his reasoned explication of Christian doctrine for the eager visitors. This act is not insignificant for it indicates the forging of the fiduciary relationship in the authority dialectic of which Ricoeur speaks by

²⁶ *Abbatis et eruditae* published in 1524. A well-annotated English translation of this colloquy of Erasmus is that of Craig R. Thompson. *Collected Works of Erasmus*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

establishing the master/disciple dichotomy. The fiduciary relationship is important for establishing the credibility necessary for legitimizing the discourse he is about to deliver.

The Marqués de Villena Diego López Pacheco, to whom the dialogue is dedicated, is explicitly invited by Valdés to imagine the interactions between Antronio, Eusebio and the Archbishop Pedro de Alva as if it were truly the Archbishop answering their questions because the authority of the Archbishop exceeds that of Valdés. The explicit use of the word *autoridad* by Eusebio (or Valdés) to describe the archbishop recognizes and attests to the exteriority of authority mentioned by Ricoeur that appears external and requires someone to awaken it (84). Valdés further affirms and sanctions the gravity of the Archbishop's authority by emphasizing his superior position in an ecclesiastical leadership role, "como de perlado de la Iglesia" and his learning as a "persona de letras sagradas" and his character as a "spíritu xp̄iano" (9). These qualifying phrases serve to legitimize the superiority of the Archbishop as the authoritative voice of Christian doctrine and point yet again to the vertical relationship or hierarchy mentioned by Ricoeur. The very meaning of archbishop is bishop over bishops and by implication the entire hierarchical structure that exists below in the *Iglesia*.

The substantive content of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* relies upon a question and answer format to relate a clarifying exposition of the meanings contained in the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue from the Old Testament book of Exodus, the seven mortal sins, the four classical virtues, the three theological virtues, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, the five commandments of the Church, Christ's prayer from the sixth chapter of the New Testament book of Matthew, and a compendium of all scripture. The questions of Eusebio and Antronio on each topic accompanied by the answers of the archbishop Alva and then consequential comments expressing affirmation, marvel, and gratitude from Eusebio and Antronio form the bulk of the

dialogue. The dialogic format is an opportunity upon which Valdés seizes to develop the characters that simulate the various levels of understanding and error among individuals within the ecclesiastical polity of sixteenth-century Spain.

Though he addresses confession in the section on the Decalogue, Valdés opts not to list particular confessional methods other than referring Antronio, and by extension Eusebio and all readers, to consult one of a myriad of confession booklets. Moving the dialogue along, Archbishop Alva states, “No queráys por amor de mí que gastemos aquí nuestro tiempo en esso, pues toparéys por ay mil confesionarios que os lo digan, especialmente uno de un maestro Cyruelo” (37). Though the title is not mentioned, he is most likely referring to Pedro Ciruelo,²⁷ a contemporary of Valdés who had composed *Arte de bien confesar* in 1514 (Homza, *Religious Authority* 152) and was the acting Chair of Thomist theology in the Universidad de Alcalá de Henares in 1510 (Homza, *Religious Authority* 81). Valdés does not completely discard the importance of confession but deems it of lesser importance than the doctrines that he considers in need of greater clarification for the understanding of prelates, priests, parents and teachers. Neither does Archbishop Alva emphasize the works of mercy that were included in other catechisms, referring Antronio instead to their inclusion in the general commandment to treat neighbors as one’s self.

In the final sections of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Valdés includes commentary on the lamentable ignorance of the clergy and its detrimental impact upon the Church as a whole. He calls for the reform of the Church reaffirming that his dialogue is faithful to the “...doctrina de Jesu Xpo., ni de sus apóstoles, ni de la ygelsia cathólica...” (133). In response to Antronio’s request for a suggestion of books in romance language that he can recommend to his brethren to

²⁷ The entry in José Sánchez Herrero’s article *La literatura catequética en la Península Ibérica, 1236-1553*, lists the title of this confessional as, “Confessionario del Maestro Pedro Ciruelo nuevamente corregido. Tratado de la confesión, dirigido a los confesores de las siete iglesias de la muy escogida ciudad de Daroca patria suya”.

foment greater understanding of Christian doctrine, the archbishop proffers the following list, that, though somewhat lengthy, is nonetheless worth quoting in its entirety here:

En el *Libro de las epístolas y evangelios y sermones del año*, aunque, para deziros verdad, ni los sermones me contentan, ni aun la traslación de los demás está como devía estar. Y también en los *Cartuxanos*, donde ay mucha doctrina de santos doctores. Y en el *Enquiridion* de Erasmo, y en algunas cositas del mismo que ay en romance, así como la *Declaración del Pater Noster*, y un *Sermoncico del niño Jesús*, y algunos *Colloquitos*. También en el *Contemptus mundi* que dizen de Gerson, y en las *Epístolas* de sant Hierónimo. Y también en los *Morales* de sant Gregorio, que agora se han imprimido en romance. Y assimismo en algunas cositas que hay de sant Agustín. (133)

This list designates which authors and which of their works on Christian doctrine are useful not only for personal edification, but also for the purpose of being sufficiently informed to instruct others. However, simply listing recommended readings is only part of Valdés's pedagogical project. The final point he raises in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is the clarion call for reform to remedy two things within the existing ecclesiastical hierarchy: a dearth of doctrinal proficiency and a laxity on the part of the highest ranking officials to personally conduct ordination examinations. He makes this call through the archbishop's impassioned declaration about not ordaining anyone within his diocese without personally examining him on Christian doctrine and finding that the candidate's life, "ha sido y es muy conforme a la religión Christiana, y que junto con esto es persona de letras y abilidad, darle he órdenes..." (136). If the candidate lacks these qualities, the archbishop claims that he would not grant ordination even if the whole world cried out for him to do so (136).

In Valdés's final message, he again refers to himself as *El Autor* and personally addresses the Marqués de Villena, assuring that all things related in the dialogue were things that the archbishop would have carried out in his diocese had God not seen fit to, "levarle desta que llamamos vida" (140). Valdés then adds that he has included for the *marqués* a vernacular translation of chapters five, six, and seven of the New Testament book of Matthew because it was cherished so much and the archbishop relied upon it in the dialogue. The translation concludes the dialogue and leaves readers with a final message that Valdés hopes will echo in their memory. The final verse of the seventh chapter of Matthew is Valdés's parting word, "Y aconteció, que como Iesú ovo acabado estas razones, espantáronse aquellas compañías de oír su doctrina, porque les enseñava como persona que tiene auctoridad, y no como los letrados y phariseos" (150). To look more closely at the concept of this authority to which Valdés refers in his dialogue, as well as the related fear and tolerance, will be the focus of the balance of the chapter.

3.4 Names of authority

As author creator of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* Valdés explicitly and implicitly claims a right to authority on the matters contained therein. The act of composing the dialogue for publication implies that this dialogue offers the necessary and essential doctrines of Christian faith for those who presume to teach others. Valdés is not shy about his understanding, but he is hesitant to reveal his personal identity. His own *converso* lineage and the death of his uncle for heresy as a Judaizer were likely an influencing factor in his choice to take as his pseudonym for the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* the titles of *autor* and *religioso*.²⁸ But the claim that Valdés makes by calling himself *autor* and *religioso* offers clues to his understanding and self-

²⁸ For a detailed explanation of Juan's *converso* ancestry see Miguel Jiménez Monteserín's critical introduction to the facsimile edition of Fermín Caballero's *Conquenses Ilustres: Alonso y Juan de Valdés* published originally in 1875.

conception as an authority. He holds himself out to be at least sufficiently learned to replicate the pedagogical project begun by Hernando de Talavera, discussed in the first chapter of this study.

There is an additional explicit claim to authority in Valdés's use of the archbishop of Granada Pedro de Alva as his adopted surrogate voice. The first claim to the right to command and impose obedience, is patent in the names that Valdés assigns to himself. He conscientiously lays hold to the right to command and to impose obedience by assuming two titles: *El autor* and *un religioso* while at the same time stepping into the shoes of the archbishop and using his status as prelate for affirming, sanctioning, and bolstering the creditable authority of the *Diálogo*. The assumption of the role is not hidden from the reader because he admonishes the Marqués de Villena to read the dialogue and hear the words of the archbishop as if it were he speaking in the author's stead.

The authoritative nature or essence of these two names demonstrates both a claim and an invitation. Within the two titles lie the characteristics of anteriority, superiority and exteriority that Ricoeur uses to label authority, and they set the stage for the reader by offering proof that the content of the dialogue is credible as a source for understanding Christian doctrine by virtue of his being an informed author or a religiously trained conveyor of doctrine.

Valdés's first epithetical use of *un religioso* comes after graciously acknowledging and dedicating his dialogue to the, "Muy Ilustre Señor Don Diego López Pacheco," the Marqués de Villena, his benefactor. The title from the dialogue states, "*Diálogo de doctrina cristiana nuevamente compuesto por un religioso*" (3). The title *un religioso* is an explicit claim to at least some basic authoritative capacity because it declares that the dialogue is authored by an individual (as opposed to numerous persons) who has sufficient formal education in the tenets of

Christian religion to refer to himself as such. Valdés's adoption of the name *un religioso* advises that he is bound to an order not of his own making, but one that precedes him, showing from the beginning that he is in submission to an authority that is anterior. Where his readers were in doubt about his personal identity, Valdés reassures them through his use of the title *un religioso* that what follows in the interrogatories and answers of his dialogue's characters is a trustworthy explanation of Christian doctrine from a man who is bound by religious vow.²⁹ It is through the interrogative and declarative statements that come later in the dialogue that his characters expound upon the obligations of Christian doctrine, revealing to his readers the anterior sources of the authority and the symbolic order to which he has apparently linked himself. Writing in his historico-biographical account of Valdés Jose Nieto comments on the title *un religioso*:

Another problem involved in the explanatory sentence of the title is that Valdés used the term *religioso* and not his own name to identify the author of the book. This has been taken to mean that Valdés tried to cover up his real name with the religious title of *religioso*, which was used, and still can be used in Spain, to describe a person who belongs to some religious order or is officially related to the Church. In other words, Valdés published his work under an anonymous device. We prefer to believe that he used the term *religioso* because, according to the regulation and constitutions of the University of Alcalá, he could consider himself as a *religioso* and as forming part of the official ecclesiastic institution.

(115)

The reason why Valdés chose not to reveal his personal identity as the author of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* by referring to himself as *un religioso* probably has something to do with a

²⁶ Nieto suggests in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation* the possibility that Valdés had taken a vow, but there is no historical document to verify that he had.

kind of fear or prudence occasioned by the ominous threat of the Inquisition, an institution with which Valdés was familiar for having testified at the Inquisition process of Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz, the lay preacher under whom he learned while living at the Marqués de Villena's residence in Escalona. Jose Nieto writes of this connection and the trial in *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*, stating that the Inquisition trial document of Alcaraz, "...reveals that he [Valdés] was a member of the household of the Marqués de Villena, at Escalona, where Alcaraz was also a lay preacher to the Marqués" (99).

The use of the title *un religioso* recognizes a right, bolsters and sanctions his claim to explain Christian doctrine. Just as a title of nobility is granted by the monarch, the title *un religioso* vouches for the credibility of Valdés's dialogue. The Latin etymology of *un religioso* points to a classical Roman concept that Ricoeur mentions in *The Paradox of Authority*, stating, "It even turns out that the connection of this foundation to its past was called precisely *religio* by these authors" (Ricoeur 99). Ricoeur shows that the Latin historian Livy, in writing about the founding of Rome, refers to its mythological origin and speaks of a founding energy to which he and his Roman compatriots are bound or linked. It is the indescribable *religio* that binds one to the foundational or original energy. The word *religio* is appropriated by Christianity when it becomes the official religion of the Roman Empire under Constantine. Though it cannot be certain that Valdés names his moderately informed interrogator Eusebio in deference to the Christian Roman historian Eusebius, it is worth mentioning the possible connection. The roots of the anterior tradition of the Christian symbolic order reach deeply into history and Valdés lays claim to them in his assumption of this title *un religioso*. He claims his right to the title of *un religioso* and binds himself to the norms, principles or rudiments of the anterior Christian order.

The *Tabla* that follows the dedication to the Marqués de Villena outlines the content of the dialogue, dividing it into ten sections. It is a brief synopsis of the principles and rudiments of Christian doctrine. The title of the final section is intriguing because it only states that it treats particular things that those who read it will see. In the *Tabla* it is listed as, “Trátanse al fin, otras cosas particulares las cuales verá el que lo leyere” (5). The content and order of the doctrine is anterior to Juan de Valdés in that the *Tabla* is partially faithful to Roman Catholic teachings prior to the Council of Trent. As Sarah T. Nalle points out in her study *God in La Mancha*. “In 1322 the National Council of Valladolid established that all churches had to display the *Tabla moral*, on which were written in Latin and Castilian the Articles of Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Commandments of the Church, and the Seven Capital Sins with their opposite virtues” (106). A unique feature of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is Valdés’s use of the archbishop as an evangelical authority. Another additional innovation is his translation from Greek to Castilian of Saint Matthew’s account of Jesus’s Sermon on the Mount which is included after the dialogue as an addendum. Valdés dedicates the translation to his benefactor, the Marqués de Villena, and speaks of its key role in Christian doctrine. His offer of a translation from Greek to Spanish is a further demonstration of the reliability of the doctrine contained therein because it is demonstrative of an uncommon skill, that of negotiating between languages.

Understanding and scholarship of the Greek language even two decades into the sixteenth century was an extraordinary rather than normal capacity. As G. R. Evans points out in *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates*, between the sixth and the sixteenth centuries there were few Christian scholars who could read Scripture in the original (38-39). But Iberian Peninsula intellectuals like Ramon Llull and Francisco Jiménez Cisneros were conspicuously at the forefront of a scholarly movement in Europe that encouraged philological scholarship in

Greek, Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic (Chaldean) in universities (39), and Juan de Valdés was a first generation beneficiary of the movement. His work on Greek and Hebrew texts in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* was not an isolated event, since he continued to work on translation and commentary for many years, leaving scriptural translations in Castilian as his primary legacy to Spanish literature, despite being better known for his historical treatment of the development of Castilian Spanish as a language in his posthumously published *Diálogo de la lengua* (1737).

3.5 Doctrinal dialogue

The body of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* follows the format of a long standing but evolutionary tradition of catechisms reaching back to the Middle Ages that began to be much more accessible to readers of Castilian in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. In large part as a result of the pedagogical efforts of Archbishop of Granada Hernando de Talavera. The teachings of the *Tabla moral* were at least familiar to much of the population as a result of the Church synods or councils that mandated posting them at the parish church. Capitalizing upon the synodal mandates of Toledo from 1480 and 1498 and the Council of Seville from 1512, Valdés targets the audience that must know doctrine in order to instruct others. He is the one with letters and experience sufficient to do so. Echoing the sentiment and pedagogical project of Hernando de Talavera, Valdés selected Archbishop Pedro de Alva as his voice of authority. He pays direct homage to the father of the modern catechistic method several times by alluding to Archbishop Hernando de Talavera for his exemplary living. As Pedro de Alva's spiritual mentor, Archbishop Talavera had strategically seized upon a close connection with the monarchy and allied himself with various printers to publish and distribute catechistic materials for pedagogical indoctrination during the years 1498-1505.

Valdés composed the body of his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* employing a similar pedagogical aim, but directed himself toward a more sophisticated audience that desperately needed instruction on the meanings of the documents they were admonished to teach. As Sánchez Herrero points out in *La enseñanza de la doctrina cristiana en algunas diócesis de León y Castilla durante los siglos XIV y XV*, there was a patently recognized need for competent teachers of doctrine by the Synod of Toledo of 1480, which emphasized “la afirmación de la no existencia de tales escuelas-catequesis por defecto de maestros” (159). The deficit of teachers for those who were to conduct the indoctrination of their parishes was the need Valdés hoped to fill. The relative sophistication of the audience to whom he directed his work was varied and his choice to write in vernacular Castilian as opposed to the more erudite Latin, was certain to make it accessible to the widest audience possible. The body of the dialogue comments thoroughly upon the doctrine of Christian faith and step by step constructs the author’s vision of authority. In *De las primeras letras: cartillas españolas para enseñar a leer de los siglos XV y XVI : preliminar y edición facsímil de 34 obras*, Víctor Infantes describes the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* as a work that falls into a category beyond the scope of the more concise and less explanatory catechisms that formed the basis of his study:

El tercer grupo estaría constituido por las *Doctrinas Christianas* que desarrollan la explicación de los contenidos y suelen por tanto ser obras de una cierta y considerable extensión, su propia constitución, que exige (ya) el conocimiento del lector y el aprendizaje de los rudimentos doctrinales... (42).

The archbishop launches the dialogue invoking God as the ultimate authority who sits at the top of the hierarchy, and Pedro de Alva serves in this dialogue as God’s voice, his vicar in the moral paradigm of the institutional manifestation of moral authority for sixteenth-century

Spanish society. It is pertinent to also point out that, according to the dedication, the reason why the dialogue is taking place at all is because God has ordained it. Valdés assures his readers of this, “nos fuymos a buscar el señor Arçobispo, al qual ordenándolo Dios assí (según que suele ayudar y favorecer las buenas voluntades) hallamos en un monesterio de su orden” (10). It is the goodness of God that enables the dialogue to take place. Although Valdés recognizes the archbishop as an authority, he looks behind him and sees God as the ultimate authority, that is to say, the one who confers the right to command.

The guide for the dialogue through the complex labyrinth of Christian doctrine is Archbishop Alva who serves as the “maestro y guía de vuestro buen desseo” (11), equating his status with that of the humble prophets who spoke God’s will. Archbishop Alva reminds Eusebio and Antronio of Jesus’s gospel promise to be present in Spirit whenever two or three are gathered in his name. Though Valdés does not offer textual proof from the Bible for this archbishop’s introductory remark, he is from the inception, positing a biblically based standard. Though the dialogue is replete with marginal citations to the Bible, it is not until much later in the dialogue, under the section dealing with the five commandments of the Church, that the archbishop answers Antronio’s question about what is meant by sacred scripture. Alva replies that sacred scripture refers,

A la Biblia, Testamento Viejo y Nuevo, donde Dios no nos encomienda otra cosa sino que gastemos lo que él nos da con personas necessitadas y de otra cosa no veo que haze mención, y pues no la haze, de creer es que sola ésta quiere y le agrada, y si todosuviésemos respecto a sólo esto, yos prometo que procurásemos de dexar nuestras memorias en el cielo, y no en el suelo. (101-102)

This claim of deference to the authority of scripture is part of the double foci of legitimation to which Ricoeur refers when he says, “there are two foci of legitimation: the one that Leclerc calls an enunciative authority; the other, institutional” (94). The institutional authority for Valdés is the “yglesia” but interestingly he does not refer to the church with the proper nouns Roman Catholic, nor does he employ capital letters. Instead he writes *yglesia católica*, specifically when referring to it in the Apostles’ Creed (27). This should not be seen as a rejection of the authority of the institutional church but neither should it be seen as a complete acceptance of all its representatives, traditions or teachings. A recurring theme in the sections on the Apostles’ Creed and the Ten Commandments is the problem of the *juyzio del vulgo*³⁰ sometimes referred to as *juyzio falso*, which the Archbishop laments as he gives instruction on correct judgment (13, 43).

To drive the dialogue forward, Archbishop Alva defers to the questions of Antronio and Eusebio who have sought him out to clarify “aquellas cosas que para instruyr a otros son necessarias” (9). Because of his ignorance, Antronio asks Eusebio, being the moderately theologically informed of the two, to be the chief inquirer (12). The dialogue commences with a question about why the name Christian is used to describe the community of faith. The Archbishop explains that the apostles adopt this name for those who listened to and then bound themselves to keep the law or the evangelical norms of Christ (12). Valdés incorporates the word ‘confess’ by which he means to come into agreement with the New Testament teachings of Christ. The next logical step in the dialogue becomes the Apostles’ Creed, the fiduciary element of authority; because it is in fact a statement of confession or agreement to which Christians submit. This idea of binding oneself to a norm is reflective of Ricoeur’s understanding of the superior nature of authority. Ricoeur says, “...we place it [authority] or rather find it ‘above’ us,

³⁰ Covarrubias defines *vulgo* as an unsophisticated segment of society not referring to intellectual capacity, but rather to their uneducated status as, “la gente ordinaria del pueblo, del nombre latino *vulgus*, *vulgi*, a *volvendo*, *quod inconstanter vultque huc atque illuc volavatur*” (1538).

at the head of our preferences” while at the same time exhibiting the “capacity to submit our action to the requirements of a symbolic order” (84).

Before launching into a detailed explanation of the Apostles’ Creed, the archbishop answers the question of why Christians are called by that name and then highlights three post-baptismal actions that distinguish the Christian from non Christian: “la fe y caridad, aprovechar todos y no dañar a alguno, y en fin, en bivar a exemplo de Jesu Christo nuestro señor pura y sinceramente” (12). Eusebio is troubled because the archbishop does not include the exterior practices required by the church. But the archbishop here and later continues to remind both Eusebio and Antronio that the interior is primary and the exterior act is secondary, categorizing the interior as what the Christian “deve tener” and the other as “accesorio” (13). What follows in the *Diálogo* is an amplification of these two concepts. The teaching is possibly controversial because it could potentially jeopardize the authority of the Church and its requirement of keeping all of its exterior practices. Protestant movements contested the emptiness of such practices.

3.6 Authority of Tradition

The institutional catechistic tradition of the Church established by regional and national synods and councils are reflected in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The brand of authority is liberating in Valdés’s dialogue because it distills the accessory from the necessary and gives considerable freedom to the practicante in matters of confession and works of mercy. Valdés is aware that the doctrines can suffer from a sclerosis and become a mere exercise in memorization. Thus he speaks of the idea of the New Testament book of James and its admonishment about faith without works being dead.

Authority is both found (anterior) and constructed by Valdés’s use of the language of authority and the people to whom Archbishop Alva refers his interlocutors. A detailed look at

his use of the word authority, other texts, and quasi personal anecdotes of the archbishop shows that these elements are woven here by Valdés into a fabric of authority that offers some insight into who dictates doctrine and on what issues in particular. The way in which the interchanges take place provide insight into the structural authority of the dialogue itself, reinforcing the existing social structure while at the same time pointing to clerical and institutional shortcomings and issuing a clarion call for reform.

3.7 The word *autoridad*

The word authority appears in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* on nine occasions and is intermittently referred to by all three of the interlocutors. A fundamental exercise for understanding how Valdés conceives of authority is to review the instances where Valdés incorporates the word *autoridad*, or its alternative orthography *auctoridad*, in his *Diálogo*. Where the word appears and from which character it proceeds are important criteria to consider. After observing and analyzing Valdés's use of the word, it will be possible to draw some conclusions about the Valdesian conception of authority in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

The word *autoridad* first appears in the dedicatory section of the *Diálogo* where the narrator, who in the dialogue assumes the role of Eusebio, lauds the authority of Archbishop Pedro de Alva for his stature as prelate in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The prelate is a position of authority reached, in the case of Archbishop Alva, through appointment by Emperor Charles V, reflecting recognition of the *letras y experiencia* to which the archbishop alludes at times during the dialogue to qualify himself as an authority. This appointment is referred to in various historical documents and attests to the monarch's sanction of the ecclesial official. Valdés simply states in the dedication that the archbishop's status as the "perlado" is per se proof of his authority. Explaining later in the section the commandment *Honrrarás a tu padre y a tu madre*,

Archbishop Alva confirms the hierarchical structure through a detailed exposition of how relationships are to function in society (43-44). As the vicar of God he holds a position that commands respect: “se endereçan a Dios e a sus vicarios, que son los padres de cada uno” (45). This is the characteristic superiority of which Ricoeur speaks when he elaborates upon the vertical nature of authority in a relational situation where there is at least one who commands and one who obeys.

However Antronio and Eusebio also play a role in contributing to the legitimacy of the archbishop’s authority by seeking out the archbishop and recognizing him as one to whom they can submit because they can and choose to believe him – the fiduciary aspect of the relationship that legitimizes his authority. He is that exterior source of authority which awakens understanding in them through the master/disciple relationship. Archbishop Alva serves as “a real stingray, or a teacher of justice as severe as the prophets of Israel, to enjoin us, in short, a wise teacher” (84). But at the same time, the archbishop recognizes that he is not the ultimate authority, always deferring to God who confers the right to command, and the power (recognized or not) to impose obedience.

Eusebio reaffirms the authority of Archbishop Alva during the exposition of the Apostles’ Creed where he states, “Dígoos de verdad que dexada aparte el auctoridad de vuestra persona, la qual yo tengo en mucho, solamente esta declaración del Credo me afficionará ha leer en Erasmo, e nunca dejarlo de las manos, lo cual entiendo hazer assí de aquí en adelante” (31). The sanctioning of Erasmus of Rotterdam as a theologian is bolstered by the ecclesial status, personal character, and historical reputation of Archbishop Alva. Though he is a fictional character here in the dialogue, his role and reputation in real life would still have been quite fresh in the memory of those readers who were familiar with the well-known reputation of Alva and

his seminal role in the establishment of the seminary in Granada chartered by the *Cédula* of Charles V.³¹

The next direct use of the word authority surfaces in the section on the Ten Commandments and is spoken in the context of the commandment to not take the Lord's name in vain. Archbishop Alva seizes the opportunity to address a common misuse of God's name by *ensalmadores*. They cured physical ailments and contributed to what the archbishop condemns as a form of superstition disconnected from the Christian doctrine. He in contrast commands that God's name not be employed to perpetuate the superstitions associated with the *ensalmador* because when combined with Christian doctrine, it constitutes a form of syncretism. Acting as the voice of popular conception, Antronio offers the *juyzio del vulgo* confirming the idea that if the intention is good the work emanating from it is too, but Archbishop Alva contravenes such a false understanding citing the authority of Saint Paul and ultimately Jesus Christ for the idea that sometimes the intention is good, albeit the work that follows diverges from the will of God. Archbishop Alva states, "Sí digo, y si no hos basta el autoridad de sant Pablo, daros he otra de Jesu Christo nuestro señor, el qual dixo a sus discípulos que vernía tiempo quando los que los matassen creerían que hazían un servicio a Dios" (38). In contravention of the popular understanding, the authoritative references to Christ offer a corrective to the practice of using God's name to support a superstitious practice. The archbishop points ultimately to the authority of Christ for the credibility of his interpretation.

In the third section of the dialogue that separately treats the four classical virtues and the three theological virtues, Archbishop Alva relies upon the testimony of Christ as recorded in the New Testament books of Matthew and Mark to explain the four moral virtues. He accepts that

³¹ That document is reproduced in both Francisco Bermúdez de Pedraza and Justino Antolínez de Burgos's *Historia eclesiástica de Granada*.

the virtues are achievable by non Christians (74) and emphasizes that they find their origin in classical Greek philosophy, but urges that they be understood “...como xpianos., e no como filósofos” (75) and taught by application of “la doctrina de Iesu Xp^o.” (75). Within Alva’s advocacy lies a preference for filtering classical philosophy through Christian teaching to bring it in line with the moral end of avoiding the vice of pride. That is to say that the Christian may pursue these four classical virtues of prudence, justice, magnanimity, and temperance, but must be aware that their attainment is attributable to the favor of God and not because of one’s own prideful efforts.

Though there is no explicit reference to any particular philosopher, it is likely Valdés is referring to Plato and Aristotle among others. Antronio declares himself “enemigo destas filosofías e letras profanas” and the archbishop in reply questions whether Antronio has “dado algún tiempo a estas letras” (75). Upon learning that Antronio has not read the philosophers, a follow up question implies that the real harm is not the classical philosophy of the virtues as much as Antronio’s ignorant scorn: “¿por qué estáis mal con lo que no conocéis?” (75). Herein lies what Alison Weber referred to as, “the way this dialogue captures a moment of intellectual cross-fertilization and poignant hopefulness, a moment when a young *converso* like Valdés could imagine the spiritual regeneration of an ignorant, fifty-year-old priest” (400). Such intellectual cross-fertilization is part of an appropriation and assimilation of moral philosophies of classical Western culture that were consonant with the moral aspect of the New Testament teachings of Christ. In his effort to assure Antronio’s understanding of how to relate the evangelical message of Christ to the moral virtues hailing from classical philosophy, Archbishop Alva offers brief examples from two synoptic New Testament gospels, Matthew and Mark.

The four cardinal virtues that the archbishop matches with appropriate scriptural teachings are *prudentia*, *justicia*, *magnanimidad*, and *temperancia*. Speaking about prudence the Archbishop advocates the following: “Sed prudentes como serpientes y simples como palomas” (75). About justice he claims that Jesus “nos mandó que hiziésemos con los hombres lo que queríamos que ellos hiziessen con nosotros” (75). Regarding magnanimity he admonishes Antronio: “No tengays miedo de los que matan el cuerpo, pues no tienen poder para matar al anima” (75). And on temperance he warns that “Qualquier hombre que mirare alguna muger para cobdiciarla, ya en su corazón ha cometido con ella adulterio” (75-76). It is readily apparent that Valdés is comparing the two moral codes and finding them compatible. Thus there is no reason to discard what the classical philosophers discerned about morally upright or ethically inclined living. However, scripture is hierarchically superior and the source to which the Archbishop directs Antronio and Eusebio. The brevity of the archbishop’s augmentation of these virtues in their gospel context piques Antronio’s interest to know more about the authority of the gospel sources. “Está muy bien dicho, pero para que yo enteramente las entendiera e supiera essas autoridades del evangelio, fuera menester que me lo declárades más. Arçobispo: “Sí haré, pero otro día” (76). The Archbishop agrees but in light of the constraints of time and the need to proceed to other necessary doctrines, defers Antronio’s request to another day.

The next part of the dialogue where Valdés employs the word authority occurs under the explanation of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and it comes from the mouth of the archbishop. Antronio has asked the archbishop to elaborate upon the difference between the gifts of wisdom (*sabiduría*) and counsel (*consejo*). Speaking of the gift of counsel Antronio suggests it is the same as wisdom, but the archbishop replies, “Engañado estáis, que muchas vezes acontece que es uno sabio y le falta consejo. ¿Queréyslo ver por autoridad de la Sagrada Escritura? Moysés

¿no creéys vos que tenía don de sabiduría?” (82). Then he goes on to point out how in the Old Testament narrative of Exodus, Moses lacked the gift of counsel and instead assigned counseling responsibilities to Jethro. As a New Testament example he points to the inequality between the apostles Paul and Peter, a sign of Peter’s lack of the gift of counsel that resulted in tension between them (83). Here Valdés uses the word *autoridad* to emphasize that Antronio should look to sacred scripture as instructive and trustworthy, gleaned from it the necessary distinctions for clearer understanding. The right to command conferred upon sacred scripture is implied by the Archbishop’s reliance upon it. Shortly after this interchange, Valdés offers through the archbishop’s voice a definition of what books he considers part of *la Sagrada Escritura*.

The seventh section of the dialogue is where Valdés outlines the five commandments of the Church and another place where Valdés incorporates the word *autoridad*. Here the word is uttered by Antronio to describe an authoritative person rather than an authoritative text. The dialogue between him and the archbishop centers upon the church’s commandment that the faithful Christian pay tithes and offerings (*pagar diezmos e primicias*). Antronio is asked how he spends the *rentas* that come to him from his parishioners who are in essence paying for his service. He explains that God gives him license to take what is necessary to maintain his *honrra* and that of his *parientes* too.

When the archbishop inquires how Antronio defines *honrra*, the response is, “A bivar con aquel estado y autoridad que biven otras personas que tienen la dignidad y renta que yo” (100). Antronio’s use of the word *autoridad* connotes a different sense of the way that Valdés has employed the word up to this point in the dialogue. The use here implies that *autoridad* constitutes an economic standard of living determined not by adherence to any ecclesial or scriptural command, but instead by Antronio’s subjective comparison between himself and other

members of ecclesiastical society whose rank and position is equal to his own. It also seems to indicate a meaning more akin to the idea of *estimación* as expressed in the definition from Covarrubias's *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Courtly habits and the naturally stratified society resulting from difference in economic and social class is to be shunned by ecclesiastics and the esteem associated with it.

The archbishop disabuses Antronio of employing this comparative method as a subjective one that leads to avarice and ambition and ultimately down the road to hell. Archbishop Alva instead implores Antronio to follow the example of Archbishop of Granada Hernando de Talavera who refused to use his *rentas eclesiásticas* to better the social status of his own “hermanas donzellas” (101). This same story is related by Don Alonso Fernández de Madrid in *Silva Palentina* where he quotes Archbishop Talavera as having said: ‘no plega a Dios que la hacienda de la igl.^a y de los pobres gaste yo en hacer más ricos a mis parientes, a los quales, puesto que soy obligado a mantener, no soy obligado, ni debo enriquecerlos’ (20). Thus, the lodestar and authority in guiding Antronio's actions should be the need of those he serves, not the opinion or status of his ecclesiastical peers. Valdés is correcting what he sees as the *juyzio falso* or *juyzio del vulgo* to bring it back into alignment with the authority of sacred scripture. It is here that Archbishop Alva defines specifically what constitutes sacred scripture while imploring Antronio, “Leed en la Sagrada Escritura adonde declara Dios en esto su voluntad en muchas partes, y hazed conforme a lo que leyéredes” (101). Authority is not social status, but scriptural command.

There are two additional uses of the word *autoridad* that grace the final pages of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, one appearing in the section that Valdés refers to in the *Tabla* when he writes: “Trátanse al fin, otras cosas particulares las cuales verá el que lo leyere”

(Tabla). Whether because of the diversity of the subject matter or the desire to remain ambiguous about the content of the section because part of it dealt specifically with reforming the church, the *Tabla* does not specify the content of the final section. In it, the word authority surfaces for the penultimate time in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* proceeding from the mouth of Eusebio who proclaims, “tomemos los medios que fueren más convenientes, y porque ningún medio ay oy más al propósito que es ser perlado, porque con su autoridad y rentas puede aprovechar mucho, hacen muy bien los que para este fin toman los semejantes cargos assí como hacen muy mal los que para otro alguno los toman” (139). Here Valdés juxtaposes the good reasons why the archbishop has taken on the task of being a prelate as opposed to those who do so out of ambition or avaricious motives. The distinction recalls the discussion of reforming the church, and in particular from the highest echelons of the ecclesiastical polity downward. The archbishop is the exemplar that others should follow. Valdés uses Eusebio to reaffirm the archbishop’s authority at the close of the dialogue just as he opened the dialogue by lauding it. However there is yet a final authority that Valdés must recognize before closing his *Diálogo* and to do so, he goes directly to the scripture that he had mentioned in conjunction with the exposition of the Ten Commandments. This final authority to which Valdés looks is the ultimate authority, which answers Paul Ricoeur’s question about who confers power. For Valdés Jesus is the ultimate authority, and Valdés relies upon his words to end the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

The final use of the word authority comes from Valdés’s translation of the seventh chapter of the gospel of St. Matthew, which expresses apostolic testimony distinguishing between the authority that Jesus has and the authority of the doctrine of the *letrados y phariseos*. Valdés’s translation is as follows: “Y aconteció, que como Iesú ovo acabado estas razones, espantáronse aquellas compañías de oír su doctrina, porque les enseñava como persona que tiene

autoridad, y no como los letrados y phariseos” (150). In comparison with this translation from the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* there is another Valdesian translation of the same New Testament verse appearing in *El evangelio según San Mateo*. There Valdés translated the same verse slightly differently: “Y aconteció que, como acabó Jesus estas palabras, se espantaron las gentes de su doctrina, porque les eneseñaba como *persona* que tenia autoridad y no como los escribas” (140). Though the second translation written by Valdés in a text composed many years later proposes variation in the words selected to represent the Greek that he was translating, the implication in both translations of the New Testament synoptic gospel of Matthew still exudes the two Ricoeurian ideas of superiority and exteriority offered by the historical person of Jesus.

With this last utterance of the word authority, Valdés arrives full circle at the concept of the authority. As mentioned, he opens the *Diálogo* affirming the authority of Archbishop Alva. He demonstrates in the first section of the *Diálogo* God’s power, ascribing to Him such attributes as *todopoderoso*, *sabio*, and *bueno* (19). He goes on to show authority within scriptures and finally in the incarnation of authority at the end of the dialogue with his translation in which Jesus is described as shocking because he taught the enunciative authority of scripture.

Valdés’s translation of chapters five, six and seven of Matthew is an addendum that offers a Castillian Spanish version of what had traditionally been available only to the *letrados* in Latin but was increasingly being translated and rendered in Castilian. Valdés’s dialogue instructs the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the spirit of the pedagogical project begun by Hernando de Talavera. However, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is very short-lived in its circulation in Spain. As Daniel Crews’s recent biography of Juan de Valdés, *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés*, points out:

In the mid-1970s Miguel Martínez Millán discovered an order from Inquisitor General Manrique dated 22 August 1529 to confiscate all copies of the *Dialogue on Christian Doctrine*. The order stated, “There are many erroneous and ill sounding things in it and thus it is declared by many doctors of theology who have seen it and examined it and agree. ...The said book is not to be sold nor distributed by any manner or person because later it will be more difficult to correct.” (41)

What could have been a particularly authoritative work for rectifying what the Toledan Synod of 1480 and the Council of Seville of 1512 considered a woeful dearth of adequately trained doctrinal experts in Christian teachings was squelched. The legitimacy of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is called into question and found lacking by a group of theologians who do not specify exactly what is offensive or in. The historical tension of the moment tests the credibility of Valdés’s interpretation of Christian doctrine and declares it erroneous and ill-sounding. However, its survival offers a glimpse of Spanish spiritual diversity that testifies to a strain of intellectual engagement with Christian doctrine that lay outside the current and prevailed for the following centuries.

3.8 Fear

The concept of fear is evoked primarily through the use of the word *temor* throughout the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, appearing more often, in fact, than the word authority. On only two occasions does Valdés make reference to fear using the word *miedo*. In all instances where he incorporates the word fear it is uttered either by Eusebio or Archbishop Alva. Through these utterances it is possible to discern two types of fear: fear of man and fear of God. The fear of God is almost always accompanied by the concept of love, and it is most carefully distinguished

by Alva when he deals with fear as it is spoken of in the section that explains the seventh of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The generic fear is primarily a cowardly manifestation that occurs when concern for self exceeds the duty to rise to the challenge. This fear is reprimanded by the archbishop when Antronio expresses his concern about what people will think if he teaches some of the amazing things he is learning from the archbishop because they might evoke harsh repercussions for him.

The first mention of fear is in the section on the Apostles' Creed when Eusebio directs his inquiry toward the archbishop, "¿Ay alguna cosa que devamos honrar, temer, o amar sino a un solo Dios?" (20). This offers the opportunity to emphasize the monotheistic focus of the whole of Christian doctrine. The fear owed to God is according to the archbishop a correlate of God's love: "...por su amor lo devemos honrrar, temer e amar" (20).

In the context of the forgiveness of sin, if the believer commits idolatry by placing something above or before God, the archbishop says that "...aquellos que sin temor e sin cuydado de aprovechar en este camino duermen a pierna tendida, verdaderamente no guardan este mandamiento" (You shall have no other gods before me). Antronio responds: "A mí dig'os de verdad que me tiemblan las carnes en oýros, y no sé qué os responda, qué hará pues a los muchachos si yo les tengo de dezir esso" (36). When referring to those who are "sin temor e sin cuydado" the archbishop points to the lack of appropriate saintly fear that indicates esteem and respect for the God who is above all others. This is his warning to those who affront the omnipotence of God by refusing to recognize his status within the hierarchy of authority. Antronio replies that the teaching of a doctrine requiring no exterior act of confession causes him to tremble. He fears the church's reaction to such a teaching for it is impossible to see the interior attitude without the external act. But the key link upon which the archbishop focuses in

his effort to assuage Antronio's trepidation over this teaching is the very subject of the command – to love God exclusively – which Archbishop Alva believes possible only by those who “tienen entera fe, firme esperanza y perfecto amor con Jesu Christo nro. dios y redemtor, dessasidos totalmente de todo affect de cosas exteriors para lo qual es sin dubda menester especial gracia de Dios” (35). When the believer recognizes God's legitimacy and loves Him before all else in complete faith, firm hope, and perfect love with Jesus, there is forgiveness. Those who do not “duermen a pierna tendida” (36). The authority to consult on this style of confession according to Valdés is Pedro Ciruelo. His name is mentioned and his *Arte bien de confesar* is probably the book to which the archbishop refers Antronio for elaboration on confession.

Different from this *quid pro quo* fear of God for his love is the fear of man. It is first spoken of under the commandment not to steal. This commandment is where the Archbishop explains that the mandate to not steal has two implications. The first is “a la letra” and the second “spiritualmente” (49). With respect to the spiritual manner of breaking the commandment, Archbishop Alva states: “Allende desto, quebrantamos este mandamiento hurtando a Dios lo que es suyo. Esto es, quando el acatamiento, el amor, y el temor que le avíamos de dar a él, pues es suyo propio, lo damos a las creaturas” (50). This saintly fear owed to God alone in conjunction with love and submission is only accomplishable by the *varón spiritual* defined as, “el que tiene puesto en Dios todo su amor e lo vivifica e conserva la gracia del Espíritu Santo, agora sea mancebo, casado, clérigo o frayle” (50-51). Here we see what appears to be a recapitulation of the complete faith, firm hope, and perfect love of which the archbishop spoke in the context of confession.

The seven mortal sins are discussed in the next subtitled section of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, and it is under the sin of sloth that the archbishop raises the concept of fear

and love at the same time. Here he mentions both the absence of love and deficient fear of God that result from a failure to engage God corporally and spiritually. Despite Valdés's general emphasis on the interior attitude versus the exterior act, he recognizes the exterior acts of Christian doctrine such as a failure to attend mass or sermon, not praying and not reading, all of which are symptoms of spiritual sickness caused by an interior absence of love and one's failure to fear God (69). Because of the sin of *pereza*, or sloth, the archbishop advises, "somos negligentes y nos paramos y estamos tibios e seguros, perdido el amor e temor de Dios..." (69). In other words, the affirmative virtue to do unto others as we would have them do unto us is not carried out when someone fails to act on another's behalf. The archbishop warns that a lack of reverent fear or respect for God's call upon his disciples to perform his will in a proactive manner and avoid sloth results in a sin of omission. Archbishop Alva says of magnanimity, "...es la tercera virtud, a la qual assimesmo llaman fortaleza, consiste en acometer grandes e arduas cosas, y en menospreciar las cosas mundanas que son inferiores al hombre, y en no entristecerse con las cosas adversas, ni alegrarse demasiado con las prósperas" (74). To support this definition and his commendation to Antronio to teach the classical virtues bringing to mind their Christian context, the archbishop quotes a verse from Matthew 10, "No tengáys miedo de los que matan el cuerpo, pues no tienen poder para matar el anima" (75).

Returning again to the kind of fear earlier characterized as pusillanimous, Archbishop Alva, in explaining the gifts of the Holy Spirit, speaks of wisdom given in particular to teachers and how they are to teach the truth to their neighbors without fear (81). *Temor* is the final gift of the Holy Spirit. Archbishop Alva explains it as a state of living in "continuo recelo y recatamiento de no offenderle" (85). He goes on to emphasize that the gift of saintly fear is what conserves the Christian's capacity to abide in the midst other gifts reiterating the commandment

to have no other gods before God alone. As proof for the fear about which he writes, the text incorporates marginal references to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Psalms and I John. Valdés also explains biblical examples from David, Solomon and John the Apostle (85). Some insight is offered into the reason why Archbishop Alva always links the concept of saintly fear with love for God when he clarifies what he means by pointing to the apostle John: “Este temor es muy contrario al que dize sant Juan, que no puede estar junto con la charidad, la qual si es perfecta según el mesmo dize, alcança fuera al mal temor” (85).

Moving to the section on the *Pater Noster*, Valdés speaks of fear using the word *miedo* while relating what thoughts should be brought to mind when one recites the portion of the prayer, *Que estás en los cielos*. The focus is on the presence of God in heaven and the Christian desire to be with Him. In contrast to the relative uncertainties experienced in life on earth, which Alva considers a state of *destierro* or exile, there will be no fear in heaven “adonde la alegría y descanso es perfecto y entero, pues se goza sin miedo de perderse...” (108). The intensity of the fear mentioned by Archbishop Alva and its connection to the idea of being lost implies an anxiety that plagues adherents to Christian doctrine during the state of exile while on earth. At the same time there is the idea that God is an absolute and ultimate authority. The Archbishop posits the doubt occasioned by an uncertainty regarding how one might be judged by God juxtaposed to a deposit or assurance offered even in the state of terrestrial exile. There is a sense of tension between the respect for authority and a thorough assurance of celestial joy for the faithful.

The second reference to fear in the archbishop’s discourses on the *Pater Noster* deals with the presumption of some who believe that they effect their own forgiveness by forgiving their *próximo*. Their presumption lies in the belief that forgiveness is something other than a gift

of God. Archbishop Alva further states that it is foolish to believe one can skip this part of the *Pater Noster* and thereby absolve oneself of the godly mandate to reconcile with others.

Employing the strongest of accusations, Archbishop Alva reprimands those who demonstrate such presumption, declaring that they lack the appropriate fear of God and even naming them “hijos de Satanás” (113). The archbishop is attempting to convey that those who omit this portion of the prayer demonstrate their lack of godly fear by their unwillingness to admit the need to forgive. The unwillingness is an affront to God’s authority. The complexity of this passage is not lost on Antronio who confesses that he has skipped this part of the prayer many times without even thinking of the purpose behind the mandate of reciprocal forgiveness.

Valdés’s final nod to the concept of fear is in the most extensive, uninterrupted discourse of Archbishop Alva as he satisfies the request of Antronio and Eusebio to offer them a brief compendium or summary of the entire sacred scripture. Alva focuses upon Old Testament writings and raises the concept of fear while speaking of Lucifer, the angelic being who challenges the authority of God. He describes Lucifer as “Éste, movido con loca y temeraria presunción, quiso poner su silla cabe el muy alto Dios, y ser semejante a él, y en pena de su loco y desvariado atrevimiento echó Dios de allá del cielo a él...” (121). The use of the adjective *temeraria* emphasizes the gravity of the presumption that Lucifer demonstrates in his act against the absolute authority of God. The marginal reference is to the prophet Isaiah’s rendering of Lucifer’s fall from heaven in chapter 14 of that book. Lucifer’s attempt to usurp God’s authority and upset the hierarchy established by God, the supreme authority in the Old Testament narrative, is futile. It is audacious presumption that is frightening and shocking in its boldness.

Valdés’s use of the words *temor* and *miedo* demonstrate the polysemy and thematic variation of the concept in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The characterizations of fear can

be summarized as fitting into either a saintly or filial type of fear on the part of those who believe and recognize the legitimate authority of God. In the absence of saintly fear, one shows either insolence and audacity toward God, or a form of cowardice.

Ricoeur's narrative theory of authority does not employ the word fear. However, he does imply it as a result of violent domination in his essay "The Paradox of Authority." The power to impose obedience without the right to do so can result in such domination. The obedient may refuse to recognize an authority that dominates by violence, but the fear of violent consequence for their disobedience most often persuades them to acquiesce. Ricoeur explains this when discussing the legitimacy of authorities: "On the one side, we have the right...on the part of the one who commands, a right that exceeds the simple capacity to make oneself obeyed inasmuch as it confers the legitimacy without which the power to make oneself obeyed would reduce to the bare fact of domination" (92). Seen in the context of Ricoeur's interpretation of authority, the saintly fear of God to which Valdés repeatedly refers in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is engendered because of God's right to. It is visible in words other than *autoridad* such as *encomendar*, *mandamiento*, *obligación*, all of which denote and connote obedience. As conveyed by the archbishop, filial or saintly fear generates a sense of respect that approaches dread but stops shy of the fear that could result from domination by violence. It stops short because it is intimately connected to the authority's concomitant promise of love.

This fear-for-love *quid pro quo* is a particularly troublesome concept to accept and apparently one that Valdés did not want to treat at great length. He deals with this intellectual conundrum by having the archbishop admit the intellectual limits of human reason. Earlier in the dialogue his archbishop speaks of the limit of human reason when confronted by Eusebio's question about the fall of humankind as narrated in the foundational narrative of Genesis.

Eusebio asks, “¿por qué consentió Dios que todo el linaje humano cayesse de tal manera” (22). The archbishop simply advises that human reason achieves little in an attempt to understand why God chose to achieve redemption through sacrifice of Christ (23). Archbishop Alva says, “Esto me da a mí a entender, no la razón humana, la qual desto alcança muy poco, sino la fe que por ninguna otra vía se pudiera hazer mayor ni con más utilidad nuestra” (23). The authoritative legitimacy of this story of Christ as substitute is what Ricoeur says must, in the ideational realm, compete with other claims of authority (105).

The other fear that Valdés writes into his dialogue is a servile fear represented as pusillanimity or cowardliness arising from the fear of other human beings. The absence of saintly fear results in presumption, like the case of Lucifer in the final example offered by Archbishop Alva in his compendium of scripture. This fear is perhaps the kind that manifests itself in situations of counterfeit authority where the one who commands has the capacity but not the conferred right to impose obedience and thus resorts to domination by violence. The historical manifestation of this style of dominant authority that procured obedience through threats or acts of violence, similar to those that prompted Valdés’s flight to Italy, was most prominently represented by the Inquisition. More than once in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, Valdés conveys a sense of prudence that approximates outright fear owing to the possible consequences for having penned this dialogue on Christian doctrine. He is conscientious about the backlash that might await him not only for what is included but also for what is excluded from his explanation of Christian doctrine in the dialogue. The first indication of his concern is his decision not to attach his own personal name to the dialogue. Whether his unwillingness to claim authorship rises to the level of cowardice is debatable. While the anonymity of the work demonstrates a touch of the pusillanimity that Valdés reprimands in the *Diálogo*, his reluctance

to claim authorship of the work is to some degree understandable in light of the controversy surrounding the theological issues from the Valladolid Conference of 1527. The tension over widely disseminated theological ideas of Erasmus of Rotterdam was such that all printed works that lauded Erasmus would undergo to increased scrutiny.³²

At the end of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* Valdés hints at the fear caused by agents of the Inquisition. When Eusebio and Antronio have departed from their day of dialogue with Archbishop Alva, they both laud his stellar character and selfless service because, in their view, he is an exception rather than the norm as a prelate. According to Eusebio, the corruption of church leaders has so stained the office of prelate that the public believed it better to refuse such an office than to take it: "...el vulgo, tenga por mejor a un buen hombre, si rehúsa los tales cargos, que si los acepta" (139). Such a reform-minded view that recognized the need for change from within was part and parcel of Valdés's pedagogical vision. The *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* was intended to be a catalyst to bring about the change, but it would have to do so with requisite caution. Valdés is not unaware of the potential hostility toward his call for reform, and he shows a hint of fear about retribution for such open criticism of the institutional church in the way he concludes his dialogue.

After leaving the monastery, Eusebio and Antronio take leave of each other. Antronio ruminates aloud about how he too was deceived along with those who mistakenly think it better even for a man who could do great good as a prelate to refuse the office. He vows to separate himself from such deception, remarking "... ya estoy desengañado assí en esto como en otras muchas cosas, querría saber de vos qué medio terné para huyr de algunas compañías de mal arte que allá en mi tierra tengo" (139). Rather than responding to Antronio's request for advice about

³² See Lu Ann Homza's discussion of this in her essay, "Erasmus as hero, or heretic: Spanish Humanism and the Valladolid Assembly of 1527." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50.1 (1997): 78-118.

how to escape from the “compañías de mal arte,” Eusebio expresses his desire to reserve that answer for later. He refrains from answering because they have arrived back in the villa: “Ya veys que llegamos a la posada. Callemos agora, que en esso, y en lo demás que quisiérades, podremos después hablar largamente” (139). What was freely discussed in the garden of the monastery is not a topic for airing in a public place. Eusebio cautiously reserves his response for a later date suggesting his concern that someone might overhear them speaking about the candid conversation they had with the archbishop, implying that a later time and a different method should govern the call to reform and indoctrinate the ecclesial polity of sixteenth-century Spain. Valdés recognizes the intolerance of the times in which he lives and writes and thus employs a heightened sense of caution in the way that he addresses those who would find fault with his doctrinal stances. Having introduced this idea of tolerance, it is appropriate now to address it and draw some conclusions about the authority, fear, and tolerance in *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

3.9 Tolerance

It takes no more than a cursory reading of Valdés’s first and only work published during his lifetime to discern that it is a work of and about Christian doctrine. Upon further reflection it becomes apparent that Valdés, although never having studied Christian theology formally, made significant personal efforts to employ his learning of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew to read the canonical works of Old and New Testament scriptures in the languages in which they were composed. He used his study of letters and his experience to interpret, and translate much biblical literature. However, some of his work was more than likely lost during the Roman Inquisition. It is to these biblical books that he makes frequent and copious references in the marginal citations of his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* to build the strongest case he can through

the voice of Archbishop Alva.

The dialogue advocates that Antronio and Eusebio alike center their daily living upon the commandments of loving God above all else and neighbor as self. The challenge to them is heightened by an optimistic hope about reaching out to and reforming the ecclesiastical hierarchy of sixteenth-century Spain, and possibly Spanish society as a whole. Because the politically expedient mass conversions or expulsion of Jewish and Islamic faiths had already occurred by the time that Valdés published his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, he made no attempt to address the issues surrounding the practice of other faith traditions. He never mentions Jews, and in fact, it is only in the context of introducing the difference between *cristianos* and *no cristianos* that he explicitly acknowledges another religious tradition.³³ Nonetheless, the question still can be posed about the tolerance of this *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* because in doing so there materializes an opportunity to see how Valdés incorporates tolerance into his writing while at the same time advocating for deeply committed and objectivist positions. Admittedly tolerance can be considered a rather complex concept, but one that T. M. Scanlon has defined very briefly in “The Difficulty of Tolerance” as a requirement that the individual “accept people and permit their practices even when we strongly disapprove of them” (226). How Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* approaches acceptance of others and permission of their practices is an integral corollary of Valdés’s construction of authority that inserts itself via his constant reiteration of the maxim to love God and then to love neighbor as self. In fact, the commendation of the translated scripture from the end of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* even goes on to state that one should love not only the neighbor but the enemy too (144).

At the end of “The Paradox of Authority,” Paul Ricoeur returns to the concept of a dialectical balance between the creditability of an authority and the recognition or accreditation

³³ “...qué diferencia avía entre los christianos y los moros” (13)

of that authority by those who obey it (104). The language of belief has surfaced again in the paradox of authority and Ricoeur poses the following question: “If it is this fiduciary connection that makes the ultimate difference between authority and violence at the very heart of the hierarchical relation of domination, to what then do we finally give credit? (105). In practical recognition of a pluralistic society, he suggests admitting “a multiple foundation, a diversity of religious and secular,” and advocates a mutual recognition, “under the double auspices of the principle of ‘overlapping consensus’ and the ‘recognition of reasonable disagreements’ (105). This is the idea of tolerance stated in terms that recognize the finitude of human capacity to “know what authorizes this authority” (94). Finally Ricoeur posits that within the framework of this double principle of ‘overlapping consensus’ and the ‘recognition of reasonable disagreements,’

a role may be found for the authority of the Bible and that of ecclesiastical institutions – but not in such a way as to give rebirth to the lost paradigm of Christendom. It would be a question, rather, of Christian communities taking up, without any hang-ups, their part in this cofoundation in open competition with other, heterogeneous traditions, which themselves are reinvigorated and driven by their unkept promises. (105)

Ricoeur’s endorsement of open competition parallels in many ways Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* takes the calculated risk of offering his view of Christian doctrine into the public arena of sixteenth-century Spain and the possibility of “dissensus and for the right to respond to the offer of creditability on the part of any authorities in place by a refusal to grant credit to them” (105). Whereas Valdés makes a very explicit and

objective claim to one omnipotent and sacred authority in the triune God- Father, Son and Holy Spirit - he does so in a very tolerant way, offering it up for scrutiny and the possibility of a refusal on the part of his readers to grant credit to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. He does not water down the fundamental beliefs of Christian faith, nor the obligations imposed upon a Christian, nor the commands of the Church. However, there are several unique means and methods that he employs in conveying his message of Christian doctrine that make it particularly tolerant.

First and foremost Valdés strikes a chord of tolerance for those who might disagree with his rendition of Christian doctrine by selecting the literary dialogue as his means of communicative delivery. The work is not a treatise from on high but a dialogue with characters that represent the plurality of the social milieu. The literary dialogue as a form of written discourse was historically employed to discuss philosophical ideas that bounced back and forth in an open-ended way between interlocutors. It thus permitted Valdés to write a fiction with historical elements in which he could assume several voices in the composition and give the appearance of not speaking from an exclusive position of omniscience. He immediately places the onus of authority explicitly upon God for the content of Christian doctrine. Valdés cloaks the doctrine with Archbishop Alva's voice who serves as the channel through which the doctrine is poured.

Valdés's work is not primarily work of proselytism because the readers to whom it is directed are those already familiar with and adhering to the doctrines of Christianity, if not also truly converted to and informed about its tenets. They are those willing to seek and to understand the traditions of Christian faith refreshed by the invocation of the Holy Spirit. The reader's stance as a seeker is represented by Antronio who is ignorant, though he was already

culturally and even vocationally integrated into a Christian tradition that he does not fully understand. Rather than humiliating him in his ignorance, the archbishop simply seeks to enlighten. Though there is not much contention over the teaching of Archbishop Alva, Antronio does resist once when the Archbishop questions whether he has even read the philosophers. Antronio responds, “No, en verdad, ni aun quisiera” (75). Rather than chastising him, Archbishop Alva replies, “Pues, ¿por qué estáis mal con lo que no conocéis?” (75). Later the Archbishop roundly condemns without specifically naming Gonzalo Berceo’s *Los Milagros de nuestra señora*, but does so without urging its destruction. Instead, he implores that prelates and bishops remedy the popular confusion about the root of Christian devotion. There is no call for the censure of Berceo’s book, but there is a call to instruct and to clarify that good devotion “deve empear de Dios” (119). Unlike the list of prohibited books promulgated later by the Inquisition, Valdés advocates a more tolerant and longsighted pedagogical project to remedy the corruption that is evident within the institutional hierarchy of the Church. His incorporation of reference to classical philosophy furthermore indicates a tolerance of and even an invitation to the kind of competition with other heterogeneous traditions as does Ricoeur.

As a final observation about the aspect of tolerance it is important to point out how the archbishop distinguishes between the necessary and accessory acts of Christian doctrine. By virtue of Valdés’s belief that the interior attitude is really the root of the exterior acts, generally what is necessary in Christian doctrine is founded in the Apostles’ Creed and the Decalogue as contemplated by the three translated chapters from the gospel of Matthew that Valdés includes at the end of *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Archbishop Alva’s first reference to a distinction between necessary versus accessory is early in the dialogue when Eusebio wonders if those who do not comply with ceremony and statutes of the church are part of the Christian faith. The

archbishop declares, “Mirad padre lo que yo dixe que el christiano deve tener, es lo principal, estotro es accesorio...” (13). Opining later about whether it is necessary in teaching children to “abezarles junto con esso algunas oraciones devotas,” (18) Archbishop Alva replies to Antronio: “En esso hazed vos como quisieredes, aquí solamente os dezimos lo que es necessario que todo xp̄iano. sepa, en essotro no me entremeto” (18). Archbishop Alva’s trust finds repose in his expectation that the orientation of the heart and mind of a faithful Christian is to be privileged over the external acts of obedience to church commands. He does not discard the commands of the Church or proscribe acts of devotion, but he certainly prefers the interior over the merely exterior.

Later, the archbishop leaves it to the faithful follower of Christian doctrine to discern what should be confessed and what the acts of mercy are rather than offering a meticulous codification. Valdés formulates his authoritative voice to tolerate the errors of the *juyzio del vulgo*, but at the same time urges throughout that responsible fathers, priests, teachers and prelates will instruct the truly converted to be weaned from the error of needing lists and tasks ad infinitum. The Archbishop conveys this message when Eusebio asks him to elaborate upon the acts of mercy by responding: “Mirad hermanos, para el christiano que de veras ama a Dios e a su próximo, sabe que es obligado a socorrerle en todas sus necesidades, de qualquier manera que sea, así como desea que a él socorran en las suyas. A mi parecer ay muy poca necesidad de señalar estas obras de misericordia” (73). The archbishop’s attitudes are indications of Valdés’s recognition of the problem of ignorance of doctrine among many in the institutional church, and though he tolerates those who are ignorant of this doctrine, he advocates reform of the church in a short section at the end the work. The particular reforms he mentions mandate that prelates administer ordination examinations rather than delegate them to unqualified subordinates.

Eusebio points out that the system suffers from years of neglect in matters of ordination, such that everything seems lost (136). Valdés answers his own character's call for reform by offering the Christian doctrine espoused in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. It is a testament to his understanding of the New Testament counsel of Christ: "Sed prudentes como serpientes y simples como palomas" (75).

In the competition of ideas in sixteenth-century Spain, Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* was not granted the credit for which he had hoped. The prohibition of its distribution for fear of errors and ill-sounding things that would later be difficult to correct was in essence an act of violence by domination perpetrated upon Valdés and his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The specific content that earned its eventual inclusion in the *Indice de 1551* was never indicated by any of Valdés's contemporaries. His departure from Spain signaled not an abandonment of ideas but rather a continuing commitment to the convictions that he upheld in his first published work. Though the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and its tenor of thought were effectively squelched, it did survive in Portugal and resurfaced owing to the efforts of Marcel Bataillon such that it can still be considered as part of the more variegated topography of sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality. Also it serves as a marker of evolutionary theological thought that permeated a society that may have seemed perfectly homogenous when in fact there were undercurrents that would continue to percolate. That evolution of religious dialogue will form the bulk of the next chapter as it looks in a briefer fashion at the works of Miguel Servet, and Luis de León.

CHAPTER 4

MID AND LATE SIXTEENTH-CENTURY DIALOGUES: MIGUEL SERVET AND FRAY
LUIS DE LEÓN

*Estas cosas, Marcello, que agora dezís,
 no las sacáis de vos,
 ni menos soys el primero que las traéis a luz,
 porque todas ellas están como sembradas y esparzidas,
 assí en los libros divinos como en los doctores sagrados,
 unas en unos lugares y otras en otros,
 pero soys el primero de los que he visto y oýdo yo que,
 juntando cada una cosa con su ygual cuya es,
 y como pareándolas entre sí y poniéndolas en sus lugares,
 y travándolas todas y dándoles orden,
 avéys hecho como un cuerpo
 y como un texido de todas ellas.*

De los nombres de Cristo 278

4.1 The conflation of classical dialogue with Christian doctrine

Scholars of the literary dialogues written and published in sixteenth-century Europe consider it a literary genre whose inspirational fount lay in a revival of Greek and Roman literary dialogues rescued from oblivion and studied, lauded, and imitated by many of the intellectual elite of the evolving university system.³⁴ Simon Goldhill opines in *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* that, “‘Dialogue’ was invented as a written form in democratic Athens and made a celebrated and popular literary and philosophical style by Plato” (i). It is with a sense of prestige and pride that scholars of occidental intellectual history, cultural studies, and literary dialogue generally agree upon the origin of the literary dialogue as stemming from Greek and Roman literature, particularly in the Socratic dialogues of Plato. This chapter will evaluate two religious dialogues, by Spanish theologians who were pursued like Valdés by the Inquisition for allegedly

³⁴ “Renace una cultura clásica, donde el hombre antiguo vive, y Horacio, Virgilio, Cicerón, Ovidio, Catulo o Platón no son pasado, sino hermanos en actualidad a los que se les pueden dirigir epístolas. En esa *correspondencia*, que es diálogo, el género epistolar crece en el Renacimiento como una *forma* literaria donde no sólo se contiene gran parte de la doctrina humanista, sino una parte de la prosa narrativa” (Prieto 5).

heterodox thought. However, before embarking upon a more detailed look at the development of the religious dialogues of sixteenth-century Spain through the dialogues of Miguel Servet and Fray Luis de León there are two rhetorical terms to be defined and a brief historical account to be given to better contextualize the genre and why these authors chose it to express their beliefs.

Keeping the terms *dialogismus* and *amplificatio* in mind will provide the minimum rhetorical orientation necessary to better understand how the oral traditions of classical rhetoric arrive at literary expression in religious dialogue. The genre reflects how its writers co-opted a Classical literary form and melded it with Christian doctrine in a pedagogical method that recapitulated and reinforced the authoritative hierarchy of Christian faith. In his definition of *dialogismus* Richard Lanham's *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* highlights its Greek origin and defines *dialogismus* as, "debate, discussion" and includes in bold typeface the terms **Right Reasoner** (52). As seen in the previous chapter, to reason rightly is an integral part of the construction of authority worked so diligently by Valdés in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, and it will be seen again in this chapter as two additional dialogues from the sixteenth-century are evaluated. An additional rhetorical term in Lanham's *Handlist* concerns the concept of augmenting understanding through *amplificatio* a term which is Latin in origin and describes the rhetorical device that is, "used to expand a simple statement" (8). The first term, *dialogismus* applies to all three dialogues, for they are each written as discussions about Christianity. The second term is also related to all three dialogues, but more prominently displayed in the dialogue of Fray Luis de León, who demonstrates in *De los nombres de Cristo* an extensive understanding of the Scriptures and amplifies the multiplicity of meanings of the names of Christ.

As Roman politics and culture officially assimilated Christianity under Emperor Constantine in the fourth century, the dialogue genre was selected to express Christian doctrine.

The dialogue would serve as a means of portraying the debate or discussion between characters who were self-consciously speculating about an entire array of practical and theoretical themes ranging from military matters, to medicine, to theology, to philosophical questions regarding the meaning of existence and the aims of human beings in life. For example, *Dialogue on the True Faith in God* is a late third or early fourth-century ante-Nicene³⁵ dialogue in which the protagonist, Adamantius, a member of the Catholic Church, dialogues with opponents about his understanding of what constitutes true Christian faith (1). A later and better-known example is Augustine's post conversion defense of Christian faith in the form of a dialogue, *Against the Academics*. The Middle Ages saw Petrarch carry on the Christian dialogue with *De remediis utriusque fortune*, and then a more comprehensive and growing corpus of religious dialogue began to take shape as Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks, and fleeing Greek scholars brought copies of ancient Greek philosophical texts to Italy in the mid-fifteenth century. Deano John Geanakoplos refers to this historical course of events in *Constantinople and the West*:

The primary texts for the teaching of rhetoric in the early Italian Renaissance in Florence were the Latin works of Cicero and Quintilian. And when Plato's *Dialogues* were brought forcefully and *in toto* to the attention of the West by the Greeks at the Council of Florence, the Italian Humanists had the opportunity to learn something of Greek rhetoric from Plato's brilliant critique of rhetoric in his *Gorgias*. (43)

Through the preservation, translation, and dissemination of the ancient Greek texts and their subsequent mixture with Christianity's theological tradition and influence, the educational institutions of Europe were inundated and permeated with people whose ideas fostered the

³⁵ "The *Council of Nicaea* (325) was convened by Constantine, the first Christian emperor, with a view to sorting out the destabilizing Christological disagreements within his empire" (Historical Theology 33).

writing of religious dialogues and filtered them into the more public arena. Prolific publication of religious dialogues is directly attributable to the resounding impact of fifteenth-century patronage of religious literature that held such a privileged, integral position as Spanish society was shaping itself during the reign of *los Reyes Católicos*. Ainara Martínez de San Vicente's "El mecenazgo de los jerarcas eclesiásticos en la época de los reyes católicos," a chapter from *La literatura en la época de los Reyes Católicos*, describes the ecclesiastics who were responsible for the foundation upon which religious dialogue could thrive as, "...hombres culturalmente instruidos, acostumbrados a la lectura y conocedores bien de autores clásicos, bien de los que escriben en romance; años de riguroso estudio han hecho surgir en ellos la ambición de difundir tanto su propia idea del saber como la de apoyar aquellas obras literarias que ellos consideran provechosas" (86). Their ideas combined with the patronage made these dialogues possible.

Recognizing a broad continuum of sincerity that spanned the gamut from the conscientiously faithful to the despicably corrupt, it is historically undeniable that Christendom and Christianity were ubiquitous in Spain's sixteenth-century cultural milieu. Christianity appealed to many whether merely as a cultural cloak of morality or as a genuine practice of charitable everyday living, and the merging of Christian ideology with the educational reform manifested in the *studia humanitatis*³⁶ made for a reciprocally nutritive intellectual environment for universities in late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century Spain. This was not a sudden Renaissance that burst upon the scene, but rather a growing tide of interest that stemmed back to the Middle Ages. As Etienne Gilson points out in *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle*

³⁶ Oskar Kristeller defines *studia humanitatis* as, "En el siglo XV, el término *studia humanitatis* adquirió un significado más preciso y técnico y aparece en documentos escolares y universitarios, así como en esquemas de clasificación para bibliotecas. La definición de entonces de los *studia humanitatis* comprendía cinco materias: gramática, retórica, poética, historia y filosofía moral. En otras palabras, en el lenguaje del Renacimiento un humanista era un represtante profesional de estas disciplinas, y nosotros deberíamos tratar de entender el humanismo renacentista principalmente en términos de los ideales profesionales, intereses intelectuales y producciones literarias de los humanistas" (194-195).

Ages, “Every time educated Christians came in contact with Greek philosophical sources, there was a blossoming of theological and philosophical speculation” (540). Despite the peculiarly Christian nature of the Spanish Renaissance it was by no means exclusively Christian, because Spanish intellectual history also benefited from the influences of Arabic scholars who had inhabited the peninsula since the early eighth century. Writing of the arrival and influence of the ancient texts of Aristotle, Geanakoplos in *Constantinople and the West* writes, “These had first come to the West from Spain in Arabic versions, second- and third-hand, as it were”(42). Additionally there was a significant resonance of Jewish influence. Incorporating ancient literary forms and ideas into the fertile rubric of the new *studia humanitatis* yielded a fecund crop of thought shaped and formed by writers like Valdés, Servet, and Luis de León.

One literary outlet through which these humanist Christian scholars expressed themselves was the religious dialogue. Current scholar of the sixteenth-century literary dialogue, Jesús Gómez, published two studies on Renaissance literary dialogue in Spain revealing that the content of the dialogues was no longer exclusively philosophical, but rather strongly influenced by Christian thought and doctrine (Gómez, *El diálogo renacentista* 53). Writers of the *catecismos* like Valdés and biblical scholars like Servet and León, particularly in the case of León, would also have been familiar with biblical dialogue such as the dialogue that occurs in the book of Job. Though perhaps classical dialogues were the principal source of inspiration for these writers of dialogue, their writers’ intimate familiarity with Job stands out as an additional inspirational source. Walter Reed’s *Dialogues of the Word* looks at the Book of Job, analyzing it based upon Mikhail Bakhtin’s *Dialogic imagination* and finds that, “...Job is peculiar in the literature of the Hebrew Bible for its presentation of unmediated speech back and forth between characters” (125). How the Biblical source of dialogue that antedates classical dialogue has been

overlooked as a possible inspiration for dialogue in sixteenth-century Spain is not the focus here, but represents a question for future consideration.

Without this admixture of classical philosophy and Christian theological doctrine the broad continuum of publications that arose from the conflation of these elements would not have been realized. Within the works themselves is a conscientious adoption, rejection or modification of classical philosophy as it is distilled through Christian teaching, sometimes more exclusively biblical and sometimes peppered with more peripheral sources. An example of Servet's inclusion of is that of Trismegistus as an ancient source that does contain aspects of doctrine that he considers universal truths. Another particularly salient example of this conjunction may be recalled from the previous chapter when the ignorant priest Antronio disparages classical philosophers but Archbishop Alva is quick to remind him not to scorn philosophies about which he knows nothing for having not read them. Then he advises him to teach them in their Christianized context always emphasizing them in light of Christ's Sermon on the Mount as related in the chapters of Matthew that Valdés offers in translated form as an appendix to the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. In looking at Servet's *Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina*, and Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo* it will become readily apparent very early in both dialogues that the authors are widely read both in biblical and classical literature. There are numerous evidences throughout both works where these authors sanction or reject the use of classical authors according to their respective understandings of each work after passing it through their own conception of Christocentricity.

In the same way that David Marsh in *Quattrocento Dialogue* and Virginia Cox in *Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its social and Political Contexts* wrote about Renaissance dialogue with their focus upon Italy, Jesús Gómez's studies are useful for their

concision and reliable review of the sixteenth-century Spanish religious dialogues. The most comprehensive bibliography of sixteenth-century Spanish dialogues is Jesús Gómez's at the end of his study entitled *El diálogo en el Renacimiento español* (217). His bibliography includes both manuscripts and published dialogues of sixteenth-century Spain, some with critical editions but many still difficult to access. Many of the dialogues composed during the sixteenth century are not available in modern critical editions and therefore much of the body of literature is still largely unread and ripe for researching and further study. *Estudios sobre el diálogo renacentista español* by Asunción Rallo Gruss and Rafael Malpartida Tirado, in contrast to the work of Gómez, offers a useful list of only the dialogues available in modern editions (517).

A difficult question to answer for investigators of literary and religious dialogue is why the genre was of such importance. There is no concise answer that adequately explains what in fact was a long, developing history of dialogue that extended back through the Middle Ages and classical history. The diverse themes treated by sixteenth-century Spanish dialogues compounds the difficulty because there is no way to link its flourishing with one particular theme. In light of Jesús Gómez investigations of the genre his opinion is one of the most reliable. He opines in *El diálogo renacentista* that,

La verdadera 'floración de diálogos' se produce a partir del Segundo cuarto de la centuria. La renovación del género, que hunde sus raíces en la Edad Media, tiene lugar por dos factores diversos que coinciden en tiempos de Carlos V (1517-1555): la influencia de la literatura y del humanismo italiano, por una parte, y la duradera influencia de los *Colloquia* (1518-1533) de Erasmo, por otra. (72)

In *El diálogo en el Renacimiento español*, Gómez explains in greater detail his view of humanism and how, "los humanistas manifiestan un gran interés por la divulgación de

conocimientos y por su aplicación a la vida práctica” (201). The work of Juan de Valdés is one that fits that description well because of its practical attempt to carry on the pedagogical project of Fray Hernando de Talavera. The later dialogues of Servet and Fray Luis de León are less practical and more treatise-like in nature, but nonetheless written in the spirit of spreading knowledge about the Christian faith that is their subject.

The rise and then relative disappearance of the literary dialogue is most accurately characterized within the phrase “dynamic negotiations of meanings” in sixteenth-century dialogues. Whereas Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* was primarily a catechism calling for the reform of the clergy from the highest ecclesiastical authorities downward, the next two dialogues maintain a didactic element but not in catechistic form. Their audiences and aims differ from those of Valdés, and yet in many ways they appropriate the same methods to prove and support their fundamental beliefs in Christian doctrine. By selecting dialogues by two other individuals who were also pursued and accused of heterodox ideas, it will be possible to gain a better sense of whether their views of authority, fear and tolerance played a role in their marginalization: in the case of Miguel Servet his death by burning at the stake in Geneva in 1553 because of the views he expressed in *Restitución del Cristianismo*, and in Fray Luis de León’s case his imprisonment and trial at the hands of the Inquisition that lasted nearly five years.

4.2 *Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina* : Servet’s *raison d’être*

Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina is a dialogue consisting of two *Libros* composed in Latin and published in 1553 as part of Miguel Servet’s larger work, *Restitutio Christianismi*,³⁷ an extensive explanation of his theological ideas. Contained within the *Restitución del Cristianismo*, the dialogue appears at the beginning of the second part of this treatise that is

³⁷ In light of the use of the translated work by Luis Betés and Angel Alcalá, the title *Restitución del Cristianismo* will be used.

steeped in profound and complex theological writing that Angel Alcalá has characterized by highlighting ten overriding principles.³⁸ The focus here, however, will be limited to the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, evaluating it for its relation to ideas already expressed in the previous chapter on Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and comparing it also to the other dialogue that will be studied in this chapter by Fray Luis de León, *De los nombres de Cristo*. The opinions expressed by Servet, the sources upon which he relies, and the passionate personal quality of the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina* will be the focus of attention for seeing how Servet's ideas about authority, fear, and tolerance compare with those of Valdés and Luis de León in their respective dialogues.

Having departed from Spain as a young man after having served as a page for Fray Juan de Quintana, confessor of Emperor Charles V, Servet began his formal study of theology in Toulouse, France despite his father's desire and intention that he pursue law. Servet is famously and rather inaccurately characterized as an antitrinitarian, a totalizing characterization that does not consider the full extent and complexity of his views on the offices of God and the manifestations of God as God the Father, the Son of God and the Holy Spirit. As Angel Alcalá writes in the critical introduction to *Restitución del Cristianismo*, "El relativo antitrinitarismo de Servet, relativo, pues que no niega la Trinidad, sino que la reinterpreta dentro de lo que él cree ser la tradición auténtica, se demuestra en *Restitutio* como marginal en relación con las doctrinas centrales que caracterizan su pensamiento maduro" (44). The most rigorous theological debates in which he engaged were probably those with John Calvin, and the letters he wrote to Calvin on a wide range of theological points show the breadth of his knowledge and his particularly enthusiastic defense of his ideas and interpretations. The original ideas Servet expressed when

³⁸ See Introduction pages 99-109, *Restitución del Cristianismo – Deus absconditus, Deus omniformis, Actio per contactum, Verbum, Spiritus, Symbolum deitatis, Positio deitatis, Analogía ad Christum, Regnum Spiritus, Pugna, Finis*.

he had written *De Trinitatis erroribus* in 1531 and *Dialogorum de Trinitate* in 1532 were modified by numerous years of additional study. The collaborative work of Luis Betés and Angel Alcalá yielded a translation of the 1553 print Vienna edition of the *Restitución del Cristianismo* from Latin into Spanish that was published in 1980. Introductory analysis by Alcalá advises that of only three known extant manuscripts of Servet's *Restitución del Cristianismo*, the Paris and Edinburgh manuscripts, were consulted, but not the Stuttgart manuscript, for producing the critical edition upon which the present analysis relies (7).

Miguel Servet's *Restitución del Cristianismo*, originally composed in scholarly Latin, took printed form between September 29, 1552 and January 3, 1553 in, "...una imprenta clandestina de Vienne del Delfinado, no lejos de Lyon, en Francia" (13). The fact that Servet composed the work in Latin indicates that he contemplated a restricted, erudite audience, and reflects that he was, in comparison with Valdés and Luis de León, much less inclined toward the more practical, vernacular pedagogical movement aimed at offering doctrine to the literate, lay Christian populace. On the contrary, it is patently clear that Servet was significantly more interested in engaging his theologically and academically inclined peers in serious dialogue about the intricate distinctions about the substance and manifestation of God. Servet did not take the theme of his work lightly nor should the reader glibly engage it. Alcalá maintains in his introduction *Treinta cartas a Calvino, Sesenta signos del Anticristo, Apología a Melanchton* that Servet was committed to restore the Church to, "...la verdad de su origen, hay que *restituir el Cristianismo* a su autenticidad de creencias y espiritualidad. Hay que beberlo en sus fuentes incontaminadas: la Biblia en sus lenguas originales, los escritores llamados Padres de la Iglesia anteriores a Nicea, los usos de la primera Cristiandad, las creencias del pueblo" (20). Nicea is mentioned as the historical reference point when the doctrine of the trinity is firmly established

as a three person unity. The commonality of the restorative goal of Servet with that of Valdés and Fray Luis de León is a mutual recognition of the perennial problem of Church reform and the ever attendant corruption that characterizes and threatens its existence.

According to Angel Alcalá's introductory analysis in *Treinta cartas a Calvino, Sesenta signos del Anticristo, Apología a Melancton*, Servet dedicated his life from the age of twenty-three onward to preparing the *Restitución del Cristianismo* in an effort to restore the institutional church that he considered had fallen victim to the corruption of political machinations of the Roman Empire after Constantine's *Edict of Milan*.³⁹ José Rodríguez Molina describes the Edict of Milan in his article, "Poder político de los arzobispos de Toledo en el siglo XV" in *Religión y poder en la Edad Moderna* :

A partir del impropriamente llamado Edicto de Milán, emitido por Constantino y Licinio, en 313, las gentes del Imperio Romano ven reconocida 'la libertad de practicar la religión que prefieran', a la vez que constatan la devolución de casas y bienes confiscados. La Iglesia, perseguida como una secta religiosa a la que hay que extinguir, 'sale de las catacumbas' e inicia una carrera de éxitos, fruto de la victoria del emperador en Puente Milvio (312), que se sustancia en el referido Edicto, 'tolerante' para todos los credos. (12)

While proclaiming religious freedom, the Edict of Milano practically effected an intertwining and blurring of political power with ecclesiastical power. This authoritative system is spoken of by Ricoeur, who characterizes the merging of the monarchy and the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a medieval dream for unity of authority when he states,

³⁹ Writing of this edict, R. Keelan Downton maintains that, "When Constantine proclaimed religious freedom with the *Edict of Milan* in 313, Pope Miltiades (c. 310-314) found himself not only the head of an organized Christian body, but a state-supported leader whose monarchic tendencies were propped up by the Emperor's desire to unite a fracturing empire" (1).

At best the two powers and the two corresponding authorities mutually supported each other, the ecclesiastical one offering its unction to the monarch, while the political realm offered the sanction of the secular arm in return. Unction plus sanction would ensure the practical functioning of an internally divided theological politics. (101)

It was this perceived and actualized marriage between the two institutional authorities that troubled Servet who worked diligently upon the *Restitución del Cristianismo* to rescue and reconstitute the Church. He refers to Rome as an impious Babylon in his *Restitución del Cristianismo* calling for its dissolution by asking that the apostolic Church, “dissolver la cautividad de la impía Babilonia” (115). Such a reconstitution would, in effect, bring about an acknowledgement of the true authority that Servet would consider authentic Christian faith only through the embrace of an ante-Nicene conception of God. For Servet, the desired emphasis would accentuate Christ’s unanimity with the Father, not merely same essence (homousia) but one essence (ousia).⁴⁰ The emphasis upon the unanimity of the Godhead is the only conception of authority that Servet acknowledges as possessing the right to command and impose obedience upon the Church. However, this intransigent distinction in the minutiae of an invisible mystery played into the fervor of internal division in the theological politics surrounding Servet and tragically ended the dialogue in which Servet longed to engage. He was arrested, tried, and convicted of heresy after a two month long trial in Geneva, and his voice was silenced when he and his *Restitución del Cristianismo* were burned at the stake in October 1553.

4.3 Summary of *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*

Servet specifies his goals in the convocatory statement that he makes on the title page of the *Restitución del Cristianismo*. On the opening page of the work, Servet most summarily and

⁴⁰ See footnote page 152 and page 234 *Restitución del Cristianismo*.

concisely calls upon all of the apostolic Church to restore itself by returning to its origins and knowledge of God, of faith in Christ, of justification, of baptismal regeneration, of the Lord's supper, and finally to the heavenly reign dissolving the captivity of Babylon and destroying the Antichrist and his followers (115). Servet's call to restitution is a pugnacious call to radical reform based upon deep-seated conviction, but it is only accessible to those who can read Latin. The treatise is restricted from a wider audience by virtue of Servet's citation of authorities inaccessible to most. Furthermore, Servet constructs a complex theological system that is accessible only to the learned elite. This is a marked distinction from the vernacular of both Valdés and León whose works effectively broadened the accessibility of the theological and devotional ideas they contained. Servet reserves the authority he espouses for a privileged, well-educated audience, but his audience was reluctant to acknowledge the authority that Servet builds in the *Restitución del Cristianismo* and recalcitrant in the end through its condemnation of him as a heretic to be burned at the stake.

While offering an overview of the entire *Restitución del Cristianismo* Servet includes a brief description of the two dialogues that are evaluated in the present study. He characterizes them in the following way:

Seguidamente, el primero de los Diálogos explicará cómo, superadas las sombras de la Ley, Cristo es la culminación de todo, aclarando también la naturaleza de los ángeles, de las almas y del infierno. El segundo Diálogo expondrá cómo se realizó la generación de Cristo, y cómo Cristo no es creatura, ni de poder finito, sino que debe ser adorado verdaderamente y que es verdadero Dios. (120)

Christ's unanimity with God and his immanence in the creative acts of Genesis are the primary foci of the work of Miguel Servet in his *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*. God's and Christ's

immanence as conceived by Servet is an admittedly complex concept, and in part, contributed to the questions raised in his trial in Geneva about the orthodoxy of his belief. Servet explains his views in the first of the two dialogues referring to the creation account in Genesis and moving through the elements of air, water, and light. He asserts that all things contain a symbol of the deity that is the generating force behind all of creation. Somehow, in Servet's view, he remains convinced that despite the presence of the symbol of the deity immanent in all creation, Christ is the archetype that is before all. However, the complexity and even confusion of how he might distinguish the created from the creator is debatable (392). For the purposes of the present study, the focus will not consider the portions on angels and souls.

At the end of his *Proemio* Servet, like Valdés, invokes the Holy Spirit to enlighten and inspire the work at hand in *Restitución del Cristianismo*. Where classical authors would have called upon their muses to inspire their work, he makes an impassioned plea to Christ for revelation for himself so that his readers may in turn be enlightened. “Manifiéstate a tu siervo para que quede bien patente tan gran revelación. Concede ahora a quien te lo pide tu buen espíritu y tu palabra eficaz. Dirige mi mente y mi pluma, para que pueda cantar la gloria de tu divinidad y expresar la verdadera fe acerca de ti” (121). This is Servet's first statement that demonstrates Christ in the position of superiority within the structure of authority that the dialogues seek to convey. Recalling that Ricoeur's essay characterizes authority as anterior, superior, and exterior, it is possible to see that Servet considers Christ to fulfill all three of these roles. Christ is before all as *hijo personal*, Christ is above all because he is the one to whom all authority has been conferred, and Christ is that master to whom Servet as disciple makes his plea for enlightenment. It is through the language of petition requesting that Christ manifest his revelation, concede his Spirit and effective word, and direct Servet's mind and pen that reflect a

recognition of *Cristo Jesús* as legitimate claimant to the right to command or the power to impose obedience. He spends the rest of the dialogue urging his readers through the process of legitimation whereby he hopes to convince and win their fiduciary consent. He wants his readers to believe that he has correctly exegeted the scriptures, formulated an accurate explanation of the unity and immanence of Christ to correct errors of the *sofistas*, scholastics who, in his view, perpetuate many fallacies about God, particularly how God has manifested himself to humankind. This attack on the *sofistas* is a theme that echoes throughout Servet's dialogues. He says, "Si Cristo volviese y predicase de nuevo que es hijo de Dios, de nuevo volverían a crucificarlo nuestros sofistas" (374). With the leveling of this charge against his *sofistas* contemporaries, Miguel peaks the interest of his interlocutor, Pedro, to begin asking questions that will afford him the opportunity to explain his theological system supporting it with exegesis of scriptures and opining about the true nature of Christ that has been mistakenly interpreted by the *sofistas*.

For the setting of the *Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina* there is neither a narrative description of a *locus amoenus* nor an explanatory introduction about the characters of the dialogue, Pedro and Miguel. Place and person in the dialogue are of little import with the exception of Miguel Servet himself. In contrast to the more traditional sixteenth-century dialogue that established a tranquil place in which the dialogue could occur such as near a fountain in a garden, Servet avoids the scene setting for the dialogue. The reader is left uncertain of the place where these dialogues occur.

Miguel Servet is himself the voice of authority, but only because he has asked for and called upon Christ to use him as a servant to convey, "la verdadera fe acerca de tí" (121). The dialogue abruptly opens with Miguel speaking aloud and opining about the unity of Christ with

*Elohim*⁴¹, Pedro interjects, “—¡Aquí está! *¡Este es Servet*, a quien yo andaba buscando!. ¡Vamos, vamos! ¿Qué haces aquí hablando solo!” (373). No question is left that the author of the *Restitución del Cristianismo* is the protagonist of his dialogue.

Having chosen to insert himself in the dialogue there is little doubt who is authoritative in the theological content expressed. The opinions expressed are personal fiduciary compromises of Servet, in other words, he believes the legitimacy of the scriptural claims upon which he bases his opinions. In Valdés and Luis de León, the reader is uncertain whether the authoritative voice is the author or not. Servet, on the other hand serves as his own authoritative voice and, as the channel for authoritative pronouncements of the true faith, Servet instructs and guides his friend Pedro and other faithful out of a state of lamentable ignorance. “Estoy viendo cómo se llaman cristianos quienes ni siquiera saben en qué consiste la fe del cristianismo” (374). Servet announces the crisis of Christian faith which he is ready to resolve by explaining to Pedro from the profundity of his own understanding so that others might know, “en qué consiste la fe del cristianismo” (374). Servet is emotionally and spiritually rent by the circumstance, if we are to take him at his word, because this ignorance of the true faith causes a visceral reaction that evokes tearful response. “Y al verlo, me echo a llorar” (374). To remedy the circumstances, however, he has one principle message that he wishes to convey and that is, “Una sola cosa unida es el Cristo único, un solo ser, un solo hijo” (374). This unique and unified and immanent nature of Christ is both the bane and boon of Servet because of its complexity and mystery.⁴²

⁴¹ In his discussion of the 10 names of God, Isidore of Seville addresses the Hebrew origins of the words for God in *Etymologies* Book VII Chapter i, “4. The second name is Eloí (i.e. Elohim), 5. and the third Eloé, either of which in Latin is ‘God’ (*Deus*). The name *Deus* in Latin has been transliterated from a Greek term, for *Deus* is from δέος in Greek, which means φόβος, that is, ‘fear’ whence is derived *Deus* because those worshipping him have fear” (153).

⁴² In an attempt to clarify how he conceives of immanence, Miguel states regarding Christ: “Nosotros, en cambio, decimos que gran Dios es Cristo, señor del mundo y omnipotente. En eso fallaron al tratar del conocimiento del ejemplar primero y verdaderos, en preferir el mundo, cuando la verdad es que el mundo fue creado para el hombre. Jesucristo, hacedor del mundo, estuvo y está sustancialmente en Dios con más propiedad que el mundo, y por él consiste el mundo en Dios de modo secundario” (391).

The marrow of theological content for the dialogue issues forth from long contemplated sources that Servet will sometimes affirm and sometimes condemn as false. Miguel's interlocutor, Pedro, is likewise of lesser import to Servet who chooses to leave Pedro undeveloped as an ambiguous character who generally offers no opposition to the answers Miguel gives when Pedro poses questions. There is little character depth to Pedro. Though Servet offers no historical hints to indicate who Pedro might have been, Jerome Friedman in "Michael Servetus: the Case for a Jewish Christianity" opines that Servet perhaps selected the name Pedro having been inspired by Petrus Alphonsus's medieval dialogue, *Dialogi in quibus impiae Judaeorum et Saraceonum opiniones confutantur*, "a dialogue between Peter before and after his conversion, with plentiful Jewish comments and explanations" (104). Another possibility is that Servet was thinking of his younger brother Pedro as his companion in the dialogue.

Having preceded the dialogues on the divine trinity by five rather lengthy arguments, Servet has built a sufficient foundation for the reader to not be jolted by his beginning the dialogue in the middle of thought. In fact, beginning the dialogue *in medias res* reflects the mind's stream of consciousness which has been likened to an internal dialogue until it is engaged in social interaction. What Miguel has thought is made available to the reader because Pedro has interrupted him in his soliloquy and makes possible the dialogue that the reader "listens" to by reading it. By listening to the dialogue between Miguel and Pedro, and looking at the content of Miguel's responses to the interrogatories that Pedro proposes, the reader is drawn into the *Restitución del Cristianismo*. Through what Miguel says to Pedro it is possible to begin to see in the *Restitución del Cristianismo* how Servet is constructing his own hierarchy and canon of authorities for his conception of authority.

4.4 Authority: explicitly naming and implicitly bolstering

There are two occasions in *Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina* that Servet explicitly uses the word authority, but one appears only in the Edinburgh manuscript that Alcalá and Betés consulted as they prepared their critical edition of the Vienna facsimile version.⁴³ Whereas Valdés incorporated the word authority early on in the stage setting narrative for his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* to establish the authority of the Archbishop Alva, Servet builds his authority more implicitly throughout the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*.

The initial explicit use of the word authority occurs when Miguel is explaining the divine manifestation of Christ. Christ is anterior as *Palabra* and here he is referring to the gospel of John, “aquella Palabra de Juan que ‘era al principio con Dios’ (373). Servet amplifies the anterior nature of this authority by also pointing out the immanent presence of Christ in the elements of nature that make up the divine essence. In reaffirming the unity of Christ with God the father, Servet says,

Por lo que respecta a la generación del verdadero hijo de Dios, Jesús el Cristo, admitimos el espíritu de *elohim* como un aliento aéreo, admitimos fuego en Dios, nube acuosa de la gloria de Dios, río de fuego, lluvia, rocío y riego de su Palabra. [A ello nos fuerza la razón, a ello nos fuerza la autoridad de la Escritura, la experiencia misma y la visión de los motivos de Dios. Y decimos que su manifestación en la Palabra de Dios no fue ilusoria, sino verdadera y sustancial].⁴⁴
(375)

⁴³ In the *Proemio* that introduces the entire *Restitución del Cristianismo*, Alcalá explains that italics in the critical edition indicate additions to the Edinburgh manuscript that do not appear in the Vienna 1553 facsimile edition.

⁴⁴ Alcalá explains that the brackets used in the critical edition mark the variants between the manuscript versions of Paris and Edinburgh when compared with the 1553 Vienna facsimile edition. The italics indicate additions.

This quote is exemplary because it shows how Servet, throughout the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, engages in a discursive exercise of accrediting the Scripture as authoritative. Whether Pedro or his reader will recognize scripture or not as authoritative and Servet's interpretation as more than fraudulent persuasion is part of the process of legitimation. As explained in Paul Ricoeur's essay, there is a polarity between legitimacy and recognition. Servet draws his reader into an admission of *elohim* as a divine breath, as fire, as a watery cloud of the glory of God, as a river of fire, rain, and dew, but the recognition of this authority is dependent upon the reader consenting to recognize or acknowledge that God manifested himself in the ways Servet has claimed. To persuade the reader, Servet points to reason, then the authority of Scripture, then experience and a vision of God's motives or designs (468).

This same combination of factors in Servet's advocacy for his ideas is reiterated in the second dialogue when he explicitly employs the word authority a second time. In his attempt to clarify Pedro's confusion over the "admirable misterio de la resurrección de Cristo" (466), Miguel offers the authority of scripture again along with reason and experience to convince, or as Ricoeur might indicate, legitimize the authority. Miguel explains that the resurrected Christ is in his essence uncreated light as opposed to created light. Created light will pass away in the resurrection of the faithful because of the, "gran poder de la luz divina que todo lo transforma y glorifica: no permanecerá la luz menor en presencia de la mayor" (468). To bolster this affirmation, Miguel adds, "En este caso la razón está de acuerdo con la experiencia y con la autoridad de la Escritura" (468). In furtherance of his argument, Servet reemphasizes just a few lines later the concept of giving credit to the scripture when he maintains, "Por último, nosotros damos crédito a la Escritura, que testimonia con toda claridad que no perdurarán ni la luz del sol ni la de la luna" (469). These two instances when Servet explicitly affirms the concept of

authority are both in deference to the scripture. Analogous to the views of Valdés and Luis de León, scripture is a primary source for the credibility of what Servet advocates as the true faith.

Though he uses the word authority only twice in the two dialogues, Miguel recalls scriptural proofs throughout the dialogue as the trustworthy source to accredit his ideas and he incorporates the cited references directly into the dialogue's text either by verbatim quotes or paraphrases throughout the dialogues. Including the abbreviated biblical citation within the text itself is a minor formatting difference from the marginal citations of Valdés, but both rely heavily upon their extensive knowledge of scriptures and predilection for the Bible as a trustworthy, authoritative source. However, Servet also draws also upon extra-biblical sources to support his systematic theology. Adding to his cadre of authoritative support Servet frequently alludes to Patristic writings and even classical philosophers, but his most interesting incorporations are those references in the dialogue to esoteric sources that fall outside of traditional and accepted texts and authors. Servet works to reappropriate the ideas expressed in the extra-biblical sources and show that though they at times contain universal truths their failure to acknowledge Christ as preeminent is always a misinterpretation of “la verdadera fe acerca de ti” (121).

4.5 Distinguishing and refuting esoteric sources

The reappropriation of the idea of the immanence of deity in the world from these other religious sources is Servet's risk-laden attempt to demonstrate his belief that the true authority of Christ is anterior and superior to all other religions. His view of Christianity subsumes all other religions that speak of the immanence of God. However, Servet maintains a distinction from pantheism in the incarnation of Christ and election of some souls to life everlasting and others to eternal torment. In a clarifying passage that reauthorizes the preeminent authority or headship

and immanence of Christ in the world as over and against the esoteric misinterpretations of *Zoroastro*, *Pimandro*, and *Trismegisto*⁴⁵ Miguel shows how these esoteric sources missed the true authority because they missed the manifestation of Christ's presence.

This Christocentric distinction for Miguel can be seen in a very clear way in response to Pedro's question about *Trismegisto*'s principle that, "el mundo es consustancial con Dios, un segundo Dios e hijo de Dios" (390). Servet counters, "Pero, según nosotros, la condición de hijo se refiere a Cristo, que es cabeza del mundo" (390). Immediately following his naming of Christ as head, Miguel engages a second esoteric faith recalling that *Zoroastro* also missed the mark of the true faith because he, "aseguraba que el Padre de este mundo omniforme es el omniforme Dios, sin tener en cuenta a Cristo" (390). And against *Pimandro*, one of the chapters from the *Corpus Hermeticum*, Miguel says, "Parece ser que ese demonio Pimandro quería enseñar la verdad, pero no conocía a Cristo; o que si conocía algo de él en la Palabra, trató de ocultarlo arteramente atribuyéndose la deidad de la Palabra, igual que se la atribuía el ángel en presencia de Moisés" (390). These are just a few examples, but sufficient to demonstrate that Miguel Servet is not offering a syncretic or pantheistic system as some have interpreted.

To recapitulate what he has offered, Miguel offers a further emphasis of his view when he states that, "[Ellos] *Tanto Zoroastro como Trismegisto* decían que el mundo es un gran Dios. Nosotros, en cambio, decimos que gran Dios es Cristo, señor del mundo y omnipotente" (391). The vertical relationship spoken of by Ricoeur is reiterated in the words of Servet who finds in Christ the anterior and superior qualities of authority. Servet evaluates biblical, philosophical and esoteric writings and concludes that Christ is the legitimate holder of the conferred right to

⁴⁵ See Susan Byrne, *El Corpus Hermeticum y tres poetas españoles: Francisco de Aldana, fray Luis de León y San Juan de la Cruz* who offers the following contextualization: "Los humanistas del siglo XVI ya conocían y respetaban a Hermes Trismegisto por las referencias a él en la literatura patristica y, como los neoplatonistas del siglo IV, Ficino y sus discípulos se inspiraron para recuperar un supuesto sincretismo primordial entre religión y filosofía" (14-15).

command and power to impose obedience. Though Ricoeur is not interpreting Servet's *Restitución del Cristianismo*, his formulation of the characteristics of authority come to mind as consonant interpretations of the very statements that Servet is making. When Servet says, "Cristo, que es cabeza del mundo", one recalls Ricoeur's statement from "Autonomy and Fragility" when he declares, "Next is superiority: we place it or rather find it 'above' us, at the head of our preferences" (84). When Servet says referring to Christ, "pues él es principio y fin de todo, y todo tiene en él su ejemplar, su idea y plenitud" it is analogous to Ricoeur's characteristic of, "antecedence: order precedes us, each of us taken one by one" (84). When Pedro has sought Miguel because he, "Había decidido preguntarte otras cosas, por eso te buscaba al principio" (435) it is Miguel Servet who assumes the role of communicating these transcendent truths of Christ. Miguel's role is to function as the communicator of authority through his answers to Pedro in what Ricoeur refers to as, "the teacher-disciple relation...that does not imply either a pact of servitude or one of domination" (84). All three qualities of antecedence, superiority and exteriority permeate the *Restitución del Cristianismo*.

Whereas Christ is patently the ultimate authority, Servet is also an authority because he wields a vast knowledge of what was once hidden in the *Ley* and in *sombra* and then made manifest and communicated through the incarnated Christ, *Palabra*, and *Verbo*. But the immanence of God that Servet sees stops short of pantheism because he privileges biblical authority and cannot deny that there is also a judgment in which some will be separated from Christ to suffer in everlasting torment. Miguel maintains in the dialogue that, "Las almas separadas de los que vivieron en Cristo 'reinan siempre' con 'el, mientras las otras permanecen detenidas en el infierno, como enseña Juan (Ap. 20) (418). Christ is separate from creation in the sense of the being *Verbo*. Servet maintains that we only know of this state *a posteriori* or after

the creation event. Christ as creator does give everything he creates a *symbolum deitatis* or symbol of the deity, but remains also separate because of his of existence before the creation act. However, Christ as creator is also present in the creation act and deposits the symbol of deity in that which he creates.

In contrast to Valdés, Servet does not explicitly speak of the holy fear of God, instead, the reader is introduced to fear in the context of eternal torment from the Old Testament and New Testament apocalyptic biblical references Miguel cites. That is, in his construction of authority in the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*, apart from the word *elohim* that contains the etymological idea of fear as pointed out in the footnote on Isidore of Seville, Servet never explicitly refers to God as inducing fear. However, at the end of the first dialogue, Pedro inquires and Miguel offers his interpretations of the consequences of the sin of *Adán* and its eternal consequence for mankind. This only comes after Miguel has elaborated in detail about the resurrection and how Christ's death does atone for that eternal punishment for those who believe. This stark contrast comes at the end of the first dialogue and offers the dialogue's vision of punishment in *infierno* and gehenna, the place where the unrepentant will suffer God's eternal wrath. It is the only context in which Servet speaks of fear.

4.6 Fear

To introduce hell and the punishment of fallen man, Servet relies upon three Old Testament references and one reference from the New Testament. This part of the dialogue details the *dolores de muerte* suffered in *infierno* and acts as a conclusion to the first dialogue. The subject is raised by Pedro's question, "– ¿Cuáles eran las penas de infierno y cómo las cambió Cristo? (419). The description of hell is initially rather straightforward and simplistic because Miguel merely repeats the words of testimony about *infierno* from Matthew clarifying

that neither souls nor demons suffer in *infierno* to the same extent that they will after the final judgment in the, “fuego preparado para el Diablo y para sus ángeles” (419). There is a distinction in the torment that is being prepared for the unrepentant that are adjudged outside the regenerative grace of Christ. Miguel explains this difference by employing the word *infierno* to signify the place where the *dolores de muerte* occur and *gehenna* to refer to the place of eternal suffering after the judgment of Christ and according to apocalyptic teaching. Miguel says, “La índole del infierno actual es muy distinta de la futura condenación a la gehena, como verás en seguida; pues será destruido el infierno y todo poder del demonio sobre el hombre, a fin de que el demonio mismo sea castigado con mayor rigor” (419). The gravity of the harsher punishment to be meted out by God in his justice will far exceed the *dolores de muerte* suffered in *infierno* prior to the final judgment.

Servet uses the rhetorical skill of *amplificatio* to elaborate for Pedro’s understanding and the reader’s comprehension what horror awaits those who do not believe. Over the next ten pages, Miguel further distinguishes those who will be subject to punishment in contrast to those who are resurrected because of their belief in Christ. In comparison to the detail offered by Servet, Valdés’s only offers a hint of the punishment when asked by Antronio about Christian perfection, “¿todos los que no tienen essa perfición se van al infierno?” (36). There is no further explanation of what is in store for those whose destiny is *infierno*. Servet’s elaboration extends well beyond the scope of Valdés’s more pedagogically oriented dialogue and the laudatory elegiac dialogue of Fray Luis de León in *De los nombres de Cristo*.

4.7 Servet’s incorporation of the words *temor* and *miedo*

Having considered the words *temor* and *miedo* in Valdés’s *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, it is appropriate here to consider how Servet incorporates analogous terms in *Dos diálogos sobre*

la Trinidad divina. Angel Alcalá opines in a footnote about the first time that Servet uses *temeroso* that he might have been recalling a frightening childhood experience (420). The relevant quote is shortly after Miguel has outlined the torment to be suffered by the souls of giants from the Book of Genesis who are to be punished by drowning in a dark abyss, analogous to their death by drowning in the great flood referenced in Genesis, and how the sodomites are to be continually consumed by fire as they were consumed by the raining down of sulfur in the Levitical account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Servet incorporates neither references to classical philosophy, as he did to explain the soul, nor the esoteric writings that he refuted while clarifying his view of the immanence of God. He has restricted himself to biblical proofs and does so by reaffirming the veracity and trustworthy authority of the prophecy of these sufferings pointing out that Christ is recorded as having spoken of them in the New Testament book of the apostle Luke (420). The personal connection to which Alcalá refers to is childhood fear. Miguel says, “Sólo el tenebroso horror del demonio ocasiona ya cierta pena al párvulo, que tan temeroso es, ya de suyo, de la oscuridad” (420). This is not the *sombra* of which Miguel spoke when referring to everything operating as an analogy of things to come, but rather a complete obscurity that hides whatever truth or light might exist. What Miguel has referred to previously with citations to biblical references, he has brought into the realm of personal experience. The manifestation of perhaps a popular understanding of how to frighten a child into obedience with the threat of the Devil is a kind of psychological violence that certainly fits into that category of domination spoken of by Ricoeur. The unreasonable and incredible nature of these prophetic narratives from Servet’s interpretation of apocalyptic scriptures stretch and break the boundaries of rational understanding, perhaps giving his readers a reason to question the legitimacy of the authority behind the writings. However, Servet is in good company for

sixteenth-century interpretation of the biblical literature describing hell, and he is relying upon the biblical proofs that speak of *infierno*, of *demonios*, and *fuego* that he uses to discuss the fears that arise from the threat of future punishment for the unregenerate.

In another textual example Servet speaks of fear using the word *miedo* in place of *temor*. Speaking of the ‘sons of ire’ who by virtue of the sin of Adán will eternally suffer for their sin, Miguel indicates that their punishment will be mollified by the effects of Christ’s descent after his death into hell. Miguel states, “A pesar de todo, también en ellos surtió algún efecto el descenso de Cristo a los infiernos, a saber: que el desesperado dolor de muerte en el infierno les fue mitigado en parte gracias a la esperanza en la resurrección, y en parte les fue conmutado por miedo a otras penas, estando todo aún pendiente del juicio futuro, según se les hizo saber entonces” (422). The theological point is contentious for there is no consensus on the descent of Christ into hell. Miguel maintains here that he did. However, the crucial part of Miguel’s statement for the purpose of evaluating Servet’s view of fear is that it contrasts markedly from the hope that is offered in the authority of the news that Christ is giving to those imprisoned in *infierno* before the final judgment and resurrection of the body, according to the prevailing Christian belief. The qualitative nature of the *miedo* described by Servet in this passage is the fear of a possibility that differs little from the fear of the child who is threatened by the possibility that the Devil exists. The class of people described as those who are in hell awaiting the final judgment have the possibility of being adjudged upright if they are purified while in *infierno*, and thus are hopeful of not being fully and finally condemned to gehenna as some will be.

A final use of the word *temor* is iterated by Miguel when Pedro asks him about those in hell who are not resurrected by him with the saints, patriarchs and prophets. There exists a

fearful uncertainty in these who suffer not knowing whether they will be condemned eternally or whether they will be purified. Miguel in answer to this uncertainty says, “No pueden saberlo con certeza, puesto que incluso los que no vayan a ser condenados están detenidos allí con los otros y son atormentados” (423). The structure of his interpretation of hell as a real place, the Devil and demons as angels who will be finally castigated at the Last Judgment is an explicit and detailed account of his view of the Old and New Testament scriptures that speak of *infierno*, *gehenna*, and *Seol* as real places.

Timing is particularly important in Servet’s interpretations of who will suffer, when they will suffer, and whether the suffering will be erased by Christ’s resurrection or not. There is a distinction between those who die prior to the advent of Christ versus those who die after his resurrection from the dead. Prior to it, there is a place Servet speaks of in biblical terms as the *seno de Abraham*. It is a place where the saints, the patriarchs and the prophets are protected from the *dolores de muerte* (426-427). But the majority of those who die prior to Christ’s descent into hell suffer the *dolores de muerte* until they are finally regenerated or condemned. The complexity of Servet’s interpretation is laden with the implicit fear of the horrors of these *dolores de muerte* and the ultimate possibility of being eternally condemned. The eternally condemned will be consumed eternally by the fire of God described as, “fuego preparado desde la eternidad es el propio Dios, que es fuego” (431). It is God’s divine and just judgment that will be meted out upon the *malos*, or unregenerate because they did not believe in Christ or were not purified by the purgation of their sin.

The judgment is either a dreadful event for those to be condemned or wonderfully joyous one for those who are presented by Christ before the presence of God. This is the end of the first dialogue and fittingly, Servet concludes it with the same emphasis on the unanimity of God and

Christ that he employed from the first page of the dialogue where he was ruminating about the unity of *Logos* and *Elohim*. He states,

Sólo Cristo será quien nos lleve a presencia de Dios Padre y quien desempeñe todos los ministerios, a fin de que en él resida la plenitud de todos y sea entonces ‘todo en todos’, acogiéndonos en su seno a todos nosotros en Dios. Sólo en Cristo tuvo el mundo su comienzo, y sólo en Cristo tendrá su fin, pues que él es α y ω . (433)

Fear for Servet is erased by Christ in the end for some, while its horror is heightened for those who live without repenting of their sin. He is theologically neither a pantheist nor a Universalist, nor is he exactly a strict Unitarian because he maintains distinct manifestations of God.

One last comment regarding fear and its manifestation in the *Restitución del Cristianismo* that deserves to be highlighted is the variation of the *Proemio* of the Edinburgh manuscript that includes the following modification to the invocation: “¡Oh Cristo Jesús, *no me abandones, siervo tuyo que trabaja en esta tu causa, agobiado por el terror a mis enemigos y por mis penas*” (121). There seems to be some sense of premonition about death by the hands of enemies in the invocation to the *Proemio* of the manuscript edition. Certainly the judgment that Servet faced in Geneva for his theological views was excessive, and though burning him at the stake was an unspeakable tragedy, it is possible to see how the intransigence of Servet and the equally certain and rigid responses of Calvin in the trial came to a tragic end that is a disheartening statement about their respective capacities to dialogue.

4.8 Tolerance

In characterizing *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina* the word “love” does not come to mind, despite textual references to God’s mercy and grace in the interchanges between Pedro and

Miguel about *infierno* and Christ's function in the resurrection as *salvador*. Neither does Servet speak of love in his own calling upon the apostolic Church to reconstitute itself according to what he offers in the *Restitución del Cristianismo*. Absent this crucial element of tolerance, it is difficult to consider either of the two dialogues as a testament to tolerance. There is instead a zealous call for the apostolic Church to believe this theological system and “prestar fidelidad a Cristo” (429). The dialogues of Servet are not intended as a pedagogical help for pastors or people because they offer no practical application of the theological system. The work instead is rather complex theological theory divorced from praxis and only accessible to readers of Latin. It speaks of how God is to be made manifest in the *Palabra* and how he communicates via the *Espíritu* (119). This is a distinct difference between Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and the *Restitución del Cristianismo*.

Servet's academic and erudite exposition is void of the pastoral orientation of Valdés perhaps because of his relative isolation. Though tinged with possible hyperbole, Alcalá's characterization of Servet is informative. “Servet vivió aislado y sigue manteniendo a lo largo de la historia ese halo sugestivo, pero ineficaz, de los fascinantes solitarios. No fundó escuela. No presidió iglesia. No aspiró a ser maestro ni líder” (109). Having not founded a school or presided over a church are the two statements about Servet's life that indicate why his *Restitución del Cristianismo* differed so markedly from Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The lack of practical application of his elaborate and well written exposition of the manifestation of God in Christ and the communication of God's will via the Holy Spirit could not be tested upon Miguel's followers for he had none.

Valdés, on the other hand, marries theory to praxis and it is evident in the ubiquitousness of the element of love. As he sets the stage for his dialogue, he describes how Eusebio and

Antronio are received by the Archbishop Alva, “con mucho amor y charidad, assí porque ésta era su costumbre, como también por ser yo algo su conocido lo qual todo se le acrecentó” (10). The stark contrast between the two dialogues demonstrates very distinct ways of achieving salvific ends. Whereas Servet aimed to explain and gain acceptance for a restored understanding of God’s theological system in order to reauthorize “la verdadera fe” (121), Valdés sought to make accessible to church leaders a practical means of teaching about the “principios e rudimentos de la dotrina Christiana” (9). Where Valdés hoped to implement a grass roots movement to reform the entire Church, Servet’s *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina* convey an urgency and zeal for immediate revolution that is compounded by his sense of fulfilling his destiny. The Edinburgh manuscript holds some autobiographical indication of Servet’s sense of conviction to restore the true faith when he writes, “que ya prosigo presto, fortificado con múltiples lecturas y, ciertamente sobre todo, con la confianza de tu verdad” (122). Servet’s confident conviction is displayed in both letter correspondence that occurred in 1546 between him and Calvin, and in the two month trial in which the two were pitted against each other writing answers back and forth in Latin regarding the intricacies of their respective theological interpretations of the nature of the Trinity.

The fruit of the encounter was contentious. If it is possible to draw a line between the idea of debate and dialogue, the trial is much more a debate than dialogue. It is not akin to the friendly and supportive interlocutions between Miguel and Pedro in Servet’s *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina*. Instead the trial process was a grueling and agonizing experience for Servet both physically and psychically demonstrated by his vituperative responses to Calvin as they approach their end in recalcitrant conviction. José Barón Fernández in *Miguel Servet: Su vida y su obra* points out that despite the sixteenth-century propensity for vigorous and sometimes

insulting exchanges between academic rivals, Servet launched various personal invectives that must have finally provoked the indignation of Calvin (253). It cannot be denied that at the same time, Calvin was just as intransigent and convinced of his views during the trial.

Staged in three separate parts, the trial dragged on from the time Servet was incarcerated upon his arrest, August 13, 1553, until his death, October 27, 1553. Servet's conviction in his theological system did not flag. Alcalá points out that "la sentencia final no encierra sino la aplicación del viejo decreto de Justiniano, puesto de nuevo en vigor en la Dieta de Spira, abril de 1529, según el cual son reos de muerte los adversarios de la Trinidad y del bautismo infantil: por esos dos 'errores' fue condenado Servet" (29). The tragedy of the intolerance shown by Calvin and those who presided over the trial of Servet is not representative of the longsuffering nature attributed to Christ, the object of their faith and subject about whom they wrote.

However, as Bruce Gordon points out in *Calvin*, "In the early-modern world heresy was not simply a matter of doctrinal error; it carried the stigma of moral corruption. It poisoned the community. The only known remedy was complete extirpation" (217-218). Not quite two decades after Servet's death, his compatriot, Fray Luis de León, found himself in similar circumstances defending himself from charges of heresy but before the Inquisition in Valladolid rather than in Geneva. Though his trial process lasted much longer, the outcome for Fray Luis was not death but vindication. Rather than being condemned as poison to the community, Fray Luis departed from imprisonment and successfully finished an illustrious university career in Salamanca and published the dialogue *De los nombres de Cristo*, among other works. It is noteworthy that the word poison used by Gordon to describe those in the sixteenth-century who were accused and convicted of heresy is the very word that Fray Luis uses to describe the confusion of those theologians opposed to offering scripture in vernacular because they consider

poison what once was considered medicine or remedy for the ills of sin (140). To remedy the situation Fray Luis was inspired and compelled to write the dialogue *De los nombres de Cristo* to offer as much scripture as possible in Castilian.

4.9 Fray Luis de León: *De los nombres de Cristo*

The dialogue *De los nombres de Cristo* was more than likely one that Fray Luis de León began working on while incarcerated and subject to the long *proceso inquisitorial*. The culmination of deep meditation, philological training, and self-reflection upon a life of theological learning and teaching served to console and support him during the nearly five years that he endured imprisonment in Valladolid by the Inquisition. The seventeen initial charges, later augmented by additional charges against him, though not the subject of the present study, were nonetheless influential and inspirational for León.⁴⁶ Rather than the process León endured however, the present evaluation is aimed at showing how he manifested the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance in his dialogue, *De los nombres de Cristo*.

The solitude and suffering of the Inquisitional experience fomented deep thought upon the names of Christ for Fray Luis de León. In its initially published first and second editions of 1583 and 1585 the reader is reminded of Fray Luis's fellow Iberian from several centuries earlier, the seventh-century Bishop Isidore of Seville, who wrote in his *Etymologies* about the ten names of God and explained the origin of the name *Deus*: "The name *Deus* in Latin has been transliterated from a Greek term for *Deus* is from δέος in Greek, which means φόβος, that is, 'fear' whence is derived *Deus* because those worshipping him have fear" (153). In the first edition of the first two books of Fray Luis de León's *De los nombres de Cristo*, published in 1583 there are nine names given for Christ, but with the second edition a tenth was added

⁴⁶ See "Las acusaciones", pages XXVI-XXXII in Angel Alcalá's *Proceso inquisitorial de fray Luis de León* (1991), and "The Strife of Tongues", pages 36-85 in Colin P. Thompson's *The Strife of Tongues: Fray Luis de León and the Golden Age of Spain*.

bringing it to parity with that of Isidore of Seville. León does not speak of the work of Isidore of Seville as having impacted him in his decision, but it is a coincidence both thematically and numerically that other scholars have noted along the path of the dialogue's evolution to its final form that includes three books and 14 names of Christ.⁴⁷

De los nombres de Cristo was published, like the majority of Fray Luis's writings, after absolution from the Inquisitional charges leveled against him. The work is traditionally characterized as a dialogue, but critical evaluation of its literary characteristics in a very recent critical edition with introductory analysis by Javier San José Lera considers *De los nombres de Cristo* a Renaissance dialogue in which, "se incrusta de fragmentos que son auténticos comentarios, o se olvida del carácter dialógico para inclinarse – y esto ocurre con frecuencia – hacia el tratado teológico" (XLI). The mixture is not unlike the work of Servet that at times is much more treatise-like because of Servet's extensive employment of the rhetorical device of *amplificatio*. Fray Luis de León takes on the exercise of expanding upon the names of Christ to an even more impressive extent.

4.10 Summary of *De los nombres de Cristo*

The three books of the dialogue each include dedications and introductions. Fray Luis de León dedicates his dialogues to a close friend, Don Pedro Portocarrero, who held bishoprics and served as rector of the Universidad de Salamanca and later as Inquisitor General. He was Bishop of Calahorra in 1589 and of Córdoba in 1594 (León 139). That Luis de León dedicated his dialogue *De los nombres de Cristo* to a friend who would later head the Spanish Inquisition demonstrated not only a confidence at having been fully vindicated of the charges brought against him in 1572, but also a sense of assurance and purpose that, despite the dialogue's

⁴⁷ See footnote 18 page 136 in "*De los Nombres de Cristo* de Luis de León y *De arcano sermone* de Arias Montano" in *Biblia y humanismo: Textos, talentos y controversias del siglo XVI español* (1997).

inclusion of significant sections of scripture in the vernacular, the work would not implicate him in further difficulties with the Inquisition. Cristóbal Cuevas García's critical edition, upon which the present study relies, indicates in a footnote the official position of the Church at the time stating that,

Aunque la prohibición de leer la Biblia en lengua vulgar proviene de antiguo, en España fue urgida severamente por el *Indice* de Valdés de 1559, lo que confirma y matiza en 1564 la regal IV del *Indice* tridentino;...Con ellos se pretendía que los católicos desecharan el ejemplo de los judíos, evitaran el peligro del libre examen, conservaran en su pureza la univocidad del texto sagrado y se alejaran de las interpretaciones y exégesis heréticas. (141)

In the face of this prohibition, as *cátedra de Escritura* at the Universidad de Salamanca, Fray Luis de León published his *De los nombres de Cristo*.

At the end of the dedicatory section, Fray Luis informs the reader that in response to the travails of life, the worthy project of writing *De los nombres de Cristo* came to fruition. Claiming that the inspiration for the dialogue arose from his recollection of a conversation that he considered worth preserving, Fray Luis memorialized it in writing as a solvent for “las calamidades de nuestros tiempos” (139). The *locus amoenus* setting for the dialogue is a monastery of the Order of Augustine, Fray Luis's order, close to the bank of the River Tormes in Salamanca, not unlike that of Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. The three characters of the dialogue, Sabino, Marcello, and Iuliano, are professors from the Universidad de Salamanca whose names were changed to respect their identity.⁴⁸ It is during St. Peter's and St. Paul's day at the end of June, a period of two days, in which the three characters engage in a dialogue. Marcello assumes the role of master while Sabino and Iuliano sit as disciples listening to his

⁴⁸ For elaboration upon the names and roles of the characters see “Prólogo” Ed. Javier San José Lera LI-LVIII.

exegesis of scripture in the vernacular through a thoroughly impressive exercise of *amplificatio*. The dialogue is as exemplary for Fray Luis's capacity to expand so extensively upon the meanings of Christ's names as it is for his technical demonstration of rhetorical eloquence.

Sabino carries with him a small paper that Marcello recognizes when Sabino pulls it from inside his cloak. Names of Christ are written on it and it is that paper that determines the organization of the dialogical progression. Six names are presented in the morning, including *Pimpollo*, *Fazes de Dios*, *Camino*, *Pastor*, *Monte*, and *Padre del siglo futuro*. After a short break the three reconvene by the River Tormes, get into a small boat and row out to an islet where they resume the dialogue covering an additional four names, including *Brazo de Dios*, *Rey de Dios*, *Príncipe de Paz*, and *Esposo*. The following day Marcello sleeps in while Juliano cannot sleep because he is so stimulated by the prior day's conversation that he roams about before the sunrise ruminating on the names of Christ. Sabino arises after Juliano and according to coincidence or divine providence they see each other and resolve to convene again with Marcello to continue their discussion.

The second day resumes the dialogue and four additional names of Christ are discussed, including *Hijo de Dios*, *Cordero*, *Amado*, and *Jesús*. Fray Luis does not offer an exhaustive list of the names of Christ because, he admits, “vienen a ser casi innumerables los nombres que la Escripura divina da a Christo porque le llama *León* y *Cordero*, y *Puerto* y *Camino*, y *Pastor* y *Sacerdote*, y *Sacrificio* y *Esposo*, y *Vid* y *Pimpollo*, y *Rey de Dios* y *Cara suya*, y *Príncipe de paz* y *Salud*, y *Vida* y *Verdad* y assí otros nombres sin cuento” (169-170). Rather than sharing all these names, Fray Luis has selected those that he believes contain the concepts of the ones that he does not share (170). The names are not names of the Trinity or of God or the Spirit, but instead names of Christ. In a similar way, the balance of this chapter will look not at all the

names of Christ presented by Fray Luis in his *De los nombres de Cristo*, rather, it will focus upon how Fray Luis's dialogue incorporated the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance.

4.11 Fray Luis's accessible authority, and the pedagogy of responsibility

To commence evaluating the concepts of authority, fear, and tolerance in Fray Luis's *De los nombres de Cristo*, it is incumbent to consider his approach toward access to scripture and, thus, necessary to consider briefly a few details of the dedicatory section of *Libro I*. It is there that Fray Luis laments the state of Spanish ecclesiastical affairs. The gravity of the situation for the larger populace of Spain, in his view, is that many who pretend to be doctors have decided that offering the Holy Scriptures in any language other than the Latin Vulgate is contrary to God's will. In opposition to that view, Fray Luis claims that the consolation offered by the Scriptures is a gift from God, divinely inspired and the very solace and panacea for the ailments of life's travails. He logically argues that the Scriptures, originally written in the language of God's people for whom they were composed should be translated by capable philologists because it will not be against the will of God that his followers have access to his narrative for them (140). The situation of ignorance and arrogance on the part of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, prelates in particular, who have shirked their responsibility to know and teach the scriptures is compounded by the ignorance and arrogance of the *vulgo* have presumed the difficult task of interpreting the complexities of theology without a master to teach them. Fray Luis's concern sounds like an echo of Archbishop Alva's concerns in Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*.

But, Luis de León does not give up hope. He takes the task upon himself to think of a way by which he might serve the Spanish speaking public with a literary work as a vessel of religious teaching containing copious, overflowing waters of scripture in the vernacular to serve to those who are thirsty for reliable indoctrination. It is Fray Luis de León's desire that scripture

in the vernacular be offered to the maximum extent possible and to that end he commits himself with the affirmation:

...a mi juyzio todos los buenos ingenios en que puso Dios partes y facultad para semejante negocio tienen obligación a ocuparse en él, componiendo en nuestra lengua, para el uso común de todos, algunas cosas que, o como nascidas de las sagradas letras, o como allegadas y conformes a ellas, suplan por ellas, quanto es possible, con el común menester de los hombres, y juntamente les quiten de las manos, sucediendo en su lugar dellos, los libros dañosos y de vanidad. (144)

In the intellectual economy of sixteenth-century Spain, Fray Luis is confident that the authority espoused through the scriptures with which he is so familiar will not cause error and corruption if translated, but instead that it will serve as a solvent for the lamentable state of ignorance and arrogance that prevails among both *prelados* and *pueblos*. This is the call to *sapere aude*, or as Paul Ricoeur speaks of it in “Autonomy and Fragility” the pedagogy of responsibility, whereby one who understands a higher truth teaches it to another, encouraging them to take the leap, or *sursum* from incapacity to capacity and think for themselves (75). The trust of Luis de León is that the authority emanating from the biblical sources he references and conveys through his work will, in the eloquence of its expression, also serve to enrich and nourish the minds of its readers.

Fray Luis de León is not far from the pedagogical project spoken of earlier in the chapter on Valdés. As argued in Chapter 2, the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* was the successor to the practical efforts of Fray Hernando de Talavera to instill Christian doctrine in Granada and throughout Spain via his *cartillas* and *doctrinas*. With his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* Valdés built upon Talavera’s ideas for indoctrination by aiming his efforts at the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Fray Luis's *De los nombres de Cristo* is longer than Valdés's dialogue and theologically denser, but it is analogous in at least a couple of very important ways. First, it is similar because it is written in vernacular, and second, because it incorporates the ideas of love for God and neighbor that were referred to as necessary in Valdés's conception of true Christian faith.

Fray Luis, like Valdés, also conceives of a hierarchically superior Christian authority that does what it can to provide more access for those who are called to obedience. He demonstrates his attitude toward offering scripture in vernacular where he writes, "para el uso común de todos" (144). As agent or vicar of God, Fray Luis considers it his obligation and duty to bridge the gap that makes the truths of scripture inaccessible. Ricoeur refers to the idea of bridging the gap as the "pedagogy of responsibility" (77). Rather than inflicting incapacities upon those who are subordinate by writing in Latin, a language inaccessible to the majority, Fray Luis as an authorized interpreter of the scripture uses his power to enable and facilitate understanding for his readers. Why is he willing to do this? He is willing because of confidence in the authority, adequacy, and supremacy of what the scriptures contain for directing, ordering, and harmonizing life. He believes in the nutritive power of the theological principles for himself, and he recognizes that he is one of those with "buenos ingenios en quien puso Dios partes y facultad" to bring the texts to the reader.

His segue to the first name from the introduction is via a personal recollection of:

unos razonamientos que, en los años passados, tres amigos, míos y de mi Orden, los dos dellos hombres de grandes letras e ingenio, tuvieron entre sí, por cierta ocasión, acerca de los nombres con que es llamado Iesuchristo en la Sagrada Escriptura; los quales me refirió a mí poco después el uno dellos, y yo por su qualidad no los quise olvidar. (146)

4.12 Characters and genre

The qualities of each name of Christ are expounded upon by Marcelo with tangentially related material. The eloquence of Fray Luis's prose is emphasized by Natalio Fernández Marcos in "De los nombres de Cristo de Luis de León y De arcano sermone de Arias Montano" from *Biblia y humanismo: Textos, talentos y controversias del siglo XVI español* when he states, "El tratado *De los nombres de Cristo*, tal vez el libro más representativo y armónico del Renacimiento español y delicia de la prosa castellana, no es un libro de lectura fácil. De 'cansado y prolijo' lo tildaba Azorín, 'lindo libro de simbolización románica' en el sentir de Ortega" (133). Despite occasionally straying from direct explanations of the names of Christ that he is elaborating, the pleasure of reading his prose far outweighs the prolixity that Azorín mentions.

Fernández Marcos probably uses the term *tratado* when referring to *De los nombres de Cristo* because the dialogue generally follows what is considered a more Ciceronian approach that contains fewer interjections from the characters Sabino and Juliano. They sit as disciples at the feet of Marcello as he offers extended discourse about each name discussed. However there is, in the second book, a segment of the dialogue where Marcello becomes silent and Juliano launches into a much more Platonic form of Socratic questioning of Sabino to elicit the way in which all human beings love, and how if the object of their love is not the fount, Christ, their love is an exercise that will end in vain because only Christ is unchanging (445).

Structurally there is a final observation that warrants mentioning. It is a minor difference between Valdés and Servet's dialogues when compared to that of Fray Luis de León. The formal appearance of the dialogues of Valdés and Servet are structured so that neither author had to insert narrative signals to alert the reader to a change of speakers. Valdés explicitly states that he

writes his work in dialogue form to avoid having to interject such language into his composition: “...e porque fuera cosa prolixa y enojosa repetir muchas vezes, Dixo el Arçobispo, y Dixo el cura, y Dixe yo, determine de ponerlo de manera que cada uno hable por sí, de suerte que sea diálogo más que tratado...” (10). In Servet we see the same formatting of the text, but in contradistinction to that typeset, Fray Luis de León opts for narrative interjections. The difference is distracting for the reader, but because the majority of the dialogue follows the Ciceronian tendency, there was less need on the part of Fray Luis to alternate between characters. The very explicit and implicit references to authority, fear and tolerance of Marcello and Julianio in Ciceronian and Platonic dialogue format in *De los nombres de Cristo* will be the focus of the remainder of the chapter.

4.13 Authority in *De los nombres de Cristo*

Just as did Valdés and Servet, Fray Luis de León recognizes throughout his dialogue the concept of authority, using the word in different senses at different times, and the explicit use of the word authority shows how Fray Luis conceives of the concept in *De los nombres de Cristo*. The first instance in which the word authority is used is under the first name for Christ, *Pimpollo*, meaning shoot or bud. Marcello is building his argument for the idea that *Pimpollo* is in fact a name referring to Christ. He is compelled to prove this because he says if he does not, there will be those that will refute him and say *Pimpollo* does not refer to Christ. It is a name that appears only in Old Testament prophecies and thus the possibility for discrepancy in understanding its intended meaning. Other names for Christ, particularly those appearing in the New Testament do not require the same basis of proof in Fray Luis’s view because according to apostolic gospel testimony Christ himself is reported to have used them in referring to himself. However, with *Pimpollo*, a more elaborate proof must be given, and Marcello recurs to Holy

Scripture. He says, “Pues viniendo al primero, cosa clara es que habla de Christo, assí porque el texto caldayco, que es de grandíssima authoridad y antigüedad, en aquel mismo lugar adonde nosotros leemos: *En aquel día será el Pimpollo del Señor*, dize él: *En aquel día será el Messías del Señor*, como también porque no se puede entender aquel lugar de otra alguna manera” (172).

There is a greater reliance or fiduciary sentiment that Fray Luis demonstrates toward the text because of its age and authority. He uses authority admitting his own belief in the fidelity of the text, attributing it partially to its age. The proximity of the writing of the text to the prophetic event seems to be paramount for him.

In the section that follows *Pimpollo*, Marcello selects *Fazes de Dios* as the next name to explain. It is also an Old Testament reference that requires sufficient proving in order to convince his readers that the name is in fact a reference to Christ. Marcello defers to patriarchal sources for his proof, mentioning the antiquity of their writings, which emphasizes yet again the credence that Fray Luis seems to be giving to older sources. Marcello says, referring to the blessing of the priest upon God’s chosen people in *los Números*:

Porque no podemos dudar sino que Christo, y su nascimiento entre nosotros, son estas *fazes* que el sacerdote pedía en este lugar a Dios que descubriesse a su pueblo, como Theodoreto y como S. Cirillo lo afirman, doctores sanctos y antiguos. Y demás de su testimonio, que es de grande authoridad... (196).

This use of the word authority as an adjective describing the testimony of two early Church fathers emphasizes the trustworthy nature of their interpretation of this Old Testament Scripture. The authority has been conferred upon them to be passed along to Fray Luis. It is like a chain of custody that Marcello is using to advocate for the reliability of the interpretation.

Of the six names for Christ that Fray Luis includes in *Libro I* of the originally published two book dialogue, the sections on *Pimpollo* and *Fazes de Dios* are the only two in which he explicitly uses the word authority. Nonetheless with the copious citations to Old Testament Scriptures and frequent references to writings of early Church fathers, Fray Luis situates himself squarely among orthodox thinkers. Any concern for suspicion of his ideas would simply be that he is violating the prohibition against vernacular translations every time he offers a biblical reference in Castilian.

4.14 Authority in the *Braço de Dios*

In *Libro II*, Marcello opens the afternoon dialogue after the three have made their way to the islet in the middle of the River Tormes and commences his explication of the Christ's name, *Braço de Dios*. Julianio becomes somewhat incredulous at the seeming passivity of the arrival of Christ as the *Braço de Dios*, connoting great power and control. Marcello inquires of Julianio, “Mas dezidme, Iuliano, ¿prometió Dios alguna vez a su pueblo que les embiaría su *braço* y fortaleza para darles victoria de algún enemigo suyo y para ponerlos, no sólo en libertad, sino también en mando y en señorío glorioso?” (321). Julianio responds by listing at length many Old Testament references that characterize the arrival of a savior for the Jewish people who will vanquish and avenge (322). However, Marcello begins to explain through a concise history of empires and great nations that those victories were allowed, but short lived, and that the promises of God, through his *Braço de Dios* are far superior. After the long list of empires, he asks Julianio “¿dióselo Dios a los que he dicho, o ellos por sí y por sus fuerças puras, sin orden ni ayuda dél, la alcançaron?” (325). Fray Luis has not explicitly used the word authority here, but implicitly he builds a very counter cultural concept of power that is normally equated with authority and particularly with a name like *Braço de Dios*. It is this very paradoxical authority of

humility in the present age that will later materialize in greater riches because, “Dios, que es sin comparación muy más liberal y más largo, os prometía, no hijo de David solo, sino hijo suyo” (328). The authority that some adjudge as weakness is a different kind of strength for Fray Luis.

Later in the same section, Fray Luis does explicitly use the word authority, and again he is equating authority with deep-seated tradition. Through Marcello, he speaks of the audacity of the apostle Peter who entered Rome at the height of its power to speak in its plazas about the life and significance of Christ and to condemn the Roman gods as idols. He elaborates how the Christian faith to which Peter called the Romans was unlike the religion of the Romans that, “alargava la rienda a todo lo que pide el desseo” (350). Marcello then adds that Peter’s task was made even more difficult in light of the deeply entrenched custom of “el respecto de los antepassados de quien lo heredaron, y la autoridad y dicho de muchos excelentes en eloquencia y en letras que lo aprobaron” (350). Fray Luis, versed in Latin literature, is quite familiar with the literary eloquence he references here. As a scholar of Latin eloquence he knows the attractive and persuasive nature of the Roman writers who lauded the gods of the religion against which Peter speaks.

Thus it is the persuasive eloquence and authority of Latin rhetoric versus Peter’s call to the Romans to adhere to, “una summa aspereza, a la continencia, al ayuno, a la pobreza, al desprecio de todo quanto se vee; y en lo que toca a la creencia, les anunciavan lo que a la razón humana parece increíble” (350). The reason Fray Luis includes this narrative recounting by Marcello of Peter’s missionary journey to Rome in the *Braço de Dios* section is to juxtapose before his readers Roman rhetorical persuasion against the poor, fisherman Peter wielding an unbelievable story about Christ, “a quien los iudíos dieron muerte de cruz” (350-351). It is an exemplary way for him to legitimize the authority of the *Braço de Dios* by showing the paradox

of how an initial lack of acknowledgement of the authority of Christ eventually transformed into a tremendously vibrant and convincing movement.

4.15 Authority in the *Príncipe de Paz*

Of all the names of Christ that Fray Luis chooses to explain, it is in the section describing the name *Príncipe de Paz* where he incorporates the greatest number of references to the concept of authority. No less than five references using the word author or authority appear. Before explaining why Christ is called *Príncipe de Paz* Marcello recognizes the need to contextualize the meaning of the word *paz* saying, “Mas, para que esto se entienda, sera bien que digamos por su orden qué cosa es paz, y las diferentes maneras que de ella ay, y si Christo es *príncipe* y author della en nosotros según todas sus partes y maneras, y de la forma en cómo es su author y su *príncipe*” (407). The author of peace is Christ. Christ as author is the originator, the one who writes, creates, or invents this peace. Beginning from Christ, and augmenting his conception of peace, Fray Luis relies upon the training of his order and particularly the teaching of Saint Augustine who teaches that peace is “una orden sossegada o un sosiego ordenada” (408).

Paying homage to Augustine by declaring him an authority is Fray Luis’s second reference to authority in this section. It comes from Sabino who, in affirming the way Marcello has defined peace says, “– Lo primero de esto que proponéis – dixo entonces Sabino – paréceme, Marcello, que está ya declarado por vos en lo que avéis dicho hasta agora, adonde lo probastes con la autoridad y testimonio de Sant Agustín” (407-408). He establishes his definition in order that later in the section Juliano can engage Sabino in the only truly Socratic example of dialogue in *De los nombres de Cristo*. The anteriority, superiority, and exteriority that were seen in Valdés and Servet are here exemplified by Fray Luis in the section describing Christ as *Príncipe de Paz*. Christ is anterior, preceding all creation and referred to by Fray Luis as *author*.

For understanding this peace, Fray Luis looks to the master of his order, Saint Augustine who sits in a superior relationship to Fray Luis. Via the reason and authority of Saint Augustine, Fray Luis is able to understand peace and know Christ as its source.

Knowing Christ as the source of peace is the theme of the Socratic dialogue that occurs at the end of the *Príncipe de paz* section. After Marcello has thoroughly defined peace, he rests. Juliano affirms and sanctions Marcello's definition and justifications, but desires to add what might be considered a more experiential aspect to the dialogue. He says, "– Es, sin duda, Marcello, *Príncipe de paz* Iesuchristo por la razón que dezís; mas no mudando esso, que es firme, sino añadiendo sobre ello, paréceme a mí que le podemos también llamar así porque con sólo él se puede tener aquesto que es paz" (435). Sabino does not fully understand though he does marvel at what Juliano says and thus, commences a rapid back and forth question and answer session in which Juliano leads Sabino to Christ as the answer to the question, who alone brings true peace for human beings. Sabino is the disciple and Juliano takes on the role of master. There is a necessary agonistic tension evident at a point when Sabino seems ready to give up and does not understand how to answer. But the interaction between Sabino and Juliano at this crucial junction of frustration for Sabino because he cannot understand what Juliano is trying to show him reflects precisely what Ricoeur refers to as, "the external relation that does not imply either a pact of servitude or one of domination" (84). Instead, Juliano takes Sabino by the hand in a demonstration of filial love and says, "– Yd conmigo, Sabino, que podría ser que por esta manera llegásemos a tocar la verdad" (437). Juliano as the exterior authority takes Sabino by the hand to help him make the *sursum*, or leap, to a capacious understanding of Christ as the source of peace.

Throughout *De los nombres de Cristo*, in addition to the specific examples cited here, Fray Luis recurs frequently to citations of Scripture and Patristic writings as reliable sources for directing and ordering the faithful Christian, thus it could be said his basis for authority is more narrow in comparison with Servet. The evidence of his humanist education is also shown by occasional reference to Latin and Greek authors. Though never at a loss for how to speak more about Christ, Marcello, Sabino and Juliano arrive at the culmination of their dialogue in the third book. The final name of Christ to be discussed is his proper name, *Jesús*, by which he was called while living. In addition to an etymological description that considers the name *Jesús* and its connections to the Tetragrammaton, Marcello speaks of health and how *Jesús* is *salud*, or health.

In this final section there is one use of the word authority that is a warning to the reader about distinguishing between true and false authority. The false authority is one that emphasizes the faithful to engage in exterior acts of religion without teaching about *Jesús* as the one who offers interior health. They induce the giving of alms as a means of achieving health that Fray Luis argues is only achievable through knowing Christ. Fray Luis de León, like Juan de Valdés, warns against the idea of emphasizing exterior acts of Christian faith to the detriment of the interior state of the soul that only remains healthy through knowing Christ. Marcello condemns these false teachings saying, “lo que es mucho peor, aprobada y como sanctificada con el nombre de piedad y con la autoridad de los que induzen a ello, que, a trueco de hazer por defuera limosneros los hombres, los hacen más enfermos en el alma de dentro y más agenos de la verdadera salud de Christo, que es contrario derechoamente de lo que pretende *Iesús*, que es *salud* (638). There is no exterior act of piety authorized by the author to achieve the health of the soul. The only means Marcello urges is knowledge of Christ. This echoes the Socratic portion of the

dialogue dealing with Christ as *Príncipe de paz* where Juliano assures Sabino that the only means of contentment is Christ, the source of the peace.

4.16 Fear

De los nombres de Cristo also addresses the concept of fear in ways more akin to Valdés than Servet. Though not explaining fear with the same explicit definitions as Valdés, who distinguished fear of man from fear of God, it is nonetheless possible to recognize these two distinct forms of fear in Fray Luis's dialogue. A few examples are sufficient to demonstrate the variety of ways that Fray Luis conceives of fear in *De los nombres de Cristo*. One way in which Fray Luis addresses fear fits within the category of fear as the result of domination like that described by Ricoeur's essay "The Paradox of Authority" is when the obedient comply out of fear because an illegitimate authority dominates them into compliance through the threat of violence (92). Another way fear is characterized is the fear engendered by the ire of God enacting his justice. This fear is the one that Fray Luis elaborates in most detail through his descriptions of Christ suffering the ire of God before and during his crucifixion.

The Inquisition had the capacity as an authorized institution to engender fear. However, in the case of Fray Luis de León the legitimacy of the claims against him were found insufficient to convict him of heresy. The fear that the Inquisition likely evoked in Fray Luis and many others by its trials was used to compel compliance with a moral code that Fray Luis adeptly critiques in his dedication to Pedro Portocarrero. The moral code that Fray Luis esteems is dead orthodoxy because it is void of the contentment and health offered in Christ. This fear of which Fray Luis speaks through the voice of his authority, Marcello, is found in the second book in the *Príncipe de Paz* section. Marcello complains that, "la religión o la policía,⁴⁹ o la doctrina o

⁴⁹ According to Covarrubias, "Término ciudadano y cortesano. Consejo de policía, el que gobierna las cosas menudas de la ciudad y el adorno della y limpieza" (1369).

maestría que no engendra en nuestras ánimas paz y composición de affectos y de costumbres, no es Christo ni religión suya por ninguna manera” (418). It is in reality a mere moralism linked to Mosaic law and Catholic tradition but not to Christ. Marcello further critiques mere moralism by pointing out the error of some within the ecclesiastical hierarchy who believe that they are bringing men to enlightenment by implementing punishments, “que le induxessen con su temor a aquellos que le mandavan las leyes” (418). In light of Fray Luis’s own experience of his nearly five year long imprisonment by the Inquisition, it is not difficult to see how the words of Marcello reflect Fray Luis’s recognition of the futility of punishment and fear to bring about the peace that stems only from the *Príncipe de paz*. Though the fear spoken of does motivate obedience, it is a fraudulent form of authority and only procures obedience that fears violence for failure to comply. The violence enacted against Fray Luis was privation from the everyday activities of life while imprisoned in Valladolid.

But also in *Libro II* under the name of *Rey de Dios*, Fray Luis speaks of a fear using the word *temor* that relates the intentional agony to which Christ submitted himself in the Garden of Gethsemane just before his arrest, trial, conviction and crucifixion according to the synoptic gospels. Marcello relates how Christ willingly subjected himself to the pains of death by willing it in his mind and refraining from any consolation he might have drawn from his divine nature. Describing the fear and the manifestation of that fear through the sweating of drops of blood, Marcello states, “Y aunque digo el temor del morir, si tengo de dezir, Iuliano, lo que siempre entendí acerca desta agonía de Christo, no entiendo que fue el temor el que abrió las venas y le hizo sudar gotas de sangre, porque, aunque de hecho temió porque él quiso temer, y temiendo, provar los accidentes ásperos que trae consigo el temor...” (366). This fear related by Marcello is a punishment to which Christ willingly submitted in his mind before the actual bodily

suffering he endured according to New Testament gospels. It is the fear of the indignation and ire of God that Jesus wills himself to suffer. The theological concept of substitutionary atonement is what is displayed in this act described by Marcello in the dialogue. It is not one elaborated upon by either Servet in the *Dos diálogos de la Trinidad divina* or Valdés in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Though both of them make reference to Christ's death and resurrection, it is only Fray Luis who elaborates so extensively upon the fear of the wrath of God that Christ willingly endured. He extends his explanation well beyond the boundaries of the New Testament writings and employs the skill of *amplificatio* to take his readers through the physical agonies that he presumes Christ suffered.

As a final comment on the concept of fear, it is important to point out that Fray Luis does not view God's love and the fear of God as equally powerful to compel, convince or persuade. His hierarchy of authority between these two character traits of God is revealed in the section describing Christ as *Rey de Dios*. Marcello is distinguishing between the law of Moses and the law of grace earned by the death of Christ that has just been explained with all the attendant fear that Christ willingly suffered. Having just cited the prophet Jeremiah who had prophesied of a new law to be placed in the heart of human beings, Fray Luis interprets that law as one of grace won by Christ. Marcello explains the benefits inuring to humankind as, "las nuevas leyes de Christo, y su manera de gobernación particular y nueva" (387). In relation to fear, Marcello claims that, "las ventajas grandes de aquesta gobernación adonde guía el amor y no fuerça de temor" (387). Under the paradigm of a new grace instituted by Christ in the heart, the interior health and contentment that Fray Luis speaks of in other sections, love is the motivation for the faithful to adhere to God's commands, not fear.

4.17 Tolerance

Within the text of the three books of Fray Luis's *De los nombres de Cristo*, he never uses the word *tolerancia*. However, the concept permeated Fray Luis's life just as much as it did his dialogue. The rigors of the trials by the Inquisition were a true test of Fray Luis's character, patience, and capacity for tolerance of his accusers who he believed had unjustly accused him. In *Proceso inquisitorial de Fray Luis de León*, Angel Alcalá opines that the complexity and duration of Fray Luis's inquisitorial trial was in part due to, "ciertas actitudes duras, inflexibles y vengativas adoptadas por Fray Luis, cuya altura moral, y hay que confesarlo con pena, no siempre estuvo al nivel que de una persona abundante en humildad, paciencia y santidad se podía y debía esperar" (XXIX). Fray Luis's reaction to the physical and emotional suffering he endured over the four years and nine months of imprisonment and interrogation at the hands of his Inquisitors arguably makes his writing more, not less credible and trustworthy as an authority in its own right. The unknown outcome and certainly the possible punishments were occasionally nearly unbearable experiences for him, despite the sequestration serving as a time in which he probably began composing the *De los nombres de Cristo*. As Alcalá also points out, two of Fray Luis's colleagues suffered death while awaiting the end of their own *procesos inquisitoriales*. "Grajál⁵⁰ y Gudiel⁵¹ no vieron ya la luz de la libertad" (XXVIII).

Exacting revenge, however, was not the task to which Fray Luis dedicated himself upon acquittal, or at least not in the way one might traditionally expect revenge to be exacted. His response upon gaining his freedom is perhaps the better and more accurate reflection of the "humildad, paciencia y santidad" ascribed to him by Alcalá. Rather than pursuing his accusers in irrational ways, Fray Luis aspired to and won the *cátedra de escritura* at the Universidad de

⁵⁰ Gaspar de Grajal

⁵¹ P. Alonso Gudiel

Salamanca, composed the literary and religious works that would define his enduring legacy as a Biblical scholar, a humanist *par excellence*, and it might be argued, followed to the best of his ability the very compelling, practical admonitions both explicitly and implicitly intimated by Marcello, Sabino, and Juliano in *De los nombres de Cristo*.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

When French historian Marcel Bataillon rescued Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* from the manuscript section of the National Library of Portugal in 1925 there was no longer a *Santo Oficio* to prohibit the work from being published and distributed. The work was published, and scholars readily reviewed Bataillon's characterization of it as an Erasmian catechism. In 1970, Jose C. Nieto sagaciously observed the influences of Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz in the theological content of the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and recharacterized Valdés's life and work to include as an influence this *Alumbrado* lay preacher that Valdés had heard in Escalona.

Upon opening Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* to read the dialogue for the present study and reviewing the available critical commentary, it seemed that Bataillon and Nieto, among others, had regarded too casually Valdés's selection of Archbishop Pedro de Alva as the voice of authority in the dialogue. Bataillon had recognized the readily apparent influence of Erasmus upon Valdés because he is specifically mentioned and lauded in the dialogue for his theological insight. Nieto focused upon the impact of Alcaraz by showing through historical documentation and cumulative circumstantial evidence that Valdés was impacted by the *Alumbrado* lay preacher in Escalona. The question of how Valdés felt compelled to select Granada's Archbishop Alva as the purveyor of Christian doctrine in his dialogue though mentioned still remained for consideration. Prior scholars opined that it was because he was a benign historical figure, well respected among his Hieronymite order, and would attract little

attention. But deeper investigation seems to suggest other more substantive reasons for Valdés's selection. As the fifth Archbishop to serve in Granada after Isabel and Ferdinand reclaimed Granada as *los Reyes católicos* in 1492, Pedro de Alva followed in the footsteps of his own master-teacher, Fray Hernando de Talavera, conspicuously lauded in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* for his noble Christian character and his wonderful methods of pedagogy.

Valdés highlighted Archbishop Talavera in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* because he admired the pedagogical strategy of Talavera whose pioneering efforts as the first to publish of *cartillas*, *doctrinas*, or *manuales*, brought about two seminal changes in the dissemination of Christian doctrine: The catechism was printed in vernacular Castillian Spanish and made available at reasonable cost to those who could read. The access to the tenets of Christian faith could be carried and kept at hand for reference and guide. No longer was it simply the *Tabla moral* hanging at the church or cathedral, but instead, a simple, portable document that put Christian doctrine at the disposal of many. It was a catechistic project that employed an evangelistic strategy of providing information while instructing about conversion, unlike other forced conversions. There is persuasion and instruction, but not baptism by aspersion. Fray Hernando de Talavera believed the doctrinal message of his Christian *cartillas*, *doctrinas*, and *manuales* would change the Muslim and Christian populace of Granada over time. He employed Pedro de Alcalá to write an Arabic dictionary, and he himself sought to learn Arabic so that he could explain Christian doctrine. And he influenced a generation of Hieronymites who would take on ecclesial and political leadership roles within the highest echelons of the Spanish church and monarchy.

It is that generation of Hieronymites, including Bishop of Cuenca Diego Ramirez de Villaescusa, Bishop of Palencia Luis Cabeza de Vaca, the Archdeacon of Alcor Alonso

Fernández de Madrid, and Pedro de Alva who carried on the legacy of Fray Hernando de Talavera. Through their implementation of ideas they learned from Talavera, it is likely that Valdés saw either directly or indirectly the meritorious effects of the pedagogical and evangelistic method. Though prior scholarship has in many ways fossilized the image of Valdés as an Erasmian, it is important to reiterate that such a totalizing characterization reduces the impact of figures like Talavera who played such a vital role in sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality. Valdés recognized Talavera's impact and his example through all the characters of his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, but particularly through Eusebio who refers to Talavera in the following quote: “Y si tales perlados uviesse como el que avéis nombrado, que assí procurassen el bien de sus súbditos y criados, ciertamente avría otra honestidad, bondad, virtud y christiandad que al presente ay” (131). To carry on that legacy, Valdés wrote his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* and esteemed Talavera as the example for other prelates to follow.

The historical weight of Talavera's impact upon Spanish spirituality is equaled by the gravity of the message that Valdés offers in his *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, the first of three dialogues analyzed in the present study. The message conveyed in the *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana* is not a simple catechism, but a detailed dialogue of Christian doctrine that expounds upon the rudiments and principles of Christian faith. When evaluated and analyzed in light of Paul Ricoeur's essay, “The Paradox of Authority” it becomes possible to see how Valdés used the dialogue format, characters, and the vernacular language in his dialogue to legitimate the message of this doctrinal dialogue. The vernacular is key because it reflects Talavera's own *cartillas* and *doctrinas* rather than Erasmus's erudite Latin.

Ricoeur's characterization of authority has served to orient the study toward close observations of authority, fear, and tolerance in Valdés, Servet, and Luis de León. The

Ricoeurian description begins using the *Robert* dictionary to define authority as, “the right to command, the power (recognized or not) to impose obedience” (91). From that foundational understanding Ricoeur pointed out three qualities to describe authority including its anteriority, superiority, and exteriority. By evaluating the dialogues of Valdés, Servet and Luis de León using these three criteria of Ricoeur the contours of authority and how it is constructed have become more evident. Whereas Servet represented himself in the dialogue, Valdés and Luis de León were less straightforward. All incorporate through the dialogue form the exteriority as manifested in the teacher-disciple relationship, “one external relation that does not imply either a pact of servitude or one of domination” (Ricoeur 84). In Valdés, Archbishop Alva is the teacher and his disciples are Eusebio and Antronio. In Servet’s *Dos diálogos sobre la Trinidad divina*, Servet aims to reconstitute the Church by urging his understanding of that to Pedro, and Luis de León expounds through the character Marcello in a masterful display of rhetorical *amplificatio* the names of Christ.

The authority of which each author speaks is decidedly Christian and in the case of Valdés and Luis de León, it is an authoritative message that they both aimed to make accessible through vernacular Castillian Spanish to a wider segment of the population. Servet is more erudite and his authority is much more designed for the learned elite. The language is also crucial for each author as has been shown through a careful review of each dialogue looking specifically for the word authority and how it was employed. Valdés framed his dialogue with the authority of Archbishop Alva who is described using the word authority at the beginning and end of the dialogue. Servet employed the word less and constructed his view of the power to command as resting in the unanimity of Christ and God and the Holy Spirit. Luis de León employed the word as well but relied also upon the images evoked by the names of Christ.

With respect to fear and tolerance, the dialogues each incorporate these concepts as part of the dynamic system of Christian authority. In ways that demonstrate Ricoeur's characterization of authority, fear comes into play in each of these dialogues when the authority, either individual or institutional has the power to command but lacks the legitimate right to do so and thus resorts to coercion or violence by domination. In the case of Valdés, there were two types of fear – fear of God and fear of man. With Servet, the fear was manifested in his exposition of the Final Judgment of God who, as authority will consume all of *infierno* in an everlasting fire. Luis de León shows in his dialogue that true Christian love motivates with greater effect than coercion or domination by violence that result in fear. A quote from his *De los nombres de Cristo* reminds its reader that such was the approach of Christ and it must be the stance of his follower: “las ventajas grandes de aquesta gobernación adonde guía el amor y no fuerça de temor” (387).

Tolerance was one of the less patent characteristics within Ricoeur's essay of authority, and the way that it played out in the lives of each of the authors and their dialogues was more a function of the historical milieu in which they lived. Valdés's *Diálogo de doctrina Cristiana* was not tolerated because it was found to have ill sounding errors and banned immediately. Servet suffered death for his *Restitución del Cristianismo* and the confusion of his writing a dialogue that found truths in esoteric and classical philosophers but always with Christ at the head. Luis de León endured prison under the coercive power of the Inquisition, but returned after being exonerated and wrote *De los nombres de Cristo* offering a different picture of Christ and Christianity for its faithful.

The one most common and pertinent thread in the dialogues written by these three sixteenth-century scholars is that of the authority of Christ and the interpretation of scripture in

the light of Christ as the focus. This is preeminent in all three dialogues and forms the core of their paradigm of understanding. They each invoke Christ's presence at the beginning of their respective dialogues as a classical author would a muse to enable them to speak the truths they utter through their characters and the language that conveys the authority of Christ in anteriority, superiority, and exteriority. Each suffered to varying degrees for their expression of authority in their dialogues. Servet's death was the harshest. Despite the controversial nature of the views of authority that each of their authors expressed, the preservation of each of these dialogues offers a fuller picture of sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality and the structure of authority in it.

At the end of Ricoeur's essay, "The Paradox of Authority," he recognizes the need to allow for dissensus or disagreement in what amounts to a dialogue between discourses of authority that claim exclusive legitimacy, that is to say, that they possess the right to command or the power to impose obedience (105). Juan de Valdés, Miguel Servet, and Fray Luis de León in their dialogues were, in essence, those voices of dissensus questioning, to greater or lesser extents, the legitimacy of the authority as manifested in the existing institutional hierarchy of the church. Their works are like voices entering into the dialogue of ideas about which authority is most credible. Analysis of Valdés, Servet, and Fray Luis de León in the present study seen from a historical perspective that includes the influence of Fray Hernando de Talavera on sixteenth-century Spanish spirituality and the theoretical perspective of Ricoeur from his "The Paradox of Authority," has aided the process of negotiating a clearer understanding of authority as it is espoused by the dialogues they wrote, and how authority, fear, and tolerance were manifested by these authors of sixteenth-century Spanish religious dialogue.

WORKS CITED

- Abad, Julián Martín. *La imprenta en Alcalá de Henares (1520-1600)*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Arco Libros, 1991.
- Alcalá, Angel. *Proceso inquisitorial de Fray Luis de León*. Salamanca: Junta de Castilla y León, 1991.
- Anipa, Kormi. *The Grammatical Thought and Linguistic Behaviour of Juan de Valdés*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa, 2007.
- Antolínez de Burgos, Justino, and Manuel Sotomayor. *Historia eclesiástica de Granada*. Granada: Universidad, 1996.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Arroyo, Luis Antonio. *Alonso Fernández de Madrid, Arcediano del Alcor y la "Silva Palentina"*. Palencia: Imprenta Provincial, 1993.
- Asensio, Eugenio. "El erasmismo y los corrientes espirituales afines" *Revista de filología española*. 36 (1952): 31-99.
- Barbolani, Cristina. "Los diálogos de Juan de Valdés, ¿Reflexión o improvisación?" Ed. Asunción Rallo Gruss and Rafael Malpartida Tirado. *Estudios sobre el diálogo renacentista español: Antología de la crítica*. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2006.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *Erasmus y España*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1950.
- Bermúdez de Pedraza, Francisco, and Ignacio L. Henares Cuéllar. *Historia eclesiástica de Granada*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1989.
- Byrne, Susan. *El Corpus Hermeticum y tres poetas españoles: Francisco de Aldana, fray Luis de León y San Juan de la Cruz*. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2007.
- Caballero, Fermín, and Miguel Jiménez Monteserín. *Conquenses ilustres*. Cuenca: Ayuntamiento de Cuenca, 1995.
- Calero Palacios, María Carmen. "La enseñanza en Granada: Tradición e innovación." *Clasicismo y humanismo en el Renacimiento Granadino*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1996.

- Coleman, David. *Creating Christian Granada: Society and Religious Culture in an Old-World Frontier City, 1492-1600*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.
- Cortés Peña, Antonio Luis. "Granada: Su traumática incorporación a Occidente." *Clasicismo y humanismo en el Renacimiento Granadino*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1996.
- Covarrubias Orozco, Sebastián de, Ignacio Arellano, and Rafael Zafra. *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*. Biblioteca Áurea Hispánica, 21. [Pamplona, Spain]: Universidad de Navarra, 2006.
- Crews, Daniel. *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Díaz, Juan Vílches. *Autores y anónimos españoles en los índices inquisitoriales*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1986.
- Domínguez Bordona, Jesús. "Algunas precisiones sobre Fray Fernando de Talavera." *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*. 145.2 (1959): 209-229.
- Downton, R. Keelan. *Authority in the Church: An Ecumenical Reflection on Hermeneutic Boundaries and Their Implications for Inter-church Relations*. New York: University Press of America, 2006.
- Elliot, J.H. *Imperial Spain 1469-1716*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Colloquies*. Trans. Craig R. Thompson. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Eusebius, Kirsopp Lake, John Ernest Leonard Oulton, and Hugh Jackson Lawlor. *The Ecclesiastical History*. The Loeb Classical Library. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Evans, G.R. *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Fernández, José Barón. *Miguel Servet: Su vida y su obra*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1970.
- Fernández de Madrid, Alonso, and Matías Vielva. *Silva palentina*. Palencia: Imp. de "El Diario palentino" de al viuda de J. Alonso, 1932.
- Firpo, Massimo. "The Italian Reformation and Juan de Valdés." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27.2 (1996): 353-364.
- Friedman, Jerome. "The Case for a Jewish Christianity." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 4.1 (1973): 87-110.

- García-Ferrer, María Julieta Vega. *Fray Hernando de Talavera y Granada*. Granada: La Universidad de Granada, 2007.
- García Oro, José. *Cisneros: El cardenal de España*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 2002.
- Geanakoplos, Deno John. *Constantinople and the West*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Gilly, Carlos. "Juan de Valdés, traductor y adaptador de escritos de Lutero en su Diálogo de doctrina christiana." Ed. Ramon Sugranyes de Franch and Luis López Molina. *Miscelánea de estudios hispánicos: Homenaje de los hispanistas de Suiza, a Ramón Sugranyes de Franch*. Badalona: Publicacions de L'Abadia de Montserrat, 1982.
- Gilson, Etienne. *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. New York: Random House, 1955.
- Goldhill, Simon. *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Gordon, Bruce. *Calvin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Gómez, Jesús. *El diálogo en el Renacimiento español*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1988.
- . *El diálogo renacentista*. Madrid: Ediciones del Laberinto, 2000.
- Haliczer, Stephen. "The Castilian Aristocracy and the Mercedes Reform of 1478-1482." *The Hispanic American Historical Review*. 55.3 (1975): 449-467.
- Herrero, José Sánchez. "La literatura catequética en la Península Ibérica, 1236-1553." Ed. Miguel Angel Ladero Quesada. *En la España medieval V: Estudios en memoria del Profesor D. Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz*. II Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1986.
- Homza, Lu Ann. "Erasmus as hero, or heretic: Spanish Humanism and the Valladolid Assembly of 1527." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50.1 (1997): 78-118.
- . *Religious Authority in the Spanish Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Ianuzzi, Isabella. "Educar a los cristianos: Fray Hernando de Talavera y su labor catequética dentro de la estructura familiar para homogeneizar la sociedad de los Reyes Católicos." *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos*. L'École des hautes études en sciences sociales 20 January 2008. Web. 11 March 2009. <<http://nuevomundo.revues.org/index19122.html>>
- Infantes, Víctor. *De las primeras letras: cartillas españolas para enseñar a leer de los siglos XV y XVI : preliminar y edición facsímil de 34 obras*. Obras de referencia, 14. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1998.

- Isidore of Seville. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Trans. Stephen A. Barney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Jerome, Saint. *The Letters of St. Jerome*. Trans. Charles Mierow. Maryland: The Newman Press, 1963.
- Lanham, Richard. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- “Legitimate.” Etymological annotation. *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- León, Fray Luis de. *De los nombres de Cristo*. Ed. Cristóbal Cuevas García. Madrid: Cátedra, 1977.
- . *De los nombres de Cristo*. Ed. Javier San José Lera. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg, 2008.
- Longhurst, John E. *Erasmus and the Spanish Inquisition: The Case of Juan de Valdés*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1950.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández and Emilia Fernández Tejero. *Biblia y humanismo: Textos, talentos y controversias del siglo XVI español*. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1997.
- Martínez de San Vicente, Ainara Herrán. “El mecenazgo de los jerarcas eclesiásticos.” *La literatura en la época de los Reyes católicos*. Eds. Nicasio Salvador Miguel and Cristina Moya García. Madrid: Editorial Iberoamericana, 2008.
- McGrath, Alister E. *The Foundations of Dialogue in Science and Religion*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 1998.
- . *Historical Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Molina, José Rodríguez. “Poder político de los arzobispos de Toldeo en el siglo XV.” Ed. Antonio Luis Cortés Peña, José Luis Betrán, and Eliseo Serrano Martín. *Religión y poder en la edad moderna*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2005.
- Nalle, Sarah T. *God in La Mancha: Religious Reform and the People of Cuenca, 1500-1650*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- . “Printing and Reading Popular Religious Texts.” Ed. Tom Lewis and Francisco J. Sánchez. *Culture and the State in Spain*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1999.
- Nieto, Jose. C. *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1970.

- . *Valdés' Two Catechisms: Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and Christian Instruction for Children*. Trans. William B. and Carol D. Jones. Kansas: Coronado Press, 1993.
- Norton, F.J. *Printing in Spain 1501-1520*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Olmedo, Felix González. *Diego Ramírez Villaescusa (1459-1537)*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1944.
- Pretty, Robert A. *Adamantius Dialogue on the True Faith in God*. Eds. Gary Trompf, Wouter Hanegraaff, and John Cooper. Belgium: Peeters, 1997.
- Prieto, Antonio. *La prosa del siglo XVI*. Madrid: Editorial La Muralla, 1973.
- Rawlings, Helen. *The Spanish Inquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Reed, Walter. *Dialogues of the Word. The Bible as Literature According to Bakhtin*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Reflections on the Just*. Trans. David Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Sánchez Herrero, José. "La enseñanza de la doctrina cristiana en algunas diócesis de León y Castilla durante los siglos XIV y XV." *Archivos leoneses*. (1976) 5: 145-184.
- Scanlon, T. M. "The Difficulty of Tolerance." ed. David Heyd. *Toleration: An Elusive Virtue*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Servet, Miguel. *Restitución del Cristianismo*. trans. Angel Alcalá and Luis Betés. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1980.
- . *Treinta cartas a Calvino, Sesenta signos del Anticristo, Apología de Melanchton*. Ed. Angel Alcalá. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1971.
- Sigüenza, José de, and Juan Catalina García López. *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*. Nueva biblioteca de autores españoles, 8, 12. Madrid: Bailly-Baillière é Hijos, 1909.
- Talavera, Fernando de. *Breve e muy provechosa doctrina de lo que deve saber todo cristiano. con otros tractados muy provechosos*. 1911.
- . *Católica impugnación*. Ed. Francisco Martín Hernández and Francisco Márquez. Barcelona: Juan Flors, 1961.
- Valdés, Juan de. *Comentario a los salmos*. Terrassa: CLIE, 1987.
- . *Diálogo de doctrina*. Ed. Emilio Monjo Bellido. Sevilla: Editorial MAD, 2008.

- . *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*. Ed. Marcel Bataillon. Coimbra: University of Coimbra, 1925.
- . *El diálogo de la lengua*. 6th ed. Cristina Barbolani. Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- . *El evangelio según San Mateo*. Ed. Edouard Boehmer. Barcelona: Libros CLIE, 1986.
- . *Obras completas, I*. ed. Angel Alcalá. Madrid: Biblioteca Castro, 1997.
- Valls, Albert G. Hauf i. "Fray Hernando de Talavera, O.S.H., y las traducciones castellanas de la *Vita Christi* de Fr. Francesc Eiximenis, O.F.M. *Essays on Medieval Translation in the Iberian Peninsula*. Omaha: Creighton University, 2001.
- Villanueva, Francisco Márquez. *Investigaciones sobre Juan Álvarez Gato: Contribución al conocimiento de la literatura castellana del siglo XV*. Madrid: S. Aguirre Torre, 1960. Anejos del Boletín de la Real Academia Española Anejo 4.
- Weber, Alison. Rev. of *Two Catechisms: Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and Christian Instruction for Children*, 2nd enlarged ed., by Intro. Jose C. Nieto. and Trans. William B. Jones and Carol D. Jones. *Renaissance Quarterly* 49.2 (1996): 399-400.