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ABSTRACT

Scholars have often commented on the ‘biblicization’ of the Spanish Monarchy under Philip II (r. 1556–1598). In contrast to the predominantly neo-Roman image projected by his father, Charles I/V (r. 1516/9–1556), Philip presented himself as an Old Testament monarch in the image of David or Solomon, complementing this image with a program of patronage, collecting, and scholarship meant to remake his kingdom into a literal ‘New Jerusalem.’ This dissertation explores how, encouraged by the scholarly ‘discovery’ of typological similarities and hidden connections between Spain and the Holy Land, sixteenth-century Spaniards stumbled upon both the form and content of a discourse of national identity previously lacking in Spanish history.

The dissertation is divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, I examine three factors—the rise of humanist exegesis, a revitalized tradition of learned travel, and the close relationship between the crown and the Franciscan Order—that contributed to the development of a more historicized picture of the Holy Land in sixteenth-century Spanish sources. In Chapter Two, I focus on the humanist historian Ambrosio de Morales’ efforts to defend the authenticity of Near Eastern relics in Spanish collections. I argue that Morales developed a logic of authentication, based on a philosophy of history first developed as a student of the Dominican theologian Melchor Cano, that symbolically transformed Spain’s Holy Land relics into national treasures.
In Chapter Three, I focus on one aspect of Benito Arias Montano’s biblical commentary, demonstrating how he made use of Sephardic sources and his knowledge of sacred geography to invent one of the most enduring legends of early modern Spanish historiography: that Spain was settled by Jews brought from the Holy Land by Nebuchadnezzar during the Babylonian Captivity. Finally, in Chapter Four I focus on Spanish efforts to build architectural replicas of the Holy Places (i.e. Holy Sepulchers, Via Crucis, etc.) on Iberian soil. I argue that these replicas belong to a larger discourse according to which Spain, by replicating certain salient measures and features of the topography of the Holy Land, was itself considered to be a New Jerusalem.
CONTENTS

Abstract......................................................................................................................................... iii

Acknowledgements.......................................................................................................................... vi

Introduction
 The Holy Land and the
 Problem of History in Philip II’s Spain ......................................................................................... 1

Chapter One
 The Rediscovery of the Levant:
 The Holy Land through Renaissance Eyes .............................................................................. 20

Chapter Two
 Sticks, Stones, and Ancient Bones:
 Relics and the Historical Record .............................................................................................. 61

Chapter Three
 Nebuchadnezzar and the New Jerusalem:
 A National Genealogy in the Renaissance .............................................................................. 108

Chapter Four
 Blueprints for a Holy Land:
 Spain as Replicated Palestine ................................................................................................. 172

Conclusion
 España mirando a Tierra Santa:
 The Holy Land and Spanish Identity....................................................................................... 227

Bibliography .................................................................................................................................. 234
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this dissertation would not have been possible without the kind and generous support of dozens of people across multiple continents. My sincerest thanks are due to Steven Ozment, my doktorvater. I first met Steven in the autumn of 1997, when I, a Harvard undergraduate at the time, sat at his feet in his Western Civilization survey. The fact that he has allowed me to tag along with him for some ten years is nothing short of remarkable; and his subtle wisdom and editorial perspicacity are unparalleled. So, too, are the patience and talents of my other readers, John Edwards and Ann Blair. Ann, in spite of her many other commitments, has always been exceptionally generous with her time and unfailing wisdom. John, as the sole Hispanist on my committee, has rendered heroic and much-appreciated aid on numerous occasions since I first met him in Oxford in the autumn of 2000.

I am also indebted to the kindness and wisdom of other colleagues and mentors who have in numerous ways helped me through the research and writing process. In Madrid, María Tausiet and James Amelang provided much-needed respite from the Biblioteca Nacional, welcoming me into their seminar room and their homes. Expert bibliographer that he is, Jim continues to send me references that remind me that the first stage of wisdom is the recognition of one’s own ignorance. Laura Bass and Ari Zighelboim made life in Madrid, on Cloud Ampáro, a pleasure. At various stages of my research, Kate van Liere, Amanda Wunder, Katie Harris, Erin Rowe, Mary Gaylord, Katy
Park, Moti Feingold, Ted McCormick and Carrie Euler, among many others, have tendered useful advice and criticism.

It is hard to imagine that I will ever again be among such a critical mass of talented people as the cohort of graduate students I am proud to call my peers, both at Harvard and during my Fulbright year in Madrid. I must especially mention John Gagné, Clare Gillis, Erik Heinrichs, Amy Houston, Elizabeth Mellyn, Janna Wasilewski, and Jeff Webb at Harvard, and Matt Crawford, Andrew Devereux, and Nick Bomba from Madrid.

As any good Renaissance scholar knew, scholarly pursuits require the largesse of patient patrons, and I have had a generous share of such help along the way. I would like to thank the Harvard History Department, the Fulbright Commission, the Program for Cultural Cooperation between Spain and United States Universities, and the Real Colegio Complutense for their generous support of my research and writing over the past five years.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my suegros Jorge and Inés, and Francisco, Eliza, Elena, Jorge Luis, Silvana, Marissa, and Christopher, as well as my own parents Ann and Charlie, and my brothers, Andrew and Ben. But none have made half the sacrifices, or brought me half the joy, as has my wife María. It is to her, the object of a very personal Marian devotion, that I dedicate this dissertation.

Cambridge, MA
May 2008
INTRODUCTION

THE HOLY LAND AND THE PROBLEM OF HISTORY IN PHILIP II’S SPAIN

You were left so changed
By comparison with what you were
Before that lamentable decline,
That even when you were rescued
You still did not recognize yourself,
Seeing yourself dressed in foreign and miserable clothes.
With temerous horror,
Your towns destroyed
Without a trace,
And of others their fame,
Like their locations, are hardly remembered;
Having been ladina before,
[Now] you spoke a fleeting aljamia.
   - Gonzalo de Argote y de Molina (1575)

DON GONZALO’S VERSES on the fate of Lady Spain, which form part of the preliminaries of the humanist historian Ambrosio de Morales’ *Antigüedades de las ciudades de España*, are a poignant reminder of the central dilemma that faced the historians of Renaissance Spain. Querying the past in search of noble ancestors with which to adorn the pantheon of their new nation, Morales’ and Argote’s learned peers were often compelled to surrender in the face of the catastrophic discontinuity that the Jewish and Moorish ‘occupations’ of medieval Iberia had inflicted upon the historical memory of

---


“Quedaste tan trocada / De lo que ser solias / Ante de aquel estrago lamentable, / Que siendo rescatada
/ Aun no te conocias / Viéndote en trage extraño y miserable. / Con horror espantable / Tus pueblos destruidos / Sin dellos quedar nombre, / Y de otros el renombre / Apénas con los sitios conocidos. / Y siendo ántes ladina, / Hablabas aljamia peregrina.”
Spain’s Christian communities. In the work to which Argote’s poem was appended, Morales made explicit his colleagues’ common lament over the disruption caused by the Moorish invasion of 711. Thanks to the long centuries of Muslim rule in the Peninsula, Morales complained, many of the towns and cities of modern Spain would never be able to trace their origins back to respectably European, Roman, and/or Christian antiquity, “their fame, like their locations, hardly remembered.” The Moors had changed the names of so many places in the Peninsula, he continued, that many of the most important cities of ancient Spain—places like Almagro, Alcántara, Algeciras, and Guadalajara—lay disguised behind Arabic names, some of which preserved the sense of their Latin antecedents, but most of which did not.  

Even more problematic, of course, was the fact that many of Renaissance Spain’s most important cities and monuments—places like Granada, the Moorish jewel in Fernando and Isabel’s crown—could boast of no Christian antiquity whatsoever. For these communities, it was not merely a question of having lost touch with their classical or Christian origins; these may never have existed at all. For Renaissance Spaniards, the thought of living in communities with ‘no’ history—no history, that is, that they recognized as their own—was too much to bear. Living as we do within a twenty-first century culture focused relentlessly on the future—a culture that encourages us to ‘reinvent’ ourselves, to put the past behind us, to start each day anew—it can be difficult to appreciate this aspect of sixteenth-century culture—the extent to which, in the Renaissance, the past often counted as much, if not more, than the present. Whether at the level of the individual, the family, the city, or even the nation, in the Renaissance the

---

2 Ambrosio de Morales, Antigüedades, 1:80–81.
question, ‘who are you?’ implied at least some obligation to answer the question, ‘who were your ancestors?’ Thus for Spaniards, who spent the Middle Ages attempting to recolonize what remained, even in the sixteenth century, the predominantly Moorish landscape of premodern Iberia, the challenge they faced was not only one of converting Muslims and rechristening mosques, but also of inventing a believable set of Christian traditions and Christian history with which to backfill the enormous void that had consumed some eight centuries of their national existence.3

From the moment that they ascended the newly united thrones of Castile and Aragón in the 1470s, Fernando V of Aragón (r. 1479–1516) and Isabel I of Castile (r. 1474–1504) recognized that the construction of some kind of shared national history—however true or false—should be one of their highest priorities. This was not merely a matter of national pride vis-à-vis other European rulers; Spain’s domestic affairs also lent a practical urgency to their project. Both Fernando and Isabel recognized that they faced strong challenges from a deeply entrenched nobility, and both had experienced firsthand—in the form of the civil warfare endemic to fifteenth-century Spain—the consequences of failing to construct a strong sense of local and national community.4

Fernando and Isabel’s determination to fabricate a national history worthy of their new kingdom corresponded with a period of upheaval in the field of historical scholarship. Beginning in the fifteenth century, a new kind of scholar—the humanist

---


historian, equipped with the latest techniques of source criticism and antiquarian know-how—appeared on the scene ready to help all of Europe’s courts construct older and better pasts for themselves. These humanists brought with them an almost evangelical commitment to the virtues of classical antiquity, and they encouraged their patrons to remake themselves in the image of ancient Greece and Rome. At the same time, however, these humanists’ stated reverence for antiquity often masked what turned out in practice to be a rather conservative methodology, and their impact upon the actual content of most national mythologies was initially quite uneven. In many cases, the partisans of the New Learning merely reworked, albeit in better Latin, the same legendary figures and events already present within the medieval chronicle traditions they proposed to displace. Even the best of the humanists, it seems, encountered antiquity as refracted through the lens of intervening centuries; and as Simon Ditchfield has demonstrated, humanist historians often adapted the contents of hagiographies and other, similar genres of medieval historical writing for reuse in their classicizing narratives.5

In Spain, the Catholic Monarchs’ corps of royal historians—which boasted several of the most distinguished names in the canon of Renaissance historiographers, including the Andalucian humanist Antonio de Nebrija (1444–1522),6 the Sicilian import

---


6 Nebrija edited an edition of Annius of Viterbo’s antiquarian forgeries, and published the very first antiquarian chorography of Spain. See Antonio de Nebrija, Muestra dela istoria quel maestro de Lebrixio dio ala Reina nuestra señora, quando pidio licencia a su Alteza para que pudiesse descubrir i sacar a la luz las antiguedades de España que hasta nuestros dias an estado encubiertas ... (Burgos, 1499). Modern edition in idem, Nebrija: Gramática de la lengua castellana (Salamanca, 1492); Muestra de la istoria de las antiguedades de España; Reglas de orthographia en la lengua castellana, ed. Ignacio González-Llubera (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926).
Lucio Marineo Sículo (ca. 1444–1536), and the Milanese panegyrist Pietro Martire d’Anghiera (1457–1526)—retained virtually unchanged most of the traditional fictions of Spanish history as they found them in the chronicles of medieval Castile. In particular, Fernando and Isabel’s historians alighted upon the writings of the seventh-century bishop S. Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636), whose *History of the Goths* ‘proved’ that Spain had existed as a united, Christian nation since at least the fifth century, when the Visigoths united the Peninsula under a single state. This “Visigothic myth,” as some historians have called it, allowed Fernando and Isabel to describe their rule to both their subjects and foreign powers as a return to the normal, pre-711 state of affairs in Visigothic Spain, making their efforts to unite the fractious constituencies of late medieval Iberia into a mere restoration of the *status quo ante*.10

With the accession of Fernando and Isabel’s grandson Charles V to the thrones of Spain (1516) and the Holy Roman Empire (1519), Spain’s royal chroniclers were

---


8 Martire tutored the Catholic Monarchs’ son Juan and served as the court’s chief panegyrist. He is perhaps best known today for his *De orbe novo* (Alcalá de Henares: Miguel de Eguía, 1530), the first history of the Spanish discovery of the New World.


instructed to refashion their national history to conform to the new, staunchly neo-Roman image of the Spanish Monarchy adopted by Charles. As a result, the king was routinely hailed as a new Caesar, and his vast domains compared favorably to those of the first Roman Empire. Charles’ choice to construct his royal image along neo-Roman lines makes perfect sense; less uniquely Iberian than the Visigothic myth, it was also more triumphally universalist and a better fit for his identity as the Holy Roman Emperor.\textsuperscript{11} It was also, perhaps, a more adequate image in light of Charles’ American empire, which Spaniards had already begun to understand in terms of Roman imperial history.\textsuperscript{12} As J.H. Elliott has argued,

In mentally and physically breaking out beyond the confines of the Pillars of Hercules into a wider world, the Spaniards were conscious of achieving something that surpassed even the feats of the Romans. … This is a fact of great importance for understanding the Spanish—or, more exactly, the Castilian—mentality of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Roman empire became a model and a point of reference for the sixteenth-century Castilians, who looked upon themselves as the heirs and successors of the Romans, conquering an even more extended empire, governing it with justice, and laying down laws which were obeyed to the farthest ends of the earth.\textsuperscript{13}

While Spain’s royal historians succeeded in forwarding a neo-Roman image of the emperor, in other areas their labors fell short. As Richard Kagan has noted, by the end of

\textsuperscript{11} José Antonio Maravall, \textit{Carlos V y el pensamiento político del Renacimiento} (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, 1999).


Charles’ reign, even the constant petitioning of the Cortes and the crown’s decision to fund the position of royal chronicler still had failed to produce a single, unitary chronicle of Spanish history.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, in spite of the best efforts of his father’s royal historians, the project of constructing a satisfactory national history remained unfinished at the time of Philip II’s accession to the Spanish throne in January 1556.

**THE BIBLICAL MONARCHY OF PHILIP II**

There is good reason to believe, based on early state portraits of Philip II (1527–1598), that Charles intended for his son to continue manipulating the neo-Roman image that he had so artfully cultivated for his own reign. Three developments, however, all but guaranteed that Philip would strike out in search of a royal image all his own. First, by the late Renaissance (ca. 1550) the claims of Spain’s Roman origins so integral to Charles’ propaganda no longer seemed quite so exclusive as they had in the early sixteenth century. As more and more historians and antiquarians unearthed an ever greater number of Roman antiquities from European soil, it became clear that Roman origins were a mere fact of life; by 1550, it would have been remarkable to find a European polity that could not claim to have descended from the emperors of Rome. This realization sparked a historiographical arms race, as European courts competed with each other to invent ever more ancient, more noble, and more improbable ancestors.\textsuperscript{15}


Secondly, Philip was not, like his father, the Holy Roman emperor. By his abdication in 1555, Charles—who some alleged had been broken by the experience of trying to impose a personal rule on his vast kingdoms—had concluded that ruling both Spain and the Holy Roman Empire was not a feasible proposition for one man. Accordingly he divided his territories among several heirs, conferring the Roman imperial title upon his younger brother Ferdinand I (r. 1558–1564) while setting aside his Spanish and Dutch possessions for Philip. Philip could, of course, continue to draw Roman analogies; Renaissance propaganda was nothing if not eclectic and agglomerative. At the same time, however, left with a massive empire but no exclusive purchase on the Roman imperial imaginary, Philip thus had an additional incentive to fabricate a new kind of imperial image.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Philip’s reign was characterized from the very start by a difficult relationship with the Papacy. In spite of his famously Catholic reputation, Philip was no ultramontane monarch, and he frequently found himself in open conflict with the Papacy because of both his foreign policy and his ambition to be master of his own ‘national’ church. Perhaps no pope had more strained relations with Philip than Paul IV (Gian Pietro Carafa, 1476–1559), the first of his reign. Within months of his election to the papal throne in May 1555—just months before Philip’s own accession—Paul entered into a secret alliance with Henri II of France (r. 1547–1559) dedicated to sabotaging Spanish interests in Italy. Scion of the proud Carafas of Naples, Paul IV resented Spanish rule over the south of Italy, and he hoped by means of his alliance to return his Neapolitan homeland to the French, who had ruled it intermittently from the thirteenth century until Philip’s great-grandfather Fernando of Aragón definitively
annexed it to the Spanish crown in 1503. Such was Paul’s hatred of the Spanish that, according to the papal historian Leopold von Ranke, he would “pour forth torrents of stormy eloquence against those schismatics and heretics, those accursed of God, that evil generation of Jews and Moors, that scum of the world, and other titles equally complimentary, bestowed with unsparing liberality on everything Spanish.” The Papal- French conspiracy against Philip propitiated the so-called Carafa War—less a war than a protracted skirmish—which concluded with a Spanish victory in the autumn of 1557 when Spanish forces under the command of the Duke of Alba marched to within twenty kilometers of Rome and routed a series of French and papal armies. The resulting treaty “attempted to impose a Spanish alliance on the papacy, or at least to ensure the neutrality of the Papal State.”

Such peace was, however, short-lived. As John Lynch has explained, “There were conflicts between Philip II and almost every pope with whom he dealt, which makes it impossible to explain those conflicts in terms of personalities and points to some deeper and more permanent cause.” Like its French allies, the Counter Reformation papacy feared the economic and military might of Philip’s global empire. It also disliked Philip’s

---


assertions of his royal prerogative to review papal bulls prior to publishing them in his kingdom. Yet one should not go too far in emphasizing these structural patterns at the expense of the many discrete conflicts that marked Philip’s later dealings with Rome. Pius V (r. 1566–1572), meant to be more docile than his predecessor Paul IV, also had a falling out with Philip over the publication of the Tridentine decrees and jurisdictional disputes arising from the Inquisition trial of Philip’s disgraced Archbishop of Toledo, Bartolomé Carranza. Gregory XIII (r. 1572–1585) and Sixtus V (r. 1585–1590), meanwhile, clashed repeatedly with Philip II over Spanish unwillingness to launch a crusade against England.20

In this context of looming conflict and recrimination, Philip and his advisers frequently found themselves searching for arguments and images with which to question Roman authority and counteract the papacy’s anti-Spanish propaganda. Philip’s advisers were keenly aware that the Vatican’s authority derived in large part from the commonly-held belief that Rome had succeeded Jerusalem as Christendom’s new Holy City, a title earned by virtue of a massive campaign of sacred *translatio* comprehending everything from the ministry of S. Peter to the reliquary expropriations of the emperor Constantine’s mother S. Helen.21 Medieval pontiffs had long used this notion of Rome as the reinstatement of Jerusalem as an argument for papal primacy. Roman pilgrimage guides highlighted Rome’s seemingly endless collection of Palestinian *spolia*: the candelabrum

---

20 ibid., 28–31; 36–38.

from the Temple of Solomon, the Veronica, Christ’s manger and swaddling clothes, the Holy Prepuce, the grand staircase of Pilate’s praetorium, dozens of fragments of lignum Crucis, the Holy Lance used by the soldier Longinus to pierce Christ’s side (a gift from the Ottoman Sultan Bayazid II [r. 1481–1512] to Innocent VIII [r. 1484–1492]), and the titulus Crucis, the famous shingle mockingly inscribed “INRI” and mounted on the Cross, to name but a few.22 Papal panegyrists like Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) and Giles of Viterbo (1469–1532) buttressed the argument for a symbolic transfer of sacral power by focusing on the actual fabric of S. Peter’s, the seat of papal power.23 According to Manetti, S. Peter’s was nothing less than the Christian equivalent of Solomon’s Temple, whose existence symbolized the transferral of God’s covenant from the Jews to the Roman Church.24

Indeed, the Renaissance papacy was happy to patronize orators like Mariano de Firenze, OFM (d. 1523) to sustain the legend that old S. Peter’s basilica, the seat of their power, was constructed from the material remains of Jerusalem carted off by the emperors Titus and Vespasian after they razed the city in 70 AD. The basilica’s right-hand door was said to be the famous Golden Gate, and the curious, spiraling columns that


guarded the altar were supposed to have belonged to the Temple of Solomon. One of the doors of the Lateran basilica, also identified with the pope in his capacity as the bishop of Rome, was rumored to have belonged to Pilate’s palace. \(^{25}\) (None of these assertions prevented Julius II (r. 1503–1513) from arguing that, in demolishing old S. Peter’s and rebuilding it anew, he, too, was worthy of being considered a New Solomon.) \(^{26}\)

For Philip and his advisers, determined to undermine Roman authority while asserting the countervailing orthodoxy of the Philippine agenda, the selection of a new royal image was probably an easy one. If the Pope could be a biblical monarch, so, too, could Philip. Philip was, after all, the titular King of Jerusalem, a title he had inherited from his great-grandfather Fernando. Philip debuted his new image in a sermon delivered by the English Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500–1558) upon the occasion of Philip’s marriage to Mary I Tudor (r. 1553–1558). In that sermon, Pole described Philip’s father Charles as a new David, and Philip as a new Solomon. While Philip’s father Charles had failed to extinguish Protestantism, Pole lamented, Philip would; thus, he averred, “I can wel compare [Charles] to David, whiche, though he were a manne elected of God, yet, for that he was contaminate with bloode and war, coulde not builde the temple of Jerusalem, but lefte the finishyng thereof to Salomon [ie. Philip] … .” \(^{27}\) This same image—Philip as Old Testament monarch, a second Solomon (or, occasionally, a second David)—ultimately appeared countless times throughout his reign in a wide range of

---


media and contexts. The most famous example of Philip’s Solomonic self-fashioning must certainly be his grand palace-monastery at El Escorial (1563–1584), which his royal architects designed as a speculative replica of Solomon’s Temple. But the image recurs in dozens of smaller-scale projects as well. In 1559, for example, Philip had the Flemish painter Lucas van Heere (1534–1584) depict him as a new Solomon, sitting on a throne flanked by lions; approximately the same image appeared some twelve years later in one of the plates illustrating Benito Arias Montano’s *Humanae Salutis Monumenta.*

References to Philip as a new Solomon or David abound in Iberian sermon literature; in 1581, at his coronation as the King of Portugal, Philip was introduced to his new subjects as a latter-day David, the same parallel that would appear in the funeral orations that proliferated upon Philip’s death in 1598. As Richard Kagan, Alain Milhou, Geoffrey Parker, and others have noted, the notion of Philip-as-biblical-monarch was so widely diffused that even the regime’s critics manipulated it in order to attack him.

---


31 In the late 1580s, when support for Philip’s rule was at an all-time low in the wake of the Armada catastrophe, his subjects began to predict that a new David would soon appear, this being a direct affront to Philip, the ‘current’ David. Richard L Kagan, *Lucrecia’s Dreams: Politics and Prophecy in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), 73; Alain Milhou, *Colón y su mentalidad mesiánica en el ambiente franciscanista español*, Cuadernos colombinos, 11 (Valladolid: Casa-Museo de Colón, 1983), 245–249.
BIBLICAL KINGSHIP IN ACTION: THE ESCORIAL ‘INSTITUTE’

Renaissance monarchies were nothing if not self-conscious about the royal images they projected. As a result, the royal image tended to have a far-reaching impact upon the nature and themes of the artistic and scholarly productions generated in and around the court.\(^\text{32}\) This was perhaps even more true in the Spain of Philip II, whose image as a biblical monarch fundamentally changed how Spaniards thought about themselves and their history.

Breaking with longstanding Spanish tradition, Philip established a sedentary court at the Escorial, which he outfitted generously with the latest in scholarly technologies. In the palace’s southwest tower, for example, Philip installed a state-of-the-art alchemical lab, which one may visit today with special permission. The glory of the Escorial’s scholarly facilities, however, was its library, reputed to be one of the finest in Christendom.\(^\text{33}\) More than a mere depository of books and curios, Philip’s library was a scholarly “complex” designed to enable the pursuit of a totalizing vision of Spanish identity commensurate with Philip’s royal image.\(^\text{34}\)

In keeping with the ‘biblicization’ of that image, Philip gathered around his library a ‘virtual institute’ for the study of Christian antiquity uniting an unparalleled group of historians, antiquarians, mathematicians, artists, architects, and biblical

\(^{32}\) See, for example, Mario Biagioli, *Galileo, Courtier: The Practice of Science in the Culture of Absolutism*, Science and its Conceptual Foundations (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

\(^{33}\) For the formation of the Escorial’s library, see Fernando Checa, *Felipe Il mecenas de las artes*, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Nerea, 1993), 380–387.

\(^{34}\) ibid., 387.
exegetes. This select group of scholars and artisans included the historians Ambrosio de Morales (1513–1591) and Esteban de Garibay (1533–1599), the hebraizing biblical scholars Martín Martínez de Cantalapiedra (d. 1579), Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598), and fr. Luís de León (ca. 1527–1591), the Hieronymite historian José de Sigüenza (1544–1606), the Jesuit exegetes Jerónimo Prado (1547–1595) and Juan Bautista Villalpando (1552–1608), the architect Juan de Herrera (1530–1593), and the academic painter Pablo de Céspedes (ca. 1540–1608). Through ties of patronage, other érudits, like the Italian Franciscan Bernardino Amico da Gallipoli (fl. late 16th century), were incorporated into the Philippine project, though they did not participate directly in the scholarly life of Philip’s institute.

Though these scholars could expect to be called upon to fulfill a wide range of academic tasks on behalf of their patron—Ambrosio de Morales, for example, was often dispatched in search of rare manuscripts and precious relics hidden in out-of-the-way Spanish churches—their main obligation was to sustain a considerable agenda of scholarly publishing intended to illuminate the world of biblical and patristic antiquity. Their various projects, many of which were published by the great Plantin press in Antwerp, occasionally focused on the glories of Spain’s Christian past; so it was that Philip’s institute produced the first complete edition of S. Isidore of Seville’s works. Alongside these clearly ‘nationalist’ initiatives, however, were a number of other projects

---


focused on reconstructing the ancient civilizations of the biblical Levant. Into this latter category fall such projects as Jerónimo Prado and Juan Bautista Villalpando’s architectonic study of the Temple of Solomon, the results of which were absorbed into Spanish royal architecture even as they were hotly debated by Prado and Villalpando’s colleagues.\(^3^7\) Perhaps the greatest achievement of the institute in this regard was the Polyglot *Biblia Regia* of 1572, completed under Arias Montano’s expert editorship.\(^3^8\)

Through its scholarly and artistic endeavors, Philip’s antiquarian institute forged a vision of the physical Holy Land that was more detailed, more vivid, and more accurate than any other vision yet achieved by the developing discipline of *historia sacra*. It would not be far-fetched to say that they also brought the Holy Land under Spanish control, achieving through academic means that which generations of crusaders had failed to do by force of arms. Philip was one of the first European monarchs to appreciate the extent to which cataloguing, surveying, and collecting the knowledge and objects of his empire could be used not only to make better tactical decisions, but also to make better propaganda.\(^3^9\) Subsumed within the virtual empire of this new Solomon, the

---


\(^3^8\) For the *Biblia Regia*, see Chapter Three.

\(^3^9\) Among Philip’s many efforts to study, chart, and quantify his overseas territories were Juan López de Velasco’s ambitious *Geografía y descripción universal de las Indias* (1571–1574) and Francisco Hernández de Toledo’s (1514–1587) multi-volume American herbarium, written in the course of a seven-year long botanical expedition to Mexico (1571–1578) made at Philip’s request. Closer to home, in the Iberian Peninsula, Philip’s two most famous knowledge-making projects were undoubtedly his
terrain, peoples, and history of the Holy Land would be transposed to Spanish soil as well. There, they would be retooled as the building blocks of a Spanish national identity in which Spain became a new Holy Land—a literal new Jerusalem.

This dissertation explores how, encouraged by the scholarly ‘discovery’ of typological similarities and hidden connections between Spain and the Holy Land, Spaniards came to rewrite their national history. Some would come to think of their homeland as a biblical museum charged with protecting sacred relics imported from the Near East. Some went further, imaginatively rewriting Spanish antiquities to prove Spaniards’ common descent from the original Israelites. Others would go further still, attempting to remake the Iberian Peninsula into a replica of the Holy Land.

In the course of elaborating, updating, publicizing, and defending the Christian image of the Holy Land, Spaniards stumbled upon both the form and content of a discourse of national identity previously lacking in Spanish history. Spaniards learned two things from every encounter they had with the biblical Near East: something about the people, places, or history of the Holy Land; and something about how to create the collective memory and identity of their own people, their own places, and their own history.

INTRODUCTION  |  The Holy Land and the Problem of History  

OUTLINE

The dissertation is divided into four chapters. In the first chapter, I examine three main forces which contributed to the historicization of the Holy Land: the rise of humanist exegesis, the renaissance of the ancient ideal of learned travel, and the Spanish Monarchy’s close relationship with the Franciscan Order and its *Custodia Terrae Sanctae*, which provided Philip’s biblical project with much of its justification as well as a few of its most important scholars. In exploring these three themes, I attempt to draw out several other tropes that will reappear in the works produced by the Escorial, such as the notion that Spain’s deeply-rooted Jewish population could be considered an asset rather than a liability to its Christian self-image.

In the following three chapters, I look more closely at the group of ecclesiastics, historians, antiquarians, artists, and architects gathered around Philip’s court, recovering the ways in which their imaginative pursuit of a more historicized vision of the Holy Land also served Spaniards’ need for a solidly Christian national history and image.

In Chapter Two, I focus on the humanist historian Ambrosio de Morales’ efforts to defend the authenticity of Holy Land relics in Spanish collections. I argue that Morales developed a logic of authentication, based on a philosophy of history first developed as a student of the Dominican theologian Melchor Cano (1509–1560), that symbolically transformed Spain’s Holy Land relics into national treasures.

In Chapter Three, I focus on one aspect of Benito Arias Montano’s biblical commentary, demonstrating how he made use of Sephardic sources and his knowledge of sacred geography to invent one of the most enduring legends of early modern Spanish
historiography: that Spain was settled by Jews brought from the Holy Land by Nebuchadnezzar during the Babylonian Captivity.

Finally, in Chapter Four I focus on Spanish efforts to build architectural replicas of the Holy Places (ie. Holy Sepulchers, Via Crucis, etc.) on Iberian soil. I argue that these replicas belong to a larger discourse according to which Spain, by replicating certain salient measures and features of the topography of the Holy Land, was itself considered to be a New Jerusalem.
CHAPTER ONE

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE LEVANT:
THE HOLY LAND THROUGH RENAISSANCE EYES

THE SEVILLAN HUMANIST Pero Mexía (ca. 1496–1551) was the rarest of things in sixteenth-century Spain: a best-selling author of secular histories. At a time when Spain’s bestseller lists were dominated by devotional works like Francisco de Osuna’s Abecedario espiritual (1525–1554) and Luis de Granada’s Guía de Pecadores (1567), Mexía—correspondent of Erasmus, veinticuatro [city elder] of Seville, and, after 1548, royal chronicler to Emperor Charles V (r. 1516–1556)—managed instead to become an international sensation with his witty and readable Silva de varia lección (1540), a compendium of seemingly random erudition recognizable as part of a tradition of Golden Age miscellanies that also includes Antonio de Torquemada’s Jardín de flores curiosas (1570) and Julián de Medrano’s Silva curiosa (1583).1 The Silva sold so well in its first edition that a second, enlarged edition was printed almost immediately. A third edition, even further revised and expanded, would roll off the presses in Valladolid in 1551, just before Mexía’s death.2

Though on the surface it adheres to many of the conventions one expects to find in a popular miscellany, upon closer inspection Mexía’s book reveals hints of something

---


much more ambitious than the grab bag of recipes, folktales, and popular myths that characterized the genre. Much of the book, it turns out, is serious history of the highest standard; indeed, as one reads through it, it is hard to avoid the impression that Mexía composed the *Silva* out of castaway fragments of an unfinished universal history. Quite a lot of this piecemeal history focuses on the Near East, and on Jerusalem in particular; one can easily gather, out of the fragments scattered across the work’s four books, more or less complete histories of the Crusades, of the Templars, and of the origins of Islam. The most sustained history, however, appears in the final three chapters of the fourth book, which narrate the entire history of the city of Jerusalem from its founding down to the thirteenth century.³

While generations of readers have passed over Mexía’s history of the Holy City without comment (except, perhaps, to note that it is somewhat dry in its particulars), there is something remarkable about his narrative. Quite unusually for the period, Mexía’s history attempts to reconstruct the history of Jerusalem in the same terms and with the same methods as his humanist contemporaries had begun to apply to other historical places and eras. In Mexía’s able hands, the history of Jerusalem becomes almost indistinguishable from the great mass of civic chorographies penned by Renaissance historians.⁴ The reader is told, for example, that the name of the city of Jerusalem has changed on many occasions throughout its history; that David aggrandized the city in the manner of a Renaissance prince, adding “alcaçares” [castles] to its fortifications; and that the Jews left the fields around Jerusalem fallow for exactly fifty-two years during the

---

³ Mexía, *Silva*, 434–481.

Babylonian Captivity. The parallel with secular history is clear from Mexia’s sources; while references to Scripture obviously predominate, Mexia also cross-referenced the biblical narrative against other authors—chiefly Tacitus, Strabo, and Josephus for the early period, with Nicholas of Lyra and Crusader epics filling in the later centuries—in an attempt to add both greater accuracy and greater depth to his account. Finally, the unusual nature of Mexia’s history is also apparent from his decision to downplay, and even elide, providential explanations in his account of Jerusalem’s many destructions and restorations. In Mexia’s narrative, God has a role to play, but it is restrained—though he naturally desires to see his Chosen People victorious, and participates in their world, he never intervenes on their behalf.

Mexia’s attempt to write the history of Jerusalem according to historiographical conventions normally reserved for secular history, while rather modest in and of itself, is merely one example—an indicator, perhaps—of a sweeping scholarly transformation underway in the sixteenth century. The Christian Holy Land had long loomed in Western consciousness primarily as the eternal, “celestial” Jerusalem of Revelation. Now, however, across the course of more than a century, historians like Mexia would move decisively to reconstitute Jerusalem as a concrete place with a human history susceptible to scholarly research and reconstruction.

---

5 Mexia, Silva, 436–441, 457.
6 For examples, see ibid., 434 & 437.
7 ibid., 452.
8 As Arnaldo Momigliano demonstrated in his seminal essay on “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” the same transformation can be observed in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century attitudes toward the canon of ancient historians. While medieval historiographers took ancient historians at face value, in the Renaissance humanists began to regard their classical predecessors as equals, debating and critiquing their histories as if they were simply one more group of fallible historians. Arnaldo Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 13 (1950): 285–315.
This transition away from a timeless, idealized Holy Land toward a more secularized understanding of its terrestrial history was a crucial element in the ‘biblicization’ of the Spanish Monarchy under Philip II. By rehabilitating the Holy Land as a material, historical place, Spaniards were able to incorporate it into European historical time, absorbing its peoples and objects into a grand narrative not only of human history but also of the Spanish nation. As we shall see in a subsequent chapter, Spaniards were keen to claim descent from the Israelites; this implied, however, that they would be able to discover who, where, and when their putative ancestors were, and when they might have migrated to Iberia. The same was true of the Holy Land’s landscape: in order to claim, as they would, that Spain replicated the essential qualities of the Holy Land’s sacred terrain, Spanish scholars would first have to form a reasonably naturalistic impression of how the Holy Land’s terrain actually looked.

The goal of this chapter, then, will be to survey the development and contours of the scholarly and religious movements that facilitated this recovery of the ‘real’ Holy Land wie es eigentlich gewesen. Though many factors must have contributed to the rise of a historicized view of the Holy Land, this chapter focuses on the three which are most relevant to the distinctive Spanish story that will unfold in later chapters: humanist exegesis, learned travel, and the Franciscan Custodia Terrae Sanctae.

THE ORIGINS OF ANTIQUARIAN EXEGESIS

In the early sixteenth century, a new breed of scholars—one could call them biblical antiquarians, though they might have preferred the term critici sacri9—began to appear in Europe’s courts and universities arguing that a deeper understanding of the

9 See the monumental seventeenth-century English Critici sacri, sive, Doctissimorum vivorum in ss. Biblia annotationes, & tractatus, 9 vols. (London: Jacob Flesher et al., 1660).
landscape in which biblical events occurred, and biblical authors wrote, would lead
naturally to a truer understanding of the meaning of Scripture. Of particular interest to
them was the physical appearance and disposition of the Holy Land, the ‘theater’ in
which biblical history had played itself out. Characteristic of their arguments was that
which the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1466–1536) made in his 1518 Ratio
seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam. According to Erasmus, a
good understanding of the Holy Land was essential to Biblical exegesis because
once we learn from cosmographers about the [Biblical] regions, we can
follow the shifting scenes of the story in our minds, as if we were being
carried along with it, as if we were witnessing the events and not reading
about them. This is not unpleasurable; moreover, what you read in such a
way will stick much faster in your mind. And when we have learned
from historical books about the peoples among whom the events hap-
pened, or whom the Apostles were addressing—not only where they lived,
but also their origin, customs, institutions, religion, and character—a mar-
velous amount of light and, as it were, life will be added to our reading.
But that reading must be yawningly tedious, and dead, for people who are
ignorant of these things, and indeed of the words for nearly everything.


In searching for the source of this new commitment to material evidence, one might note
how closely Erasmus’ injunction to study Near Eastern topography echoes the treatises of
contemporary antiquarians like Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), Cyriac of Ancona
(1391–ca. 1453), and Biondo Flavio (1392–1463), all of whom complemented their
textual scholarship with the study of ancient geography. He who would truly understand
Rome, they argued, must know the topography and climate of the ancient Roman
countryside as well as the rhetoric of Cicero.

Indeed, the antiquarian obsession with geographical knowledge is visible in the
impassioned *Rudimentaria in Geographiam Catechesis sequitur* with which the German
humanist Joachim von Watt (1484–1551) prefaced his edition of the Roman geographer
Pomponius Mela’s *De situ orbis*, published in the very same year as Erasmus’ *Ratio*.
Watt’s preface makes the same argument concerning the value of geography to the
historian. Citing the authority of the ancient geographer Strabo (ca. 64 BC–ca. 25 AD),
who argued that geographers’ “knowledge both of the heavens and of things on land and
sea, animals, plants, fruits, and everything else to be seen in various regions” enables
them to write an unparalleled kind of “terrestrial history … of importance to these men
who are concerned as to whether this or that is so or otherwise, and whether known or
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12 The historiography of Renaissance antiquarianism is large and ever-expanding. See, among others,
William Stenhouse, *Reading Inscriptions and Writing Ancient History: Historical Scholarship in the
Late Renaissance* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2005); Christopher S. Wood, “Maximilian I
as Archeologist,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 58 (2005): 1128–1174; Daniel Woolf, “Varieties of Anti-
141–182; Massimo Miglio et al., *Antiquaria a Roma: Intorno a Pomponio Leto e Paolo II* (Rome:
Roma nel Rinascimento, 2003); Anthony Grafton, “The Ancient City Restored: Archaeology, Ecclesi-
astical History, and Egyptology,” in idem, *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation* (Cambridge,
MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 31–61; Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and
Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999);
Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Eric W. Cochrane, *Historians and Historiog-
raphy in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1981); and Roberto Weiss,
unknown.”13 Watt declared that “In truth, neither history nor literature can be fully and correctly understood without Geography.”14 In the hands of the humanists, these ancillary disciplines came alive once more, and geographical acumen became one of the prime criteria by which professional scholars were judged. Paeans to the explanatory power of geography became a commonplace of the sixteenth-century European *artes historicae*.15

While the ‘antiquarian revolution’ of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries doubtlessly influenced the antiquarian turn in biblical scholarship, it is important to note that would-be biblical antiquarians could cite an additional, unimpeachably Christian precedent for their interest in the geographical and material contexts of Scripture: namely, the critical practice of S. Jerome (d. 419), translator of the Vulgate and the humanists’ favorite Church father.16 Against the criticism of influential contemporaries like Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 335–394), who denounced Palestine as a wicked and worthless land “because it had drunk in the blood of the Lord” and dismissed the study of the Holy Places as “Judaizing,”17 Jerome—who spent the final four decades of his life

---


living in Bethlehem—argued that no exegete could understand the historical narrative encapsulated within the Bible without first familiarizing himself with the historical sites of Old- and New-Testament Judea.\(^{18}\) In the Preface to his Latin translation of the Septuagint’s version of the Book of Chronicles (\textit{Paralipomenon}), written in 387, Jerome argued that

In the same way that one understands better the Greek historians when one has seen Athens with his own eyes, and the third book of the \textit{Aenead} when one has journeyed from Troade to Sicily and from Sicily to the mouth of the Tiber, so one understands better the Holy Scriptures when one has seen Judea with one’s own eyes and contemplated the ruins of its ancient cities.\(^{19}\)

Jerome repeated the comparison five years later, in a letter sent from Bethlehem to the Roman aristocrat Marcella in the hope of persuading her to join him in the Holy Land.

Writing in the name of his charges Paula and Eustochium, he lauded the bishops, the martyrs, the divines, who have come to Jerusalem from a feeling that their devotion and knowledge would be incomplete and their virtue without the finishing touch, unless they adored Christ in the very
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\(^{19}\) Jerome, \textit{Praefatio in Librum Paralipomenon de graeco emmendato} (395), in \textit{Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad codicum fidem ...}, vol. 7: \textit{Liber Verborum dierum} (Rome, 1948), 7–10. “quomodo grecorum historias magis intellegunt qui athenas uiderint, et tertium uergilii librum qui troade per leucaten et acroceraunia ad siciliam et inde ad ostia tiberis nauigarint, ita sanctam scripturam lucidius intuebitur qui iudaem oculis contemplatus est et antiquarum urbiurn memorias locorum que uel eadem uocabula uel mutata cognouerit.”
spot where the gospel first flashed from the gibbet. If a famous orator [ie. Cicero of Cæcilius] blames a man for having learned Greek at Lilybæum instead of at Athens, and Latin in Sicily instead of at Rome (on the ground, obviously, that each province has its own characteristics), can we suppose a Christian’s education complete who has not visited the Christian Athens?20

Thus it was every serious Christian’s duty to study the topography of Palestine, God’s classroom. In an effort to encourage such studies, Jerome translated Eusebius of Caesarea’s Greek *Onomasticon* (ca. 330), a rough sort of biblical atlas, into Latin as the *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraeorum* in ca. 390.21

Jerome’s determination to incorporate geographical data into his exegesis was to lead him into a second methodological commitment, which also would prove to be of lasting import. In the 380s, as he moved between Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and Caesarea conducting the preliminary research that would inform his famous Vulgate Bible, Jerome recognized that eyewitness travel had its limitations, and that he would have to supplement the geographical and ethnographical information gleaned from it with sources closer to the world in which the Scriptures were originally composed. For this, he embraced Hebrew texts—what he called the *Hebraica veritas*—arguing, quite rightly, that the Jewish tradition must represent a great, untapped storehouse of knowledge about the places (not to mention the peoples and customs) of the Hebrew Bible.22 In his *De

---

20 Jerome [as “Paula & Eustochium”], Epistle 46, 63–64.
hebraicis quaestionibus (ca. 388), he exhorted the exegete to seek help in the Hebrew “to make plain through consideration of the native language the etymologies of objects, of names, and of territories which have no meaning in our own language.”

In the De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraeorum, his aforementioned translation of Eusebius’ Onomasticon, Jerome noted that the Hellenized Jew Philo, the notorious polymath Origen, and his near-contemporary Eusebius had all employed the Hebraica veritas to great profit. He explained that

after he had written … the book in which he set forth the names of the different nations and those given to them of old by the Jews and by those of the present day, the topography of the land of Judea and the portions allotted to the tribes, together with a representation of Jerusalem itself and its temple, which he accompanied with a very short explanation, Eusebius bestowed his labour at the end of his life upon this little work, of which the design is to gather for us out of the Holy Scriptures the names of almost all the cities, mountains, rivers, hamlets, and other places, whether they remain the same or have since been changed or in some degree corrupted.

Paradoxically, given his decades of residence in Bethlehem and frequent exhortations regarding the value of seeing the Holy Land with one’s own eyes, Jerome’s simultaneous insistence on the value of Hebrew learning for ‘antiquarian’ research contributed to the transformation of his research agenda into an almost purely etymological, bookish pursuit in the Middle Ages.

Jerome’s commitment to adorning his commentaries with knowledge of the peoples, places, and things of the Holy Land garnered through mastery of the Hebraica

---


25 Onomasticon.
veritas was passed down through the Middle Ages to the Renaissance via a long chain of
medieval exegetes interested in the sensus literalis of Scripture. As Beryl Smalley has
shown, such ‘antiquarianizing’ and ‘hebraizing’ exegesis was particularly associated with
the Franciscan Order and its scholarly friars like Hugh of S. Victor (ca. 1078–1141) and
Robert Grossteste (ca. 1175–1253). The most famous of these Franciscan literalists,
however, was undoubtedly the late medieval commentator Nicholas of Lyra (ca. 1270–
1349). Lyra, who made extensive use of Hebraic commentaries, also illustrated his
glosses with maps and sketches of biblical architecture in the belief that their sacred
measures and divine proportions concealed new layers of understanding to the text.

With such authorities as these, it should be no surprise that by the mid-sixteenth
century the universities and royal courts of Europe were beginning to play host to a
virtual respublica litterarum sacrarum determined to read the Bible not as so many of
their medieval predecessors had done—as a collection of moral allegories—but rather as
a historical record of the civilizations of ancient Israel, no different from the histories of

26 On medieval interest in the literal sense of scripture, see Steven Ozment, The Age of Reform, 1250–
1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe (New Haven,
CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 67–72; Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages
(Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 1964); idem, English Friars and Antiquity in the
Early Fourteenth Century (Oxford: Blackwell, 1960). On medieval Hebraists in particular, see (in ad-
tinction to Smalley) Berthold Altaner, “Zur Kenntnis des Hebräischen im Mittelalter,” Biblische
Zeitschrift 21 (1938): 288–308; Samuel Berger, Quam notitiam Hebraicae habuerint Christiani Medii

27 Note, however, that Spanish Dominicans demonstrated a healthy interest in oriental languages as well.
See André Berthier, “Un maître orientaliste du XIIIe siècle: Raymond Martin, O.P.,” Archivum
Fratrum Praedicatorum 6 (1936): 267–311; idem, “Les écoles de langues orientales fondées au XIIIe

28 Deeana Copeland Klepper, “Nicholas of Lyra’s Questio de adventu Christi and the Franciscan encoun-

29 On Lyra’s exegesis, see the essays in See Philip D.W. Krey & Lesley Smith, eds., Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); E.A.

30 The term is Debora Shuger’s; see her study of The Renaissance Bible, 13.
ancient Greece or Rome. One of the chief centers of this republica was located in Spain, at the University of Alcalá.

**ALCALÁ AND THE HEBRAICA VERITAS**

Though sixteenth-century Spain has acquired a reputation as a ‘closed’ society, hostile to both religious minorities and international scholarship, one must remember that it was within Spanish territory, and under the patronage and supervision of Spanish maecenae and scholars, that two of the sixteenth century’s great scholarly bibles—Cardinal Cisneros’ Complutensian Polyglot (1514–1517) and Philip II’s Biblia Regia or Antwerp Polyglot (1572)—were produced.31 Both of these bibles originated in the intellectual humus of the University of Alcalá, founded for the express purpose of promoting polyglot biblical scholarship by the Franciscan Cardinal Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros (1436–1517) in 1508.32

The Complutensian Polyglot, sponsored by Cisneros, was a scholarly undertaking of prodigious proportions, requiring an editorial team capable of collating and reconciling Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldean [Aramaic] manuscripts specially procured from the Vatican with the Vulgate text of the Bible. By the time the manuscript went to press, in 1514, the list of participants in Cisneros’ team read like a who’s who of early sixteenth-century Spanish humanists. Among those in charge of the Greek and Latin texts were the

---


great Antonio de Nebrija (1444–1522), the “Greek Commander” Hernán Núñez de Toledo (ca. 1470–1553), and Erasmus’ bitter foe Diego López de Zúñiga [aka Stunica] (d. 1531). Cisneros’ Hebraists were, perhaps, an even more distinguished group, including the *conversos* Pedro Ciruelo (ca. 1470–1548), Alonso de Zamora (ca. 1474–ca. 1544), and Pablo Coronel (1480–1534). While the majority of their labors were directed toward philological criticism, this team was also able at least to aspire to Jerome’s totalizing exegetical method by incorporating a modicum of geographical and archaeological knowledge into its scholarship. Nebrija composed a dictionary of biblical toponyms on the model of Eusebius’ *Onomasticon*, while contributing editor Demetrios Doukas—a Greek emigré who had spent time in Constantinople (where he had practiced his epigraphical skills, he noted in his preface to the Polyglot’s New Testament volume)—was able to critique the Greek text of the New Testament on the basis not only of philological knowledge, but also of observed liturgy.

Though the members of Cisneros’ team disbanded following the Polyglot’s publication, Alcalá remained the epicenter of Spanish biblical humanism for the rest of the sixteenth century. In the 1530s and 1540s, the *converso* Hebraists Ciruelo, Zamora, and Coronel were joined by a second generation of superstar exegetes like the Cistercian

---


parallel to their expanded use of hermetic and classical authors. Under their patronage, the works of medieval and contemporary Jewish commentators like David Kimchi (ca. 1160–ca. 1235), Yohanan Isaac ben Allemanno (1435–1504), Flavius Mithridates (fl. late 15th c., translator of Kabbalistic texts for Pico della Mirandola and Sixtus IV), and Elias Levita (1469–1549, tutor to Reuchlin and Giles of Viterbo) became the object of serious study.  

The Hebraists of Alcalá generally went even further than their northern colleagues in their willingness to use the works of Hebrew scholars to question received authority—even (and especially) the received wisdom of Jerome’s Vulgate. As Lu Ann Homza has noted, Pedro Ciruelo’s interlineated Hebrew-to-Latin translations of the Old Testament, which he produced in the 1520–1530s, essentially amounted to an extended assault on the authority of Jerome’s text. Though he veiled his criticism in de rigeur denunciations of Jewish blindness, he also attacked the insufficiency of Jerome’s sources, the inconsistencies between his biblical commentaries and biblical translations, and his overall ignorance and laxity as a translator, deeming the Vulgate a paraphrase rather than a translation. By contrast with the circumstances under which Jerome had labored, he argued, sixteenth-century Spain was a translator’s paradise: surrounded by so many

---


38 Homza, Religious Authority, 83 n. 20.

39 ibid., 83–94.
Jewish academies, said Ciruelo, Spanish expositors should find it comparatively easy to learn from them how the Bible ought really—i.e. literally—to be understood. 40 For the Christian humanists of Alcalá, Spanish Jews constituted a new sort of living *Hebraica veritas*.

**PEREGRINATIO: THE RENAISSANCE OF LEARNED TRAVEL**

While the scholars of Alcalá sat hunched over their Hebrew grammars, an entirely different kind of student—less textual, and more visual—began to appear along the trade- and pilgrimage routes between Europe and the Levant.

Though the Spanish pilgrim Pedro de Escobar Cabeza de Vaca would complain in the prologue to his *Luzero de la Tierra Sancta* (1587) that far too few Spaniards made the journey to Jerusalem—“in our Spain,” he lamented, “the journey is considered to be very dangerous and difficult, and perhaps even impossible” even though it was “in fact so easy, flat, and enjoyable”—the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries marked a veritable Golden Age in Spanish pilgrimage to the Levant. While the number of surviving pilgrimage guides is surely a poor measure of the total amount of pilgrim traffic in the period, it is significant that, after several centuries’ absence, Spaniards rejoined the rolls of pilgrimage authors at a very respectable rate in the sixteenth century. 41 On the sole basis of their guidebooks, we know of Iberian travelers visiting the Levant in 1485, 1494, 40 ibid., 94. According to Ciruelo, “in hac nostra Hispania (in qua erant multae Judeorum achademiae) … sine fictione ulla nos docuerunt veteris testamenti secreta literalia.” See his *Pentateuci Mosayci veridicam interpretationem ad verbam* (Salamanca, 1536), f. 2v.

1502–1503, 1508, 1512, 1518–1519, 1523, 1529–1530, 1584–1585, and 1590. Some of these accounts—such as the Franciscan Antonio de Aranda’s *Verdadera informacion de la Tierra Santa*—became instant best-sellers; Aranda’s book went through ten editions between its first printing in 1531 and its last in 1584.

This rejuvenation of travel between Spain and the Near East was important to the ‘antiquarianization’ of biblical scholarship, and the emergence of a more historicized picture of the Holy Land, in several ways. To be a proper historian or antiquarian, as we have seen, contemporaries believed that one had to learn as much as possible about the land under study—not only where everything was located, but also how those places looked, how many people lived in them, and what customs they followed. For armchair antiquarians interested in the biblical Levant, this meant reading detailed descriptions of the Holy Land and studying reliable views and maps of its ruins—the only examples of which were to be found in illustrated pilgrim narratives like those written by (not to mention those translated and printed for) these newly active pilgrims. The single most important pilgrimage account in this regard was that written by the German pilgrim Bernard von Breydenbach (d. 1497) and beautifully—and more importantly, realistically—illustrated by Erhard Reuwich, which was published throughout Europe in multiple Latin, German, French, and Spanish editions between 1484 and 1498. By
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43 Antonio de Aranda, *Verdadera informacion de la tierra sancta, selon la dispusicion que en el año de mil y quinientos y treynta el auctor la vio y passeo* (Alcalá de Henares: Miguel de Eguía, 1531). Aranda’s account was reprinted as follows: Toledo, Juan de Ayala, 1537; Seville, Juan Cromberger, 1539; Toledo, Fernando de Santa Catalina, 1545; Toledo, Juan Ferrer, 1550; Alcalá de Henares, 1552; Alcalá de Henares, 1562; Alcalá de Henares, 1563; 1568; and Alcalá de Henares, Hernán Ramírez, 1584.

44 For a sampling of the first fifty years of editions and translations, see: *Die heyligen Reyssen gen Jherusalem* (Mainz: Erhard Reuwich, 1486); *Peregrinatio in terram sanctam* [in French], trans. Nico-
reading and studying Reuwich’s fold-out woodcuts of Near Eastern scenes, the immobile historian could gain at least proxy access to the sort of vivid visual knowledge of the Levant that Erasmus and others demanded of their scholarly peers. Thanks to Reuwich’s precision, moreover, Breydenbach’s readers were exposed to a much less idealized, and much more naturalistic, view of the Levant in its chaotic and ruined splendor.45

For more intrepid souls, nothing could take the place of actually making the journey to Palestine in person, and here again the revitalized contact between Spain and the Levant facilitated some of the first moments of recognition that the reality of the Holy Land was quite a bit more complicated—and more historically contingent—than the idealized, timeless tableau which Europeans had forged for themselves from the other shore of the Mediterranean. The jarring conflict which Renaissance travelers began to detect between their timeless image of the Holy Land and the impermanence of its actual monuments is nicely illustrated by the experience of one of the Catholic Monarchs’ most distinguished humanists, Pietro Martire d’Anghiera (1457–1526).46

In 1501–1502, Martire traveled to Egypt on behalf of his sovereigns, Fernando and Isabel, to renegotiate the terms of their anti-Ottoman alliance with the Mamluk
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sultanate. Martire, who was Milanese by birth, was an early proponent of antiquarian studies in Spain, and he took ample advantage of his embassy to “research … the nature of the country, the customs of its inhabitants, the power of its slaves, and of all other aspects that seemed to me worthy of commemorating.” Still en route to the Levant, he used a seven-day delay in Pola to research the city’s antiquities. He did the same in “Jadera” (Zara), in Dalmatia, where he was forced to stop by the weather. There, he “visited the body of the blessed Simon, the prophet, buried there (as the jadertinos prove with many testimonies) with full honors, and his body is still perfectly preserved. I marveled at the fact that that body—treated neither with myrrh, nor balsam, nor any medicament whatsoever—could remain uncorrupted for so long.”

Once in Egypt, Martire made the obligatory survey of the pyramids and Alexandrian obelisks; but the destination that he most yearned to see was the village of Matarea. Located approximately a league outside of Cairo, Matarea was one of the most


48 Maritre, Legatio, f. A viii. “de regionis natura, de incolarum moribus, de seruorum imperio ceterisue rebus qui memoratu mihi digna visa sunt pro tempore scrutatus sum.”

49 ibid. “Quo tempore duobus theatris antiquis et vetustarem rerum plurium epitaphiis illustratarum vesti- tigii insignem fuisse urblem pollam cognoui. Quapropter quom in mentem venisset splendidissimam vestram curiam generosis iuuenibus ingenio pollentibus et antiquitatum studiosis esse omni tempore ornatam non absonum mihi visum fuit ex epitaphiis aliqua quorum pleraque vetustate collapse alia fragmentata iam sunt colligere de manibus pollesium quaedam extorsi … .”

50 ibid., f. A iii. “Ubi multis veterum monumentis illustratam Jaderam comperimus, ex quibus scripta marmoribus haec epitaphia annotavi. … . Ibi etiam beati Simeonis prophetae corpus (ut iadertini multis testimonis probant) honorifice sepultum atque adhuc integrum salutau. Admiratutque sum tanto tempore simplex sine myrrha aut balsamo cadauer, quod nullo medicamento fucatum est potuisse incorruptum servari.”
important of the ‘second-tier’ shrines scattered throughout Anatolia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt which, together with the cardinal sites in and around Jerusalem and Galilee, constituted the Holy Land of Renaissance imagination. Biblically speaking, Matarea’s modest importance derived from its role in the Holy Family’s flight into Egypt, the brief exile occasioned by Herod’s Murder of the Innocents (described, albeit sparingly, in Matthew 2:13–18). According to legend, the Holy Family had sheltered in a stand of trees on the edge of the village; ever since their departure, these trees were said to secrete a precious natural balsam with prodigious curative properties.  

In anticipation of his journey to the Levant, Martire had read and digested several medieval guidebooks that reported on the balsam trees of Matarea. The most important of these in shaping Martire’s expectations was the highly fictionalized travel account written ca. 1450 by the Córdoban nobleman Pero Tafur, who many scholars now believe embellished, or perhaps even invented, his account in order to gain in reputation and advance his social status. In the course of his alleged travels through the known world, Tafur, too, claimed to have visited Matarea. “Matarea is a great orchard enclosed by a wall,” he reported,

and in it is the garden where the balsam grows. It is about sixty or seventy square feet in extent, and here it grows, and it resembles two year old vine, and they collect it in the month of October. The Sultan comes with great ceremony to collect the oil, and they say that there is so little that it does not reach half an _azumbre_ of our measure.  

---


52 An _azumbre_ is an archaic Castilian unit of measure, equivalent to approximately two liters.
and boil them in the oil and deliver them to the world as balsam. Having finished gathering the roots, they commence at once to cultivate the ground, and they take specially prepared cuttings and drive them in, and they water them with that water which Our Lady, the Virgin, called forth in that place when she was fleeing with her Son into Egypt. It is a place of great devotion for us Christians. When they have watered the plants with that water the next day they find they have taken root. Many times they have tried to water them with Nile or other water, but the roots dry up at once. As one goes out from this garden there is a very great fig-tree, which produces figs of the Pharoah, which are red, and inside the trunk is a little building like a small chapel. The tree, they say, opened of itself, and there Our Lady and her Son hid when they were in danger of capture.53

Martire too would visit the famous Matarea spring toward the end of his embassy, on 8 February 1502; it was, he reckoned, some ten thousand paces outside of Cairo. He hoped to locate the precious balsam that Tafur mentioned; much to his dismay, however, he found the site in ruins, the balsam completely gone. Upon arriving, Martire explained,

we entered a palace, which appeared to be a royal palace from its size and facade. But it was ruined and deserted within, since the balsam trees have all disappeared. … What sorrow! These trees, of such exquisite balsam have disappeared. No one knows whether it was caused by the carelessness of the guards, fraud, envious tricks, or in order to wound religion and piety.54

Stricken by the tragic loss of the balsam grove, Martire sought in vain for explanations. Had his guidebooks lied? Or were the holiest of shrines truly this impermanent?

Antonio de Aranda was similarly disappointed by the state in which he found Jerusalem when he arrived in the Holy Land in 1529; the yawning chasm between

---


54 Martire, Legatio, ff. Bv"igitur die sexto ydus februarii qui nostrae quadragesimae primus eo anno fuit (ubi primum eluxit) mataream versus proficiscimur : palatium primo aspectu et prima fronte regali mole constructum ingredimus : in internis autem dirutum eo quod desertum ex quo balsami arbusta interiere. Illuc enim quo tempore balsamum coligebatur soldani relaxandi animi gratia sese quotannis conferebant. Proh dolor! adeo pretiosi arbusta liquoris interiere: sed incertum an custodum incuria an fraudel doloue et inuidia an religione et pietate laesa id acciderit.”
Jerusalem’s traditional image in Christian thought and its modern, less exalted, reality is one of the dominant motifs of his best-selling pilgrimage account. Aranda did not attempt to hide his disdain for the demography and ecology of the contemporary Holy City. Where his reading of Josephus had led him to expect to find something resembling the Judean “Promised Land” described in the Scriptures, Aranda found instead a dilapidated, modern city manifestly in decline, its population reduced to a mere 6000 Muslims, Christians, and Jews in the wake of the Ottomans’ 1516 conquest of Palestine.55 The city’s infrastructure was failing; its buildings lay in heaps of rubble. Aranda warned his reader that Josephus’ famous description of “the fertility and beauty and population was with respect to the time in which the Israelites possessed the land peacefully;”

because if we regard its current state, after so many destructions, most of the best of the Promised Land in general, and especially in Judea, is lacking. … This province of which we speak is especially destroyed, because it has been overrun more times by Moors and Christians alike, and ultimately, by Turks for the past twelve years. … And it would not be untruthful to affirm as well that the land was punished and stripped of its fertility and beauty … because of the wickedness of its inhabitants.56

The shock and disappointment of ‘rediscovery’ that greeted Martire and Aranda expose one of the more interesting fault lines in Renaissance biblical antiquarianism. The thoroughgoing compatibility—or even the identity—of learned travel and pilgrimage has
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55 The figure of 6000 inhabitants corresponds to 1525. While that number climbed considerably to approximately 16,000 in 1553, it then declined again in the latter half of the century. See Amnon Cohen & Bernard Lewis, *Population and Revenue in the Towns of Palestine in the Sixteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), 94.

56 Aranda, *Verdadera información*, f. 9r. “Esta fertilidad y esta hermosura y poblacion se ha de entender haviendo respecto al tiempo en que los hijos de isrrael la posseyeron pacificamente: porque si tenemos ojo al tiempo de agora depues de tantas destrucciones lo mas y mejor falta en toda la tierra de promision en general y en esta de Judea en especial. Ca dado que toda este muy destruyda y atalada: mucho mas aquesta provincia de quien hablamos lo esta por aver sido mas vezes assi de moros como de xpinanos y ultimamente agora doze anos de turcos conquistada. … E no seria contra verdad afirmar que por la malicia de los moradores de la tierra tambien fuesse punida y castigada y perdiessse la fertilidad y hermosura que por ventura allende de su natural dios le avia dado por la bondad de los patriarchas a quien la prometia: y los sanctos varones que la avian de posseer.”
a long pedigree in the Western tradition. One could point, for example, to the character of Demetrius of Tarsus in Plutarch’s first-century dialogue *On the Decline of the Oracles*, who was said to have traveled on imperial orders as far as Britain “for the purposes of investigation and sightseeing.” Pausanias’ second-century *Description of Greece* is perhaps the most comprehensive example of antique ‘scholarly pilgrimage;’ as E.D. Hunt has observed, Pausanias’ work was conceived less a guide to modern Greece than a “panorama … dominated by the vestiges of Greek antiquity,” “a committed search for what he perceived to be the roots of Greek culture and identity.”

This syncretism of scholarship and pilgrimage was easily absorbed into the Christian tradition. Jerome, not surprisingly, drew a direct link between ancient travelers like Pythagoras and fourth-century pilgrims in a letter to Paulinus of Nola. Even prior to
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60 Jerome, Epistle 53 to Paulinus of Nola (ca. 388–389), in Freudenthal, ed., *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, 96–102, here at 97. “We read in old tales that men traversed provinces, crossed seas, and visited strange peoples, simply to see face to face persons whom they only knew from books. Thus Pythagoras visited the prophets of Memphis; and Plato, besides visiting Egypt and Archytas of Tarentum, most carefully explored that part of the coast of Italy which was formerly called Great Greece. … Again we read that certain noblemen journeyed from the most remote parts of Spain and Gaul to visit Titus Livius, and listen to his eloquence which flowed like a fountain of milk. … Apollonius too was a traveller—the one man who is called the sorcerer by ordinary people and the philosopher by such as follow Pythagoras. He entered Persia, traversed the Caucasus and made his way through the Albanians, the Scythians, the Massagetæ, and the richest districts of India. At last, after crossing that wide river the Pison, he came to the Brahmans. … After this he travelled among the Elamites, the Babylonians, the Chaldeans, the Medes, the Assyrians, the Parthians, the Syrians, the Phoenicians, the Arabians, and the Philistines. Then returning to Alexandria he made his way to Ethiopia to see the gymnosophists and the famous table of the sun spread in the sands of the desert. Everywhere he found something to
Jerome, however, Christian exegetes had already begun to seek out the Holy Land.

Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica* offers a description of two such early ‘biblical antiquarians’: the bishop Melito of Sardis, who traveled to the East to learn definitive information about setting of the Old Testament, and the Anatolian bishop Alexander, who in his old age “journeyed from Cappadocia, his original see, to Jerusalem, in order to worship there and to examine the historic sites.”61 Origen, too, E.D Hunt believes, “display[ed] the biblical scholar’s interest in the topography of the contemporary Holy Land”: in his *Commentary on John*, Origen described himself journeying around Palestine “in search of the traces of Jesus and his disciples and the prophets.”62

While it may thus be true that the Holy Places had long “attracted the attention of devotees [whose] quest was at the same time ‘intellectual’ and ‘religious,’”63 it is also true that during the Renaissance the disenchantment which some biblical antiquarians experienced upon discovering the chasm between the idealized Jerusalem of the pilgrimage guides and the decay of the Holy Places *in situ* began to fracture the traditional marriage between pilgrimage and study. Much the same rupture had already occurred a century earlier to Roman antiquarians like Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459) and Pomponio Leto (1425–1498), the latter of whom has been credited with introducing
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“systematic field archaeology” into the study of the Roman past. These antiquarians came rather quickly to define themselves against pilgrims, whom they excoriated in their treatises for their sloppy misidentifications of historic sites and their willingness to accept myths about Roman history plainly contradicted by the material evidence at hand. Humanists like Poggio found little to like in medieval pilgrimage guides like the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, scorning them for creating the myths and misattributions attached to ancient ruins which they were now forced to banish. No longer would pilgrims be allowed to mistake the Quirinal’s ancient statues of the Dioscuri for “horse tamers;” no longer would they identify the Colosseum as a temple of the sun; no longer would the Lateran’s equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius be taken for Constantine. To a large extent, the antipathy and suspicion with which antiquarians looked upon pilgrims’ way of seeing the world make perfect sense. The point of pilgrimage, after all, is precisely to suppress one’s historicist instincts; pilgrimage is, at bottom, an attempt to create immanence, not distance. Historicism and skepticism, generally the antiquarians’ best friends, are the pilgrim’s worst enemy.

In the case of the Holy Land, the growing historicism of antiquarian travelers was particularly threatening to the survival of the pilgrim-researcher. As any good antiquarian
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64 Grafton, “The Ancient City Restored,” 38.


knew, even the most educated traveler would find it virtually impossible to locate a single remnant of the Biblical Promised Land in the Palestine of the Mamluks and Ottomans. Astute readers of Josephus, they knew that Titus and Vespasian had razed Jerusalem to the ground and expelled its residents in 70 AD, leaving behind nary a trace of the city that formed the backdrop to the Hebrew Bible and the Crucifixion. Moreover, when the emperor Hadrian finally rebuilt Jerusalem (as Aelia Capitolina) in 138 AD, in the wake of the Bar Khokba rebellion, he did so demonstrably to the west of the city’s original site. As the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs argued in his brilliant 1941 book on *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte*, this meant that Constantine’s well-known Christian ‘restoration’ of the Holy City in the fourth century was nothing more than a fantasy—the emperor had not ‘rediscovered’ Calvary or the Holy Sepulcher, but rather had superimposed imaginary localizations upon Hadrian’s Aelia Capitolina, while the true Jerusalem of Christ lay undiscovered at the edge of town. The Holy Places known to sixteenth-century travelers, then, were by and large untrustworthy fourth- and twelfth-century localizations, the fruits of Constantine’s and the Crusaders’ efforts to recreate the Holy Land according to contemporary tastes. Unlike in Rome, where antiquarians could replace pilgrim legends with reliable Roman testimony, in the Holy Land no such core of truth was available. Strip away the legends surrounding Pilate’s *praetorium* or the Cave of the Nativity, and there would be nothing left at all. To paraphrase Leonard Barkan, who has written of Roman antiquarians that they were

---

“writing the history of the idea of a city that had ceased to be,” in the Holy Land, the antiquarian was instead challenged to write the history of the idea of a place that never was.68

Many antiquarians thus rejected what they now saw as a compromising entanglement with the culture of pilgrimage, and they began fundamentally to distrust eyewitness knowledge extracted from the Holy Land. Some even went so far as to raise doubts about the localization and authenticity of the Holy Places to which the Franciscans of the Custodia Terrae Sanctae, who were responsible for their upkeep, guided their pilgrim charges. One of the most skeptical of all the humanists on this count was, interestingly enough, Erasmus, whose professed interest in the culture, society, artifacts, and topography of the Holy Land I have documented above. In a 1522 colloquy entitled De visendo loca sacra, Erasmus equated the putative Holy Places of Jerusalem with a pack of falsehoods. Early in the dialogue, when the character Arnoldus asks, “Is there anything worth seeing [in Jerusalem]?” his counterpart Cornelius responds, “To be frank with you, almost nothing. Some monuments of antiquity are pointed out, all of which I thought faked and contrived for the purpose of enticing naïve and credulous folk. What’s more, I don’t think it’s known for certain where ancient Jerusalem was.” Most immediately, of course, Erasmus’ assertion that the authentic Holy City had been lost to the vicissitudes of time was meant to redound with discredit upon the city’s Franciscan tour guides, whom Erasmus wished to paint as guilty of fakery and deception designed to exploit the faithful’s “credulity.” More broadly, however, the critique could apply just as
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68 Barkan, Unearthing the Past, 20.
trenchantly to the careless antiquarian pilgrim deluded into thinking that it was possible to obtain a ‘true’ picture of biblical topography by visiting modern Palestine.\(^6\)

In the wake of Erasmus’ iconoclastic colloquy, other antiquarians began to look twice at the evidence culled from ancient authorities like Josephus and Eusebius and to question the veracity of the Holy Places as restored in the fourth century. Sebastian Münster (1488–1552), for example, used the “Appendix geographica” of his 1552 edition of Ptolemy, published at Basel, to raise Aranda-like doubts about the notion that the fallow landscape of Judea could ever have been received by the Israelites as a “Promised Land.” (He greatly preferred Germany, he confessed, to Jerusalem.)\(^7\) By the late sixteenth century, the Franciscans of the *Custodia Terrae Sanctae* found themselves on the defensive against a group of skeptical antiquarians who, having read up on their late Roman history, rejected Constantine’s siting of the Holy Sepulcher.\(^8\) We shall return to these doubts in Chapter Four; for now, however, we should turn to the Franciscans.

**FAITHFUL FRIARS: THE CUSTODIA TERRAE SANCTAE**

Erasmus’ radical doubt about the location of modern Jerusalem received a thorough airing in the version of his *Colloquies* most readily accessible to Spanish readers, a Castilian translation published by the Benedictine Alonso Ruiz de Virués (d.
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1545) at Burgos in 1529. Ruiz was a theological moderate who earnestly believed that, if properly tempered, Erasmus’ critiques could be of use to the Church. As he explained in his translator’s preface, Erasmus’ critiques could not be released to the masses without some judicious editing, for the maelstrom that Erasmus’ criticism had stirred up among mendicant theologians meant that it had become nearly impossible for Erasmus to get a fair hearing. And yet, when he came to De visendo, which he rebaptized as Peregrinación, Ruiz actually expanded upon Erasmus’ declaration of doubt about the historical Jerusalem. Ruiz’s Cornelius responds at much greater length to Arnoldus’ query about whether there remained sights to be seen in Jerusalem:

Few, to tell you the truth. There are some signs of antiquity to be seen, but, what could we expect to find in Jerusalem, knowing that it has been razed by so many wars since Jesus Christ was born? Not to mention what the march of time undoes, such that there remains hardly a trace nor sign of the ancient Jerusalem where God performed such great things among both laws [ie., Judaism and Christianity]. And what will not the wars of the pagans have destroyed, when even the devotion of the Christians has undone so many of the things that were found there in days of old? As you know, the holy wood of the Cross has been divided up among many places; the nails, the spear, even the manger in which Jesus Christ was born, with other markers of the beginning of our salvation, have all been uprooted and moved to Rome, the city which God has deputed as the head of the monarchy and reliquary of the treasures of his Church.

72 See Andrea Herrán & Modesto Santos, “Estudio introductorio,” in Erasmus, Coloquios familiares: edición de Alonso Ruiz de Virués (siglo XVI), Textos y Documentos. Clásicos de Pensamiento y de las Ciencias, 23 (Barcelona: Anthropos, 2005), IX–LV, here at X–XI.

73 Alonso Ruiz de Virués, “Argumento del intérprete en el siguiente colloquio llamado Peregrinación,” in Erasmus, Coloquios familiares, 63–64, here at 63.

74 Erasmus, Peregrinación, 64–65. “Cornelio: Pocas, para dezirte la verdad. Muéstranse algunas señales de antigüedad, pero, ¿qué puede aver donde sabemos que Jerusalem después que Jesu Christo nació en ella ha sido tantas vezes asolada por guerras? Allende de lo que el tiempo deshaze, de tal manera que apenas ay rastro ni señal de aquella antigua Jerusalem donde tan grandes cosas en entramas leyes Dios hizo. E ¿qué no avrán hecho las guerras de los paganos, quando la devoción de los christianos a deshecho muchas de las cosas que antigüamente allí se hallavan?, como sabes el santíssimo madero de la cruz por muchas partes está repartido, los clavos, la lança, hasta el pesebre donde Jesu Christo nació, con otras insignias del comienço de nuestra salvación, fue todo derraygado e passado a Roma, cibdad deputada por Dios para cabeça de monarchia e sagrario de los tesoros de su Yglesia.”
In short, Ruiz was willing to concede to Erasmus that Jerusalem was not what it once was. He was also willing to concede that the Jerusalem pilgrimage probably was not worth making: in his preface he declared that, though he would not say that “it is bad to go to Jerusalem,” nevertheless “these days I find little benefit in it.”

Other Spanish authors, like the heretical physician Miguel Servet (1511–1553), could be equally pessimistic about the wisdom that might be gleaned from the modern Holy Land. Servet, who is now most famous for the anti-Trinitarian views which led to his imprisonment and execution at Geneva, was also a polyglot biblical scholar deeply interested in reconstructing the material context of the Bible. Struck by contemporary reports of the Holy Land’s degradation, however, he—like Münster—appended a gloss questioning the accuracy of the Bible’s account of the Promised Land to the “Tabula Terrae Sanctae” in his edition of Ptolemy’s *Geographia* (1535). The examples of Servet and Münster are striking illustrations of how the elevation of eyewitness knowledge over textual authority was not always a good thing for Holy Land pilgrimage; the shock of finding a Holy Land so debased could drive Christians back into their books, where they could still attempt to bask in the glow of the idealized Holy Land they had once known.

While Ruiz de Virués and Servet demonstrate that Spanish biblicists occupied the entire spectrum from faith to doubt, it is nevertheless true that the majority of Iberian scholars who filled the courts and universities of Philip II’s Spain showed little concern
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75 Servet’s skills as a biblical antiquarian are ably demonstrated in the lengthy antiquarian commentary that he appended to his seven-volume edition of Santi Pagnini’s polyglot Bible: *Biblia Sacra ex Santis Pagnini tralatione, sed ad Hebraicae linguae amussim novissi-mè ita recognita, & scholiis illustrata, ut planè nova editio videri possitt. Accessit praeterea liber interpretationum Hebraicorum, Arabicorum, Graecorumque nominum, quae in sacris litteris reperiumtur, ordine alphabetico digestus, eodem authore*, ed. Miguel Servet (Lyon: Hugo à Porta, 1542).

76 Shalev, “Sacred Geography,” 67 n. 53.
about their near-total dependence upon not only the reconnaissance, but even the judgments, of Christian and Jewish pilgrims. Benito Arias Montano, for example, whose biblical scholarship is the subject of Chapter Three, was content to use images borrowed from pilgrimage accounts to illustrate his antiquarian treatises. Indeed, Spanish scholars of this period are often considered by historians to be among the most conservative in Europe, deeply complicit in sustaining the pilgrimage legends that had ceased to satisfy the budding Orientalists of France, the Netherlands, or Germany. Philip Mansel, for example, argues that by the 1570s “French travel books described Turks, Greeks, Arabs, Egyptians and different provinces of the [Ottoman] Empire, such as Armenia or Trebizond, at much greater length than the Holy Land. Jerusalem, if visited, was a stop on the journey, not its destination.” When Spanish scholars appear in his account, however, they remain frozen in time: “When Spaniards wrote travel books about the Ottoman Empire, they were generally traditional Christian accounts of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.”

Yet the same tendencies which may seem to others to be a sign of Spanish conservatism might also be explained as a function of the Spanish Monarchy’s historically close ties to the Franciscan Order, the group perhaps most directly jeopardized by the gradual decline of Europeans’ faith in the Holy Land. Indeed, the
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Franciscans played a central role in Philip II’s scholarly ‘institute’ at the Escorial, and their relationship with Spain and their contributions to the nascent discipline of biblical criticism deserve more attention than they have received.

The Franciscans had occupied a frontline position in Christian efforts to promote the cult of the Holy Places since the 1330s, when Philip’s Aragonese ancestors installed them in a network of convents in Palestine known as the *Custodia Terrae Sanctae*.80 While the Franciscans’ chief obligation was to tend to Western pilgrims and maintain the shrines and churches in their care (including, most importantly, the Churches of the Holy Sepulcher and of the Nativity), they were also meant in part to serve Spanish diplomatic interests in the Levant. In the late thirteenth century the Aragonese crown had received from the Mamluk sultans of Egypt the right to declare a Protectorate over Christians in the Near East, and over the three centuries between their arrival in the Holy Land and the termination of the Spanish Protectorate in 1516, the Franciscans frequently found themselves shuttling back and forth between Jerusalem and the Spanish court fulfilling embassies, soliciting donations, and translating relics destined for the towering *retablos* of Spanish cathedrals.

Over the course of these centuries of collaboration, the Spanish crown treated the Franciscans who served in the Levant with the same solicitude it reserved for its own
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subjects, showering patronage upon them and speaking up on their behalf when they perceived that they were being treated unjustly by the Levant’s Muslim majority. In April 1395, for example, Joan I wrote vigorously to the Egyptian sultan to defend the *Custodia* and its emissary, a certain fr. Polo, in their plans to renovate their perpetually inadequate living quarters:

Having [1] read in the chronicles of our most high predecessors, of good name, that they had purchased from your ancestors the Monastery of Mount Sion, and [2] heard from our pilgrims returning from there that certain buildings are decaying because of the lack of maintenance that the said Monastery, as well as in the Church of Bethlehem … ; we affectionately beseech you, not only out of reverence for Our Lord God … , but also, because it was our ancestors who purchased that Monastery, as I have said—which means, therefore, that everything pertaining to the aforesaid Monastery and its buildings redounds in no little interest to Our Royal House … — … that you give license and leave to the said friar to make all of the necessary repairs, so that neither in your lifetime nor ours [the Holy Sepulcher] should come to ruin, which we would consider an offense to our honor.”

As Spanish interests in the region expanded in the years after the union of the crowns, so, too, did Spain’s commitment to support the friars of the *Custodia*. In the late 1480s, Fernando the Catholic assigned the Franciscans an annual aid of 1000 ducats from his Sicilian treasury, and agreed to pay the costs of any repairs that needed to be made to churches in the Holy Land. Isabel, whose formation suggested a close relationship with
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81 Archivo de la Corona de Aragón, leg. 1968. Edited in Eiján, *España en Tierra Santa* (Barcelona, 1910), 341. “Habiendo hallado y leído en las crónicas los muy altos predecesores nuestros, de buena memoria, que ellos han comprado de vuestros antecesores el Monasterio de Monte Sión, y diciéndose por nuestros peregrinos venidos de allá que algunos edificios vienen a menos por falta de obra en dicho Monasterio y también en la Iglesia de Belén … ; no sólo por reverencia de Nuestro Señor Dios … , sino, además, porque dicho Monasterio fué comprado por nuestros antepasados, según he dicho, y que, por consiguiente, redunda en no poco interés de Nuestra Real Casa todo lo que atañe al dicho Monasterio y a los edificios de aquél … , os rogamos con afecto que, teniendo benignamente en nuestra especial recomendación los dichos Monasterio e Iglesia y a Fr. Polo, servidor de Dios en aquel Monasterio, déjéis y deis licencia a dicho fraile para que haga todas las reparaciones que sean menester, y ni en nuestros ni en vuestros días vengan en decaimiento, cosa que reputaríamos como hecha en nuestro propio deshonor.”

the Franciscan Order anyway, was at least as generous. Hieronymus Münzer, a German humanist and physician traveling through Spain in 1494–1495, reported that “The Queen is also a great almsgiver. Every year she sends the friars of S. Francis in Jerusalem 1000 ducats and the richest ornaments,” and noted that upon departing the royal court, where he had been granted an audience with the Catholic Monarchs, “we were accompanied by two friars—one from the Order of S. Francis from Jerusalem, a Spaniard; and the other from the Order of S. Basil from Mount Sinai, who had a beard. The Sultan had sent them in a ship laden with balsam and other presents for the [Catholic] Kings.” The royal chronicler Alonso de Santa Cruz likewise noted that Isabel, “with devout spirit, ‘visited’ the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem with great charity, since she could not visit in person due to the royal dignity and womanly weakness of her person.”

Future generations of Spanish monarchs followed Isabel’s precedent, intervening on the Custodia’s behalf whenever the friars found themselves on the losing end of Muslim-Christian disputes over the two faiths’ overlapping devotional interests. In March 1523 the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman I ‘the Magnificent’ (r. 1520–1566) confiscated the Franciscans’ headquarters on Mt. Sion and converted it into a mosque, because local
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84 Hieronymus Münzer, *Viaje por España y Portugal, 1494–1495*, trans. José López Toro (Madrid: Colección Almenara, 1951), 112–113. “Es también la reina una grande limosnera. Anualmente envía a los frailes de San Francisco en Jerusalén mil ducados y riquísimos ornamentos. Al tiempo de salir de Madrid Estuvieron con nosotros dos frailes, uno de la Orden de San Francisco de Jerusalén, español, y otro de la Orden de San Basilio en el monte Sinaí, que gastaba barba, a los que el sultán envió en una nave con bálsamos y otros presentes para los reyes.” Münzer, fascinated, also mentioned that “Al fraile con barbas lo vió celebrar misa en lengua griega, según creo, mi compañero Antonio Herwart.”

Jews had told him that it rested on top of David’s tomb. The Franciscans were forced to relocate to an abandoned bakery in the heart of Jerusalem. Spanish protests and monies eventually helped the friars to secure more suitable lodgings in a convent formerly occupied by Georgian Christians, which became the house of San Salvatore.86

In return for their patronage, the Catholic Monarchs received something more than the Franciscans’ diplomacy and gifts of relics. From the very moment of their installation in Jerusalem in the early 1330s, the Franciscans became the center of a great Mediterranean network of travelers, objects, and information that would prove extremely important to scholars, too. (The friars also, as we shall see, cultivated their own brand of scholarship within the Order.) In fulfilling the many diplomatic, financial, and spiritual duties that accompanied their three-year tours of duty, the friars had the opportunity to become acquainted with the various peoples and regions of the Near East with a freedom unequaled among any other class of travelers.

Much of the information that the Franciscans gathered came directly home to the Iberian Peninsula, where it was used for scholarly as well as strategic purposes. Sometimes the information came in the form of books; this was the case for Pere ‘the Ceremonious’ (r. 1336–1387) of Aragón and his son Joan I (r. 1387–1396), both profoundly interested in the geography, inhabitants, and marvels of the Near East. Pere and Joan were avid collectors of chorographical works describing the Holy Land, and Joan was so thrilled to receive a copy of the Franciscan Odoric da Pordenone’s (ca.

1265–1331) *De mirabilibus Terrae Sanctae* (ca. 1330) in 1378 that he had copies made and distributed to several of his closest associates, including his confessor Nicolao de Termens. At other times, the Franciscans’ knowledge base might be communicated orally. The fifteenth-century friar Francisco Sagarra, a native of Barcelona who spent perhaps as many as five decades in the Custodia between 1430 and 1490, became an expert in eastern languages while in the Levant. After spending a quarter-century conducting missionary work among the Maronites of Lebanon, in 1482 he was sent by Pope Sixtus IV (r. 1471–1484) on a mission to the emperor of Abyssinia. Upon his return, he traveled to Rome, where he delivered a report *viva voce* to Sixtus. From Rome, he returned to his native Cataluña, where he spent the rest of his life fulfilling a series of important administrative positions in his order.

Some Franciscans pursued a more formal level of erudition, producing learned treatises on the same lands and shrines to which they directed pilgrims. Francesco Suriano (ca. 1450–1529), an Italian friar who served in the Holy Land in the 1480s, is one of the better known antiquarians to have graced the Order. In the early 1480s, Suriano began compiling a *Trattato di Terra Santa*, which after several decades of editing and reediting he published at Venice in 1524. In some ways, it was a conservative

---


publication, defending the various pilgrim legends which had grown up over the years and which Erasmus found so uncertain. It also, however, represented the culmination of a shrewd, archivally-based attempt to compile all of the privileges that the Custodia had accumulated over the previous two centuries, and thus (perhaps unintentionally) constituted a tremendously useful resource for tracing the evolution of two centuries of Christian practice in the Holy Land.

In the 1550s, Philip, too, would have his chance to present himself as the Franciscans’ doting patron, funding a renovation of Jerusalem’s most important shrines and thereby furthering his self-image as a ‘new Constantine.’ In the mid-1550s, as his court began taking the first steps to impart a biblical aura to his kingship, Philip struck up a close friendship with the charismatic Guardian of the Holy Sepulcher, Boniface of Ragusa (Bonifazio Stivanic-Drakoliza, d. 1582). Fr. Boniface had wrested permission from the Ottoman authorities in Jerusalem to make much-needed repairs to the roof and structure of the Holy Sepulcher, and he hoped to leverage Spain’s customary interest in patronizing the Holy Places as a means to recruit Spanish backing for his ambitious restoration. He began writing to Philip, still a prince at the time, to request the necessary funds. Philip welcomed this first request, and construction began in 1555. Yet this was only the first of a series of letters reaching across the 1550s, in which Boniface would

90 On Boniface of Ragusa, see Girolamo Golubovich, Serie cronologie dei superiori di Terra Santa (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1898), 52–55.

write to Philip—now fully the King of Spain in the wake of Charles’ abdication in January 1556—to update him on repairs to the Holy Sepulcher made with Spanish money and to beg him to send further aid with which to defend the Franciscan custody against the Ottomans.92

Boniface, like Philip, was aware of the political repercussions of the King’s charity—repercussions that may have seemed unusually high at the outset of Philip’s reign in 1556. In light of the looming Carafa War pitting Philip, nominally King of Jerusalem, against a Pope whose authority emanated in part from Rome’s status as a ‘New Jerusalem,’ Boniface had no difficulty in persuading Philip to donate generously to the Franciscans in Jerusalem. “If Your Majesty should fail in his Royal clemency to provide for us the funds which our regular charity payments lack,” he once threatened, “we will be forced to abandon the Holy Places, which would be a great embarassment to Christendom—all of whose princes would impute it to Your Majesty, since you are the one who holds the title King of Jerusalem.”93 Philip duly sent the funds through his Venetian ambassador, saving his reputation as well as the custody’s friars; but his attempt to ‘rent’ the title to Jerusalem nevertheless angered his papal antagonists. Art historians have discovered, for example, that Paul IV had a replica of the Holy Sepulcher erected in the Pauline Chapel at the Vatican in the mid-1550s, at precisely the same time as Philip was paying for Boniface of Ragusa’s restoration of the real Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. Marion Kuntz theorizes that the replica, which was styled more accurately on the original

92 For Boniface’s letters, see Archivo General de Simancas, sección de Estado, leg. 483, #88 & leg. 485, s.n.

93 ibid. “Si Vuestra magestad por su Real clemençia no manda proveer en esto y en que la limosna ordinaria no falte seran forçados a dexar los sanctos lugares que seria grande oprobrio de la christianad todos los princes de la qual los Remiten a Vuestra magestad como a quien tiene el titulo de Rey de Hierusalem.”
Constantinian foundation than was Philip’s gaudy remodel, was an attempt to counter Philip’s project.\textsuperscript{94}

Philip’s generally amicable relationship with Boniface of Ragusa continued well past the conclusion of the latter’s term as Custos. Boniface’s close working relationship with Philip and his court in the 1550s shaped both the rest of his career and Philip’s antiquarian project for the Holy Land. After finishing his tour of duty in the Levant and participating in the final sessions of the Council of Trent, fr. Boniface was appointed Bishop of Stagno and then, by Pius V (r. 1566–1572), special papal nuncio for Holy Land affairs at Philip II’s court in Madrid. There, making use of the library that Philip and his humanist advisers had assembled at the Escorial, Boniface authored a carefully historicized account of the Catholic liturgy in the Holy Land, the \textit{Liber de perenni cultu Terrae sanctae et de fructuosa ejus peregrinatione} (1573).\textsuperscript{95}

Boniface of Ragusa’s career trajectory thus demonstrates, in particularly clear terms, the impact which the Spanish Monarchy’s decision to support the Franciscans in Jerusalem had upon the scholarly enterprise that Philip II would eventually mount at the Escorial. Nor was Boniface the only Franciscan to be engaged in such research project during Philip’s reign. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, at least three Franciscan antiquarians would have a major impact upon European understandings of the historical development of the Holy Land: Antonio de Angelis da Lecce, who would produce one of the most famous learned maps of the Holy Land in 1578; Bernardino Amico da Gallipoli, whose painstaking study of the architecture of the Holy Places we


\textsuperscript{95} Bonifacius Stephanus, \textit{Liber de perenni cultu Terrae sanctae et de fructuosa ejus peregrinatione} (Venice: Guerraea, 1573).
will examine in Chapter Four; and Francesco Quaresmio (1583–1656), whose *Elucidatio terrae sanctae* remains one of the most impressive achievements in a field of scholarship that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, attracted the best and the brightest.96

**CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, I have attempted to show why and how a newly historicized picture of the Holy Land emerged in sixteenth-century Spain. This new way of seeing the Holy Land was created largely by humanist churchmen who accepted that the meticulous study of ancient languages as well as scaled maps and printed views of the Holy Land’s topography and architectural ruins was crucial preparation for any aspiring exegete.97 But it was also the product of articulate pilgrims and their Franciscan guides, both of whom had as much to offer to the budding discipline of biblical criticism as the antiquarians whom Peter Miller has described as “fascinated and obsessed with understanding every jot and tittle of the sacred text,” and prepared to “turn to the Bible’s context for help: the history of the ancient Near East as it could be reconstructed from texts, objects, and the long-lived traditions preserved by marginal groups like the Samaritans or in out of the way places like the Coptic monasteries of Wadi Natrûn.”98

As we shall see in the next three chapters, that new vision of the Holy Land was crucial to Spaniards’ ability to integrate the *historia sacra* of the Bible with the human


history of their nation. Drawing upon Jerome’s example, the methods of their antiquarian peers, and the collective memory of pilgrimage literature, the new breed of biblical humanists and antiquarians that migrated from Alcalá to the royal court in the early years of Philip II’s reign would all make valuable contributions not only to the emerging discipline of *historia sacra*, but also to the self-image of the Spanish Monarchy.
CHAPTER TWO

STICKS, STONES, AND ANCIENT BONES: RELICS AND THE HISTORICAL RECORD

In April 1572, a courier arrived at Philip II’s court in Madrid bearing an official document from Oviedo, the capital of the northern principate of Asturias. It was, Philip was pleased to discover, an inventory of all of the relics, royal burials, and ancient books contained in the city’s Cathedral Church of San Salvador. The cathedral chapter had compiled and sent it in response to a royal questionnaire which Philip had mandated some time before, after a royal agent had warned him that careless and ignorant clerics around the Peninsula were mistreating Spain’s most precious Christian antiquities.

One can only imagine the mixture of elation and envy that the Oviedo inventory must have elicited in Philip, almost certainly the most avid relic hunter of the later sixteenth century. After his own collection of sacred artifacts—which numbered some seven thousand objects by the 1580s¹—San Salvador was by far the largest repository of Holy Land relics in the Iberian Peninsula. So massive was its collection that many of the pieces that would have occupied places of honor within the high altar of any other church—relics like a fragment of S. Bartholomew’s clothing, a fingerlength of Moses’ staff, and corporeal relics of all four evangelists plus Peter and Paul—were treated as mere sidelights to the even more precious relics at the core of the Cathedral’s holdings.

Those relics were kept within the church’s Cámara Santa, or Holy Chamber, a reliquary chapel on par with the Sainte-Chapelle erected by the great Crusader king Louis IX of France (r. 1214–1270). Accessed via a series of staircases and vaulted stone antechambers, the roughly four hundred square foot Cámara was a church in its own right, dedicated to S. Michael and decorated with a series of paired marble sculptures representing the Apostles.

The Cámara Santa’s most famous piece, kept behind protective railings at the center of the room, was the ornate cedar chest known simply as the Arca Santa. Made of “incorruptible wood,” this marvelous ark was said to have been translated from Jerusalem to Spain in 632, in order to protect the relics within from the Arabian armies who were encircling the Holy City. Its contents, which were last inspected in 1075, included practically every signal relic typically associated with the life of Christ—a fragment of lignum Crucis; thorns from the crown of thorns; a stone from the Holy Sepulcher; earth from the spot where Christ ascended to Heaven; Christ’s swaddling-clothes; a scrap of Christ’s vestments; milk, hair, and clothing from the Virgin; one of the thirty coins for which Judas betrayed Christ; and preserved bread leftover from the Last Supper—as well

---


as (perhaps most remarkably) mannah from the Israelites’ time in the desert. While some of these relics were within the grasp of lesser churches—rare indeed was the Spanish church without at least one *lignum Crucis*—others, like the Virgin’s breastfeeding, were of the very rarest sort. Coupled with Oviedo’s convenient location along the pilgrimage route to Santiago de Compostela, it is no surprise that the Cámara Santa and its Holy Ark attracted droves of Christian pilgrims in the high Middle Ages.

Philip almost certainly studied Oviedo’s dazzling surfeit of Jerusalem relics with an eye to expropriating many of them for his own collection. Yet he was also wary of certain items mentioned in the cathedral chapter’s memorandum. Many of the relics listed there Philip assumed to be beyond suspicion; but he also knew that some of these items—particularly those relics associated with the Passion, like Judas’ coin⁵—were, by the late sixteenth century, almost universally tainted by allegations of widespread fraud.

---


⁵ For the proliferation of false coins associated with Judas, see, for example, Antonio Agustín, *Dialogos de medallas, inscripciones y otras antiguedades* (Tarragona: Felipe Mey, 1587). Agustín devoted four pages of the *Dialogos* to dismantling as rotundly as anyone the widespread belief that a coin exhibited in the Roman Church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme was one of the thirty coins paid to Judas for betraying Christ: “B. Querria saber, si es verdad que en Roma se muestra uno de los treynta dineros en que vendio Judas a nuestro Señor, y que moneda es. A. Verdad es que en santa Cruz de Hierusalem, donde esta la mejor antigualla del mundo, que es el titulo de la cruz por la qual fuimos redemidos, se conserva una medalla de peso de dos reales, la qual yo he visto, y tengo algunas a ella semejantes. … Es verdad que aquella medalla no es batida en Hierusalem, ni en Iudea, ni en Syria. … Porque tiene letras Griegas que muestran ser moneda de la isla de Rodas que disen RODION [in Greek characters in the original] con la postrera O pequeña como usavan los muy antiguos Griegos, y tiene de la una parte una cara con rayos que representa el sol, cuya figura fue el colosso tan nombrado que estuvo en Rodas. Y de la otra parte hai una flor que muchos piensan que sea rosa, algunos disen que es tornasol, otros amapola: yo no tengo dello certidumbre. … B. No seria possible que huvisessen pagado a Judas con diversas monedas y entre las otras huviese essa de Rodas? A. Possible es, pero mas es de creer que le pagaron en siclos, o en otra moneda de aquella tierra, especialmente pues le pagaron de dinero publico. B. Pues porque la tienen por reliquia en Roma … ? A. Por la razon que tienen en el monasterio de Poblete un dado grande como quatre de los que agora se usan y es de jaspe colorado, y disen que es uno de los que se sirvieron los ministros de Pilato en jugador o sortear las vestiduras de Christo. Y semejantes cosas son inciertas, y no merecen tan buen nombre como de reliquias … ” (27–28).
Thanks in part to the research of Augustin Redondo, who has collated many examples of the appearance of false relic peddlers in both Inquisitorial documents and popular literature of the period, we have begun to see just how ubiquitous such frauds were. Sixteenth-century Spain brimmed with newly imported and recently rediscovered relics from the Holy Land, their provenance often uncertain, their worshippers legion. Individual hucksters were thick on the ground in sixteenth-century Castile, where rogue *picaros* regularly donned tattered robes to hoodwink the laity, assuming the personae of religious men returning from Jerusalem with relics in tow. So common were these unscrupulous relic-hawkers that the Inquisition came to regard their swindles as a veritable epidemic, and by the 1530s, they were occupying a significant percentage of the Holy Office’s attention. Particularly worrisome was the fact that these roving relic peddlers were using their specious wares to extort money from penitent laity. In May 1536, the Council of the Inquisition issued a pragmatic warning that it had “discovered many foreigners calling themselves apostles or messengers of God. They extort money from the populace by telling them that, in order to remedy their sins, they must give them money to send to Rome and Jerusalem to fund masses. And they engage in other trickery, all under the name of sanctity, promising them that they will remedy their souls.”

---


7 ibid., 406.

8 Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid, Inquisicion, lib. 322, f. 38r. “han descubierto muchos estrangeros que se dezían apóstoles y embiados de Dios y sacan a las gentes sus dineros diziéndoles que, para remedio de sus pecados, es menester dezir misas en Roma y en Jherusalem y danles los dineros para que las embien a dezir con ellos y hazen otros engaños, so título de santidad, diziendo que les han de rremediar las ánimas.” Quoted in Redondo, “Devoción tradicional,” 409.
diocesan constitutions of Toledo from the same year also warned the faithful about suspicious ‘pilgrims’ bearing false relics.

The Inquisition’s inability to contain the threat which such notorious frauds posed to popular trust in the cult of relics opened the door to scandal. Some of the most scathing exposés came, not surprisingly, from Protestant polemists, who were eager to incorporate Catholics’ own concerns about falsified relics into their broader assaults on both the cult of relics and the Holy Land pilgrimages that had produced them. John Calvin (1509–1564), who famously ridiculed the dozens of holy preputces on display in Europe’s churches and speculated that there must be enough lignum crucis in the world to fill a ship, was merely the best-known of these Protestant critics.9 The English playwright Anthony Munday (ca. 1560–1633), who visited the English College at Rome under an assumed name in the late 1570s, was more typical but no less trenchant. In his account of his travels, published under the title The English Romayne Lyfe (1582), he ridiculed the unscrupulous Jesuits who accompanied him on a tour of the catacomb of S. Pancrazio:

if they chaunce to finde a bone … whether it be a Dog, a Hog, a Sheepe, or any Beast, they can tell presentlie what Saints bone it was … Then must no body touch it, without he be a Preest, and it must be brought home for an especiall Relique : and thus … encreaseth the genealogie of the holy Reliques in Roome.10

Northern, Protestant propagandists like Calvin or Munday were not, however, the only authors to take up and publicize the uncertain nature of many relics in their writings. Spanish authors—in spite of Spain’s notorious religious orthodoxy—also confronted the

---

9 John Calvin, Traité des reliques ou advertiseurement très utile du grand profit qui reviendrait à la chrestienté s’il se faisoit inventaire de tous les corps saints et reliques qui sont tant en Italie qu’en France [1543] (Paris: Nord-sud, 1947), 22.

contested authenticity of Spain’s copious collections of Near Eastern relics, making the
subject into one of the commonplaces of Golden Age literature.

A now-famous passage from the court humanist Alfonso de Valdés’ *Diálogo de
las cosas ocurridas en Roma* (1528) exemplifies Spanish humanists’ campaign to banish
false relics from their nation’s churches. Though he composed his scandalous dialogue
primarily as an apologia for Charles V’s role in the 1527 Sack of Rome, Valdés also took
the opportunity to introduce Spanish readers to some of the most signal examples of
reliquary fraud from across Europe. As “Lactantius,” an imperial soldier, details the
abuses which Charles’ troops heaped upon Roman reliquaries, he is interrupted by an
Archdeacon arguing that precisely this mockery should be considered the very greatest of
the travesties perpetrated by Charles V’s armies. Lactantius, however, disagrees, opining
that relics are nothing more than *cuerpos muertos*—dead bodies. In fact,

God has permitted this [ie. the sacking of relics] because of the trickery
that is practiced with these relics in order to get money out of the simple
folk, since you will find many relics that are shown in two or three places
simultaneously. If you go to Dura, in Germany, they will show you the
head of S. Anne, Our Lady’s mother, and they’ll show you the same thing
in Lyon, France. It is obvious that one or the other of them is a lie, unless
they mean to say that Our Lady had two mothers or S. Anne had two
heads. … I’ve seen Our Lord’s foreskin in Rome and Burgos, as well as in
Our Lady in Anvers, and S. John the Baptist’s head in Rome and Amiens,
France. As for apostles, if we should want to count them, though they
were no more than twelve, … nevertheless we find more than twenty-four
scattered throughout the world. Eusebius writes that there were three nails
used on the Cross, and that S. Helena, mother of the Emperor Constantine,
threw one into the Adriatic to calm a tempest, the second she melted into
an amulet for her son, and with the third she had a bridle made for his
horse; and yet now there is one in Rome, another in Milan, another in
Cologne, another in Paris, another in León, and an infinite number more.
As for wood from the Cross, I tell you honestly that if every bit of it that is
said to be scattered throughout Christendom were to be reassembled, it
would be enough to fill a ship. In France alone there are exhibited more
than five hundred teeth said to have been lost by Our Lord when he was a
child. As for Our Lady’s milk, the Magdalene’s hair, S. Christopher’s
molars—there are too many to count. And given all the uncertainty on these matters, it is tremendously shameful to see what they tell people in some places. The other day, in a very old monastery, they showed me a plaque listing the relics that they had, and among other things I saw listed ‘a piece of the River Kedron.’ I asked if what they had was a piece of the water, or of the rocks from that stream; they told me not to poke fun at their relics. There was another item—‘some of the earth from the spot where the angel appeared to the shepherds’—but I didn’t dare ask them what they understood that to mean.

The point of Lactantius’ outrageous inventory is clear. Most of the biblical relics available to Spaniards were objectively false, the desiccated bodies of random women or common criminals masquerading as S. Anne, and therefore mocked and impeded true religious devotion.\textsuperscript{11}

Philip took these attacks on the cult of relics especially badly, and not only because they insulted his famously orthodox, Counter Reformation spirituality. For Philip, relics also had a historical purpose: that is, to bring together in one place a

\textsuperscript{11} Alfonso de Valdés, \textit{Diálogo de las cosas ocurridas en Roma}, ed. José F. Montesinos (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1928), 119–124. “Dios ha permitido esto [ie. the sacking of relics] por los engaños que se hazen con estas reliquias por sacar dinero de los simples, porque hallaréis muchas reliquias que os las mostrarán en dos o tres lugares. Si vais a Dura, en Alemania, os mostrarán la cabeza de Santa Anna, madre de Nuestra Señora, y lo mismo os mostrarán en León de Francia. Claro está que lo uno o lo otro es mentira, si no quieren dezir que Nuestra Señora tuvo dos madres o Santa Anna dos cabeças. … El prepucio de Nuestro Señor yo lo he visto en Roma y en Burgos, y también en Nuestra Señora de Anversia, y la cabeza de Sanct Johan Baptista en Roma y en Amians de Francia. Pues apóstoles, si los quisiésemos contar, aunque no fueron sino doze …, más hallaremos de veinte y quatro en diversos lugares del mundo. Los clavos de la cruz scribe Eusebio que fueron tres, y el uno echó Santa Helena, madre del Emperador Constantino, en el mar Adriático para amansar la tempestad, y el otro hizo fundir en almetal para su hijo, y el otro hizo un freno para su cavallo, y agora ay uno en Roma, otro en Milán y otro en Colonia, y otro en París, y otro en León y otros infinitos. Pues de palo de la cruz digoos de verdad que si todo lo que dizen que ay della en la cristiandad se juntasse, bastaría para cargar una carreta. Dientes que mudava Nuestro Señor quando era niño passan de quinientos los que oy se muestran solamente en Francia. Pues leche de Nuestra Señora, cabellos de la Madalena, muelas de Sant Cristóbal, no tienen cuento. Y allende de la incertenedad que en esto ay, es una vergüenza muy grande ver lo que en algunas partes dan a entender a la gente. El otro día, en un monasterio muy antiguo me mostraron la tabla de las reliquias que tenian, y vi entre otras cosas, que dezia: ‘Un pedaço do torrente de Cedrón.’ Pregunté si era dell agua o de las piedras de aquel arroyo lo que tenían; dixéronme que no me burlasse de sus reliquias. Havia otro capítulo que dezía: ‘De la tierra donde apareció el angel a los pastores’, y no les osé preguntar qué entendían por aquello; “No dexaron reliquias que no saquearon para tomar con sus sacrílegas manos la plata y el oro con que estavan cubiertas, que era la mayor abominacion del mundo ver aquellos dessuellacaras entrar en lugares donde los obispos, los cardenales, los summos pontifices apenas osavan entrar, y sacar aquellas cabeças y braços de apóstoles et de sanctos binaventurados.”
complete set of ‘artifacts’ testifying to both the truth of Christianity and the glory of Spanish history. As Guy Lazure has argued,

> Combining religion and history, Christianity and the Spanish character, the antiquities of Spain were, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, chiefly those of its saints. As a tangible link with the past, relics therefore provided an evocative, compelling means of reshaping the Spanish monarchy’s relationship to its history and of reweaving a coherent social fabric. As one chronicler puts it, relics had become all the more important since the written memory of Spain’s Christian antiquity had all but been lost with the ‘destruction’ wrought by the Moors.\(^\text{12}\)

Caught thus between his faith, his better judgment, and his determination to salvage Spanish history by saving the cult of relics, Philip knew to whom he would turn:

Ambrosio de Morales (1513–1591), a ten-year veteran of his court and one of Spain’s most celebrated humanist historians. In April 1572, Philip had the Oviedo memorandum forwarded on to Morales, who received it in his study at the University of Alcalá and fired off a quick response.\(^\text{13}\) Though Morales did not anticipate it at the time, this exchange proved to be the beginning of a much larger project that would see Morales placed in charge of researching and cataloguing dozens of relic collections all across the north of Spain. Morales’ attempt to address Philip’s concerns, delivered in his straightforward, unadorned style, affords a rare glimpse into the relationship between humanist erudition, the connoisseurship of Near Eastern antiquities, and the construction of Spanish identity.

---


13 Morales’ response to the Oviedo memorandum was later published in Ambrosio de Morales, *Opúsculos castellanos ... cuyos originales se conservan ineditos en la Real biblioteca del monasterio del Escorial ... a los que se han añadido otros varios recogidos y copiados de algunos libros impresos y manuscritos, y del archivo de la Santa iglesia de Santiago*, ed. Francisco Valerio Cifuentes, 3 vols. (Madrid: Benito Cano, 1793), 2:93–99.
THE MAKING OF AN HISTORIAN

To understand Morales’ approach to relics, we must first understand his formation as an historian. In the case of Morales, that formation began in the cradle.

Ambrosio de Morales was born and raised in Córdoba, the son of the successful physician Antonio de Morales (ca. 1470–1535) and Mencía de Oliva.14 Morales senior was the archetype of the Renaissance man: in addition to his reputation as a learned doctor, he was also one of Spain’s first and most eminent antiquarians. Easily conversant with the chorographical works of Pliny, Ptolemy, and Pomponius Mela, Morales stood out among the distinguished Andalucían milieu of fellow collectors and antiquarians centered on early sixteenth-century Córdoba.15 Ambrosio liked to tell the story, which he included in his own study of Spain’s *Antigüedades*, of how his father had identified the ancient Phoenician city of Larissa while traveling between the southern cities of Arcos and Jeréz de la Frontera:

My father Doctor Morales being en route between Arcos and Xerez in Andalucía, he saw a very handsome plot of land. And since he had a good eye for all things, he studied it well and said, “O what a handsome site for a large city.” To which someone responded: “There once was [a city] there, and such-and-such signs of it remain.” [My father] turned off the path, and went to see the site; and knowing that the plot was called Carixa, it reminded him that Ptolemy and Pliny [the Elder] had located a town called Larissa in the same place. And little by little he gathered the evidence which made it possible to prove that it was indeed the site of that city.16

---


15 See José Beltrán & Fernando Gascó, eds., *La Antigüedad como argumento: Historiografía de arqueología e historia antigua en Andalucía* (Seville: Taller Gráfico de Antonio Pinelo, 1993).

For this and other such noteworthy discoveries, Antonio was revered throughout the south of Spain as a luminary of the new learning. His fellow Córdubenses installed him and his young family in a house widely believed to have belonged to the Roman sage Seneca, traditionally reserved for the wisest man in the city;\(^{17}\) and, when it came time in 1508 for Cardinal Cisneros to fill the chair of Philosophy and Metaphysics at his fledgling humanist University of Alcalá, it was Antonio to whom he turned.\(^{18}\)

Through the antiquarian exploits of his father, Morales was introduced from a young age to the wider world of young Spanish scholars committed to the new sciences of archaeology, numismatics, and epigraphy imported from Italy by a self-conscious generation of scholars that gathered under the leadership of Antonio de Nebrija (1444–1522), Lucio Marineo Siculo (ca. 1444–1536), and Pietro Martire d’Anghiera (1457–

---

\(^{17}\) As Ambrosio de Morales explained this donation, “[Seneca] Fué natural de Córdoba, donde se muestra hasta agora una casa junto con la del Ayuntamiento de la ciudad, la cual creen fué de Séneca, y así la llaman. Y el primero Marqués de Pliego Don Pedro Hernández de Córdoba … compró aquella casa por la fama de haber sido de tal dueño, y luego la dió al doctor Morales mi padre, diciéndole que la casa de un cordobés sapientísimo no había de estar sino en poder de otro cordobés tan sabio. Y yo nacía en aquella casa.” Of course, Morales was his usual skeptical self, assembling evidence that this could not be true: “Lo que les mueve en Córdoba á creer esto, es que ha venido de unos en otros, y se ha conservado así aquella opinión. También labrando allí mi padre se hallaron una lucerna antigua de bronce, y cuatro figurillas de medio relieve en una tabla de piedra, metidas en sus encaxamientos y las hizo poner en una esquina de la pared frontera de aquella calle. … Estos rastros de antigüedad confirmaron la opinión que antes desto se tenía. Y púdole verdaderamente persuadir á los pasados, que pensaron haber tenido allí su casa Séneca, la excelencia del sitio, digno de ser escogido de un hombre tan sabio como él para su morada.” But he then goes onto explain that this could not have been so, chiefly because (as Morales incorrectly believed) ancient Córdoba was not located on the same site as modern Córdoba. See Ambrosio de Morales, *La coronica general de España, prossiguiendo adelante de los cinco libros que Florian de Ocampo dexo escritos*, 3 vols. (Alcalá de Henares: Juan Igüez de Lequerica, 1574–1586), IX.9.

\(^{18}\) Morales, *Antigüedades*, 1:30. “le puso el Ilustrísimo Cardenal Don Fray Francisco Ximenez por una de las primeras y principales piedras de esta su Universidad de Alcalá de Henares, quando la fundaba, y juntaba para esto de todas partes hombres excelentes en letras y doctrina. Y así fué el primer Catedrático que aquí leyó Filosofía y Metafísica.”
1526). At the head of the movement in Córdoba was the first Marqués de Priego, Pedro Fernández de Córdoba (1483–1517), whom Antonio de Morales frequently accompanied on expeditions. Fernández de Córdoba was an exhaustive collector of classical artifacts, which he used to adorn his residence in the center of Córdoba; Ambrosio de Morales later recalled seeing a “cippo grande” inscribed to the distinguished Roman citizen Quintus Herennius in the Marqués’ palace, a precious antiquity perhaps recovered during one of his father’s hunts. At the same time, Fernández de Córdoba’s antiquarian tastes also ran to the religious. Morales would also later recall the Marqués playing an important role in the rediscovery of the relics of the Martyrs of Córdoba in the Iglesia de San Pedro in his native city.

Young Morales was also exposed to the scholarly example of his maternal relatives. His maternal grandfather, named Fernán Pérez de Oliva, was known as a learned man with a taste for antiquarian pursuits; he left behind a chorographical work entitled *Imágen del mundo*. His uncle, also named Fernán Pérez de Oliva (1494?–1533), was a professor at Salamanca. This Pérez de Oliva moved back to Córdoba in 1524 after

---

19 See my Introduction for brief portraits of Nebrija, Marineo, and Martire.


22 Morales, *Coronica*, XVII.8. “Esto movió al primer Marqués de Pliego Don Pero Fernández de Córdoba, hijo de Don Alonso de Aguilar, para querer mandar cavar allí y buscar estas santas reliquias. … Tuvo aquel caballero un grande entendimiento adornado con algunas letras y grandísima afición á ellas y esto y su alto ánimo y religión le hacían desear la invención destas reliquias. Y demás de la tradición y del mármol refieren que afirmaba tener un libro por donde sabía estar allí el santo tesoro que buscaba. Si acaso tuvo el libro de San Eulogio de los Mártires, pudo de allí y de ser la iglesia de San Pedro la de los tres santos, rastrear con su ingenio algo de aquello.”

12 years spent in Paris and Italy; once more at home, he became interested in ancient sailing techniques, and wrote a treatise on the subject which he presented to the civic Ayuntamiento.\footnote{Redel, \textit{Ambrosio de Morales}, 47.} Morales would later credit this learned uncle with “rais[ing] him,” a debt which he repaid in part by editing a collection of his essays for publication.\footnote{Morales, \textit{Antigüedades}, 2:29. “el Maestro Fernan Perez de Oliva, mi tio y mi Señor … me crió.” The collection of essays was published in 1586: Fernán Pérez de Oliva, \textit{Las obras del maestro Fernan Perez de Oliva ... Con otras cosas que van añadidas, como se dara razon luego al principio ...}, ed. Ambrosio de Morales (Córdoba: Gabriel Ramos Bejarano, 1586).}

Growing up in a family so full of scholarly distinction,\footnote{Though Morales’ brother, Agustín de Oliva, followed his father into the medical profession, he, too, became an accomplished collector of Spanish antiquities “distinguished for his letters and as such esteemed among the Lords of Andalucía.” Morales later noted that he kept the base of a statue dedicated to Quintus Herennius (the same Quintus whom the first Marqués de Priego was collecting) in his house in Córdoba. He also had a small marble stone excavated in the Córdoban town of Peñaflor. Agustín’s son, the lawyer Jerónimo de Morales—Ambrosio’s nephew—was also a great antiquarian who helped his father. See Morales, \textit{Coronica}, IX.9; idem, \textit{Antigüedades}, 2:45. “... el Doctor Agustín de Oliva, ... Médico de la Santa Inquisición, insigne por sus letras y por tal estimado entre los Señores del Andalucía.”} it was almost inevitable that Morales would receive the sort of hybrid humanist-antiquarian education that would prepare him to function as a scholar of Greek and Latin texts at the same time as it ingrained the rudiments of the new antiquarian science, including epigraphy, numismatics, and archaeology. This education began in earnest in 1524 or 1525, when Morales was eleven or twelve years of age; at that point he began to study grammar with a priest named Alejo Montesino, rector of the San Andrés parish. One of his fellow tutees was Alonso Fernández de Argote, the paternal grandfather of the famous baroque poet Luis de Góngora (1561–1627).\footnote{Redel, \textit{Ambrosio de Morales}, 44.} Morales was also mentored by the jurist Pedro de Vallés, one of the Marqués de Priego’s servants. In a treatise on “Un error muy dañoso
común entre los hombres en desear muchas veces lo que no les conviene,” Morales later credited his mentor Vallés with being

one of the most distinguished and refined intellects, and the most profound and broadest judge that our Córdoba could have produced in these times . . . . In his old age, he dedicated himself completely to the study of Holy Scripture and Holy Doctors [of the Church] . . . . I greatly enjoyed his company, treating him and obeying him like my true father, while he loved me always and treated me in all things like his child.28

In the early 1540s, Morales retraced his father’s footsteps to the University of Alcalá, where he planned to immerse himself in the study of history. History was one of the most dynamic disciplines at the time, as the sixteenth-century revolution in the artes historicae—occasioned, at least in part, by the sort of secular antiquarianism that Morales had come to know so well in Córdoba—destabilized the canon and raised the possibility of writing a new kind of systematic, critical history from a wider array of sources.29

Morales apprenticed with the brilliant master Melchor Cano, OP (1509–1560).30 Though Cano was primarily a theologian—he held the Prime professorship of Theology at Alcalá from March 1543 until the death of the even more famous theologian Francisco de Vitoria (ca. 1486–1546) enabled him to decamp to Salamanca31—he held the Prime professorship of Theology at Alcalá from March 1543 until the death of the even more famous theologian Francisco de Vitoria (ca. 1486–1546) enabled him to decamp to Salamanca31—his search for firm foundations on which to base his theological refutations of Protestantism had led him to

---

28 Quoted in Redel, Ambrosio de Morales, 45. “uno de los más señalados y delicados ingenios, y más profundo y general juicio que nuestra Córdoba en estos tiempos pudo producir . . . . Siendo ya viejo se dió todo al estudio de la sagrada Escritura y Santos Doctores, escribiendo muchas cosas como la que aquí se ha de poner. Yo le gocé mucho, teniéndole y acatándole como á verdadero padre, y amándome él siempre y tratándome en todo como á hijo.”

29 On the fate of the artes historicae in the sixteenth century, see Anthony Grafton, What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

30 Redel, Ambrosio de Morales, 79. For more on Cano, see Fermín Caballero, Melchor Cano, Conquenses ilustres, 2 (Madrid: Imprenta del Colegio Nacional de Sordo-Mudos y de Ciegos, 1871).

31 Caballero, Melchor Cano, 80.
take up many of the same questions about source criticism and historical truth that characterized contemporary debates about the *artes historicae*.

Cano was not, perhaps, the most galvanizing personality, but Morales developed a deep and abiding affection for him and an unwavering respect for his approach to the writing of history, noting late in life that he had been “well loved” by Cano and treated with a “great affection” matched only by his reciprocal “esteem” for Cano’s “distinguished” method. That “distinguished” method, the key to understanding Morales’ evolving historical sensibility, is spelled out most clearly in the eleventh of Cano’s twelve books *De locis theologicis*, his polemical summa of Christian learning written in an unencumbered scholastic style. Cano had begun this work at the suggestion of his father, the jurist-turned-Franciscan Fernando Cano (d. 1553), while he was resident in the Dominican convent of San Gregorio in Valladolid in the late 1530s. It would not be finished until 1558, but the outline of the entire work was already set, embedded within the work’s first book, when Morales came under Cano’s tutelage in 1543.

32 ibid., 383.

33 Morales, *Coronica*, IX.prólogo. “El Padre Maestro Fray Melchor Cano, Obispo de Canaria, cuyo discípulo yo fui, y estimo como es razón haberlo sido, y haber sido muy amado dél, con mucha afición que me tuvo, en su insigne obra de los lugares teológicos trato … .”


To read Cano’s *Loci* today is above all else to be reminded of the strength of biblical criticism at Alcalá in the 1540s. Though ultimately a textbook on historical method, the eleventh *locus* on history is also a dizzyingly erudite tour through the sources of early Christian history, from Jerome to Augustine and Josephus to Nicephorus. Centered on eighteen “debates” about the possibility of extracting theological truth from history, it is also a splendid humanist (and occasionally vaguely antiquarian) treatise touching on many of the most contested topics in the biblical criticism of Cano’s day. Emblematic of both Cano’s interests and his methodological preferences is the eighth debate, joined in Chapter Three, on the traditional belief that Adam was buried directly under the site of the Crucifixion. (Theologically speaking, there was a certain attractiveness to this symmetry, as it allowed the remains of the fallen ‘first’ Adam to be redeemed by literal contact with the blood of the ‘second’ Adam.) After reviewing the various scriptural and patristic authorities’ positions on this legend, which he found to be inconclusive, Cano turned to the “collective memory” of centuries of Christian pilgrims for an answer. As Cano knew, the localization of Adam’s tomb within Calvary was one of the oldest and most venerable traditions which the Franciscans shared with pilgrims as they visited the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and it appeared in almost every pilgrimage account from Late Antiquity through the Renaissance. This, Cano, judged, gave it a

---

36 Cf. above, pp. 31-35.


38 The legend first appeared in Origen’s Commentary on Matthew 27:32–33. For a sample reference from a sixteenth-century Spanish pilgrimage guide, see BNM MS. 10883, “[U]n muy devoto tractado del viaje & misterios de la Tierra Sancta de Jerusalem & del Monte de Sinay según lo cuentan dos religiosos sacerdotes de la Orden del glorioso padre Sant Hierónimo, professos desta sancta casa & monasterio de Nuestra Señora Sancta Maria de Guadalupe, en el qual se contienen muchas cosas de gran devoción para consolación de las animas devotas” (ca. 1520), f. 106r. Francesco Quaresmio, the learned Franciscan author of an *Elucidatio Terrae Sanctae*, also subscribed to the theory. See
certain amount of credibility. And yet, it also seemed a bit too implausible. And so, admitting a healthy dose of skepticism to his calculation, on the grounds that “The populace … is in the end too inclined to believe these sorts of things; and the disposition to believe it insinuates itself into the minds of even the best people with the greatest of ease,” ultimately he decided that the legend was “rather unlikely” and ought to be dismissed.39

Though hardly exhaustive, this example touches on three key themes within Cano’s historical thought that would later reappear in Morales’ work. Chief among them is the probabilistic nature of historical inquiry. Historical truth is always elusive, argued Cano; one constantly finds texts that contradict each other, or even themselves. Given these circumstances, the best that the historian can do is to calculate the probability of truth, and thus Cano advocated dividing all sources and problems into three categories: those which were manifestly true, those which were manifestly false, and those which seemed merely possible.40 The second theme running through Cano’s thought is the relative value of individual observation versus accumulated tradition. Cano refused to opt decisively for one over the other, preferring instead to favor traditional authority in those matters pertaining to the Church and eyewitness testimony in all other subjects. (Hence his willingness to credit the ‘evidence’ of ingrained pilgrim tradition, the length or depth of which—strictly speaking—should have been irrelevant to determining its truth.) Last

---

39 Cano, L’autorità, 67–68. “memoria colletiva;” “Il popolo … è fin troppo incline a credere a cose di questo tipo; e la disponibilità a crederle si insinua con la massima facilità anche nella mente dei migliori;” “più probabile.”

40 ibid., 33–38, esp. 35–36.
but not least, the final theme running through Cano’s *Loci* is its innovative focus on the Holy Land as a concrete historical place—a feature that puts Cano’s history in the context not only of the humanist exegetes of Alcalá, but also of such popular historians as Pero Mexia (ca. 1496–1552), whose *Silva de varia lección* (1540) includes what is perhaps the first demythologized history of Jerusalem published in Spanish.41 Morales himself attempted to compose a history of Jerusalem in the early 1550s, though he never finished it; the unfinished manuscript was deposited in the Escorial.42

**MORALES AT COURT**

After finishing his degree, Morales accepted a teaching position at Alcalá, occupying for some time the post of Rector of the Colegio de SS. Felipe y Santiago (aka “del Rey”), which Philip II founded ca. 1550–1551.43 By all accounts, Morales was a dedicated teacher, and he managed in his relatively brief career at Alcalá to train nearly all of the most distinguished historians and antiquarians of the later sixteenth century—men like Juan Fernández Franco (ca. 1518–1601) and Alonso Chacón, OP (1530–1599).44 (He was also proud to have taught don Juan de Austria [1547–1578], the famous

---


43 ibid., 113.

At the same time, Morales doggedly continued his own historical inquiries into the Spanish past. Often, this meant organizing hands-on excavations close to home, of the sort that he had learned to do as a youth in Córdoba. Digging in Alcalá’s old Roman town, for example, he unearthed a “gran cippo” of Roman origins, installing it in the courtyard of his college.

Pitching himself as an accomplished member of Alcalá’s faculty, conversant in the latest techniques for dating coins and deciphering inscriptions, Morales now began to petition Philip’s Cámara de Castilla to appoint him royal chronicler (a post held at the time by Florián de Ocampo [ca. 1495–1558]), which would bring him a stipend and, more importantly, access to the royal court. Morales’ numerous petitions always made the same (good) argument, pointing to the incomplete state of Castilian historiography—a topic which he knew had been a sore spot with the royal government for some time.

Ocampo, appointed royal chronicler by Philip’s father Charles V in 1539, seemed to be producing little in spite of his generous stipend—his history of Spain would remain stalled at 208 BC—and the Castilian Cortés’ dream of producing a universal history of Spain, documented in a series of petitions to Charles across the 1520s and 1530s, seemed to be slipping away. While other budding nations and city-states had acquired complete histories linking antiquity to the present in a continuous stream, Spain had only a series of

---

45 Redel, Ambrosio de Morales, 88.

46 Morales, Antigüedades, 1:98. “un gran cippo que está aquí en Alcalá de Henares en el Colegio del Rey, y yo le hice traer allí de Alcalá la vieja.”

false starts. The Cámara de Casilla nevertheless demurred in the face of Morales’ pressure, and appointed Juan Páez de Castro (ca. 1512–1570) to Morales’ coveted post upon Ocampo’s untimely death in 1558.

Morales did not have to wait long, however, for his next opportunity, which came in 1560. Attending the king’s second wedding (to Isabel of Portugal) in Toledo, the spiritual capital of the Spanish Monarchy, Morales had the opportunity to mingle with the numerous ambassadors and foreign dignitaries whom Philip had invited to witness the occasion. What should have been a joyous occasion, Morales later reported to Philip’s Cámara, was instead marred by insults to Spanish national pride:

Being at the Court in Toledo, I conversed there with all of the Ambassadors of the Signorie and potentates of Italy; and all dwelled on [our lack of a universal history] and on how this lacuna reflected poorly on us; and they all showed great desire that this should be remedied. It pained me greatly to recognize how right they were to complain and to skewer our carelessness, in not having a single historian among us Spaniards worthy of being read and published, with the exception of Florián de Ocampo, who had just begun to write and who absented himself from the better part of the task.48

In apparent confirmation of the old axiom about the squeaky wheel, in 1561 the Cámara finally relented, offering Morales the post of royal historiographer. Once he accepted, he was given Páez de Castro’s papers and charged with completing Florián de Ocampo’s unfinished history.49

48 Ambrosio de Morales, Coronica, Prólogo. “Particularmente el año de mil y quinientos y sesenta cuando el Rey nuestro Señor, venido de Flandés, se casó, estando en la Córte en Toledo, comuniqué allí todos los Embajadores de las Señorías y potentados de Italia: y todos daban luego en esto y sentían esta falta con nuestro oprobio y mostraban mucho deseo de verla suplida y remediada. Doliámé á mí mucho el entender con cuánta razón se quejaban y nos zaherían nuestro descuido, de no haber autor ninguno de nuestros españoles en la historia digno de ser leído y publicado, sino Florián de Ocampo, que comenzó solamente y faltó al mejor tiempo en lo que proseguía.”

49 The first seven books of Morales’ continuation were published in 1574, followed by two more in 1577 and an additional five in 1586. See above, p. 70 n. 17.
In spite of his weighty obligation to complete Ocampo’s chronicle, Morales soon discovered that his symbolic move to the royal court (he still maintained his study at Alcalá de Henares) also entailed a significant amount of spontaneous consulting for his patron on questions of historical interest. (The day of the modern ‘historical consultant,’ one might observe, was not far off in the sixteenth century.) As construction on Philip’s monumental palace-monastery got underway at El Escorial, many of these ad hoc missions involved the selection and cataloguing of books and manuscripts for the Escorial’s library, the importance of which Morales’ predecessor Páez de Castro had impressed upon the king and his architects.50 These missions—several of which, it seems, were oriented towards satisfying Philip’s well-known curiosity about the geography and topography of his kingdoms51—also afforded Morales ample opportunities to travel about the kingdom and research the stones, coins, and inscriptions that had been of such interest to him since his youth. It was probably at this point in his career that Morales began to contemplate writing a comprehensive history of Spanish antiquities as a companion volume to the slow-moving Coronica (the latter of which he had already begun to treat as a burden.) This ‘side’ project, which many regard as Morales’ masterpiece, was eventually published in 1575 as the Antigüedades de las ciudades de España que van nombradas en la Coronica.52

50 For the formation of the Escorial’s library, see Fernando Checa, Felipe II mecenas de las artes, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Nerea, 1993), 380–387.

51 See above, p. 16.

52 Ambrosio de Morales, Las antigüedades de las ciudades de España que van nombradas en la Coronica con la averiguación de sus sitios y nombres antiguos. Con un discurso general, donde se enseña todo lo que a estas averiguaciones pertenece, para bien hacerlas y entender las antigüedades (Alcalá de Henares: Juan Iñíguez de Lequerica, 1575). I have consulted the third edition, published in 1792: Ambrosio de Morales, Las antigüedades de las ciudades de España que van nombradas en la corónica con las averiguaciones de sus sitios y nombres antiguos, ed. Enrique Flórez, 2 vols. (Madrid: Benito Cano, 1792).
At the same time as Morales was indulging his interest in secular antiquities, he was also greatly expanding his knowledge of historia sacra, as Philip began ever more frequently to ask him to consult on religious matters. In 1566, for example, Philip requested that he compose guidelines for the composition of accurate hagiographies, which he intended to pass along to the Hieronymite Order.\footnote{Morales’ instructions are preserved as AGS, Seccion de Escorial. Ambrosio de Morales, *Instrucciones para escribir vidas de santos*.} In 1567, Morales was given responsibility for shepherding the canonization case of the Franciscan Diego de Alcalá (d. 1463) through the Vatican. (Morales’ Spanish patriotism eventually prevailed, and S. Diego was canonized in 1588).\footnote{Redel, *Ambrosio de Morales*, 158.} One year later, he stepped in to advise the king about the translation of the bodies of SS. Justo and Pastor, the fourth-century child-martyrs of Morales’ adopted hometown of Alcalá de Henares, from their medieval shrine in the Aragonese town of Huesca back to their original home in Alcalá.\footnote{Morales also wrote an account of the translation: Ambrosio de Morales, *La vida, el martyrio, la invencion, las grandezas y las translaciones de los gloriosos niños martyres san Justo y Pastor : y el solenne triumpho con que fueron recibidas sus santas reliquias en Alcala de Henares en su postrera translation* (Alcalá de Henares: Andrés de Angulo, a costa de Blas de Robles, 1568). One of the interesting bits of trivia in the account is the story of an attempted earlier translation—more properly, a furta sacra—sponsored by Cardinal Cisneros, which resulted in the death of the Cardinal’s agents at the hand of the angry townspeople of Huesca.}

It was in the course of these extraordinary projects that Morales came face-to-face for the first time with the necessity of authenticating relics. As Morales attempted to apply his antiquarian erudition to these relics—inspecting them, comparing them to textual authorities, examining their provenance—he came to realize that relics were very unusual objects, quite unlike the other artifacts he had become accustomed to authenticating for Philip. They often came without reliable textual testimonies, and only rarely was it possible to learn anything from their physical appearance. Moreover,
Morales realized, in handling relics one inevitably entered into a preexisting universe of attitudes about what constituted authenticity—attitudes that could be quite different from the criteria agreed upon by most Renaissance antiquarians.

**WHOSE AUTHENTICITY?**

Reading sixteenth-century reformers’ numerous critiques of the cult of relics, one might be tempted to believe that medieval Catholics placed little or no importance on the authenticity of the relics they so fervently worshipped. This is simply not true. As Annabel Wharton has observed, relics’ very powers depended “on the perception that they were authentic;” whenever their “authenticity was doubted … they did not perform.” It would, therefore, be more accurate to say that medieval Catholics operated with a definition of authenticity different from ours. In fact, medieval believers were exceptionally sophisticated in their approach to relics’ authenticity; what has confused historians for so long is their failure to recognize the existence of two different concepts of authenticity itself.

Some medieval collectors thought about authenticity in much the same fashion that we do—that is, as an exclusive, unique purchase on truth. Simply put, certain relics were held to be authentic only insofar as they were ‘originals’ and not ‘copies,’ composed of actual wood from the actual Cross or actual stone from the very same sepulcher in which Christ had been buried. Relics held to this exacting standard generally tended to be those which were exchanged at high levels of society, as gifts between friendly sovereigns, or those which came directly from the papal treasury. If relics were to continue to play a prominent role in this gift economy, rulers had to be able to count on

---

their rarity, uniqueness, and authenticity—in short, on their potential to serve as status symbols. As Holger Klein has noted, it was precisely their aura of “pricelessness and restricted accessibility that made relics a particularly powerful gift on Byzantine diplomatic missions to the Christian rulers and heirs of Charlemagne’s empire in the West.”57 From the very beginning, therefore, the practice of using relics as instruments of high diplomacy also entailed a widespread need for some very particular standards for determining whether a relic was “authentic” or “unique.”

Relics held to these standards were generally authenticated via the constant, discursive telling and retelling of their provenance.58 As early as the fourth century, when S. Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 315–386) boasted that “the holy wood of the Cross … now almost fills the whole world, by means of those who in faith take portions from it,”59 *ekphrases* of Holy Land relics were always careful to trace them back to their place of origin in the Biblical Near East.60 Owners of ‘secondhand’ relics found it essential to establish a chain of custody certifying that, once invented, their relics had never left the possession of notable and trustworthy persons, ideally bishops and hermits, in the interim. A letter of S. Paulinus of Nola (354–431) to Sulpicius Severus provides an excellent early example of this preoccupation with provenance. In describing a fragment of *lignum Crucis* he had sent Sulpicius, Paulinus was careful to verify its pedigree by

---


tracing its provenance all the way back to S. Helena herself. Explaining that “I have found … a fragment of a sliver of the wood of the holy Cross to send you as a worthy gift. … This goodly gift was brought to me from Jerusalem by the blessed Melania [the year before], a gift of the holy bishop John there,” Paulinus then proceeded to relate the history of S. Helena’s *inventio Crucis* before once again declaring that it is “by [the bishop’s] gift alone that these tiny fragments of sacred wood from the same cross are made available.” Between its discovery by S. Helena and its arrival at Sulpicius’ door, the Cross had been in the possession of no one but a bishop, a devout donor of the Church, and Paulinus himself.

Most relics, however, circulated outside of this exclusive economy and, therefore, did not (indeed, could not) benefit from such elaborate pedigrees. For these relics, Morales discovered, “authenticity” was interpreted to mean something entirely different from the usual, narrow definition it possesses today. Rather than focus on relics’ uniqueness or exclusivity, lay believers sought to define authenticity in a way that made it compatible with an equally strong belief in relics’ seemingly infinite duplicability. In a recent article, Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have explored this unusual belief in the replicability of objects—what they term their “double historicity”—noting that “this was not a matter of self-delusion or indolence but a function of an entire way of

---


thinking about the historicity of artifacts repeatedly misunderstood by the modern
discipline of art history.”

This way of thinking about relics was equally rooted in patristic authority.
According to some early theologians, relics—as a special class of objects acting in the
present to commemorate the past—could be multiplied and replicated at will. In other
words, relics were thought to participate in the principle of synecdoche, each fragment
capable of standing for the whole. In his *Curatio affectionum graecarum*, the bishop
Theodoret of Cyrrhus (393–ca. 457) explained that, though a martyr’s remains may have
been scattered, “the grace remains undivided, and the tiniest particle of a relic has a
power equal to that which the martyr would have had if not divided.” The same was
true for Victricius of Rouen (d. ca. 409), one of the staunchest defenders of the doctrine
that relics were not diminished by their division. When approaching relics, he preached,
“one should not introduce division into fullness, but rather worship the essence of
fullness in this very division which lies before our eyes.” Relics could be duplicated and
replaced without losing their essential veracity. According to Patricia Cox Miller, “the so-
called ‘cult’ of relics … [is] better described as an aesthetic in which division—the
parceling-out of the bones, ashes, and other remains of the martyrs’ bodies—was
paradoxically also multiplication, as in the analogous case of the holy cross in Jerusalem,

---


which remained miraculously whole despite being constantly broken up into fragments, themselves considered to be ‘whole.’”

This theory of the whole’s relationship to its parts applied not only to a relic’s powers, but also to its very substance. Again, Paulinus of Nola’s letter to Sulpicius Severus provides an example. According to Paulinus, in spite of the fact that the Cross had “lent its wood” to “countless” faithful, “yet it suffers no diminution; though daily divided, it seems to remain whole to those who lift it, and always entire to those who venerate it. Assuredly it draws this power of incorruptibility, this undiminishing integrity, from the Blood of the Flesh which endured death yet did not see corruption.”

The survival into the Renaissance of this popular belief in the replicability or “double historicity” of relics is clearly visible in the popular dichos and refranes of early modern Spain. Hernán Núñez’s 1555 Refranes o proverbios en romance and the Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales (1627) of Gonzalo Correas (ca. 1571–1631), for example, contain roughly the same story illustrating lay acceptance of the idea that lignum Crucis was infinitely replicable and substitutable:

It is said that a devout person requested of a man who was going on pilgrimage to Rome and the Holy Land that he bring him a bit of lignum Crucis; but the man forgot, and only remembered the request on his return voyage, while crossing a river by boat. Since there was nothing else he could do, he cut a bit of wood from the boat, and gave it to the sick man as if it were the real Cross. Later, as it was believed to be a true relic, it was applied with devotion to many pains and illnesses, and they were healed.

65 Miller, “‘Differential Networks’, ” 123.
67 Redondo, “Devoción tradicional,” 400 n. 41.
68 Hernán Núñez, Refranes o proverbios en romance ... (Salamanca: Juan de Cánova, 1555), f. 3v. “Afición es la que sana, que no el palo de la barca.”
Therefore the pilgrim said to himself: “It’s the intent that cures, not the splinter from the boat.”

This story in particular proved popular, and was referenced by the Franciscan Antonio de Aranda (d. 1555) in order to explain to readers of his *Verdadera informacion de la Tierra Santa* (1531) why it was

less dangerous to reverence a stone or stick or other such thing given to us by someone whom we judge to be trustworthy, with the understanding that it came from the column or Holy Sepulcher or Calvary or True Cross, even though it were a fake, than it is to toss them in the gutter or anywhere else out of incredulity, not believing that they could be real. I would not doubt that Our Lord would even allow true miracles to be worked through these fakes, in recognition of the merit of your devotion … . From whence comes the proverb: “I would rather have the devotion of Martha than a splinter from the boat.”

Thus, according to Aranda, “singular faith and devotion [should always be had] for the earth and relics taken from such holy places [ie., Jerusalem]. So even if you have been deceived, as often happens (by vagabonds who pretend they have visited the Holy Places and are carrying relics—they and their relics are frauds and lies) you will not lose the merit earned by your pious faith and devotion because the Christian faith recognizes it as

---

69 Gonzalo Correas, *Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales*, ed. Louis Combet (Bordeaux: Institut d’études ibériques et ibéro-américaines de l’Université de Bordeaux, 1967), 182b. “La intención es la ke sana, ke no el palo de la barka … Dizen ke una persona devota enkomendó a uno ke iva en rromería a Rroma i la Tierra Santa ke la truxesse un poko de ‘Lignum Crucis’; él se olvidó, i a la buelta, pasando un rrío por una barka, se akordó de la enkomienda, i komo ia no avía rremedio, kortó un poko de un madero de la barka, ke dio en lugar del verdadero. Después, komo verdadera rrelikia, aplikándola kon devozión a dolores i enfermedades, sanavan. Entonzes el rromero dezía entre si: ‘La intención es la ke sana, ke no el palo de la barka.'”

70 Antonio de Aranda, *Verdadera informacion de la tierra sancta, segun la dispusicion que en el año de mil y quinientos y treynta el auctor la vio y passeo* (Toledo: Juan Ferrer, 1550 [1531]), f. 17r. “Menor peligro es, por cierto, tener en reverencia una piedra o un palo o otra cosa desta calidad que una persona que al parecer juzgamos ser digna de fe nos dio afirmando que era de la columna o del sepulcro o Calvario o de la Vera Cruz, aunque sea falso, que no por incredulidad hechar en el muladar o en otro lugar las tales cosas no dando fe como pudiessen ser verdaderas. E aun no dudaríamos por el merescimiento de la devoción permitir Nuestro Señor que con las tales cosas falsas se hiziesen efectos verdaderos … . De donde salió el proverbio: ‘No me echa a mí el palo de la barca mas la devoción de Martha.'”
true.”71 In other words, a relic’s power depended less on its “authenticity” *per se* than on the individual Christian’s *faith* in its authenticity.72

**MORALES’ SANTO VIAJE**

Morales’ first forays into the evaluation of relics in the late 1560s had impressed upon him how easily these competing concepts of “authenticity” could make any attempt to authenticate a relic into a fool’s errand—or, as his mentor Cano might have put it, how little the authentication of relics had to do with certainty, and how much more it was a matter of probabilistic reasoning. By the time Philip forwarded him the memorandum from the Oviedo cathedral chapter in April 1572, Morales had already begun to articulate some general principles for determining the probability of a relic’s authenticity. When faced with competing claims of authenticity, Morales decided, one should turn first to *local* testimony: that is, the oral traditions and beliefs preserved by the community most closely affiliated with the relic in question. He had also concluded that, among written testimonies of a relic’s authenticity, liturgical texts should generally be regarded as the most compelling.73

---

71 Aranda, *Verdadera informacion*, f. 13r. “Singular fe y devoción [se debe] a la tierra o reliquias tomadas y traydas de lugares tan santos. Ca puesto que fuessen engañados, como muchas vezes acaces (de hombres vagamundos que se fingen aver visitado los lugares sanctos y traer reliquias, como ellos y ellas sean falsedad y mentira) no se perderá la merced de vuestra piadosa fe e devoción pues so titulo de verdad la piedad christiana lo recibe.”

72 Interestingly, even Philip seems to have been capable of subscribing to this way of thinking about relics: when his secretary Cristóbal de Moura warned him that many of the relics that he had collected at the Escorial were probably spurious, Philip responded that false relics “no nos engañaran, pues no perderemos nuestro merecimiento delante de Dios reverenciado a sus Sanctos en los Huesos, aunque no sean suyos.” Archivo del Palacio Real, Madrid, legajo 1816, 4. Quoted in Lazure, “Possessing the Sacred,” 60 n. 7.

73 This latter conclusion first appears in Morales’ work in 1566, in the guidelines he had prepared for Hieronymite hagiographers. When advising them about which sources yield the most reliable historical information, Morales singled out the “lecciones que usan ya las Iglesias en sus maytines y breviarios.” See Palma Martínez-Burgos García, *Idolos e imágenes: La controveria del arte religioso en el siglo*
Soon, Morales would have the opportunity to put his criteria to the test. After reading Morales’ response to the Oviedo memorandum with care, Philip forwarded it in late April 1572 to his learned councillor Martin de Velasco. Impressed by Morales’ erudition, Dr. Velasco suggested an idea to Philip. From his service on the royal council, to which Morales reported, Velasco knew that Morales was planning to spend the summer in the Galician city of Santiago de Compostela, where he intended to examine the famous shrine of Spain’s patron saint while foraging in the cathedral’s archive for more documents with which to lard the forthcoming installment of his *Coronica*. Why not commission him to make an exhaustive *visita* of all of the churches and monasteries not only of Galicia, or Asturias, but also León? That way, Velasco suggested, Morales could devote his considerable talents to composing an eyewitness (*por vista de ojos*) report of all of the relics, burials, and manuscripts in all three provinces.\(^74\)

Philip, whose legendary fascination with maps and surveys earned him the epithet “the Paper King” (*el Rey papelero*) from his contemporaries, naturally embraced

\(^{74}\) Morales faithfully recorded the details of his commission, and the lengthy peregrination that ensued (which Morales referred to as his *viaje santo*, or “holy voyage”), in the memorandum which he ultimately produced for Philip II upon the conclusion of his journey in early 1573. [See below, p. 91 for a fuller discussion of this memorandum.] The text of Morales’ memorandum has come down to us in somewhat circuitous fashion. Philip had Morales’ autograph manuscript deposited in the Escorial library, where it was consulted frequently by a generation of antiquarians and then abruptly forgotten in the seventeenth century. The manuscript was rediscovered, and finally printed, in the mid-eighteenth century by Enrique Flórez (1702–1773), Morales’ intellectual heir: Ambrosio de Morales, *Viage de Ambrosio de Morales por orden del rey D. Phelipe II. a los reynos de Leon, y Galicia, y principado de Asturias. Para reconocer las reliquias de santos, sepulcros reales, y libros manuscritos de las catedrales, y monasterios*, ed. Enrique Flórez (Madrid: A. Marin, 1765). I have consulted the second print edition of the *Viage*, which fills the majority of the second volume of Benito Cano’s 1792 edition of Morales’ *Antigüedades de las ciudades de España* [see p. 80 n. 53 above]. In Cano’s edition, the *Viage* is paginated separately from the *Antigüedades* as pp. 1–274; it is to these numbers that I refer. Velasco’s desire to have Morales compile a report “por vista de ojos” appears on p. 7.
Velasco’s recommendation. And so, on 18 May 1572, he issued a Cédula Real at Madrid dispatching Morales on his scholarly peregrination. Guided purely by his “zeal and desire for the divine service and cult, and particularly for the veneration of the Saints and their bodies and relics,” Philip decreed, he was ordering his historian Ambrosio de Morales to visit all of the “Churches and Monasteries” within the confines of León, Asturias, and Galicia. There, he should study … the said relics and holy bodies, and their testimonies and authority, as well as how they are cared for and kept, and the veneration and decency with which they are treated. And do the same for the remains of our royal ancestors: look into where, and in what form and manner they are buried, as well as what sort of donations and endowments they left behind, and what commemorations, vigils, masses, prayers, and sacrifices are performed on their behalf. And also look into and identify the ancient, rare, and exquisite books, whether manuscript or printed, that you find in the said Churches and Monasteries.

The cédula concluded with an instruction to “compose and deliver to us a very specific memorandum of everything,” followed by a paragraph addressed to the royal and ecclesiastical officials that Morales was likely to encounter ordering them to comply with his wishes.

Morales could hardly refuse his sovereign; and so, in early June he departed Alcalá and headed north to Olmedo. There he met Dr. Velasco and received his official

---


76 Morales, Viaje, 8–9. “el zelo y deseo que tenemos del servicio y culto divino, y particularmente de la veneracion de los Santos y de sus cuerpos y reliquias;” “Iglesias y Monesterios;” “os informéis muy particularmente de las dichas reliquias y cuerpos santos, y los testimonios y autoridad que dellos hay, y veréis el recaudo y guarda en que estan y la veneracion y decencia con que son tratados. Y asimismo por lo que toca á los cuerpos de los Reyes nuestros antecesores, veais en qué partes y lugares, en qué manera y forma estan sepultados, qué dotaciones y fundaciones dexaron, y las memorias, vigilias, misas, oraciones y sacrificios que por ellos se hacen. Y otrosí veais y reconozcais los libros asi de mano, como de molde antiguos, raros y exquisitos que en las dichas Iglesias y Monasterios hay, y de todo hagais y nos traigais muy particular relacion.”
copy of Philip’s cédula.\textsuperscript{77} With that settled, Morales headed north to the old imperial capital of Valladolid, where he began his researches in the city’s famous Benedictine house. From Valladolid, he continued north, spending the next eight months roaming the verdant hills of northwestern Spain, ducking into churches and monasteries, brandishing his cédula, and rummaging through their relic collections and libraries. In late February 1573, Morales returned to Valladolid, meeting first with Dr. Velasco (on the last day of the month) and then with Philip himself (on 1 March) to debrief his findings and preview his final report. Once back in Alcalá, he drew up a final copy of his memorandum, which he delivered to the royal secretary Antonio Gracián on 20 November 1573.\textsuperscript{78}

Much to his surprise, some of the churches and monasteries that Morales uncovered in the course of his long and punishing journey turned out to have reasonably good documentation of the provenance of their Holy Land relics. In Sahagún, for example, Morales found what he considered to be a fully verifiable fragment of \textit{lignum Crucis} in the possession of the local Benedictines: “according to the monastery’s trustworthy memorials, dating from the time of King Alonso VI [(1040–1109)], it is known that he [ie. Alonso VI] donated it, and that he had received it from the Emperor Alexus [Comnenius] of Constantinople.”\textsuperscript{79} These were the most satisfying encounters, he recorded in his memorandum. Though Morales cultivated a reputation as a hardened pugilist in his \textit{Coronica} and \textit{Antigüedades}, always skeptical (and often intolerant) of mistaken conclusions and mishandled evidence, in fact he claimed to have a strong

\textsuperscript{77} ibid., 10.

\textsuperscript{78} ibid., 254.

\textsuperscript{79} Morales, \textit{Viage}, 48. “por memorias fidedignas de la casa de tiempo del Rey Don Alonso el VI. se sabe como la dió él, y que se la había enviado á él el Emperador Alegio de Constantinopla.”
aversion to overturning past consensuses: “As everyone who knows me understands,” he once wrote, “it is God’s will that I am always inclined to esteem and to praise the works of lettered men. And since I find celebrating them so sweet, it leaves a bad taste in my mouth to contradict them.”\(^\text{80}\) And indeed, whenever trustworthy relics were to be had, Morales rushed to embrace their claims of authenticity.

Yet this preference for the *status quo* did not prevent Morales from excoriating those priests and friars who doggedly insisted upon the veracity of laughably dubious relics. Morales—like his contemporaries Juan de Orozco and the Jesuit Pedro de Rivadaneira, who ridiculed relic traffickers in their *Tratado de la verdadera y falsa prophecía* and *Tratado de la tribulación*—justified the violence of their opinions in these cases by noting that it was only by denouncing notorious abuses that one could defend the cult of relics as a whole.\(^\text{81}\) In the Church of Santo Domingo, in León, for example, Morales noted that pilgrims were shown a stone, ensconced in a gilded reliquary, “which they say is one of the stones which were thrown at S. Stephen” and which they “consider

---

\(^{80}\) Morales, *Coronica*, XIII.1. “Verdaderamente algunos de nuestros historiadores y especialmente los de nuestros días usaron diligencia en lo que han escrito, descubriendo algunas cosas de que antes no se tenía noticia: y se les deben por estos buenos trabajos las gracias siendo sus libros estimados por ellos. Mas todavía se verá en esta mi historia como faltaba aún mucho de lo que se debía escribir y averiguar destos tiempos que en ella se prosiguen. Por esto entre todo mi gusto y placer en escribir, habrá también algo de desabrido y enojoso para mí, cual será haber de contrardecir á otros para averiguar y dar clara la verdad. Y tanto será esto más desabrido para mí cuanto de mi natural, como alguna vez ya he dicho, soy enemigo de contradecir ni de tener contienda con nadie: antes, por merced de nuestro Señor, soy inclinado á estimar y á alabar (como todos los que me conocen entienden) los trabajos de los hombres de letras: y como me es dulce el celebrarlos, así me ha de ser de mal gusto el contrareírlos. Mas esto se hará solamente en las cosas de importancia para la historia y en que forzosamente se requiere manifiestar la verdad: y entonces se hará de tal manera y con tal moderación que se entienda como no se buscó ocasión de reprehender sino que siguió la necesidad de dar luz á la verdad.”

a very precious relic.” Yet the stone, Morales noted, was most certainly a forgery, and made him so angry that he wished to “smash” it. 

In the Benedictine monastery of S. Payo, in Galicia, the monks’ fraud was even more naked, and offered Morales a rare opportunity to incorporate his exhaustive knowledge of Roman antiquities into his survey:

They have an altar stone, which serves them as the high altar, … which they consider to be a distinguished relic, and famous throughout the land. They say that the Apostles consecrated this altar, and celebrated the mass on it, and that the disciples of the Apostle S. James [the Greater] brought it here with his holy body. I will describe it here exactly as it is, and you will see not only that there are no grounds for saying this, but that it is positively wicked to say it, and to use this stone as an altar, given what it was (which is so plain to see). It is a slab of beautiful white marble, three quarters (or a little less) square. It is sculpted all around, embellished with very handsome, very meticulously carved foliage. Similarly well carved are the letters which appear on the slab’s broad face. … “D.M.S. ATIAMO ET AT TE T LUMPSA VIRIA EMO NEPTIS PIANO. XVI. ET SFC.” What this clearly shows, without any doubt, is that this stone was the tomb of one or two Gentiles, because of the ‘Diis Manibus Sacrum,’ which is how they consecrated their memory to their damned gods of the underworld. … Given that this stone was the tomb of Gentiles, and that the writing on it is a dedication to the gods of the underworld, the bishop who consecrated that altar was certainly careless, because with just a little inspection he would have recognized that this stone is unworthy of being used as an altar, and that the Most Holy Sacrament should not be placed on words which invoked Gentile gods. …

“How no thinking bishop would have consecrated that altar,” Morales reported, “you well can see what a wicked thing it is to say that the Apostles consecrated it, and said Mass upon it.”

---

82 Morales, Viage, 76. “tienen por reliquia muy apreciada, y engastada en relicario de plata dorada, una piedra, que dicen es de las que se tiraron á San Esteban: tiene letras y caracteres de lo grabado con agua fuerte y cera; y por ellos me parece sería bueno quebrar aquella piedra.”

83 ibid., 169–170. “Tienen por insigne reliquia, y muy famosa en toda la tierra, un ara, que sirve en el altar mayor … . Dicen que los Apóstoles consagraron esta ara, y celebraron sobre ella, y que los discípulos del Apóstol Santiago la truxeron con su santo cuerpo: yo la representaré aquí toda como ella es, y se verá no solamente que no hay fundamento para decir aquello, sino que no es bien decirlo, ni tener aquella piedra para que sirva de ara, habiendo sido lo que fué, y teniéndolo tan manifiesto lo que
In Oviedo, where Morales spent the largest amount of time, he also dared to question two reliquaries displayed in the Cámara Santa; one contained two thorns from the crown of thorns, which failed to impress him; the other, one of the thirty *denarii* for which Judas betrayed Christ. Here, just as Philip had feared, Morales made no secret of his skepticism, deploying his numismatic training to warn his patron off of these particularly hackneyed relics:

In general this business of the *denarii* that are shown this way in some places is an uncertain one, with little foundation, because the Jews did not have their own coinage in those days, but rather used that of their rulers, the Romans. Thus their response to our Redeemer’s questions: *Cujus est imago haec? Caesaris*. Given this, it is clear that any *denarius* without the image of Augustus Caesar, or of a Roman predecessor who minted coins, cannot have been among those for which our Redeemer was sold. And so far, every one which I have seen exhibited as such has not been a Roman *denarius*.

“Though this should be enough to prevent people from believing that they are one of the thirty [coins],” Morales argued, “others insist upon their authenticity.”

---

fué. Es una losa de muy lindo mármol blanco, tres quartas, ó poco ménos en quadro. Tiene molduras al derredor, enriquecidas de follages muy hermosos, labrados con mucha delicadeza: así estan tambien labradas harto bien las letras que la losa tiene en lo llano … . ‘D.M.S. ATIAMO ET AT TE T LUMPAS VIRIA EMO NEPTIS PIANO. XVI. ET SFC’ Lo que desta piedra se entiende claro, sin que pueda haber duda en ello, es, como es sepultura de uno ó dos Gentiles, por tener el Diis Manibus Sacrum, que es el consagrar aquella memoria á sus malditos dioses que tenian de los defuntos. … Siendo esto así que aquella fué piedra de sepultura de Gentiles, y que tiene en las letras aquella dedicacion á los dioses de los defuntos, tuvo poca consideracion el Obispo que consagró aquel ara, porque con poca advertencia entendiera ser indigna cosa que sirviera de ara una tal piedra, y que se ponga el Santísimo Sacramento sobre palabras con que se invovaban los dioses de los Gentiles, … y pues qualquier Obispo bien considerado no consagrara aquel ara, vese bien quán mal hecho es decir que los Apóstoles la consagraron, y dixeron Misa sobre ella.”

84 ibid., 96–97. “en general esto de los Denarios que así se muestran en algunas partes, es cosa incierta, y de poco fundamento, porque los Judios no tenian en aquel tiempo moneda propia, sino que corria entre ellos la de los Romanos sus Señores. Así respondieron á la pregunta de nuestro Redentor: *Cujus est imago haec? Caesaris*. Conforme á esto está claro que ningun Denario, que no tuviere la imagen de Augusto César, ó de los Romanos, que antes dél batiéron moneda, no pueden ser de aquellos, por que fué vendido nuestro Redentor: y los que hasta agora yo he visto mostrar por tales, no son Denarios Romanos: y aunque esto basta para no haberlos de tener por los de treinta, tienen otros hartos achaques en esta su verdad.”

---
THE IMPORTANCE OF PLACE

While Morales thus was able to label a surprising number of the relics he encountered as either “manifestly true” or “manifestly false”—Cano’s categories again—the great majority of those which he reviewed during his eight-month sojourn were, predictably, merely “possibly” authentic. In the convent of Las Huelgas, in Valladolid, for example, he reported that he had discovered a “large” piece of the True Cross, “the size of one and a half fingers,” but “there was no way to say where, nor how, it had been obtained.” (The same was true of the relic which the convent claimed had belonged to one of S. Ursula’s 11,000 virgins; “there is no testimony in support of any of this,” Morales sighed.)

More urgently, Morales discovered, the same could be said of many of the most precious relics within the Cámara Santa in Oviedo, the original objective of his mission. Morales was quite taken with the Arca Santa, which he had never seen before this visit, rhapsodizing over the “holy ark so celebrated … in our Histories of Spain.”

It is six palms long, three and one-half wide, and slightly more in height, …. its lid is broad, and not caved in, and everywhere it is covered in silver plate of considerable thickness, gilded in places. On the front it has the twelve Apostles in medium relief, and on the sides histories of Our Lady. On the top of the lid there is a drawing of a Crucifix with four nails, and many images surrounding it, and the arms of the thieves [with whom Christ was crucified] are represented strangely as being inserted in holes in the arms of their crosses, such that they are half embracing the wood from above, with their hands coming out underneath.

---

85 ibid., 28. “como dedo y medio;” “No hay decir cómo, ni de dónde se hubo;” “de nada de esto hay testimoio.”

86 ibid., 91–93. “santa arca tan celebrada … en nuestras Historias de España. Es de seis palmos en largo, tres y medio en ancho, y otro tanto en alto, y está mas levantada, por estar sobre peana de piedra hecha para ella. Es llana en la tapa, y no tumbada, y por todas partes cubierta de planchas de plata de razonable grueso, doradas en algunas partes. En la delantera tiene los doce Apóstoles de medio relieve, y á los lados historias de nuestra Señora. Mas en lo llano de la tapa está de debuxo [sic] un Crucifixo con quatro clavos, y muchas imágenes al rededor, y los Ladrones tienen de extraña manera metidos los
True to his antiquarian instincts, Morales focused first on the many inscriptions
decorating the Arca and the Cámara Santa in hope of finding some confirmation of the
Arca’s alleged seventh-century origins.

The Arca had one inscription, he reported, which “everyone here affirms”
recorded the deeds of Alfonso III (r. 866–ca. 910). This might be good evidence for the
Arca’s antiquity, Morales admitted; unfortunately, however, upon further investigation he
concluded that the inscription clearly alluded to Alfonso VI (r. 1072–1109), making it
much less convincing as a proof of the Arca’s alleged arrival in Oviedo nearly five
centuries before, in 632.87 Surveying the church as a whole, he excitedly recorded an
inscription on “a stone that is in the exterior wall of this Church, which is called ‘del Rey
Casto,’” and which actually did seem to make reference to Alfonso III.88 Yet again,
neither of these inscriptions offered decisive evidence of the Arca’s alleged origins in the
Near East.

87 ibid., 92–93. “La otra parte del arca santa está toda labrada sobre la plata de un enladrillado menudico,
y todo representa bien tanta antigüedad, como de haberla hecho el Rey Don Alonso Tercero, llamado
el Magno, como allí lo afirman todos, aunque yo creo cierto es todo de Don Alonso Sexto, que ganó a
Toledo, según lo dicen estas letras que estan al rededor en la tapa en quatro renglones que andan al
rededor della. ‘ … Manus & industria Clericorum & Presulum qui propter hoc convenimus cum dicto
Adefonso Principe, & cum germana letissime Urraca nomine dicta, quibus Redentor omnium concedat
indulgenciam & suorum peccatorum veniam per hec sanctissima pignora Apostolorum & Sancti Justi
& Pastoris, Cosme & Damiani, Eulalie Virginis, & Maximi, Germani, Baduli, Pantaleonis, Cypriani, &
Justine, Sebastiani, Facundi, & Primitivi, Chistophori [sic], Cucufati, Felicis, Sulpicij.’”

88 ibid., 94. “Veo tambien otro gran testimonio de la antigüedad y veneracion de esta Santa Cámara, y
Arca, en una piedra que está en la pared de fuera de la Iglesia, que llaman del Rey Casto, de quien
después dirémos, y la piedra es del Rey Don Alonso el Magno, que es el tercero deste nombre, y tiene
estas letras. ‘In nomine Domini Dei & Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, sive omnium ejus gloriose Sancte
Marie Virginis bisensique Apostolis, ceterisque sanctis Martyribus ob cujus honorem templum
edificatum est in hunc locum Oveto a quondam religioso Adefonso Principe. Ab ejus namque discressu
usque nunc quartus ex illius prosapia in regno succeedens consimili nomine Adefonhsus Princeps dive
quidem memorie Ordonii Regis filius hanc edificari sanxit munitionem cum conjuge Scemena
duobusque pignore natis adjunzione muninis thesauri aulae hujus Sancte Ecclesie residendum
indemnem cayentes, quod absit, dum navale gentilitas piratu solent exercitu properare ne videatur
aliquid deperire. Hoc opus à nobis offertum idem Ecclesiae perhemni sit jure concessum.’”
Following the rubric he had begun to articulate in the 1560s, Morales turned to both the liturgy and local tradition for aid. It seemed to him that “the feast in honor of the arrival of this Santa Arca, which has been celebrated in this Church with great solemnity on the thirteenth of March from most ancient times,” and which included the chanting of “Vespers and a High Mass in the Cámara Santa, which are attended by a great throng,” was “another, even greater, testimony” than either of the inscriptions he had studied. “It has an entire Office of its own,” enthused Morales, “in which reference is made to the Arca Santa’s journey from Jerusalem to Africa, from there to Spain, and ultimately from Toledo to here. The fact that the Church has instituted a feast similar to that which celebrates events like the Triumph of the Cross … is a very serious testimony; indeed, for theologians it is almost irrefutable.”

It was also on the basis of local devotion that Morales was willing to accept the authenticity of one of the most problematic relics affiliated with the Arca Santa, a relic which otherwise he might well have dismissed. It was a stained cloth, alleged to be a fragment of Christ’s *sudarium*, which was shown to the people with great pomp and circumstance on three occasions every year. *Sudaria*, like Judas’ thirty coins, were

---

89 ibid., 94–95. “Es otro testimonio aun mayor que todos estos la fiesta que en esta Iglesia de tiempo antiguísimo acá se celebra de la venida de esta Santa Arca á ella con gran solemnidad á los trece de Marzo diciéndose las Vísperas y Misa mayor en la Cámara Santa, y hay gran concurso de la tierra á ella. Hay Oficio propio entero, donde se refiere la venida del Arca Santa desde Jerusalen á Africa, de allí á España, y últimamente de Toledo acá. Este es un gravísimo testimonio, pues los Teólogos tienen por tal, y de verdad quasi irrefagable, instituir la Iglesia fiesta de un suceso como el Triunfo de la Cruz, S. Juan Ante portam latinam, y otros semejantes.”

90 ibid., 101–102. “El Santo Sudario es quadrado de tres quartas en largo y media vara en ancho, poquito mas ó menos todo. El lienzo no está miy blanco, y aunque se mire con atencion se extraña en cierta manera para no poder bien verse qué tal es. Tiene manchas de sangre deslavada, mayores y menores, por muchas partes: unos dicen, que en una gran mancha de éstas hay representacion del rostro de nuestro Redentor, y otras cosas particulares. Lo que yo, aunque indigno, ví, es que pone notable devoción, así que enagena en cierta manera aun hasta un pecador como yo, para que no pueda tener advertencia á cosas de éstas. Muéstrase al pueblo el Santo Sudario tres veces en el año, el Viérnes Santo, y las dos fiestas de la cruz, siempre con gran solemnidad; y porque yo pudiese dar á S.M.
among the most problematic relics in sixteenth-century Europe, dispersed far too widely to be believable. Yet when it came to the question of this relic’s authenticity, Morales accepted it almost without comment, noting “the very ancient veneration in which this relic is held.”

Why such faith in the continuity of local devotion? There are two possible explanations for Morales’ willingness to accept the length and strength of Ovetenses’ belief in these relics as a valid substitute for more conventional proofs of their authenticity. The first would be to place Morales squarely within the culture of “double historicity,” to argue that he believed that the value of relics was confirmed by the mere fact of their veneration rather than by any objective measure of authenticity. This, however, seems unlikely given his willingness to dismiss so many other relics over the fervent objections of their partisans. Much more likely, then, is the second possibility, that Morales’ appreciation for local devotion was a proxy for his faith in something else, something more solid than the opinions of the common people. In fact, that seems to have been exactly the case. “The institution of a feast,” postulated Morales, “is particularly

91 The town of Jaén, located in the south between Córdoba and Granada, claimed in the 1480s to have acquired a sudarium imprinted with Christ’s image, the original of which was widely believed to rest in S. Peter’s. That did not stop the citizens of Alicante from claiming to own the very same sudarium, which they said had been brought to their town from Jerusalem via Constantinople (where it belonged to the Paleologan emperors), Cyprus, and Rome. (It was there, in the Eternal City, that the common cleric Pedro Mena was supposed to have tucked it into his baggage when he departed to take up his Spanish benefice in 1489.) See BNM MS. 10883, f. 206r; G. Fabiani, *Disertación histórico dogmática sobre la sagrada Reliquia de la Santa Faz de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo* (Murcia, 1764).

92 Morales, *Viaje*, 104. “El testimonio es la veneracion antiquísima en que se tiene esta reliquia, y la tradicion tambien antiqua de que se sacó del arca santa, donde, como se ha visto en su letrero, se dice que hay parte de la sábana de nuestro Redentor; y no hay duda sino que no está en esta reliquia todo el Sudario de nuestro Redentor, sino parte de él, pues no fué posible envolverse toda la divina cabeza en esto solo.”
authoritative evidence [of authenticity], for it is a thing of such moment that one may believe that God would not allow it to happen erroneously.\textsuperscript{93} In other words, popular devotion could not make a false relic authentic, but it could reveal the authenticity of a true one. Spain’s relics must be authentic, Morales seems to say, quite simply because God would not have allowed the Spanish nation to have been so deceived for so long. In one deceptively quick move, Morales thus shifted the burden of authenticity attached to Spain’s Holy Land relics from Jerusalem—where they originated—to Spain, where they were now, after so many centuries, embedded within the historical narrative of the Spanish nation.\textsuperscript{94}

COLLECTING JERUSALEM

Morales’ method of redeeming Spain’s relics was, to a certain extent, bad news for Philip. As Morales explained in his memorandum, it meant that Philip would be remiss in expropriating many of Spain’s best relics for his ever-expanding collection at the Escorial. If he did, Morales argued, the wealth of local traditions that surrounded these relics would dry up, and no proof of their authenticity would remain. Would the Ovetenses continue to throng to their feast day after the Arca Santa had been spirited away to the Escorial? “Some saints, as distinguished as they are,” Morales warned Philip, “are so particular to the lands where they reside, that it is doubtful whether one ought to

\textsuperscript{93} Morales, \textit{Viaje}, 158. “Autoriza también la much antigüedad, y sobre todo la institucion de la fiesta, que es cosa de tanto momento, que se puede creer que no permitiria nuestro Señor se errase en ella.”

\textsuperscript{94} Morales’ attempt to turn Spain’s relic collections into a set of national artifacts is highly reminiscent of the approach of his contemporary, the Roman Cardinal Cesare Baronio (1538–1607). See Simon Ditchfield, “‘Tota regio nil nisi religio’: Nations, Nationalisms and ‘Historia Sacra’—Some Preliminary Reflections,” \textit{Annali di storia moderna e contemporanea} 10 (2004): 593–605; idem, \textit{Liturgy, Sanctity and History in Tridentine Italy: Pietro Maria Campi and the Preservation of the Particular} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
expropriate them” or “disturb that which belongs to its own land.”95 From this perspective, Morales’ theology of relics arguably represents a macro-level application of a way of thinking about relics’ place-boundedness that Morales witnessed in miniature at the Cistercian house at Sandoval: when some minor relics were discovered inside the altar of a condemned hermitage there, “The residents resisted the [proposal] to translate the relics to the Monastery, and for the sake of keeping the peace they remained there.”96

To focus on the obstacle which Morales’ memorandum posed to Philip’s collecting, however, would be to miss the point entirely. For in this case, what was bad for Philip was most certainly good for Spain. In the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, Spain’s centuries-long relationship with the Franciscan *Custodia Terrae Sanctae* coupled with a resurgence in Spanish pilgrimage to generate a golden age of Spanish relic collecting. From the fourteenth century forward, the Franciscans occupied a crucial role as facilitators of the transfer of relics and images from Jerusalem to Europe. As custodians of the Holy Sites, the friars offered European pilgrims their most reliable source of relics and souvenirs. Sir Richard Guildford (1455?–1506), who traveled to the Holy Land late in his life, reported that after the Franciscans treated him and his fellow pilgrims to dinner on the eve of their return to Europe, they passed among them “a basin full of folded papers with relics in each of them.”97 For those collectors not able to visit Jerusalem firsthand, the Order also devised an impressive network for exchanging friars

95 Morales, *Viaje*, 265. “[son] algunos Santos, aunque insignes, tan particulares de sus tierras, que se puede dudar si es bien traer de ellos, y causas hay en algunos para que no se deba estorbar lo particular de su tierra … .”

96 ibid., 54. “Resistieron los vecinos el traer las reliquias al Monasterio, y por bien de paz quedaron allí.”

and Near Eastern objects between the Church of Ara Coeli in Rome and the Franciscan Guardianship at Mount Sion. It was through this network, for example, that the famous Santo Bambino, a Christ doll carved by a friar from an olive tree on the Mount of Olives, came to reside in Ara Coeli in the fifteenth century.

Styling themselves protectors of the Holy Sites, Kings of Jerusalem, and leading patrons of the Franciscan Custodia, the rulers of medieval and Renaissance Iberia expected to receive a substantial share of the relics trafficked by the Franciscans through their pilgrim hospitals in Judea and the Church of Ara Coeli in Rome. From fragments of the Holy Sepulcher to splinters of lignum Crucis, the Catholic Monarchy found itself immeasurably enriched by the spoils of Jerusalem sent home by friars, diplomats, and crown agents traveling to and fro between Iberia and the Levant.98 We cannot overestimate the size of the vast sea of holy objects through which Spaniards of all stations attempted to ‘collect’ the Holy Land between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, reassembling anew it on Spanish soil. By the late fifteenth century, it was possible to traverse the Peninsula from one end to the other without ever being a day’s ride from an important relic. The Cathedral of Pamplona, in Navarra, owned a very old

98 In 1501, for example, the Mamluk sultan selected a Spanish Franciscan from the Custodia Terrae Sanctae, named Mauro de San Bernardino, to lead an embassy westward to his homeland. As fr. Mauro prayed inside the Holy Sepulcher on the eve of boarding ship, he miraculously discovered what was later described as a “marble slab, three feet long and one foot wide, speckled with blueish stains” upon the site where Christ’s body had rested between Good Friday and the Resurrection. The blueish stains, he speculated, must be bloodstains left behind by Christ, sacred blood that had leached through the shroud in which Joseph of Arimathaea had wrapped his crucified body. Fr. Mauro secured the Mamluks’ permission to remove the stone, and carefully divided it into five equal pieces. Upon reaching Rome, he gave the first to Pope Nicholas VI, and the second to Fernando and Isabel’s ambassador Bernardino López de Carvajal, the Cardinal of S. Croce. Continuing on to Spain, fr. Mauro offered the remaining three fragments as gifts to Manuel I of Portugal; Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros, the Archbishop of Toledo; and, of course, Isabel the Catholic. Cisneros, who ardently dreamed of leading a Crusade to the Casa Santa, used the precious marble as his personal altar for the remainder of his career, leaving it to his Cathedral of Toledo when he died in 1517. Alvar Gómez de Castro, De las hazañas de Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros [1568], ed. & trans. José Oroz Reta (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1984), 140–141.
fragment of *lignum Crucis*, ensconced in a spectacular thirteenth-century reliquary from Reims depicting the three Marys and the Holy Sepulcher.99 The Collegiate Church of S. Isidoro in León also owned a fragment of *lignum Crucis*, as well as stone fragments from the Holy Sepulcher and the column against which Christ was scourged, the cloth with which he washed his disciples’ feet on Holy Thursday, the gold, incense, and myrrh proffered by the Three Kings, and the oak near which Abraham had lived.100 The neighboring Cathedral of León displayed a nail used in the Crucifixion,101 while another cathedral in the diocese, that of Palencia, owned a piece of Christ’s manger and fragments of the cross, the crown of thorns, and the column against which Christ was flagellated—as well as relics from the tomb, robe, and milk of the Virgin, hair from the Magdalen, bones and clothes belonging to the apostles, stones from Zacharias’ house, charcoal used to roast S. Lawrence, and stones used to stone S. Stephen.102

These relics were, from the beginning, coopted into local and national histories as symbols of Spain’s Catholic identity and commitment to the defense of the Holy Places. In Seville, for example, one of the cathedral’s several fragments of *lignum Crucis*103—a

---


103 The Cathedral of Seville displayed a total of three separate splinters of *lignum Crucis*. The first, a donation Alfonso X ‘the Wise’ of Castile (r. 1252–1284), had arrived shortly after the city was retaken, in 1248, from its Muslim rulers. The second and third, which arrived in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, were testamentary bequests of the Archbishops Pedro Gómez de Albornoz (d. 1374) and Alonso de Fonseca (1418–1473). See Alfonso Franco Silva, “El Arzobispo de Sevilla Alonso de Fonseca el Viejo: Notas sobre su vida,” *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 196 (1999): 43–92; María Jesús Sanz Serrano, “Reliquias y relicarios del ‘Lignum Crucis’,” in José Sánchez Herrero, ed., *Las cofradías de la Santa Vera Cruz: Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Cofradías de la Santa Vera Cruz (Sevilla, 19–22 de marzo de 1992)*, CEIRA, 4 (Seville: Centro de Estudios e Investigación de la Religiosidad Andaluza, 1995), 257–276, esp. 264–266; idem, “Algunas cruces y relicarios
testamentary bequest of Alonso de Fonseca (1418–1473)—was said to be the very piece of *lignum Crucis* that the Emperor Constantine had once worn on a chain around his neck. Spain’s possession of such a storied relic with such strong imperial associations with Jerusalem was taken by Spaniards an official acknowledgement of the Spanish monarch’s role as a ‘new Constantine’, solicitous patron and defender of the Holy Places.104

Perhaps the most important Holy Land relic in this regard was the Crucifix of Burgos, a truly marvelous piece which had been in the possession of the Augustinian house of Burgos since ca. 1308. The crucifix, which was said to have been carved from life by Nicodemus, the Pharisee who helped Joseph of Arimathea bury the crucified Christ,105 was ostensibly discovered adrift in the North Atlantic by a penitent Castilian merchant returning from a voyage to Flanders.106 Having rescued it from a tempest, the merchant was startled by the crucifix’s uncanny verisimilitude. The figure was thoroughly lifelike, with flexible limbs which could be detached from the Cross and manipulated as if made of real skin, bone, and muscle. As a 1554 pamphlet would later describe it, “The joints of the arms, legs, and fingers move around as if it were a human

---


106 *Hystoria de como fue hallada la ymagen del sancto Crucifixo, que esta en el monesterio de Sancto Augustin de Burgos, con algunos de sus miraglos* (Burgos: Juan de la Junta, 1554).
body.” The figure’s torso also had an eerily human suppleness about it. In that inimitable early modern way of describing things, the same pamphlet noted that it was “soft in the parts where a human body is soft: such that, pressing it with a finger makes an indentation, and [the flesh] is depressed the same way as if one pressed with a finger on the flesh of a human body. When the finger is lifted, the depression reinflates: and truly, this is a very noteworthy thing.”

The crucifix’s potent combination of wondrous origins and artistic verisimilitude moved all who heard of or saw it to make a pilgrimage to the Augustinian cloister at Burgos. The cult of the crucifix extended across the length and breadth of the Iberian Peninsula, and reached the very top of the social pyramid. Royalty and the greatest dignitaries of the realm were a common sight at the Augustinians’ house. Isabel the Catholic, a lifelong devotée of the crucifix, visited the shrine during her reign, even clambering up a hastily-procured ladder to study and caress the crucifix where it hung above the altar. Afterwards, she asked the friars to remove one of the nails from the Christ figure’s hand, so that she might carry it off for her private collection—a request which, as we have already seen, Spanish monarchs would continue to make of the custodians of noteworthy shrines. When the nail was removed, and the hyperrealistic figure’s arm dropped to its side, however, the stunned Isabel fainted and fell to the floor.

107 ibid., f. 16v. “Las coyunturas de los braços y de las piernas: y de los dedos se le andan como a un cuerpo organico.”

108 ibid., f. 18r. “Tiene el sancto Crucifixo blando en las partes que un cuerpo humano lo tiene: de arte que poniodole el dedo haze assiento y concavidad, y se abaxa como lo haria si lo pusiessen en la carne de un cuerpo humano, y quitando el dedo se torna a levantar la concavidad: y cierto esta es cosa muy notable.”

109 William Christian has called this crucifix “the most popular Castilian shrine to the Crucified Christ;” see William Christian, Apparitions in Late Medieval and Renaissance Spain (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 221–222.
Her paralysis was so complete that some of the friars in attendance feared that the queen had died. Upon waking, the shaken monarch insisted that the nail be restored to its rightful place, and made a pious donation to the house. Virtually the same thing happened shortly thereafter, when the Catholic Kings’ fearsome “Gran Capitán” Gonzalo Fernández of Córdoba (1453–1515), champion of Fernando’s Italian conquests, visited the shrine on a pilgrimage of his own. Upon ascending Isabel’s ladder to the crucifix, the manly commander swooned and fainted, another powerful demonstration of the crucifix’s aura.110

Many of the pilgrims who thronged to Burgos came in hope of witnessing one of the crucifix’s stunning miracles, of which—according to a pamphlet issued by the Augustinians as part of a campaign to prove the relic’s authenticity—there were many. Like many relics, the crucifix was said to have demonstrable curative powers. The friars had for many years poured water over the feet of the crucifix and then given it to the poor and infirm to drink, thereby inducing an untold number of cures.111 When Fernando and Isabel’s son, the Príncipe Juan, fell ill as a young child, he was cured after Isabel had him commended to the crucifix; the cure was so impressive that it prompted the queen to send the Augustinians a generous donation, as well as the prince’s cradle, in gratitude.112 The relic’s efficacy extended to other spheres, as well. Perhaps most importantly given its Spanish context, the crucifix had proven a reliable weapon against Islam. The pamphlet contained three dramatic miracle stories demonstrating the crucifix’s power over Spain’s Muslim foes. In the first story, a party of Christian prisoners in the North African city of

110 Hystoria, ff. 16v–17r.
111 ibid., f. 20r.
112 ibid., ff. 35r–36r.
Oran were empowered by the crucifix to escape their captors; in the second, a devout adherent of the crucifix magically escaped being kidnapped by a Moorish landing party on the coast of Andalucía in 1493; and in the third, the crucifix rescued a Spanish flotilla from a fearsome fleet of Turkish warships at sea.113

In the course of Spanish history, these magnificent relics came to represent something much more than the average biblical artifact. They could draw powerful visitors from miles away on crucial state business. In an age before mass media, they were strikingly able to sustain cults stretching across the entire Peninsula—though Burgos is in the north, most of its crucifix’s miracles occurred when it was invoked by inhabitants of southern Iberia. And they were all recruited to work miracles guaranteeing Spain’s ‘national security’ against Islam. These Holy Land relics were, in short, truly national treasures—important symbols, and stimuli, of Spain’s nascent national identity. The presence of relics like Nicodemus’ crucifix and the Arca Santa of Oviedo was considered evidence of God’s favor to the Spanish nation, a sign that God had chosen Spaniards above all other nations to enjoy tokens of his grace and to benefit from their powers.

Ambrosio de Morales, by authenticating these relics and incorporating them within the fabric of Spanish history, played an important role in Spaniards’ appropriation of the Holy Land. In a recent article on Morales’ santo viaje, Sylvène Édouard purports to find evidence of an imperialist agenda in his memorandum.114 While reading Morales’ voyage as a top-down mission to serve Philip’s pretensions “within the framework of

---

113 ibid., ff. 79v–82v.

Tridentine Reform,” calling it “one of the chief stakes of ‘his’ Counter Reform … a response to the attacks of the Protestants against the cult of the saints as intercessors,” Édouard also attributes Philip’s interest in relics to the fact that he “sought to erect a history of Spain past and present in service of his imperial pretentions.” At the same time, however, Édouard chooses only to count Morales’ interactions with Spanish relics toward this project—those which originated within “Hispania” (a notion only vaguely defined in her article). But clearly there was something about Jerusalem, too, which lifted the spirits of Spanish collectors like Philip II. It is no accident, I would argue, that Spain’s most ambitious period of Levantine relic collecting coincided with the golden age of Renaissance self-fashioning. One can read Spaniards’ enthusiasm for collecting the Holy Land’s most marvellous possessions, its biblical relics, as their way of taking possession of Palestine’s legacy—as an act of ‘self-fashioning’ as a New Jerusalem on a truly national level. By consuming and possessing the best bits and fragments of the Holy Land, by siphoning its holiness into Spanish reliquaries, Spain would itself become a reconstituted Palestine.

---

115 ibid., 43, 33.
116 ibid., 47.
CHAPTER THREE

NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND THE NEW JERUSALEM:
A NATIONAL GENEALOGY IN THE RENAISSANCE

The most prolific member of Philip’s virtual ‘institute’ for the study of biblical antiquity was its librarian, Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598).\(^1\) Arias Montano, a royal advisor to Philip II for several decades, was also perhaps the late sixteenth century’s preeminent biblical humanist. For Arias Montano, a thorough understanding of the topography of the Holy Land was the *sine qua non* of solid biblical exegesis, and he was known to counsel Philip II that “one who seeks understanding in Sacred Geography will find, without a doubt, a perfect and absolute knowledge of all things.”\(^2\) “All histories,” he admonished, “show openly how necessary it is to have knowledge of the places which appear in various passages in Sacred Scripture. If one were to narrate warlike deeds without taking note of their places, or read histories without knowledge of the

---


topography, everything would seem so confused and mixed-up that everything would seem dark and difficult.”\textsuperscript{3} As Zur Shalev has noted, in Arias Montano’s opinion, “sacred geography is needed by everyone: doctors, merchants, and soldiers can learn from it about customs, rites, religion, matters private and public, ways of war and peace, trade, and even vestments.”\textsuperscript{4} Indeed, Arias Montano was as good as his word. In 1579, at Philip’s urging, he employed his extensive knowledge of Palestinian geography to counsel the Portuguese king Sebastião I (r. 1557–1578) on his ill-fated plans to take the Holy Land by Crusade.\textsuperscript{5} Better use was made of Arias Montano’s knowledge earlier, though, in the 1560s, when he was granted a commission by Philip II to travel to Antwerp and edit the ambitious new Polyglot Biblia Regia proposed by the printer Christophe Plantin.\textsuperscript{6} It was Arias Montano’s intention to use the Polyglot as a vehicle for

\textsuperscript{3} Benito Arias Montano, *Chaleb, sive de terrae promissae partitione*, in idem, *Prefacios de Benito Arias Montano*, 188–194, here at 190. “Quam vero necessaria sit locorum cognitio, quae in diversis Sacrae Scripturae locis commemorantur, nulla historia aperte non docet. Si enim absque locorum observatione res gestae narrentur, aut sine topographiae cognitione historiae legantur, adeo confusa atque perturbata erunt omnia, ut ex iis nihil non obscurn, nihil non difficile elicis possit.”

\textsuperscript{4} Shalev, “Sacred Geography,” 69. Cf. Arias Montano, *Phaleg*, 170: “Nullum denique vel discipline, vel artis genus est, quod non geographiae cognitione iuvetur, atque excolatur. Hanc imprimit philosophi omnes, qui quidem rerum naturas inquirunt, rerumque causas indagant ac perscrutantur, adhibeant, necesse est, cum infinita prope rerum multitudo, atque varietates tum in ipsis terris, tum etiam in mari continentur. Eos etiam, qui in ea philosophiae parte versantur, quae de moribus est, geographia opus habere constat, ut varia ac diversa hominum ingenium ingenia ac studia, et quid cuique genti, pro locorum ratione conveniat, statuere possint. Hac medici, quam qui maxime, tum ad medicamentorum, tum ad corporum variatem ex locorum diversitate observandum, hac mercatores, hac nautae indigent. Hanc, si e re militari demas, tota illius disciplinae peritia constare nullo pacto poterit.”


demonstrating the centrality of geographical knowledge to biblical exegesis, and toward that end, he planned to salt the edition with multiple treatises, illustrations, and maps derived from his research into biblical topography.

Ultimately, the finished product did not disappoint. Arias Montano’s antiquarian apparatus, the *Opera ad sacrorum Bibliorum apparatum* (1571–1572), ran to ten treatises and filled a folio volume all its own; it was, in fact, so rich in itself that after his death it was excerpted and published as a freestanding work at least four times, the first in 1593. The four specifically geographical treatises—*Phaleg, sive de gentium sedibus primis, orbisque terrae situ*, on the settlement of the world; *Nehemias, sive de antiquae Jerusalem situ*, on the topography of ancient Jerusalem; *Chanaan, sive de duodecim gentibus*, on the Holy Land through the time of Moses; and *Chaleb, sive de terrae promissae partitione*, on the Holy Land under Israelite rule—were illustrated with four truly stunning maps: one *mappamundi* (accompanying *Phaleg*), two maps of ancient Palestine (*Caleb* and *Chanaan*), and one topographical view of Jerusalem (*Nehemias*).

Like many of his peers, Montano was interested in these images for their own sake, as

---

7 The critical apparatus actually comprised volumes VII–VIII of the original *Biblia Regia*, though volume VII (and a portion of VIII) were consumed by dictionaries of ancient languages, indices, and tracts on translation that do not concern us here. Montano’s antiquarian and geographical works are confined to volume VIII, which is not paginated. The four freestanding editions of the work are: [1] *Antiquitatum Judaicae libri IX, in quos, praeter Iudaeae, Hierosolymorum, & Templi Salomonis accuratam delineationem, praecipui sacri ac profani gentis ritus describuntur ... Adiectis formis aeneis*, ed. Francisco Raphelingen (Leiden: Christoph Plantin, 1593); [2–4] *Critici Sacri* (London, 1660; Frankfurt, 1696; Amsterdam, 1698). I cite from a modern edition of these essays; cf. n. 2 above.

8 Twelve other exquisite plates—ten of them architectural drawings accompanying the treatise *Exemplar, sive de sacris fabricis*—rounded out the illustrations. On these illustrations, see Sylvaine Hänsel, *Der spanische Humanist Benito Arias Montano (1527–1598) und die Kunst*, Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, 2nd ser., 25 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1991), 24–52.
stimuli to devotion, and he encouraged his readers to use them to facilitate a ‘mental pilgrimage’ of their own.\textsuperscript{9} But the images also were serious scholarly business, meant to be advanced study aids to Holy Writ. For Montano, as for all biblical antiquarians, there was a dynamic relationship between textual and visual knowledge; each way of knowing sacred history could be said to clarify the other. In the introduction to \textit{Nehemias}, the treatise on the plan of ancient Jerusalem, Arias Montano again made his case for the centrality of sacred topography to Biblical exegesis:

\begin{quote}
First taught by demonstrations … , then having observed many things in the reading of the Holy Scripture, and then noted in other authors what may be useful for understanding the principles of topography, I made sure to place in the Apparatus a description of the site of ancient Jerusalem, the knowledge of which, I think, will be no less useful than pleasant to the students of the sacred disciplines … .\textsuperscript{10}
\end{quote}

Montano, therefore, spent a significant portion of his time and attention in Antwerp in collaboration with the pious cartographer Abraham Ortelius.\textsuperscript{11}

In the wake of the Polyglot’s triumph, Arias Montano spent the remainder of his life calling upon the considerable resources of the Escorial and his colleagues in Antwerp to produce treatises of stunning erudition on biblical antiquities, including his


\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{10} Arias Montano, \textit{Nehemias, sive de antiquae Jerusalem situ}, in idem, \textit{Prefacios de Benito Arias Montano}, 228–230, here at 230. “Igitur … demonstrationibus primum instructus, cum multa deinde ex sacrorum librorum lectione obseruauerim, quaemad etiam apud alios scriptores adnotaverim, quae ad topographiae rationem expendiendam conducere possent, antiquum Ierosolymorum demonstratum situm, cuius cognitionem non minus utilem quam icundam sacrarum disciplinarum studiois futuram censebam, brevi descriptione inita, et tabula etiam depicta in sacro Bibliorum apparatu, opportune collocandum curavimus, additis iis quae in celebriorum locorum partiumque notis observatu videbantur dignissima.” \end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{11} See Walter Meliom, \textit{Ad ductum itineris et dispositionem mansionum ostendendam: Meditation, Vocation, and Sacred History in Abraham Ortelius’ Parergon}, \textit{The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery} 57 (1999): 49–72. \end{flushleft}
masterpiece, a massive two-part history of all mankind from the Fall to the Resurrection, replete with archaeological evidence.\textsuperscript{12} These polished fruits of Arias Montano’s labors have been ably studied by others, such as Bernard Rekers and, most recently, Zur Shalev, and I do not intend to repeat their conclusions. Rather, I hope to direct more attention to Arias Montano’s sources and methodology, and then to his ‘rough drafts,’ particularly his early attempt to apply humanist methods and Jewish learning to scriptural topography in a treatise he wrote in the mid 1560s on the prophetic book of Abdias.\textsuperscript{13}

Arias Montano’s research should be considered one more way that early modern Spaniards’ scholarly encounter with the Holy Land shaped their nascent awareness of their own national identity. For, as we shall see, by the time he had finished his commentary, Arias Montano’s Hebrew sources had revealed to him that mastering the topography of the Holy Land could also yield wholly unanticipated insight into the genealogy of modern Spain. According to Arias Montano, certain toponyms mentioned in this obscurely prophetic book of Abdias referred, in fact, to places in the Iberian Peninsula; and, therefore, Spaniards could be proven to be the direct descendants of the ancient Israelites. In a remarkable example of the power of productive misunderstanding to change history, Arias Montano’s hackneyed hypothesis about Old Testament geography became a foundational legend of Spanish historiography, as well as an answer to Philip’s need to reinvent Spain as a New Jerusalem capable of rivaling Rome. This

\textsuperscript{12} Benito Arias Montano, \textit{Liber generationis et regenerationis Adam, sive, De historia generis humani: operis magni pars prima, id est, anima} (Antwerp: Christoph Plantin, 1593); \textit{Naturae historia, prima in magni operis corpore pars} (Antwerp: Johannes Moretus, 1601).

chapter, and the next, aim to show how and why Arias Montano, who will always be remembered by historians of scholarship for his rigorous approach to reconstructing the Holy Land, also deserves a place among the most patriotic fabulists of Spanish historiography.

THE MYSTERY OF ABDIAS

In the early 1560s—before his triumphal editorship of Philip II’s Polyglot made him a household name among Christian humanists—Arias Montano put his belief in the utility of geographical knowledge to biblical exegesis to its first test. During a mission to the Council of Trent, where he met other humanists interested in the material circumstances of biblical civilization, he resolved to write a commentary on Abdias, one of the so-called ‘minor prophets’ of the Old Testament. The shortest and one of the most opaque books in the Hebrew Bible, Abdias had frustrated every generation of Christian exegetes down to the sixteenth century. Because it narrates both the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem by an invading force and the conditions of their return, it was believed to contain invaluable secrets for Christian eschatology; and yet, it speaks of these events in such vague language that even modern biblical scholars remain unclear on which of the several Old Testament expulsions and diasporas it purports to narrate. Abdias might describe the sack of Jerusalem by the Philistines and the Arabians, led by Joram, in the ninth century BC (cf. 2 Chronicles 21:16–17); but it might also refer to the more famous invasion and “Babylonian Captivity” wrought by Nebuchadnezzar in 587–586 BC (cf. Jeremiah 49:7–22)—or, perhaps, to some other destruction of the Holy City altogether.14

14 Modern scholars generally agree that it refers to the invasion of Joram’s Philistines and Arabians. The only other viable theory, that it refers to Nebuchadnezzar’s sack as described contemporaneously by Jeremiah, would seem to be ruled out by the fact that Jeremiah seems to have taken Abdias 11–14 as a model for his account.
Abdias’ enduring elusiveness is due, first and foremost, to the fact that its meaning depends so heavily upon obscure Israelite geographical lore. The book is filled with long-lost toponyms, and (as Arias Montano himself had argued) it is virtually impossible to make sense of what the author intended to prophecy without knowing where he understood those places to be. This is particularly true of the book’s final verses (1:19–20), redolent with puzzling placenames like Edom, Ephraim, Samaria, Gilead, Sarepta, and Sepharad, all of them important to the passage’s meaning. The eschatological significance of verse 1:20—the crucial line concerning the destruction of Jerusalem by heathen invaders, the expulsion of the Jews, and their eventual return—depends entirely upon what one understands by its reference to the “captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad.” Of all the topographical mysteries of Abdias, this reference to “Sepharad” was the most impenetrable. The original text gives no clue as to the location of Sepharad, which has long since disappeared. (In fact, it is quite likely that it was in the Near East, and most Biblical scholars now identify Sepharad with Sardis, in Turkey.)

As Arias Montano knew, even the great Jerome had struggled to understand this passage. In his Commentariorum in Abdiam Prophetam of 395, Jerome explained that, after much debate, he had come to conclude that the destruction and diaspora mentioned in Abdias must refer to the deportations that followed the Roman defeat of the Bar Kokhba rebellion of 138. Because he knew that the emperor Hadrian had deported Jerusalem’s Jews to Asia Minor, Jerome decided that ‘Sepharad’ must be somewhere

near the Bosphorus. On this basis Jerome’s authoritative rendering of Abdias 1:20 in the Vulgate transmuted Sepharad into the Latin “Bosphorus”:

Et transmigratio exercitus hujus filiorum Israël, omnia loca Chananæorum usque ad Sareptam: et transmigratio Jerusalem, quae in Bosphoro est, possidebit civitates austri.

At the same time, however, Jerome admitted that the etymological evidence could also be read as locating Sepharad somewhere in Babylonia. Medieval exegetes generally followed Jerome’s vague placement of Sepharad/Bosphorus somewhere in the Near East, circa Asia Minor. If one looks to Nicholas of Lyra, the most authoritative exegete of the late Middle Ages, for example, one finds him convinced that Sepharad “is a place in the Kingdom of Babylonia.”

Arias Montano, like other biblical humanists of his generation, was not one to take Jerome’s judgments lightly. Jerome was, in fact, Arias Montano’s idol: during his student years at Alcalá, he was known around the university as “Jerónimo español,” the “Spanish Jerome,” for his attempt to mimic the great Church Father’s prodigious knowledge of ancient languages and antiquities. Yet in this case, Jerome’s and


18 Nicholas of Lyra, Postilla in Totam Bibliam (Strassburg, 1492), f. kkkiv. “Nomen est loci in regno babylonie quam illam expositione ad quem aliquid de hierusalem fuerunt translati.”

19 Rekers, Benito Arias Montano, 2–3.
Nicholas’ uncertainty seemed to indicate to him that the true location of Abdias’ Jewish diaspora remained an open question, amenable to correction.\(^{20}\) If he could find a new way to bring his knowledge of the geography and topography of the biblical Near East to bear upon these verses, perhaps he could explain, once and for all, what God intended to communicate about the Jews’ much-awaited return to Jerusalem. And so it was that Arias Montano, still a young and relatively untested exegete, came to invest the better part of five years in a commentary on the geographical mysteries of Abdias, finally finishing the manuscript in Madrid on 13 July 1567.

“JERÓNIMO ESPAÑOL”

Like a new Jerome, Arias Montano attempted to decode Abdias’ mysterious toponyms and track down the “Jews in Sepharad” by cross-referencing geographical knowledge derived from two different sources. The first of these was eyewitness knowledge of the Near East gained from the sort of learned travel extolled by his fellow humanists and antiquarians.\(^{21}\) As we have seen, Jerome had set a precedent by embracing eloquent and persuasive defenses of this approach to the Near East could be found in the books of peripatetic scholars like Cyriac of Ancona (1391–1452), Guillaume Postel (1510–1581), and the Habsburg ambassador Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq (1520–1592), who traipsed across the Mediterranean in search of commerce with the ruins of the ancient civilizations of the Levant. For Cyriac of Ancona, see his Later Travels, ed. & trans. Edward W. Bodnar with Clive Foss, The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 10 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); and Francesco Scalamonti, Vita Vīri Clarissimi et Famosissimi Kyriaci Anconitani, ed. & trans. Charles Mitchell & Edward W. Bodnar, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 86.4 (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1996). For Postel, see Marion L. Kuntz, “Voyages to the East and their meaning in the thought of Guillaume Postel,” in Jean Cear & Jean-Claude Margolin, eds., Voyager à la Renaissance: Actes du Colloque de Tours, 30 juin–13 juillet 1983 (Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve et Larose, 1987), 51–63; and idem, “Journey as Restitutio in the Thought of Guillaume Postel (1510–1581),” History of European Ideas 1 (1981): 315–329. For Busbecq, see The Turkish Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, ed. & trans. Edward Seymour Forster (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1927). Indeed, some of the most

\(^{20}\) For a discussion of Renaissance attempts to ‘correct’ Jerome, see p. 35 above.

the raw observations of pilgrimage as a source for biblical exegesis: “one understands better the Holy Scriptures when one has seen Judea”—the “Christian Athens”—“with one’s own eyes.” Jerome, we will recall, compared the Holy Land pilgrim to the Apostle Paul, whose willingness to “go up to Jerusalem” (Galatians 1:18) proved that he was the kind of admirable man, like Pythagoras or Plato, who had “traversed provinces, crossed seas, and visited strange peoples, simply to see face to face persons whom they only knew from books” and thereby to “find something to learn” and “become constantly wiser and better.”

The value of learned travel in the study, cataloguing, and reconstruction of the Holy Land was something that Arias Montano had come to appreciate at a young age. His very first encounter with the Holy Land, when he was a child of perhaps eight or ten, occurred under the sway of the humanist tutor Iago Vázquez Matamoros, who exemplified the link between Levantine travel and biblical antiquarianism I described in Chapter One. Recognizing Arias Montano’s precocious intellect, his parents had enlisted his wealthy godfather to provide him with the classical education necessary to accomplished scholarly examinations of Palestinian topography were born as byproducts of conventional pilgrimages to the Holy Land. One of the best examples of this phenomenon is the map of Antonio de Angelis, OFM, a meticulous survey of the Holy Places drawn up over the course of seven years spent in Jerusalem ministering to pilgrims and published at Rome in 1578. Some modern scholars, in fact, cite works like de Angelis’ map to argue that, in the early modern period, intellectual curiosity replaced religious devotion as the primary justification for pilgrimage—a thesis which, though greatly exaggerated, captures something of the antiquarians’ enthusiasm for travel to the Holy Land. On the de Angelis map, see Antonio de Angelis da Lecce, Hiersalem (Rome: Convento di S. Maria Araceli, 1578); Rehav Rubin, Image and Reality: Jerusalem in Maps and Views, Israel Studies in Historical Geography (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1999), 87–97; A. Moldovan, “The Lost de Angelis Map of Jerusalem, 1578,” The Map Collector 24 (1983): 17–24.

22 For Jerome on Jerusalem as “the Christian Athens,” see pp. 27–28 above.


24 See above, pp. 35–48.
rise through the ranks of the Renaissance Church or State.\textsuperscript{25} In Badajoz, not far from his native village of Fregenal de la Sierra, he was placed under Vázquez Matamoros’ tutelage. As Vázquez Matamoro drilled his young charge in Greek, Latin, rhetoric, history, art, epigraphy, and numismatics—the rudiments of the new science of humanist antiquarianism—he also turned his thoughts to the east by sharing with him tales of his personal peregrinations across the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{26} Vázquez Matamoro, it turned out, was an intrepid traveler with a taste for the ancient Near East, and in middle age he had made the arduous trek to Palestine.

As might be expected, his pilgrimage blended equal parts devotion and antiquarian curiosity. Having been moved by guilt that “he had omitted that best and most powerful voyage of all, the journey to Palestine in Syria, which, on account of piety, is often taken by many Christians,” he spent two years “engaged in the activities which always occupy pious men in those places, that is, the visitation, retracing, and study of all the sites which commemorate events in the lives of the ancient Fathers, or lived and suffered by Christ the Lord and his apostles.”\textsuperscript{27} At the same time, like a good antiquarian,
he “crisscrossed the Holy Land” and, “blessed with an acute intellect, skilled in identifying true antiquities and distinguishing them from the later fables of those living there, whatever he saw he noted down exactly, and described either in words ... or in maps that he drew himself.”

Back in Seville, Vázquez Matamoro narrated his adventures to the wide-eyed Arias Montano, and master and student pored over the notes and diagrams that he had brought back with him. Arias Montano later recalled the vividness of Vázquez’s Matamoro’s firsthand accounts, which had enabled him to imagine himself in the Holy Land. Vázquez Matamoro gave Arias Montano the autograph of his manuscript study as a gift of friendship.

In his mature scholarship, Arias Montano was a frequent proponent of learned travel and pilgrimage, arguing that eyewitness knowledge of the Holy Places was a valuable resource for the scholar. In Chaleb, the Polyglot’s treatise on the Holy Land under Israelite rule, Arias Montano expressly noted that he had known many “very erudite men” (viros eruditissimos) who had gone to the Holy Land multiple times, and every time returned with an enhanced knowledge of both the land and Scripture.

---

28 ibid., 228–230. “Itaque cum eleganti adeo ingenio, totque artibus praeditus et instructus esset, omnemque illam regionem quae a Ioppe in Iordanem, et a Damasco usque in Beersebagh iacet, diligentem attenteque peragrasset, atque ad antiquas cognoscentas res, a fabulisque recentiorum, qui in illis locis degunt, dignoscedas acro praeditus esset iudicio, quaecunque vidit, omnia exacte notavit, et tum literis ... tum etiam tabulis a se depictis, expressit.”

29 ibid., 230 “Demonstrabat saepe ille mihi puerus, & ex ore narrantis pendenti omnia fere illius regionis loca, quo singula modo essent, ut quondam habuisse viderentur, ut nunc haberent; ita ut ego ipse iam adulescens simulachra illa locorum ab eodem demonstrata ac depicta referre expeditissime alios possem, a quo etiam magnus & elegantissimus totius Ierosolymae urbis, & suburbii exemplum suis coloribus in tela depictum accepi.”

30 ibid. “autographum mihi amicitiae pignus gratissimum dono dedit.”

31 Arias Montano, Chaleb, 192. “Eorum autem, qui pietatis causa illo sunt profecti, nemo—ut opinor—adhue est inventus, quem laboris, temporis, ac sumptus eam in rem facti adhue poenituerit, quinimo,
Though Arias Montano never went to the Holy Land himself, he attempted to make up for this lack in his education by assimilating the vicarious knowledge found in historical and contemporary travel accounts in search of secondhand knowledge. As he noted in the apparatus to the Polyglot, travel literature was almost as good, and quite a bit safer, than the actual Holy Land pilgrimage.32 Thus, for armchair antiquarians like himself, Arias Montano translated and published the Hebrew pilgrimage account of Benjamin of Tudela (fl. 12th c.), who traveled to the Holy Land in 1165–1173.33 In Arias Montano’s eyes, the fact that Tudela’s text was a fairly modern eyewitness account was an advantage, for it meant that it contained a level of detailed description of the physical appearance of the Holy Land that one could never hope to get from Scripture.34

Of the many things that Arias Montano learned from such travel accounts, one fact in particular provided the key to his commentary on Abdias: the linguistic

quamplures ipse et vidi et novi, qui, cum eorum locorum sibi in mentem veniebat, eaque, quae ipsi viderant, commemorabant, mirifica quodam delectatione affectionabant. Vidi praeterea quosdam alios, eosque viros eruditissimos, qui non bis aut iterum, sed saepius eo contenderunt, atque hi quidem, quo frequenter et proficiscebantur, hoc maiorem se suis ex pergrinationibus fructum capere suis mihi verbis su testati.”

32 ibid., 192–194. In introducing his topographical treatise, Arias Montano explained that since “nihilominus, quia non parum refert eos, qui Sacrae Scripturae studiis sunt dediti, illam et singulas eius partes pensoscere, pro nostra … industria, ex accurata sacrorum librorum lectione, eam, demptis locorum periculis ac laboribus, lectori conspiciendam exhibemus … .”


34 ibid., f. 11. This was an opinion with which many, including the Inquisition, disagreed; Arias Montano’s translation was quickly placed on the Index of Prohibited Books. See below, p. 159, for Bernardo de Aldrete’s criticism.
conservatism of Jews in exile. Nearly a century after the expulsion of 1492, he observed, Christian travelers who stumbled upon colonies of formerly Spanish Jews always remarked that “they are all called Spaniards, and retain not only the name, but also the Spanish language as their mother tongue;” whether in Africa or Italy, diaspora Jews unfailingly preserved their “name, language, and way of life.”

Arias Montano seems to have been thinking of accounts like Antonio de Aranda’s *Verdadera informacion de la tierra sancta* (1530), which included this portrait of Jews in the Galilean town of Safet:

> Here I saw many houses like those in Old Castile, where the top half is made of small planks nailed together, and the bottom of clay; and I think that they were made by the Jews who live here, almost all of whom are Spanish. … [W]hen I was walking through the city, eighty out of every one hundred people were Jews, and all of them spoke Spanish. You should know that their *lingua franca* is Spanish, wherever they may be or from whatever nation they have come, whether they were born here [in the Levant] or came from there [in Spain].

---


36 Antonio de Aranda, *Verdadera informacion de la tierra sancta, segun la dispusicion que en el año de mil y quinientos y treynta el auctor la vio y paseo* (Toledo: Juan Ferrer, 1550 [1st ed.: Alcalá de Henares: Miguel de Eguía, 1531]), f. 99r. “En este lugar vi muchas casas a la manera de Castilla la Vieja, de aquellas que de medio arriba son de unos maderos pequeños clavados unos con otros, y en medio adobes de tierra; y creo que las han hecho los judíos que moraban allí, que son casi todos españoles; … andando yo por la ciudad, entre cien personas que encontrábamos, los ochenta eran judíos, y todos hablaban español. Porque habéis de saber que la lengua común entre ellos, adondequiera que están o de cualquier nación que sean, es la española, así de los nacidos acá como de los que vinieron de allá … .”
Similar testimony of Jews’ linguistic conservatism was also to be found in the popular travel accounts of the Portuguese pilgrim Pantaleão de Aveiro and the Habsburg ambassador Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq. Arias Montano recognized that this ‘law’ of Jewish linguistic stasis could constitute the cornerstone of a successful assault on the mystery of Abdias. By establishing that Jewish communities in exile always retained their native language, Arias Montano had laid the groundwork for an alternative, and more straightforward, strategy for localizing the Abidian diaspora in its final destination. If, like ‘all’ Jews, the members of the diaspora had preserved their mother tongue after settling “in Sepharad,” then they must have baptized their new villages, synagogues, and civic institutions with Hebrew names—and, therefore, it should be possible to locate the remnants of their settlements simply by surveying the known world for incongruous clusters of Hebrew toponyms. It was a clever idea.

Knowing what to look for, however, was only one part of the solution. One also had to know where to look for these dormant Hebrew toponyms. As Arias Montano freely admitted in his finished commentary, ancient toponyms frequently mutated as they were translated from the languages of their original founders into those of their subsequent inhabitants. It might, therefore, require some extra etymological detective

37 For Aveiro’s numerous encounters with Iberian Jews in the Holy Land of the 1560s, see Pantaleão de Aveiro, *Itinerario da Terra Sancta e suas particularidades; dirigido ao illustrissimo e reverendissimo senhor D. Miguel de Castro, dignissimo arcebispo de Lisboa metropolitana*, ed. António Baião (Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1927), 60, 65, 435, 467, 474, 478, 483, 497. Arias Montano’s contemporary Busbecq reported two encounters with hispanized Jews in the 1560s: in the Turkish city of Amasia, Busbecq recorded that “the houses are made of clay on almost the same principle as is employed in Spain;” in Constantinople, he observed after breaking into a secret synagogue full of Jews that “an elderly lady, rather well dressed, came forward, and, in Spanish, remonstrated with me for my violence and the damage which I had done to the house” (*Turkish Letters*, 58 & 145).

38 Arias Montano, *Commentaria*, 462. “Constat enim seculorum vi & impulsu humanarum rerum, regnorum, & provinciarum non solum facies & status, sed nomina etiam mutari, turbari, atque saepe etiam penitus extingui.” In a marginal note, Arias Montano credited this insight to his reading of Cicero’s *pro Fonteio.*
work to uncover the Hebrew toponyms he sought. To cut through the centuries of linguistic corruption and correctly identify which modern placenames had Hebraic roots, Arias Montano resolved to invoke the aid of Hebrew texts.

This, too, was an exegetical strategy cribbed from Jerome’s study of the Holy Land. As we have seen in Chapter One, Jerome frequently invoked the aid of the *Hebraica veritas* in order (as he explained in his *De hebraicis quaestionibus*) “to make plain through consideration of the native language the etymologies of objects, of names, and of territories which have no meaning in our own language” —perhaps because they “have since been changed or in some degree corrupted.” For obvious reasons, Jerome’s demonstration of the utility of Hebrew texts would have resonated with Arias Montano as he produced his commentary on Abdias. 

Arias Montano’s personal acquaintance with the *Hebraica veritas* began at Cardinal Cisneros’ great University of Alcalá, where he arrived fresh from his Sevillan arts course in 1548. Arias Montano’s stay at Alcalá coincided with the peak influence of polymath Hebraists like the *converso* Pedro Ciruelo (ca. 1470–1548) and the great

---


41 Though Arias Montano’s work contains no explicit references to this particular work, there remain no fewer than six incunable editions of Jerome’s translation in Spanish collections today: those of Parma (1480), Venice (printed by Bernardino de Benali, 1490), Basel (Nicolaus Kesler, 1492 & 1497), Nuremberg (Antonius Koberger, 1495), and Venice (Johannes Rubeus, 1496).
Cipriano de la Huerga (ca. 1510–1560).\textsuperscript{42} In men like Ciruelo and the Huergistas, Arias Montano found a kindred spirit, and his mature scholarship reveals the impress of their fascination with ancient languages and their holistic interest in Jewish texts ancient and modern.\textsuperscript{43} By the time he completed his studies at Alcalá, at a time when most university students sought proficiency in Latin and Greek only, Arias Montano had mastered the biblical languages of Hebrew and Syriac (and perhaps Arabic, as well). He also seems to have imbibed from Ciruelo the notion that sixteenth-century Spain was a hebraist’s paradise—that is, that Spanish Jews could be tapped as a sort of virtual, living Hebraica veritas.\textsuperscript{44} Putting these two lessons together, Arias Montano used his linguistic facility to become acquainted with the biblical commentaries and histories of Sephardic luminaries, most notably Isaac Abravanel (1437–1508). Abravanel, who was born in Lisbon, served an illustrious career in the service of the Catholic Kings, appointed by Fernando as his Interior Minister in 1484, before he was forced to flee the Peninsula in the Jewish expulsion of 1492. In exile in Italy, he wrote a string of famous and much-referenced commentaries on the Hebrew Bible, several of which were printed at Venice.\textsuperscript{45}

To his knowledge of erudite travel, then, Arias Montano joined the commentaries of the rabbis and the sharpened tools of philological and etymological criticism. His

\textsuperscript{42} See above, p. 33.


lifelong determination to disseminate the *Hebraica veritas* colored his visual reconstructions of the Holy Land as well as his prose work. The *mappamundi* which he designed for the Antwerp Polyglot, though impressively *au courant* with respect to its geographical projection, was labeled exclusively with Hebrew names lifted *verbatim* from Genesis, written in Hebrew characters. Designed not to increase knowledge of the modern world, but rather “to facilitate the understanding of biblical toponymy,” the map was conceived as the final summation of everything that Arias Montano had learned about Scriptural geography—a considerable body of knowledge gained through the intensive study undertaken, at least in part, for his commentary on Abdias.46

**JEWS IN SEPHARAD**

When Arias Montano turned to Hebrew commentaries for clues about the Abdian toponyms, he found an interpretive tradition surrounding the ‘Jews in Sepharad’ passage thoroughly at odds with that which Christians had followed since the fourth century, when Jerome first identified Sepharad with the Bosphorus. Some of the Sephardic commentators known to Arias Montano actually agreed with Jerome, placing Sepharad in Asia Minor: Abner of Burgos (ca. 1270–ca. 1348, also known as Alfonso of Valladolid after his conversion to Christianity), for example, argued quite convincingly that all of the places mentioned in Abdias 20 corresponded to locations in the ancient Near East.47 The fifteenth-century rabbi Moses Arragel left the location of Sepharad an open question in his Castilian translation of the Hebrew Bible, though his close reliance on Jerome would indicate that he, too, presumably imagined it to be somewhere in the vicinity of

---


Palestine. Yet most Jewish commentaries argued a line much more likely to pique Arias Montano’s abiding interest in the Christian antiquity of Spain: according to many Sephardic commentators, Sepharad was, in fact, the Iberian Peninsula.

This imaginative reading of Abdias’ topography originated in Sephardic historiography’s deep investment in proving that Spanish Jews were descended from only the most noble of the Israelite tribes. (In a sense, this obsession constitutes a medieval Jewish counterpart to the later Christian fascination with ever more noble origins.) Abdias 1:20, with its suitably vague and untraceable references to a very ancient dispersion and far-flung lands, was identified as early as the eleventh century as an ideal source of raw material for a Sephardic myth of origins. So, while the followers of Abner of Burgos were content to leave the Jews of Sepharad in Asia, the vast majority of medieval Iberian Jews were busy staking a claim to be the sons and daughters of the Israelites described in Abdias 20.

From an early date there emerged two different legends linking Abdias’ ‘Jews in Sepharad’ to the Iberian Peninsula. The first of these claimed that Abdias referred to Titus’ and Vespasian’s destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, undertaken in retribution for

---


the Jewish uprising described in Josephus’ *Jewish Wars* (ca. 75 AD). According to this version of events, the Jews whom Vespasian cast out of Judea had sailed across the Mediterranean and settled in southern Iberia. This reading of Abdias was supported by the influential twelfth-century Tudelan commentator Abraham Ibn Ezra (1089–1164).\(^5\) It was also the narrative found in the so-called *Libro de ayunos*, or *Book of Fasts*, a medieval adaptation of a first-century “Jewish *monumentum aere perennius*” much-glossed in medieval rabbinical literature as a source for ancient Jewish practice.\(^5\) This *Libro* popularized the notion that the city of Mérida—founded by the Roman Emperor Augustus as a retirement colony for Roman soldiers—was actually settled by Jews fleeing Vespasian’s reprisals in 70 AD, a legend frequently repeated in Christian historiography.\(^5\)

The second attempt to link Sepharad and Spain argued for a much earlier date for the Abdian diaspora: 587 BC, when Nebuchadnezzar II (r. ca. 605–562 BC) sacked Jerusalem, destroyed Solomon’s Temple, and deported its Jewish residents into the Babylonian Captivity (cf. 2 Kings 25). According to this version, Nebuchadnezzar himself departed Jerusalem with an army of his Jewish captives, crossed the Mediterranean, conquered Iberia, and settled his Jewish host in the south of the Peninsula to rule in his stead as he returned to the Near East. In later medieval incarnations, the story became more complex, and in some versions it was the legendary Spanish king


Pirrus who was said to have brought the Jews to Spain—either on Nebuchadnezzar’s behalf, or simply because Nebuchadnezzar had granted the Spanish king one-third of the Jews of Jerusalem as his personal slaves in gratitude for his assistance in besieging the city.

This fanciful reading of Abdias was elaborated, in the first instance, on the basis of a questionable reference to Nebuchadnezzar’s conquests in the *Historia Indika* of the Greek chorographer Megasthenes (ca. 350 BC–ca. 290 BC), a text which survives only in fragments scattered throughout other classical chorographies. In describing the ancient kingdoms of India, to which he had been deputed on an embassy in the mid-third century BC, Megasthenes had marvelled that the subcontinent had never succumbed to foreign invasion—a remarkable isolation, he opined, in light of the fact that the Chaldean king Nebuchadnezzar, more revered than Hercules, had led his armies all the way to “the Pillars”—presumably the Pillars of Hercules, on either shore of the Strait of Gibraltar separating Spain and Africa.53

Megasthenes’ passing and rather unsubstantiated reference to Nebuchadnezzar’s Spanish sojourn was rescued from oblivion by Strabo and Josephus, both of whom cited Megasthenes’ history. Strabo, in Book XV of his *Geographia*, mentioned Nebuchadnezzar in the same limited context in which he had appeared in Megasthenes—as proof of India’s relative isolation—noting simply that “Nebuchadnezzar, who enjoyed greater repute among the Chaldeans than Hercules, led an army even as far as the

---

pillars.\textsuperscript{54} The two passages in which Josephus borrowed from Megasthenes, however, were rather a different story. When Josephus cited Megasthenes’ fleeting mention of Nebuchadnezzar, he did so in such a way as to lead his reader to believe that Megasthenes was a reliable source for Nebuchadnezzar’s reign. In his \textit{Jewish Antiquities} (ca. 95 AD), Josephus inserted Megasthenes’ ‘testimony’ into his list of Nebuchadnezzar’s deeds, the bulk of which were drawn from Berosus the Chaldean:

“Megasthenes also, in the fourth book of his \textit{Indika},” wrote Josephus, “endeavors to show that [Nebuchadnezzar] surpassed Hercules in courage and the greatness of his achievements, for he says that he conquered Libya and a great part of Iberia.”\textsuperscript{55} Again, in his \textit{Against Apion} (ca. 100), Josephus asserted that

we meet with a confirmation of what Berosus [the Chaldean] says in the archives of the Phoenicians, concerning this king Nebuchadnezzar, that he conquered all Syria and Phoenicia; in which case Philostratus agrees with the others in that history which he composed, where he mentions the siege of Tyre; as does Megasthenes also, in the fourth book of his \textit{Indika}, wherein he pretends to prove that the aforementioned king of the Babylonians surpassed Hercules in courage and the greatness of his exploits; for he says that he conquered a great part of Libya, and conquered even Iberia.\textsuperscript{56}

Thus, as it passed from Megasthenes to Strabo and on to Josephus, this offhand mention of Nebuchadnezzar’s Spanish conquest acquired the \textit{imprimatur} and corroboration of ancient authority. Though less numerous than the partisans of the Vespasian theory, many Sephardic historians elected to accept and elaborate Josephus’ claim, dubbing

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Flavius Josephus, \textit{Against Apion}, I.20; in \textit{The New Complete Works of Josephus}, 937–981, here at 946.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Nebuchadnezzar the founder of Spain’s Jewish communities. Among the most vocal were the followers of Moses Ibn Ezra of Granada (ca. 1055–ca. 1139).57

Though initially Spanish Jews were proud to date their arrival in Sepharad/Spain to either 70 AD or 587 BC, ultimately it was 587 BC, and Nebuchadnezzar’s legendary conquest, that triumphed. This reflects less on its verisimilitude than on the preoccupations of Jewish intellectuals in the wake of the horrific pogroms that decimated Iberia’s Jewish communities in 1391.58 These brutal persecutions marked the beginning of a very long fifteenth century for Iberian Jews, who were subjected to an ever-rising tide of anti-Judaic violence inflamed by both the Jews’ purported role in the Crucifixion and the revival of the high medieval legend of the blood libel.59 In this context of unremitting violence, Jewish communities in Spain acquired a strong incentive to argue that they had arrived in Europe prior to the Crucifixion. Sometime around 1440, for example, a group of Spanish Jews forged and disseminated a letter purportedly from the Jewish community of Toledo to their co-religionists in Jerusalem, dated fancifully to the


time of Christ’s Crucifixion. The letter was supposed to have been discovered and translated from Hebrew into Castilian in 1085, when Alfonso VI of Castile (r. 1072–1109) conquered Toledo. In the letter—written by “Levi the archpriest, and Samuel, and Joseph, gentlemen of the Jewish community of Toledo,” addressed “to the very high priest Eleazar, and to Samuel, Canut, and Annas, and Caiphas, gentlemen of the Jewish community of the Holy Land,” and dated in Toledo “fourteen days of the month of Nisan, the eighteenth year of the reign of Caesar, and of Augustus Octavian the seventy-first”—Spanish Jews expressed their curiosity about the man rumored to be the Messiah, lauded his behavior and teaching, and warned their fellow Jews that “we will never be made to consent to his execution, neither by counsel nor by our will.”

It was the same desire to acquit themselves of responsibility for the Crucifixion that persuaded Spanish Jews to privilege the Nebuchadnezzar legend, which placed their ancestors in Iberia well before the Crucifixion. If their ancestors had left Jerusalem in the sixth century BC, how could Spain’s Jews be held accountable for crimes that their ancestors had left Jerusalem in the

---


61 Sandoval, *Historia de los Reyes*, 233–234. “Leví, archisinagogo, et Samuel, et Josef, homes bonos de el Aljama de Toledo, á Eleazar, muid gran Sacerdote, é á Samuel Canut y Anás, y Caiphás, homes bonos del Aljama de la tierra Santa, salud en el Dios de Israel;” “catorce días de el mes Nizan, era del César diez y ocho, y de Augusto Octaviano setenta y uno;” “nin por consejo, nin por noso advedrio veniremos en consentimiento de la sua morte.” It should be noted that Spanish Jews were not alone in this kind of fabrication. In the early fifteenth century, German Jews likewise forged a letter dating from the Crucifixion from the Jews of Jerusalem addressed to the Jews of Mainz, Halle, and Regensburg; they hoped to prove thereby that (1) German Jews were already living in Germany by the time of the Crucifixion, and (2) German Jews had attempted to save Christ. In 1477, during the throes of anti-Semitic uprisings in Germany caused by the blood libels of 1476–1480, the Jews of Regensburg again fabricated such a letter. See Joseph Shatzmiller, “Politics and the Myth of Origins: the Case of the Medieval Jews,” in Gilbert Dahan, ed., *Les Juifs au regard de l’histoire. Mélanges en l’honneur de B. Blumenkranz* (Paris: Picard, 1985), 49–61, here at 58.
Jerusalem-dwelling co-religionists committed in 33 AD? According to José Ramón Ayaso Martínez, “Jewish authors’ insistence upon the antiquity of their communities was not … a mere exercise in antiquarian erudition, but rather an urgent answer to the problems that affected their community’s relations with Gentiles.” Such a strategy had the distinct advantage that it not only exculpated the Jews of the Crucifixion. It also gave them legal standing in Castilian courts by proving that “the Jews, though not native to [Spain], had acquired certain rights by virtue of their extended residence in the Peninsula ….”62 (It also, not least of all, would protect Jewish communities from the taxes which Christians regularly imposed upon their Sephardic neighbors in “retribution” for the Crucifixion.63)

The work of the Sevillan Jew Selomoh Ibn Verga (fl. 16th c.) epitomizes the benefits which Spanish Jews hoped to derive, vis-à-vis peninsular Muslims as well as Christians, from the diligent assertion of their noble origins. Ibn Verga’s Sefer Shebet Yehudad (1536) includes a dialogue between the hostile king “Alfonso of Sepharad” and the wise man Tomás, in which Tomás explains to the dubious Alfonso—who has raised the spectre of the blood libel against his Jewish subjects—that Spanish Jews deserved Christians’ trust, for they were of ancient and unalloyed royal bloodline:

May your lordship know that when Nabucodonosor marched on Jerusalem, other powerful kings came to his assistance, motivated by their fear of him (since he dominated the nations of the earth with his great power) as well as by the hatred which they had for the law of the Jews. At the head of those aiding princes was the king Hispanus, from whose name the kingdom of Sepharad took its new name of Hispania. Along with Hispanus came his son-in-law Pirrus, a prince of Ionia, and together they destroyed and laid waste to the Jewish nation with all their might and

---


bravery, and conquered Jerusalem. When he saw the help which they had given him, Nabucodonosor gave them part of the booty and the captives for their use. Your Lordship should know that in Jerusalem there were, from north to south, three walled enclaves. ... Those of the royal line, of the family of David, and the priests charged with the service of the altar lived between the second and the third. Now, when he divided Jerusalem among those kings, Nabucodonosor took for himself two of those enclaves with all of their inhabitants, plus those who remained in the provinces, and he carried them off to Persia and Medea. Nabucodonosor left the third enclave to Pirrus and Hispanus. The aforementioned Pirrus took some ships and carried off all of his captives to Sepharad—that is, to Andalucia—and also to Toledo, from which city they dispersed to other places, because they were so numerous that the country could not contain them all. Some of those deported Jews, who were of royal ancestry, went to Seville, and from there, others went to Granada.

Therefore, Tomás could assure Alfonso that “the Jews who live in your reign today are of royal bloodline, and a large part of them, at least, belong to the lineage of Judah.

Therefore, why does your lordship find it so surprising to find among the Jews of his state a family that claims with pride to descend from King David?"\(^64\)

\(^64\) Selomoh ibn Verga, *La vara de Yehudah (Sefer Sebet Yehudah)*, ed. & trans. María José Cano, Biblioteca Nueva Sefarad, 16 (Barcelona: Riopiedras, 1991), 48–49. “Sepa nuestro señor que al venir Nabucodonosor contra Jerusalén, otros reyes poderosos acudieron en ayuda de aquél, movidos por el temor que le tenían, ya que dominaba con su gran poderío sobre las naciones del mundo, y también por el odio que sentían contra la ley de los judíos. A la cabeza de aquellos príncipes auxiliares vino el rey Hispano, de cuyo nombre tomó el reino de Sefarad su nueva denominación Hispania. Con Hispano marchó su yerno llamado Pirro, de los príncipes de Jonia, y ambos arruinaron y desbarataron la nación judaica con todo su poder y bravura, y también tomaron a Jerusalén. Nabucodonosor cuando vio la buena ayuda que le habían prestado, les dio parte en el botín y en los cautivos a usanza de los reyes. Aun ha de saber nuestro señor que en Jerusalén había de norte a sur tres recintos amurallados. … Desde el segundo recinto al tercero vivían los de estirpe real, de la familia de David, y los sacerdotes encargados del servicio del altar. Ahora bien, al ser repartida Jerusalén entre aquellos reyes, Nabucodonosor tomó para sí dos de aquellos recintos con todos sus moradores más los restantes en las provincias, y se los llevó a Persia y Media. Nabucodonosor dejó el tercer recinto a Pirro e Hispano. El referido Pirro tomó unas naves y en ellas se trajo a Sefarad, esto es, a Andalucia, a todos los cautivos de su parte, y también a Toledo, desde cuya ciudad se fueron extendiendo a otros lugares, por ser tan numerosos que el país no podía contenerlos a todos. Algunos de aquellos judíos deportados, que eran de prosapia real, se dirigieron a Sevilla y de ésta marcharon otros a Granada. … Al suceder la destrucción del segundo Templo mandaba en Roma un césar que imperaba sobre todo el mundo. Entonces el mencionado césar sacó de Jerusalén y otras ciudades 40,000 familias del linaje de Judá y 10,000 del de Benjamín y de los sacerdotes, y las envió a España que a la sazón formaba parte del imperio del césar. Los más de aquéllos del linaje de Benjamín y de los sacerdotes y unos pocos de los hijos de Judá, se pasaron a Francia. … los judíos existentes hoy en tu reino son de estirpe real y una gran parte de ellos por lo menos pertenece al linaje de Judá. Por tanto, ¿cómo ha de maravillarse nuestro señor de hallar entre los judíos de su estado una familia que se precie de descendencia del rey David?”
Isaac Abravanel, Arias Montano’s main portal into the world of Sephardic historiography, was painfully aware of the immediacy of Sephardic Jews’ need to defend themselves. Abravanel, as mentioned above, lost his trusted position at the Catholic Kings’ court and was forced to flee his homeland in the wake of the 1492 expulsion. In 1493, a year after departing the Peninsula for Venice, Abravanel authored a commentary on 2 Kings in which he poignantly emphasized the supposed link between Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction of Jerusalem and the toponyms of Abdias 20. In his discussion of 2 Kings 25:1–12, which describes Nebuchadnezzar’s siege and conquest of Jerusalem, Abravanel argued that “it is correct to say that the diaspora from Jerusalem is found in Spain, given that the children of Judah went to Spain because of the destruction of the First Temple.”

According to his reading of Jewish history,

It was Pirrus who brought to Spain the inhabitants of Jerusalem who belonged to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Simon, the Levites, and the Priests, a great multitude who came with him of their own volition. He lead them across the seas to the kingdom of Spain in ships, establishing them in two provinces. One is the province known today as Andalucía, in a city which in those days was a great Jewish metropolis which they called Lucena, a name which has endured to the present. … Perhaps they named it Lucena so that it should be like the city Lud in the Land of Israel, rich in prophecy. The second province was the land of Toletula. Perhaps it was the Jews who named the city Toletula, because they had wandered [tiltul = wandering] from Jerusalem to here, since the Christians had previously called it Pirrizuela, and not Toletula like its Jewish residents. In the same manner I think that they called the city next to Toletula Maqueda, after the city of Maqueda that existed in the Land of Israel. And they called another city, also near Toletula, Escalona, after Ascalon in the Land of Israel. It is

---


66 This opaque reference seems to refer to the city mentioned several times in the prophets, for example, at Isaiah 66:19.
possible that those cities were similar to the others in the Land of Israel, and therefore they gave the other cities near Toletula Israeli names, too.67

Abravanel’s discussion of the Abdian diaspora, printed at Venice in 1579 but circulating in manuscript much earlier, became for future Christian readers like Arias Montano the authoritative Sephardic pronouncement on the identity of Sepharad and Spain.

When this long tradition of Jewish historiography began to infiltrate Christian history writing in the fifteenth century, the Nebuchadnezzar legend faced a certain amount of resistance among Christian audiences. Christian polemicists, like the *converso* historian Pablo de Santa María (ca. 1350–1435), were committed to dating the Sephardic diaspora to either 70 or 138 AD, for these later dates allowed them to assert that Spain’s Jews had been banished from Jerusalem as punishment for the Crucifixion. In his encyclopedic work on the *Edades del mundo*, Pablo rehearsed the legends of Spain’s many apocryphal founders—Noah’s son Japhet and grandson Tubal, the mythical kings Hispanus and Pirrus, and Nebuchadnezzar—but, when it came time to delineate the origins of Spanish Judaism, he opted for the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD.68 Other

67 ibid., 17. “Pirro es quien trajo a España habitantes de Jerusalén pertenicientes a las tribus de Judá, benjamín, Simón, Levitas, y Sacerdotes, una gran multitud que vino con él voluntariamente. Los condujo al reino de España a través del mar en naves, estableciéndolos en dos provincias. Una es la provincia llamada hoy Andalucía, en una ciudad que en aquellos días era una gran metrópoli judía y que los judíos denominaron Luzena, nombre que se conservó hasta el día de hoy. … Tal vez dieron ellos el nombre de Luzena para que fuese como la ciudad de Luz en la Tierra de Israel, lista para la profecía. La segunda provincia fué la tierra de Toletula. Puede ser que los judíos hayan dado a la ciudad el nombre de Toletula a raíz del trajín [tiltul] que tuvieron desde Jerusalén hasta allí, puesto que los cristianos la habían llamado con anterioridad Pirrizuela y no Toletula, como la llamaron los judíos que allí se radicaron. Asimismo pienso que a otra ciudad contigua a Toletula denominaron Maqueda, en base de la ciudad de Maqueda que existía en la Tierra de Israel. Y a otra ciudad más, cercana a Toletula, llamaron Escalona, según la Ascalón de la Tierra de Israel. Es posible que aquellas ciudades hayan sido similares a las otras ciudades de la Tierra de Israel, y por ello los dieron al resto de las ciudades próximas a Toletula también nombres de Israel.”

authoritative skeptics included Alonso de Madrigal (‘El Tostado’, 1400–1455) and Antonio de Nebrija (1441–1522), both of whom rejected the legends of Sephardic historiography in their own histories of Spanish antiquities. For Arias Montano, however, the Christian’s duty to score theological points vis-à-vis Judaism was less important than the duty to understand the Bible.

**JEROME’S BOSPHORUS**

On the authority of Abravanel (whom he cited as “Isaac Hispano”—his own version of Jerome’s *Hebraica veritas*—Arias Montano was now prepared to argue in his commentary on Abdias that its prophecies should be understood, in conjunction with 2 Kings 25:1–12, as a description of Nebuchadnezzar’s dispersion of the Jews in 587 BC—not, as Jerome had done, as a description of the events of 138—and, moreover, that Sepharad was in Spain rather than Asia Minor. Jerome, in other words, would have to be corrected by Jewish tradition. This was not an unprecedented claim for a Renaissance Spanish exegete to make, as we have seen in the example of Pedro Ciruelo. That said, it was still extremely risky in Counter Reformation Spain. Ciruelo was eventually incarcerated by the Inquisition for his daring critique of Jerome; and even in the 1510s, a rather less vigilant era, Cardinal Cisneros had demanded that the team of scholars editing his Complutensian Polyglot reconcile their Hebrew texts to the Vulgate, insisting on the sanctity of Jerome’s Latin text.69 Revising the Vulgate by the light of the rabbis,
particularly those who had lived and written in recent memory, required tact and
delicacy. Arias Montano responded to the challenge of the censors by adapting a strategy
first used by Ciruelo: he “camouflaged his objections to the Vulgate with … praise for
Jerome.” Assuming an outwardly deferential stance toward his illustrious predecessor,
Arias Montano argued that Jerome had, in fact, believed that Sepharad was Spain all
along—he had simply been misunderstood by later interpreters.

Jerome, Arias Montano insinuated, could not have missed the abundant
etymological and geographical cues signalling that Abdias’ two key toponyms—Sarepta
and Sepharad—referred to France and Spain, respectively. With regard to Sarepta,

the name Tsarpath is more apt than … Sarepta. It is not easy, however, to
discern from the holy books where in the world Tsarpath was located.
From the traditions of the Hebrews, however, and their retention of this
name to this day, we know that it is the province of Gaul.

Arias Montano offered two proofs in support of his decision to substitute France for
Sarepta. The first was simply the weight of tradition and authority: both the spurious
writings of the ancient Chaldean priest Berosus (albeit, as forged by Annius of Viterbo in
the 1490s), and the work of modern Hebrews such as Elias Levita could be adduced in
favor of the identity of Sarepta and Gaul. The second proof, which was more

target of the Vulgate-toting Dominican Bartolomé de Medina’s invective for his lectures on the literal
sense of Scripture. Grajal was arrested by the Inquisition and died in prison.

Homza, Religious Authority, 93.

Arias Montano, Commentaria in duodecim prophetas, 462. “Itaque alii cuipiam nomen Tsarpath, quàm
Sareptae Sidoniorum convenire intelligimus. Sed quo terrarum orbis sita Tsarpath haec fuerit, non
facilè ex sacris libris divinare est. ex Hebraeorum autem traditionibus, & retento hactenus apud eam
gentem nomine Galliam provinciam esse, hanc accepimus … .” Arias Montano seems to have arrived
at this conclusion by confusing Gallograecia, in Asia Minor, with Gallia; a confusion he could have
obtained by reading Isidore of Seville’s Etymologiae, IX.2.26: “Gomer, ex quo Galatae, id est Galli.”

For the forgeries of Annius of Viterbo (ca. 1432–1502), see Anthony Grafton, “Traditions of Invention
and Inventions of Tradition in Renaissance Italy: Annius of Viterbo,” in Defenders of the Text: The
speculative, was more characteristic of Arias Montano’s tendentious approach to reconciling Jerome and Sephardic tradition. Noting that Jerome had believed that Sarepta and Sepharad referred to some sort of distant borderland, Arias Montano asked: in Jerome’s lifetime, what were the furthest borderlands known to house Jewish populations? The answer, he indicated, lay in both classical geographers like Pomponius Mela and Jewish tradition, who concurred that France—and Spain—were most westerly limits of Jewish settlement:

Indeed, it is known that many places in Gaul … were continually frequented by a great number of Israelites, who publicly instituted philosophical schools in various places around Narbonne and Marseille. … Since in ancient times the end of the earth was believed to be in the west, in the direction of Gaul and Spain (which are bathed by the Western Ocean), those places must also define more precisely the boundaries of the diaspora itself—for the ancients believed that there was no habitable land beyond Asia, Africa, and Europe in our hemisphere, and if any lay beyond those, it was deemed to be part of Asia.73

Thus, in describing Sarepta and Sepharad as boundary regions, Arias Montano inferred, Jerome must have meant to describe either France or Spain, or both.

And yet there remained Jerome’s explicit and inconvenient decision to translate ‘Sepharad’ as ‘Bosphorus’. Turning Bosphorus into Spain was to be more difficult than transforming Sarepta into Gaul. Here Arias Montano began by undermining the Vulgate with a dissonant passage he had found in the Aramaic translation of the Torah (the

---

73 Arias Montano, Commentaria, 462–463. “constat enim Galliae complura loca maximè es parte, quae Narbonensis dicitur, & Britanniae, quae Galliis olim ascripta fuit, magna Israelitarum copia usque ad nostram fèrè aetatem fuisse frequentata, à quibus etiam gymnasia tum alibi, tum Narbonae et Massiliae publicè sunt instituta. … Ut autem extrema olim terrarum continentis orbis loca occasum versus Gallia & Hispania, quas Oceanus occidentalis abluit, existimata sunt; sic etiam cum locorum ipsorum finibus dispersionis ratio optime definita est: nam antiqui aut nullam praeter Asia, Africam, & Europam in nostro hemispherio terram habitabilem esse putavère. aut si quid ulterius esset, Asiae assscribendum censuerunt.”
Peshitta, or “Chaldean Bible,” to Arias Montano), suggesting that something was transparently wrong with the contemporary understanding of Jerome’s text:

We have said that where the Latin reads Bosphorus, the Hebrew reads Sepharad. That was the name imposed from ancient times on this region of the earth, as the Chaldean Bible openly teaches. … The Chaldean interpreter translated this locus as: Et transmigratio Ierusalem quae in Spamia. To the Chaldeans Spamia meant the same thing as Hispania in Latin—that is, the last of the earth’s continents, bathed and bounded by the Atlantic (or Western) Ocean … and called Sperida by the ancient Greeks.74

Similarly problematic was the evidence from Greek etymology. The Greeks, observed Arias Montano, called Spain ‘Sperida,’ which is composed of the same consonants (SPRD) as the Hebrew ‘Sepharad’. Allowing for the fact that the passage of time often causes the mutation of vowels, he argued, it was more than obvious that SP[e]R[i]D[a] was, in fact, the same word as S[e]Ph[a]R[a]D.75 Why, then—in the face of both of these counterarguments—did Jerome translate Sepharad as Bosphorus? Here, too, Arias Montano had an answer. Because “Bosphorus” means simply “strait,” and the Strait of Gibraltar, bounded by the Pillars of Hercules, “is the most famous strait in the

---


75 ibid. “antiqui graecorum autores Sperida nominarunt. … Illud autem ex variis linguis, quorum cognitione usus nobis divino beneficio contigit, observavimus, propriorum nominum variam pronuntiationem, non tam consonantium literarum, quam vocalium corruptione aut mutatione in alia, & persaepe in eadem lingua incidere: quam rem exactè considerantibus varia quae videntur nomina componere inter se, atque ad antiquissimam & certam rationem revocare, non magni negotii esset. Exemplis autem hanc rem indicabimus, quoniam iusta disputatione explicare nunc non possimus. In huissimodi igitur nominibus reductio semotis omnibus atque consonantibus etiam iis, quae certum in unaquaque lingua pronuntiandi modum statuere solent, & caeteris consonantibus relictis fit. … Eandem itaque rationem secuti SPRIDA ad SPARAD, nobis hoc loco oblatum nomen facilè reducemus, cùm iisdem utrimque consonantibus constet literis.”
Mediterranean,” when Jerome “translated Sepharad as Bosphorus … he meant and interpreted the Bosphorus, or Strait, of Hercules.”\(^{76}\)

Having ‘proven’ the identity of Sepharad and Spain, Arias Montano proclaimed the riddle of Abdias solved. He then turned to a “brief treatment of [the Jews’] history”:

Spain was inhabited by a multitude of Jews, as we know from our own times. … As all of their writings say, this whole multitude of Jews came, with their families, from Jerusalem and the tribe of Judah, and not from any other tribe. It is said that at the time that the first sacred temple of Jerusalem was destroyed by the Assyrians, many Jews were brought into Hispania by Pirrus, the captain of the Assyrian empire, and were permitted to settle in two places. One, called *Lucina*, a heavily populated citadel in the province of Baeticum, is now called Lucena; it is not far from the region of the Iliberritana, the ancient Lucentia, which we now believe to be Sesa. The other is Toledo, the capital city of the Carpetanians, which they called Tholedoth in their Hebrew language, because in that city were found the most distinguished Jewish families, and the name Tholedoth means ‘generations’ or ‘families.’ And they gave Judean names to the neighboring places they inhabited, in memory of their beloved Syrian places—that is, similar names like Escalona, & Maqueda & others.

“We know this,” he concluded, “from their ancient commentaries on the end of the book of [2] Kings.\(^ {77}\)

\(^{76}\) ibid. “... Europae nomen & fines Herculeis columnis ad calpe terminat, qua Gaditanus Bosphorus permeat, omnium que in mari nostro sunt celeberrimum fretum. ex quo factum est, ut Latinus interpres extremitatem & terminum ipsum orbit, & sententiae rationem affinemque vocem secutus, Sepharad Bosphorum verterit: quem Herculeum Bosphorum sive fretum intelligi accipique voluit.”

\(^{77}\) ibid., 463–464. “Nunc iam historiam ipsam breviter tractemus. Hispaniam Iudaeorum innumera multitudine fuisse habitatam, nostrae etiam aetatis testimonio cognovimus. … Omnen vero hanc multitudinem ex Iudaearum, qui Ierosolymam Iudaque tribum coluerant, familias, non ex aliis tribubus fuisse, constans omnium eius gentis scriptorum opinio est. Narrant enim quo tempore sacrum Ierosolymorum fanum ab Assyris primum dirutum est, multos ex ea gente in Hispaniam, à Piro quodam duce, qui Assyriorum imperium observabat, fuisse traductos, qui duobus primum locis consedisse dicuntur: alteri quidem nomen Lucina, frequentissimo illis seculis in Betica provincia oppido, quod nos vel Lucenam nunc dictam; vel, quae non longe ab hac in Iliberritanae regione est, Lucentiam olim, nunc Sesam esse arbitramur: alteri verò Toleto regiae Carpentanorum urbi nomen fuit, quam quidam ex illis Hebraico nomine Tholedoth dictam ex eo putant, quòd in ea urbe Iudaicarum familiarum distinctio maximè fuerint observata. Id ipsum autem Tholedoth nomen significat generationes sive familias. Atque ab is qui ea loca incoluere Iudaeis nomina quibudam vicinis oppidis, ex rectorum in Syria locorum desiderio, aut etiam similitudine indidisse, ut Ascaloniae, & Maquedae & aliis. Haec ex illorum antiquis receptionibus, & ex commentariis in posteriorem regum librum habuimus.”
In drawing his commentary to a close, Arias Montano could not help but wonder at God’s purpose in dispersing the Jews outward from Jerusalem, settling them in so many foreign lands—Spain, Portugal, France, and Egypt among them. His Christian contemporaries typically interpreted the Hebrew diaspora—particularly that of 70 AD—as confirmation of the triumph of Christianity over Judaism. This was the view expressed by Luis de Granada, OP (1504–1588), the most popular devotional writer of Arias Montano’s day, in his best-selling *summa* of Christian doctrine, the *Introducción del símbolo de la fé* (1583).78 According to fray Luis, the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jews represented both the satisfaction of the prophecy of Hosea 3:4, which foretold a period of Jewish exile, and vivid confirmation that God intended to abandon the Jews after their stubborn refusal to accept Christ.79 “This, God’s sentence,” he cried, “we see executed today against those Jews who remain unbelievers: they wander scattered throughout all the nations of the earth, some in lands belonging to the Turk, some to the Moors, some to the Gentiles, and some to the Christians, without a King, Priest, Temple, Republic, or land to call their own.”80

Arias Montano, however, chose to cast the exile of 587 BC in a radically different light. Like his fellow Hebraist Pedro Ciruelo, Arias Montano considered the Jewish diaspora a sort of mutual gift to Christians and Jews alike. Each was meant to learn


79 ibid., 39. “Veis también el destierro (que Dios avía amenazado) por todas las naciones del mundo. Veis el cumplimiento de aquella profecía de Oseas, que es, estar los hijos de Israel sin Rey, sin Príncipe, sin altar y sin sacrificio y sin vestiduras sacerdotales, y también sin ídolos.”

80 ibid., 40. “Esta sentencia de Dios [against Cain] vemos ejecutada el día de hoy en aquella parte de Judios que permanecen en su incredulidad: los cuales andan derramados por todas las naciones del mundo, ya en tierras de Turcos, ya de Moros, ya de Gentiles, ya de Christianos, sin tener Rey, ni sacerdote, ni Templo, ni República, ni tierra que sea suya.”
something from the other. Jews, of course, needed Christians to help them see the truth of
the Messiah; but Christians needed Jews, too, to teach them the literal sense of Scripture
and serve as their *Hebraica veritas*. Without Jews, in fact, Christians could never have
come to know God at all: it was the Jewish diaspora, Arias Montano explained, that had
brought the Gentiles into contact with God in the first place, so that they might live
together harmoniously in a single republic dedicated to Christ.\(^\text{81}\) If anything, Spain’s
Christians were the greater debtors in this exchange. With that suggestively ienic
observation, Arias Montano fell silent.

**ENTER GARIBAY**

Arias Montano’s erudite, Latin commentary was published in a modest edition at
Antwerp in 1571. One can only speculate as to what its impact might have been had it
been forced to fend for itself in the marketplace of ideas. Fortunately for Arias Montano,
and for his patron Philip II, however, a popularizer was immediately to hand: Esteban de
Garibay y Zamalloa (1533–1599), author of a tremendously popular (and aptly-named)
*Compendio historial de las chronicas y universal historia de todos los reynos de España*
(1571).\(^\text{82}\) Garibay first came in contact with the Nebuchadnezzar legend well in advance
of its publication, through his personal acquaintance with Arias Montano at Philip’s

---

\(^{81}\) Arias Montano, *Commentaria*, 464. “Cui in divinam gratiam restitutae, eas, quae meridiem versus sitae sunt, hoc est Hispaniae, quae & Ierosolymis & Gallia meridionalior est; Africae, Libiae, Aegyptique urbes habitandas ascribit; ita ut in unum iam cum iis terrae incolis, qui Christianam religionem susceperint, populum eiusdem religionis interventu: imò in unum corpus, cuius caput unicum Christus sit, coniuncti, compacti, atque coaugmentati, quietam, tranquillam & beatam vitam sine ullo fugae aut migrationis metu, sine insidiarum suspicione, communi divina tutela usi peragant.”

court. In a series of casual conversations dating back to the mid-1560s, Garibay recalled, Arias Montano sketched an outline of his commentary for his friend. Almost immediately, Garibay recognized the potential contributions of Arias Montano’s commentary to the realm of Spanish ‘nationalist’ historiography. Though it contradicted the accumulated opinions of a thousand years’ of Iberian historians, adding Nebuchadnezzar’s dubious conquest of the Peninsula to the narrative could add the lustre of biblical antiquity to Spanish history. Garibay even contemplated attributing the post-diluvian repopulation of the Peninsula not, as was always done, to Noah’s grandson Tubal, but rather to an entirely unsubstantiated “King Sepharad,” calculating that this too-convenient fiction would be enough to convince potential critics of the truth of his colleague’s speculative etymologies. Ultimately, Garibay rejected this detail as contrary to prevailing wisdom, but he enthusiastically co-opted everything else he learned from Arias Montano into his bestselling *Compendio*.

A splendidly colorful and copious writer, if hardly an original thinker, Garibay embraced Arias Montano’s theories with a pseudo-scholarly ardor entirely in keeping with his character. He was an inveterate promoter of the Spanish cause, eager to embrace any fact—no matter how improbable—if it could be put to use in defense of his patria.

He was also, like so many of his peers, educated just enough to be a bad historian.

---

83 Garibay informed the reader of his *Compendio historial* that “trat[é] yo con el mismo Autor [ie. Arias Montano] sobre esta materia, preguntando” him about his “opinion” as follows: “El Dotor Benito Arias Montano …, varon muy doto, y universal en letras Theologas y liberales, y lenguas, en los Comentarios que escrive sobre la Sancta Escritura, y en otros libros pertenecientes a la mesma facultad, especialmente sobre el Profeta Abdias, declarando el verso que dize en Latin Transmigratio Hierusalem, quae in Bosphoro est, como ve, que en el Testamento viejo, España se llama Sepharad en lengua vieja, es de nueva opinion, sobre el primer poblador de España después del diluvio … [fue] algun … sucesor propinquo de los descendientes de Noe, llamado Sepharad.” Since Garibay drafted his history in the decade 1556–1566, he must have conferred with Arias Montano about the meaning of Abdias well before Arias Montano published his commentary in 1571. See Garibay, *Compendio historial*, 1:89–90; and idem, *Discurso de mi vida*, ed. Jesús Moya, Clásicos vascos en castellano, 1 (Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco, Servicio Editorial, 1999), 140.
Outfitted with what he himself described as a charmingly haphazard training in the classics, Garibay was ill-equipped to critique textual authority, but perfectly competent to manipulate it to his own ends. What he lacked in skepticism and methodological savvy, he made up for with his blustery enthusiasm and talent as a storyteller. It is no surprise, therefore, that his *Compendium*’s accessible repackaging of the Nebuchadnezzar legend as a settled, coherent, and memorable episode, suitable for insertion into the grand narrative of Spanish vernacular historiography, did more than any other text to popularize Arias Montano’s theories about Spain’s Hebrew ancestry. Though it was not entirely faithful to the original, the vast majority of subsequent enthusiasts and critics knew Arias Montano’s commentary only through Garibay’s epitome.

Garibay signalled his allegiance to Arias Montano early in his compendium, scoffing at those scholars who, upon finding “some Chaldean names” in Andalucía, therefore assumed that Chaldean was simply the original language of Spain. As anyone familiar with Arias Montano’s research clearly could see, he argued, Spain’s Chaldean toponyms were actually the fruit of “the powerful arrival in Spain of Nebuchadnezzar, Prince of the Babylonian Chaldeans, very celebrated in the Holy Scriptures, he who destroyed the city of Jerusalem, and the Temple of Solomon.” Garibay’s full and melodramatic account of this invasion, however, came later, in a chapter “On the

---

84 For Garibay’s education, see his *Discurso de mi vida*, 133–135.

85 Garibay, *Compendio historial*, 1:76–77. “ay tambien altercacion entre nuestros Chronistas, diziendo muy pocos ser la Chaldea, por ventura movidos de hallar en las tierras de Andaluzia algunos nombres Chaldeos, cuyas significaciones se notaran en el capitulo decimoquarto del libro quarto, y mas copioso se declararan en el capitulo quarto del libro quinto, adonde remito a los letores, porque alli se verà, como tuvieron origen aquellos nombres de la poderosa venida a España de Nabucadnezer, Principe de los Chaldeos Babylonios, muy celebrado en la Sagrada Escritura, que fue el que destruyò la ciudad de Ierusalen, y Templo de Salomon, pero para el tiempo que este Principe Chaldeo vino a España, ya avian passado mas de mil y quinientos y setenta años que Tubal avia venido a ella … y assi quando este Principe llegò a estas partes, ya eran diversas las lenguas, que se hablavan en las regiones de España, de las muchas naciones de diversas lenguas, que despues de Tubal vinieron a ella.”
Destruction of the Holy City of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar … and his Arrival in Spain with Chaldeans and Persians and Jews, and the Chaldean Names that are Found in Spain …”—set off by a warning to the somnolent reader that “this chapter may be long, but it is very noteworthy.” He began by narrating how Nebuchadnezzar, after sacking Jerusalem and carrying off the Jews into the Babylonian Captivity, was foiled in his attempt to lay siege to the city of Tyre by Phoenician reinforcements called home from their Spanish colony of Cádiz. After mercilessly subjugating Africa, Nebuchadnezzar “passed into Spain, hoping to do the same, especially because of the indignation he felt toward the Phoenicians who lived there because of the aid they had sent to Tyre. And so, around 590 BC, he led his armies of diverse nationalities into Spain.” There, in Andalucía, they founded the cities of Seville and Córdoba and gave them Chaldean names, “hoping to leave behind for posterity the memory of their arrival in Spain …, the sort of thing that every one of the world’s nations has done, in every century.”

Most important for Garibay were the actions of the “Iudios,” the Jews, “one of the most distinguished nations in Nebuchadnezzar’s army.” After arriving in Cádiz with the rest of the great Babylonian’s host, the Jews wandered north into the province of Carpetania, “in which they founded on the banks of the River Tajo, in a naturally well fortified mountain range, a settlement which they called in their Hebrew language

---

86 ibid., 1:106–112. “Es capitulo grande, pero muy notorable.”

87 ibid., 1:107. “passò a España, queriendo hazer lo mesmo, especialmente por la indignacion que tenia contra los Fenices en ella habitantes, por los socorros que avian dado a los de Tiro, y metio en ella exercitos de diversas naciones cerca del año de quinientos, y noventa, antes de nacimiento de nuestro Señor.” Garibay cited Book X of Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities and Book XV of Strabo’s Geographia in support of his claim.

88 ibid., 1:108. “queriendo dexar a los posterros memoria de su llegada a España … cosa en todos siglos siempre assi usada en qualesquiera naciones del mundo.”

89 ibid. “una de las mas señaladas naciones que en los exercitos de Nabucadnezer venian.”
‘Toledoth’, which means generations, because members of every generation of the ten tribes of Israel joined in its foundation and settlement.” Moreover, “these tribes of Israel not only founded the city of Toledo, making it the capital of their Spanish settlements; they also erected in their territory other settlements with names taken from their own homeland; one of these was the town of Escalona … , which they named Ascalona, after a town within the boundaries of the kingdom of Judea;” another was “the town of Maqueda, which also, like Escalona, was given a name from their region; and they did the same with Noves, naming it after Nobe, a town in their homeland. And in the same manner they founded another town called Yope, from whence was derived the name Yopes; and from Yopes it became Yepes.” Finally, he noted, “in the town of Lucena, they had a Hebrew language university, as Joseph Abravanel wrote in his Comment [sic] on the Minor Prophets.”

Up to this point, Garibay’s narrative was essentially a straightforward recapitulation of Arias Montano’s commentary. Unlike his colleague, however, Garibay did not hide the extent to which his chronicle of the Jews’ march through Andalucía and the supposed Hebrew roots of Spanish towns like Yepes and Toledo aimed to build a case for Spanish exceptionalism. When he commented that the Jews had founded a synagogue in Toledo, “where a single God, and not the vain gods of other ancient nations, was

90 ibid., 1:109–110. “en la qual fundaron en la ribera de Tajo en un cerro harto bien fuerte a natura una poblacion, que en su lengua Hebrea llamaron Toledoth, que significa generaciones, resultando este nombre por aver concurrido a su poblacion y fundacion de todas las generaciones de los diez tribus de Israel;” “estos tribus de Israel, no solo fundaron la ciudad de Toledo, constituyendola por cabeça de sus poblaciones en España, mas aun en su territorio fabricaron, y erigieron otras poblaciones con los nombres de sus proprias patrias, siendo una dellas la villa de Escalona … dandole el nombre Ascalona, pueblo de los confines del reino de Iuda;” “fundaron en el mismo territorio la villa de Maqueda, con nombre de su region como el de Escalona, y lo mesmo hizieron en la mesma comarca a Nove, dandole el nombre de Nove, pueblos de su patria, y por la mesma orden fundaron otro pueblo llamado Yope, de donde vino después a derivarse el nombre de Yopes, y de Yopes Yepes;” “en la villa Lucena, tuvieron universidad de letras Hebreas, como escrive Josepho Abarbenel en el Comento [sic] de los Profetas Menores.”
adored and reverenced,” it was no idle observation. According to Garibay, it demonstrated how, as the Jews “erected various settlements in Spain, this being their first time there,” they also “began to spread throughout Spain the holy law of Scripture, which God gave to Moses on Mount Sinai, so as to set in motion the future salvation of peoples. For theirs was the law that God had commanded men to observe, which the holy and the just followed until [it was replaced by] the advent of the evangelical law of grace whose figure it had been”—that is, Christianity. As if to buttress his claim of a typological transference from Israel to Spain, Garibay embellished Arias Montano’s commentary with yet another original detail. “Because of their great love for their homeland,” he noted, the Jews “took care not only with their names, but even with the relative distances between each town—founding each one at the same distance from Toledo, as the towns in their region were from Jerusalem—in this way and in everything else, to duplicate [retratar] their homeland.”

In Garibay’s history, the full propagandistic potential of Arias Montano’s researches was made manifest. Arias Montano’s Hebrew toponyms became a sharp-edged weapon with which to undercut the authority of Paul IV. Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion was said to have initiated a profound transfer between Jerusalem and Toledo, a transfer with important implications for the shape of Spanish—not just Christian—history. Spain, Garibay implied, and not Rome, was the true New Jerusalem. This was a

---

91 ibid., 109. “hizieron en España diversas poblaciones siendo esta su primera venida a ella, y comenzaron a estender en ella la santa ley de Escritura, dada por Dios a Moysen en el monte Sinai, para la carrera y salvacion futura de las gentes, siendo la que mandó Dios observar, y la que los santos y justos siguieron hasta la predicacion de la ley evangelica de gracia, cuya figura era aquella;” “donde un solo Dios, y no los vanos dioses de las otras naciones deste siglo era adorado, y reverenciado.”

92 ibid., 110. “En cuyas erecciones, con el grande amor de su patria, tuvieron cuenta, no solo con los nombres, mas aun con las distancias de cada pueblo, fundando cada uno a tanta espacio de la ciudad de Toledo, quanto los de aquella su region distavan de la ciudad de Ierusalen, de manera, que en esto y en lo demas se esforçaron a retratar a su patria.” For more on this idea, see the next chapter.
profoundly anti-Roman conception of history, pointedly opposed to the conventional belief that it was Rome that had allowed for the dissemination of Christianity throughout the world. Instead, Nebuchadnezzar—and then Spain—became pre-Roman agents for the spread of the Word throughout the world.

‘JEWISH PERFIDY’

Not all Spanish historians greeted Arias Montano’s commentary with the unalloyed praise of Garibay. Authoritative thinkers as far back as Alonso de Madrigal and Antonio de Nebrija had rejected the legends of Sephardic historiography already in the fifteenth century, and their intellectual heirs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could be unsparing in their criticism of Arias Montano’s willingness to believe that Nebuchadnezzar had conquered Spain. In his In Librum Duodecim Prophetarum commentarii, Francisco de Ribera, SJ (1537–1591) flatly denied that Nebuchadnezzar would have brought Jews to Spain with him—if he had come at all. “Why,” he asked, “would [Nebuchadnezzar] send his captives to Spain? Why would he have had to separate them from the others, whom he carried off to Babylonia? Why do [the Jews] call certain that which is uncertain, and improbable?”

More influential was the criticism of Ribera’s brilliant Jesuit colleague, Juan de Mariana (1535–1624). In his 1595 Historia general de España, a masterpiece of erudition and source criticism, Mariana raised grave doubts about Arias Montano’s sources, methodology, and conclusions. When Mariana

---


94 Juan de Mariana, Historia general de España (1595), in idem, Obras, 2 vols., Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 30–31 (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 1864–1872). Georges Cirot,
took up the Nebuchadnezzar legend in Book I, Chapter 17, he professed himself willing to accept—on the *bona fides* of Josephus’ account alone—certain outlines of Arias Montano’s tale. Indeed it seemed that Nebuchadnezzar had tried to besiege the city of Tyre, but was forced to raise his siege when the Phoenician inhabitants of Cádiz raced home to the Levant to reinforce their homeland. After pacifying Africa, Nebuchadnezzar may well have come to Spain “intending to seize its riches and at the same time exact revenge upon the people of Cádiz for the aid which they sent to Tyre. He and his people disembarked at the boundary of Spain, at the foothills of the Pyrenees; from there, without reverse, he descended via rivers and ports until he reached Cádiz.” His victory, however, could not have been but temporary, noted Mariana, for “in his *Antiquities* Josephus says that [when] Nebuchadnezzar conquered Spain, the residents sounded the alarm and banded together to mount a resistance. The Babylonian [ie. Nebuchadnezzar], fearing a defeat that would blacken all of his other victories and the glory that he had won, and contented with the many riches that he had acquired, and having enlarged his empire to the very limits of the earth, agreed to turn back, which he did 171 years after the foundation of Rome [ie. in 651 BC].”

If Mariana could accept, however begrudgingly, Josephus’ claim that Nebuchadnezzar had visited Spain, he absolutely could not accept Arias Montano’s grasping etymologies, which attempted to find Hebrew or Chaldean roots in the names of towns around Toledo.

This visit of Nebuchadnezzar to Spain is very famous in the books of the Hebrews; and because he brought many Jews in his retinue, some thought it reason to believe—and even to say—that in Andalucía and the kingdom

---

*Mariana historien*, Bibliothèque de la Fondation Thiers, 8 (Bordeaux: Feret & Fils, 1905), offers a superb analysis of Mariana’s historical method and sources.
of Toledo, which was then Carpetania, one may still find many Hebrew names among the various towns that they founded. Among these they count Toledo, Escalon, Noves, Maqueda, [and] Yepes, not to mention other towns of less importance; and they say that these towns took their names from the Palestinian cities of Ascalon, Nobe, Magiddo, [and] Joppa. They claim that “Toledo” came from “Toledoth,” which in Hebrew means “lineages” and “families,” referring to those [families] who are said to have come together in great numbers to dig the ditches and found that city.

This thesis was evidence of “a lively imagination, to be sure,” sighed the laconic Mariana, “but at this moment we will attempt neither to approve nor criticize it in every particular. It’s enough to warn that the evidence for it is of little consequence, since it is not based upon the testimony or authority of any ancient writer.”

---

95 ibid., 1:20–21. “quebrantaron por esta manera el coraje de los babilonios, los cuales por esto y porque de Egipto, donde les avisaban se hacian grandes juntas de gentes, les amenazaban nuevas tempestades y asonadas de guerra, acordaron de levantar el cerco;” “pasó en España con intento de apoderarse de sus riquezas y de vengarse juntamente del socorro de los de Cádiz enviaron á Tiro. Desembarcó con su gente en lo postrero de España á las vertientes de los Pirineos; desde allí sin contraste discurrió por las demás riberas y puertos hasta llegar a Cádiz. Josefo en las Antigüedades dice que Nabucodonosor se apoderó de España. Apellidáronse los naturales y apercibíanse para hacer resistencia. El babilonio, por miedo de algún revés que escuriese todas las demás victorias y la gloria ganada, y contento con las muchas riquezas que juntara, y haber ensanchado su imperio hasta los últimos términos de la tierra, acordó dar la vuelta, y así lo hizo el año que corria de la fundación de Roma de 171. Esta venida de Nabucodonosor en España es muy célebre en los libros de los hebreos, y por causa que en su compañía trajo muchos judíos algunos tomaron ocasión para pensar y aun decir que muchos nombres hebreos en el Andalucía y asimismo en el reino de Toledo, que fue la antigua Carpetania, quedaron en diversos pueblos que se fundaron en aquella sazón por aquella misma gente. Entre éstos cuentan a Toledo, Escalon, Noves, Maqueda, Yepes, sin otros pueblos de menor cuenta, que dicen tomaron estos apellidos de Ascalón, Nove, Magedón, Jope, ciudades de Palestina. El de Toledo quieren que venga de Toledoth, dicción que en hebreo significa ‘linajes’ y ‘familias’, cuales fueron las que dice se juntaron en gran número para abrir las zanjas y fundar aquella ciudad. Imaginación aguda sin duda, pero que en este lugar ni la pretendemos aprobar ni reprobar de todo punto. Basta advertir que el fundamento es de poco momento, por no estribar en testimonio y autoridad en algún escritor antiguo.” It is worth noting that elsewhere, in his chapter “De los emperadores Flavio Vespasiano y sus hijos,” Mariana also criticized the alternate Jewish traditions whereby Jewish exiles founded Mérida in 70 AD, after Titus’ expulsion: “Grande fue el número de los judíos cautivos; parte dellos, enviados a España, hicieron su asiento en la ciudad de Mérida. Así lo testifican sus libros; si fue así o de otra manera, no lo determinamos en este lugar. Lo que consta es, que les vedó morar de allí adelante ni reedificar la ciudad de Jerusalem” (I: 92–93). Mariana’s incredulity attracted the censure of a fellow Jesuit, Pablo Ferrer, in a series of letters written in 1596. In his final letter, Ferrer excoriated Mariana for questioning the Nebuchadnezzar legend. Arias Montano’s evidence may have been imperfect, acknowledged Ferrer, but at least it existed; Mariana, on the other hand, proposed to overturn Arias Montano without any solid evidence that Nebuchadnezzar had not come to Spain! See Cirot, Mariana historien, 154–164, esp. 161–162.
While Juan de Mariana delicately hedged his contempt for the “inconsequentiality” and novelty of Arias Montano’s sources, the like-minded linguist Bernardo José de Aldrete let loose a torrent of acerbic invective in his own discussion of the Nebuchadnezzar legend. In the third book of his landmark *Del origen y principio de la lengua castellana ó romance que oi se usa en España* (1606), Aldrete took aim at Arias Montano, Garibay, and all overenthusiastic etymologists who lent credence to the Nebuchadnezzar legend by ‘discovering’ Hebrew roots in the place names around Toledo. Aldrete was one of the few men of his generation—surprising though it may seem—to support the thesis that Castilian had descended from Latin, and was not one of the original seventy-two languages of Babel; his hard-headed empiricism on this question is a reliable indicator of his critical and evolutionary approach to philology in general. Aldrete was willing to countenance discrete components of Arias Montano’s argument—in his case, that many Castilian words had Hebraic origins. Yet for Aldrete, this was patently obvious and mundane, the natural consequence of Jewish-Christian comingling in the medieval Peninsula. He could not, under any conditions, accept the notion that those Hebraic echoes were the product of a Semitic invasion of nearly twenty-three centuries prior.

---

96 Bernardo José de Aldrete, *Del origen y principio de la lengua castellana ó romance que oi se usa en España* (Rome: Carlo Wllietto, 1606).


98 ibid., 305. “no dudo sino que los [ie. nombres Hebreos] ai, recibidos i admitidos en al uso por diversas causas, los quales son menos, que de ninguna otra lengua.”

99 Aldrete argued instead for dating the Jewish arrival to 70 AD, basing his decision on the testimony of ancient historians like Paulus Orosius (ibid., 319).
Aldrete would have preferred, he averred, to avoid the subject, “so as not to offend;” ultimately, however, he could not resist pointing out the absurdity of believing that Nebuchadnezzar had come to Spain with an army of Jews. To believe as much, he argued, was to fall victim to fallacious reasoning: it was like concluding “that the Kingdom of New Granada in the Indies [ie. modern Colombia] was populated by moriscos from the Kingdom of Granada in Spain, on the basis of the facts that [1] the Catholic Kings had just won [the latter] when they began the conquest and discovery of [the former], and thus could have brought [the moriscos] there, and that [2] it is called the Kingdom of Granada.”

This would not do, and Aldrete felt that he had no choice but to publish his dissent. Aldrete levied two counterarguments against Arias Montano and his followers: first, that reliable Greek and Latin sources did not support the Nebuchadnezzar legend; and second, that the legend’s primary source, Hebrew historiography, was inherently untrustworthy.

With regard to the classical tradition, Aldrete displayed the sort of ‘modern,’ humanist approach to Greco-Roman source criticism characteristic of the most advanced historiographers of the Renaissance. Aldrete had read at least as widely as had Arias Montano, and was able to cite not only Strabo, Josephus, and Jerome, but also Berosus the Chaldean, Diocles, Philostratus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, Alexander Polyhistor, Clement of Alexandria, and Suidas on this question of Nebuchadnezzar’s conquests. That wide reading gave him the context to see that

---

100 ibid., 311. “por evitar offensiones;” “no es verisimil, que Nabucodonosor los truxesse a España;” “que el nuevo reino de Granada en Indias fue poblado de los Christianos nuevos del Reino de Granada de España, porque quando lo acabaron de ganar los reies Catholicos comenzaron aquella conquista, i descubrimiento, i juntamente afirmasse, que era verisimil que los llevaron alla, arguiendo del nombre del reino de Granada.”

101 See Grafton, What was History?.

---
Megasthenes was only one among a number of ancient historians to have mentioned Nebuchadnezzar’s deeds; moreover, Aldrete recognized, he was hardly the most reliable. Megasthenes—whose specialty was India, and who dedicated but a single brief phrase to the question—was the only historian ever to mention Nebuchadnezzar’s dubious Spanish sojourn. Neither Berosus, nor Tertullian, nor Eusebius—in spite of their otherwise exhaustive recording of the Babylonian king’s many achievements—placed him in Iberia. Even if Nebuchadnezzar had come west, there would be no reason to believe that he would have brought the Jews, his sworn enemies, with him; and he certainly would not have left them in control of his new domains. Thus, Aldrete, concluded, one could believe one of two things about Megasthenes’ testimony: either Megasthenes knew something about the Babylonians’ Mediterranean attainments that no other historian recorded; or, he was mistaken. Faced with that choice, Aldrete came to the discerning critic’s easy conclusion: it was Megasthenes who was not to be trusted.

With regard to Arias Montano’s Jewish sources, Aldrete’s argument was even more unforgiving. Jewish sources, argued Aldrete, “deserve much less credit than do the [classical ones],” for the simple reason that Jews were congenital liars:

honestly, there is nothing in the world that I would not put past this Godforsaken people, especially since they are enemies of Christ our Lord and Saviour. He is the light, and gate, and way to truth; without him—in darkness, having lost the way, and full of lies—one falls into the chasms of falsehood and deception. Such is the fate of the Hebrews, who have refused to believe in Christ our Lord. They remain in this state of blindness and infidelity, and for this they are punished with the bondage and vexation that they suffer at the hands of every nation.

---

102 Aldrete, Del origen, 308–310. “tengo por cierto, que autores gravissimos tuvieron por fabuloso, lo que dixo Megasthenes.”

103 ibid., 310–311. “quando admitamos, que Nabucodonosor aia venido a España, no por esso se sigue, que truxo consigo, para dexar en ella Israelitas del pueblo de Dios.”
It was the Jews, after all, Aldrete reminded his reader, who had concocted “the shocking
blasphemies that fill the books of the Talmud, in which—with diabolical
shamelessness—they dare to contradict the truth of holy Scripture, and to write glosses
contrary to the Divine law.” 104 What is more, “with the same brazenness they have
infiltrated even secular historiography,” proving that they would say and do anything, and
leave no truth unperverted, “for the sake of sustaining their insane pertinacity and blind
stubbornness.” 105

To really understand the vigor of the critique with which Aldrete followed these
allegations of Jewish perfidy, one must acknowledge Aldrete’s indebtedness to one of the
oldest traditions in Spanish Christian historiography, one surprisingly absent in the work
of his peers Arias Montano and Garibay. This was the tradition coupling lamentation for
medieval Spain’s long subordination to Muslim rule, the source of so much religious and
ethnic shame, with hyperbolic exaggeration of the oppression faced by medieval
Christians. Though Jewish life in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Iberia was undeniably
a difficult affair, Spanish sources of the era betray what can only be described as an
irrational fear of Jewish conspiracies and Jewish oppression, a fear that could be used to
unite Christians outraged over the imaginary inversion of ‘proper’ Jewish-Christian

104 ibid., 312–313. “mucho menos credito se deve dar a esto, que a lo otro. Porque realmente no ai cosa en
el mundo, que no se pueda creer de los hombres desamparados de Dios, maiormente siendo enemigos
de Christo nuestro Señor, i salvador, que es la luz, la puerta, i el camino para la verdad, sin el qual a
escuras, descarriados, i llenos de mentiras, caeren en los despeñaderos de la falsedad, i engaño. Tales
quedaron los Hebreos, que no an querido creer en Christo nuestro Señor, i en esta ceguedad, i
infidelidad permanecen por lo qual son castigados con el avasallamiento, i vexacion, que padecen entre
todas las naciones. Desde principio nacieron las blasphemias espantosas, de que estan llenos los libros
del Talmud, en que con desvergunzena diabolica se atreven a contradizir la verdad de la sagrada
escritura, i hazer glosas contrarias a la lei Divina, de que autores mui graves an escrito mucho.”

105 ibid., 313. “con el mismo atrevimiento an inficionado las historias, aun en lo que toca a lo profano,
todo encaminado a sustentar su loca pertinacia, i ciega porfia … .”
relations. Iberian Jews were accused time and again of colluding with their Muslim overlords to inflict misery on Christians and stir them to apostasy. This was one of the primary themes of the oft-quoted *Dialogus Pauli et Sauli Contra Judaeos, sive Scrutinium Scripturarum* (1434), written by the *converso* polemicist Pablo de Santa María (ca. 1351–1435).107

The recrudescence in the later fifteenth century of the high medieval blood libel, indirectly responsible for the Jewish expulsion of 1492, was similarly couched in terms of *Christian*, not Jewish, oppression. The Aragonese decree of expulsion alleged that, “in addition to their restless and perverse lifestyle, we find that the aforementioned Jews are devouring and consuming the Christians’ estates and sustenance, by means of their extravagant and unbearable usury … for which reason we have heard grave complaints from our subjects and citizens … .”108 It is no accident that the noble German tourist Hieronymus Münzer (d. 1508), visiting the Peninsula shortly after the expulsion, recorded his Spanish hosts’ belief that “when the Jews and *marranos* were the dominant power in almost the entire realm of Spain, they held almost all of the best offices and

---

106 For Spanish self-definition against Judaism, see Américo Castro, *De la edad conflictiva* (Madrid: Taurus, 1972), 99–133.

107 Pablo de Santa María, *Dialogus Pauli et Sauli Contra Judaeos, sive Scrutinium Scripturarum* (Burgos, 1591), part II, d. 6, chapter 10. “Obtinebant enim in domibus Regum, & etiam magnatum officia magna, per quae omnes subditi etiam fideles eos in magna habebant reverentia, & timore, quod in non modicum scandalum, seu periculum animarum cedebat simplicium, de facili enim tales consueverunt ad errores eorum, qui eis præsunt moveri. Infideles Iudæi etiam ex hoc occasionem persistendi in suis erroribus summebant, dicentes, & in nonnullis suis codicibus scribentes, quod Propheta Iacob Patriarchae, in qua dicitur. Non auferetur sceptorum de Iuda &c. verificabatur in hoc, quod Iudæi in Hispania sceptorum dominii seu regiminis obtinebat, modo supradicto.” For a fascinating study of the larger historiographical framework in which Pablo de Santa Maria worked, see Juan Carlos Conde, ed., *La creación de un discurso historiográfico en el cuatrocientos castellano: Las siete edades del mundo de Pablo de Santa María*, Textos recuperados, 18 (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1999).

108 Quoted in Ayaso Martínez, “Antigüedad y excelencia,” 235 n. 1. “añadiendo a su inquieto y perverso vivir, faltamos los dichos judíos, por medio de grandísimas e insusceptibles usuras, devorar y absorber las haciendas y sustancias de los cristianos … de lo qual graves querellas de nuestros subditos y naturales a nuestras orejas han erenido, … .”
oppressed the Christians,” a direct echo of Pablo de Santa María. It was no wonder, mused Münzer, that Spaniards erupted in sheer jubilation over the fact that Fernando and Isabel had “expelled from their realms more than 100,000 Jewish families, and ordered that many marranos be burned.” Finally, they could rest easy, knowing they would be safe from nefarious Jewish plots. It was a commonplace of medieval anti-Judaism that Jews were constantly said to be plotting to poison Christians’ water supply; in 1321, for example, Christians allegedly discovered that the Jews of Teruel had attempted to poison Aragonese wells with putrid filth supplied them by lepers and the Muslim rulers of Egypt and Granada.

Aldrete channeled this fantasm of Jewish oppression in his commentary on the legendary Babylonian invasion. For Aldrete, there could be no question that the legend

---


was an insidious falsehood concocted by conniving Sephardic historians seeking to poison the well of Christian historiography—the literary equivalent of Jews’ well-known attempts to poison Christians’ drinking water. Aldrete ‘reminded’ his readers that Jews lived to sabotage Christian civilization and lord it over a Church brought low by despair and dejection. The Nebuchadnezzar legend was quite simply one of the many weapons which they had stockpiled for their long battle of attrition against the Christian faith. After all, if one believed the legend, Spanish Christians owed their very existence to heroic Jewish progenitors—a dishonorable and humiliating thought by any measure.111

The whole story was a ploy, a shameless attempt to rewrite the Peninsula’s true history, dreamed up by medieval Jews emboldened by watching their Christian enemies chafe helplessly under the rule of the Jews’ unwitting Islamic accomplices.112 “In the era of Spain’s great misery, when the Moors became her lords,” he fulminated, the Jews were able to get away with almost anything vis-à-vis the Christian princes . . . . They dreamed up these things in those miserable times, in which [the Jews] lorded over Christian princes—and no less over the Moors, who made use of them to populate and defend their conquests vis-à-vis the Christians. Thus they became so numerous that it seemed to them that they could pass themselves off as the first, or most ancient, inhabitants of Spain.

Aided and abetted by the relative peace and tolerance characteristic of Muslim rule, the Jews excelled in letters and founded schools, thus endowing their false histories with the imprimatur of ancient learning and facilitating their spread throughout Spain.113 There is

111 Américo Castro, De la edad conflictiva (Madrid: Taurus: 1972), 99–133.
113 ibid., 313–315. “En tiempo, que la gran miseria de España llegó, a que los Moros fuessen señores della, pudieron mucho con los principes cristianos . . . . Se forjó en aquellos miserables tiempos, en que esta gente podia con los principes cristianos mucho, i no menos con los Moros, los quales como dire abajo, se aprovecharon dellos, para poblar i defender lo que iavan ganando de los cristianos, i assi
more than a little irony in Aldrete’s denunciation of Jewish perfidy. Technically correct about the Nebuchadnezzar legend’s medieval Jewish origins, and also about its purpose—ie. to raise Spanish Christians’ opinion of their Sephardic neighbors—his venomous anti-Judaism and distorted understanding of Christian-Jewish power dynamics in late medieval Iberia nevertheless led him to assume the worst of Jewish historians.

He also assumed the worst of his fellow Christians. However impressive the lies of medieval Jews, Aldrete continued, Christian exegetes like Arias Montano should have known better than to accept them. For when Jews scheme and lie, “they always do it in such a way that their ignorance eventually discloses their falsehood.” Serial liars, they were also serial bunglers, perpetually unmasked by their own ineptitude. In the case of the Nebuchadnezzar legend, Arias Montano should have noticed that the toponyms which his sources credited as Hebraic were, in fact, Phoenician: “I believe that it is beyond a doubt that the Hebraic roots which we find in the names of very ancient Spanish cities and towns were put there not by the Hebrews, but rather by the Phoenicians or Carthaginians, who inhabited and ruled Spain in ancient times, and whose language is almost identical to Hebrew.” The fact that Arias Montano had failed to notice this obvious flaw in his Jewish sources, Aldrete implied, did not speak well for either his scholarship or his orthodoxy. (It was for precisely this reason that Aldrete also included a

---

114 ibid., 313. “todo de manera, que su grande ignorancia luego de lejos descubre la mentira.”

115 ibid., 332. “tengo por sin duda que en los nombres, que hallamos en España puestos a Ciudades, o pueblos mui antiguos, los quales en el origen corresponden a la lengua Hebreá, que estos no los pusieron los Hebreos, sino los Phenices, o Cartagineses, que fueron tan antiguos pobladores, i señores en España, i cuia lengua fue tan cercana, i cassi una con la Hebreá.”
scathing *ad hominem* attack on Arias Montano’s “indecent” Latin translation of Benjamin de Tudela’s travel account, proclaiming the Inquisition’s censors “justified” in prohibiting such a “seedbed of flaming lies, designed to appeal to those simpletons who are seduced by such tales” from further contributing to the “evil ends of those who wrote them.”

**THE APOTHEOSIS OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR**

In spite of Aldrete’s ardent opposition, the majority of his colleagues embraced Arias Montano’s etymological genealogies for their usefulness as propaganda, overlooking their Jewish origins. On the strength of Garibay’s vernacular retelling, Arias Montano’s commentary on Abdias cut a wide swath through the world of Spanish letters, inspiring a multitude of contemporaries to insert Nebuchadnezzar’s legendary invasion into the history of their homeland. The historians and jurists gathered around the Spanish court were among Arias Montano’s earliest and most ardent glossators. Over the next several decades, his etymological genealogies and Garibay’s idiosyncratic reading of the *translatio imperii*—long a cornerstone of Habsburg identity in their Central European realms—became the reigning paradigm according to which historians and theologians would begin to shape their histories of the Spanish Empire. They are certainly in evidence, for example, in the massive defense of the Spanish Monarchy’s universalist

---

116 ibid., 313. “Por esta causa justificadamente se prohibió el libro del viaje de Benjamín de Tudela de Navarra indignadamente traducido en latín, siendo seminario de mentiras urdidas, para que las crean, los que con sencillez se dexan llevar de semejantes cuentos, no penetrando la malicia, i fin, de quien los escrive.”

117 Cipriano Muñoz y Manzano [Conde de la Viñaza], *Biblioteca histórica de la filología castellana*, 3 vols. (Madrid: Atlas, 1978), I: 3–39 cites ten authors who took up the subject to 1672.

pretensions which the Dominican Juan de la Puente published in 1612.119 Entitled the *Conveniencia de las dos Monarquías Catolicas, la de la Iglesia Romana y la del Imperio Español, y defensa de la Precedencia de los Reyes Catolicos de España a todos los Reyes del Mundo*, its four volumes were to be dedicated to proving “In the first, that our faith is the first. In the second, that Spain is the oldest and most monarchical kingdom. In the third, that it is more holy. In the fourth, more universal and powerful.”120 Without a doubt, argued Puente, Spain was the “first nation in Europe to profess the Christian religion.”121

Over time, the legend also spread to an ever-widening circle of popular histories published in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Sometimes the borrowing is subtle. Such was the case, for example, with Andrés de la Poza’s *De la antigua lengua, poblaciones y comarcas de las Españas* (1587), in which the author defended his native Basque language on the grounds that Spaniards had been speaking it as long as they had been speaking Hebrew—which was a very long time, reaching as far back as the founding of Toledo, “as one can see in the prophet Abdias.”122 In other cases, Garibay’s influence is felt more directly. Luis del Mármol Carvajal’s *Historia de la rebelión y castigo de los moriscos del reino de Granada* (1600), a bestselling account of the 1567 Muslim uprising in the south of Spain, also made use of Arias Montano’s exegesis as
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119 Juan de la Puente, *Tomo Primero de la Conveniencia de las dos Monarquías Catolicas, la de la Iglesia Romana y la del Imperio Español, y defensa de la Precedencia de los Reyes Catolicos de España a todos los Reyes del Mundo* (Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1612).

120 ibid., 23.

121 ibid.

122 Andres de la Poza, *De la antigua lengua, poblaciones y comarcas de las Españas, en que de paso se tocan algunas cosas de la Cantabria* (Bilbao: Mathias Mares, 1587). “como se puede ver en el profeta Abdias.” Cited in Reyre, “Topónimos hebreos,” 37 n. 22.
filtered through Garibay. Surveying the site and history of Granada, Carvajal sought to emphasize the insuperable cultural unity of the southern Spanish and Northern African coasts, his point being that Spain might never be safe from renewed Islamic invasion.\textsuperscript{123}

To do so, he cited “what the curious Garibay, a modern author, says in his \textit{Compendio historial}” about the city’s origins as an ancient Jewish settlement called Garnat, which in Hebrew means ‘the Pilgrimess’, because it was populated by the Jews who came to Spain from Jerusalem in the second diaspora. (By that I understand him to mean they must be those who came with Nebuchadnezzar, who came many years prior; they were from Phoenicia, from Tyre and Sidon, and were called ‘Mooriferous Moors’.)

They settled on this coast, and on the coast of Africa, the Libyan Phoenician cities, and from them [the Roman provinces of] \textit{Mauritania Tingitania} and \textit{Mauritania Caesariensis} took their names.\textsuperscript{124}

By the early seventeenth century, Arias Montano’s spurious etymologies had so entered the popular consciousness that Sebastián de Covarrubias y Orozco (1539–1618) included them in his famous dictionary, the \textit{Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española} (1611). For Escalona, for example, Covarrubias’ definition ran thus:

\begin{quote}
ESCALONA, a maritime town in Palestine, in Syria, called Ascalon, ‘seaport,’ birthplace of Herod ‘the Ascalonite.’ The Jews who came to
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{124} Luis del Mármol Carvajal, \textit{Historia del rebelion y castigo de los Moriscos del reyno de Granada} (1600), in Cayetano Rosell, ed., \textit{Historiadores de sucesos particulares}, 2 vols., Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 21 & 28 (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1852), 1:123–365, here at 129–130. “lo que el curioso Garibay, escritor moderno, dice en su Compendio historial, que Granada se llamó Garnat, que en lengua hebrea quiere decir la Peregrina, porque la poblaron los judíos que vinieron a España en la segunda dispersión de Jerusalén. Cuanto a esto, entiendo que debieron ser los de Nabucodonosor, que vinieron muchos años antes, y éstos eran de Fenicia, de Tiro y Sidón, y se llamaron mauros mauroforos. Poblaron en esta costa y en la de África las ciudades libias fénicas, y dellos tomaron nombre las Mauritianias Tingilania y Cesariense. En los altos pues que caen sobre Granada parece que pudo estar fundada la antigua ciudad de Illipa, que refiere Tito Livio en el quinto Ebro do la cuarta década cuando dice que cerca d ella Publio Cornelio Escipión, procónsul romano, venció a los lusitanos que andaban robando aquella tierra, y les mató quince mil hombres y les quitó la presa que llevaban; y llegándose a la ciudad de Illipa, lo puso todo delante de las puertas para que los dueños conociesen lo que les habían robado, y se lo restituyó. Y conforme a esto los judíos debieron de poblar entre los dos ríos referidos, y no en los altos, donde Dios habría permitido la destrucción de aquella ciudad, como de otras muchas deste reino.”
Spain inhabited certain places in the kingdom of Toledo, and named them after the places they left behind in their homeland, like Yepes, Maqueda, Nones, [and] Aceca—from Joppe, Magedon, Nobe, Aceca, [and] Ascalon. … Some say that in Chaldean Escalona means ‘balance.’

Likewise the entry for Toledo, which commenced “TOLEDO, according to the opinion of many, was a Hebrew settlement, and in their language was called Toledoth, ‘nations …”

Arias Montano’s theory even appeared on the Spanish popular stage, in a monologue written by the famous playwright Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600–1681). In the first act of his Orígen, pérdida y restauración de la Virgen del Sagrario (ca. 1617–1618), a historical triptych tellingly renamed Las tres edades de España in some later editions, Calderón had none other than Toledo’s patron saint S. Ildefonsus rehearse the supposed origins of the Virgen’s home city:

I hold the truest opinion to be that Nebuchadnezzar, that proud Assyrian who had himself adored as God, founded [Toledo]: and this is confirmed by the name; since Toletot in Hebrew means “the foundation of many”, and he brought in his army, when he founded it, Egyptians, Persians, Medans, Parthians and Chaldeans. And thus the name, corrupted, passed from one master to the next, and from the Hebrew Toletot

---

125 Sebastián de Covarrubias y Orozco, Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1611), f. 244r–v. “ESCALONA, pueblo maritimo de la Palestina de la Siria, llamado Ascalon, Puerto de mar, de donde fue Herodes dicho Ascalonita. Los Judíos que vinieron a España, poblaron ciertos lugares en el reyno de Toledo, y pusieronles los nombres de los que dexaron alla en su tierra, como Iepes, Maqueda, Nones, Aceca : de Ioppe, Magedon, Nobe, Aceca, Ascalon. … Algunos dizen, que Escalona en Caldeo, vale balança.”

126 ibid., f. 189r. “TOLEDO, segun la opinion de muchos, fue poblacion de Hebreos, y en su lengua la llamaron Toledoth, naciones.”
it came to be pronounced *Toledo*.  

While the legend thus filtered down to the illiterate public, it also remained firmly ensconced in learned discourse of biblical antiquarianism. As late as the 1650s, historians and exegetes like the doctor Martín Vázquez Siruela (d. 1653) still singled out Arias Montano’s theory for glowing praise.  

In retrospect, Nebuchadnezzar and his mythical Jewish armies fared much better against the humanists of Renaissance Spain than against their supposed enemies in ancient Iberia. Though they never actually landed on Spanish shores, Nebuchadnezzar and his Hebrew host stormed the citadel of Renaissance historiography. Their striking success vis-à-vis the critical faculties of historians and antiquarians like Arias Montano and Garibay speaks to one of the defining characteristics of the budding national mythologies of early modern Europe: their single-minded obsession with dynastic pedigree and provenance. As Anthony Grafton has noted, in the competitive sport of Renaissance diplomacy, fabulous genealogies and spectacular origins had “a great deal to

---


128 In his manuscript *Observaciones varias*, under § *Transmigración de los judíos de España*, Vázquez Siruela argued that “En tiempo de Tito Vespasiano que triunfó fe Jerusalem, hubo transmigración de judíos a España; pero ésta fue principalmente a la ciudad de Mérida y a toda la provincia de Lusitania, y a los confines de la Bética. Así lo refiere Arias Montano in *Abdiam*, ad illa verba *Et transmigratio Jerusalem*, etc., por autoridad de un libro que titulan los Hebreos *De ieiuniorum causis et rationibus*”—the so-called *Libro de ayunos*. See Bartolomé José Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos*, 4 vols. (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra & Manuel Tello, 1863–1889), 4: col. 943.
offer the heralds, panegyrist, and court historians of a parvenu world collectively bent, as all good parvenus are, on tracing its genealogy back to ancient roots. “

This appreciation for the value of lineage was, of course, deeply ingrained in the Western tradition well before the Renaissance. As Patrick Geary has observed, at the origin of most European civic and national identities stands a myth of origin or genealogical fable tracing the birth of the nation or republic back to the appearance of a heroic founding mother or father (or, at least, a founding generation). More often than not, these origin myths began within, and drew upon, both Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian precedents, the two traditions that delimited the mental horizons of European rulers and their publics. Europe’s ruling dynasties knew that their political legitimacy at home, and their diplomatic influence abroad, depended upon their ability to identify their bloodline and their rule with that of their predecessors running back to time.


immemorial, and, for this reason, the great powers of medieval Europe typically claimed not only to be powerful, but to be of Greek or Roman heritage, too.132

In the Renaissance, however, the new national monarchies began to demand something better than the Greek and Roman roots favored by their medieval predecessors. This was one of the unintended consequences of Renaissance humanism: as the tireless labor of antiquarians and philologists revealed, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that all Europeans shared the same classical heritage, the coinage of Roman ancestry was debased even as it was excavated. Suddenly, “Every nation and city from Novgorod to Naples felt the need for an early history that rivaled or surpassed the ancient histories of Greece and Rome.”133 When their patrons’ pasts were found wanting, Renaissance historians never failed to bend their new tools of historical criticism to the task of inventing older and more marvelous origins from whole cloth.134 In the works of humanist historiographers and forgers, the Florentines became the direct descendants not only of the Romans, but of the Etruscans.135 The French, meanwhile, began to style

---


133 Grafton, “Traditions of Invention,” 82.


themselves the heirs of the eminently primordial Celts. In Germany, the Reformation gave native scholars an even greater incentive to discover specifically barbarian, non-Roman origins upon which to construct new national histories in which Italians could be recast everywhere and always as foreign tormentors.

More often than not, these whimsical genealogies were based on tendentious etymologies. The German case provides several clear examples. In addition to their claims to have descended from the Tacitean hero Arminius and Noah’s grandsons Gomer, Gog, or Magog, some Germans also claimed descent from an even later son of Noah, named Tuyscon, from whom was derived “Teutsch.” (Tuyscon’s grandsons Suevus, Vandalus, Prutus, and Hercules Alemannus were then said to have fathered the Swabians, Vandals, Prussians, and Bavarians.) The city of Trier, likewise, was founded by Trebeta, son of Semiramis, who fled the Near East upon his father’s death; the Franks, though rather less ancient, were said to have descended from Aeneas’ comrade Francio;
and the name “German” derived from Aeneas’ habit of calling the Franks his *germani*, or brothers.\(^{139}\)

Among the nascent nations of early modern Europe, Spain was most certainly the most *parvenu*, and the construction of an improbably prestigious national past was imperative among the Spanish Monarchy’s corps of royal historians.\(^{140}\) The *Siglo de Oro* of Spanish culture was also the Golden Age of Spanish historical writing, as the ranks of Spain’s historians and chroniclers boasted several of the most distinguished names in the canon of Renaissance historiographers—men such as Antonio de Nebrija, Florián de Ocampo, Melchior Cano, OP, and Ambrosio de Morales, in addition to the skeptical Mariana and the credulous Garibay.\(^{141}\) These historians, writing in this climate of European competition for ever greater antiquity, saw their mission very clearly as locating ever more antique origins for the suspiciously parvenu Spanish nation. As Ocampo, Charles V’s royal chronicler, confessed, it was the mission of any red-blooded Spanish historian “to present an image of primitive Spain worthy of the majesty of

---


contemporary Spain.”\footnote{Quoted in Gloria Mora, *Historias de marmol. La arqueología clásica española en el siglo XVIII*, Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología, 18 (Madrid: CSIC & Ediciones Polifemo, 1998), 20. “presentar una España primitiva digna de la majestad de la España contemporánea.”}

Or, as Mariana fumed in his *Historia de España*, “what is it but delirium and foolishness to reduce something so ancient as are the origins of Spain to a mere Latin derivative, marring venerable antiquity with lies and delirious dreams … ?”\footnote{Mariana, *Historia general*, 7. “¿qué otra cosa es sino desvario y desatinar reducir tan grande antigüedad como la de los principios de España a derivación latina, y juntamente afear la venerable antigüedad con mentiras y sueños desvariados como éstos hacen?”}

Robert Tate has described Spain’s Renaissance historians as participating in an arms race, writing that “The Graeco-Roman mythological world, satisfactory to the Middle Ages, stifled the Spaniard of the ensuing epoch and led him to search above and beyond it.”\footnote{Robert B. Tate, “Mythology in Spanish Historiography of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance,” *Hispanic Review* 22 (1954): 1–18, here at 18.} To Tate, the search for pre-Roman origins clearly signaled Spain’s unmistakable imperial pretensions: “The pursuit of an exclusive heritage as independent as possible of a European background reveals the spiritual state of Castilian aspirations, and brings about many revaluations of data handed down by classical historians.”\footnote{ibid., 7.}

In practice, the feverish search for pre-Roman origins typically meant the transmutation of the central assumptions and conclusions of medieval Spanish historiography. The so-called “Visigothic Myth,” according to which the origins of unified Spain were traced back to the Visigothic kingdoms of the sixth century, was to be supplanted by ever more ambitious foundation myths.\footnote{On the ‘Visigothic Myth’ and Spanish national identity, see Miguel Ángel Ladero Quesada, “Ideas e imágenes sobre España en la Edad Media,” in *Sobre la realidad de España* (Madrid: Instituto de Humanidades y Comunicación Miguel de Unamuno, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, 1994), 35–58, esp. 41–47; Hillgarth, “Spanish Historiography;” Koenigsberger, “Spain,” 155.}
As the naked ambition and etymological gymnastics of the humanists pushed the race for fabulous origins further back into the mists of antiquity, most of Spain’s neighbors and rivals sought to connect their national histories to the nonbiblical civilizations of prehistoric Eurasia—pagan civilizations like the Etruscans, Celts, Trojans, and Goths. Spain, however, looked instead to the Bible, borrowing the arguments of Sephardic historiography to trace a genealogical link back to the ancient Israelites, God’s Chosen People, through the evidence buried within the soil of their respective Holy Lands. As one Spanish historian has noted, this choice to forge a “connection with the Holy Land, even before the arrival of the Christian messiah” was available to every Christian nation as a means “to prove the excellence of their peoples and their states.”

And yet, while the national mythologies of both medieval France and Protestant Germany included gestures in the direction of Jerusalem, it was Spain that most ardently pursued its link to Hebrew antiquity.

As Aldrete’s biting critique of Jewish perfidy makes clear, there is something remarkable about this fact. The success of the Nebuchadnezzar legend attests at the very least to the complexity of Spanish scholars’ attitudes toward Jews and Judaism. Medieval Christian historiography made the Muslim conquest of 711 out to be the beginning of a long Jewish ‘occupation,’ a rupture that destroyed both the unity and purity of Spanish

---

147 Ayaso Martínez, “Antigüedad y excelencia,” 251.

descent. While most early modern Spaniards continued to view the presence of Jews in their midst as a mark of national shame, under Arias Montano’s influence some antiquarian scholars broke with tradition and called attention to the important role Jewish learning might play as a repository of ancient wisdom, a guide to biblical exegesis, and a witness to Christian truth. For historians like Garibay, the (false) recognition of their Jewish ‘ancestry’ transformed Spanish Jews into a sort of ‘living relic.’ Like the other relics imported from the Holy Land, the Jews’ arrival in Spain had a transformative effect on the Iberian heartland, reproducing—in this case, through toponymy—the Holy Land in miniature.

This last idea we will take up further in the next chapter. In the meantime, it is enough to note that in Garibay’s hands, Spain’s Jewish inhabitants belonged simultaneously to two histories—both the universal, sacred history of the Bible, and the particular history of the Spanish nation. The modern descendants of Nebuchadnezzar’s Jewish settlers became the material remains of a lost chapter of Spanish history, anchoring the distant past of their homeland to the broader, providential narrative of human affairs and predicting a glorious future for the Spanish empire.


150 It may not be an exaggeration to see an echo of these sixteenth-century attempts to resurrect Spain’s Hebrew origins in modern attempts to recover Spain’s Jewish history prior to the expulsions of 1492. In a recent article in *The New York Times*, Renwick McLean has described how “[c]ities and towns across Spain are searching for the remains of their medieval synagogues, excavating old Jewish neighborhoods and trying to identify Jewish cemeteries. Scholars say they are overwhelmed with requests from local governments to study archaeological findings and ancient documents that may validate a region’s Jewish heritage.” She quotes Javier Castaño, a distinguished scholar of medieval Sephardic literature and culture at the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, professing that “I don’t go a week without someone calling and asking me if their last name has Jewish roots. … It’s the opposite of 300 years ago when people changed their last names to Spanish names and looked for ancestors of pure Spanish blood,” adding that Spaniards now consider Jewish lineage to be “trendy.” According to Castaño, “in some cases people are falsifying the past by creating a Jewish patrimony that never existed”—a strategy that Arias Montano and his supporters would no doubt have
CHAPTER FOUR

BLUEPRINTS FOR A HOLY LAND: SPAIN AS REPLICATED PALESTINE

In 1593, some two decades after Arias Montano’s *Biblia Regia* was incorporated into Philip II’s library, another aspiring biblical antiquarian abandoned Europe for Jerusalem with the aim of attracting the munificence of the aging king. Bernardino Amico da Gallipoli, OFM, whose biographical details remain shrouded in mystery, would spend nearly five years in the Levant before returning to his native Italy in 1598, the year of Philip II’s death.¹ During his extended stay in the Holy Land, Amico’s collegial relationship with the Franciscan Custodian Gianfrancesco della Salandra, a fellow Italian, guaranteed that he was entrusted with a series of important commissions that also gave him the opportunity to travel the length and breadth of Palestine and Egypt.² (In 1597, for example, while serving as the President and confessor to the Christian community of Cairo, Amico revisited the Christian shrine at Matarea as part of a campaign to entice the city’s Florentine merchants to fund its restoration. Unlike Pietro Martire, however, Amico seems not to have taken much interest in Matarea’s legendary balsam trees,


² Gianfrancesco della Salandra hailed from Calabria, and served in the Holy Land from 1568–1601. He became *Custos* soon after Amico’s arrival in Jerusalem in 1593.
though he did have a vivid memory of eating a fig plucked from the very tree that had
sheltered the Holy Family on its flight into Egypt.)³

Amico made the most of his travels, using his visits to the Holy Land’s numerous
shrines to measure each of them in preparation for what he hoped would become an
illustrated book of architectural plans of the Holy Sites. Some sense of Amico’s fanatical
patience and diligence can be grasped from the measurements he took inside the Church
of the Nativity in Bethlehem, which included chapels dedicated to S. Jerome and the
Massacre of the Innocents as well as Christ’s crèche. Over the course of his visits there,
Amico produced at least nine detailed sketches of the complex’s floorplans and
elevations, which he based upon literally hundreds of his own careful measurements—
measurements which included, among others, the perimeter of the entire complex (2850
palms), the dimensions of the church’s porch (26 palms by 14), the size of the stable (115
by 43), and even the width of each rafter in the roof (1.5 palms square).⁴ To such
arguably minute trivia Amico also added a number of large-scale topographical
reckonings—such as when he walked the entire length of the Via Dolorosa from the site
of Pilate’s Praetorium to Golgotha, carefully counting his paces heel-to-toe so as later to
be able to convert them into regular measures.⁵

Amico’s painstaking researches in the Holy Land finally bore fruit in 1609 with
the publication at Rome of his impeccably detailed Trattato delle Piante & Imagini de

---
³ Amico, Plans of the Sacred Edifices, 66–69. Amico’s account of his time in Egypt is also available in a
modern, French extract: Bernardino Amico da Gallipoli, Aquilante Rocchetta, & Henry Castela, Voy-
voyageurs occidentaux en Égypte, 11 (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, 1974),
1–9.
⁴ Amico, Plans of the Sacred Edifices, 43–62.
⁵ ibid., 86.
Sacri Edificii di Terra Santa, which he dedicated to Philip’s son Philip III (r. 1598–1621) in the hope that it would “be very acceptable to you, since … Jerusalem is deservedly counted among your other realms.”6 (The book is also filled with a smattering of facts likely to guarantee Spanish goodwill: in his entry on Bethlehem, for example, Amico celebrated “the Catholic and most Christian King and Queen don Ferdinand and Lady Isabella” for supplying the lead used to repair the Church of the Nativity’s roof in the late fifteenth century, when in fact the lead had been donated by Edward IV of England [r. 1461–1483].)7 Not surprisingly, Amico’s volume included highly detailed descriptions of the Holy Land’s cardinal buildings and shrines, as well as a wealth of information about their topographical settings and the spatial relationships between them. This was particularly true of sites in and around Jerusalem, and especially of the Via Dolorosa that he had so carefully measured:

First from the Palace of Pilate to the Arch [where Pilate is said to have ordered Christ scourged] is 60 steps; from there to where the most holy Mary met her only begotten Son is 100 steps; and from that place to the Cyrene [i.e. where Simon of Cyrene took up Christ’s cross] is 60 steps; and from there to the house of the Pharisee is 90 steps; and from there to the Veronica is 75 steps; and from there to the Judgment Gate is 100 steps; and then to Calvary is 400 steps, which in total is 940; and to finish it, it will make a mile, and especially nowadays since from Mount Calvary to the Judgment Gate there are many corners to be turned.8

Amico’s book complemented these textual descriptions with highly realistic engravings of the floorplans and/or elevations of all of the major Holy Places, produced from Amico’s notes by the well-known artist Antonio Tempesta. (Interestingly enough, Tempesta had also produced the illustrations for Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata, the

---

6 ibid., 37.
7 ibid., 54 n. 3.
8 ibid., 86.
Crusade epic that angered and inspired Lope de Vega to author his own *Jerusalén conquistada*.)

In both its fanatical attention to detail and its self-consciously draughtsmanlike illustrations, Amico’s treatise is a remarkable book, the first of its kind in a tradition of Jerusalem guidebooks stretching back more than a thousand years—which begs the question of what, exactly, his careful attention to the dimensions, plans, and sitings of the Holy Places was meant to achieve. It also begs the larger question of what the Spanish Monarchy hoped to gain from its solicitous patronage of Amico’s research. There are several possible explanations. Some, undoubtedly, will see Amico’s project primarily in terms of the academic endeavor of biblical antiquarianism described earlier in this dissertation. As his modern editors have noted, Amico published his book in an era marked by antiquarians’ increasingly radical doubt about the localization and authenticity of the Holy Places to which Amico’s Franciscans guided their pilgrim charges. As we have seen in Chapter One, ever since Erasmus published his colloquy alleging that the true site of Jerusalem had been lost during the devastation of 70 AD, antiquarians had begun to look twice at the evidence culled from ancient authorities like Josephus and Eusebius and to question the accuracy of the Constantinian “restoration” of the biblical Jerusalem. The debate had been reignited just a few years prior to Amico’s voyage by the Dutchman Christiaan van Adrichem (1533–1585), author of two influential studies of ancient Jerusalem: *Ierusalem, sicut Christi tempore floruit, et suburbanorum, insigniorumque historiarum eius brevis descriptio* (1584) and the *Theatrum Terrae*

---

9 Shalev, “Geographia Sacra,” 113.


11 For Erasmus’ doubts about the Constantinian restoration of the city, see above, pp. 46–47.
Sanctae et Bibliarum Historiarum (1590). Adrichomius, as he became known throughout Christendom, had never traveled to the Holy Land in person, making his treatise a thoroughly armchair production based on a handful of early sixteenth-century pilgrimage accounts written by fellow Dutchmen like Pieter Calentijn and Jan Pascha. The derivative nature of his knowledge did not, however, dissuade van Adrichem from making a series of confident assertions about the conventional localizations of the Holy Places. Most vexing for him, it seems, was the fact that Calvary was said to be outside of the city walls in the Bible, but within the city limits according to the accounts written by modern pilgrims. Perhaps the city walls had moved; but perhaps things were not so simple. What if Calvary itself had been misidentified?

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Franciscan scholars like Philip II’s lifelong collaborator Boniface of Ragusa (d. 1582) and Francesco Quaresmio (1583–1656) joined the debate en masse, defending the traditional localizations of the Holy Places in prose at the same time as they urged the Spanish Monarchy to do so with the sword, by retaking the mantle of Crusade. Amico fits quite comfortably into this new tradition of Franciscan érudits. He quite clearly resented van Adrichem’s armchair

12 Christiaan van Adrichem, *Ierusalem, sicut Christi tempore floruit, et suburbanorum, insigniorumque historiarum eius brevis descriptio* ... (Cologne, 1584) [3rd ed.: *Urbis Hierosolymae quemadmodum ea Christi tempore floruit, et suburbanorum eius brevis descriptio* (Cologne: Birckmann, 1588)]; idem, *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae et Bibliarum Historiarum* (Cologne, 1590).

13 van Adrichem, *Urbis Hierosolymae ... descriptio*, 63–64, 96. “Hanc viam Dominus Petrus Potens et Magister Mattheus Steenberch Licentiatus Theologiae ... olim Hierosolimam dimensi sunt ... ;” “Quae etiam diligentissime describitur in libro cui titulis est Via crucis, per Petrum Calentinium aeditus. Et praeterea a Domino Iohanne Pascha Sacrae Theologiae Doctore in peregrinatione sua die ... ;” “Iohannes Pascha Sacrae Theologiae Doctor in peregrinatione sua ... .”

incursion into the study of biblical topography, just as he must have been offended by van Adrichem’s implicit accusation that his fellow Franciscans were guilty of leading pilgrims on fabricated tours of sham Holy Places. Amico’s determination to marshal his research against these enemies of the Holy Places is apparent in the forty-fifth chapter of his *Trattato*, which is dedicated to a “Discussion on the Design of the Ancient Said City [ie. Jerusalem] at the Time of Christ” designed to debunk the doubts expressed by van Adrichem. Referencing a map purporting to show Jerusalem “at the time of Christ … showing by the numbers all the places of the Passion and Death of Our Lord, and the known sites that are within and without the city,” Amico criticized academics who raised questions about such matters as the true location of Calvary:

I shall force myself to remove that bad opinion of some [ie. van Adrichem] who wish with poor reason to state that this is not the City, but that it has been transferred and that Holy Mount Calvary is found inside it, as is seen in the previous plan; availing themselves of the saying of St. Paul to the Hebrews Chapter 13,13: *Christus extra portam passus est*. And they add: even today it is inside, therefore it has been transferred. The author who advances this query affirms that such say so because they have never seen these countries, nor this City; and I add that in fact they have seen it, but not having wished to employ the necessary diligence, they left confused, and later said that only which pleased them. However, I do not wish to gainsay how worthy of blame is he who without having seen the aspect of a place minutely and carefully considered it, dare to put it on paper and discuss its details, thus falling into thousands of mistakes. And this is not enough for I, who have seen it and read many books, modern and ancient, and in particular *The Wars of the Jews* by the celebrated author Josephus, on whom I rely, to tell the truth remain almost confused, when I find no mention of any kind nor anything to be seen of what the said Josephus recounts …

And so, after adducing several pages’ of proofs from Josephus, scriptural passages, and eyewitness testimony about the disposition of contemporary Jerusalem, Amico reassured the reader: “My devout and inquisitive reader should know that the site of this Holy City

is that which it has always has been and will be, because positively it is surrounded by mountains and valleys, so that it can well be said with the royal prophet in Psalm 86,1 *Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis*. … And these valleys are not known to all, save by reflection, because some of them are covered with houses; but if one wishes to exercise himself and investigate things, he will find, if not all, at least a part.”

If this antiquarian aspect of Amico’s project seems thoroughly reminiscent of Arias Montano’s preoccupation with *geographia sacra*, so, too, will the second thread running through Amico’s book: the promotion of a devotional practice generally known to modern scholars as “virtual” or “mental” pilgrimage. By the sixteenth century it was widely accepted among Catholic authors that one might gain at least some of the spiritual benefit normally accruing to a real pilgrimage by simulating the journey in one’s mind. Some devotional authors, like the fifteenth-century Italian Franciscan Niccolò da Osimo (d. ca. 1454), promised their readers that they could base their visits to Jerusalem on little more than their lived experience seasoned with a dollop of imagination. In his *Zardino de oratione fructuoso*, or *Garden of Fruitful Prayer*, fr. Niccolò advised the would-be pilgrim

> to fix the people and places in your mind: a city, for example, which will be the city of Jerusalem—taking for this purpose a city that is well known to you. In this city find the principal places in which all the episodes of the Passion would have taken place—for instance a palace with the supper room where Christ had the Last Supper … and that of Caiphas … and the room where he was brought before Caiphas and mocked and beaten. Also

---

16 ibid., 137.

the residence of Pilate … also the site of Mount Calvary, where he was put on the Cross and other like places …. And then too you must shape in your mind some people, people well-known to you, to represent for you the people involved in the Passion … every one of whom you will fashion in your mind. When you have done all this, putting all your imagination into it, then go into your chamber. Alone and solitary, excluding every external thought from your mind, start thinking of the beginning of the Passion, starting with how Jesus entered Jerusalem on the ass. Moving slowly from episode to episode, meditate on each one, dwelling on each single stage and step of the story.\(^{18}\)

More common, however, were those authors who recognized that the majority of their readers required something more than a quiet room to make the leap from their European surroundings to Palestine, an exotic destination whose physical appearance few could even begin to imagine. These readers were encouraged to acquire and meditate upon a realistic image of the Holy City, whether a woodcut or a painting, the ultimate goal being to penetrate the plane of the image and imagine oneself actually standing before the temples and shrines which it depicted.

We have already seen at least one example of this practice, in Arias Montano’s childhood recollections of lost hours spent ‘peregrinating’ through the paper-and-ink Palestines given him by his tutor Vázquez Matamoro.\(^{19}\) In later life, Arias Montano and his fellow antiquarians, whose scholarly rigor was tempered by a traditionalist respect for pilgrimage legend, continued to believe in the salutary nature of such imaginative journeys. Though it might seem to fall outside of a purely scholarly agenda, facilitating such mental pilgrimages thus became one of the most important ancillary goals of antiquarian publishing. By mid-century dévots of mental pilgrimage, once dependent


\(^{19}\) See above, pp. 117-119.
upon the amateur sketches and rough woodcuts typical of pilgrimage guides, could now turn as well to antiquarian texts boasting more refined and realistic illustrations to fire their imaginations.\(^{20}\) Arias Montano, of course, fully expected readers of the critical apparatus in Philip’s *Biblia Regia* to press their faces to his maps and views of Jerusalem, looking down upon the city from the engraver’s vantagepoint and tracing a route through its streets with their eyes.\(^ {21}\) The same must surely have been true of the copious illustrations gracing the pages of dozens of similar hybrid antiquarian-virtual pilgrimage treatises, like Heinrich Bünting’s (1545–1606) *Itinerarium Sacrae Scripturae, das ist, Ein Reisebuch uber die gantze Heilige Schrifft ...*, published in 1581.\(^ {22}\) Amico’s rich textual descriptions, careful enumeration of paces, and perspectively accurate images, then, would have seemed quite familiar to readers already acquainted with the idea that one might recreate the experience of visiting the Holy Land without leaving one’s *studiolo*.

**A SEA OF REPLICA**

While Amico’s project thus fits comfortably into a certain broad milieu of antiquarian writing about the Levant, there is, however, one significant difference

---


\(^{22}\) Heinrich Bünting, *Itinerarium Sacrae Scripturae, das ist, Ein Reisebuch uber die gantze Heilige Schrifft ...*, 2 vols. (Helmstadt: Jacobus Lucius Siebenbürger, 1581). Bünting’s book also exists in a seventeenth-century English translation: *Itinerarium totius sacrae scripturae, or, The travels of the holy patriarchs, prophets, judges, kings, our saviour Christ, and his apostles, as they are related in the Old and New Testaments: with a description of the townes and places to which they travelled, and how many English miles they stood from Jerusalem: also a short treatise of the weights, monies, and measures mentioned in the Scriptures, reduced to our English valuations, quantitie, and weight*, trans. Richard Brathwait (London: Adam Islip, 1619).]
between Amico’s text and the general drift of its genre—a difference which opens a window onto yet another facet of Spanish attempts to marshal the Holy Land for ‘national’ purposes. Amico’s copious measures and luxurious engravings were not merely fodder for readers hoping to practice virtual pilgrimage in two dimensions; they were far too detailed for that. (Can one really find God in the radius of a barrel vault?) Rather, as Amico himself advertised, he had chosen his particular set of renderings of the Holy Places in the hope that “expert craftsmen will be able from the plans and the descriptions to comprehend the whole,” and that even “simple craftsmen” might be able erect reproductions of the Holy Places for themselves. In other words, Amico’s book was not primarily a propadeutic to mental pilgrimage; it was a fully-functional set of blueprints intended to help craftsmen construct life-size architectonic replicas of Jerusalem on Spanish soil.

Amico’s expectation that his readers might want to build a replica of Pilate’s praetorium or the church at Matarea may seem odd to a modern reader. In its own day, however, Amico’s attention to “simple craftsmen” and their need to know how to erect a passable Holy Sepulcher would scarcely have provoked comment. Early modern Spain was a land awash in a veritable sea of replicas of the Holy Places of Jerusalem, accumulated through more than five centuries of the very devotional sensibility which Amico’s book was intended to satisfy. By the time Amico sailed for Jerusalem, late in the

---

23 Amico, Plans, 110.

24 In this sense, Amico’s book project was of a piece with another one of his hobbies in the Levant. While still in the Holy Land, Amico had already begun to put his measures to use by founding what one scholar has called a “local industry” in Bethlehem dedicated to making intricate scale models of the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of the Nativity and selling them as souvenirs to pilgrims returning to Europe. See Bellarmino Bagatti, “Introduction,” in Amico, Plans, 1–34, here at, 12–13; and Shalev, “Geographia Sacra,” 122.
reign of Philip II, most Spaniards were no more than a few days’ travel from at least one representation of the Holy Sepulcher, the *Via Dolorosa*, the deserts of the Egyptian fathers, or the Temple of Solomon.25

The first known replicas of the Holy Land on Spanish soil began to appear in the north of the Peninsula, along the pilgrim road to Santiago de Compostela, in the closing decades of the eleventh century.26 These early replicas always took the form of the

---


Church of the Anastasis, the site of the Holy Sepulcher, and were easily identified then as now by their emulation of the distinctive round shape and dome of the original. Among the many exemplars built by Spanish and Portuguese architects between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries are those located in the Catalán towns of Tallada and Palera; in the Aragonese city of Zaragoza (in the Conventos del Carmen and of the Canonesses of the Holy Sepulcher); in Valencia; in the Navarrese towns of Eunate (the Iglesia de Santa María) and Torres del Río; and in the Old Castilian burghs of Valladolid and Segovia (the latter long thought to have been built by the Templars but in fact erected by Augustinian Canons of the Holy Sepulcher).\(^\text{27}\) In the sixteenth century, Spanish and Portuguese patrons continued to build replicas of the Holy Sepulcher, though on an even grander scale and with somewhat greater accuracy—perhaps reflecting the increase in eyewitness knowledge of the Holy Land circulating in early modern Iberia. Juan Téllez de Girón (1494–1558), the IV Count of Ureña, ordered that his Cuencan tomb be built in the likeness of the Holy Sepulcher ca. 1530, while the Portuguese painter Francisco de

---

Holanda (1517–1584) designed a replica of the Anastasis for the city of Lisbon in 1571.28 (Holanda, like Amico, may have brought a certain expertise on the architecture and antiquities of the Holy Land to his replica-building: upon his death in 1584, he left behind a sketchbook of biblical illustrations produced over the course of thirty years.)29 The most impressive of all of Spain’s Anastasis replicas also dates to the sixteenth century: it is the Cathedral of Granada, begun in 1528 under the direction of Charles V and his imperial architect Diego de Siloe.30

At the same time as replicated Holy Sepulchers continued to multiply within Iberia’s cities and towns, the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries also witnessed the introduction across Europe of two new forms of replication: the Via Crucis and sacromonte.31 Whether departing from city gates or perched upon rural hillsides,

---


these more comprehensive reconstructions offered a realistic stage set in which poor
and/or cloistered pilgrims unable to travel to the Levant might perform a substitute
pilgrimage among a series of chapels recapitulating the life of Christ or, more commonly,
the Passion sequence. Their appearance in the West at this juncture—some five centuries
after the first Holy Sepulcher replica—speaks to a significant late medieval innovation in
the Christian cult of the Holy Land: namely, the reconfiguration of the various Holy
Places associated with the Crucifixion—places such as the putative houses of the high
priests Caiphas and Annas, the praetorium of Pilate, and the arch commemorating Simon
the Cyrene’s heroic decision to shoulder Christ’s cross, all of them scattered throughout
Jerusalem’s Latin Quarter—into a unitary concept of “the” Via Dolorosa capable of
replication.\footnote{As Maurice Halbwachs has shown, while the idea of a single Via Dolorosa appears as early as fourth-century liturgies, it must have looked very different from the devotion as practiced today, or in the Renaissance. Prior to the late Middle Ages, it would not have been possible to imagine fixing a single Via Dolorosa, as there were often multiple, competing Viae staged by different convents. It may only have been the Muslim reconquest of Jerusalem in 1187 that forced Christians to adopt a single Via in common. Maurice Halbwachs, La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte. Étude de mémoire collective (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1941), 102–111. See also F.E. Peters, “The Procession That Never Was: The Painful Way in Jerusalem,” The Drama Review 29 (1985): 31–41.}

Interestingly enough, this concerted effort to do away with the considerable
ambiguity that had long surrounded the Via Dolorosa, and to fix it at a universally-
recognized number of stations, seems to have been driven largely by the surging
popularity (particularly pronounced in Spain) of the new type of piety known as imitatio
Christi\footnote{Giles Constable, “The Ideal of the Imitation of Christ,” in idem., Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 143–248, esp. 228. Paintings and devotional literature on the life of Christ saw a major upswing during the Catholic Kings’ reign. Michel Darbord argues that Spanish spirituality underwent a transformation precisely between the 1470s and 1560s, characterized in part by an intensified focus on the life of Christ and his immediate company (Mary, the apostles, etc.) explored through the Gospel. Alan Deyermond concurs, noting that whereas vita Christi literature based on Pseudo-Bonaventure’s Meditationes Vitae Christi appeared in northern Europe in the fourteenth century, Deyermond has argued that such “classically Franciscan affective” texts didn’t appear in Spain until the end of the fifteenth century. They were reinforced by the}
demands of pilgrimage and popular devotion had already nurtured a tendency among European Christians to fabricate an idealized image of the Holy Land for Western consumption.

Though the *Via Crucis* and *sacrimonti* are often associated, particularly in their early stages of development, with northern Europe and Italy, they quickly became common sights in Iberia as well. Spain was, in fact, home to Europe’s very first *sacromonte*, integrated within the landscape surrounding the Observant Dominican house of Escalaceli [lit. Scala Coeli, or ‘Stairway to Heaven’]. Located in the mountainous Torre de Berlanga north of Córdoba, Escalaceli was designed by its founder—Álvaro de Córdoba, OP (d. 1420), the trusted advisor and sometime royal confessor of Enrique III of Castile (r. 1393–1406) and his hapless son Juan II (r. 1406–1454)—as a fanciful

---


35 There exist several early modern biographies of fray Álvaro; the richest are Juan de Marieta, *Vida del bienaventurado fray Alvaro de Córdoba* (Madrid: Miguel Serrano de Vargas, 1601); Juan López, *Tercera parte de la historia general ...* (Valladolid: n.p., 1613), 77–83; Luis Sotillo de Mesa, *Breve compendio de la vida y milagros del gran siervo de Dios el padre maestro fray Alvaro de Córdoba, de la Orden de Predicadores ...* (Seville: Francisco de Lyra, 1660); and Juan de Ribas Carrasquilla, *Vida y Milagros del B. Fray Álvaro de Córdoba, del Orden de Predicadores ...* (Córdoba: Diego de Valverde y Leyra & Asciscle Cortés de Ribera, 1687).
reconstruction of Jerusalem from the time of the Crucifixion, complete with its own Calvary and Mount of Olives. Álvaro was a lifelong devote of the cult of the Holy Land, and he took advantage of the Castilian court’s increasing interest in the Levant to go on pilgrimage to the Holy Places of Palestine in 1405. According to his biographer, he chose his friary’s asperous site near Córdoba some ten years later expressly because seemed to him to be nearly identical to the landscape he had visited in Jerusalem. Stone by stone, he made good on the terrain’s natural promise, building various oratories, and stations, representing, and evoking, certain of the Holy Places of Jerusalem. … To the east of Jerusalem is the Mount of Olives, to which the Redeemer of the world often retired to pray, and so to the east of the cloister, at the summit of another mount, S. ÁLVARO found a cave, which he chose for his particular refuge. … To the southwest, he placed three crosses at the summit of another mount, in memory and reverence of Calvary, where Christ died; and this Calvary was almost at the same distance from the cloister as the real Calvary is from the city of Jerusalem, or very close.  

He also rebaptized the brook at the base of the cloister the “Río Cedron” after the River Kedron in Jerusalem. His replica more or less complete, Álvaro spent the last years of his life peregrinating among its numerous small chapels, meditating on the Stations of the Passion sequence and enjoining his fellow Dominicans to follow his holy example.

---

36 Ribas Carrasquilla, Vida y Milagros, 144–145. “dispuso en el del Convento de Escalaceli varios Oratorios, y estancias, que representasen, y traxesen a la memoria algunos lugares Santos de Jerusalem. … A la parte de Levante tiene Jerusalem el monte Olivete, donde solia retirarse a hazer oracion el Redemptor del mundo, y a la parte Oriental del Convento en la eminencia de otro monte hallò SAN ALVARO una Cueva, de que hizo eleccion para su particular retiro. … Entre medio dia, y Poniente puso en la eminencia de otro monte tres Cruces en memoria, y reverencia del monte Calvario, donde murio Christo, y casi con la misma distancia de pasos del Convento a este Calvario, que ay del monte Calvario a la Ciudad de Jerusalem, ó muy poca diferencia.”

37 ibid., 173.

38 The house, which survives to this day in a modern refoundation, can boast of having played an exceptionally important role in shaping the spirituality of Renaissance Spain: in addition to its prominent role as one of the mother houses of the Dominican Observance, its atmosphere was also a formative influence on the famous theologian and best-selling devotional author Luis de Granada, OP (1504–1588), who lived in the house for more than a decade between 1534 and 1545. Was it, perhaps, at Escalaceli that Luis de Granada drafted the dilatory passages on the destruction of Jerusalem later incor-
Spain’s first *Via Crucis*, meanwhile, was erected ca. 1521 at Seville at the wishes of Fadrique Enríquez de Ribera (1476–1539), the first Marqués de Tarifa. The background to Enríquez’s commission is worth narrating, as it offers a rare glimpse into how individual patrons gathered the information necessary to build these replicas in the days prior to a publication like Amico’s *Trattato*. Enríquez, like Álvaro, was a pilgrim before he was a builder: departing for the Levant from the Andalucían town of Bornos in November 1518, he returned home in 1520 having spent nearly two years visiting the Holy Places of Palestine. Also like Álvaro, don Fadrique was an upwardly-mobile man. He had ascended to the ranks of the nobility by complementing his mercantile family’s considerable riches—earned in the soap business—with a record of faithful service to Fernando and Isabel. Tutored in the *studia humanitatis* by Lucio Marineo Siculo (ca. 1444–1536), an emigré student of the great Italian antiquarian Pomponio Leto (1425–1498), don Fadrique liked to hide his middle class origins by cultivating a reputation as an educated patron of antiquarian learning. Like any *nouveau riche* mogul of the Renaissance, he spent the better part of his adult life amassing an impressive collection of classical *spolia* as a bulwark against the terrifying possibility that fortune’s wheel might somehow return him to the mediocre origins whence he came. The many courtyards and cabinets of his sprawling palace in Seville teemed with Roman coins, bronzes, and

---


marbles, while his library was among the very best in Spain.\textsuperscript{42} It is not surprising, therefore, that Fadrique planned to spend his pilgrimage purchasing for his \textit{wunderkammer} as much as praying for his soul. During an extended stopover in Italy, he caught up on the latest fashions: in Milan, he purchased a finely-wrought suit of armor; in Venice, thirty-three Turkish rugs; and in Genoa, he commissioned sculptures for the tombs of his parents from the well-known sculptors Pace Gazini and Antonio Maria de Aprile, setting aside an exorbitant sum for the purpose.\textsuperscript{43} The autobiographical pilgrimage account that he published shortly after his return, in 1521, is marked almost predictably by a certain tension between his need to present himself as simultaneously a great collector and a humble pilgrim.\textsuperscript{44}

Not that these two imperatives necessarily conflicted. From the Holy Land, where he confessed to ogling the assortment of relics available to the discriminating believer, Fadrique brought home chests full of precious medallions bearing the image of the Holy Sepulcher and the Church of the Nativity.\textsuperscript{45} Like the Spaniards we met in Chapter Two, Enríquez regarded these relics as a way of simultaneously ‘collecting’ and venerating the Holy City. One can easily imagine him imitating the example of the German pilgrim Felix Fabri, who described in his own travel account how he roved Jerusalem and the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item González Moreno, “Don Fadrique,” 235–236. The sum was 3000 silver \textit{escudos}.
\item Fadrique Enríquez de Ribera, \textit{Este libro es de el viaje que hize a Ierusalem de todas las cosas que en el me pasaron desde que sali de mi casa de Bornos miercoles 24 de Noviembre de 518 hasta 20 de Otubre de 520 que entre en Sevilla} (Seville, 1521). The book was reprinted twice in the early seventeenth century: in Seville, by Francisco Pérez, in 1606; and in Lisbon, by Antonio Alvarez, in 1608. I have used the 1606 edition.
\item ibid., 227, 236.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
surrounding countryside in his free time, chipping off or picking up souvenir fragments of the Holy Places and stowing them away for his return voyage. Yet perhaps the most precious ‘object’ that Enríquez collected during the course of his pilgrimage was no object at all. It was, instead, a complete set of measurements of each of the cardinal stations along the Via Dolorosa. The poet Juan del Encina, who accompanied don Fadrique on his expedition, recorded in one of his commemorative poems that in Jerusalem

Some measured by armlengths and yards
and palms and fingers the Church and its chapels,
and many mysteries, and the countryside in miles,
to see and understand everything more clearly.
But I only measured the dearest things,
those which I esteemed to be most precious …

In spite of his profession only to have measured the “most precious” sites, the ensuing poem is practically overwhelmed by the endless detail it provides about the dimensions and construction of the Holy Sites.

As soon as he returned to Seville, Fadrique put these measures to work building his Via Crucis through the streets of his native city. Contemporaries noticed that Enríquez was especially concerned that his Via Crucis match as closely as possible the real Via Dolorosa he had traversed in Palestine: its length, they noted, was made identical to the number of paces Enríquez himself had walked in Jerusalem, and Enríquez’s own

---

47 Enríquez de Ribera, Este libro es de el viaje, 77.
palace—the first of the twelve Stations of the Cross—was rebaptized as the “Casa de Pilatos,” or “Pilate’s House.” To make sure that no one could miss the point, Enríquez commissioned a local artisan to inscribe the legend “A 4 días de Agosto 1519 entró en Jerusalem”—“On 4 August 1519, he entered Jerusalem”—over his palace’s Italianate doorway.49

While Escalaceli and Seville have proven to be Spain’s most famous reconstructions of the Via Dolorosa, there are many other sixteenth-century replicas, such as those at Arrabida, near the Portuguese town of Sesimbra (1542); at Terzaga, near Guadalajara (before 1568); at Alcorisa, near Murcia (ca. 1570); at Guadalajara proper (before 1575); at Mondéjar, near Guadalajara (1515–1581); at Priego, near Córdoba (1593); and at the Franciscan house of Santa Catalina del Monte in Murcia (1600).50 (This list might be expanded further by including Spain’s steadily augmenting number of Carmelite deserts, a characteristically Spanish Counter Reformation invention of the friar Tomás de Jesús which attempted to resurrect the Egyptian deserts of the Patristic hermits.)51 In the seventeenth century, with the support of Amico’s book and the friars of

49 Memoria muy devota y recuerdo muy provechoso, del camino trabajoso que hizo Christo Redemptor Nuestro, para encaminaros a la Gloria, y de los passos que dio con la pesada Cruz sobre sus delicados ombros, desde la Casa de Pilatos, hasta el Monte Calvario, donde fue crucificado y muerto, para darnos vida eterna. Cuyo trecho es el que comienza desde las Casas de los Excelentissimos Señores Duques de Alcalá, hasta la Cruz del Campo desta Ciudad de Sevilla (Seville, 1653).

50 Pedro José Pradillo y Esteban, Vía Crucis, Calvarios y Sacromontes: arte y religiosidad popular en la contrareforma. Guadalajara, un caso excepcional (Guadalajara: Diputación Provincial de Guadalajara, 1996), 60, 142, 177; Gil Atrio, “España,” 75–77 & 85–87; Francisco de Cascales, Discursos históricos de la muy noble y muy leal ciudad de Murcia (Murcia: Luis Berós, 1621), 337–338. I am also aware of at least two more sixteenth-century Vía Crucis, belonging to the Dominicans of San Pablo in Córdoba and the Clares of Marchena, for which I do not have precise dates.

his Franciscan Order, the concept of the *Via Crucis* caught fire and became something of a Spanish national custom. It appears, for example, to have been in Spain that the *Via Crucis* first acquired its modern, canonical configuration of fourteen stations.

Descriptions of the devotion in its modern form appear in Spanish sources as early as the first decade of the seventeenth century, in works such as the second volume of Juan Carrillo’s *Historia de los santos y personas de la tercera Orden* (1610–1613), which included a brief “tratadito de la muy pía y santa devoción de los pasos que anduvo Cristo N. R. con la Cruz,” Francisco Pérez Carrillo’s *Via Sacra y Ejercicios Espirituales* (1619), the Cistercian Basilio López’s *Calle de amargura, como habemos de seguir a Cristo y meditaciones de su pasión* (1622), and the Franciscan Antonio Daza’s *Exercicios Espirituales de las ermitas instituydos por Nuestro Serafico Padre San Francisco para sus frayles* (1625). This self-consciously “Spanish style” of *Via Crucis* was even exported, first to Sardinia, and then to Italy, by Franciscan missionaries. In 1616 the Capuchins of Monte Valverde (Sardinia) celebrated the devotion in the Spanish manner, and one of the Sardinians, Salvatore Vitale, later introduced the Spanish form to Florence. On 14 September 1628 the Florentines inaugurated their new *Via Crucis* through the streets leading to the church of San Miniato, an event described in Vitale’s *Trilogia della via crucis* (1629). So strongly did the Jerusalem replica become

---

52 Juan Carrillo, *Historia de los santos y personas de la tercera Orden*, 2 vols. (Zaragoza, 1610–1613); Francisco Pérez Carrillo, *Via Sacra y Ejercicios Espirituales* (Zaragoza, 1619); Basilio López, *Calle de amargura, como habemos de seguir a Cristo y meditaciones de su pasión* (Madrid, 1622); Antonio Daza, *Exercicios Espirituales de las ermitas instituydos por Nuestro Serafico Padre San Francisco para sus frayles* (Barcelona: Sebastián y Jayme, 1625). This question is discussed further in Gil Atrio, “España.”

identified with Spanish piety that the eighteenth-century Franciscan missionary S. Leonardo da Porto Maurizio (1676–1751), who founded nearly six hundred *Via Crucis* for the instruction of the laity in twenty years spent traveling through the Italian Peninsula, credited his Spanish brethren with inspiring him to spread the devotion through Italy: “Having learned from some Spanish religious that in Spain they erected *Via Crucis* to the great advantage of the people’s souls, my spirit was fired by an ardent desire to obtain such a great benefit for Italy.”

**WHAT’S IN A REPLICA?**

In thinking about the many ways in which premodern Spaniards collected, studied, and interacted with the Holy Land, historians generally tend to ignore these replicas. This represents a significant deficit in our understanding of the presence and uses of Jerusalem in early modern Spain. A wide swath of Spanish society—from the monarchs, nobles, and religious orders who paid to build them down to the thousands of common laymen who traveled to pray before them—considered these replicas serious business. So, too, should historians.

Yet this is easier said than done. Two problems confront the historian who wishes to treat these replicated Jerusalems as something more than three-dimensional manifestations of their patrons’ devotional tastes. The first is one of intentionality. Unlike relics, which occasioned a large amount of cogent theological and/or theoretical discussion in the sixteenth century, replicas occasioned no such discussion, making it exceptionally difficult to recover anything beyond a *post hoc*, functionalist understanding

---

*Cruz (Sevilla, 19–22 de marzo de 1992), CEIRA, 4* (Seville: Centro de Estudios e Investigación de la Religiosidad Andaluza, 1995), 43–60, here at 53–54.

54 Leonardo da Porto Maurizio, *Via crucis ... con altre divote orazioni* (Naples, 1782).
of the individual beholder’s response to them. (This much we owe to art historians, who are practically the only scholars to have devoted attention to these large-scale Jerusalem replicas, both within Spain and abroad.) Indeed, the current trend among the small community of scholars working on these replicas is to deny them any importance beyond their functional role as markers of prestige (for their wealthy patrons), calling cards (for the religious orders who occupied them), or sources of escapist entertainment (for the laity). One of the leading historians of these Spanish replicas dismisses them, characteristically, as “equal to the Universal Expositions and amusement parks of the modern world … the same as Disneyland,” designed to “offer their visitors an illusion,” proffering a blend of realistic detail and fantasy.55

This last assessment of replicas cannot but remind one of Umberto Eco’s essay on “Travels in Hyperreality,” which Eco published in 1975 soon after an American holiday spent visiting the Hearst Castle, Disneyland, and Madame Tussaud’s.56 Eco’s essay, an extended reflection on Americans’ fascination with building historical replicas of the signal places and events of other nations’ pasts, is the work of an author divided about the significance of such replicas. On the one hand, he finds them to be pathetic, shallow, vulgar, plebeian, and consumerist—in other words, quintessentially American, which is to be read as a word of opprobrium.57 Like Americans’ hollow attempt to find meaning as consumers of everything “more,” “bigger,” and “better,” these replicas are “a neurotic reaction to the vacuum of memories; the Absolute Fake is offspring of the unhappy


57 ibid., 4, 6, 6, 57.
awareness of a present without depth.”58 At the same time, however, Eco also sees something quixotic, almost noble, in this quest for history. Building a replica of a faraway place, from which one is separated by both time and distance, can be read less polemically as a salutary attempt to ameliorate one’s own lack of history by rescuing someone else’s from the oblivion that might otherwise overtake it.59 Thus replicas at their best reveal their builders’ “search for glory via an unrequited love for the [foreign] past;” like museums, they are avatars of “the ideology of preservation, in the New World, of the treasures that the folly and negligence of the Old World are causing to disappear into the void.”60

While Eco seems to believe that the drive to build replicas is exclusively American, I would suggest that his attempt to supply the practice of replica-building with a theory and cultural significance that transcends individual response also suggests a better approach to understanding the replicated Jerusalems of the Middle Ages and Renaissance.61 Less important than the question of how such replicas were used is the question of why they were built—that is, of what it was that suggested to Philip II and Amico, as well as the many lesser patrons like Álvaro de Córdoba, that transposing the

---

59 ibid., 53.
60 ibid., 28, 38.
61 Eco’s last remark, about an “ideology of preservation” arrayed against the “folly and negligence of the Old World,” is especially apropos of Spain’s Holy Land replicas, as early modern pilgrims and antiquarians alike so frequently lamented Near Eastern Muslims’ incomprehensible lack of concern for biblical ruins and antiquities, a carelessness which they felt was contributing to the tragic and inexorable destruction of Christians’ cultural patrimony. See Amanda Wunder, “Western Travelers, Eastern Antiquities, and the Image of the Turk in Early Modern Europe,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 7 (2003): 89–119, here at 100–102.
shrines of the Holy Land onto Spanish soil (and not just doing it, but writing books about it, too) might be a good idea.

The second interpretive dilemma which these replicas pose is equally difficult: namely, the fact that that vast majority of them, in spite of their origins in the eyewitness observations of real Jerusalem pilgrims, are extremely poor reproductions, only tangentially similar to the original exemplars to which they ostensibly refer. The art historian Richard Krautheimer first articulated this problem years ago in a prescient article on German, French, and English shrines. Observing what he politely termed a certain “inexactness in reproducing the particular shape of a definite architectural form, in plan as well as in elevation,” he speculated that medieval artists must have had “a quite different approach as compared with that of the modern mind to the whole question of copying.” The same could be said, perhaps even more forcefully, about premodern Spain’s Holy Land replicas. With the possible exception of Diego de Siloe’s plan for the Cathedral of Granada, which pretended to adhere quite closely to the specs of the prototype, not one of the many reconstructions enumerated above—such as Enríquez’s putative ‘reconstruction’ of Pilate’s palace in Seville, for example—has much of anything in common with the architecture of the Near East. In what way, then, were these replicas ‘replicas’?


63 It may be interesting to note that in 1520 an anonymous Hieronymite chronicler recorded his opinion that “the Holy Sepulcher of Our Lord Jesus Christ does not look like … those which painters depict in representations of the Resurrection.” BNM MS. 10883, “[U]n muy devoto tractado del viaje & misterios de la Tierra Sancta de Jerusalem & del Monte de Sinay según lo cuentan dos religiosos sacerdotes de la Orden del glorioso padre Sant Hierónimo, professos desta sancta casa & monasterio de Nuestra Señora Sancta María de Guadalupe, en el qual se contienen muchas cosas de gran devoción para consolación de las animas devotas” (ca. 1520), f. 90v. “Es de considerar que el Sancto Sepulcro de Nuestro Señor Jesu Christo no es de la forma destos sepulchros de piedra que acá en nuestra España se usan ni como vemos que los pintores lo pintan en el mysterio de la Resurrección.”
THE SANCTITY OF MEASURES

The key to resolving this question, and to understanding why premodern Spaniards were so keen to build replicas, lies in the deep history of Christian attitudes toward sacred measures.

Amico, Enríquez, and Álvaro were not the only pilgrims to insist upon taking careful measures of the Holy Places. This passion for devotional draughtsmanship is evident in every one of the pilgrimage accounts published in sixteenth-century Spain. Antonio Cruzado, OFM, Antonio de Lisboa, OSH, and Diego de Mérida, OSH—who traveled from Iberia to Palestine in ca. 1480, 1507, and 1512, respectively—peppered their manuscript narratives with measurements of the Holy Sepulcher and *Via Dolorosa*. Together, their accounts constitute essentially a prose relation of the Holy Land’s topography. One learns, for example, that the Holy Sepulcher lies exactly thirty paces south of the site where Christ appeared to Mary Magdalene; this was in turn a few steps from the chapel where Christ appeared to the Virgin on the day of the Resurrection. Fifty-three paces east of the spot of Christ’s appearance before Mary Magdalene was the cave where Christ was imprisoned during his trial; twenty paces further east was a chapel on the spot of the Roman soldiers’ dice game; and so on.64 Along the *Via Dolorosa*,

From Gethsamene to this bridge [which Christ crossed on his way to the garden] it is 222 paces, and from this bridge to the site of Annas’ house … it is 1760 paces. And from Annas’ house to that of Caiphas it is 350 paces, and from Caiphas’ house to the place where Our Lady stood listening to the injuries and vituperations they directed against Our Redeemer, 10

---

64 BNM MS. 10883, “[U]n muy devoto tractado del viaje & misterios de la Tierra Sancta de Jerusalem & del Monte de Sinay según lo cuentan dos religiosos sacerdotes de la Orden del glorioso padre Sant Hierónimo, professos desta sancta casa & monasterio de Nuestra Señora Sancta María de Guadalupe, en el qual se contienen muchas cosas de gran devoción para consolación de las animas devotas” (ca. 1520), f. 96rff.
paces more; and from the church of Mount Sion to the aforementioned bridge it is 1900 paces ... 65

On Gethsemane itself, the cave where Christ prayed was said to be 252 paces from the spot where his disciples fell asleep, and the spot on which he was arrested was forty-two paces from the garden.66 It is worth noting, in light of Amico’s subsequent book, that the Holy Places’ Franciscan caretakers were especially active in encouraging pilgrims to collect these sacred measures. The Spanish Franciscan Antonio de Aranda, whom we met in an earlier chapter, reported a measurement of 1862 paces for the Via Dolorosa in his 1531 guidebook to the Holy Land.67

These Renaissance pilgrims were preceded by a medieval tradition of collecting and venerating measures as rich as it was long.68 To read medieval pilgrimage guides is

---

65 ibid., f. 152v. “Desde Gethsamení hasta esta puente ay dozientos y veinte y dos pasos, y desde esta puente hasta donde era la casa de Anás ... ay mil y setecientos y sesenta pasos, y de casa de Anás a casa de Cayphás ay trezientos y cinquenta pasos, y de casa de Cayphás hasta el lugar donde Nuestra Señora estava oyendo las ynjurias y vituperios que eran hechos a Nuestro Redemptor, diez pasos, y desde la yglesia del Monte Sión hasta la susodicha puente ay mil y novecientos pasos ... .”

66 ibid., f. 151v.

67 Antonio de Aranda, Verdadera informacion de la tierra sancta, según la dispusicion que en el año de mil y quinientos y treynta el auctor la vio y passeo (Toledo: Juan Ferrer, 1550).

68 This tradition should serve as another reminder about the inseparability of early historia sacra from traditional religious belief. Many scholars have been tempted to explain these Renaissance travelers’ passion for measuring Jerusalem as an outgrowth of the advent of serious antiquarianism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which led practically to the fetishization of empirical data collected from Near Eastern landmarks. Writing about Enriquez de Ribera, for example, Amanda Wunder finds him “entrenched in the new Renaissance culture of evidence,” asserting that “In Jerusalem the Marquis followed [the example of Leon Battista Alberti] as he measured, counted, and surveyed the relationships among the sacred landmarks. Like antiquarian authors working in Rome or Constantinople, the Marquis related measurements rather than visual descriptions in order to communicate things ancient and foreign to his home audience.” His fascination with measuring Jerusalem is thus construed as a demonstration of “how early modern ideas about evidence—in particular, the evidence of eyewitness observations and mathematical measurements” were overlaid onto older, explicitly less empirical ways of approaching the Holy Land. Zur Shalev corroborates this view, arguing that “the antiquarian movement emerges as the natural backcloth of the phenomenon of early modern pilgrimage to Jerusalem.” Yet this interpretation fails to take account of the long history of pilgrims’ interest in collecting these sacred measures; as Wunder herself hints, antiquarianism represents merely an updated version of a general current of reverence and awe that runs deep through the Christian tradition: “In the case of Jerusalem the numbers took on an even greater meaning, for their significance was religious as well as academic.” See Wunder, “Classical, Christian, and Muslim Remains,” 200; Shalev, “Geographia Sa-
to recognize that no Christian traveler ever considered his or her experience of the Holy Land complete lest he could render a minutely detailed account of the number of paces required to traverse the Via Dolorosa or to move between each of the chapels in the Church of the Anastasis. Later medieval pilgrims like Margery Kempe (b. ca. 1373)—who carried off “the measure of Christ’s grave” from her fourteenth-century pilgrimage—or Joannes Poloner—who recorded the length of the Via Dolorosa at 450 paces in 1422—always carved out time during their stays in the Holy Land to measure and record the dimensions of signal buildings and the distances between sites along the Via Dolorosa. One finds the same devotion among even earlier pilgrims like the Gallic bishop Arculf, who traveled to the Holy Land in the mid-seventh century. According to his biographer Adomnan, Arculf “examined the Holy Places by daily visits” so that he could take careful measurements of everything he saw. Among the measures he recorded were the distance from the pavement of the Church of the Anastasis “up to the edge of the Sepulcher,” which he reckoned at “about three palms,” and the length of the burial chamber of the Sepulcher, which he “measured with his own hand” at seven feet.

---


He also “drew on a waxed tablet” blueprints of several of Jerusalem’s churches, including the Anastasis, which were later incorporated into manuscript accounts of his travels.\(^71\)

To locate the origin of this fascination with measuring the Holy Places, one must go at least as far back as S. Jerome (d. 419). Jerome, as we have seen in Chapter One, was an enthusiastic proponent of the academic study of the Holy Land and its shrines on the grounds that understanding the landscape in which biblical events took place was an essential prerequisite to sound biblical exegesis. But alongside this natural scholarly interest in measuring and charting the Holy Land Jerome’s letters and commentaries also show him eager to attach a higher, more mystical significance to the role of sacred measures in the unfolding of biblical history. In an early letter sent from Palestine to the Roman noblewoman Marcella, Jerome looked forward to the Apocalypse and pointed to the mystical importance of the measurements that Christians were called to make in the Holy City in the last days:

\[
\text{in the apocalypse it is written: “Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months” [Revelation 11:2]. … At the close of the book [Jerusalem] is further described thus: “And the city lieth four-square, and the length of it and the breadth are the same as the height; and he measured the city with the golden reed twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the walls thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel”—and so on [Revelation 21:16–18].}
\]

With respect to the latter passage, Jerome allowed that such measurements seemed implausible, and wondered aloud at whether in this instance the preoccupation with

\(^{71}\) ibid., 6–8.
sacred measures ought to “be mystically understood.” Yet in general, he took them literally, arguing later in the same letter that the minute study of sacred objects like the crèche and the wood of the cross was salutary to the Christian believer. This veneration of ‘sacred measures,’ which Jerome shared with other early Christian thinkers, seems to have originated as a response to the apocryphal book of the Wisdom of Solomon, which taught patristic readers that all of creation followed divinely-ordained principles of “mensura et numero et pondere.” Patristic readers like Jerome extracted two messages from this verse: first, that the careful study of ratio, proportion, and measure could also yield insight into the mysteries of revelation; and second, that the weights and measures themselves, as the divinely-inspired handiwork of God, ought to be considered relics.

It is no wonder, then, that the measurements and blueprints collected by pilgrims were so valuable; doctrinally indistinguishable from corporeal relics, these measures were easier to procure at the same time as they were equal in status to more conventional pilgrim mementos like splinters of the True Cross, bits of the crown of thorns, stone fragments prised from the Holy Sepulcher, or even earth collected along the Via Dolorosa. By the fifth century, if not before, Christians everywhere had come to share in this understanding of measures. It became standard practice among pilgrims not only to

---

72 Jerome [as “Paula & Eustochium”], Epistle 46 to Marcella (ca. 388–389), in W.H. Fremantle, ed., *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church [2nd ser.], 6 (New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1893), 60–65, here at 62–63. In this case, Jerome doubted whether the Christian was meant to value such measurements literally, for they seemed absurdly great: “Now where there is a square there can be neither length nor breadth. And what kind of measurement is that which makes length and breadth equal to height? Evidently this description cannot be taken literally (in fact, it is absurd to suppose a city the length, breadth and height of which are all twelve thousand furlongs) … .”

73 ibid., 64–65.

tabulate their paces around Jerusalem, but also to produce miraculous cures by touching the ill or infirm with ribbons and rods that had been used to measure objects and edifices associated with the Passion. The late sixth-century authors Antonio of Piacenza (also known as the ‘Piacenza Pilgrim’) and Gregory of Tours, for example, took note of pilgrims’ eagerness to retain ribbons with which they had measured the column where Christ was flagellated and the footprints he left on a stone in front of Pilate’s palace.⁷⁵ They described how pilgrims would “make ribbons of cloth and put them around” these holy objects, and then use the ribbons to produce miraculous cures by touching the ill or infirm with them, just as one would do with a corporeal relic.⁷⁶ Gregory noted quite explicitly that pilgrims drew no distinctions between these measures and more conventional relics, considering them to be imbued with the same sacred power as the splinters of lignum crucis which they might also collect.

The remarkable continuity of this form of devotion across the Middle Ages is attested by the appearance of just this kind of miracle-working ribbon in the relic collections of sixteenth-century Spanish churches. One example is found in Fernando and Isabel’s burial chapel, known simply as the ‘Capilla Real’, in Granada.⁷⁷ Drawn from various sources, the Capilla’s relic hoarde includes all of the bits of bone, splinters of

---


⁷⁶ ibid. According to Antonio, “In ipsa Ecclesia est columna, in qua tale est signum, ut dum eam quidam amplexus fuisset, in ipsa ei pectus adhaesit et apparent in ea palmae et digitii; ita ut inde per singulos languores tollatur, et qui circa collum habent, sanantur;” “Etiam de ipsa petra multae fiunt virtutes: tulentes mensuram de ipso vestigio, ligant per singulos languores et sanantur.” Gregory noted that “Ad hanc vero columnam multi fide pleni accedentes, corrigias textiles faciunt, eamque circumdant: quas rursum pro benedictione recipiunt, diversis infirmitatibus profuturas.”

wood, and phials of blood, soil, and Jordan water that a Holy Land pilgrim might ever want to collect, making it one of the finest collections of the Holy Land’s physical remains in all of Spain. Yet one of its most prized relics is a very old and very fragile envelope, marked simply “medida del sepulcro” (“measure of the Sepulcher”), in which rest several lengths of fraying black thread, cut by the hand of some long-forgotten sixteenth-century pilgrim to the dimensions of Christ’s tomb in Jerusalem.78

It may be of interest to note that this same belief in the mystical significance of measures often held true in the context of other Spanish relics, as well. In the sixteenth century, the caretakers of the shrine of Fuente de la Salud, in Castellón, for example, evidently distributed keepsake ribbons cut to the “exact measurement” of their image to pilgrims.79 In 1565, the Council of Valencia—apparently disinclined to indulge practices that smacked of ‘superstition’ in the wake of Trent—decreed that “nobody should measure the images of saints with threads or anything else, in order to take the measure to the sick, nor let there be given to the sick hosts on which there are things written, as all this gives off an odor of superstition,” as good an indication as any of the popularity and wide diffusion of the notion that measures shared in the powers of the object from which they derived.80 (In some parts of rural Spain, the belief survives to this day).81

---

79 Jaime Prades, Historia de la adoración y uso de las santas imágenes, y de la imagen de la Fuente de la Salud (Valencia: Felipe Mey, 1597), 463. Cited in Christian, Local Religion, 100 n. 33.
81 In fact, William Christian has observed that the practice of measuring holy places and objects “continues in many parts of Spain today.” See his Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 100 n. 33.
DOUBLE HISTORICITY

This practice of venerating measures as relics explains why, in the final analysis, Krautheimer was able to distinguish one aspect common to all of the many seemingly eccentric replicas, an aspect which “evidently satisfied the minds of mediaeval men as to their identity” with their prototypes: all of them, he found, attempted to reproduce with exactitude certain cardinal measurements taken in situ from the Holy Sepulcher and/or Via Dolorosa. Here we might remember (in addition to Fadrique Enríquez’s concern to reproduce in his Sevillan Via Crucis the exact number of paces that he and Juan del Encina had measured between Pilate’s house and Calvary in Jerusalem) Álvaro de Córdoba’s biographer’s statement that the Dominican’s replica of Calvary “was almost at the same distance from the cloister as the real Calvary is from the city of Jerusalem, or very close.” In the Sevillan and Córdoban examples—indeed, in all of Spain’s premodern replicas—the measure was not an indifferent fact used to build the replica; if anything, the replica was an indifferent edifice which served to house the measure. One might almost say that replicas ‘contained’ sacred measures in the same manner that reliquaries contained corporeal relics.

At the same time, the fact that replicas did not simply hold these measurements cum relics, but actually physically embodied them, also meant that they were much more than hollow copies of particular buildings or places. They were themselves reinstated relics, endowed with exactly the same powers as their prototypes. According to Robert

82 ibid. After considering the evidence, Krautheimer concluded that medieval minds were persuaded by “an approximate similarity of the geometric pattern.” We can see this typological ligature in action at the Church of S. Stefano in Bologna, which has little in common with the Anastasis except that it conserves between its representations of Christ’s tomb and Calvary the same distance that separates the real tomb of Christ from the real Calvary in Jerusalem. See Robert Ousterhout, “Loca Sancta and the Architectural Responses to Pilgrimage,” in idem, ed., The Blessings of Pilgrimage (Urbana/Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 108–124, here at 113.
Ousterhout, “It seems that copies of the Tomb of Christ … were regarded as relics, as were measurements taken from Jerusalem. In medieval texts, copies, relics, and measurements are mentioned together indiscriminately.” Ernst Kitzinger agreed: “A transfer of measurements was enough to ensure a transfer of the divine powers believed to reside in the original building.”83 This way of thinking about mimesis and the relationship between originals and copies is alien to our modern way of thinking, predicated as it is upon distinguishing between ‘the real thing’ and imitations.84 But it was not, as we have seen in Chapter Two, so strange in the Renaissance; indeed, one can see in these replicas the same mindset which had permitted the multiplication and reinstatement of relics throughout the Middle Ages. Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood’s recent article on “Renaissance Anachronism” explains quite well the extent to which this logic applied as much to replicated shrines as to relics:

all artifacts— … even churches—were understood in the pre-modern period to have a double historicity: one might know that they were fabricated in the present or in the recent past but at the same time value them and use them as if they were very old things. … [C]lasses of artifacts were grasped as chains of substitutable replicas stretching out across time and space. Under this conception of the temporal life of artifacts … new buildings

83 Ousterhout, “Loca Sancta,” 113; Ernst Kitzinger, “The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 8 (1954): 83–150, here at 105. Ousterhout continued: “On an architectural scale, a sort of topographical transfer was effected, through which the faithful could visit by proxy the holy sites of Jerusalem, gaining similar spiritual benefit in the process. … an image of the Holy Sepulchre could recreate the spiritual presence of the original. For the faithful the copy had an iconlike value, and it would have been considered a conduit of the Tomb’s life-giving power, effecting miracles, cures, and aid in salvation.” (118).

84 See Hillel Schwartz, The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles (New York, NY: Zone Books, 1996); Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in idem, Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York, NY: Schocken Books, 1969), 217–252. Reproducing a work of art, according to Benjamin, “interferes with” its “authenticity.” “The authenticity of a thing is the essence of all that is transmissible from its beginning, ranging from its substantive duration to its testimony to the history which it has experienced. Since the historical testimony rests on its authenticity, the former, too, is jeopardized by reproduction when substantive duration ceases to matter. And what is really jeopardized when the historical testimony is affected is the authority of the object” (221).
were understood as reinstatements, through typological association, of prior structures.\textsuperscript{85}

Hence the otherwise inexplicable fact that some replicas achieved total parity with the original Holy Sites: many Spanish replicas were entitled to offer their visitors identical indulgences to those offered at the corresponding site in Jerusalem. Such was the case with the Catalán Holy Sepulcher in Palera, which received the privilege in 1085.\textsuperscript{86}

This way of seeing these replicas, as full reinstatements, seems to have had a wide diffusion among premodern Europeans thinking about the Holy Land. For the replicas of early modern Spain, I must confess, the most illustrative example I have found thus far dates from a mid-nineteenth century travel guide, though the response it describes would be equally at home in a sixteenth-century text. In 1848 the French traveler Antoine de Latour passed through Seville, where he visited Enríquez’s “Casa de Pilatos.”\textsuperscript{87} The porter who led Latour on his tour of the residence seems literally to have confused the \textit{Via Crucis} of Seville with Jerusalem’s \textit{Via Dolorosa}. In Latour’s words:

> When I arrived at the first floor, my guide called my attention to a small recess that concluded in a narrow window and served, on the right, as the back for a tiled bench. “There,” he told me, “is where S. Peter was seated when he denied Jesus. And there,” he added, indicating across the way a peephole covered with a grate, hidden in the wall, “is where the servant-girl who recognized him paused.” … After reciting the same stories for forty years the simpleton has doubtless forgotten that that which he is showing to travelers is nothing more than a \textit{copy} of Pilate’s house. … Back out in the street, my guide, following me still, pointed out to me a window in a wall behind us with a stone balcony: “It’s there,” he told me,


“that Jesus was shown to the people wearing the crown of thorns and a scepter of reeds!”

Concluded Latour, “The brave man’s illusion seemed to augment as my visit grew longer.”88 What Latour thus described as the old man’s ‘confusion’ or ‘illusion,’ however, I would explain as a persistence of the premodern understanding of mimesis—the Casa de Pilatos as a fifteenth-century Spanish noble residence, and simultaneously, a first-century Judean public building. By mimicking the spatial arrangements of the Palestinian originals, such replicas forged a typological bond that conferred upon them the status of sacred buildings.

It is interesting to note in this vein a significant amount of ‘confusion’ in the popular imagination on the distinction between relics and replicas. Many of the replicas built by returned pilgrims were designed to house ‘authentic’ relics harvested in Jerusalem. Such was the case with the Iglesia de Vera Cruz in Segovia, which was built to hold a fragment of lignum Crucis in the possession of the Augustinian Canons of the Holy Sepulcher. 89 Most, however, could not claim to possess such tangible artifacts reinforcing their otherwise typological connection to Jerusalem. In these cases, almost without fail, the laity nevertheless succumbed to a powerful temptation to invent imaginary relics or other false connections back to the Holy Land on behalf of their

88 ibid., 2:9–10. “Quand j’arrivai au premier étage, mon guide appela mon attention sur une petite embase terminée par une étroite fenêtre et servant, à droite, de dossier à un banc revêtu d’azulejos. — ‘Voilà, me dit-il, où saint Pierre était assis quand il renia Jésus, et voilà, ajouta-t-il en me désignant de l’autre côté un judas grillé, perdu dans la muraille, voilà où se tenait la servante qui le reconnut.’ … A force de raconter la même chose depuis quarante années le bonhomme a fini sans doute par oublier que ce qu’il montre aux voyageurs n’est que la copie de la maison … de Pilate. … Quand je me retrouvai dans la rue, mon guide, qui me suivait encore, me fit remarquer, sur une muraille en retour, une fenêtre avec un balcon de pierre: — ‘C’est là,’ me disait-il, ‘que Jésus fut montré au peuple avec la couronne d’épines et le sceptre de roseau!’ … L’illusion du brave homme semblait augmenter avec la durée de ma visite.”

replicas. Again, the Casa de Pilatos provides the clearest example. Antoine de Latour, who understood the nature of Enríquez’s replica from something like our critical distance, correctly explained in his travel guide that the palace was so named only because of the role it played in the Sevillan *Via Crucis*. However, he recorded, “popular imagination went further, wanting to believe that the cement of the walls had been formed from the very earth of Jerusalem”!90 This desire to see in replicas relics, to endow them with false genealogies they did not possess, is one more proof that medieval and early modern Spaniards viewed their replicated Holy Sepulchers, *Via Crucis*, and Carmelite deserts not as functional copies of the Holy Sites, but rather as full “reinstantiations” of them on Spanish soil endowed with precisely the same powers as their prototypes.91

As such, these replicas could be of immediate practical use to the Spanish Monarchy as a means with which to resacralize Iberian terrain stained, as they saw it, by centuries of Moorish occupation. The construction of physical replicas of Jerusalem, such as the late tenth-century town of Borgo Sansepolcro, Italy, founded to replace preexisting Christian shrines destroyed by Muslim invaders, was a well-known device by which premodern Christians attempted to expiate guilt and purify terrain that had been recovered from non-Christian dominion.92 The Cathedral of Granada, begun in 1528,


91 According to Robert Ousterhout, “On an architectural scale, a sort of topographical transfer was effected, through which the faithful could visit by proxy the holy sites of Jerusalem, gaining similar spiritual benefit in the process. … an image of the Holy Sepulchre could re-create the spiritual presence of the original. For the faithful the copy had an iconlike value, and it would have been considered a conduit of the Tomb’s life-giving power, effecting miracles, cures, and aid in salvation.” Ousterhout, “Loca Sancta,” 118.

should certainly be read in this light, its expiatory function confirmed by the fact that Diego de Siloe’s ingenious mimicry of the real Anastasis allowed the consecrated host (which was to be displayed at all times) to be positioned on an altar precisely in the location occupied by the Holy Sepulcher in the original: the transubstantiated body of Christ on triumphal display at the very site of the Resurrection.\footnote{For other medieval examples of Holy Sepulcher replicas as eucharistic repositories, see Bresc-Bautier, “Les imitations,” 320–321.} This same expiatory function also helps to explain the geographical distribution of Spain’s Holy Land replicas. While Spain’s earliest replicas are clustered largely in the north, several of them along the pilgrimage route to Santiago de Compostela, the early modern Jerusalems are found mostly in the south, in lands only recently retaken in the Christian \textit{reconquista} of Andalucía. The reproduction of Palestine on Spanish soil thus truly completed the reconquest, and guaranteed the pedigree and cohesion of Spain’s \textit{communitas Christiana}.\footnote{On a related note, see Stephania Stefani Perrone, “\textit{I Sacri Monti} come Citta’Ideale,” in Corrado Maltese, ed., \textit{Centri storici di grandi agglomerati urbani}, Atti del XXIV Congresso internazionale di storia dell’arte, 9 (Bologna: CLUEB, 1982), 55–66.} This, more than anything else, probably explains why these replicas became so popular in Spain, to the extent that Leonardo da Porto Maurizio was convinced that the \textit{Via Crucis} was a Spanish ‘national’ custom.
IBERIA AS RELIC

While it may be easiest to see this premodern way of thinking about measures and mimesis-as-reinstantiation at work in these replicas, it was influential across a much broader swath of early modern intellectual life—including history, geography, ethnography, and botany, for example, all disciplines preoccupied by concepts of reproduction and the search for typological similarity. In the remainder of this chapter, I would like to broaden the lens by turning to two authors who deployed this understanding of replicas and replication to read the Iberian landscape, contributing thereby to a precocious sensibility of Spanish national identity.

The first of these authors is the Franciscan Antonio de Aranda. Aranda, as we know, traveled to the Holy Land in 1529, spending only a year there in his Order’s Custodia Terrae Sanctae before he was recalled to Spain on a diplomatic mission. In 1531, Aranda published a detailed account of his time in the Levant entitled the Verdadera informacion de la Tierra Santa.95 Early in his account, in a passage originally penned soon after his arrival in Jerusalem, Aranda recalled his trepidation as he awaited his own encounter with this unknown land. He and his fellow friars, he recalled, feared “that everything here [in the Holy Land] would be very different from things there in Spain. We assumed that across great distances and in such diverse regions there are always fruits and birds and animals different from those with which we are already familiar, as experience has taught us, through the diversity not only of houses but even of men which are brought back from the Indies.”96 And yet, Aranda reported, upon arriving

95 Cf. p. 198 n. 67 above.

96 Aranda, Verdadera informacion, f. 10v. “E porque muchos de nosotros quando alla estamos: creemos las cosas de aca ser muy diferentes de las de alla de españa: conjeturando que en grande distancia de
in the Holy Land he discovered that it was not so strange as he had assumed it would be. There appear to have been two reasons for this. For one thing, the landscape, climate, and flora and fauna that greeted him were not so different that those that he knew from his native Castile. According to Aranda, “one can say with certainty that the things that one finds in this land that are not also in Spain are very few. … [T]here is not a single thing here [in Palestine] that [in Spain] would be a novelty worthy of admiration.”

On the basis of these discoveries, Aranda drew a triumphal conclusion, averring that he “could well affirm, for plenty of reasons, that neither Italy, nor France, nor Flanders, nor upper nor lower Germany, is so similar to the Promised Land—in its wheat, hay, vines, trees; in its way of tilling the soil, milling grain, and planting vines; and in the way that it is sometimes flat and sometimes mountainous, sometimes dry and sometimes verdant—as is our Spain.” Aranda’s contemporaries could not have missed that final statement’s transparent evocation, and Christianization, of the laudes Hispaniae tradition dating back to Pompeius Trogus’ *Phillippic History*; according to the standard formula set down by Pompeius and repeated by Pliny, Isidore of Seville, and nearly every

tierra y en diversas regiones siempre ay cosas assi como frutos y aves y animalias diferenciados de lo que conocemos: segun la experiencia nos ha enseñado en las diversidades que no solo de casas pero aun de hombres traen de las indias.” Aranda’s assumption that unfamiliar places would be populated by unfamiliar flora and fauna was indeed a common byproduct of Spanish experience in the New World; As Antonio Barrera has noted, royal licenses such as that conceded in 1501 to the explorer Diego de Lepe—authorizing him to trade in “plants and animals of any quality, fish, birds, species and drugs, and any other thing of any name and quality”—“assumed that there would be known entities of unknown qualities and names” in the Americas. See Antonio Barrera, “Local Herbs, Global Medicines: Commerce, Knowledge, and Commodities in Spanish America,” in Pamela H. Smith & Paula Findlen, eds., *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (London: Routledge, 2001), 163–181, here at 163.

97 Aranda, *Verdadera informacion*, ff. 10v–11r. “bien es que tenga por muy averiguado ser muy pocas las cosas que en esta tierra ay que alla no las aya. … no ay aca cosa que alla cause novedad admirativa.”

medieval chronicler, the Spanish countryside is always deemed worthy of praise for its temperance and fecundity.\(^{99}\) What is unique in Aranda’s updated version, however, is that the temperance and fecundity of Spain are made praiseworthy precisely because they replicate the idealized conditions of the biblical Promised Land—idealized conditions which Aranda drew not from his eyewitness experience (which failed to impress him), but rather from Josephus, whose view of the Holy Land he considered more accurate because it was penned closer to the lifetime of Christ.\(^{100}\)

This interest in reconciling eyewitness testimony about modern Spain with patristic testimony about the Holy Land links Aranda with the second author whom I should like to consider, the Hieronymite Rodrigo de Yepes (fl. 1565–1585). Yepes was a well-placed insider at the court of Philip II, preacher in the convent of S. Jerónimo el Real in Madrid and confessor to the royal family. Like Amico, we know surprisingly little about fr. Rodrigo given his apparent importance at Philip’s court. Given his toponymic (and his obvious love for the region around Toledo), it seems more than likely that he was a native of Yepes, one of the small towns mentioned as a possible Hebraic

---


\(^{100}\) Aranda, *Verdadera informacion*, ff. 8r–11v.
foundation in the Nebuchadnezzar legend. (It was thought to memorialize the Palestinian port of Joppe, known well to Yepes’ contemporaries as the city where Christian pilgrims typically disembarked upon arriving in the Holy Land.) Beyond this speculative birthplace, the only other information we have about fr. Rodrigo pertains to his social network: we know, for example, that his friends included Benito Arias Montano and José de Sigüenza, his Order’s almost painfully erudite historian.

Those friendships alone would have placed Yepes within the circle of antiquarian érudits at Philip’s court; it is, therefore, not surprising that he seems to have cultivated the persona of a student of Christian antiquity. He clearly shared Arias Montano’s intellectual interest in Hebrew antiquities, and was apparently a very respectable student of the geography and topography of the Holy Land. In 1583, he published a chorographical treatise on the subject, the Tractado y descripción breve y compendiosa de la tierra santa de Palestina ..., its observations harvested from the works of Jerome, Josephus, and the scriptural testimonies that were the mainstays of armchair antiquarians of the Levant. (Yepes never visited the Holy Land in person.) Though thoroughly derivative, Yepes’ chorography was deemed competent enough to be translated and reprinted some years later at Venice.101

While Yepes’ Italian readers would encounter his chorographical treatise as a standalone work of scholarly erudition, in its original Spanish edition Yepes’ treatise was bundled together deliberately with four other treatises under the title Historia de la muerte y glorioso martyrio del Sancto Innocente que llaman de La Guardia, natural de la

ciudad de Toledo. ... Con otros tractados de mucha doctrina y provecho ...

In addition to the chorographical essay on the Holy Land and the featured history of the Holy Child of La Guardia, the other three “learned and beneficial treatises ... collected from diverse and faithful sources” included a consolatory treatise to the city of Toledo, a discourse “on the pilgrimage that Our Lord Jesus Christ performed in this world, sanctifying the Promised Land by his presence,” and a history of several early Spanish saints with a complementary genealogy of the Spanish monarchy. The book contained a number of illustrations, including a plate depicting the Crucifixion, a pair of plates comparing the landscapes of Toledo and Jerusalem, and a map of the Holy Land (though this last illustration does not appear to survive in any extant copies of the text).

Yepes’ eccentric book has attracted very little scholarly attention, with the exception of its first treatise—the study of the martyrdom of the Holy Child of La Guardia—which is often found bound separately from the other four. In this treatise Yepes purported to offer readers a journalistic retelling of how, in 1490–1491, a ring of six Toledan Jews headed by the laborer Yuce Franco kidnapped and ritually crucified a Christian child in a cave on the outskirts of Toledo. In 1491, the Inquisition of Ávila

---

102 Rodrigo de Yepes, Historia de la muerte y glorioso martyrio del Sancto Innocente que llaman de La Guardia, natural de la ciudad de Toledo. Con las cosas procuradas antes por ciertos Judíos, hasta que al Sancto Innocente crucificaron: y lo sucedido después. Con otros tractados de mucha doctrina y provecho ... Collegido de diversos y fidedignos testimonios ... (Madrid: J. Yñiguez de Lequerica, 1583–1584). For a complete bibliographical description of Yepes’ volume, see Cristóbal Pérez Pastor, Bibliografía madrileña; ó, descripción de las obras impresas en Madrid (siglo XVI) (Madrid: Tipografía de los huérfanos, 1891), no. 135.

103 See, for example, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, R/30981.

arrested Franco and his co-conspirators and sentenced them to death for their role in the plot; in handing down their verdict, the inquisitors noted that the Jews’ already horrifying act was aggravated by the fact that ultimately they had intended to perform a magical incantation on the child’s heart and a stolen, consecrated host that would poison the drinking water of all of Spain’s Christians. (The Jews’ clumsiness—a fault that Yepes attributed to their stubborn and benighted nature—prevented them from executing this final stage of their plan before they were caught.)\(^{105}\) The seriousness of this charge converted the case of the Holy Innocent into a cause célèbre, and contemporaries and modern historians alike have always understood it to be one of the primary motivations behind Fernando and Isabel’s decision to expel all Jews from their Iberian kingdoms in April 1492, just months after the conclusion of the case.\(^{106}\)

Yepes’ claim that his narration of the Jewish plot, trial, and the Holy Child’s subsequent miracles was based faithfully upon an authenticated relation extracted from the Inquisition’s own archives was disingenuous, and other scholars have gone to great lengths to prove the extent to which Yepes seized every opportunity to embellish the gory

\(^{105}\) For the twin tropes of Jewish poisoners and Jewish ineptitude, see above, pp. 156–157.

\(^{106}\) The Catholic Kings’ Inquisitor General, fr. Tomás de Torquemada, was at great pains to publicize the case as proof of the great Jewish threat to Christian Spain, going so far as to have the Inquisitors of Aragón publish a Catalan translation of Benito García’s sentence in Barcelona. See “Translat de la sentencia, donada per los reverents pares inquisidores de la herética pravedat de la ciutat de Ávila del Regne de Castella contra un nomenat Benet García, queis cardador, herètich é condemnat del loch dela Guardia, en l’any Mil CCCCLXXXX[I], tramés por lo reverent pare lo Senyor prior de la Sancta Creu, inquisidor general de la herética pravitat, als reverents pares inquisidores de la ciutat de Barcelona,” ed. Manuel de Bofarull, in Colección de documentos inéditos del Archivo General de la Corona de Aragón (Barcelona, 1865), 28: 68–75.
details and heighten the repugnance of the Holy Child’s murder.107 Yepes’ most significant enhancement was without a doubt his ‘discovery’ that the child’s martyrdom was something more than the standard blood libel or poisoning plot. In fact, he reported, the Jews had conceived it as nothing less than a thorough recapitulation of Christ’s Crucifixion, an intentional mockery of the Christian faith’s defining event. Such patently inflammatory embellishments of the ‘true’ Holy Child story have earned Yepes a reputation among many scholars as, essentially, a tragically gifted pornographer. On the one hand, Yepes’ obvious talent for vicious and voyeuristic drama has earned him a bizarre sort of respect among students of Spanish literature, who consider him the likely inspiration behind Lope de Vega’s 1603 staging of the Holy Child episode, *El niño inocente de La Guardia*.108 On the other hand, Yepes’ gruesome imagination has also led many scholars to dismiss his book as simply one of the baser and more embarrassing

---

107 Yepes, *Historia*, f. 41v. The actual nature of Yepes’ sources is in fact more complicated. He seems to have drawn on at least three independent accounts of the affair, not all of them objective summaries of the original Inquisitorial testimony as he claims (see Part III, Chapter 1 of his text for more detail). The first of Yepes’ sources, about which we know the least, was a relation of the case obtained in 1533 from the Inquisition of Granada by Alonso de Fonseca, the Archbishop of Toledo at the time, as part of his larger campaign to promote the cult of the Holy Innocent—it was he who commissioned the altar-piece seen inside the cave where the child was supposedly martyred, as well as a thorough renovation of the attached chapel and the erection of a modest shelter for pilgrims. The second version of the story, which seems to have had the greatest influence on Yepes, was a polemical narrative history of the case drafted in the late 1540s by the lawyer and Toledano canon Damián de Vegas. At the time, the Archbishop Diego Siliceo was engaged in a battle of wills with several members of his Cathedral chapter who opposed his wishes to impose a blood purity statute excluding anyone of Jewish ancestry from becoming a canon. Siliceo’s party wrote to Charles V on several occasions denouncing the ‘judaizers’ blocking the imposition of the statute, and Vegas’ history was included in their supporting materials presumably to remind the Emperor of what could happen to Toledo’s Jews were left uncowed. Finally, Yepes’ third source—almost certainly the one to which he makes explicit reference—was a two-folio composite history extracted from the procesos of the original case’s seven defendants at the orders of the diocesan governor of the Bishop of Ávila, Sancho Busto de Villegas, in Madrid on 19 September 1569.

examples of Renaissance Spaniards’ anti-Semitic predilection for the medieval blood libel.  

Yet to focus solely on Yepes’ recapitulation of the blood libel is to risk missing completely the intent of his history of the Holy Child, and indeed, of his entire volume. Yepes only offered the heartrending tale of the Holy Child, though ostensibly the subject of the book’s first (and longest) treatise, in the service of a much larger argument he wished to make about Spanish history and Spanish destiny. The Holy Child’s martyrdom at the hands of Jews was instrumental to that argument, but not because of its power to sadden or inflame his readers against the long-dead Jews of Toledo. In fact, his murder might even have been taken as a prophecy of good news, of God’s impending grace for the Spanish people. This point, which is often missed by modern readers, is the subject of the second half of his treatise, in which Yepes explains how, exactly, he had to come to realize that the Holy Child’s martyrdom was intended to recapitulate the Crucifixion.

Yepes had been led to his startling conclusion, he averred, by his ‘discovery’ that the landscape surrounding Toledo, the site of the Holy Child’s martyrdom, was an exact match for the landscape around Jerusalem. In an exhaustive, four page long comparison of the two sites, illustrated with virtually identical plates giving visible proof of the identity of the two cities, Yepes explained that this corner of Castilla-La Mancha was a faithful replica of Palestine in every way imaginable—from the disposition of the terrain, to the location of relevant orchards, caves, and rivers, to the relative positioning and function of key towns and edifices, such that even the lines of sight between any two

---

109 Such was the opinion, for example, of Lea. For an exceptional mention of the treatise in a different context, that of symbolic cartography, see Richard L. Kagan, Urban Images of the Hispanic World, 1493–1793 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 60–61.
places around the village of La Guardia mimicked those in Jerusalem. To quote just a small fragment of Yepes' lengthy dissertation:

Between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives stands Mount Calvary, upon which our Savior was crucified for the salvation of mankind, because it was the place where evildoers were brought to justice, which is why it was called the mount of skulls ... . It is a harsh and sterile mount. In proportion and likeness to this Mount Calvary, in between La Guardia and its olive orchards, is the mount or range where ... the Holy Innocent was crucified, which truly looks just like Mount Calvary, and is at the same distance and disposition [relative to its surroundings]. It is a harsh and sterile mount covered with ... bald crags, like skulls, where evildoers are brought to justice. ... It is said that the Jews brought the Holy Innocent here, whipping him, and making him carry his cross, and fall down on his knees, just like Christ did from the house of Pilate to Mount Calvary.

110 Yepes, Historia, ff. 14r–15v. “Ya sabemos lo primero que la ciudad de Ierusalem estaba en alto, y se subia a ella de qualquier parte, como lo nota Eucherio sobre el Genesi, y S. Hieronymo en los lugares Hebraicos, y sobre el propheta Abacuc cap. 3 dize, la ciudad de Ierusalem estaba asentada sobre montes, y ella cercada de montes: y sobre el propheta Oseas cap. 2 y consta del texto del mismo propheta. Y allende que esto es claro, se saca tambien de lugares del sancto Evangelio, Mirad, dize Christo, que subimos a Ierusalem. Y en otra parte, Descendia un hombre de Jerusalem a Ierico, y cayo en ladrones. Assi esta aqui en alto la villa de la Guardia, porque yendo a ella de Toledo y de Ocaña, y de alli a la redonda, se passa por una vega y valle y se va subiendo a la Guardia, que se descubre en un monte alto. Tiene en frente la Guardia a la vista muchos olivares de aquellos pueblos y suyos, a los cuales se sube desde el mismo valle, que esta en medio, y responden al monte Olivete de Jerusalem, a donde subio David los pies descalços, y llama san Agustin, monte grueso y de misericordia, donde Iesu Christo se fue a orar la noche antes quando vino al templo a librar a la muger adultera, y desde donde subio a los cielos. Tiene este monte Olivete a la halda del la villa de Bethania, desde donde vino Christo a padecer: a la qual corresponde aqui la villa de Dosbarrios, que esta detras de aquellas olivas que responden al monte Olivete. Por la halda del monte Olivete le passa el arroyo de Cedron, cerca de Jerusalem a la parte Oriental, y el divide al monte Olivete de Jerusalem, porque esta en medio: assi va tambien al pie de aquellas olivas aqui junto a la Guardia un arroyo de agua por en medio de un valle abaxo, bien cerca de la cueva del Innocente, y a la halda del monte en que ella esta, llamase el arroyo de Escorchor, y assi se parece al arroyo de los cedros, que estvba en la misma disposicion en Jerusalem, y le pass nuestro Redemptor, quando desde la Cena ultima salio con sus discipulos a orar al huerto de Gethsemani donde fue preso, porque Gethsemani estava a las rayzes del monte Oliveti: y en el mismo huerto avia una cueva donde el Señor se entro a orar, y en ella esta agora una yglesia edificada, como lo dize san Hieronymo in locis Hebraicos, y assi era necesario passar el arroyo para yr a el: y tambien en este lugar que dezimos es necesario passar el arroyo, para yr a aquellas olivas, y por esto el arroyo esta en buena y semejante disposicion del arroyo de Cedron. Entre Jerusalem y el monte Olivete esta el valle de Iosaphad, como lo dize alli san Hieronymo. Desta manera aqui entre la Guardia y aquellos olivares esta en medio un valle ancho y grande, y va por el el dicho arroyo. ... “

111 ibid., f. 15r. “entre Ierusalem y el monte Olivete esta el monte Calvario, en el qual nuestro Salvador fue crucificado por la salud de los hombres, porque era lugar donde justiciavan los malhechores, y por esso se dezia monte de las calaveras, y hasta oy se muestra en Jerusalem a la parte Oriental del monte de Syon, según san Hieronymo, en esse lugar. Es un monte aspero y infructuoso. En proporcion y semejança este monte Calvario, esta cerca de la Guardia y desta olivas dichas, en medio de lo uno y de lo otro, un monte o cerro donde esta la cueva en que fue el niño sancto Innocente crucificado, que ver-
Likewise, Yepes instructed local lord Juan Cristóbal de Guardiola that “all that it is left to do is to adorn the cave and palaces of the fortunate martyr with a small monastery of Franciscans called Mount Sion, in order to make it look like the Holy Sepulcher and city of Jerusalem in every detail ....”\footnote{ibid., ff. ¶5v–¶6r. “no falta ya sino illustrar la cueva y palacios del dichoso martyr con un monesterio pequeno de religiosos de señor S. Francisco que se llame el monte Syon: para que en todo se parezca al sepulcro Sancto y ciudad de Hierusalem ... ’”} Thus, in choosing the village of La Guardia near Toledo as the site of their ‘second Crucifixion’, Yuce Franco and his henchmen had succeeded in finding the most ideal site in the world in which to repeat, and thus mock and invalidate, the Crucifixion of Christ.

After announcing his ‘discovery’ of the topographical identity of Toledo and Jerusalem, Yepes paused to explore “the conformity between this land and that of Jerusalem and Judea, not only in the shape and disposition of certain parts, but also in the Hebrew names which are to be found.” More or less an extended homage to Arias Montano’s commentary on Abdias, the chapter moved from topographical to etymological identity, using his eyewitness knowledge of the landscape to demonstrate that Castilian placenames echoed toponyms found in Palestine.\footnote{Yepes, \textit{Historia}, ff. 17v–18r “Esta dispersion y dilatacion es muy digna de considerar en el propheta Abdias, al fin del, donde dize. Y la transmigracion deste exercito de los hijos de Israel, que agora esta en los lugares de los Cananeos, llegara hasta Sarepta, donde Santes Paganino traduze claramente hasta Francia. Y dize despues, Y la transmigracion de los hijos de Jerusalen, que esta en el Bosphoro, posseera las ciudades del Austro y Mediodia. Donde el mismo Pagnino y la paraphrasis Chaldaica, donde dize que esta en el Bosphoro, dizen claramente España. Y no traduze en contrario San Hieronymo, diziendo Bosphoro, porque este nombre se dize de cualquier estrecho de mar, que puede passar un buey: y por mas señalado y eminente se entiende por el Estrecho de Gibraltar, que es en España. De dadera mirandole bien parece el monte Calvario, y esta en la misma distancia y disposicion. Es monte aspero y esteril lleno [de] unos riscos pelados propriamente de calaveras para justiciar malhechores. Esta agora a la redonde hecha una senda, y ella y todo el monte sembrado de cruces y hermitas, como estaciones, que causan grandissima devocien: de lo qual la villa de la Guardia ha tenido religiosa diligenzia. Dizese aver traydo por alli estos Iudios al sancto Innocente açotando, y como a Christo desde casa de Pilatos al monte Calvario cargado de la cruz, y haziendole arrodillar con ella.”} “Those who know something of the Hebrew language ... ,” he puffed,
consider it (in spite of its apparent brevity and curtness) to be the most copious and abundant in meanings and mysteries of all the languages, even by comparison with Latin, which is serious and authoritative, and Greek, which is very copious and chatty. And [Jerome] says that many sounds and words were left in Hebrew by the translators, because of the poverty of Greek and Latin, which could not properly capture the meaning of the Hebrew. And in our Spanish or Romanic, or Romance, language, we also find Hebrew words.114

These Castilian borrowings from Hebrew dated, of course, to the now-familiar events of the early sixth century BC, when Nebuchadnezzar came to Spain in the company of his Israelite host.115 Yepes assured the reader that all of this information was backed by reliable authorities, including Esteban de Garibay, all of whom could trace their knowledge back to Arias Montano: “the very religious doctor Benito Arias Montano, who has stood out in our time for his knowledge of ten languages (especially the holy languages of Hebrew, Chaldean, and Syriac), of histories, and of humane letters and

...
Divine Scripture, is of the opinion that these are Hebrew names, because it is supported by trustworthy histories and verisimilar conjectures.”

Like Garibay, Yepes considered Spain’s simultaneous toponymical and topographical identity with the Holy Land to be proof of God’s desire to share knowledge of himself with Spaniards before all other nations. As he trundled through the requisite folios of topographical etymologies—Toledo/Toledoth, Escalon/Ascalon, Yepes/Joppe, ... —he embellished Arias Montano’s scholarship with a smattering of imaginative additions. They were often strikingly amateurish: he frequently treated Hebrew and Chaldean derivations as interchangeable, as when he traced the moniker of the city of Seville back to both the Chaldean ‘Hispalis’ and the Hebrew ‘Bethis’—which, moreover, he believed to be in turn the root of the ‘Chaldean’ word Guadalquivir, the Arabic name of Seville’s main river. Even more likely to strain the reader’s credulity was his etymology for the town of Tembleque, one of the places featuring in the martyrdom of the Holy Child:

TEMBLEQUE: a town close to La Guardia, to its south. Its name corresponds to that of Bethlehem, ... which stands in the same relation to Jerusalem, to its south. If one studies this name carefully, having removed the vowels, and separating out only the consonants (which the Hebrews call ‘radicals’), ‘Tembleque’ is the same word as Bethlehem: for in both words

116 ibid., f. 20r. “Esta opinion de ser estos nombres Hebreos ... allende que se sabe de historias fidedignas y de conjecturas verisimiles, la tiene el muy religioso doctor Benito Arias Montano, que en conocimiento de diez lenguas, especialmente de la sancta Hebrea, Chaldea, y Syra, de historias y letras de humanidad y Divina scriptura, se ha mucho señalado en nuestros tiempos. Tienela tambien, y haze particular mencion de algunas destas cosas el doctor Figuerola canonigo de Valencia, en la summa contra los Judios primera parte, como lo refiere Pedro Beuter, libro primero, cap. 24. y Estevan de Garivay en su compendio historial, libro 5 cap. 4.”

117 ibid., f. 17r. “ ... es, aver venido a España en los tiempos antiguos, y morado en ella muchos Hebreos y Judios: para que desta manera oviesse conocimiento del verdadero Dios en todo el mundo, porque ellos en aquel tiempo eran los catholicos que servian a Dios ... .”

118 ibid., f. 19r.
the radicals are ‘b’, ‘t’, ‘l’, and ‘m’, and since the radicals are the same, it
matters not that they are twisted around in a different order.

“That happens very easily in Hebrew,” added Yepes.119

Yet such flourishes speak more to Yepes’ purpose than they do to his tenuous
grasp of etymology. Each of his embellishments was carefully crafted to strengthen the
case for an implicit link between Arias Montano’s historical proofs and modern Spain’s
imperial fortunes. In his rehearsal of the Hebrew roots of ‘Spain,’ Yepes noted that

this, our principal province of Europe, is called in the language of Syria
(so closely related to Hebrew and Chaldean) ‘Hisphania’, on account of
the skill in seafaring by which the Spaniards have so extended their rule,
and made themselves lords of other peoples, bringing them knowledge of
God . . . . The name which is in the prophet Abdias, which is translated as
‘Spain’ (which is ‘Sepharad’ in Hebrew, and means ‘port’ or ‘that which
extends its limits’) is in agreement with this interpretation. From whence
is derived the PLUS ULTRA, which means, ‘Above and beyond’, in the
arms of the Emperor Charles [V], since he passed through the Pillars of
Hercules, which were in the Bosphorus and Strait of Gibraltar, so far be-
yond to the Indies, Islands, and terra firma of the Ocean Sea.120

In other words, Spain’s Hebraic heritage not only proved its antiquity, but also mandated
that its modern inhabitants acquire an empire. While Hebrew toponyms had been, for
Arias Montano and Garibay, purely a question of history, for Yepes they were also a
form of prophecy. Read in concert with its exceptional topographical similarity, Toledo’s

---

119 ibid., f. 22r. “TEMBLEQUE, villa cerca de la Guardia al mediodia: en el nombre responde a Bethleem ...
... el cual esta en la misma disposicion de Jerusalem al medio dia. Si bien se mira este nombre, quitadas
las vocales, y dexadas las letras consonantes, que llaman los Hebreos radicales, Tembleque es el
mismo nombre que Bethleem, porque en entrambos nombres las letras radicales son, b, t, l, m: y siendo
unas mesmas letras radicales, poco importa estar trastocadas, que es cosa que acaece facilmente en la
lengua Hebra.”

120 ibid., f. 18r–v. “ESPAÑA, esta nuestra provincia principal de Europa, en la lengua de Syria, tan alle-
gada a la Hebra y Chaldea, la llaman Hisphania, por la destreza del navegar en que los Españoles han
dilatado tanto sus terminos, y enseñoreadose de otras gentes, dandeles el conocimiento de Dios . . . .
Conforma con esta significacion el nombre que esta en el prophet Abdias, donde trasladan España,
que en Hebreo es Sepharad, y significa, puerto, o que estiende los limites, como el suceso lo ha
mostrado en el PLUS ULTRA, que quiere dezir, Mas adelante, en las armas del Emperador Carlos, por
aver passado de las columnas de Hercules, que estavan en el Bosphoro y estrecho de Gibraltar, tan ade-
lante a las Indias, Islas y tierra firme del mar Oceano.”
linguistic identity with Jerusalem indicated that Spaniards had indeed become the new Israelites, endowed with a providential mission of their own. It was, therefore, no mere accident that the Jews had brought word of their God to Spain before all other nations. Where else could they have settled? God had prepared the Spanish landscape especially for the Jews.

**LANDSCAPE AND IDENTITY**

It seems clear to me that Aranda and Yepes thought of Spanish topography in precisely the same terms that we have seen their contemporaries apply to replicated relics and edifices. Both had, or claimed to have, firsthand knowledge of Jerusalem; and both used that knowledge to assert that Spain was not merely *like* Palestine—it typologically *was* a second Palestine, because the land reproduced the prototype’s most essential features. For Aranda, Spain’s flora and fauna were virtual relics harkening back to the Promised Land; for Yepes, it was topography and toponyms that exuded the presence of Jerusalem. It would not be unreasonable to say that, for Aranda and Yepes, the entire Iberian Peninsula had become a sort of macro-relic—a replicated object that, like the Casa de Pilatos, was susceptible to being viewed through the lens of double historicity. There is at work here a series of cascading or telescopic relic transfers, from relics to the replicas that contain them—which become relics themselves—and from the replicas to the landscape that contains them—which, finally, also becomes a relic no less authentic than the original. Consequently, the Spanish landscape was imbued with the same power to produce miracles as the Holy Land. According to Aranda, any place where God has

---

121 For further discussion of this sense of election in sixteenth-century Spain, see Alain Milhou, “1492–1598: Un climat favorable au messianisme ibérique,” in Jean Franco & Francis Utéza, eds., *Millénarismes et messianismes dans le monde ibérique et latino-américain* (Montpellier: Université de Montpellier 3, 2000), 13–33.
revealed himself partakes of the qualities of the original Holy Land: “we can infer … that everywhere that in biblical times, or in others, God has thought it good to reveal himself for singular effect are and should be called ‘holy land.’ And the more God declared himself to be present there, and to greater effect, the holier they are … .”

Yepes’ decision to invest the similarity of Spanish and Palestinian topography with so much meaning is yet another reminder of the power of analogical thinking—the fluid relationship between lineage and likeness—in the Renaissance mind. Like the common Spaniard unwilling (or unable) to distinguish between the Casa de Pilatos in Seville and the ruins of Pilate’s praetorium in Jerusalem—or, at least, incapable of believing that the Casa de Pilatos was not at a minimum constructed of cement imported from the Holy City—Yepes found in Arias Montano’s assertion of etymological descent an argument for topographical aemulatio, as well. Spain’s Hebrew toponyms were the ‘signatures’ by which the deeper likeness of the terrain was revealed. This conflation of topography and toponymy became one of the most popular aspects of the Nebuchadnezzar legend in subsequent historiography. Like the physical replicas discussed earlier in this chapter, “Hebrew toponymy came to be an ideal resource for the ‘sacralization’ of Spanish terrain.”

More broadly, the many efforts of Spanish authors to reconstruct Spain as a ‘replicated’ Holy Land also touch upon an even more deeply-felt sense of determinism.

---

122 Aranda, *Verdadera informacion*, f. 13r. “podemos inferir por no particularizar que todos los lugares donde en aquellos tiempos, o en otros dios ha tenido por bien de mostrarse por singular efecto son y se deven llamar tierra sancta. Y tanto mas sancta, quanto mas se declaro ser alli por mayor efecto presente dios … .”


between landscape, history, and nationhood. The assimilation of Iberia to Judea meant, as we have seen, that Spaniards could look to their terrain for clues to their shared past and their future mission. Historians of nationalism—who speak of the “discovery [by the members of a nation] of the poetry of landscape, a particular, historic landscape, and its relationship with its inhabitants and cultivators” and “the growing appreciation of the colours and contours of the land itself—that is, the transformation of territory into landscape, ‘land’ seen as a physical and economic object into ‘landscape’ treated as an aesthetic and a moral subject”—have long claimed that such belief in a preordained and intimate connection between landscape and history is exclusive to post-Enlightenment Romanticism. This “territorialization of memory,” the fixing of national memories to particular topographic landmarks, is alleged to have been an impossibility in an age not yet marked by the top-down imposition of European geographical understandings of territory and boundaries.

What I have tried to show in this chapter is that there may, in fact, be a closer link between the early modern spatial imagination and the birth of nation-states than we have previously recognized. Spanish attempts to remake their landscape in the image of the Holy Land can be seen as a hitherto underappreciated, pre-French-Revolution conception of national identity rooted not in a shared concept of particular national boundaries or

---


126 Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, 134; Winichakul, “Maps,” 68.
national character, but rather in a shared sense of sacred space.127 There is a parallel to be drawn here with the premodern hagiographical imagination, which envisioned saints’ lives not so much as linear biographical narratives governed by the principle of chronology, but rather as sacred maps compiled from the saints’ worldly itineraries, composite landscapes reverberating with moral significance because a saint had lived in them.128 As anthropologists have observed, ultimately the saint became less important than his or her shrines, the places valued more than the individual; or the individual subsumed into the sacred map.

This same logic applied to the sixteenth-century national imagination. The multi-layered presence of Jerusalem in Spain—achieved by ever-broadening concentric circles of replication, from relics to replicas to the very topography of Palestine—overlaid the disparate geographies of the Iberian kingdoms with a single, composite topography re-assembled from the Holy Land, and it made Spaniards a new Chosen People, providing a narrative of national exceptionalism for the Spanish nation.


128 Michel de Certeau, L’écriture de l’histoire, 2nd ed. (Paris: Gallimard, 1993), 285–287. “L’hagiographie se caractérise par une prédominance des précisions de lieu sur les précisions de temps. … Elle obéit à la loi de la manifestation … : les discontinuités du temps sont écrasées par la permanence de ce qui est le commencement, la fin et le fondement. L’histoire du saint se traduit en parcours de lieux et en changements de décors; ils déterminent l’espace d’une “constance.” … La vie de saint est une composition de lieux. … Le texte, avec son héros, tourne autour du lieu. … La manifestation est essentiellement locale, visible et non dicible; elle manque au discours que la désigne, la fragmente et la commente en une succession de tableaux. Mais cette ‘discursivité’, qui est passage de scène en scène, peut énoncer le sens du lieu, irremplaçable, unique, extraordinaire et sacré (hagios).” The conglomeration of all the loci belonging to the saint formed a new, composite place—which de Certeau calls a “non-place” (non-lieu) “qui n’est ni un ailleurs ni l’endroit même où la vie de saint organise l’édification d’une communauté. Un travail de symbolisation se produit là souvent. Peut-être cette relativisation d’un lieu particulier par une composition de lieux, comme l’efficacité de l’individu derrière une combinaison de vertus ordonnées à la manifestation de l’être fournissent-elles la ‘morale’ de l’hagiographie … .”
CONCLUSION

ESPAÑA MIRANDO A TIERRA SANTA:
THE HOLY LAND AND SPANISH IDENTITY

It can be difficult, as a modern scholar, to paint a sympathetic portrait of sacred antiquarians like Arias Montano or Bernardino Amico—not, as one might suspect, because they often come across as unlovable pedants, but rather because they so often seem like traitorous friends. The more one reads Arias Montano, for example, the more one begins to recognize in him a kindred spirit, a fellow scholar committed to questioning his sources and applying rigorous methodologies not so unlike the interdisciplinary approaches that characterize modern cultural history.¹ One almost feels the distance between the biblical antiquarians of the Renaissance and their heirs in the modern disciplines of biblical criticism and biblical archaeology begin to evaporate. This seems particularly true by comparison with the changes weathered by other academic disciplines since the Renaissance. It goes without saying, for example, that a Renaissance philosopher like Marsilio Ficino—for whom ‘philosophy’ meant, essentially, the art of living well—would be at a complete loss if transplanted into the philosophy department at any Western university at any time after the eighteenth century.² One wants to believe that the same would not be true of a biblical antiquarian like Arias Montano; that, while


he would struggle mightily to catch up with his modern counterparts, he would at least have the proper skills and mindset to do so.

And then, just as one begins to nod and smile at one of Arias Montano’s brilliant insights into ancient Hebrew culture or society, he suddenly says something so bizarre—like his assertion, expanded by Yepes, that one can change around the order of the letters in Hebrew words without affecting their meaning—that one is suddenly reminded of the impassible chasm which separates modern scholarship from Renaissance historia sacra. Most of the concerns which drove the research agenda which Philip set for the Escorial—like the quest for a fail-safe method by which to authenticate relics—cannot help but strike us as quaint, or even a bit ridiculous. Likewise, many of the methods and discoveries of which his scholars were most proud—like Arias Montano’s eagerness to find Hebrew “etymologies,” or Ambrosio de Morales’ dictum that God would not have allowed Spaniards to worship false relics—cannot help but highlight their willingness to invent that which they could not prove.

One of my objectives in this dissertation has been to elucidate the reasons why these Spanish students of the Holy Land should be so different from modern biblical scholars in spite of their apparent commonalities. Some of those differences can be explained by transformations internal to the disciplines associated with biblical criticism. Scholars wishing to specialize in geography or archaeology today have many more techniques and much more training at their disposal than did any of the figures discussed in this dissertation, and one imagines, for instance, that most hebraists working today know quite a bit more Hebrew than did Rodrigo de Yepes.
Other differences may have more to do with epistemology, broadly speaking. One of the questions that most exercised the sixteenth-century actors who appear in this dissertation had to do with how one ‘knows’ the Holy Land. Is it best known firsthand, by seeing it with one’s own eyes? Or is it better to research it at a distance, in one’s study, through the mediation of texts? Though they never fully solved it to their own satisfaction, the fact that Renaissance scholars asked this question so persistently is to their credit, for it goes to the heart of that which is most unique about the Holy Land: namely, that it only exists at the intersection of text and landscape.3 To say that the Holy Land exists solely in books would be untrue; it is objectively possible to journey to the Near East and to find there many of the places mentioned in Scripture. At the same time, however, to insist that the Holy Land is self sufficient, that it could exist without the support of textual testimony, would be equally false. Without the filter of sacred texts to signal which hills, valleys, and ruins are significant, the pilgrim is lost within the mundane reality of a Palestine that—as many of our sixteenth-century Spaniards noticed—looks surprisingly little like the Promised Land that one might expect. While this remains as true today as it was in the sixteenth century, modern scholars are probably more willing to resolve the inevitable discrepancies between text and landscape in favor of their direct observations, while premodern antiquarians—with some noteworthy exceptions—were probably more likely to retreat into the safe haven of textual authority and to find moral or supernatural reasons for doubting their own lived experience.

While acknowledging these universal differences in method and bias that separate us from our sixteenth-century predecessors, this dissertation has also examined the effects of another influence on sixteenth-century Spaniards’ attempts to read and interpret the Holy Land—namely, their embeddedness within a unique matrix of religious commitments, imperial pretensions, historiographical traditions, and national pride unique to Renaissance Spain. Spaniards’ unrequited quest for a narrative of national exceptionalism with which to neutralize the centuries of Moorish and Jewish “occupation” of the Iberian Peninsula—centuries that Renaissance historiographers viewed as an inexcusable interruption in the historical record of Spanish Christianity—impacted every stage of their interaction with the history of the biblical Levant. From the questions they asked, to the sources they employed, to the conclusions they reached, the humanist pilgrims and scholars gathered around the Escorial turned to the Holy Land looking for answers to Spanish questions.

It is for this reason that the veracity of relics was of such concern to Ambrosio de Morales, and that the notion of Israelitic heritage—whatever manipulations of Hebrew it took to produce those elusive roots—seemed like an appealing possibility to Arias Montano. Brought together at the court of a monarch claiming title to the Kingdom of Jerusalem and portraying himself as a second Solomon, the patrons, scholars, and artisans profiled in this dissertation constructed a Holy Land for the Catholic Monarchy; in the process, they reconstructed Spain in the image of the Holy Land.

As the biblical antiquarians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries became the Orientalists of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, Spain’s special relationship with the Holy Land remained an important component of Spanish national
identity. Though he is little remembered now, one of the most influential Spanish intellectuals of the early twentieth century was the Franciscan scholar-poet Samuel Eiján (1876–1945). Early in his career Eiján served in the Holy Land as the Superior of the Holy Sepulcher and Procurator General of the Custodia Terrae Sanctae, during which time he, like Bernardino Amico or Francesco Quaresmio, found his devotional interest in the Holy Places complemented by a scholarly interest in the history of the Custodia. In Eiján’s case, this latter interest took on a patriotic cast, as he began to explore what he called (in his first publication on the subject) the Relaciones mutuas de España y Tierra Santa a través de los siglos. This early publication was followed by three more toward the end of Eiján’s life: España mirando a Tierra Santa: Nuevas anotaciones históricas (1934), Hispanidad en Tierra Santa: Actuación diplomática (1943), and El Patronato Real de los Santos Lugares en la historia de Tierra Santa (1945–1946).

The middle of these three books, on the long history of Spanish diplomacy in the Levant, was subvented by Franco’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores), which also retained a special department dedicated solely to the charitable support of the Christian Holy Places of Jerusalem. The book attempts to offer general readers a complete overview of the long and copious history of Spanish interventions on behalf of the Christian Holy Places of Palestine, and was meant both to instill national pride and to solicit donations for Eiján’s fellow Franciscans in Jerusalem. Eiján’s

---

4 Samuéll Eiján, Relaciones mutuas de España y Tierra Santa a través de los siglos. Conferencias históricas dirigidas a bordo del “Ile de France” a la sexta peregrinación española a los santos lugares (Mayo–Junio, 1911) (Santiago de Compostela: Tipografía de el Eco Franciscano, 1912).

5 Samuel Eiján, España mirando a Tierra Santa: Nuevas anotaciones históricas (Santiago: Tipografía de “El Eco Franciscano,” 1934); idem, Hispanidad en Tierra Santa; actuación diplomática (Madrid: Imprenta de Galo Sáez, 1943); idem, El Patronato Real de los Santos Lugares en la historia de Tierra Santa (Madrid: Ibarra, 1945–1946).

6 Eiján, Hispanidad, 7.
prefatory Carta abierta gives a sense of the importance which he attributed to the historical relationship between Spain and the Holy Land, which he thought “would appeal for the objective toward which it was oriented”—ie., the conquest of the Near East for Christendom. He wrote of a “curious manifestation of official religiosisty,” a “centuries-long, predominantly national role of Spanish efforts on behalf of the homeland of Jesus.” The “knowledge and divulgation of our elaborate, epic service to the Holy Places, incomparable in its uniqueness as well as its grandiosity” could be used abroad, he believed, “to enhance Spanish prestige.” Spanish history provided countless examples of “the outpouring of the nation’s generosity, lavishing its patronage with open arms in support of the cult of the first sanctuaries of Catholicism, and for their restoration.” Spanish archives, he felt, should be the “signposts of a splendid history unequaled by any other people on earth.” In short, his work would commemorate “those heroic ancestors who spent their lives serving God and Country” by defending the Holy Places, and seeing to it that the cult of the Holy Places “has not suffered, across countless centuries, a single reverse except for those shared by our Country.”

One suspects that Eiján’s twentieth-century paean to Spaniards’ heroic efforts on behalf of the Holy Land could just as easily have been written in the sixteenth century. Touching upon many of the same topoi that preoccupied early modern Spaniards—the quest for a narrative of national exceptionalism, the desire to be able to produce an

---

7 ibid., 13–15. “sería atrayente por la finalidad a la que se orienta;” “curiosa manifestación de religiosidad oficial;” “papel predominante nacional de la gesta española desarrollada durante siglos a favor del país de Jesús;” “conocimiento y divulgación de la epopeya incomparable elaborada entre los nuestros a servicio de los santos Lugares, por lo grandiosa y por lo única en su género;” “dar realce al prestigio español;” “el derroche de generosidad de la nación, prodigando sus caudales a manos llenas en sostenimiento del culto y para restauración de los primeros Santuarios del Catolicismo;” “pregoneros de un pasado de esplendor que no encuentra parangón en los demás pueblos de la tierra;” “esos antepasados heroicos que consumieron la vida sirviendo a Dios y a su Patria;” “que no ha sufrido, a través de los siglos, otros colapsos que los sufridos conjuntamente por nuestra Patria;”
unblemished historical record of Spanish Christianity, even the assumption that Spain’s international reputation needed burnishing—Eiján offered a course of action that would have been eminently familiar to the Spaniards who are the primary focus of this dissertation: by yoking their national identity to the Holy Land, Spaniards would serve God and Country at one and the same time.
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