

Introdução (pp. xxvii-xxxii). Além disso, pela indagação da *arete*, este tratado abre outros domínios temáticos dentro das qualidades éticas e morais, em especial das mulheres, mas também, por comparação, dos homens.

**Antonio Dávila, Benito Arias Montano. *Apología de la Biblia Regia*. Colección de Textos y Estudios Humanísticos "Palmyrenus", Serie Textos XXII, Alcañiz-Lisboa: Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos, 2019. 290 págs. ISBN 978-84-17999-05-6.**

EDUARDO DEL PINO<sup>6</sup> (*Universidad de Cádiz – España*)

Antonio Dávila presents in this book the discovery, edition and study of Arias Montano's *Apologia* of the *Biblia Regia*. This *Apologia* had two parts: firstly the so-called "Defension" ("Defence"), written in Spanish to the Inquisitorial Court; and secondly a Latin *Commentatio de uaria Hebraicorum librorum scriptione et lectione* published further on by Montano to complete the *Apologia*. The book offers as well an edition and translation of the *Animaduersio de Hebraicorum uaria scriptione et lectione atque de uario interpretum instituto*, which was a first draft of the *Commentatio*.

The "Defence" of that Bible got lost for centuries. Many scholars looked for it in libraries and archives. Some of them even thought that it never existed. Dávila had already assured its existence from some epistolary passages. He developed a rigorous and meticulous tracking of documentary sources like few others. Finally, he found it in a manuscript preserved in the Hispanic Society of America in Nueva York. The discovery is significant. We do not have still heard the defence of the main responsible of the polemic Bible.

Davila's introductory study is instrumental. He showed in detail the ideological and historical context. He explains to us the matters which León de Castro accused Montano about, thanks to subsequent publications by the Spanish theologian (the accusation itself is not preserved). We can see also at the same time the defence of Montano, and even the judgement results from Mariana's censorship. Dávila uses these three sources of information also in his notes to the "Defence" and the translation of the *Animaduersio-Commen-*

---

DOI 10.34624/agora.v0i23.24487.

<sup>6</sup> eduardo.delpino@gm.uca.es.

*tatio*. In this way, we have always kept on display of the whole and punctilious debate.

Antonio Dávila does not take a step in the assessment of the controversy without being firmly supported by the consultation of published and archive material. It stands out in the book the number of primary sources consulted as well as the domain of the Montanian epistolary and that of other contemporaries. Nevertheless, he has read the modern bibliography (Baldo-mero Macías, Juan Francisco Domínguez, Asunción Sánchez Manzano) until the most up-to-date Dunkelgrün's PhD thesis.

The critical apparatus of Latin texts has exact references to every quotation. It offers as well notes about the textual development from the "Defence" to the *Commentatio* through the *Animaduersio*. The book finishes with some illustrations of the main passages in discussion, which is very useful to confirm Davila's assessments.

Antonio Dávila demonstrates that Montano was not only an excellent scholar but also a magnificent helmsman to take a ship of that size amid storms. Before he left for Antwerp, the cloister of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Alcalá insisted that the Vulgate should occupy the central place of the Latin version and many (perhaps a majority) rejected the use of Pagnini's translation. However, Montano achieved half an agreement so that it could appear in an additional volume for the use of scholars. Furthermore, the King's instructions with which Montano left for Flanders spoke of consulting everything with the theologians of the University of Louvain. So the Spanish took advantage of this so that the Brabantine cloister confirmed the inclusion of Sanctes Pagnini's text.

The printing work took place between 1569 and 1573. From the beginnings the Spanish theologian León de Castro attacked that Bible from Spain. His queries reached even the King and the Inquisition. The result of this was the journey that Montano had to do to Rome in 1572, where he visited every essential cardinal (Sirleto, Madruzzo, Morone, Caraffa, the Varmiense) to explain them, one by one, the aims, methods and characteristics of the publication. The Pope himself issues a "privilege" for the sale of the work, which meant some authorisation.

As Antonio Dávila says, the reception of the Bible is a textbook case of what the letters constituted in the so-called “Republic of Letters”. León de Castro allied himself with the Bishop of Roremunda, Lindano, in his opposition to the Royal Bible; and her supporters, both in Spain (Fuentidueña), as in Italy (Pedro Chacón), and in Flanders (Raphelengius, Harleminus), did the same for the defence of Montano.

Finally, León de Castro presented in 1576 a formal accusation before the Inquisition. The president of the Court, Gaspar Quiroga, commissioned the Jesuit Juan de Mariana to carry out a prior censorship of the work, as a first measure. Montano was advised of the accusation and presented his “Defence” in Spanish, the document here published.

Juan de Mariana faced his task in three or four months, and gave his result to the Court on September 2, 1577. The resolution of the Jesuit was very moderate. He did not condemn the Royal Bible at all, but only pointed out three of the “complaints” by Castro, which Montano could efficiently resolve in his Bible. Both parts criticised the censorship, but it was benevolent, meant an approval, and in any case stopped the process before the Inquisition Court.

The Royal Bible remained as a milestone in the history of biblical studies. Montano’s Bible indeed pays little attention to the ecclesiastical contributions in favour of the Vulgate or the Septuagint, compared to the vast arsenal of citations referring to the Hebrew text and the rabbinical tradition. It is also true that its director accepted contributions from specialists who did not present a certificate of prior orthodoxy, but only specialisation in Aramaic, Syriac, or similar issues. However, it was an actual cause to the acceptance of Greek and Hebrew Bibles in Western civilisation. That is what Dunkelgrün calls the “multiplicity” of Scripture. This view has let Roman-catholic writers accept the incoherences of the Bible at the same time of some nuclear inputs of information for specific purposes, although in the mid of a torrent of traditions, literary texts of defective transmission, and all the like. As it is well known, the Roman-catholic church promoted some improvements on the Vulgate text: that of the Sixto-Clementin Bible (after Trent Council), and another one, the so-called New-Vulgate (after Vatican II).

Not by accident Leiden (where the Hebraist Raphelengius moved) was a vital place to biblical criticism onward. In the world of the Reformed church

ches, this awareness of Bible weakness as a trustworthy source of factual information was even more traumatic than in Roman obedience. That was because the principle of *sola scriptura* did not rely on neither the “tradition”, nor the ecclesiastical “magisterium”. As the testimonies that have come down to us were studied, all demonstrated the Bible as a set of texts, often of doubtful authorship; sometimes inconsistent with their supposed time frame; with repetitions, interpolations and non-rectifiable errors; with striking similarities with the legends of other contemporary literatures. Scaliger began to doubt its truth in dates and similar, and therefore its prescribing value for society. His disciples in Leiden, Heinsius and Grotius, delved into the same line.

We are used to thinking that the hinge of epochal change that gave rise to the contemporary world was in relation to the birth and diffusion of experimental sciences, and Cartesian Rationalism (second half of the 17th century to the beginnings of the 18th). Nonetheless, some scholars (Anthony Grafton, Dirk van Miert, Henk Nellen, to name just a few) have recently pointed out the role that that loss of confidence in Scripture (the one developed in Nederland in the first half of the seventeenth century) played in the hinge of history.

Logically, particular and divergent interpretations of Scripture emerged, such as those of Arminius and Gomarus, the Remonstrants or the Mennonites, until the Reformed Church of Nederland reached an official text for its Bible: that of the General States.

Antonio Dávila’s book shows us that this process of questioning the Bible had already begun in 16th-century Humanism. The interest in going *ad fontes* to make a reliable edition of the Bible was early, both in the Roman-catholic field and in the Reformed churches.

This process of questioning and explanation survived until our days. I suppose, for instance, that all theological discussion between “historical Jesus” and the “Christ of Faith” had ultimately to do with that. Whatever it be, Montano’s Bible established its mark in the whole process, and one can say the same to the edition of Montano’s Apology by Dávila.