

PEDRO DE VALENCIA, FRANCISCO DE GURMENDI AND
THE *PLOMOS DE GRANADA*

GRACE MAGNIER
Trinity College, Dublin.

In March 1618,¹ when controversy about the authenticity of the *plomos de Granada* was at its height,² the Inquisition seized papers relating to the *plomos* from Pedro de Valencia (1555-1620), the highly esteemed *cronista real* of Philip III.³ It also confiscated papers from members of his circle and banned further discussion on the Granada artefacts.⁴ Don Pedro de Castro Cabeza de Vaca y Quiñones,

¹ The relics forger Cristóbal de Medina Conde gives the date as March 6th, as archived in the Abadía del Sacromonte: Medina Conde, C. de, *Informe a los Eruditos sobre la Oposición que hicieron a los Descubrimientos antiguos de Granada el famoso Antig^ro Pedro de Valencia y otros Literatos*, MS 1271 (fols 28^r-40^r), fols 35^r-35^v.

² In 1588, in Granada, the builders involved in the demolition of the minaret of the former mosque found a lead box amongst the rubble. This contained a manuscript, which claimed to be an apocalyptic prophecy of St. John the Evangelist. The minaret had been renamed torre Turpiana and the parchment became known as the *pergamino de la torre Turpiana*. Subsequently, engraved lead discs were found. They are described by the Morisco Jesuit, Ignacio de Las Casas: "Son todos estos libros de delicadas hojas de plomo redondas al tamaño de hostias no muy grandes": *Información de las láminas, libros y lo demás hallado en la la ciudad de Granada y cerca de ella el año de 1588 y dada a Nuestro Santíssimo P^r Paulo V por Ignacio de Las Casas, de la Compañía de IHS, en este año de 1607*, MS 7187, BNM (fols. 66^v-115^v), fol. 75^v. The four replicas of the *libros plúmbeos* on display in the Abadía del Sacromonte have diameters ranging from approximately 5cms to 9cms.

³ Gaspar Moroch Gayo has discovered that Valencia was both *cronista del reino* for Castile and *cronista general de Indias*. He was appointed *cronista de Indias* on 4 May 1607 and *cronista del reino* on 22 May of the same year: *Humanistas españoles: Pedro de Valencia*, V, *Relaciones de Indias*, I. *Nueva Granada y Virreinato de Perú. Estudios introductorios y notas históricas por Jesús Paniagua Pérez*, edición crítica por Francisco Javier y Jesús Fuente Fernández (León: Universidad de León, 1993), 44-57.

⁴ Medina Conde lists the others to be censured as Fray Alonso Remmón (or Remnón), Dr. Martín Berrotarán y Mendiola, Fr. Francisco de Borja, Francisco de Gurmendi, Dr. Luis Zapata and Valencia's brother-in-law, Juan Moreno Ramírez: Medina Conde, *Informe*, fol. 35^r. In volume IV, 2, of Valencia's *Obras completas* there are short biographies of each of those named above: *Humanistas españoles. Pedro de Valencia, Obras completas*, IV, 2. *Escritos políticos*, ed. R. González Canal & H. B. Riesco

Archbishop of Seville and formerly Archbishop of Granada, was a passionate defender of the veracity of the *plomos* and had instigated this drastic action. His authority to set in motion this course of events derived from the briefs of Clement VIII, particularly that of 15 January 1596 which forbade all further discussion on the *plomos*.⁵ This action taken by the Inquisition prompts two comments. The first is an obvious consequence of the seizure of these papers; which ones precisely were confiscated and where are they now (if they all still exist)? The second is to query why exactly the papers were deemed to be so dangerous that Castro invoked the briefs of Clement VIII, issued twenty-two years previously, to force the Inquisition to take them out of public circulation. Pedro de Valencia and his circle were not the first to criticize the *plomos* yet this was the first time that the censorship of the Inquisition had been imposed.⁶ Which papers of this circle had caused most controversy and what was their content?

Pedro de Valencia's *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada* and the *Libelo segundo* of Francisco de Gurmendi

The most controversial papers, it would seem, were those of Pedro de Valencia and Francisco de Gurmendi. Valencia's critique of the parchment and *plomos* of Granada, *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada*, was written at the behest of the Archbishop of Toledo and Inquisitor General, Don Bernardo de Sandoval y Rojas. There are three extant manuscripts, two of which are dated 26 de

Álvarez (León: Universidad de León, 1999), 319-332. The three most important members of the group were Valencia, Gurmendi and Mendiola.

⁵ “En virtud de requisitoria del Provisor del Yllmo S. D. Pedro de Castro, que lo era ya de Sevilla, y con comisión suya, y facultad concedida p. los Brebes de Clemente VIII privativamente a su Persona, se requirió con censuras a Fr. Alonso Remmón, a Pedro de Valencia, a el Dr Martín Berrotarán y Mendiola, al Pº Franº de Borja, a Franº de Gurmendi, al Dº Luis Zapata y a Juan Moreno Ramírez, para qº no hablasen en pro, ni en contra de los libros, como mandaba su Santº en los Brebes, lo que ofrecieron cumplir”: Medina Conde, *Informe*, 35^t.

⁶ In 1632 the Inquisition banned the following book on the *plomos* written by Adán Centurión, Marqués de Estepa: Centurión, A., *Informacion para la historia del Sacromonte llamado de Valparaiso y antigamente Illipulitano junto a Granada donde parecieron cenizas de S. Cecilio S. Thesiphon y S. Hiscio, discipulos del Apostol, unico patron de las Espanas, Santiago y otros santos discipulos dellos escritos en laminas de plomo* (Granada: Bartolomé de Lorenzana, 1632).

nobiembre de 1618; the third gives the same day and month but the year noted is 1607.⁷ Elsewhere I have argued that the critique was first written in 1607, when Pope Clement VIII was demanding that he be informed urgently about the parchment and *plomos* of Granada.⁸ Many years later, in 1616, this same document was probably that sent to Rome, where it caused great concern to Pope Paul V.⁹ The relics forger Cristóbal de Medina Conde mentions a *memorial* that Valencia and his circle wrote and intended to publish in 1618. He does not say if this critique was published but he claims that it was submitted to the Inquisitor General, Bernardo de Sandoval y Rojas on 26 November 1618, the date on two of the extant copies of Valencia's *Parecer*. Medina Conde calls this memorial *De Sacris Granatensis Cimelijs*, a title that is cited among Valencia's works in Nicolás Antonio's *Biblioteca hispana nova*, II.¹⁰ However, I have never come across a work of this title nor have the editors of the *Obras completas*. Perhaps it still lies in some archive of the Inquisition? Medina Conde insists that a *memoria* of this title "corre entre los eruditos" but perhaps his assertion is unreliable. After all the date 26 November 1618 is exactly the same as that on the resubmitted *Parecer* of 1607. Valencia may have wished to write another critique but pressure of time may not have allowed this. (Sandoval y Rojas was very ill at this time.) Or perhaps he contributed instead to Francisco de Gurmendi's *Libelo segundo*, which I describe below.

⁷ Valencia, P. de, *Para el ilustrísimo cardenal arçobispo de Toledo Don Bernardo de Rojas y Sandoual, mi señor. Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada*, MS 2316, BNM, fols. 1^r-30^r: MS 7187, BNM, fols 116^r-138^r and leg. VI, 2, fols 143^r-168^v, Archivo Secreto de Cuatro Llaves del Sacromonte (AS). Quotations are taken from my edition, which is based on MS 2316.

⁸ Magnier, G., «The Dating of Pedro de Valencia's *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada*», *Sharq al-Andalus*, 14-15 (1997-1998), 353-373.

⁹ Morocho Gayo, G., «Estudio introductorio del discurso *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada*: *Obras completas*», IV, 2, 325.

¹⁰ "Exasperado más y más [Clement VIII's brief that forbade discussion of the *plomos* had once again been imposed on Valencia and his circle] este Anticuario [Valencia] se determinó a formar un Memorial, criticando las Sagradas Reliquias, proponiendo contra ellas y el Pergamino y Libros varias dudas y dificultades; que es el Papel tan decantado de Pedro de Valencia que hoy corre entre los eruditos, aunque sin las respuestas que se le dieron. Habla del memorial D. Nicolás Antonio, *Bibliot^{ca} Nova*, tom. 2.^º pag. 200, con este título: *De sacris Granatensis Cimelijs*". Este memor^l y parecer lo dirixió y dio al Inquisidor Grál D. Bernardo de Roxas y Sandobal en 26 Nov.^e de 1618": Medina Conde, *Informe*, fol. 35^v.

Francisco de Gurmendi (d. 31 March 1621) composed two critiques or *libelos*.¹¹ He wrote the first during 1615, at the request of Philip III's confessor, Fray Luis de Aliaga OP. Gurmendi had not yet, at this time, joined the circle of Pedro de Valencia.¹² His *Libelo segundo* was written in 1617. Gurmendi was from Guipúzcoa and a nephew of Don Juan de Idiáquez (1540-1614), chairman of the Council of the Military Orders, member of the Council of State and former secretary of Philip II. Gurmendi had been appointed interpreter of Arabic to Philip III in 1615 on the death of the previous incumbent, the Morisco Alonso del Castillo.¹³ He had translated the first two Lead Books in 1615, the *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley* and *La essencia de Dios*, using transcripts that Archbishop Castro had sent to Philip II. He had found these among the papers of Don Juan de Idiáquez, when the latter died in 1614. The manuscript of the *Libelo segundo* from the Sacromonte archive claims that Gurmendi undertook this translation at the command of the king.¹⁴ Archbishop Castro responded to Gurmendi's translations by publishing two critical *memoriales* in defence of one of his own translators.¹⁵ The *Libelo*

¹¹ F. J. Fuente Fernández claims that Gurmendi died a violent death and cites as his source MS 9/2228, RAH, fol. 55^r: Fuente Fernández, F. J., «La Academia de Pedro de Valencia: Los intelectuales de su círculo (Madrid 1615-1620)», *Real Academia de Extremadura de las Letras y las Artes. El humanismo extremeño. 1^{as} Jornadas*, 1997, ed. Marqués de la Encomienda *et al.* (Trujillo: Real Academia de Extremadura de las Letras y las Artes, 1997), 163. Another member of the circle, Pedro de Valencia's brother-in-law, Juan Moreno Ramírez, who with Valencia had publicly defended Arias Montano's version of the *Paraphrasis chaldaica*, died from a knife in the back in July, 1624.

¹² Morocho Gayo, *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 324.

¹³ Alonso del Castillo is considered to have been one of the forgers of the *plomos*. Ironically, he was one of the first translators of the *pergamino de la torre Turpiana*. Dario Cabanelas has written a monographic study of his life: Cabanelas Rodríguez, D., *El morisco granadino Alonso del Castillo* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1965).

¹⁴ “El intérprete de V. Mag^d dice que el tradujo de aráigo en castellano por mandado de V. Mag^d unas láminas o libros de los q[ue] se hallaron en el monte de Valparáyo de Gra^{da} intitulados el uno libro de los fundam^{tos} de la ley y el otro de la essencia de Dios”: F. de Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, leg. VI, 2, AS, fol. 850^r. Medina Conde corroborates this statement indirectly: “[la dha versión errada] havía hecho el Gurmendi a solicitud del Confesor de S. M^d Fr. Luis de Aliaga, Religioso Dominico”: Medina Conde, *Informe*, fol. 35^r.

¹⁵ There are two printed pamphlets bound with Medina Conde's *Informe* in MS 1271, BNM. The first was written in response to an unnamed “Intérprete” [Gurmendi] and defends the translation of the first two Lead Books by an anonymous translator employed by Archbishop Castro. The *Libelo segundo* of Gurmendi is a response to the arguments of this pamphlet. The second pamphlet is an account of the discovery and contents

segundo is a response to Castro's *memorial*. Gurmendi was aware of his lack of theological background and so his linguistic critique is supplemented by a theological commentary by Fr. Martín Berrotarán de Mendiola SJ (Mendiola had also helped in the first *libelo*.) The *laminarios*, or those who believed in the authenticity of the *plomos*,¹⁶ delight in reviling Mendiola, as he had been expelled from the Jesuit Order for his refusal to accept the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.¹⁷ The *Libelo segundo* was written in May of 1617 and Gurmendi sent it to the king the following October. In May of this same year Fr. Luis de Aliaga had authorised the sending to Rome of Gurmendi's translation of the Lead Books *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley* and *La essencia de Dios*, with the theological notes of Mendiola. This was the first full and unadulterated translation of these books to be seen in Rome; indeed the first to be seen outside Granada.¹⁸ The Morisco Jesuit, Ignacio de Las Casas, had made copies and partial translations of these two books but he no longer had these when writing his *Información* for Pope Clement VIII in 1607;¹⁹ his notes had been taken from him by his Provincial and returned to Archbishop Castro.²⁰ On receiving Gurmendi's translation,

of the *pergamino* and *plomos* written for Pope Paul V. There seems to have been another apologetic pamphlet, which I have not found to date. These details confirm that the first pamphlet is probably one of the two *memoriales* printed for Castro between 1616 and 1617: MS 1271, fols 1^r-11^r.

¹⁶ This neologism is used by Gaspar Morocho Gayo in his Introduction to the edition of Valencias's *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada: Obras*, IV, 2, 169.

¹⁷ Medina Conde, *Informe*, 34^v.

¹⁸ According to the Kurdish Christian interpreter, Marcos Dovel, Castro only allowed the first two books, *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley* and *La essencia de Dios* to be translated: Valencia, *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 263. Versions that did not please the Archbishop were never made public: Valencia, *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 313. Castro had in the spring of 1595 entrusted Alonso del Castillo and Miguel de Luna with a translation of the first two books. Copies were sent to both Philip II and to Pope Clement VIII. Both had been altered, particularly that of the pope: Valencia, *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 264. Miguel de Luna is also considered to have among those who forged the *pergamino* and *plomos*.

¹⁹ “De los libros que yo vi y interpreté... diré solamente los que interpreté ad Verbum y de uno que solo copié en su forma”. He is aware that his memory may be faulty: “...que ay en estos libros aprobando la puríssima concepción de nra señora porque (si bien me acuerdo) por estas palabras... tiene otras difficultades como es una comparación que pone en la processión de las divinas personas y otra de la parte de la cabeza comparándolas a la iglesia que ay que notar en ellas, como noté, cuando tenía el original y aora por hablar solo de memoria, no puedo”: Las Casas, *Información*, fol. 86^v.

²⁰ Benítez Sánchez-Blanco, R., «De Pablo a Saulo: Traducción, crítica y denuncia de los libros plúmbeos por el P. Ignacio de las Casas, SJ.», *Al-Qantara*, XXII, 2 (2002), 420. Las

Clement's VIII's successor, Pope Paul V, requested that Sandoval y Rojas give the matter due consideration and also asked for the opinions of Pedro de Valencia.²¹

Ideological Backgrounds of Pedro de Valencia and of Francisco Gurmendi

Before looking again at the critiques of Valencia and Gurmendi I shall attempt to sketch their individual ideological backgrounds to try to understand why they were both so insistent in their condemnation of the *plomos*, why the brief of Clement VIII had to be imposed twice, as Valencia and his group ignored the first one,²² and why, after the confiscation of their papers by the Inquisition, Valencia and Gurmendi continued their public challenge to the authenticity of the *plomos*, even when their opposition brought them both much open hostility at court. The following letter was sent to Archbishop Castro on 6 February 1618 by Don Francisco de Barahona: "Bien veo quan poco fundamento tienen lo [sic] que oponen; mas mi cuidado mayor es del efecto que esto que dicen tal y cual hacen en los pechos de los que lo oyen y no cuidara de otra satisfacción ni examen. *Muy grande es el alboroto que ay sobre el caso*".²³

Casas's most detailed critique of the *plomos* was the *Información* cited above in note 2. It is a description of the parchment and *plomos* and a general critique of their contents.

²¹ "Hecha por Gurmendi la versión de los dos Libros, y puestos unos escolios y notas el D^r Mendiola, formaron un Libelo que presentaron a el Consejo Real, y al de la Ynqqⁿ delatando todo el Hallazgo de Granada. Lo mismo hicieron en la Suprema de Roma y a la Sant^d de Paulo 5. Lo que motivó que este Pontífice mandare por Brebe especial a el Cardinal Ynquisidor Gräl. Arzpō D. Bernardo de Roxas que reconociese esta material con la gravedad que ella pedía y que le sugiriese entonces varias especies Valencia, cuio dictamen era siempre mui apreciable, como tan docto": Medina Conde, *Informe*, fol. 34^v.

²² In spite of a letter written on 16 February 1618, in which he agreed to comply with Clement VIII's briefs, Valencia later continued to oppose the *plomos*: "Sentido Valencia de esta notificación, se reunió con Mendiola y Gurmendi, y resolvieron estos dos últimos, a su nombre, dar memorial segundo a el Consejo y imprimirlo. Executado lo vno, sabiendo el Consejo, querian imprimir el Memorial dado (como le representó D. Fran^{co} Baraona a nombre del Cavildo del Sacro Monte) acordó el Consejo se pasase oficio a el de Ynquisición, y por esto se mandó recoger el Memorial, los papeles de los coligados, y se los impuso otra vez [los breves], y mandó observar silencio en el punto en 6 de marzo de 1618: fue la notificación a los dos Gurmendi y Mendiola, y también a el Arzpō de Monte Líbano, mezclado entonces en esto, y también a Pedro de Valencia": Medina Conde, *Informe*, fol. 35^v.

²³ D. Francisco de Barahona, a canon of the Abadía del Sacromonte, wrote this in a letter to Archbishop Castro, dated 6 February 1618. Barahona and another canon called

Gurmendi's *Doctrina phisica y moral de Principes*

Francisco de Gurmendi published an *espejo de principes* in 1615, which he dedicated to the Duke of Lerma.²⁴ The full title of *Doctrina phisica y moral de Principes. Traducido de arabigo en Castellano por Francisco de Gurmendi* prompted José Antonio Maravall to wonder if the claim of being a translation may have been a fiction such as that used by the Morisco Miguel de Luna in his *Historia verdadera del rey don Rodrigo*, and which Cervantes parodies in the *Quijote*.²⁵ Whether or not it was a translation, Gaspar Morocho Gayo comments on the carelessness of the presentation, as very few sources are given for the philosophical sayings.²⁶ My concern is not to argue for or against Gurmendi's ability as an Arabist; rather my interest lies in its content and Gurmendi's choice of subject matter. The topics developed by Gurmendi do not continue the tone of flattery of the "Dedicatoria" rather they reveal a philosophy that reflects some of the preoccupations of the *cronista del reino*.

The *Doctrina phisica* is divided into two parts; the first sets out general philosophical principles and the second is an application of these principles to kingship and government. The book is more concerned to extol general spiritual virtues than to offer pragmatic political guidelines. The most frequently cited source is "la sabia Hind" and the second is an unnamed "el poeta". Such sources are in contrast to the many mirrors of princes of early modern Spain inspired by his-

D. Antonio Tavares, were in Madrid to represent Castro's interests. Barahona acted as the Archbishop's agent at court: AS, leg. VII, fol. 920^r. The emphasis is mine.

²⁴ Gaspar Morocho Gayo, in the *Obras completas* of Pedro de Valencia considered that Gurmendi wrote the book to advance his career in the public service. There is some flattery of the *valido* in the dedication, which perhaps supports this view. Gurmendi states that the Duke of Lerma has embodied in his life the qualities described in the book: "...[el duque de Lerma es] dueño de la material en que ha resplandezido siempre con tanto fruto y aum^{to} de toda la Christiandad y Monarquía del Rey Philipo III": Gurmendi, F., *Doctrina phisica y moral de principes*, "Dedicatoria".

²⁵ Harvey, L. P., *The Moriscos and Don Quixote: Inaugural Lecture in the Cervantes Chair of Spanish of London's King's College 11 November 1974* (London: King's College, 1975), 7-8.

²⁶ Morocho Gayo, G., *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 319-320. The following sources are acknowledged: "la sabia Hind", fols 3^v, 55^v, 123^r, 130^r, 137^v, 150^r etc.; "Calid bin Safuan", fol. 75^v; "Ebu el Atahiya, rey Arabe", fol. 83^v; "Mahamed bin Caab el Curdi", fol. 82^v; "Enuxiruan, King of Persia", fol. 108^v; Plato 130^r; 151^v; "King Ali bin Ebi Taleb", 77^r. All of them are well known authorities quoted in the Islamic tradition of "Mirror of Princes".

torians such as Tacitus.²⁷ There are many references to the supremacy of reason over the passions and the importance of an open-minded intelligence.²⁸ Ignorant people jump to conclusions without careful consideration of the facts: “El contrario de la sciencia: es la anticipada experiencia della, dexando de estudiarla antes de saberla”.²⁹ The following passage from the *Doctrina phisica* echoes the one quoted below from Valencia’s *Parecer*. Gurmendi writes that it is important to consider ones words carefully before articulating them: “Sería muy acertado...que callássemos mientras no sabemos, y que no obrássemos hasta que supiésemos”.³⁰

Valencia had used similar arguments when he agreed with reluctance to write his critique in 1607, as he knew that Archbishop Castro and the city of Granada had prejudged the outcome uncritically:

Yo lo he rehusado hasta aora por hauer hechado de ver luego...que la piedad de la causa y la consideración que an hecho el Sr. Arçobispo y la Ciudad de Granada, como de propia onrra i interés grande, an llevado tras sí el vulgo...y an anticipado el juiçio. Esto es han hecho praejudicio sin esperar conocimiento de causa y el egsamen que tan graue material requería.³¹

Chapter 12, Part I, of the *Doctrina phisica* is called “De la importancia del conocimiento de nosotros mismos”. Here the cultivation of the spirit is given precedence over the adornment of the body: “Indigna cosa es que pongamos tanto cuidado y diligencia en las cosas exteriores y que componen el adorno de nuestro cuerpo, y que faltemos a la guarda de aquello en que consiste la excelencia y esséncia de nuestra alma”.³²

Valencia, in Part II of his *Parecer*, had criticised the carnivalesque processions and festivities that took place in Granada in celebration of the *plomos* and “relics”. Such outward celebrations were a travesty of true religion:

Astuçia antigua a sido ésta del enemigo de la gloria de Dios acometer y ganar primero a la Eua,³³ la parte más flaca y blanda de la república, y persuadir al bul-

²⁷ Maravall, J. A., «La corriente doctrinal del tacitismo en España», *Cuadernos Hispano-Americanos*, CCXXXVIII-CCXL (1969), 84-91.

²⁸ Gurmendi, *Doctrina phisica*, fols 44^r; 105^v; 111^r; 132^r.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 9^r.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, fol. 10^v.

³¹ Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 6^v-7^r.

³² Gurmendi, *Doctrina phisica*, fol. 34^v.

³³ For Valencia Eva stands for the senses and the passions. When the senses are not

go ignorante de vn culto como que sea religioso. Porque, persuadido éste, lleva tras sí (o los sigue quando preceden), a los poderosos cuyo consejo de estado es, agradar a los más, a la turba vulgar cuya condición y de todos los descuidados de la virtud, y verdadero culto de Dios, suele ser lisongearle, y quererle satisfaçer con exterioridades y culto de los labios³⁴.

Both Valencia and Gurmendi shared also a sceptical, dry wit.³⁵ Valencia, as a biblical scholar and humanist, insisted that rigorous critical methods be used; if the *plomos* were authentic texts they could stand up to this scrutiny: “Las causas de Dios nunca tienen flaqueça, no se les hace onrra en juzgarlas y apruarlas sin egsamen, y como sentençiarlas en fauor. Por fauor, antes les conuiene el rigor, el fuego y la resistençia para que luzguen y se manifiesten sus quilates y sus filos”.³⁶

Archbishop Castro’s *memorialista* had constantly cited from scripture in support of his arguments. Gurmendi in his *Libelo segundo* argued that heretics often used scripture to support their arguments: “Además no es nueblo el tomar los herejes lugares de la sagrada escritura y hablar con ellos p^a explicar y aun para prouar sus locuras”.³⁷ Valencia went ever further when he linked the mixture of truth and falsehood found in the *plomos* with demonic guile: “Cíerto es que el Demonio, fingiéndose ángel de luz, y viniendo a engañar, que no ha de mostrar luego las huñas y los cuernos”.³⁸

guided by the light of reason then they can be taken in by appearances: Valencia, P. de, *Discurso sobre materias del Consejo de Estado dirigido a una persona que le pidió dictamen*, MS 11160, BNM, fols 32v-33r.

³⁴ Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 7^r-7^v.

³⁵ “Dícen...que lo que el pergamino y las láminas contienen, es lo cierto. Y que ellos convencen de falsedad a todas las historias y escritores. Es lo que respondió vn sacristan a vn Obispo que le reprehendía porque traía mal rexido el relox y lo convençia con el sol. ‘Mire el sol como anda, que mi relox bien regido está’” (my emphasis); “Dícenme... que al apóstol, cuya diçen ser la profecía, se llama San Juan, escriuiéndolo con letras aráuigas con este mismo sonido y lenguaje castellano que es muy diferente de como suena el nombre de aquel santo en arábigo. Ello no se puede negar sino que el que escriuió el pergamino saúia hablar castellano como se habla oí. Resta que los assertores prueuan con semejante certeza que se hablaua así en tiempo de Nerón, o que se vayan a milagro y reuelación, que es con lo que todo se salua”. (My emphasis): Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 26^v, 21^v-22^r. “...dize el intérprete ...que consulte los diccionarios arábigos o a los peritos de la dha lengua y hallará que el intérprete dize tanta verdad como el que dixerá [? the MS is almost illegible here] que significa Dominus, al señor. A lo qual puede responder al author del dho papel dado por el Arzobispo de Seu^a lo que respondiera un ciego si le mandaran q[ue] juzgase de colores” (my emphasis): Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fol. 856^v.

³⁶ Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fol. 8^r.

³⁷ Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fol. 867^v.

³⁸ Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fol. 24^v.

Pedro de Valencia and Francisco de Gurmendi

Pedro de Valencia and Francisco de Gurmendi wrote their critiques of the content of the *plomos* at the behest of the two most powerful churchmen at court: the Inquisitor General and Primate of Spain, Don Bernardo de Sandoval y Rojas, and Philip III's chaplain, Fray Luis de Aliaga. Both Valencia and Gurmendi had been singled out because of their intellectual ability. Valencia had been *cronista real* for just a few months when he reluctantly accepted the task of reviewing the *plomos* for the first time.³⁹ He realized that the issue had been prejudged uncritically in Granada and that those who found fault with the *plomos* would be accused of impiety. His critique *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada* of 1607 was written before the acrimonious feelings of the *laminarios* had reached their height. By 1618 Sandoval y Rojas had come to accept the *plomos* as genuine scriptural texts but was too ill to take an active part in the controversy. He died on 7 December 1618, just eleven days after the date on Valencia's *Parecer*.

Pedro de Valencia's *Parecer* is divided into two parts. In the first he gives a summary of the critiques of Benito Arias Montano and of Juan Bautista Pérez, Bishop of Segorbe. Arias Montano confined himself to criticising major historical inaccuracies and anachronisms, showed how the parchment had been doctored to make it appear old and that the text of the *pergamino* embodied theological concepts that did not belong to Apostolic times.⁴⁰ Segorbe's critique is that of an antiquarian and ecclesiastical historian. Valencia probably had the texts of Arias Montano and Segorbe before him as he wrote, because the order of his critique follows that of the original texts.

Part II of the *Parecer* contains Valencia's own criticisms. His most conclusive arguments are those of a biblical scholar and theologian. However, he also uses commonsensical reasons to highlight the implausible circumstances in which the Lead Books were "discov-

³⁹ Valencia had been appointed in May. A letter of the Duke of Lerma, dated 28 October 1607, requested that Sandoval y Rojas set up a commission of enquiry into the *plomos*. This commission met for the first time in December: Hagerty, M. J., *Los libros plúmbeos del Sacromonte* (Madrid: Nacional, 1980), 43. Valencia, then, had just over a month to compose his critique.

⁴⁰ "Que el nombre Trinidad y esencia, que se pone en el título de vn libro, y llamar tercera persona al Espíritu Santo son del lenguaje escólastico posterior a aquellos tiempos": Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fol. 2^v.

ered” and to show that such lead discs would have deteriorated rapidly when buried underground.⁴¹

Francisco de Gurmendi’s interest in the *plomos* seemed to stem from his translation of the first two of the Lead Books. His ability as a translator was much reviled by the *laminarios*: “Y diciendo el [Gurmendi] que es intérprete no haze esse officio sino de calumniador imprudentíssimo [...] Franº Gurmendi es incapaz y no idóneo para interpretar ni entender estos libros”.⁴²

Yet Gurmendi’s teacher, Marcos Dovel had a very high opinion of his pupil:⁴³ “Vn hombre inteligente en la lengua árabe y traduxo las láminas, que se hallaron en el Monte Valparaíso, que la vna se intitula: *Libro de los fundamentos y reglas de la ley*, y la otra *De essentia Dei*. Que parece inuención de moriscos”.⁴⁴ Perhaps Juan Bautista Hesronita, so-called Archbishop of Monte Líbano, helped

⁴¹ “Porque la caxa [which contained the *pergamino de la torre Turpiana*] no se descubrió en el muro de la torre, yéndola derriando, sino quando se derribaua lo alto de ella, se halló en lo derribado...Pasaron casi siete años, en los quales el autor tubo tiempo para pensar, y traçar confirmación de su hecho, y proseguir a mayores cosas...y escritos de espacio sus libros y láminas, y sepultado todo para que se envegeçiese y carcomiese...quando le pareció tiempo dio memoria a dos hombres como que la hauía traído de África, [y] de que en aquella parte hauía tesoro. Pusieronse a cauar, y en descubriendose la primera lámina, fue tanta la gente que concurrió, y el alboroto y gusto de hallar, que cada vno pudiera llevar en la faldriquera su libro y lámina y salir súbito dando boces, o que ‘Me lo hallé aquí’”: Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 28^r-28^v. “...he oido decir que algunos hombres particulares, a sus solas, hallaron algunos de estos libros y los ofrecieron al Sr. Arzobispo pidiendo premio por ellos...también sé por relación cierta, que tres de estos libros se hallaron no dentro en el monte, yendo cauando, sino que después en la tierra, y [en] piedras que se auían sacado fuera”: Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fol. 27^v. “...a las láminas les repugna toda verisimilitud y toda la historia y la misma naturaleza, la qual en muy menos años corrompe y consume el plomo en la humedad y deuajo de tierra y lo buelue en albayalde. Pruébese a poner una lámina semejante deuajo de tierra siquiera diez años y veráse quanto se envejece y deshaçe”: Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 25^v-26^r.

⁴² *Memorial contra Gurmendi en el Consejo*, 20 de febrero de 1618: AS, leg. VII, 1, fol. 940^r.

⁴³ Dovel had been a translator of both Clement VIII and Paul V. The latter sent him to Spain to examine the *plomos*. However, Archbishop Castro was not pleased with his translation of the first two Lead Books and refused to pay him. There is a copy of the *Discurso que Dovel hiço sobre las Láminas* in the public library in Toledo. There is a description of this paper and of his critique *Nueuo descubrimiento de la falsoedad del metal* in the following article: Cotto Andino, M., «Los manuscritos árabes y aljamiados de la Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha», *Tulaytula* (Revista de la Asociación de Amigos del Toledo Islámico), IX, 2 (2002). Dovel’s Introduction to the book *Nueuo descubrimiento de la falsoedad del metal, libello de Marco Dobelio, turco de nacion 1638* is in the Sacromonte archive, fols 199^r-270^v.

⁴⁴ *Obras completas*, IV, 2, 327.

him to write the critique? Gurmendi was aware of his limitations as an Arabist and makes constant references to the skill of Monte Líbano. He also recommends Marcos Dovel.⁴⁵

The king, Philip III, had such confidence in Gurmendi's ability as an interpreter that he entrusted to him the cataloguing of the newly acquired library of Muley Zidan, Sultan of Morroco, which had been requisitioned in 1611 in the port of Mamora by part of the royal navy under Don Rodrigo de Silva, Comendador de Martos.⁴⁶ Philip III's letter to the Prior of El Escorial, dated 7 May 1614, demands that Gurmendi, "mi criado, que me sirve en la traducción y interpretación de las lenguas Arábiga, Turquesca y Persiana" be given every facility in this task. Gurmendi had already sorted the books and found there to be almost four thousand.⁴⁷ This library served as the source for the *Doctrina phisica* and for the *Libelo segundo*.

The first section of the *Libelo segundo*, in which Gurmendi uses linguistic arguments to prove that the *plomos* are not Apostolic, shows an awareness of different registers in Arabic. He states that interspersed in the modern Arabic of the text are direct quotations from the *Qur'ān*, whose more refined style stands out against the unpolished prose of its context:⁴⁸

El árabe perfecto sembrado por los libros son cláusulas trasladadas del Alcorán de Mahoma y en otras partes las mismas sent[encijas] del dho Alcorán son casi las mismas palabras mudando qual o qual nombre comprobando con ellas la doctrina q[ue] ba escribiendo con tal destreza como si fuera prosa propia suya [...] pero como el estilo suyo es tan bárbaro sale el lenguaje del Alcorán como lo blanco sobre lo negro.

⁴⁵ "...todos aquellos que hicieren las partes de los libros del monte de Valparayso de Gran^{da} se remitan a los que supieren las dhas lenguas: de los cuales ay agora en españā gente doctíssima quales son el arzobispo del Monte Líuano, Religioso de la orden de S^{to} Domingo, residente al presente en esta corte nacido y criado en la Subia [Suria] y predicador euangélico con autoridad del Papa Paulo 5 en la dha lengua aráuiga, en la qual fue intérprete de su S^d de Clemente 8. Marcos Obelio el qual fue también intérprete de su S^d y éstos dicen assimismo ser language morisco el del los dhos libros usado de poco tiempo acá": Gurmendi, F. de, *Libelo segundo*, AS, leg. VI, 2, fol. 853^r.

⁴⁶ *Diccionario de Historia de España*, II (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1969), 1155-6.

⁴⁷ Pérez Pastor, C., *Bibliografía madrileña*, II (Madrid: RBAM, 1906), 332-333.

⁴⁸ There is a lists of the passages that Gurmendi considers to be from the *Qur'ān* in the Archive of the Sacromonte: "Las cláusulas que el intérprete dice son del alcorán": AS, leg. VI, 2, fols, 126^r-128^v.

He also points out grammatical solecisms:

...si se siguiera la versión de la p^{te} del Arzobispo de Seu^a auía de decir: “no ay otro Dios sino Dios, ungido espíritu de Dios” a causa de q[ue] la palabra q[ue] ellos quieren que aya en estos libros con propiedad significa ungido. Síruase pues aora V. M. de uer quan mal suena en nuestro castellano el dezir: “No ay otro Dios sino Dios vngido espíritu de Dios” si no es que al participio vngido se le añada el artículo “el”, pues mucha mayor dissonancia haze en la lengua Aráuiga el dezir lo que ellos quieren que diga la dha abreviatura sin que se le ponga el dho artículo “el” de tal manera que viene a ser un enorme solecismo en Grámatica.⁴⁹

The context for this critique is Gurmendi's insistence that the final sentence of *De essentia Dei* is the *šahāda*, or the Islamic profession of faith, which Gurmendi translated thus: “No ay otro Dios que Dios y Mahoma embaxador de Dios”. Castro's *memorial* insists that the Arabic characters are an abbreviated form of “Christo IESVS”. The author claims: “Abreuió el nombre. Puso sola la primera letra del, que es ﴿ (M [mim]) Asi lo vsan los Arabes ﴾ Mesias, Vnctus”.⁵⁰ As *Vnctus*, the Anointed one or the Messiah can refer to Christ the *memorial* translates the statement as: “No ay Dios sino Dios Christo IESVS testigo de Dios”.⁵¹ The Arabic letters mim [M] and ra [R] are used more than once in the *plomos*. In abbreviated form they are ambiguous as they can mean either *Muhammad Rasūl* (Muhammad is the messenger), or else *Masīḥ Rūh* (the Messiah is the Spirit (of God)). So, in a way, both the *memorialista* and Gurmendi are correct yet neither admits this possibility. This ambiguity may have been intended by the author(s) in the same way as the translation of purification is, as described in the following paragraph.⁵² Here and elsewhere the *memorialista* is at pains to justify his arguments by giving unsubstan-

⁴⁹ Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fol. 851^r.

⁵⁰ Anon., *Memorial*, fol. E1^r.

⁵¹ Anon., *Memorial*, fol. F1^r. As M. J. Hagerty pointed out in his edition of the *plúmbeos*, Estepa mistranslated *rūh Allāh*, “espíritu de Dios” as “Verbo Encarnado”. Pedro de Valencia's arguments on the existence of the *šahāda* in the *plomos* is lucid and well-informed: “Entera su fórmula diçe a la letra ‘No Dios sino Dios y Mahoma embiado de Dios’. La que se halla en estos libros dice ‘No Dios sino Dios y Jesús, espíritu de Dios’. Toda la qual también se compadece con la doctrina del Alcorán. Porque Mahoma loa y celebra mucho a Jesu Christo pero niégale que sea Dios, ni hijo de Dios, sino fue *ruhu*, espíritu, huelgo, o resuello de Dios”: Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 21^v-22^r.

⁵² Many thanks to Professor L. P. Harvey for this interpretation.

tiated scriptural precedents. Valencia, the biblical scholar rejects such lack of scholarly rigour.⁵³

Castro's *memorial* summarises the arguments of Gurmendi's first *Libelo*: "Dize que estos libros mandan hacer el guadoc de los Moros: que celebran la victoria de Mahoma en Meca: que expressamente niegan el mysterio de la Sanctissima Trinidad".⁵⁴ The *Libelo segundo* answers these accusations in turn. Gurmendi answers the first point, when refuting the antiquity of the *plomos*, by pointing out that the language is modern and like that used by Moriscos of about sixty years previously. For example in the passage of Castro's *memorial* that purports to find a description of the sacrament of baptism in the *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley* the word for cleansing used is the verb *tahhara*, which Gurmendi claims is that used by the Moriscos to describe the *guado* or *guadox*, the Morisco rite of purification;⁵⁵ the word used in Classical Arabic for Christian baptism is *ta'ammada*.⁵⁶ Of course, as Professor L. P. Harvey pointed out in his doctoral thesis, "The Literary Culture of the Moriscos", the Christian Arabic terminology used in the *plomos* is *sui generis*; words that would usually have an Islamic connotation are used with a Christian sense. Indeed perhaps this deviation from Christian Maronite usage may have been intentional if what the forgers wanted to do was provide evidence of the use of Arabic for Christian purposes that went back to apostolic times.⁵⁷ It is interesting to compare Gurmendi's translation of this

⁵³ "La doctrina en sí ¿qué nota o señal tiene para ser conocida por rebelada y diferenciarse de la que no lo es? Porque ser muy buena y pía no basta": Valencia, *Parecer*, fol. 25^r.

⁵⁴ Anon., *Memorial*, fol. F1^v.

⁵⁵ For a description of the *guado* or *guadox* see Boronat y Barrachina, P., *Los moriscos españoles y su expulsión*, I (Valencia: F. Vives y Mora, 1901), 509 and García-Arenal, M., *Los moriscos*, Madrid, 1975, 90.

⁵⁶ "Responde también el autor [of Castro's *memorial*] que el purificarse tocado arriba significa luarirse de los peccados con la gracia sacramental del Bautismo. Lo qual deuió de responder no tanto por ser ignorante de la lengua Aráuiga como por no querer aduertir que purificarse con el bautismo se llama en Arábigo *te ammede* [*ta'ammada*] pero la palabra original *tahare* [*tahara*] significa purificarse con el guadoc...por huir Mahoma de la purificación Christiana se apruechó del verbo *tahare* que está en estos libros el qual de ninguna manera significa la purificación con la gracia sacramental del Baptismo como se demuestra de [sic] todos los diccionarios Árabes pero si quisiesen autoridad de persona consulten al Arzobispo de Monte Líbano y a otra qualquiera libre de pasión y echarán de ver que no les pretende engañar el dho intérprete [Gurmendi] antes quitarles uno de los mayores engaños que a auido en la Ig^{la} después que se fundó": Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fols 855^v-856^r.

passage with the later one of Adán Centurión, Marqués of Estepa (1632).⁵⁸ Gurmendi translates thus: "Mandó a los Apóstoles... que el que se purificase con el agua creyese y hiciese buenas obras sería bienauenturado".⁵⁹ Estepa, in his translation, refers directly to the sacrament of baptism: "Y el que fuere bautizado con agua y creyere y obrare justamente será salvo".⁶⁰

The *memorialista*'s second argument goes thus: "En otra parte traduce el Intérprete. *Embió Dios al mundo los Prophetas por nuncios de la buena nueua de la expugnación, y Victoria...*[dice que] lo hace Mahometano y dize, *que trata de la victoria, que Mahoma tuuo en Meca...*la Victoria de que hablan los libros, es la de la Cruz: *Triumpho de Christo en la Cruz contra el Demonio, y contra la muerte, y contra el pecado, y la redempcion de las almas...*".⁶¹ Gurmendi's argument is linguistic: "...toda la fuerza de la objeción depende de saber la rigor de la significación deste vocablo *Fetaha* la qual palabra exponiéndola los intérpretes del Alcorán...dizen que significa la dha victoria".⁶²

The third accusation of the *memorialista* concerns the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Gurmendi found evidence in the *plomos* of Arianism and Nestorianism. The passage concerned comes in the *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley* which Gurmendi translates thus: "El padre miró en el espejo y con la luz santa spiritual apareció el hijo en el espejo. El padre es la prim^a persona y el hijo es la segunda persona y el spírito santo la tercera persona tres personas en una esencia. Fue pues María el espejo y no vio [sic] hombre su auxilio".⁶³ The critique of this passage by

⁵⁷ Harvey, L. P., «The Literary Culture of the Moriscos. A Study based on the Extant MSS in Arabic and Aljamía (1492-1609)» (Oxford: Unpublished D.Phil Thesis, 1958).

⁵⁸ Estepa's translations are included in the book cited above, in footnote 6. The translations have been edited by M. J. Hagerty.

⁵⁹ Gurmendi, F. de, *Version. Libro de los fundamentos y reglas de la ley por Tesión Aben Atar Discípulo de Jacobo Apostol*, fol. 809^r. In the corner of the MS is the following note: "Este es el libelo que D. Fran^{co} Gurmendi dio a el Rey a principio del año de 1616". A copy was sent to Castro in March of the same year.

⁶⁰ Hagerty, *Libros plúmbeos*, 65.

⁶¹ Anon., *Memorial*, fol. F2^r. The *memorialista*, here and elsewhere, uses a phrase from the *plomos* as starting point for an uncritical and unwarranted exposé of Catholic doctrine.

⁶² Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fol. 856^r. Sūra 48 of the Qur'ān is called *Al-fath*, The Victory, and the interpretation of Gurmendi is implied, especially in verse 27: *The Bounteous Koran*, Trans. Dr. M. M. Khalid (London: MacMillan, 1986), 678-684. My thanks to Dr David Morray of the Department of Near Eastern Languages, University College Dublin, for this information and for that on translations of purification.

⁶³ Gurmendi, *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley*, fol. 810^r.

Gurmendi and Mendiola comes in Part II of the *Libelo segundo*: “Y ansí añadió el author del dho libro “Pues María fue el espejo” con que manifestam^e declaró...o que la Reyna de los Ángeles era *quo eterna* con el Padre eterno en su ser actual o que la segunda persona de la ss^{ma} Trinidad no tiene ser coeterno al Padre sino solo temporal rezebido en las entrañas de la Reyna de los Ángeles a la qual llamó el espejo...con lo qual no solamente sembraba la doctrina Nestoriana sino también la de Arrio”.⁶⁴ In Part I of the *Libelo segundo* Gurmendi had used linguistic arguments against those of the *memorialista* on this topic. He is replying to another *memorial* which I have not read so can only give one side of the argument: “Que en el segundo lugar aya de dezir pues “María”, y no “encumbrado espejo” lo prueba el dho intérprete claram^e. Lo primero porque Miriamo en toda la lengua Arábiga no tiene otra significación que María. Y porque esto conste aun a los no peritos en la lengua, pone el intérprete el segundo argumento. En la lengua Árabiga ay verbos Femininos y Masculinos los quales en buena gramática también se juntan con nombres Masculinos o Femininos... el verbo “fue” puesto en el original es femenino luego es necesario que la persona que haze sea de género femenino. Y así sera María y no espejo”.

Part of Pedro de Valencia’s arguments on Trinitarian doctrine have already been discussed.⁶⁵ He argues that some of the ideas are acceptable from the point of view of logic but form no part of the Catholic tradition.⁶⁶ He also notes the adulterated quotation from the opening of the Gospel of St. John in the *pergamino*: “...en el pergamino traducido en arábigo faltan algunas palabras que perteneçen a la confesión de la diuinidad de Christo”⁶⁷.

⁶⁴ Gurmendi, *Libelo segundo*, fol. 860v. Arius denied the divinity of Christ. Nestorius had argued against the use of the term *Theotokos*, “the one who gave birth to God”, which was used by the Greek fathers to refer to Mary, because he believed that the term implied that Mary, a human being, had given birth to God. He proposed instead the term *Christotokos* and this was upheld at the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451): *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. F. L. Cross & E. A. Livingstone, Oxford, 1997, 1608.

⁶⁵ See note 51.

⁶⁶ Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 22r-22v.

⁶⁷ Valencia also corrects the mistranslation, in the *pergamino*, of the Latin “unigeniti” into Arabic as “servants” (nominative plural) rather than “of his only son” (genitive singular): “I vimos su gloria, así que somos criados del padre” [“Y hemos visto su gloria, gloria como de Unigénito del Padre”]: (Jn 1, 14)]; Valencia, *Pergamino y láminas*, fols 23v-24r. The translation in the Pergamino, in suggesting textual corruption, is in the tradition of *tahrif*, the Islamic claim that the Christian and Jewish scriptures have been falsified, deliberately or unintentionally.

Conclusion

The opposition of Pedro de Valencia and Francisco de Gurmendi to the *plomos* of Granada stemmed from their personal convictions. With rational and well thought out arguments they tried to combat a superstitious, overly emotional form of Christianity that accepted religious forgeries uncritically. Archbishop Castro's *memorialista* embodies such attitudes in his pamphlet: prejudice is very evident in the insistence that the translation by Gurmendi of the Arabic letters mim [M] and ra [R] as "Mahoma Embaxador" is instead an abbreviation of "Christo IESVS"; his constant appeal to authority is in sharp contrast to the thoughtful and rational arguments of Valencia and Gurmendi. Their critiques led to controversial public discussion among the "eruditos" mentioned by Medina Conde; Pope Paul V also requested further information from the *cronista del reino*. Both men would appear to have suffered for their convictions. Valencia had enjoyed good health all his life but seems to have undergone stress during his last year, and this may have precipitated his death.⁶⁸ Gurmendi's translations were still making waves in 1620 as a Maronite priest wrote an attack on his translation of *Libro de los fundamentos de la ley*.⁶⁹ It seems too much of a coincidence that two members of Pedro de Valencia's circle, Francisco de Gurmendi and Juan Moreno Ramírez, should die violently. The unsolved mystery of their deaths and the disappearance of some of the papers of Valencia and his circle give the events of 1618 the characteristics of a tantalisingly unsolved detective story that a researcher is loathe to set aside.

⁶⁸ "Vivió sesenta y cuatro años con mui buena salud, hasta un año antes que muriese, que se fue enflaqueciendo i melancolizando de manera que passava con desconsuelo i desaliento, que fue creciendo hasta que murió": Anon., *Vida de Pedro de Valencia*, MS 5781, BNM, fol 136v. Valencia had during his last years been fighting on two fronts; as well as writing against the *plomos* he had, with Juan Moreno Ramírez, been defending Arias Montano's *Biblia regia* against the attacks of Fr. Andrés de León: Jones, J. A., «Censuras acerca de la impresión de la *Paraphrasis chaldaica* de Andrés de León: un aspecto de la amistad entre Benito Arias Montano y Pedro de Valencia», *Homenaje a Pedro Sainz Rodríguez*, I: *Repertorios, textos y comentarios* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1986), 339-348. Gaspar Morocho Gayo argues that the two controversies were linked: *Valencia, Relaciones de Indias*, I, 53.

⁶⁹ "Está aquí la traducción hecha por Sergio Sciadensi, maronita sacerdote, y la corrección de Gurmendi", 2 de octubre de 1620, leg. VI, 1, AS, fols 1122r-1126r. Sciadensi states that Gurmendi "minime intelexit".

ABSTRACT

The Inquisition in 1618 seized all the papers of Pedro de Valencia, renowned humanist, biblical scholar and chronicler of Philip III. The papers of other members of his circle were also confiscated. In this article I examine the two most important texts: *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada* of Valencia and a *Libelo segundo* of Francisco de Gurmendi, interpreter of Oriental languages for Philip III. The article is structured around Gurmendi's response to a *memorial* published in 1617 by Archbishop Pedro de Castro in defence of one of his translators. Gurmendi, working from his translation of the first two Lead Books, shows how these contain heretical ideas on the Trinity and how the *memorialista* has mistranslated many passages.

RESUMEN

En 1618 la Inquisición confiscó todos los papeles de Pedro de Valencia, humanista insigne, exégeta bíblico y cronista del reino y de las Indias de Felipe III. También confiscó los papeles de otros miembros de su círculo. En este artículo examino los dos textos más importantes: *Sobre el pergamino y láminas de Granada* de Valencia y un *Libelo segundo* de Francisco de Gurmendi, intérprete en lenguas orientales del rey. El artículo se centra en la respuesta de Gurmendi a un memorial del Arzobispo Pedro de Castro en el que se defiende a uno de sus traductores. Partiendo de su traducción de los dos primeros libros plumbagos, Gurmendi muestra las herejías trinitarias que éstos contienen y cómo el memorialista ha traducido mal muchos pasajes.