

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *The transmission of the thought of St John of the cross 1600 - 1630*

Kelly, Mark McKenzie

#### How to cite:

---

Kelly, Mark McKenzie (1986) *The transmission of the thought of St John of the cross 1600 - 1630*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:  
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7082/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE THOUGHT OF  
ST JOHN OF THE CROSS  
1600 - 1630

by

MARK MCKENZIE KELLY

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the University of Durham

Department of Spanish

September 1986

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.



21 MAY 1987

Thesis  
1986/KEL

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to examine the history of the transmission of the ideas of St John of the Cross during the early years of the seventeenth century. Thomas of Jesus is shown to have exercised a profound and detrimental influence over this transmission both by his early, unfulfilled commission to prepare a first edition of St John's works and, more significantly, by the use he made of the saint's doctrines in his own descriptions of prayer and the subsequent absorption of his ideas into the Carmelite school of spirituality. Father Salablanca was responsible for the numerous textual alterations to St. John's works in their first edition. His interventions are found to have misrepresented key aspects of St John's system, an influence which persisted for almost three hundred years, until the first critical edition appeared in 1912. Despite precautions taken by Salablanca, the sect of the alumbrados in Seville derived many of its doctrines from St John's works. This thesis reveals the correspondence between the Sevillian Inquisition and the Inquisitor General relating to the involvement of the 1618 edition with the alumbrados. The defence made of St John's works by Basilio Ponce de León is discussed. It is found that this defence relies largely on the textual amendments introduced by Salablanca and on doctrinal accommodations similar to those initiated by Thomas of Jesus. Therefore, while accomplishing its immediate aim, the defence was to reinforce the flawed image of St John's ideas which had been promoted by St John's editor and earliest commentators. The coincidence of themes misrepresented by Thomas of Jesus, amended by Salablanca, adopted by the alumbrados and censured by the Inquisition is finally taken to indicate the areas where St John made innovative contributions to the field of spirituality.

## CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	i.
COPYRIGHT NOTICE	ii.
CHAPTER 1      INTRODUCTION	1.
CHAPTER 2      ST JOHN AND THOMAS OF JESUS	2.
CHAPTER 3      ST JOHN AND THE EDITOR	59.
CHAPTER 4      ST JOHN AND THE CENSOR	89.
CHAPTER 5      CONCLUSION	148.
BIBLIOGRAPHY	154.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AA	Archivo Agustiniانو
AHN	Archivo Hist6rico Nacional
BAC	Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos
BHS	Bulletin of Hispanic Studies
BMC	Biblioteca Mística Carmelitana
BNM	Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid
CSIC	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
CT	Ciencia Tomista
CUP	Cambridge University Press
EC	Ephemerides Carmeliticae
EE	Estudios Eclesiásticos
INQ	Inquisición
LEG	Legajo
MC	El Monte Carmelo
MST	Mensajero de Santa Teresa
OUP	Oxford University
VS	La Vie Spirituelle

Abbreviations used for St John's works are as follows:

CA	Cántico espiritual - first redaction
CB	Cántico espiritual - second redaction
L1	Llama de amor viva
N	Noche oscura
S	Subida del Monte Carmelo

None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in this or any other university. The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**



## INTRODUCTION

Just as mountaineers are faced with the increasing difficulty of discovering significant but as yet unconquered peaks, so the student of St. John of the Cross confronts the awesome task of uncovering fresh perspectives where generations of scholars have passed before. To attempt to repeat the endeavours of the giants who preceded us, without recourse to their academic or intellectual resources, would be as fruitless as it would be pointless. Hence this study will aim, at least in part, to build on the foundations they laid and, even where it reaches different conclusions, will readily acknowledge their role in providing the necessary tools. Pygmies on the shoulders of giants may occasionally see further than either could manage individually.

Most of the scholarly works alluded to make their contribution to a specific area such as the bibliography or biography of St. John of the Cross. Other such areas include the preparation of editions or translations of St. John's works, discussion of the problems of textual transmission and literary and theological analysis and evaluation. For all categories identified it is considered useful to outline the prevailing consensus where one has been achieved or otherwise to render a subjective judgement as to the most authoritative works to consult for any given subject. Conversely, in severe cases it has been felt desirable to draw attention to works which do not appear to form a reliable base. This outline for each category is of some importance as it represents a point of departure or platform on which many of the conclusions of later chapters will be based. To give an example, the third chapter of this thesis draws heavily on Silverio's edition of St. John's works<sup>(1)</sup>. If it were discovered that



Silverio's footnotes were completely inaccurate (fortunately not the case) then many of the conclusions of that chapter would be invalidated.

### Bibliography

Pier Paolo Ottonello is so far the only person to have produced a comprehensive bibliography of St. John of the Cross. This book, published in 1967, is a compendious work containing over 2,000 entries. These chart the multilingual literature surrounding St. John through the course of four centuries, from the main manuscripts still in existence through early printed editions and biographies to the most recent studies available to Ottonello in 1967. It is arranged somewhat idiosyncratically, with St. John's manuscripts listed in the body of the book, but with the aid of the scheme of contents and index of names at the rear it becomes eminently usable and useful.

To the best of my knowledge, there has been no Carmelite attempt to compile a similar work since the partial bibliography produced by Benno a S. Joseph in Ephemerides Carmeliticæ between 1947 and 1949. However, in the BAC edition of St. John's works, Lucinio del SS. Sacramento gives more details of extant manuscripts than does Ottonello, as well as a select bibliography of non-autobiographical studies<sup>(2)</sup>. This bibliography, although of limited scope, has the advantage of being readily accessible due to its presence in a popular edition of St. John's works. Less accessible and of still more limited scope, although still useful, is the index to the contents of Ephemerides Carmeliticæ produced by Simeón de la Sagrada Familia in 1975. While publishing articles in the language of submission, this journal continues to use Latin in its editorial interventions. It has consistently published material of the highest quality relating to the founders of the Order of Discalced Carmelites, their spirituality and writings. Thus a summary of its contents over its then twenty-eight years of existence

is an aid to the orientation of any student of St. John of the Cross.

### Biography

It is a curious anomaly that biographical details of St. John of the Cross were first published in the biography of his less famous brother, Francisco de Yepes, and were penned by a friar of the Calced Carmelites rather than by one of St. John's colleagues in the Reform<sup>(3)</sup>. The amended edition of 1617 bears the subtitle 'En particular se trata de las cosas maravillosas, que en una medalla, en que esta un poco de carne de su bendito hermano, se muestran', which might lead us to treat the work as of hagiographic rather than historical interest. However, a later biographer (Crisógono) was to be grateful for the details it provides of St. John's early life.

The strange delay of the Discalced order in producing either an authorised biography or a first edition of St. John's works is discussed in a later chapter, but the main factors are well represented by Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen in 'Primeras ediciones del Cántico espiritual'<sup>(4)</sup>. The first Discalced biography was the one included in the first edition of St. John's works. This was written by José de Jesús María, who is more often given his secular name of Francisco de Quiroga. Quiroga was also responsible for a fuller biography published separately in 1628<sup>(5)</sup>. The other major early biographer of St. John was Jerónimo de San José, another Discalced Carmelite, whose works, the first of which was published in 1629, were to remain influential into the twentieth century<sup>(6)</sup>. In fact, these early biographies were to provide the material for almost all of those which followed until 1929. In this year were published major works by Bruno de Jesús María<sup>(7)</sup> and Silverio de Santa Teresa<sup>(8)</sup>. These works respected modern criteria by returning wherever possible to

manuscript sources such as the depositions collected for St. John's beatification. This trend was continued and extended in what has become in many respects the standard biography of St. John of the Cross, written by Crisógono de Jesús in 1945 and forming part of the BAC edition of the life and works of St. John<sup>(9)</sup>. In its introductory material this biography describes all of the sources from which it is derived, which are more comprehensive and authoritative than those of any of the preceding biographies. They include depositions for the beatification, commencing in 1616, as well as others for the canonisation, which were taken eleven years later. At that time many people were still alive who had known St. John well and their declarations consequently have an immediacy and authenticity which can hardly be disputed. Crisógono's biography does more, however, than merely to name its sources. Throughout the work, in extensive footnotes, he gives the literal quotations upon which the biographical narrative is based. These notes allow the reader to delve as much or as little into the supporting documentation as suits his purpose.

Should we be sceptical as to the objectivity of depositions whose declared purpose was to secure the beatification or canonisation of a fellow friar? As might be expected, these depositions contain numerous accounts of miraculous occurrences, which causes some discomfort to modern sensibilities. Crisógono robustly brushes aside such misgivings, stating 'El valor de los documentos históricos es independiente de que los hechos sean o no milagrosos'. (p. 13). Yet despite this comment, Crisógono generally eschews accounts of miracles in favour of the more commonplace details of St. John's life. The objectivity of the witness is impossible to assess from the standpoint of the twentieth century, but as he is mainly concerned with extracting the external circumstances of the saint's life, Crisógono has

less to fear from this than if he were solely interested in establishing St. John's sanctity of character or action.

Finally, it is interesting to note that Crisógono disagrees with his posthumous editor in detecting an antipathy for St. John in the General of the Discalced, Nicolás Doria. He explains fully the part of Doria in St. John's disgrace and death in chapter 19 of the biography (pp. 295-314). Matías del Niño Jesús, however, adds an appendix in which he attempts to absolve Doria from any blame in the matter. It is sufficient to observe in passing that it is Matías who holds the minority view on this subject, as most commentators agree with Crisógono's interpretation of the evidence.

#### Editions of St. John's works

The editorial history of St. John's writings is similar in many respects to the history of his biographies. Delays within his own order did not prevent his manuscripts from being liberally extracted for publication by other authors<sup>(10)</sup>. The first publication of his works in their own right was the edition of 1618, prepared by Diego de Jesús (otherwise known as Salablanca), which also continued Quiroga's first brief biography, as mentioned above. This edition, together with its *sister* of 1619, was most notable for its complete omission of the Cántico espiritual poem and commentaries, the reasons for which will exercise us later. The Cántico was later incorporated into the 1630 edition which, although prepared by Jerónimo de San José (St. John's biographer), drew heavily on the first edition as regards both the text itself and the surrounding material<sup>(11)</sup>. It was the 1630 edition which, because of its greater completeness, was to be reprinted throughout the seventeenth century. As with the biographies, the earliest works were to retain their influence until the twentieth century saw the widespread adoption of more scientific methods for resolving textual problems.

The first attempt to apply modern methods of textual analysis to the problem of producing a critical edition of St. John's works was by Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz between 1912 and 1914<sup>(12)</sup>. While achieving notable advances over what had gone before, Gerardo's work was soon to be eclipsed by the monumental edition prepared by Silverio de Santa Teresa, an edition which after more than half a century is still considered by many to be the only critical edition of St. John's works<sup>(13)</sup>. This reputation is founded on the manifest care taken by Silverio in both his use of manuscripts and in the additional material he supplied. His footnotes are particularly full and allow the student to examine the differences between all of the main manuscripts. Of particular use to this study has been the noting of variants which are only found in the first published edition and may thus suggest editorial amendment. Since Silverio a number of further editions have been published<sup>(14)</sup>. They have for the most part been united in their desire to contain St. John's works within a single volume and, perhaps, in aiming for a general rather than a specialist readership. Simeón de la Sagrada Familia hoped to appeal to readers in both camps when he labelled his edition crítico-popular. This attempt appears not to have been well received by St. John specialists such as Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen<sup>(15)</sup>. Eulogio also expressed reservations regarding early editions of Lucinio's work. These early editions were found to be both internally inconsistent and to show important variations between successive versions, all of which casts serious doubts on the BAC's claim that this was the (or a) critical edition. Later editions published since Eulogio's review have shown more stability of content and greater circumspection in their claims. A note in the introduction to the fifth edition (p. 354) concedes that 'la edición crítica de San Juan de la Cruz no existe' and that its

eventual construction will be based on the work of Gerado and Silverio. There are a number of reasons, however, for suggesting that the later versions of Lucinio's edition may provide the best introduction and initial orientation to St. John of the Cross. They are readily accessible in a volume which also contains Crisógono's excellent biography of St. John. The introductory notes to the individual works are compact but informative while the merits of the bibliographical guide have already been discussed. In addition both the biblical and subject indices may be of great assistance, depending on the exact requirements of the reader. Only in the footnotes to the text itself does Lucinio's edition suffer seriously by comparison with Silverio's work. This is a sufficient failing, however, to necessitate recourse to Silverio when detailed textual analysis is required.

The accuracy of a translation depends, above and beyond the skill of the translator, on the accuracy of the source from which it is derived. In this respect, then, the translation by Edgar Allison Peers must rank as the nearest we have to a critical edition in English, as it is based on the 1929 Spanish edition prepared by Silverio de Santa Teresa<sup>(16)</sup>. Where the poems are concerned a wider choice is available, all based on Silverio's text. A continuum may be discerned between works which through the literal nature of their translation are lacking in poetic expression and others which occasionally follow their own poetic impulse at the expense of the faithful transmission of St. John's meaning. As an example of the former one could cite Allison Peers, while the latter could hardly be better demonstrated than by Roy Campbell's 'for our sweet encounter tear the robe!' as a translation of 'rompe la tela deste dulce encuentro' or 'Upon a gloomy night' for 'En una noche oscura'<sup>(17)</sup>. The translations by Lynda Nicholson which accompany Gerald Brenan's St. John of the Cross: His Life and Poetry<sup>(18)</sup> appear to stand at a point on this continuum

where a suitable compromise between the two trends has been achieved and the English reader may gain much of the flavour of the originals.

### Textual transmission

No subject relating to St. John of the Cross has been more earnestly studied in the twentieth century than the question of the textual transmission of his works and, in particular, of the Cántico espiritual. Nor has any topic occasioned more acrimonious debate. More than a hundred contributions were made to this debate, sufficient to warrant a bibliographical note by Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen<sup>(19)</sup>. Half a century later, it is difficult to understand the ferocity of the battles which were fought or the sense of personal involvement which could lead a respected scholar to publish a pseudonymous appreciation of one of his own works and subsequently to quote that praise as evidence of the work's critical acclaim<sup>(20)</sup>. In recent years there has been a large measure of agreement among editors and commentators as to the status of the various manuscripts of the Cántico espiritual. Thus the debates of the first half of the twentieth century might seem to be of limited interest. Yet subsequent pages of this thesis seek to re-open some aspects of those discussions and this demands at least an appreciation of the main issues. Fortunately the essential details of the disputed matters are quickly related. The version of the Cántico espiritual about which there has never been any dispute is the first redaction or Cántico A (CA). Within the manuscripts of CA may be discerned two families, one characterised by a certain amount of re-working. This re-touched, later family is generally termed Cántico A' (CA'). Cántico B or the second redaction is the name given to a group of manuscripts which show far more extensive revision of the original text. One whole stanza is inserted, there are substantial changes in the ordering of the remaining stanzas



and the prose commentary is liberally reordered, amended and expanded. The whole history of the Cántico's textual transmission has been of interest to scholars, but the central question has been whether the revised Cántico B was the work of St. John or another. Those who argued in favour of St. John's authorship, for the most part Spanish Carmelites, were to prevail as far as future editors were concerned. Those who opposed St. John's authorship, mainly French non-Carmelites, found their most eloquent spokesmen in the Benedictine, Dom Philippe Chevallier<sup>(21)</sup> and Jean Krynen<sup>(22)</sup>. Chevallier's position was seriously weakened both by the series of learned articles attempting to overturn his arguments and by the extravagant lengths to which Chevallier himself went in order to support his assertions<sup>(23)</sup>. Jean Krynen's position contained two main planks, namely that Thomas of Jesus disagreed with the doctrine of St. John of the Cross and that for this reason he undertook a revision of Cántico A, becoming the author of Cántico B. The Carmelite School adequately disproved Thomas's authorship, but I hope to show that this does not of itself invalidate all of Krynen's assertions.

The fact that CB is now generally accepted as St. John's own final version has not, however, finally eclipsed CA. In general, literary commentators continue to prefer CA while theologians opt for CB. The reasons are readily discernible. Theologians are mostly interested in St. John's doctrinal exegesis, which is most fully developed in CB. Literary studies generally seek to explore the poetry of the verses rather than the doctrine of the prose and CA seems to represent more closely St. John's initial poetic impulse.

### Literary studies

Only within the last hundred years has St. John become widely regarded as a figure of literary as well as theological interest. Before this time his fame was largely confined to the religious world and, most particularly, to his own order of Discalced Carmelites. Since then, the wider availability of his works in modern editions has ensured a greater secular diffusion of his poetic output. The three poems which have attracted most critical attention are those for which St. John produced a prose commentary. This coincidence suggests that St. John was in agreement with later literary opinion as regards the division of his poems into major and minor works. St. John does not appear to have made any serious attempt either to publish his writings or to collect them together in one place in manuscript form. There is thus always the possibility that new manuscripts of his poetry and prose may surface, as has happened several times in the twentieth century. In a recent article, I suggested that the sonnet which begins 'No me mueve, mi Dios' may be attributable to St. John<sup>(24)</sup>. Whether or not this is true, the body of significant poetry which St. John left is a very small one and it is a measure of the excellence of the major poems that so great a reputation has been erected on so narrow a base.

Colin Thompson points out in The Poet and the Mystic that literary evaluations of St. John show 'a persistent tendency to describe or eulogize San Juan's poetry rather than subject it to serious critical examination'<sup>(25)</sup>. However, this study by Thompson of the Cántico espiritual is the most comprehensive and effective evaluation of any single poem by St. John, giving due weight to both the literary and theological aspects of St. John's achievements. To date, nothing on a similar scale has been attempted for the Noche oscura or the Llama de amor viva. Among earlier literary commentators, Dámaso Alonso's contributions may still be found useful as they draw attention to some

of the technical means by which St. John achieves his effects<sup>(26)</sup>. Helmut Hatzfeld has specialised in studying the language by which mystical writers attempt to convey their experiences and his comments on St. John's poetry underline the inseparability of the mystical experience and the manner of its expression<sup>(27)</sup>.

St. John's poems have been widely anthologised in the twentieth century. Since this has generally divorced the poems from their commentaries, the secularisation of St. John's verse has been all but achieved. It is unlikely, however, that when St. John said 'no hay para qué atarse a la declaración'<sup>(28)</sup> he envisaged interpretations such as that of R. O. Jones, who says of the Noche oscura that 'unless we respond to the sexuality the poem must fail of its full effect'<sup>(29)</sup>. While not advocating a slavish adherence to St. John's own commentaries, I believe that the most successful evaluations of St. John's poetry have been achieved where the authors have kept in mind the religious, social and intellectual milieu in which St. John lived and worked.

#### Theological commentaries

For as long as St. John's prose works have been in print theological commentaries on his doctrine have been available. These commentaries have served a number of purposes other than that of merely evaluating St. John's theology: works of pure theological appraisal are in the minority. Most of the earliest commentaries on St. John's theology were protective in nature, designed to gloss the saint's explanation of mysticism in a way that made manifest its conformity with scholastic theology. For instance, Salablanca's notes included in the first edition of 1618 attempt to qualify and explain certain mystical expressions which might otherwise be open to misinterpretation. It will, I hope, be made evident in a later chapter that Salablanca's interventions were motivated by the attitudes then prevalent among the censors of the Inquisition.

Another significant type of commentary has the aim of disseminating a simplified, readily understood version of St. John's teaching on prayer as an aid to the personal devotions of the reader. Into this category would fall works such as Fr. John Venard's simplified version of the Cántico<sup>(30)</sup>. A greater threat to the accurate transmission of St. John's ideas has been posed by commentaries which endeavour to place St. John's own system of spirituality within a more all-embracing framework. Some such commentaries were in circulation even before St. John's works had found their way into print and these are discussed in some detail in the next chapter. They were not, however, confined to the early years. At the beginning of this century two influential books on prayer were published, each of which used St. John in its synthesis of the topic, yet each of which came to very different conclusions about the nature of mystical prayer and the stages which precede it<sup>(31)</sup>. In the debate which these works engendered there came to prominence a further type of commentary, which was combative in nature. Such articles as 'Inanidad de la contemplación adquirida'<sup>(32)</sup> used St. John's works merely as fuel for the controversy. Every shade of opinion found support in carefully selected extracts from St. John. This dispute was, of course, unhelpful in promoting the sincere and impartial evaluation of St. John's works which they deserved. Sadly, unlike the debate over Cántico B which was resolved to most people's satisfaction, neither side in the debate on mystical prayer was to prevail in any clear fashion. The heat merely went out of the argument and both sides retired, their opinions fundamentally unchanged.

Among those who have written on the theology of St. John of the Cross none have gone on to greater fame than Karol Wojtyła, now Pope John Paul II. His doctoral thesis 'Doctrina de fide apud S. Joannem

a Cruce' falls most readily into a final category of pure doctrinal appraisal, since his only concern is to elucidate exactly how the concept of Faith is employed by St. John<sup>(33)</sup>. Colin Thompson, typically, provides a very useful evaluation of St. John's contribution to theology in The Poet and the Mystic<sup>(34)</sup>. Along with this, Federic Ruiz Salvador's Introducción a San Juan de la Cruz is among the most helpful books available in orientating the reader as to St. John's theology<sup>(35)</sup>.

### Conclusion

When the extent of the bibliography of St. John is considered the above sketches necessarily appear superficial. Yet there is a danger when approaching St. John of descending into detail before the overall picture is adequately sensed. Having identified the major topics related to St. John, it will be easier to locate the subject of this thesis and to define the boundaries within which it aims to make a contribution. The area of interest lies midway between the subjects of textual transmission and theological evaluation and may be termed, for want of a more elegant classification, the transmission of the thought of St. John of the Cross.

The means by which a person's beliefs, ideas or teachings may be influential after their originator's death are both varied and of unequal value. During the period embraced by this study there were many people alive within the Discalced Carmelite Order who had lived and worked with St. John of the Cross and had first-hand knowledge of his character and teachings. Their sworn depositions, collected during this period, were to be influential in the eventual beatification and canonisation of St. John, thus ensuring that his name at least would be remembered by later generations. Many more people were familiar with the saint only through his writings as they circulated

in manuscript form through the convents and monasteries of the Reform. But it was the publication of his ideas in 1618 which ensured that St. John's influence would be felt far beyond the confines of his order and long after the generations which immediately succeeded him. Greater importance, then, should be attached to the dissemination of St. John's thought in printed form. This consideration is of assistance in defining the chronological scope of this study, for the first three decades of the seventeenth century appear crucial to this process of dissemination. In the first few years of this period the leaders of the Reform decided to commission a first edition of the saint's works. It was not until 1630 that an edition containing all of the major works was published in Spain. This period also saw the thoughts of the saint published extensively, often without acknowledgement, within treatises by other spiritual writers. The way in which material drawn from St. John was used by these writers was to have a certain impact on the subsequent interpretation of St. John's own work. Perhaps most significant of all for the transmission of St. John's ideas to future generations, these ideas, in both their authentic and derivative forms, were to be scrutinised during these years by the censors of the Inquisition. Here, despite having achieved publication, St. John's teachings could have sunk without trace. That they did not has often been ascribed to the perfect conformity of his writings with scholastic theology, the yardstick of the Holy Office. The truth, inevitably, is more complex.

The observations above, as well as explaining the period of time chosen for study, indicate the specific areas of interest. How was St. John's doctrine assimilated and used by the subsequent generation of spiritual writers? What were the criteria used in translating St. John's writings from manuscript to print? How were St. John's printed works viewed by the Inquisition? These are the questions which I hope to answer in the next three chapters of this thesis.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Silverio de Santa Teresa, Obras de San Juan de la Cruz, doctor de la Iglesia, 5 vols (Burgos: El Monte Carmelo, 1929).
2. Vida y obras completas de San Juan de la Cruz, 5th edn (Madrid: BAC, 1964).
3. Vida y virtudes del venerable varón Francisco de Yepes by José de Velasco (Valladolid: Jerónimo Murillo, 1617).
4. EC 18 (1967), pp. 3-48.
5. Historia de la vida y virtudes del venerable P. Fr. Juan de la Cruz (Brussels: Juan Meerbeck, 1628).
6. Dibujo del venerable Varón Frai Joan de la Cruz (Madrid: Francisco Martínez, 1629), Historia del venerable padre Fr. Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: Diego Díaz de la Carrera, 1641).
7. Vie de Saint Jean de la Croix (Paris: Plon et Nourrit, 1929).
8. See note 1 above.
9. See note 2 above.
10. See for example Juan Bretón's Mística theologia y doctrina de la perfection evangélica (Madrid: Alonso Martín, 1614).
11. Salablanca's edition is entitled Obras espirituales que encaminan a una alma a la perfecta unión con Dios (Alcalá: Ezpeleta, 1618). Jerónimo's title begins Obras del venerable i místico doctor F. Joan de la Cruz (Madrid: Madrigal, 1630).
12. Obras del místico doctor San Juan de la Cruz, 3 vols (Toledo: Peláez, 1912-14).
13. See note 1 above.
14. Apart from the BAC edition noted above (note 2), these include two editions prepared by José Vicente de la Eucaristía, Obras completas (Madrid: Editorial de la Espiritualidad, 1957), and Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, Obras completas (Burgos: El Monte Carmelo, 1959).

15. 'La crítica sanjuanista en los últimos veinte años' in Salmanticensis 8 (1961), pp. 195-246 (pp. 218-21).
16. See note 1 above.
17. Poems of St. John of the Cross Translated by Roy Campbell (Glasgow: Collins, 1979).
18. (Cambridge: CUP, 1973).
19. 'La cuestión crítica del "Cántico espiritual", nota bibliográfica', MC 65 (1957), pp. 309-23.
20. Hervé D'Illac (anagram of D. Chevallier), 'Du Cantique primitif au texte définitif' in La Vie Spirituelle - Supplement 23 (1952), pp. 495-99, Philippe Chevallier, 'Le texte définitif du Cantique Spirituel par fr. Philippe Chevallier, moine bénédictin', Cuadernos Ibero-Americanos 13 (1953), pp. 249-53.
21. 'Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix, a-t-il été interpolé' BH 24 (1922), pp. 307-42, Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix docteur de l'Église (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1930).
22. Le 'Cantique Spirituel' de Saint Jean de la Croix commenté et réfondu au xviie siècle: un regard sur l'histoire de l'exégèse du Cantique de Jaén (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1948).
23. The full history of this episode is related in Eulogio's article mentioned in note 15 above. For the essential bibliography of Chevallier's interventions see notes 20 and 21 above.
24. 'The Sonnet "No me mueve, mi Dios" and St. John of the Cross', BHS 62 (1985), pp. 281-87.
25. (Oxford: OUP, 1977), p. 81.
26. La poesía de San Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: CSIC, 1942).
27. Estudios literarios sobre mística española (Madrid: Gredos, 1955).
28. CB: Prólogo: 2.



29. A Literary History of Spain - The Golden Age: Prose and Poetry (London: Ernest Benn, 1971), p. 111.
30. The Spiritual Canticle of St. John of the Cross (Sydney: Dwyer, 1980).
31. A. Saudreau, Les degrés de la vie spirituelle (Angers: Germain et Grassin, 1897), A. Poulain, Les grâces d'Oraison (Paris: Rétaux, 1906).
32. CT 29 (Jan-June 1924), pp. 331-49 and 30 (July-Dec 1924), pp. 5-27.
33. Available in Spanish, translated by Álvaro Huerga, as La Fe según San Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: BAC, 1980).
34. Op. cit. (see note 25 above), pp. 146-72.
35. (Madrid: BAC, 1968).

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **ST. JOHN AND THOMAS OF JESUS**

ST JOHN AND THOMAS OF JESUS

In the first half of the twentieth century the writings of St. John were subject to investigation by a variety of scholars from different disciplines. While psychologists interested themselves in the problems of mystical experience and literary critics began to attempt an objective study of his poetic techniques, purely theological questions were broached with renewed vigour. The renewal of theological debate and the tendency towards controversy may have been due in part to the appearance of new editions of St. John's works, edited according to modern criteria by Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz O.C.D. and later by Silverio de Santa Teresa O.C.D.<sup>(1)</sup> As his writings reached an ever larger readership and became less exclusively the province of the Discalced Carmelites it was inevitable that discrepancies of interpretation would arise. A more important factor was that spirituality in general and mystical prayer in particular were the subject of heated debate in the early years of this century following the assumption of contrary positions by Father Poulain and Abbot Saudreau in their respective treatises on prayer<sup>(2)</sup>. These two writers and their partisans sought to use St. John's scheme of spirituality as a model for their own account of the spiritual life. The incompatibility of their conclusions is an indication both of their different starting points and of the special difficulties of interpretation presented by St. John's works.

The Carmelite contribution to the controversy surrounding St. John's doctrine focussed on one problem, namely the existence of acquired contemplation. Increasingly, the discussion of this problem required an examination of the role played in the transmission of St. John's thought by one man, Thomas of Jesus O.C.D. The most

vitriolic phase of the debate was opened by Father Marie-Joseph du S. Coeur O.C.D. with an article entitled 'Il existe une contemplation acquise'<sup>(3)</sup>. The Carmelite position was consolidated by the appearance in 1922 of Thomas's previously unedited work De Contemplatione Acquisita (Milan, 1922) and by the Cursus Theologiae Mystico-Scholasticae of Joseph a Spiritu Sancto two years later (Brussels, 1924). The Carmelite contention was that Thomas of Jesus accurately reflected St. John's own doctrine on prayer and merely clarified several points (such as acquired contemplation) which were not fully developed in the saint's writings.

This position was challenged initially by Father Juan G. Arintero O.P. in a series of articles which were highly sceptical of the existence of acquired contemplation and attributed the whole idea to the misconceptions of Thomas of Jesus who, according to Father Arintero, departed radically from the spirituality of both St. John and St. Teresa of Avila<sup>(4)</sup>. These attacks in turn inspired a series of articles in defence of the Carmelite view, having failed to make a significant impression either on how the Carmelites saw Thomas of Jesus or on their support for the idea of acquired contemplation<sup>(5)</sup>. This support was definitively endorsed by the 'Congreso ascético-místico en honor de San Juan de la Cruz', held in Avila in 1927<sup>(6)</sup>. The congress defined acquired contemplation as 'Una vista interior sencilla y amorosa, puesta en Dios, la cual se obtiene como resultado de repetición de actos de meditación'<sup>(7)</sup>. The overall Carmelite position has not changed significantly since then as regards acquired contemplation, although individual writers have done suggestive work in new directions<sup>(8)</sup>. Completely new evidence has come to light, however, regarding the extent to which Thomas of Jesus knew and used the works of St. John in the early years of the seventeenth century.

It was always known, for instance, that Thomas was commissioned in 1601 to prepare an edition of St. John's works (an edition which never appeared) <sup>(9)</sup>. It was assumed, then, that before Thomas left Spain in 1608 he had probably read St. John's works in manuscript form. In the middle of this century two documents were produced which confirmed that assumption. The Repertorium P.N. Thomas a Jesu in ordine ad libros de contemplatione et oratione was described by Fray José de Jesús Crucificado O.C.D. in 1949<sup>(10)</sup>. It seems to have been a notebook, dating from Thomas's residence in the desierto of Las Batuecas, in which he composed the schemes for his treatises on prayer and compiled quotations and references from spiritual writers. St. John and his works are mentioned several times in this manuscript. The other important document is a manuscript containing the first two books of the Subida del Monte Carmelo, the Noche oscura and Llama de amor viva<sup>(11)</sup>. In 1950 Fray Simeón de la Sagrada Familia O.C.D. pointed out that the manuscript bore notes in the hand of Thomas of Jesus and his secretaries<sup>(12)</sup>. Simeón believes that these notes may date from the period of Thomas's commission to edit St. John's writings, and may offer valuable insights into how he regarded these works.

Unfortunately these most useful documents became involved in another controversy, which caused them to be used as tools in an argument rather than evaluated with a view to discovering their own worth. The immediate cause of this controversy was the publication of Jean Krynen's book, Le "Cantique spirituel" de saint Jean de la Croix commenté et réfondu au XVIIe siècle: un regard sur l'histoire de l'exégèse du Cantique de Jaén <sup>(13)</sup>. In Krynen's view Thomas of Jesus felt so strong an antipathy towards St. John's doctrine as expressed in Cántico A as obliged him to rewrite this work to a large

extent, making him the author of what we now know as Cántico B. This bold theory was disproved in a series of articles by Carmelite scholars<sup>(14)</sup>. Subsequently, Simeón de la Sagrada Familia O.C.D. summarised and consolidated the Carmelite position with regard to Thomas of Jesus's attitude towards St. John<sup>(15)</sup>. Since Father Simeón deals with this problem in greater detail than any other writer, his articles on the subject will serve as a first term of reference. The conclusions of his first article which are relevant to this study are reproduced below.

- 1) El P. Tomás conoce y cita las obras de San Juan de la Cruz, tanto manuscritas como impresas.
- 2) El P. Tomás aprecia profundamente durante toda su vida la persona y la doctrina de San Juan de la Cruz:
  - a) Su persona: Para él fray Juan de la Cruz es "el Santo Padre fray Juan de la Cruz", "nuestro Beato Padre" ...
  - b) Su doctrina: Le parece que "toda es doctrina infundida del cielo", "magis a Deo infusa quam humano labore comparata", que su autor la escribió "divino spiritu illustratus" y que "en los libros de la tierra no se hallan estos tesoros de ciencia y sabiduría celestial". Su lectura le enciende en los más vivos amores divinos.

While the first point is supported by the evidence which Father Simeón presents, it fails to explain a curious anomaly in Thomas's treatment of St. John: although Thomas draws heavily on St. John's works, particularly for the composition of his earlier treatises, he never acknowledges his debt to St. John in print. This contrasts markedly with his readiness to refer explicitly to St. Teresa or to other contemporary spiritual writers such as Juan de Jesús María. Direct references to St. John are confined to manuscripts never intended for publication, as in the case of the Repertorium.

Many of the facts adduced by Father Simeón show that Thomas of Jesus had a deep respect for St. John as a saintly person. Other expressions used by Thomas indicate an attitude of awe in the face of St. John's writings and particular appreciation of his treatment of individual points. These facts do not, however, preclude the possibility of Thomas of Jesus either misunderstanding what he reads in St. John or differing in his understanding of some aspects of the spiritual way. Perhaps the most crucial factor omitted from Father Simeón's studies is how St. John is used in Thomas's writings. The mere fact of reproducing a section based on St. John does not necessarily mean either that Thomas understands St. John's words in the context of St. John's own framework, or that he is using them in a way which accords with the saint's overall structure. To gain a fuller picture of Thomas's view of St. John requires a closer analysis of the available evidence.

The manuscript of St. John's works annotated by Thomas of Jesus is at first sight a useful guide to Thomas's opinion of St. John's doctrine. However, the majority of additions to the text take the form of vertical strokes in the margin, sometimes accompanied by the underlining of a passage of the text. Although obviously denoting areas of greatest interest these marks present two notable difficulties to the commentator. In the absence of additional comment it is difficult to determine both who is responsible for these marks and whether they denote appreciation or disagreement. They tend to occur in those places which deal with areas of St. John's doctrine which later aroused controversy; the nature of contemplation and the passivity of the soul within this state. A judgement on the interpretation of unexplained marks must be reserved until we have seen how far Thomas of Jesus agrees with these aspects of St. John's teaching in his own writings.

The marginal annotations and corrections to the text are too few in number to allow of generalisation, but it will be useful to determine their trend where this is possible. The first note is a reiteration of St. John's advice not to abandon meditation until God intervenes to suspend "las imagines y arrimos" of discursive mental prayer. This note seems to accord fully with what St. John says at this point in the manuscript as well as elsewhere in his writings<sup>(16)</sup>. It does, however, testify to Thomas's concern to determine rigidly the conditions for passivity on the part of the soul. The underlined heading of the note reads 'Como se entiende q no an de obrar nada'. A second note on the following page was badly mutilated when the manuscript was bound. Father Simeón takes it to be a continuation of the previous note and transcribes what remains

(.....)

cluye acto de entendim<sup>o</sup> y volu(ntad...)

una advertencia co el ojo de la fe y (...)

It is likely that Thomas is here already beginning to stress that the natural faculties of the soul are not truly lost during contemplation but continue to act in some way, although too little is left of the annotation to deduce anything with certainty. The definition of mystical theology which St. John gives at the bottom of the same page of the manuscript evidently had great significance for Thomas of Jesus since as well as being underlined and marked with a vertical line in the margin, it also bears a marginal note in the hand of Thomas himself.

St. John's words read:

Porque contemplacion no es otra cosa que infusion secreta pacifica y amorosa de Dios, que si le dan lugar inflama al alma en spiritu de amor, segun ella lo da a entender en el verso siguiente, es a saber ...

(IN:10:6)



Thomas's note explains 'trata aqui de la cõtêplaciô de mixtica (theologia) q es la mas alta'. This clarification is surprising since it assumes a distinction between various grades of contemplation which is neither made nor implied in St. John's text. On the contrary, St. John is discussing at this point the transition from discursive meditation to contemplation, so presumably if a distinction were to be made the contemplation under discussion would be of the lower order. The most likely explanation of Thomas's intervention is that he already had in mind the divisions of contemplation which were to be the feature of his mature writings. According to these, contemplation could be either of an acquired variety, which would use the soul's faculties in a natural way, or it could be infused from God, in which case the natural exercise of the faculties would be suspended. When Thomas of Jesus read the last paragraph of this section of the manuscript (IN:10:6) and found a description of contemplation which bore all of the marks of his definition of infused contemplation he felt it necessary to make a note to that effect. This is the first example we have seen of how Thomas's own ideas on spirituality affect his reading of St. John.

Of the very few additions to the text made by Thomas of Jesus, only one is relevant to this study. This occurs when St. John is advising the soul which is being led from meditation to contemplation to abandon itself to God's influence 'contentándose sólo con una advertencia amorosa y sosegada en Dios, y estar sin cuidado y sin eficacia, y sin gana de gustarle o de sentirle'. Thomas's intervention here is the insertion of 'mucho' between 'sin' and 'cuidado', apparently in a bid to attenuate the degree of abandonment to which St. John exhorts the soul.

Such small indications as we have seen in the treatment of this manuscript by Thomas of Jesus would be almost devoid of value if taken in isolation. But they may be put into context by anticipating information gained from other sources. The desire to attenuate St. John's advice on abandonment to God's influence, for example, will be found again in the editor of the 1618 edition, Diego de Jesús. Instead of 'sin mucho cuidado' Salablanca will moderate the sentence by writing 'sin gana demasiada'. This should make us wary of interpreting Thomas's pen strokes as marks of appreciation. It is at least as likely that if, as Father Simeón believes, this manuscript was being prepared by Thomas of Jesus for publication, the purpose of the marks was to denote those passages which required adaptation before being presented to the public.

Another document dating from the early years of the seventeenth century offers more detailed insight into Thomas's view of St. John's doctrine.

The Repertorium ... in ordine ad libros de contemplatione et oratione compiled by Thomas of Jesus appears to have been a notebook in which he devised the schemes of his later treatises on prayer and collected useful references from various spiritual writers. There are a number of favourable references to St. John among these, a fact which Father Simeón has used to contradict Krynen's assertion of Thomas's antipathy towards the doctrine of St. John. More may be learnt from the Repertorium, however, than the simple fact of St. John's inclusion and the approval which this implies. Five of the eight references simply mention St. John as an authority on certain aspects of spirituality. The Cântico espiritual in its first redaction is quoted as an authority on union and rapture, the Subida for its teaching on locutions and the Noche Oscura for the spiritual

imperfections of beginners. In the other three cases St. John's teaching is given a place within a wider framework of spirituality of Thomas of Jesus's devising. The clearest of these is entitled 'De los tres caminos de oracion' and continues:

la union del alma con Dios es el termino y puerto de la oracion y del amor. ay tres caminos para llegar a ella. el prim<sup>o</sup>. es por meditaciones y discursos y contemplaciones afirmatiuas. el 2<sup>o</sup>. por uia de actos y sequedades, etta<sup>a</sup>. el 3<sup>o</sup>. por uia de contemplacion negatiua.

Al prim<sup>o</sup>. se reduce el camino de nra s.<sup>ta</sup> Madre, de fr. Luis de granada. p.<sup>e</sup> Auila, Ricardo. Al 2<sup>o</sup>. el camino del p.<sup>e</sup> fr. juan de la cruz de la noche obscura y subida del monte Carmelo maxime quando esta purgacion se hace passiuamente. Al 3<sup>o</sup>. la mystica theologia de s. Buenau.<sup>a</sup> ...

The inclusion of St. John in this scheme should not obscure the fact that the scheme itself is incompatible with St. John's teachings on prayer. St. John would agree that the aim of every soul is union with God, but would strenuously reject the notion of a variety of different ways to achieve this union. Although Thomas of Jesus's ideas are in a formative stage in the Repertorium we may recognise in the first of the ways to union which he describes the origin of the doctrine of acquired contemplation which he was to develop in his later writings. Since this would be a keynote of Thomas's teaching I will concentrate on comparing this first way to union with the way described in the works of St. John.

The framework which St. John advances to explain the way to union with God is essentially simple, although since its components are dispersed among all of his works a degree of synthesis is necessary in order to reconstruct the fullness of his doctrine.

The vital factors in attaining union with God are the removal of impediments between the soul and God and the use of a means which is capable of uniting the faculties of the soul with God, a medio próximo in St. John's terminology. The most basic of the impediments to the soul's progress are sin and voluntary imperfections. Turning from sin and desires for worldly goods and honours are within the soul's natural capabilities and St. John spends little time on these first steps on the spiritual road 'porque para los principiantes hay muchas cosas escritas' (CB:prólogo:3). The Subida is mainly concerned with souls which have progressed rather further in holiness, urging them to deny themselves the spiritual self-indulgence of looking for visions and locutions and other supernatural phenomena in their prayer. All such tendencies are impediments to true spiritual progress and must be abandoned. In Noche Oscura, however, St. John acknowledges that there are limits to how completely the soul can purify itself through its own natural activity:

por más que el alma se ayude, no puede ella activamente purificarse de manera que esté dispuesta en la menor parte para la divina union de perfección de amor, si Dios no toma la mano y la purga en aquel fuego oscuro para ella como y de la manera que habemos de decir (IN:3:3).

Active self-negation is a desirable preparation but in no way a substitute for the essential direct intervention of God in the soul's purification:

Mas conviene al alma, en cuanto pudiere, procurar de su parte hacer por perficionarse, por que merezca que Dios la ponga en aquella divina cura, donde sana el alma de todo lo que ella no alcanzaba a remediarse;

(IN:3:3)

Thomas of Jesus seems to acknowledge both the active and passive aspects of the soul's purification when he describes the second way to union as proceeding 'por uia de actos y sequedades'. The actos would presumably consist of the soul's own efforts at self-negation while the sequedades would be those acts of purgation which the soul experienced as a result of God's intervention. Thomas also recognises the greater importance of the latter when he says that the second way corresponds to the way of St. John above all 'quando esta purgacion se hace passiuamête'. But within the terms of St. John's own system this purgative way may not be classed as one of three distinct and equally valid ways of achieving union with God. For St. John, as we have seen, it is a sine qua non of union. No soul may be united with God while it remains imperfect and no soul may become perfect without experiencing the 'sequedades' of passive purgation at God's hand.

For another reason the 'triple way' proposed by Thomas of Jesus fails to conform to the doctrine of St. John, that is with regard to the first of the ways described, 'por meditaciones y discursos y contemplaciones afirmatiuas'. Apart from the purgative way we have been discussing, the most crucial component of St. John's doctrine on attaining to union with God is the use of a 'próximo y proporcionado medio para que el alma se una con Dios' (2S:9:1). The basis for this idea lies in the Dionisian concept of God as wholly and essentially distinct from his Creation and completely inaccessible through the mediation of the created order. The practical implications of this in the doctrine of St. John are that not only may Man not be united with God through the mediation of his fellow creatures, whether human or angelic, nor through attention to statues or other physical objects, but it is impossible for union to come about through the natural

activity of the faculties of the soul, such as the Intellect. While these faculties are exercised in a natural way they may only function in relation to the natural order, which has no essential similarity with God (2S:8:3). To overcome this problem, St. John proposes a supernatural mode of operation for each of the three spiritual faculties of Intellect, Memory and Will. These supernatural modes, being beyond the natural capacities of the soul, must be infused from God when He desires to lead the soul towards Him. Their action is initially to create a void or vacío in the faculties with regard to their natural functions and subsequently to be the supernatural agents effecting union with God in each of their respective faculties. St. John created nothing new in describing this process. Rather, in a unique use of the supernatural theological virtues, he explained that Faith was the supernatural mode of operation of the Intellect which, when infused by God, would negate the natural function of this faculty and unite it with God, and that Hope and Charity would occasion the same effects in Memory and Will respectively. As in the purgative way St. John deemed it desirable that the soul should do all in its power to prepare itself for union, so in the Subida he exhorts the soul not to be impeded in its progress towards union by excessive attachment to the natural operation of the faculties in prayer. Few aspects of St. John's doctrine have aroused such debate as his application of this advice to the practice of discursive meditation. This is contained in chapters twelve to fifteen of the second book of the Subida. In these chapters St. John does no more than explain the implications of the framework he has constructed for this particular sphere of spirituality. He begins with an examination of the components of discursive meditation (2S:12:1-4). It is a product of the operation of the inner corporeal faculties of imagination and fantasy. These

create a mental image, such as Christ crucified or in glory, which can then be considered by the Intellect and may rouse the Will to love of God. Whilst this process is of benefit to beginners it shares the limits of all natural operations of the soul in that it cannot produce anything which bears an essential likeness to God. St. John concludes, logically enough, that such a form of prayer can be no more than a 'medio remoto' towards union with God, and, as such, must be willingly abandoned by the soul when the 'medio próximo' of Faith is made available to the Intellect. St. John goes on to give three signs which, when observed together, would reassure the soul that it could now safely abandon meditation as its normal form of prayer in the knowledge that a supernatural mode of operation was now available to one or more of the faculties. The form of prayer which takes place when one or more of the faculties begins to operate under the influence of their respective theological virtues is termed contemplation by St. John. As well as a form of prayer or communication with God, contemplation, since it embraces the operation of the theological virtues, is also the way towards union with Him. What is important to bear in mind when we return to discussing Thomas of Jesus is that this way of contemplation is not available until God makes it so and that it may not be followed unless the soul leaves behind meditation as its normal form of prayer. St. John's teaching on the latter point could scarcely be more plain:

porque, aunque a los principiantes son necesarias estas consideraciones y formas y modos de meditaciones... ha de ser de manera que pasen por ellos y no se estén siempre en ellos, porque de esa manera nunca llegarían al término, el cual no es como los medios remotos ni tiene que ver con ellos... Por lo cual, el alma que hubiere de llegar en esta vida a la unión de aquel descanso y bien por todos los grados de consideraciones,

formas y noticias, ha de pasar y acabar con ellas, pues ninguna semejanza ni proporción tienen con el término a que encaminan, que es Dios. (2S:12:5)

Having seen the necessity of abandoning meditation in order to progress towards union, according to St. John's doctrine, it is now apparent how incompatible with this doctrine is Thomas's proposed way to union 'por meditaciones y discursos y contemplaciones afirmatiuas'. If St. John's teachings are accepted, then both the idea of three distinct ways to union and the first of these as described by Thomas of Jesus are untenable.

Two aspects of the above discussion require further brief clarification. The 'contemplaciones afirmatiuas' mentioned by Thomas of Jesus are not entirely the same as the 'meditaciones y discursos'. Rather they draw on the traditional concept of a Via Positiva or positive way of obtaining knowledge of God. According to this we can gain an idea of God by thinking of Him in terms of human virtues infinitely amplified. So He is infinitely good, wise, compassionate and merciful, for example. This approach had as much currency as the alternative Via Negativa, although it was the opinion of spiritual writers in general that the positive way was a less perfect way of describing God than that which based itself on His incomprehensibility. For our purpose it is sufficient to note that St. John's system is constructed exclusively on the basis of the Via Negativa and that for him positive affirmations as to the nature of God, like any other natural act of the human faculties, are ultimately an impediment to the soul's progress towards union. The other point which should be explained is that although for the sake of convenience I have discussed separately the meaning of St. John's purgative way and his doctrine of the medio próximo, these are, in



fact, complementary concepts in his doctrine as a whole. The prayer of contemplation infused by God is the agent of the passive purgation of the senses and, subsequently, of the passive purgation of the spirit. The sequedades which the soul experiences are the result of the disorientating suspension of its accustomed mode of operation.

The brief but eloquent extract from the Repertorium which has been discussed above offers the key, I believe, not only to the understanding of Thomas's use of St. John, but also to that of his own aims as a writer on spirituality. For this extract is far from untypical in its concern to include as many different descriptions of the spiritual life as possible within one all-embracing framework. Thomas of Jesus's subsequent printed works were always to tend towards the compendious. This would often result in excessive subdivisions and a bewilderingly copious nomenclature. On the other hand it would risk doing violence to hermetic, coherent systems of spirituality such as that of St. John. It is not impossible to relate the doctrines of St. John to the traditional teachings of the Church. However, since he constructs them from first principles which have a universal application, it is incorrect to present them as a simple alternative to systems which derive different conclusions from the same principles. At some stage it becomes necessary to choose between parallel but mutually incompatible doctrines. The historical judgement of the Church is that in matters relating to spirituality and, above all, mysticism, St. John's works are a prime authority.

The Repertorium was unknown until comparatively recently<sup>(17)</sup>. Another product of the pen of Thomas of Jesus was to exercise a far greater influence over the world's understanding of the doctrines of St. John. The famous Tratado Breve<sup>(18)</sup> was able, by reason of its historical circumstances, to achieve an extraordinary dissemination

of Thomas of Jesus's interpretation of St. John's doctrines, even though it has never been published under Thomas's name. The Tratado was only recently discovered to be imperfectly extracted from an unpublished work of Thomas of Jesus, written in the early years of the seventeenth century and long attributed to the Portuguese José del Espiritu Santo<sup>(19)</sup>. This work will be referred to as the Primera Parte. The author who produced the Tratado itself is unknown, so our discussion of its contents will be restricted to those parts which we know to proceed directly from Thomas's original work. The immediate cause of the wide diffusion of the Tratado was its inclusion without acknowledgement in the Arte de bien vivir published in 1608 by Antonio de Alvarado, O.S.B.<sup>(20)</sup>. While this work made available to the general public the concepts of the unnamed St. John as interpreted by the equally unnamed Thomas of Jesus, the Carmelite school of spirituality was to be more influenced in its formation by the belief that the Tratado Breve was the work of St. John himself. In the eighteenth century Andrés de la Encarnación discovered a manuscript copy of the Tratado dated 1618 which attributed its composition to fray Juan de la Cruz. The key role of the Tratado in the evolution of the spirituality of the Reform has been affirmed by Father Gabriel de Sainte Marie Madeleine O.C.D. in the Dictionnaire de Spiritualité<sup>(21)</sup>. Until the twentieth century it was held to be the work of St. John. After this idea had been generally rejected it was taken to be the work of an early disciple of St. John's. Only in 1961 did Father Simeón show that it proceeds almost in its entirety from the Primera Parte by Thomas of Jesus. Throughout its history this treatise has been accepted in Carmelite circles, if not always as written by St. John himself, then at least as a faithful reflection of his teachings, whether oral or written. Father Simeón echoes this traditional judgement in the conclusion of his study of the Tratado Breve.

Al devolver hoy al venerable P. Tomás de Jesús su paternidad formal y eminente sobre las páginas del Tratado breve... plácenos hacer una vez más justicia de este aspecto de su persona y de su doctrina tan malamente aceptado y comprendido: su fervoroso y nunca desmentido sanjuanismo<sup>(22)</sup>.

It is my belief that in the Tratado Thomas of Jesus uses the works of St. John in a similar way to that which has been observed in the Repertorium.

The Tratado presents certain difficulties of interpretation for the reader familiar with the works of St. John, for these are extracted and paraphrased so copiously that attention is initially drawn by the individual doctrines derived from the saint rather than by the manner of their presentation or the surrounding material provided by Thomas of Jesus. On a closer examination the hand of Thomas becomes more apparent. The tendencies which were suggested by the brief note in the Repertorium emerge in a similar form in this treatise. Although in the chapters which are certainly by Thomas we do not find the same reference to other spiritual writers by name, Saint John's doctrines are again included in a framework which attempts to be more comprehensive yet fails to respect the integrity of St. John's teachings in their totality. In this respect chapters 1, 9 and 10 are not much different to those which are taken directly from the Primera Parte. They show the same degree of extraction from St. John<sup>(23)</sup> and the same inclination towards all-embracing sub-divisions<sup>(24)</sup>. However, the passages chosen for examination will all be among those which are taken from the Primera Parte. Two tendencies in particular will be examined; the proposal of general schemes of prayer incompatible with St. John's plan and the modification of individual doctrines of St. John in a way which devoids those doctrines of their true meaning.

Chapter two of the Tratado breve is principally concerned with describing the varieties of contemplation which may be experienced by the soul, drawing on the concept of the Via positiva and Via negativa as the two ways of gaining knowledge of God. Towards the end of the chapter Thomas gives his estimation of how these varieties compare with one another in value:

en primer lugar, y como más perfecta contemplación, se ha de poner la que nace y se funda en el conocimiento negativo; en el segundo lugar, la que se funda en el conocimiento positivo general y confuso, que es el de la simple inteligencia; y en el tercero, el afirmativo, que se funda en las noticias y conocimientos particulares de Dios<sup>(25)</sup>.

From what we have already seen of St. John's doctrine on contemplation it is apparent that the third grade described by Thomas does not accord with St. John's understanding of this form of prayer, as it depends on just those particularised concepts of God which must be left behind when the Intellect begins to operate under the supernatural influence of Faith. The second grade, the contemplation 'de simple inteligencia' requires further comment since it was to become very popular as a way of explaining St. John and of validating the notion of a form of contemplation which was available to all souls. The basis for this grade lies in the belief that in addition to its operation through particular forms and images, the soul was also naturally capable of forming a general concept of God which would consider Him in His totality, without recourse to any of his attributes in particular. Although this idea of a 'synthetic' glance at God, within the natural capacity of the soul, has enjoyed wide support even as far as the present day, it was rejected in the clearest fashion by St. John himself:

si hablamos naturalmente, como quiera que el entendimiento no puede entender cosa si no es lo que cabe y está debajo de las formas y fantasías de las cosas que por los sentidos corporales se recibe(n)-- las cuales cosas, habemos (ya) dicho, no pueden servir de medio--, no se puede aprovechar de la inteligencia natural. (2S:8:4)

For St. John it is only when the Intellect works in a supernatural manner, through Faith, that it is freed from specific forms and images and enabled to appreciate the 'noticia amorosa general' which is the beginning of contemplation. At one point in the Subida St. John offers a summary of every possible perception of the Intellect, which encompasses 'todas las aprehensiones así naturales como sobrenaturales, que puede recibir' (2S:10:1). Within this scheme there is only one perception which is 'confusa, oscura y general' and this falls within the supernatural group. It is identified as 'la contemplación que se da en fe', the only perception of the Intellect which is given the title of contemplation in this all-embracing scheme. These considerations help to make patent the exclusion from St. John's system of a contemplation 'que se funda en el conocimiento positivo general y confuso, que es el de la simple inteligencia'. This natural but generalised act of the Intellect as a form of contemplation was to be much used by later apologists of St. John. For Basilio Ponce de León it would offer a way of explaining that the natural functions of the soul were not lost during contemplation, but merely simplified. This allowed him to minimise the passivity of the soul in St. John's doctrines and so dissociate him more completely from the errors of the alumbrados<sup>(26)</sup>. In the later works of Thomas of Jesus the concept would be developed and given a theological context to form his characteristic doctrine of acquired contemplation. The Tratado breve, or more exactly the Primera Parte was, however, a

formative work, inconsistent in some respects with his later treatises on prayer. To take an example, the earlier work treats active contemplation as inferior to the negative and infused variety, and teaches that it may act as a preparation for the latter. In his mature works Thomas sees acquired contemplation more as a parallel way, by which the soul may have access to the same knowledge of God through its own efforts as that obtained passively in infused contemplation. This is the trend we observed in the Repertorium, where 'meditaciones y discursos y contemplaciones afirmatiuas' and St. John's purgative way were held to be separate but equally valid paths towards union with God. The general structure of spirituality proposed by the Tratado breve is not, then entirely typical of Thomas's teaching; but neither is it compatible with that of St. John.

Perhaps a more significant feature of the Tratado is Thomas's tendency to extract an entire doctrine from the works of St. John and then immediately to modify that doctrine to conform to his own ideas on prayer. In chapter three Thomas is speaking of the step from affirmative to negative contemplation. He intends to explain 'en qué se conocerá que un alma tiene ya disposición para dejar este conocimiento y contemplación clara de Dios de formas y noticias particulares, que casi todo es uno, y pasar a la contemplación oscura y desnuda de estas formas y conocimientos particulares de la Mística Teología' (27). The three signs he gives are substantially based on the three signs given by St. John in the Subida by which the soul may know that it may safely abandon meditation in favour of contemplation as its normal form of prayer. Thomas suppresses the reference to meditation, as he is maintaining that the starting point for this transition is already a form of contemplation:

Cuándo se ha de ir a la contemplación negativa y oscura.--La primera señal es, cuando cualquier cosa que se oye o se entiende por el alma por medio de los sentidos, así de Dios como de las criaturas, no sólo no le satisface, sino le causa tedio.

La segunda, cuando en cosa ninguna que conoce sea de Dios, o de las criaturas, toma gusto.

La tercera, cuando siente dentro de sí que crece un deseo, una hambre y una sed grande de Dios, entonces seguramente podrá aspirar a la contemplación oscura<sup>(28)</sup>.

In St. John's version of the three signs, unless the soul observed all three in conjunction it should never attempt to abandon the lower form of prayer. Thomas's signs initially seem to have the same absolute value. Yet the next paragraph of the Tratado contradicts this assumption:

Asimismo, aunque no sienta estas<sup>s</sup> señales que he dicho, como esté suficientemente ejercitada en la contemplación inmediata de Dios Nuestro Señor, podrá seguramente extenderse a la contemplación por negación y comenzar en las imágenes y contemplación afirmativa, e ir subiendo hasta venir a parar a la incomprehensibilidad e inaccesibilidad de Dios, según la práctica que puse<sup>(29)</sup>;

This qualification rather complicates matters, but it also contains two implications which are not consonant with St. John's ideas on contemplation. The 'contemplación inmediata de Dios' cannot be a preparatory stage preceding negative contemplation since, according to St. John, the only contemplation which may approach God without intermediaries, indeed the only form of contemplation, is that which is infused by the supernatural action of one or more of the theological virtues in their respective faculties. St. John does

distinguish different grades of contemplation on the basis of how many of the faculties experience the supernatural mode of operation at any one time.<sup>(30)</sup> However, he never applies the term contemplation to any form of prayer which does not involve the abstraction or suspension of the natural function of at least the Intellect. This fact in itself renders untenable the view of a contemplation in St. John's works which is exercised precisely through the natural activity of the Intellect. Similarly we must reject the second implication of Thomas's qualifying paragraph, that the soul may advance step by step, through its own activity in the formation of particular concepts about God, until it arrives by natural progression at the state of negative contemplation. The infusion of the supernatural theological virtues which at once dispose the soul for contemplation and are also contemplation's essential components is entirely the work of God, who is in no way obliged to this action by the soul's self-preparation, 'que no todos los que se exercitan de propósito en el camino del espíritu lleva Dios a contemplación, ni aun a la mitad; el porqué El se lo sabe' (IN:9:9).

Where Thomas of Jesus is most reluctant to leave the doctrines of St. John unmodified is where they touch on the loss of the natural faculties during contemplation. He shares with later apologists a concern to exclude any complete suspension of natural activity on the part of the soul. In one respect he follows St. Teresa's ideas on prayer, as he sees them, namely in his reluctance to allow the consideration of the Humanity of Christ to be abandoned even in the highest forms of prayer<sup>(31)</sup>. He concludes that this consideration may be left at the very moment of contemplation but at no other time. St. John only mentions the consideration of the life of Christ as an aid in the soul's initial self-negation of the sensitive appetites. (IS:13:3). He does not except it from the general rules governing



the transition from meditation to contemplation, presumably because the human concept which we can form of Christ's nature, like all of our affirmations about God, bears no essential relationship to His being, and so must be left behind when the 'noticia amorosa general' of God is recognised within the soul.

Thomas of Jesus is more dogmatic in his refusal to exclude from the prayer of contemplation several active components of prayer which he considered essential as well as the practice of certain virtues:

También se advierta que aunque esta noticia general desnuda al alma de otras noticias particulares, acerca de particulares obras, aunque sean del mismo Dios, pero no excluye los actos de particulares virtudes acerca de Dios, como le conocemos por fe, antes sería error muy grande pensar lo contrario, y así el alma se ha de ejercitar, no sólo en aquella vista amorosa de Dios, sino en alabar, bendecir, honrar y glorificar a tan gran Dios, y en los actos de las demás virtudes, como diremos adelante<sup>(32)</sup>.

Although St. John admits the possibility of occasional gentle participation by the active Intellect in the first stage of contemplation, 'más movidas de Dios que de la mesma habilidad del alma', the degree of activity exhorted by Thomas of Jesus conflicts with St. John's advice to souls in this state expressed in both the Subida and the Noche oscura:

A estos tales se les ha de decir que aprendan a estarse con atención y advertencia amorosa en Dios en aquella quietud, y que no se den nada por la imaginación ni por la obra de ella, pues aquí (como decimos) descansan las potencias y no obran activamente, sino pasivamente, recibiendo lo que Dios obra en ellas. (2S:12:8)

Sólo lo que aquí han de hacer es dejar el alma libre y desembarazada y descansada de todas las noticias y pensamientos, no teniendo cuidado allí de qué pensarán y meditarán, contentándose sólo con una advertencia amorosa y sosegada en Dios, y estar sin cuidado y sin eficacia, y sin gana de gustarle o de sentirle; porque todas las pretensiones desquietan y distraen al alma de la sosegada quietud y ocio suave de contemplación que aquí se da. (IN:10:4)

The second of these passages was certainly known to Thomas of Jesus since as we have seen, he changed the phrase 'estar sin cuidado' to 'estar sin mucho cuidado' in the manuscript of St. John's works which passed through his hands (note 12 above). This alteration, together with his appeal for greater activity on the soul's part, suggests a conscious disagreement with St. John rather than oversight or misunderstanding. The same is suggested by Thomas's concern to explain the term ocio, which appears in the above passage from the Noche oscura (Tratado p. 313, no. 7).

Despite the examples which have been discussed, much of what is extracted from St. John is left almost indistinguishable from St. John's own presentation. Thomas's exposition of the action of the theological virtues on the soul in chapter seven only differs in that Thomas does not associate Hope specifically with the faculty of Memory. Yet, as we have seen, Thomas fails in his application of St. John's principles to the key points in the spiritual way. He repeats St. John's idea that 'por la fe se aniquilan todos los actos de la razón' but includes in contemplation, the prayer of Faith, such rational activities as the praise of God. He recognises the need for purity in the soul which aspires to union, but does not appreciate that the necessary purgation of the soul cannot be effected by the soul itself, but requires God's gift of infused contemplation, a

gift not conceded to the majority of souls (IN:9:9). Because of this misunderstanding he conceives of the path from meditation through to union as a logical progression, in which advancement is not denied to any soul which has faithfully exercised itself in its present stage of prayer, 'porque así como la meditación, excediéndose a sí misma, para en contemplación, así la contemplación, excediéndose a sí misma, para en unión!'<sup>(33)</sup> Although this idea of a linear progression was to be modified subsequently by Thomas, the history of the Tratado breve was to ensure a wide diffusion of the concept as a way of interpreting the doctrines of St. John. The doctrine of acquired contemplation, germinal in this work, was to be developed extensively by Thomas of Jesus and others, and so our observations on the Tratado may assist in the discussion of later developments in the Carmelite school of spirituality.

In his later works Thomas of Jesus moved away from the direct dependence on St. John which we observed in the Tratado breve, preferring to develop further his own structures of spirituality, furnishing them with a more theological framework. As was mentioned earlier, these structures became increasingly complex and compendious. In the opinion of P. José de Jesús Crucificado O.C.D., the commentator who has most extensively analysed Thomas's doctrinal works, 'el intento de nuestro Autor al escribir sus tratados místicos fué compilar una especie de suma doctrinal acerca de la oración mental'<sup>(34)</sup>. In his mature writings Thomas affirmed the existence of three forms of contemplation, acquired, infused and 'oración infusa super-eminente', distinguished by whether they were exercised 'mediante el esfuerzo e industria de la razón natural bien que iluminada y sostenida por la gracia y los hábitos de las virtudes, o sea, "modo humano", o bajo el influjo peculiar del Espíritu Santo, sea mediante los dones habituales, sea inmediatamente en forma de moción superior o

iluminación del mismo Dios a modo de acto transeunte semejante a la que tiene lugar en las llamadas gracias 'gratis datas', o sea, 'modo supra-humano' (35). Each of these divisions demands consideration and comparison with the teachings of St. John. The only new term introduced here, though not the only change from the Tratado breve, is the supereminent prayer which, as P. José informs us, includes 'el raptó, el éxtasis, la profecía, las visiones y revelaciones, y también la percepción experimental de Dios o la unión mística del alma con Dios' (36). For Thomas of Jesus this prayer ranked higher than any other, as its name suggests. St. John speaks rather differently of some of the constituents of this prayer. In the Subida visions and revelations are among the supernatural perceptions of the soul to which St. John advises the reader to pay little heed (2S:16-32). That the soul should not be hindered in its progress towards union by even the most profound spiritual visions and revelations is a key point in St. John's system:

Las (noticias sobrenaturales) espirituales son también en dos maneras: unas distintas y particulares, y otra es confusa, oscura y general. Entre las distintas y particulares entran cuatro maneras de aprehensiones particulares, que se comunican al espíritu no mediante algún sentido corporal, y son: visiones, revelaciones, locuciones y sentimientos espirituales. La inteligencia oscura y general está en una sola, que es la contemplación que se da en fe. En ésta habemos de poner el alma, encaminándola a ella por todas esotras, comenzando por las primeras, y desnudándola de ellas. (2S:10:4)

No intellectual perception should be sought except that obscure and general perception or contemplation which is caused by Faith. The reason, as we have seen before, is that Faith is the only agent with the capacity to unite the Intellect with God in this life, the

'próximo y proporcionado medio' for this faculty. Revelations, visions and other such phenomena are the particularised spiritual communications which must be eschewed in favour of the darkness which can alone unite us with God. It seems to contradict St. John, then, to place visions and revelations in a bracket above the prayer of 'ordinary' infused contemplation.

The phenomena known as 'raptos y extasis' are normally given the generic title of 'arrobamientos' in St. John. These 'arrobamientos', far from indicating a supreme level of prayer, are taken to be signs that the recipient soul is not yet sufficiently strong to receive spiritual communications from God without a certain 'spilling over' of their effects into the lower portions of the human frame:

Y estos sentimientos tienen en estas visitas los que no han aún llegado a estado de perfección, sino que van camino en estado de aprovechados; porque los que han llegado ya tienen toda la comunicación hecha en paz y suave amor y cesan estos arrobamientos, que eran comunicaciones y disposición. (CB:13:6) see also (2N:1:2).

'Arrobamientos' are seen by St. John as a manner of side-effect often encountered by 'aprovechados' as they pray in the way appropriate to their stage, that is to say, contemplation. It is the exercise of contemplation which will ultimately bring about the union of the soul with God and it is for this reason, perhaps, that St. John does not attach great importance either to the accidental concomitants of contemplation, such as raptures, or to those particularised spiritual communications which will distract the soul from contemplation, such as visions.

The final item included under the title of supereminent prayer is rather different. It is 'la percepción experimental de Dios o la unión mística del alma con Dios'<sup>(37)</sup> There can be no doubt that union is

indeed a more exalted state than contemplation. It is also true that the communication of God's being in union is effected without the use of intermediaries, ('es toque de sustancia, es a saber, de sustancia de Dios en sustancia de el alma' (L1:2:21)), as is the supereminent prayer described by Thomas of Jesus. Yet Thomas's prayer of union differs from that of St. John in that he does not suggest any essential relationship between this and contemplation. For St. John the prayer of contemplation is exercised through the supernatural operation of the theological virtues within the spiritual faculties. The virtues both suspend the natural operations of the faculties, causing a vacío within them, and bring about the union between the faculties and God. Union with God begins within contemplation and the degree of union of the soul is seen to be directly proportionate to the extent of the infusion of the virtues, so that, for example, 'cuanto más fe el alma tiene, más unida está con Dios' (2S:9:2). The reason why Thomas cannot make this connection between contemplation and union is that in his later works he found a theological cause of infused contemplation which was quite different to that proposed by St. John and echoed by Thomas in the Primera Parte. Although in his early writings Thomas had acknowledged the role of the virtues in contemplation and the disposition of the soul for union,<sup>(38)</sup> he later suggested that infused contemplation was brought about 'bajo el influjo peculiar del Espíritu Santo... mediante los dones habituales'<sup>(39)</sup>. The theological virtues were now seen as constituents of acquired but not of infused contemplation. The introduction of the special actuation of the habitual gifts as an explanation of infused contemplation is certainly an innovation, but it is sufficient for our purposes to contrast this view with St. John's scheme of the theological virtues as the constituents of any prayer to which he applies the name of contemplation as well as

the agents of union within contemplation. Also relevant to this study is an examination of whether the general idea of two forms of contemplation, acquired and infused, is compatible with St. John's teachings. We return to this theme as a matter of prime importance simply because it was to be the main source of debate among scholars of St. John's works until the present day.

Something made clear by Father José's study of Thomas of Jesus is that Thomas himself seems to have had difficulty in maintaining a distinction between acquired and infused contemplation, not so much in their theological definition as in their practical application to the soul, for example in the information conveyed by these prayers. Despite the fact that Thomas clearly affirms 'que la diferencia entre la oración adquirida y la oración infusa proviene así de parte del principio de donde proceden como de parte del modo con que el alma ejercita, en una y otra, su actividad' (40), the difference is reduced, on closer analysis by Father José, to a question of the ease or otherwise with which the prayer is exercised. Infused contemplation is practised easily and pleasurably, while in acquired contemplation the soul 'tiende a Dios con la industria y laboriosidad propias de la razón humana, es decir, "humano modo" (41). The distinction between these two forms of prayer is further eroded when we read Thomas's affirmation that 'todo aquello que podemos conocer o contemplar de Dios por medio de la oración adquirida, eso mismo podemos penetrarlo--si bien de un modo más alto--mediante la infusa, y viceversa.' (42) Without the phrase 'y viceversa', underlined by Father José, this sentence would have been understandable, though perhaps questionable. The inclusion of the phrase seriously undermines the claim that the infused prayer of the gifts is a higher form of prayer than the contemplation which may be acquired through the soul's own efforts. The implication is that the soul may enjoy, as a result

of its own diligence, even the most exalted communications of the pre-unitive stage, precisely the same in kind as those conceded as a special favour to those who practise infused contemplation. The internal contradictions of such an idea and its total incompatibility with St. John need not be stressed. Yet it is worth observing that the idea was to find many adherents, who would develop the idea so as to suggest that the soul, through acquired contemplation, could achieve what they termed an active union with God just as, through infused contemplation, the soul might be led to mystical union with Him. Thomas of Jesus's ideas were to open up the possibility of a double way of spirituality. The soul would normally adhere to the ascetical way of self-purification, which would lead through acquired contemplation to an active union with God. As an exception, a soul might sometimes be led by God by the way of infused contemplation towards a mystical union with Him. Yet on tracing these ideas to their source we find that Thomas of Jesus himself cannot distinguish acquired and infused contemplation sufficiently to describe them in different terms, as Father José explains:

Por lo que a la exposición de la doctrina sobre los dos primeros géneros de oración se refiere, es de notar en general que, no difiriendo estos por razón de la materia, como explícitamente afirma el Autor, la estructura y contenido de los tratados correspondientes son perfectamente paralelos y a veces tan idénticos que su Autor no hace otra cosa sino transcribir materialmente íntegros capítulos de una obra en otra a formar un sólo capítulo con períodos tomados literalmente aquí y allá de otros, sin otra variación que la de trocar la palabra oración en contemplación, o el apelativo de adquirida en infusa, y viceversa<sup>(43)</sup>.



The only difference suggested by Thomas, that of the comparative passivity and ease of infused contemplation, does not correspond to any such difference in the works of St. John. Contemplation as described in both the Subida and Noche oscura is classed as peaceful, loving and secret, or obscure (2S:12:7, 14:12, 1N:10:6). The prayer of contemplation in St. John is, I suggest of one kind only, even though it may be experienced in greater or lesser degrees. It is caused exclusively by the operation of the theological virtues in the soul which, when infused by God when and to whom He chooses, negate the natural operations of the faculties and bring them to union with God. This view of St. John's scheme of prayer which, I believe, has been sufficiently demonstrated in previous pages, allows us to judge the validity of the lowest form of prayer in Thomas's system, 'la oración adquirida'. This term embraces more than acquired contemplation, since it may be applied to discursive meditation, but it is acquired contemplation which may most clearly be contrasted with St. John's teachings. According to Thomas it is practised 'con nuestra industria y trabajo mediante el discurso de la razón iluminada por la fe y confortada por la gracia divina y los hábitos de las virtudes'<sup>(44)</sup>. For St. John the theological virtue of Faith is the supernatural mode of operation of the Intellect, whose practice demands, and which itself effects, the loss of the natural operation of the Intellect through Reason. It is a contradiction of St. John's concept to speak of 'el discurso de la razón iluminada por la fe', since Reason and Faith are incompatible operations of the Intellect. The supernatural quality of Faith also means that the soul may not acquire this virtue through its own activity but that it must be infused by God. A contemplation acquired by the soul which involves this virtue is, then, quite incompatible with St. John's doctrine.

As well as making the divine natural, so to speak, by holding that the theological virtues were available to all, Thomas of Jesus continued in his mature works to attach great importance to the exercise of meditation. Chapter fifteen of his Via brevis et plana orationis mentalis<sup>(45)</sup> is entitled:

Quod anima, quae proficere cupit, ab initio viae purgativae usque ad omnimodam viae unitivae perfectionem semper debeat eadem exercitia frequentare<sup>(46)</sup>.

Which exercise he has in mind is made quite clear:

quemadmodum nullus etiam sine miraculo potest perfectam contemplationem sine meditationis exercitio comparare... ita nec illam sine meditatione conservare<sup>(47)</sup>.

Meditation, then, must accompany the soul throughout acquired contemplation and even as far as (active) union with God. It is not a 'medio remoto' to be left behind, as in St. John's system, but rather, as an essential element of acquired contemplation, must be regarded as a proximate means towards the active union which is the goal of this contemplation. What manner of union may be brought about through the finite concepts of discursive meditation is difficult to imagine, and Thomas does not explain active union in detail. Yet the doctrines he initiated were to be applied by later writers to the works of St. John, with devastating results for the saint's correct interpretation.

Two distinct but equally mistaken interpretations of St. John find their origin, I believe, in the writings of Thomas of Jesus. The first, most popular among Dominican writers of the early twentieth century, stems from the Primera parte, through the Tratado breve. In this Thomas proposed that the soul could progress, by virtue of its own activity, from meditation through acquired and infused contemplation to mystical union with God. This idea denies, as we

have seen, the direct intervention of God which, in St. John's view, is absolutely necessary for the purification of the soul which must precede union. Except for the inclusion of acquired contemplation, Thomas's notion of a natural progression towards union was taken up as a way of interpreting St. John's doctrines. According to this interpretation St. John taught a universal vocation to the mystical life and to mystical union with God.<sup>(48)</sup> There was only one spiritual way, in which asceticism gave way to mysticism, and mystical prayer should end in mystical union. This system supposed a fault in any soul which did not attain the highest degree of mystical experience in this life. Ranged against this view was an alternative interpretation of the spiritual life, more popular among Carmelite writers, which may be traced to the later writings of Thomas of Jesus. This is the concept of the double way, described above (note 40). While it is true that Thomas of Jesus did not fully develop this idea, he laid its foundations by teaching that meditation need never be abandoned and that a form of contemplation existed which was available to the soul as a result of its own natural activity. From his description of this acquired contemplation, which includes the action of the theological virtues, was to develop the idea that the virtues, entirely supernatural in St. John's scheme, could and did have a natural or human mode of operation which was accessible to all. According to the exponents of the double way, the soul must normally be prepared to remain in the ascetical way permanently, progressing through acquired contemplation towards an active union with God. This, then, was the normal way of perfection. The mystical way was seen as something added to the soul from outside itself, not dependent on the soul's merit and therefore not necessary for the perfection of the soul. The double way treats mysticism as merely an alternative way by which God sometimes leads souls to that same degree of perfection which others acquire for themselves in the ascetical way.

Where do St. John's doctrines differ from those of the universal vocation and double way? We have seen, I believe, how the constituents of the ascetical side of the double way are inconsistent with St. John's teaching. Acquired contemplation and active union are concepts which contradict his basic principles regarding the nature of the virtues and the transcendence of God. For St. John there is one spiritual way and its main steps are meditation, infused contemplation and union. But this is not to say that there is a universal vocation to union in this life. We have seen how the direct intervention of God is essential if the soul is to receive the infused theological virtues to a degree which will permit the abandonment of meditation and the establishing of contemplation as its normal mode of prayer. We have also seen that this intervention is not conceded to the majority of souls who have exercised themselves in the prayer of meditation:

no todos los que se ejercitan de propósito en el camino del espíritu lleva Dios a contemplación, ni aun a la mitad; el porqué El se lo sabe (1N:9:9).

Does this mean that God denies the opportunity to achieve perfection to the majority of souls? St. John's writings do not leave this difficulty unresolved.

The word 'perfección' has two distinct meanings in St. John. In the most common usage it refers to the state of 'perfectos', that is those enjoying the unitive life. In another usage, however, perfection has no fixed value in relation to the spiritual way, but only in relation to the individual soul and its attainment of the grade to which it has been predestined:

aunque acá en esta vida hallemos algunas almas con igual paz y sosiego en estado de perfección y cada una esté satisfecha,

con todo eso, podrá la una dellas estar muchos grados más levantada que la otra y estar igualmente satisfechas, por cuanto tienen satisfecha su capacidad. (2S:5:11)

All souls are called to a specific stage in the spiritual way and their perfection lies in the fulfilment of the capacity which has been given to them. Consequently there is no universal vocation to the highest mystical states. We may surmise that God's infusion of contemplation will only occur in those souls who have been given the capacity for mystical prayer and for whom perfection lies within this sphere. Conversely, since the majority of souls are excluded from contemplation, we may perhaps deduce that perfection for them consists of the faithful practice of discursive meditation, along with the other exercises of the ascetic life. These exclude, of course, acquired contemplation and active union.

How may a soul know whether it has the capacity for mystical prayer? This question touches on the keynote of the Subida and Noche oscura. St. John is concerned in both of these books to orientate the individual soul. His concern is not so much with those souls for whom meditation is to be a lifelong exercise, but with those others who have been predestined to higher forms of communication with God, yet are impeded in their progress by avoidable obstacles:

Y así, es lástima ver muchas almas a quien Dios da talento y favor para pasar adelante, que, si ellas quisiesen animarse, llegarían a este alto estado, y quédanse en un bajo modo de trato con Dios, por no querer, o no saber, o no las encaminar y enseñar a desasirse de aquellos principios. (S:Prólogo:3).

These souls must learn to recognize when God is seeking to lead them to a deeper knowledge of Him, so that they may respond in a way which will not impede this transition, and know when to abandon themselves to this divine call. This knowledge is what St. John seeks to impart:

Y así, para este saberse dejar llevar de Dios cuando Su Majestad  
 los quiere pasar adelante... daremos doctrina y avisos (S:Prólogo:4)

The mistake of the concept of a universal vocation is the belief that St. John is speaking to every soul when he supplies such advice; in fact he normally addresses himself exclusively, though not always explicitly, to those 'a quien Dios da talento y favor para pasar adelante', in other words, to that minority for whom perfection lies within the realm of mysticism.

Thomas of Jesus may not be charged in a general fashion with deliberately misrepresenting St. John. In his later works his concern was to develop his own ideas on the nature of the soul's communication with God. Even in the Tratado breve, largely extracted from the saint's works, the name of St. John never actually appears<sup>(49)</sup>. Yet all of his works were to have far-reaching consequences for how subsequent generations interpreted St. John's doctrine. During the later part of his life Thomas enjoyed a considerable reputation in his order, so that as early as 1630 his ideas on natural or acquired contemplation were applied to the doctrine of St. John, in a bid to answer once and for all the doubts which had been raised about the saint's orthodoxy in the sixteen-twenties<sup>(50)</sup>. The Tratado breve, believed to have been written by St. John, was similarly influential in the development of Carmelite teaching on mysticism. The reaction of the careful scholar, Andrés de la Encarnación, to the Tratado is illuminating. On first finding the work Andrés cannot suppose it to be certainly authentic. One of the doubts he expresses concerns acquired contemplation:

desmenuza demasiado las materias místicas, y tiene visos el modo de tratarlas de más moderno que el Santo, pues habla de contemplación adquirita, natural y sobrenatural, del conocimiento de Dios por afirmación y negación,<sup>(51)</sup>.

When Andrés became more convinced of the Tratado's authenticity, however, he used the presence of acquired contemplation in the work as evidence that contemporary doubts as to the existence of this form of prayer in St. John's framework were unfounded:

dice de la contemplación de fe y vista amorosa, que unos la ejercitan activamente, y otros son introducidos en ella pasiva y sobrenaturalmente, con que tenemos en su sentencia clara y expresa la contemplación activa y ordinaria, y no tan ajena de las almas como han querido algunos, que sólo se les conceda como de milagro (52) .

The idea of acquired contemplation as a feature of St. John's doctrine has proved to be the most durable of Thomas's legacies, even if it has undergone some changes in the intervening centuries. Not until 1971 was the idea of a human mode of operation of the theological virtue of Faith discredited, when Fr. Joseph Ferraro showed the concept to be theologically invalid as well as inconsonant with the writings of St. John (53).

It need hardly be stressed, in the light of the above discussion, that Thomas of Jesus must rank as a major influence militating against the accurate transmission of St. John's thought in the early part of the seventeenth century. Yet he was not by any means the only figure to exert an influence over the subsequent interpretation of St. John's writings. At least as large a role must be conceded to Father Salablanca and the other collaborators in the first edition of St. John's works, as will be shown in the next chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. For full details see bibliography. The initials O.C.D. will be used to indicate members of the Discalced Carmelite order, as will the term Carmelite without further qualification.
2. See bibliography.
3. Études Carmélitaines 5 (1920), pp. 12-18.
4. 'Inanidad de la contemplación adquirida', CT 29 (Jan-June 1924), pp. 331-49 and 30 (July-Dec 1924), pp. 5-27, 'Incoherencias y fantasías peligrosas de la contemplación adquirida', CT 30 (July-Dec 1924), pp. 332-56.
5. For a more complete description of this debate see Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'Tomás de Jesús y San Juan de la Cruz', EC 5 (1951-54), pp. 91-159.
6. See the article of the same title by Florencio de la Cruz for an account of this congress, MST 6 (1928-29), pp. 209-14.
7. Quoted by Angel L. Cilveti in Introducción a la mística española (Madrid: Cátedra, 1974).
8. See bibliographical entries for Gabriel de Sainte Marie-Madeleine, Gabriel a BB. Dionysio et Redempto and Federico Ruiz Salvador.
9. In 1601 Thomas of Jesus was given a joint commission with Juan de Jesús María (Aravalles) to examine the works of St. John as a preliminary to their publication. In 1603 his name alone was mentioned when the Definitorio authorised him to print the works. See BNM MS 13.482, sections B32 and B33.
10. 'El P. Tomás de Jesús, escritor místico', EC 3 (1949), pp. 305-49 and 4 (1950) pp. 149-206.
11. Hereafter referred to as Subida, Noche and Llama respectively. Quotations from St. John's works will normally be given according



to the BAC fifth edition of 1964. References will be included in the text and will take an abbreviated form as follows: (3S:6:5) will refer to the fifth paragraph of the sixth chapter in book three of the Subida. The conventional sigla of CA and CB will normally be employed in references to the Cántico espiritual.

12. 'Un nuevo códice manuscrito de las obras de San Juan de la Cruz, usado y anotado por el P. Tomás de Jesús', EC 4 (1950), pp. 95-148.
13. (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1948).
14. See for example the two articles by Juan de Jesús María, 'La segunda redacción del "Cántico espiritual" y el comentario al mismo de Agustín Antolínez, O.S.A.', MC 53 (1949), pp. 13-37 and 'El Cántico espiritual de San Juan de la Cruz y Amores de Dios y el Alma de A. Antolínez, O.S.A.', EC 3 (1949), pp. 443-542 and 4 (1950), pp. 3-70.
15. See notes 5 and 12 above.
16. See for example 1N:10:4.
17. See note 10 above.
18. Unedited until 1914 when it was included in volume 3 of Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz's edition of St. John's works, pp. 271-335, from which all quotations are taken.
19. See the two articles by Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'La obra fundamental del P. Tomás de Jesús, inédita y desconocida', EC 4 (1950), pp. 431-518 and 'Gloria y ocaso de un apócrifo sanjuanista, el "Tratado breve del conocimiento oscuro de Dios afirmativo y negativo"', MC 69 (1961), pp. 185-208 and 419-40.
20. Arte de bien vivir y guía de los caminos del cielo (Hirache: Matías Mares, 1608).

21. Vol. 1, column 201.
22. 'Gloria y ocaso...' (note 19 above), p. 440 .
23. See for example the 'Reglas breves' of Chapter 9, p. 329,  
taken from 1S:13:11.
24. See Chapter 1, pp. 287-90.
25. Tb, p. 298.
26. Of whom more in Chapter 4.
27. Tb, p. 301.
28. Tb, p. 301.
29. Tb, 302.
30. 2S:14:10-12.
31. Tb, pp. 309-10.
32. Tb, p. 313.
33. Tb, p. 326.
34. EC 4 (1950), p. 152 (see note 10 above).
35. EC 4 (1950), p. 154.
36. EC 4 (1950), p. 157.
37. EC 4 (1950), p. 157.
38. Tb, pp. 319-24.
39. EC 4 (1950), p. 155.
40. EC 4 (1950), p. 155.
41. EC 4 (1950), p. 157.
42. EC 4 (1950), p. 157.
43. EC 4 (1950), p. 159, Fr. José cites several examples.
44. EC 4 (1950), pp. 154-55.
45. Quoted from Opera omnia (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1684).
46. Opera omnia, p. 89.
47. Opera omnia, p. 89.
48. See Cilveti, p. 149 (reference at note 7 above).

49. Although it does in one MS of the Primera Parte, BNM MS 12.398; see EC 5 (1951-54), pp. 116-17.
50. See Chapter 4 of this thesis.
51. Memorias historiales (BNM MS 13.482), section A53, ff. 13r-14r.
52. Tb, p. 282.
53. 'Sanjuanist doctrine on the human mode of operation of the theological virtue of Faith', EC 22 (1971), pp. 250-94.

**CHAPTER 3**

**ST. JOHN AND THE EDITOR**

ST: JOHN AND THE EDITOR

Introduction: Thomas of Jesus

In the Definitorio or Chapter of Discalced Carmelites held in 1601 it was decided to publish the works of St. John of the Cross and the preparation of the first edition was entrusted to Thomas of Jesus and Juan de Jesús María. The governing body of the Reform returned to this theme in 1603 when Thomas of Jesus was given licence to publish the Saint's works. According to Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen in 'Primeras ediciones del "Cántico espiritual"' this suggests that an edition was either ready for the press or in an advanced state of preparation<sup>(1)</sup>. However, the edition licensed by the 1603 decision never reached the presses. The main reason suggested by Eulogio is that St. John's works encountered implacable resistance in the hierarchy of the Reform centred in the person of Alonso de Jesús María. As General of the Spanish Carmelites between 1607 and 1613, moreover, Alonso was uniquely able to suppress all activity relating to St. John during his term of office. Corresponding to this period Eulogio notes a suspension of all activities in favour of St. John. Efforts to secure the publication of his works, preparations for a first biography and the collection of depositions for his subsequent beatification did not begin again until 1613, when Alonso had completed his term of office and made way for a new General, José de Jesús María. During the term of this new General work on all of these subjects was resumed in earnest. The first edition of St. John's works was published and the necessary information was collected both for a biography of St. John and for his beatification cause. The circumstantial evidence against Alonso accumulated by Eulogio, already

persuasive, becomes decisive when a second suspension of activity in favour of St. John is seen to coincide with Alonso's second term as General, between 1619 and 1625.

Eulogio, then, clarifies one of the central mysteries surrounding the variable fortunes of St. John's writings in the early seventeenth century. Yet one of the problems he identifies remains unexplained:

Hubo, sin duda posible, una prolongada suspensión de la obra, suspensión que no se explica por el simple hecho de que el encargado, Tomás de Jesús, abandonara en 1607 España. Desde 1601 había tenido tiempo suficiente... En todo caso, cabe distinguir dos períodos abiertos a la interrogación: el que abarca el mandato del P. Tomás y el que, fenecido éste, se prolonga hasta 1617. (p. 8)

Eulogio finds the second of these questionable periods (i.e. 1607+1617) 'más comprometedor e intrigante' and so concentrates on the role of Alonso de Jesús María during this time. Yet the period embracing Thomas's involvement has its own interests. For until 1607 Thomas of Jesus was still in Spain and the Reform was still governed by those who had given him his commission to publish the saint's works. That the climate within the order was still favourable to such endeavours is suggested by Quiroga's continued collection of testimonies for his biography of St. John ('Primeras ediciones', p. 9). Silverio de Santa Teresa, in the Preliminares volume of his edition of St. John's works, suggests that Thomas was probably unable to work much on his commission because the life of the Desiertos<sup>(2)</sup>:

Consagra la mayor parte del tiempo a ejercicios piadosos de comunidad, a la lectura y oración, y está desterrado de ellos el estudio propiamente escolástico, para que no entorpezca la vida interior propia de estos yermos.<sup>(3)</sup>

Since Silverio's day, however, a great deal of evidence has been discovered to contradict this view. A manuscript of St. John's works annotated by Thomas of Jesus probably dates from this period as does the Repertorium, Thomas's notebook wherein he devised schemes for his subsequent treatises on prayer and in which the doctrines and name of 'fray Juan de la Cruz' appear several times<sup>(4)</sup>. The manuscript certainly bears signs of examination such as underlining and marginal marks and annotations. But, as discussed in the previous chapter, these notes are very few in number and the manuscript as a whole, though evidently used, does not appear to have been brought to a state of readiness for publication. The Repertorium, also studied in Chapter 2, shows the assimilation of Thomas's knowledge of St. John into Thomas's own schemes for future treatises on prayer. A third item produced during the period of Thomas's commission to edit St. John's works is described by Simeón de la Sagrada Familia in 'La obra fundamental del P. Tomás de Jesús, ineditada y desconocida'<sup>(5)</sup>. The work in question is the Primera parte del camino espiritual de oración y contemplación, which Simeón deftly proves to have been written by Thomas of Jesus before his departure from Spain. One of the treatises contained in this work, the Tratado de Contemplación, is shown by Simeón to have been written before 1604 and in another study he declares it to be 'repleto de enjundiosa doctrina sanjuanista'<sup>(6)</sup>. From the Tratado de contemplación was extracted the famous Tratado breve discussed in Chapter 2 and attributed as late as 1914 to St. John of the Cross himself.

Thomas of Jesus, then, was by no means idle during his time in Las Batuecas. He himself affirms in the dedications of two of his major Latin works that these works were conceived and elaborated to a large extent during his seven years in the Desierto<sup>(7)</sup>. Between 1601 and

1607 Thomas had access to manuscripts of St. John's works, ample time at his disposal and a Discalced hierarchy favourably inclined towards the saint. Yet rather than preparing the awaited edition of St. John's works, he made use of the manuscripts at his disposal to assist him in developing his own schemes and treatises on prayer. Once having left Spain, Thomas continued to make use of the material gleaned from his examination of St. John's manuscripts. Passages uniquely of St. John's invention such as the three signs of initial contemplation are used and re-used by Thomas of Jesus in his printed works, always without acknowledgement and always, in my judgement, within a context which mutilates the saint's meaning. This process begins with the publication in Rome in 1610 of Thomas's Tratado de oración mental. In this, with St. John's first edition still some years in the future, Thomas prints liberal extracts from the saint's writings without revealing his source: the manuscripts from which Thomas himself had been asked to produce an edition.

Silverio makes the valid point in dealing with similar topics that the seventeenth century was not the twentieth as regards concepts of intellectual copyright and accuracy of textual transmission. Yet such indulgence is generally only extended between members of the same order. So when Simeón speaks of the inclusion without acknowledgement of the Tratado de contemplación in the Arte de bien vivir published in 1608 by the Benedictine Antonio de Alvarado, he comments on the author's 'gran disimulo para que no se conociera el hurto'<sup>(8)</sup>. Similarly, Eulogio refers to the 'plagiario mínimo Juan Bretón' who included extracts from St. John in a work published in 1614<sup>(9)</sup>. Yet the presence in Thomas of Jesus's writings of large unacknowledged extracts from the unpublished manuscripts of St. John of the Cross, manuscripts entrusted to Thomas for the precise purpose of preparing them



for publication, merits no such opprobrium. Rather this is taken by Simeón as one more proof of Thomas's devotion to the Saint:

Al devolver hoy al venerable P. Tomás de Jesús su paternidad formal y eminente sobre las páginas del Tratado breve ... plácenos hacer una vez más justicia de este aspecto de su persona y de su doctrina tan malamente aceptado y comprendido: su fervoroso y nunca desmentido sanjuanismo<sup>(10)</sup>:

The facts we have seen might be equally well explained by an attitude of cynical opportunity on Thomas's part. This illustrates the dangers of surmising intentions at a distance of several centuries. Without attempting to uncover motives, then, we may summarise Thomas's role so far as follows:

1. As I hope to have shown in Chapter 2, Thomas's activity during the period of his commission, in writing treatises and developing theories, laid the foundation for the misunderstanding of St. John's ideas by future generations.
2. By the time Thomas of Jesus left Spain, his commission unfulfilled, the first period of time conducive to publication had expired and, due to Alonso de Jesús María's influence, work was not re-commenced until after 1613. Thomas's inactivity in this respect, then, was responsible for a long and unnecessary delay in the textual transmission of the Saint's ideas.

The first official attempt to prepare and publish an edition of St. John's works came to nothing. During the years which followed, the cause of St. John was not actively promoted. So it was not until 1617 that the Chapter returned to the subject, licensing once again the publication of St. John's works. A stipulation of this decision which was lacking in the earlier commissions was that the work should first be presented to three renowned theologians and their written opinions sought<sup>(11)</sup>. Rapid progress was made. During the following

year the necessary licences, approvals and other accompaniments were assembled and in December of 1618 the first edition appeared. St. John's works had achieved a remarkably wide circulation in manuscript form<sup>(12)</sup>. Yet his influence was still largely confined to the Discalced Carmelite order and selected friends and benefactors of the Reform. It was the publication of the 1618 edition which was to bring St. John to the notice of the world at large. The evaluation of this edition, then, is of great relevance to the theme of this thesis. This evaluation will concentrate on the three main features of the edition, namely the omission of the Cántico espiritual, the accompanying material supplied by the editor, Salablanca, and others and the textual changes introduced by Salablanca into the works which were published.

#### Omission of the Cántico espiritual

When Father Salablanca began to prepare the first edition of St. John's works he must have been aware of the enormous responsibility which had been given to him. The delay in publication had been so long as to cause widespread comment and concern. Contemporary letters express the general desire felt amongst St. John's admirers that his works should find their way into print<sup>(13)</sup>. Yet this feeling was not shared universally even within the Carmelite order. Occupying the post of Provincial between his terms as General, Alonso de Jesús María, St. John's principal opponent, still maintained a highly influential position within the order. Merely to avoid internal conflict, then, a cautious approach was indicated. But the scale of the precautions taken by Salablanca suggest that this was not the only factor which needed to be considered.

By far the most radical of Salablanca's interventions was to omit from the first edition any part of or reference to the Cántico espiritual.

Both the number of manuscripts in circulation and contemporary comments suggest that this was the most widely copied and admired of St. John's works<sup>(14)</sup>. Why then should it be omitted? To answer this it is necessary to recall the religious ambience within which the first edition was produced and in particular the presence and all-pervasive influence of the Spanish Inquisition. For, although not at the peak of its power, the Inquisition was still the principal moderator of all published works. Particularly where books on spirituality were concerned, no editor could fail to be aware at every moment of the need to satisfy the Holy Office as to the rigid orthodoxy of any pages submitted for examination. In its heyday the Inquisition had been capable of incarcerating Archbishop Carranza on account of a catechism containing very little of a controversial nature<sup>(15)</sup>. Fray Luis de León had also suffered imprisonment for having the temerity to produce a translation of and commentary on the Song of Solomon<sup>(16)</sup>. While the days of Fernando de Valdés and Melchor Cano were gone and the Spanish Inquisition, partly as a result of the Carranza episode, had lost some of its influence in Rome, it could still prove a formidable adversary should it take exception to the writings of a religious author. Sufficient proof of this might be found in the trial of the luckless Antonio de Rojas, denounced and prosecuted as late as 1630 for a work which was virtually a paraphrase of large portions of St. John's works<sup>(17)</sup>.

St. John's poem, the Cântico espiritual, was replete with verbal and thematic allusions to the Song of Songs. His prose commentary likewise made no secret of the source of St. John's inspiration. This was still an age where vernacular editions of the Bible had been suppressed. And of all of the books in the Bible, the Song of Songs was the one which was most likely, in the eyes of certain theologians, to lead the uneducated reader into errors of interpretation. The

reason for this is apparent from even a superficial reading of the book. Now commonly recognised as a collection of traditional Jewish wedding songs<sup>(18)</sup>, the Song had long exercised the ingenuity of theologians who attempted to produce an exegesis of the verses which would conform with ecclesiastical precepts. Neglecting, of necessity, the modern explanation of the book, two allegorical meanings had frequently been ascribed to it. The Song was often seen as prophesying the relationship between Christ and his Church. From a conservative point of view this was a particularly harmless interpretation of the Song and it enjoyed widespread official sanction in the early Church. Colin Thompson points out that after St. Bernard of Clairvaux a second traditional interpretation was to gain the ascendancy<sup>(19)</sup>. According to this the partners in the spiritual wedding were Christ and the individual soul. St. John generally favours this second interpretation. While this reading of the Song of Solomon was confirmed to a small proportion of contemplatively inclined religious communities and further limited to those with sufficient education to read the Latin of the Vulgate, the Church hierarchy does not appear to have been unduly concerned. What cause for concern was there in the appearance of vernacular translations and commentaries? One possibility was that the allegory, when not suitably explained, might be taken at face value and its sensuous imagery cause scandal or endanger moral rectitude. This will be difficult to discount when we see how St. John's works were subsequently interpreted by the alumbrados. Yet some theologians may have seen the second of the traditional interpretations, if propagated among the laity, as potentially more damaging to the authority of the Church. The reason for this lies in the reforms which had wracked Europe for much of the sixteenth century. According to G. R. Elton, one historian of the Reformation period, the Reformation did not cause a

fundamental shift in religious perspectives through its condemnation of religious malpractice and charlatanism<sup>(20)</sup>. Rather, it changed the focus of religious life from a relationship between God and his Church to one between God and the individual soul. Salvation was promised not to the institution of the Church, and, by participation, to all of its adherents, but to the individual soul when repenting of its sins it embraced Christ as its Saviour. This was the offer of God without intermediaries, except in the form of his Son, God Incarnate. Only a change of perspective as radical as this could have won the hearts of such a vast proportion of the population of Europe. And only such a complete by-passing of the institution of the Church, the traditional intermediary between Man and his Creator, could have caused the great divisions of the sixteenth century. The Church had undergone many purges of malpractice. Whether successful or unsuccessful these had always left the central authority of the One, True Church untouched. What it could not withstand, ultimately, had been the offer to the lay christian of a direct route to his Creator in exchange not for the observance of a formalised array of rules but simple repentance and turning towards God. At a stroke, for those who accepted the precepts of the Reformation, the labouring of the exegetes through the ages and the formal definition of the dogma of the Church were undone. Unlearned man, with access to the vernacular Bible, could find his own way to salvation. The reformers would, of course, in time develop their own dogma. But, once shattered, the idea of one authorised interpretation of Scripture and one corporate road to salvation would never again command total obedience in Europe. In its individualism lay the great strength of the Reformation as well as its tendency to produce further similar schismatic movements. Central authority having been rejected, it could not then be re-imposed. Within a short time, various doctrinal trends were discernible within the Reformation, united only in their opposition to Rome.

The above comments, so general as to verge on caricature, may yet, I hope, give some flavour of the times under discussion. On the one hand they may explain to some extent why Luis de León was made to suffer for wishing to put the Song of Songs into wider circulation, to make its mysteries available to the uneducated and to the lay man and woman. They explain too why the Roman Church in the sixteenth century became more entrenched in its centrally-defined core of dogma and less tolerant of those who, like Carranza, wished to give fresh insight into that body of doctrine. Within this siege mentality there were few more serious charges than those of introducing 'nueva doctrina' or of suggesting within a spiritual treatise that the reader might decide for himself or herself how to uncover spiritual truth. Consider, then, the Cántico espiritual and the problems it posed for Salablanca. Largely drawn from one of the most ambiguous books in the Bible, a book moreover which it was forbidden to circulate in vernacular versions, it yet lacked a straightforward allegorical commentary which might render it less confusing to the uneducated. St. John himself appears to recognise this and encourages the reader to draw his own conclusions when he says 'no hay para qué atarse a la declaración' (CB: Prólogo:2). Salablanca was faced with preparing an edition long before the beatification of St. John might place his sanctity beyond question and thus give some measure of protection to his spiritual writings. On the other hand an adverse judgement on these works by the Inquisition might have a disastrous effect on the beatification cause, already in progress. The other works of St. John as well as not being so obviously based on such a contentious book of the Bible, were more straightforwardly allegorical in their explanation of the poems which preceded them. Salablanca, then, decided to omit the Cántico.

In the Preliminares to his edition, Silverio says little about the exclusion of the Cántico:

El Cántico Espiritual no se creyó oportuno publicarlo, por ser una especie de comentario del Cantar de los Cantares.

(BMC 10, p. 210)

This suggests that he thought the omission sufficiently explained by the still-current prohibition of the Song of Solomon in vernacular translations and commentaries. Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen suggests other, possibly complementary reasons<sup>(21)</sup>. Perhaps most telling of these is the involvement of Ana of Jesus, then out of favour with the Spanish Discalced hierarchy. She was the nun at whose request the prose work was written and she is referred to by name in the prologue to the Cántico. Bearing in mind Salablanca's other textual changes, however, it would have been comparatively easy for him to omit or amend the prologue. Less convincing is the possibility that Salablanca experienced confusion on discovering two completely separate but equally well-authenticated versions of the Cántico. The suggestion here is that Salablanca in his haste to publish St. John's works may have decided to limit himself to those works which presented a lesser task to his editorial abilities. Although the two principal redactions of the Cántico have been the subject of heated debate until well into the twentieth century, this explanation is unsatisfactory. Early editors of the Cántico were to be quite content merely to include the extra stanza in Cántico A and this route was surely open to Salablanca.

The explanation which derives from the textual confusion of the Cántico appears to me to be the argument of least moment. Whilst bearing in mind the dangers of attempting to uncover motives at this remove, the explanations which derive from political considerations

seem more reliable. The Cántico, for instance, was inextricably linked in the minds of all members of the order with the rebel prioress Ana de Jesús. This nun, through her spirited opposition to the reforms initiated by Nicolás Doria had long been a thorn in the side of the government of the order. To have published the work, even without its prologue, could not have alleviated the political problem which she continued to pose from her places of refuge outside Spain. Of most importance, however, I would judge the actual source, content and style of the work and its likely impact on the censors of the Inquisition. In an order not long established, it was of the utmost importance to be able to have recourse to the patronage of illustrious founding fathers. The process of St. Teresa's canonisation was already well under way. The order was confident that in St. John of the Cross it had another suitable candidate for official sanctification once all the necessary depositions had been collected for submission to the ecclesiastical authorities. Of the various obstacles which might be encountered in this process, an adverse judgement on his writings by the Holy Office could prove to be the most serious. Better then, in the light of these considerations to take whatever steps might minimise the risk of such an occurrence. For the other works, as we will see, amendment was considered sufficient. Salablanca may have expected, with some justification, that the pervasive presence of the Song of Songs in the Cántico would attract an unwelcome degree of inquisitorial attention. His decision to exclude it, viewed in the light of the priorities of the Reform, seems a logical necessity.

#### Preliminaries and Apuntamientos

One of the more notable features of the preliminaries to the 1618 edition is how seriously Salablanca took the Chapter's exhortation to seek authoritative approval before publishing the works. The



preliminaries include a joint censura by members of the theological faculty of Alcalá as well as three separate aprobaciones by respected theologians of the day. St. John's works thus appeared in public with as formidable a supporting cast as could be mustered. This was, as we have seen, the result of a conscious decision by the government of the order. In due course the strength of these supporting declarations was to be acknowledged by the Inquisitor General, Andrés Pacheco, as the next chapter will show. Contributions to the edition from within the order include a brief sketch of St. John's life, now known to have been Quiroga's first biographical essay, and a short treatise by Salablanca which in Silverio's edition is entitled 'Apuntamientos y advertencias en tres discursos para más fácil inteligencia de las frases místicas y doctrina de las obras espirituales de nuestro padre San Juan de la Cruz'<sup>(22)</sup> Rather than a work of clarification as its title suggests, this appears to be one of defence. My reason for saying this is that although Salablanca acknowledges the difficulty of many readers, even among the clergy, in reading works in Latin (p. 387), his treatise makes extensive use of Latin quotations from earlier Spiritual writers, far more than St. John's works themselves. This suggests that far from being intended to clarify St. John for the general reader, this treatise was aimed at convincing a more select, educated audience of St. John's conformity with traditional received doctrine. The treatise foresees very specific difficulties of interpretation related to certain mystical turns of phrase. Those specifically dealt with are:

1. Máculas or involuntary imperfections
2. passivity of the soul during contemplation
3. transforming union
4. substantial touches and locutions
5. the place of meditation

Salablanca attempted first and foremost to validate St. John's ideas on the above doctrinal topics. He also tried to prove with logical rather than doctrinal arguments that St. John's works should appear:

1. in an authorised version - this in response to various inaccurate representations of his doctrine which had appeared (p. 349)
2. in the vernacular rather than Latin, so that more people might benefit from them (p. 392).

The conclusions which Salablanca reaches on the doctrinal matters are set out below.

### 1. Máculas or involuntary imperfections

Salablanca concedes that scholastic theology does not recognise the term mácula 'sino adonde hay culpa' whereas in mystical terminology 'se llama mácula... cualquier cosa que impide la mayor ilustración de Dios' (p. 352). This apparent contradiction is reconciled both by way of a generous clutch of lengthy Latin quotes from the Church fathers and by the general observation that different branches of knowledge often use the same terms in a different sense.

### 2. Passivity of the soul during contemplation

Explaining St. John's doctrine on passivity was a more exacting task for Salablanca (and all of St. John's commentators) since this was 'lo más levantado y dificultoso de la doctrina de nuestro venerable Padre' (p. 363). Essentially, Salablanca follows the same line as St. John's other commentators, Thomas of Jesus before him and Basilio Ponce de León some years later, in reducing this to a perceived or relative rather than absolute passivity:

'no obran las potencias como de suyo' (p. 360)

'no parece que obra' (p. 361)

'Todo aquello la hace entender que no obra, o que no hace nada' (p. 361)

'lo que a lo animástico y escolástico se dice obrar, se diga a lo místico no obrar sino recibir' (p. 362)

'Obramos, pero a modo de quietud' (p. 362)

'Es, pues, frasis mística decir que no obran las potencias' (p. 363)

'no se quiere decir que absolutamente no obra ni libremente no consienta' (p. 364)

We may recall here that this theme of passivity had already attracted the attention of Thomas of Jesus in both his Repertorium and his annotated manuscript of St. John's works which is still preserved. In the manuscript it merits the longest of his marginal annotations, under the heading 'como se entiende q no an de obrar'. In the 1618 edition this theme, as well as featuring prominently in the Apuntamientos, was to exercise Salablanca in his textual amendments.

### 3. Transforming union

St. John's affirmations concerning this union are immediately classified as 'a lo sobreperfecto y por hipérboles' (p. 364), although such turns of phrase are justified by reference to various saints and to Teresa of Ávila. In other parts of the treatise, Salablanca defends St. John's concept of union by referring to the substantial permanent union between God and the soul which in St. John's hierarchy of the types of union occupies the lowest rung, rather than drawing on St. John's description of the more exalted union of transformation, which is St. John's major topic (2S:5:3). St. John's treatment of the union of transformation had also been referred to by Thomas of Jesus in his Repertorium, although his reference is to the Cántico rather than the Subida<sup>(23)</sup>.

#### 4. Substantial touches and locutions

These are defended by Salablanca by reference to his earlier defences of union and passivity. Thomas of Jesus, again in his Repertorium, had drawn attention to St. John's teaching on substantial locutions<sup>(24)</sup>.

#### 5. The place of meditation

A central area of disagreement between St. John and Thomas of Jesus, this topic was highlighted in both the Repertorium and the annotated manuscript. Salablanca seems inclined at first to follow the advice of Thomas that meditation on the Passion should never be abandoned (p. 384). However, Salablanca's subsequent words on the subject appear far closer to St. John's own thoughts:

Sea, pues, la regla la que el Santo repite en tantas partes, que en el tiempo de contemplación de vista sencilla y amorosa de Dios, se queda en aquella abstracción y desnudez total de criaturas, discursos y particulares noticias, que por aquel tiempo sin duda impiden la obra que va haciendo Dios. (p. 385)

Could it be mere coincidence that so many of the notes made by Thomas of Jesus during the period of his commission to edit St. John's works were to be echoed by the main themes of Salablanca's Apuntamientos? The answer is that this could easily be a coincidence based on a common awareness of the religious climate of the day and of the themes which were likely to attract inquisitorial attention. As we will see in the next chapter, both the alumbrados in the formation of their doctrines and the inquisitors of Seville in their condemnation of the books were to fasten, quite independently, on largely the same themes. There are other indications, however, which link Thomas's commission with the edition which appeared in 1618.

1. Silverio considers it 'muy posible que si el P. Tomás de Jesús hizo algunos preparativos, se los dejara a este su discípulo

predilecto' (i.e. Salablanca)<sup>(25)</sup>. He gives no source for this supposed affinity between the two but is not given as a rule to groundless statements.

2. In his discussion of Thomas's annotated manuscript, Simeón de la Sagrada Familia says 'Tampoco falta algùn que otro caso de igualdad de variantes entre nuestro ms. y la ep en contra de los demás còdices'<sup>(26)</sup>. Although few in number, he believes that these may indicate that this manuscript may have been sent to assist Salablanca in the preparation of his edition.
3. In almost every case where the manuscript shows an intervention of any kind, be it a mark, underline or marginal note, the first edition shows corresponding deviations from all other known manuscripts. These deviations consist of modifications, paraphrases, omissions and additions following consistent criteria of doctrinal accommodation, as will be discussed in detail below.

Mere coincidence begins to flag as an adequate explanation. This is not to suggest, of course, that Thomas of Jesus is responsible for even a significant portion of the changes introduced in the 1618 edition. These, as Silverio points out 'son muy numerosas. Todas las pãginas tienen algunas, y buena parte de ellas, llevan muchas'<sup>(27)</sup>. Those which may derive from the areas of interest indicated by Thomas of Jesus are comparatively few in number. It may be, however, that Thomas's main bequest to Salablanca, more important than the single manuscript of which we know, was a set of criteria to apply to the preparation of the Saint's works for publication, a collection of themes in relation to which particular caution was indicated. It is impossible at present to prove such an influence. It will, however, be difficult to exclude it as the extent and discernible trends of Salablanca's textual interventions become clear.

### Textual Changes

Although, as I noted earlier, Silverio had little to say regarding the exclusion of the Cántico from the first edition, Salablanca's editorial interventions in the remaining text are more fully discussed. Silverio shows the indulgence mentioned earlier to the effect that 'con los tiempos cambian las costumbres, y la fidelidad de reproducción de los escritos no se entendía entonces con el mismo riguroso criterio que ahora' (p. 211)<sup>(28)</sup>. He comes, nonetheless, to firm conclusions:

El P. Salablanca ajustó la edición a determinados criterios o normas. (p. 211)

Por el cotejo detenido que hemos realizado de la edición alcalañina con los códices sanjuanistas, hemos venido a la conclusión cierta de que en aquélla faltan párrafos que, de propósito, suprimió su editor. (p. 211).

En general, aunque las interpolaciones sean su mayor defecto, tiene también muchos otros debidos a las reglas que se propuso seguir en ella el P. Diego. (p. 212)

The criteria which guided Salablanca in his amendments appear to have been of two kinds, those of a perceived theological 'risk factor' and those of literary taste. Silverio defends Salablanca's activity under the first category but goes on to say:

Menos disculpa merecén las enmiendas de índole literaria. Aunque hubiera tenido el don infalible de acertar en cuantas correcciones hizo, que estuvo muy lejos de lograrlo, no le habríamos perdonado esta fechoría. (p. 217)

For without doubt the vast majority of the innumerable alterations which Salablanca introduced reflected nothing more than his own literary taste and preferences. The general trend of such amendments was towards clarification, moderation and accommodation to the norms of

what Salablanca thought seemly in a spiritual treatise. Examples of trivial changes of this last variety include the following:

<u>sensuales</u> to <u>sensitivos</u>	(1S:1:4)
<u>mozo</u> to <u>mancebo</u>	(1S:2:2)
<u>meajas</u> to <u>migajas</u>	(1S:6:2)
<u>cara</u> to <u>rostro</u>	(1S:8:1)
<u>maldades</u> to <u>iniquidades</u>	(1S:8:1)
<u>por el mismo caso</u> to <u>por la misma causa</u>	(1S:10:1)
' <u>daca</u> <u>daca</u> ' to ' <u>dame</u> , <u>dame</u> '	(1S:10:2)

All of these examples show the concern of an educated man to bring the everyday phrases which St. John frequently used into step with his own 'culto' style of writing. Many other examples show a genuine desire to clarify the Saint's words or to straighten out some examples of hyperbaton, as Silverio points out (p. 214). Another striking feature with doctrinal as well as literary repercussions is the ubiquitous attenuation of the Saint's words practised by Salablanca, whereby barely a superlative is left unmodified or an absolute unqualified. It may be argued that to change 'sumamente fea es' to 'tiene su parte de fealdad' (1S:4:4) when describing the soul still attached to the created order shows nothing more than a sense of moderation on the part of the editor. Yet in the passage from which this is taken St. John is seeking to persuade the soul of the absolute need to detach itself from the things of this world and that until this happens 'no podrá unirse con Dios' (1S:4:4). In Salablanca's version, however, this latter phrase is also modified, to become 'no podrá unirse con Dios en perfecta unión'. The net result of these alterations is to assuage the demand for detachment from the created order and to leave the way open for a certain, lesser degree of union even without complete detachment. A similar effect is created in later pages where the Saint is speaking again of disorderly worldly attachments:

aun sólo un apetito desordenado ... basta para poner un alma tan sujeta, sucia y fea, que en ninguna manera puede convenir con Dios en una unión. (15:9:3)

The ending is changed by Salablanca to:

ensucia y afea al alma y la indispona para que no pueda convenir con Dios en perfecta unión.

By such shifts of emphasis, apparently minor in themselves, Salablanca erodes the foundations upon which many of St. John's major doctrines are based.

Silverio gives Salablanca more support as regards the more clearly doctrinal interventions. His argument here is that there existed at the time of the 1618 publication various sects of false mystics such as the alumbrados who would not hesitate to misuse the words of St. John in furtherance of their own cause (pp. 212-13). Such abuses should be prevented wherever possible:

Por eso se advierte en la edición de 1618 que algunas autoridades del Santo que hacen referencia a la quietud de las potencias del alma ... las suprime o arregla, no porque las conceptúe erróneas en doctrina, sino para precaver torcidas y siniestras interpretaciones. (p. 213)

In Silverio's opinion 'Las encaminadas a evitar malas inteligencias místicas son las enmiendas más importantes que en la edición de Alcalá se hicieron' (pp. 213-14) and later he asserts that these corrections 'tenían disculpa muy fundada, comoquiera que de otro modo no habría sido posible publicar los escritos del Santo' (p. 216). This last motive, to enable the works to be published, might at first seem to be different from the other reason put forward to explain doctrinal amendments 'para precaver torcidas y siniestras interpretaciones'. However, they are merely two sides of the same coin, as Silverio must have felt was sufficiently evident. For the



risk perceived by all of St. John's early apologists and editors was not just that readers might be led astray by St. John's works or make use of them to lead others astray. The more serious risk, in my opinion, was that faced with evidence of misuse or simply anticipating the likelihood of such misuse, the Holy Office might intervene to prevent the book's publication or withdraw it from circulation once published. The double aim of the editor, then, had to be

1. to transmit as faithfully as possible the writings of St. John
2. to convince the guardians of orthodoxy that these works could neither lead astray the general readership nor give succour to those who would lead others astray.

It cannot be stated in general terms that these two aims were incompatible. The majority of St. John's words, amendments notwithstanding, were left untouched in the 1618 edition. But that there was substantial conflict between the two aims is sufficiently clear. The second consideration also explains the purpose of the Apuntamientos which, as has been mentioned, were too full of Latin authorities and couched in too defensive terms to have been intended as clarification for the lay reader. Might not the Apuntamientos, then, have been enough of a defence, enabling St. John's own text to remain in its original form? Silverio explains why not:

a un glosador o declarador de doctrina se puede oponer otro glosador que entienda los textos de manera diferente, pues, al fin, siempre permanecía la letra del original. Los tiempos aconsejaban procedimientos más radicales. (pp. 216-17)

It is not surprising to discover when we turn to look at the doctrinal amendments of St. John's writings that they largely echo the themes picked out in the Apuntamientos and, going further back, those highlighted by Thomas of Jesus during his editorial commission.

### Involuntary imperfections

One preoccupation which appears to be peculiar to Salablanca is that of máculas or involuntary imperfections. It evidently did not accord well with Salablanca's own theological training for an imperfection 'aunque esto sea en primer movimiento y sin libertad' (p. 359) to be an impediment in the soul's dealings with God, since scholastic theology, as was noted above, 'no admite mácula sino adonde hay culpa' (p. 352). So as well as explaining twice in the Apuntamientos how mácula is one of the terms given a different meaning by mystical writers, Salablanca omits the final clause from the following passage:

así como el madero no se transforma en el fuego por un sólo grado de calor que falte en su disposición, así no se transformará el alma en Dios por una imperfección que tenga, aunque sea menos que apetito voluntario. (15:11:6)

It was insufficient for him, then, to explain away St. John's treatment of involuntary imperfections; he also felt it necessary to remove offending passages or interpolate them so as to make the published version conform to his own ideas. Thus he changes 'imperfección' to 'conocida imperfección' (15:12:3) to make it appear that involuntary imperfections are not included in the list of items which delay the soul's progress towards union.

### Activity versus passivity of the soul

This is the theme which Salablanca said in the Apuntamientos was 'lo más levantado y dificultoso de la doctrina de nuestro venerable Padre'. In fact it is one of the central themes of St. John's works, above all in the Subida and Noche where the description of the co-operation between God and the soul necessary to bring the soul to union is St. John's whole aim. It is also a theme which runs through the whole of this thesis, finding a place in the previous chapter in

Thomas's adaptations of St. John's thought, in this chapter within Salablanca's Apuntamientos and textual changes and in the next chapter in the oral doctrine of the alumbrados, in the censures of the Inquisition and in the replies made to these by Basilio Ponce de León. All of St. John's commentators were to find particular difficulty in accepting that the soul should relinquish the natural activity of its three faculties of Intellect, Will and Memory. I hope to have shown in Chapter 2, with particular reference to Thomas of Jesus, that these commentators either failed to appreciate or were in disagreement with St. John's fundamental doctrine of the theological virtues. According to this, for example, Reason and Faith are incompatible operations of the Intellect, one natural and the other supernatural, one exercised by the soul itself, the other infused by God. Therefore within contemplation, the prayer of Faith, St. John excludes the natural operation of the Intellect. Thomas of Jesus consciously disagreed with this aspect of St. John's doctrine as we saw in examining Thomas's own works on the subject of prayer.

Salablanca, whether influenced by Thomas or through his own theological formation, also shows signs of disagreement both in the Apuntamientos and in such examples of textual modification as are described below.

1. (1S:1:3) An important paragraph summarising the spiritual way according to St. John is omitted. Within this St. John makes clear the primacy of God's intervention both in the transition from beginner to contemplative, 'al tiempo que Dios los comienza a poner en el estado de contemplación', and in the transition from contemplation to union, 'los ya aprovechados al tiempo que Dios los quiere ya poner en el estado de la unión con Dios'.
2. (1S:8:3) St. John states that Reason is the 'mozo de ciego' of the sensitive appetites which, in themselves, are blind. Salablanca takes the opportunity to enlarge on the role of Reason saying

'que la razón es la que siempre derechamente guía y encamina al alma en sus operaciones'. This enlargement is superfluous in context and serves only as a pre-emptive measure against St. John's later advice to abandon the natural operations of the Intellect.

3. (1S:13:1) Here St. John is explaining that there are two complementary methods by which the soul enters into the 'noche del sentido' or transitional stage, one active and one passive. The Saint's clear description of these two manners is confused by Salablanca's liberally inserted qualifications, indicated by the underlined phrases in the passage below:

Activa es lo que el alma puede hacer y hace de su parte para entrar en ella ayudada de la gracia. Y pasiva es en que el alma no hace nada como de suyo o por su industria sino Dios lo obra en ella con más particulares auxilios, y ella se ha como paciente consintiendo libremente.

The attenuation here is so severe as effectively to rob St. John's words of their original sense and to reduce both activa and pasiva to mere turns of phrase.

4. (2S:6:1) One further example will suffice to show how Salablanca deliberately attempts to inhibit the reader's understanding of St. John's theological framework. St. John, having specifically mentioned 'entendimiento, memoria y voluntad' now begins to discuss 'fe, esperanza y caridad, que tienen respecto a las dichas tres potencias como propios objetos sobrenaturales'. Salablanca completely omits the qualifying clause so central to St. John's structure. Without the opposition between natural and supernatural modes of operation of the faculties, the concepts of vacío and noche are devoid of meaning and the passivity of the soul during contemplation and union cannot be understood.

### Transforming union

We have seen how within the Apuntamientos Salablanca explained as 'a lo sobreperfecto y por hipérboles' phrases which suggested that during the union of transformation 'ya las operaciones son divinas'. Upon editing the text, however, he evidently decided that this was insufficient precaution, for he omits the clearest of statements to this effect from St. John's description of union:

y entonces es de manera, que las operaciones no son distintas, sino que las que obra el alma son de Dios, y son operaciones divinas, que, por cuanto como dice San Pablo, el que se une con Dios un espíritu se hace con El. De aquí es, que las operaciones del alma unida son del espíritu divino, y son divinas. (3S:2:8-9)

### Substantial locutions

The word sustancia clearly caused Salablanca great discomfort: he generally attempts to paraphrase or qualify any reference to the substance of the soul (e.g. 2S:5:3). This is particularly true when St. John is describing substantial locutions where, so as to exclude the clear overriding of Free Will by God, Salablanca carries out extensive paraphrasing and omits the following lines:

ni es menester su querer para que Dios las obre, ni basta con no querer para que dejen de hacer el dicho efecto (25:31:2)

The details of Salablanca's amendments here and the use to which they were put by Basilio Ponce de León are discussed in the next chapter.

### From meditation to contemplation

Few areas of St. John's doctrine have aroused more controversy than this, mainly because in the step from meditation to contemplation is focussed the whole problem of activity and passivity, naturally acquired and supernaturally infused operations of the soul. Not

surprisingly, the chapters which contain St. John's explanation of this step show particular signs of Salablanca's attention. A few examples will demonstrate the trend of his interventions:

1. el alma que hubiere de llegar en esta vida a la unión de aquel sumo descanso y bien, por todos los grados de consideraciones, formas y noticias, ha de pasar y acabar con ellas. (25:12:5)

Here the phrase 'y acabar con ellas' is suppressed, leaving the way open for assertions such as that of Thomas of Jesus, that meditation must never be entirely abandoned.

2. descansan las potencias y no obran activamente, sino pasivamente, recibiendo lo que Dios obra en ellas.

This description of the operation of the faculties during initial contemplation is changed by Salablanca to read 'no obran sino en aquella simple y suave advertencia amorosa'. As we will see, the idea of a 'simple inteligencia' was to be taken up by Basilio in his defence of St. John. But it is clear how this was only possible at the cost of St. John's true meaning.

The main importance of Salablanca's publication derives from its having been the first edition. Silverio comments that subsequent editions 'se ajustaron a ella en los tratados que publicó. Hay algunas diferencias, pero en lo substancial se reprodujeron todos los defectos' (p. 218). This state of affairs persisted through three centuries until Gerardo's edition of 1912. Since this is the case it may readily be seen how profound an impact Salablanca's editorial amendments were to have. The changes noted above were to enjoy the status of received text until the twentieth century. All exegesis of the text in the intervening years, establishing St. John's place in the Carmelite School of Spirituality, all commentaries on his scheme of prayer and dissemination of his doctrine were based on the flawed

representation of his ideas shown above. Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen declares that the first edition 'no fue éxito en ningún sentido'<sup>(29)</sup>. To a large extent he is right. The edition was a poor transmission of St. John's ideas. It omitted a key work. It failed to prevent misuse by the alumbrados or subsequent inquisitorial examination and censure. It was to propagate for three hundred years a flawed image of St. John's scheme of prayer. Yet those are not the only weighty considerations. For the deliberately numerous approbations in the preliminaries to the edition were to be an important factor in influencing the Inquisitor General and the textual amendments made by Salablanca were made in precisely the right places, if not to pre-empt attack, then at least to furnish Basilio with the tools to rebuff it, as will be made clear in the next chapter. To have the works survive in an adulterated form was preferable to having them condemned and banned in their original versions, as the accurate transmission of St. John's actual words was possibly of secondary importance compared to the smooth progress of St. John's beatification cause. It could be a serious impediment to this process should his writings be found wanting by the Inquisition. That the converse was also true and that the wide circulation of well-received spiritual writings could give a fillip to the beatification cause is made clear by an item included in the Interrogatorio or beatification questionnaire, where witnesses are asked:

Si saben que los libros que dejó escritos de Teología mística están llenos de sabiduría del cielo, y muestran bien la grande luz y levantado espíritu que tuvo su autor... Por lo cual estos libros son muy estimados de personas doctas y espirituales, y se han sacado innumerables traslados de ellos, que andan por estos Reinos de España, y se han llevado a las Indias, Italia, Flandes y otros Reinos remotos; y es común concepto de las

personas que los leen que resplandece en ellos la doctrina y espíritu que el apóstol San Pablo comunicó a San Dionisio, su discípulo, para toda la Iglesia (30)。

The repetition above of the point I made when discussing the omission of the Cântico is intended to redress to some extent what is likely to be the twentieth-century perspective on the subject of St. John's early editorial history. To the modern reader, as Silverio has noted (p. 211), the accuracy of textual transmission is all. To those engaged in the preparations for the first edition it may have been neither the only nor even the main consideration.



NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. EC 18 (1967), pp. 3-48 (pp. 6-7).
2. The Desiertos were a particularly austere style of Carmelite house founded by Thomas of Jesus himself. He lived in the Desierto of Las Batuecas between 1600 and his departure from Spain in 1607.
3. BMC 10, p. 204.
4. The manuscript is described by Simeón de la Sagrada in 'Un nuevo códice manuscrito de las obras de San Juan de la Cruz, usado y anotado por el P. Tomás de Jesús', EC 4 (1950), pp. 95-148. For the contents and significance of the Repertorium see José de Jesús Crucificado, 'El P. Tomás de Jesús, escritor místico', EC 3 (1949), pp. 305-49. and 4 (1950), pp. 149-206.
5. EC 4 (1950), pp. 431-518.
6. 'Tomás de Jesús y San Juan de la Cruz', EC 5 (1951-54), pp. 91-159.
7. EC 4 (1950), p. 517.
8. 'Gloria y ocaso de un apócrifo Sanjuanista, el "Tratado breve del conocimiento oscuro de Dios afirmativo y negativo"', MC 69 (1961), pp. 419-40.
9. EC 18 (1967), p. 6, note 7.
10. MC 69 (1961), p. 440.
11. EC 18 (1967), p. 6, note 8.
12. See, for example, Eulogio Pacho, Cántico espiritual: primera redacción y texto retocado (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1981), pp. 91-121 for the diffusion of the Cántico.
13. EC 18 (1967), p. 5.
14. See note 12 above.

15. See José Luis G. Novalín, El Inquisidor General Fernando de Valdés (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1968).
16. R. O. Jones, A Literary History of Spain: The Golden Age: Prose and Poetry (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1971), p. 78.
17. Eulogio Pacho, 'San Juan de la Cruz y Juan de Santo Tomás, O.P., en el proceso inquisitorial Antonio de Rojas'. EC 22 (1971), pp. 349-90.
18. Gerald Brenan, St. John of the Cross: His Life and Poetry (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), p. 108.
19. The Poet and the Mystic (Oxford: OUP, 1977), p. 16.
20. Reformation Europe 1517-1559 (London: Collins - The Fontana History of Europe, 1963), pp. 274-83.
21. EC 18 (1967), pp. 22-23.
22. BMC 10, pp. 347-95. References in the text will be to this rather than the less accessible 1618 edition, with apologies for the occasional anachronistic references to 'el Santo'.
23. EC 4 (1950), p. 139.
24. EC 4 (1950), p. 138.
25. BMC 10, p. 206.
26. EC 4 (1950), p. 124.
27. BMC 10, p. 216.
28. All references to Silverio's discussion are taken from BMC 10.
29. EC 18 (1967), p. 12.
30. Colin Thompson, p. 24, quoting from BMC 14.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **ST. JOHN AND THE CENSOR**

ST. JOHN AND THE CENSOR

The sect of the alumbrados was first given a tangible identity by the Inquisition of Toledo when in 1525 it published an edict condemning the teachings of a group of people of that diocese. It is impossible, without oversimplifying, to give a concise account of their beliefs and practices<sup>(1)</sup>, but the name of alumbrados was to acquire in the sixteenth century a significance which the original group of Toledo could never have suspected. For the Inquisition and the church hierarchy in Spain it came to signify the Spanish manifestation of all of the undesirable spiritual currents which were then sweeping Europe.. The alumbrados were linked with Luther and Erasmus as well as with the older heresies of the Gnostics and Beghards; their name was used as a convenient label for all tendencies which ran counter to the ever more dogmatically scholastic stance of the Spanish Church in the sixteenth century. The groups thus labelled ranged from those sincerely desiring a personal spiritual renewal to those finding a hypocritical veil for a relaxation of morals. In the eyes of the Inquisition, however, Illuminism was always seen as a unified and serious challenge to orthodoxy.

The discovery of the alumbrados of Seville was consequently taken very seriously by both the Sevillian Inquisition and the Inquisitor General in Madrid, Andrés Pacheco. The leaders of the group were imprisoned immediately, and the lengthy process of gathering testimonies for a subsequent trial was undertaken. By the end of January 1623 the inquisitors of Seville had to stop taking prisoners since the heresy was far more widespread than had been imagined<sup>(2)</sup>. It was determined that an edict of grace should be published which would bring the case into the open and offer those who voluntarily

denounced themselves or others the chance of secret absolution. The edict was signed by Pacheco on 9th May 1623 and disseminated thereafter by the Sevillian Inquisition. The subsequent implication of St. John's works in the case of the alumbrados of Seville and the defence of these works from the attacks which followed is the subject of this chapter.

The work which has been done in the twentieth century on St. John's association with the alumbrados of Seville has been spasmodic and of uneven value, and it would be well to give some account of these previous studies before attempting to reconstruct the events in question. Three documents have provided material for the majority of these studies and so, although they will be dealt with more fully at a later stage, we will detail them briefly here.

In many ways the most useful of these documents is the collection of Memorias Historiales compiled by Andrés de la Encarnación in the eighteenth century. He possessed an encyclopaedic knowledge of matters relating to the two founders of the Discalced Carmelites, which has given his notes an exceptional value for students of early Carmelite history. In the first volume of these a brief section (G) is concerned with the attacks suffered by the works of St. John in the seventeenth century and the defence which was made of them. This first volume is MS.13482 of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid. The contents of section G are described below.

G.1. refers to a letter written to Gerónimo de san José in 1630 by Alonso de la Madre de Dios. This is not the same Alonso who collected the depositions for St. John's beatification and subsequently wrote a biography of the saint<sup>(3)</sup>, but his older homonym. In this often quoted letter he expresses the opinion that it is:

bien menester que salgan las obras con tan graves y fuertes censuras como V.Ra. me dice, y plega a Dios que vaste para que

no las muerdan como hicieron a las primeras, que trahe consigo  
gde. ocasión lo Mystico.

This was written on the eve of the publication of Gerónimo's edition of 1630. The reference Andrés gives for this letter is cód. 1. pág. 4447. This document is now kept in the BNM under the classmark MS. 12738. The above quotation is taken from f. 1447<sup>(4)</sup>. When Andrés refers to cód. 1. or "el codice de N.S.P.", he invariably means this collection of papers.

G.2. This note is one of several references Andrés makes to Basilio Ponce de León's famous defence of St. John. It is introduced thus:

Por los años 1622 delato algun Aristarco las obras de el sto.  
al tribunal de España: comunicose por este rectissimo senado  
la delacion al Doctissimo fr. Basilio Ponze de Leon, y dio a la  
consulta la siguiente respuesta.

Andrés then copies Basilio's introductory sentence and first paragraph, "Cumpliendo lo que me fue mandado... calificación tan insigne".

This is followed immediately by Basilio's concluding paragraph,

"Concluyo esta censura... a once de Julio de 1622 etc."

Some commentators have seen G.2. as a copy of a complete, brief censura which Basilio later developed into a full scale defence of St. John<sup>(5)</sup>.

This view finds support in a comment by Andrés in G.2:

solo la autoridad deste gran varon, fundada en la extrinseca  
de estas aprobs. y inconvenientes, sin satisfacer nada a los  
reparos que se le expondrían, hizo mas peso que todos los  
reparos y ponderaciones de los contrarios...

In the complete "Respuesta", as we shall see, Basilio goes into great detail to reply to specific attacks on St. John's writings. A précis of Basilio's complete work is included in E.6. of the Memorias Historiales.

Contrary to his usual practice, however, Andrés gives no cross reference between these two notes; he treats them as references to different documents.

But there are strong reasons to reject the possibility of Basilio having written two defences of St. John. The most obvious of these is the identical wording of G.2. and the beginning and end of Basilio's full reply. This exact duplication makes it difficult to think of G.2. as a complete text since it includes the first item on Basilio's list of arguments against the prohibition of St. John's works "Lo primero etc.", and then ignores "Lo segundo" to run immediately into the conclusion. A more conclusive factor is that the text given in G.2. bears the same date as the Carmelite copy contained in BNM MS. 18749 (70). If we are correct in believing that this copy is wrongly dated<sup>(6)</sup>, then the most likely explanation is that Andrés was in possession of two documents, one the full copy of Basilio's "Respuesta" and the other a short extract from this copy which Andrés took to be a separate work.

G.3. is a censura of some of the excesses of Gerónimo's biography of St. John.

G.4. refers to an Apologíā, presumably of St. John's works, by "N. Polaco" but merely relates its acclaim within the order.

G.5. deals with a veiled denunciation of St. John by a certain P. Poza, using another name, in 1633.

G.6. This note, like G.1. and G.2., has often been used in twentieth-century studies of St. John. It quotes from a letter written in 1627 by Juan de san Angelo which recounts the circumstances which led to Basilio's defence. According to this letter Andrés Pacheco first asked Agustín Antolínez to reply in writing to a "memorial" denouncing St. John's works. Antolínez was unable to do

this at the time but referred Pacheco to Basilio. His response was to write "doce pliegos" in St. John's defence which sufficed to confound the unnamed opponent.

Basilio's Respuesta itself is the second document which has been widely used in modern studies of St. John. As we have indicated, a copy is contained in MS. 18749 (70) of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid. The two modern editions of this work, as well as its contents will be discussed in another part of this chapter.

A third very useful document, unknown until 1932, is a Memorial or note penned in 1626 by the dominican Domingo de Farfán. One section of this note refers specifically to St. John's works, which Farfán saw as a source of the alumbrado heresy, and contains a great deal of information regarding the procedure of the Inquisition in dealing with St. John's works. The full title of Farfán's note is "Memorial en orden a la buena direccion de las causas de los alumbrados de Seuilla y su buen despacho". It is dated 4th May 1626. Together with an accompanying letter from Farfán it is preserved in legajo 2.963 of the Inquisition section of the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid.<sup>(7)</sup>

With the above documents in mind, we may now survey the modern studies which have made mention of this turbulent period in the history of St. John's works. The earliest modern commentators knew only of Andrés de la Encarnación's Memorias Historiales and Basilio's defence. P. Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz, basing himself on Andrés, mentioned in his edition of St. John's works that Basilio had written a defence of St. John, but believed that the complete text of this defence had been lost<sup>(8)</sup>. In July of 1918, P. Gregorio de Santiago Vela O.S.A. gave the location of Basilio's work in an essay published in the Archivo Agustiniiano<sup>(9)</sup>. This apparently went unnoticed in Carmelite circles. Indeed the scholars of the two orders seem to have "discovered" this text entirely independently.



In 1927, when the Conferencias Místicas took place in Segovia, P. Claudio de Jesús Crucificado O.C.D. delivered a lecture entitled "La influencia y desarrollo de la autoridad y doctrina de San Juan de la Cruz hasta las controversias antiquietistas"<sup>(10)</sup>. In the section dealing with the period under discussion (p. 257-62) P. Claudio gives a brief outline of the precautions which accompanied the first edition and devotes several pages to the defence of St. John in the sixteen-twenties. To establish the difficulties encountered by the first edition he quotes from the 1630 letter to Gerónimo, but although he quotes Andrés for his reference he names Alonso de Jesús María as the author (p. 258). Andrés correctly attributes the letter to Alonso de la Madre de Dios (G.2.).

P. Claudio deals in more detail with P. Quiroga's "Apología mística" and shows that it is aimed as a reply to the doubts of certain "teólogos escolásticos". He accurately points out the change in "el punto de ataque" of St. John's opponents after Quiroga's apology. "ya no se estribaba tanto en la escolástica, como en la novedad y peligro que en la doctrina del Santo creían ver." (p. 260). But, although Claudio implies that this change is the result of Quiroga's work, a more likely cause was the discovery of St. John's works in the homes of the alumbrados. Since the document relating this discovery was unknown to Claudio, the rest of his description of St. John's involvement with the alumbrados is somewhat vague. One source of Claudio's account which we have not mentioned before now is the Elucidatio by P. Nicolás de Jesús María, first published in 1631<sup>(11)</sup>. From this book he takes the reason for St. John's implication in the alumbrado heresy:

parece que algunos directores y dirigidos, sospechosos de iluminismo, se dieron a buscar en los escritos del Místico Doctor frases y sentencias con que autorizar sus opiniones, (p. 258, Eluc. pt.1.c.3).

He also draws from the Elucidatio an overall view of the opposition to St. John (pp. 258-59). When dealing with Basilio's Respuesta he refers exclusively to the Memorias Historiales, apparently unaware of the discovery of a complete text in 1918. Because of his dependence on Andrés, he makes the mistake of believing G.2. to be the complete text of a first brief censura by Basilio, "un papel corto, pero substancioso" (p. 261), and E.6. to be the précis of a more fully elaborated defence written shortly afterwards. He follows Andrés for the date of the Respuesta and, like Andrés, believes that Basilio's reply was sufficient to confound St. John's opponents: "con tan valioso defensor, las obras de San Juan de la Cruz pasaron victoriosas la primera crisis después de su publicación". (p. 262)

Another Carmelite to deal with this period in the history of St. John's works was their next editor, P. Silverio de Santa Teresa. His discussion of this period in the "Preliminares" volume of his edition<sup>(12)</sup> is however, largely based on the "docta conferencia" delivered by P. Claudio in Segovia (see above). P. Silverio's major original contribution is to publish for the first time the complete text of Basilio's Respuesta, according to the copy in the Biblioteca Nacional<sup>(13)</sup>. Surprisingly, three years later, the same document was published again, as though for the first time, by Miguel de la Pinta Llorente O.S.A. in the Archivo Agustiniiano<sup>(14)</sup>. The reasons for this duplication can be deduced from a comparison of the presentation given to the document by the two scholars. P. Silverio, like P. Claudio, seems to have been unaware of the discovery of the BNM copy by P. Gregorio in 1918. Both Carmelites know of it only through the Elucidatio and Memorias Historiales. P. Gerardo, as we have said, maintained that this document was lost. P. Silverio believes that he has at last located the missing manuscript: "puede decirse que hasta hoy sólo fragmentariamente se conocía" (p. 396). Pinta Llorente on

the other hand, working within the Augustinian order, knows of P. Gregorio's discovery, but not of the work of the Carmelites in the intervening years. He introduces the Respuesta without mentioning its prior publication by P. Silverio.

The major difference between the two presentations of the Respuesta is that Pinta Llorente claims a greater status for the same manuscript than does P. Silverio. For Silverio the BNM manuscript is a copy and as such is subject to inevitable flaws: "La copia traslada con algún descuido los textos y autoridades que aduce de otros autores". (p. 398)

He transcribes the name and date at the end of the manuscript without comment. Nowhere does he commit himself to claiming that the BNM copy is either written or signed by Basilio. Pinta Llorente asserts that the signature at the end of this manuscript is autograph and therefore presumably believes that these pages are the very same "doce pliegos" which Basilio handed to the Inquisition, which must later have been given to the Carmelite community and bound in a notebook with other notes relating to St. John. Both Silverio and Pinta Llorente regard the date of the work as indisputable. This is understandable, as the copy they use is clearly dated 11th July 1622. Since the status of the manuscript in the BNM and the dating of Basilio's original are of some importance we will return to these questions in another part of this chapter. All references to the Respuesta will be made according to Silverio's edition, as that of Pinta Llorente omits to enumerate the propositions to which Basilio replies.

The next major contribution to the study of this period was made by P. Bernardino Llorca S. J. in 1932 with his publication in Estudios Eclesiásticos of the section of Domingo de Farfán's Memorial dealing with the "libro llamado vulgarmente Noche Oscura" taken from the files of the Inquisition<sup>(15)</sup>. It is curious that he was the

first to discover references to St. John's involvement with the alumbrados where they might most logically have been supposed to exist. It is still more strange that no-one since Llorca has searched the documentation of the Holy Office for further clarification of its dealings with St. John's works. Since its publication, Llorca's article has been a widely-used source of information.

In 1954 the Monte Carmelo published an article by Carmelo de la Cruz O.C.D. entitled "Defensa de las doctrinas de San Juan de la Cruz en tiempo de los alumbrados"<sup>(16)</sup>. Although this is primarily concerned with the apologetic work of P. Nicolás de Jesús María (see note 11), he makes full use of the material relating to St. John's defence which was known at that time. So, for example, he quotes from Andrés' copy of P. Juan de San Angelo's letter describing the history of Basilio's Respuesta (G.6.), as well as using the letter from Alonso de la Madre de Dios (G.1.) to give more general confirmation of the problems encountered by the first edition (p. 44, 48). He also quotes at length from Llorca's edition of Farfán's Memorial in order to show that when P. Nicolás was writing his Elucidatio in 1627 opposition to St. John was far from dead!<sup>(17)</sup>.

The next scholar to deal with this period was P. Angel Custodio Vega O.S.A. in the introduction to his edition of Amores de Dios y el Alma by Agustín Antolínez<sup>(18)</sup>. The main innovation in his treatment is that for the first time he suggests that the date of 1622 on Basilio's Respuesta must be mistaken. The reason for this is that the edict condemning the alumbrados did not appear until May of 1623, and Vega assumes that Pacheco's request to Antolínez was subsequent to this. If Juan de San Angelo's anecdote is accurate and Basilio's Respuesta was the result of Antolínez's referral, then it could not possibly have been written in 1622. P. Vega does not, however, question the autograph status of the BNM copy, believing instead that Basilio

simply dated it wrongly. He produces no documentary evidence to support either his assertion that Pacheco consulted Antolínez in May of 1623 or his supposition that Basilio's Respuesta must have been written in 1624.

Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen O.C.D. returns to this problem in his study on the Primeras ediciones del Cántico Espiritual, published in 1967<sup>(19)</sup>. In a lucid and useful footnote he resumes P. Vega's argument and adds a decisive point:

Según la fuente original de toda esta historia, la petición del Inquisidor General fue hecha a Antolínez "recien electo obispo de Ciudad Rodrigo"; como quiera que fue preconizado para ese sede el 10 de mayo de 1623, la conjetura del P. Vega no anda desprovista de fundamento.

In other words, provided we accept the accuracy of the traditional anecdote, Basilio's Respuesta could not have been written before May of 1623. Both Vega and Eulogio mention a document which would seem to bear some relation to this series of events. The 1630 edition of St. John's works contain a censura by Antolínez dated 4th September 1623. This would seem to be Antolínez's own response to Pacheco's request, written once he had settled into his post of bishop and had a little more time at his disposal. The brevity of the censura may suggest either that he considered Basilio's "doce pliegos" to be sufficient defence, or, as P. Vega believes, that he had not yet read St. John in any depth. What is not clear is why Vega chooses 1624 as the date for the composition of the Respuesta, when from the circumstantial evidence we have so far seen the summer of 1623 would seem a more natural choice.

The involvement of St. John in the trial of Antonio de Rojas in 1630 was examined in 1971 by Eulogio Pacho O.C.D., although this trial is curiously lacking in references to the alumbrados of Seville<sup>(20)</sup>.

More recently, in his book St. John of the Cross, José C. Nieto briefly mentions the implication of St. John's works in the alumbrado heresy:

To complicate matters even further, John's work, the Dark Night of the Soul, was used and quoted by the Alumbrados of Seville for their own purposes (21).

In fact the alumbrados did not use this one work exclusively. They used the term "noche oscura" to refer to the 1618 edition of St. John's works, which also contained the "Subida" and the "Llama", as is made clear in Farfán's Memorial. Eulogio's note in 1967 was, to the best of our knowledge, the last original contribution to the question.

At this point we may begin to reconstruct the events which were the cause of so much study. Since the documents which will begin this reconstruction have not figured in any of the studies listed above, we will first describe their character and location. They proceed from two sources within the Inquisition section of the Archivo Histórico Nacional. Legajo 2.960 contains original documents, letters for the most part, sent to the Inquisitor General's office in Madrid by the Seville Inquisition during the year of 1623. The abundance of this correspondence is a measure of the significance which both the local and national Inquisition attached to the discovery of the Illuminist sect in Seville. A letter to Pacheco dated 19th August 1623 reveals that the Sevillian inquisitors were under instructions to keep him informed daily of the progress of their proceedings against the alumbrados:

Aunque no ay cossa de nuevo que dezir a V.Sa. en materia de alumbrados, por no dexar descriuir con todos los hordinarios como V.Sa. nos tiene mandado...

Within this legajo are to be found the first letters linking St. John with the alumbrados. Libro 592 of the same section contains copies of

letters sent by the central Inquisition to various local Inquisitions between 1612 and 1629. At the front of this book there are indices for each local Inquisition. From fol. 314 the letters to the Sevillian Inquisition begin to refer to the case of the alumbrados. Within these letters can be found replies to the letters from Seville which implicated St. John's works.

St. John's works were first denounced by the Sevillian inquisitor Alonso de Hoces in a letter dated 29th May 1623 sent to Gerardo de Villegas, secretary to the king and the Holy Office<sup>(22)</sup>. The head of the letter bears a note, presumably added in Madrid, which reads:

libro q embia intitulado noche oscura  
q conviene asentar en el tribunal la union

The second part of this note, as of the letter, is concerned with internal disagreements among the Sevillian inquisitors. The beginning of the letter reads as follows:

Con esta remito al Illmo Sr. Inquor general un libro que los alumbrados llaman la noche oscura con unos apuntamientos Por donde se vera ques de donde sacan la doctrina q pratican y assi lo digo a su Illma y a vmd q por lo mucho que yo estimo su sta yntención y grandeca deseo sacarle de este empeño vmd se lo diga assi de officio...

The slight obscurity of the latter part does not negate the clear indictment contained in the first few lines: this book is the source of the doctrine of the alumbrados. The letter is signed with Alonso de Hoces' informal monogram<sup>(23)</sup> on 29th May 1623.

The Inquisitor General did not delay long in replying. His letter, dated 6th June 1623, is copied in Libro 592 (fol. 345r-v). The first half of this letter refers to the case of a certain Francisco Serón, detained at the time in the secret prison of the Inquisition in Seville. In the second half Pacheco reveals that he has seen "el

libro y npreso yntitulado la noche oscura", which in his judgement contains:

doctrina dificultosa q no me espanto que en su inteliga.  
 ayan herado algunas personas y ayan (sacado) mal della como  
 suelen de la escriptura sagrada

On the other hand Pacheco seems to be influenced by the approbation given to the book by "tan señalados theologos". He ends by promising to give the matter his attention and to keep Hoces informed "en lo que fuere mas conveniente". Pacheco's deferral of a decision on the book seems to indicate a reluctance on his part to condemn it outright. The phrase "como suelen de la escriptura sagrada" is significant. It implies that, like the Bible, St. John's works are not wrong in themselves, but can be wrongly interpreted by the ignorant or ill-intentioned. The censuras wisely sought by the Carmelites for the first edition seem to have weighed heavily in the matter. To condemn the book would be to disregard the judgement of the entire theological faculty of Alcalá, as well as of other esteemed theologians. Faced with this prospect, Pacheco delayed any decision, giving himself time for further thought and consultation.

But Alonso de Hoces did not leave the matter there. A copy of a letter written by Villegas to Hoces on 11th July 1623 can be found in Libro 592 fol. 352v. In this Villegas refers to "la de v.m. de quatro deste". As in a previous post Hoces had both sent a letter to Villegas and the book and apuntamientos to Pacheco, so it appears that on the fourth of July he sent letters simultaneously to Villegas and the Inquisitor General. Of the letter received by Pacheco, Villegas has this to say:

la que venia para su Illtma. leyo en mi presencia y quedo con mucha satisfacion de todo lo que v.m. en ella dize y se quedo con l(os) dos apuntamts. sobre los dos libros que tocan a





materia de alumbrados para juntarlos con lo primero q. vino de la noche oscura.

So, less than a month after Pacheco's reply to the first denunciation of St. John, Hoces sent him two further sets of notes. Had we possessed no further documentation on the matter it would have been impossible to infer with any certainty that one of the new sets of apuntamientos was again directed against the "noche oscura". Fortunately, however, Hoces's reply to this letter is preserved in legajo 2.960. Dated 18th July 1623 and signed with the monogram he uses when writing to Villegas, this letter refers unmistakably to Villegas's letter of 11th July 1623 described above. It begins:

Mui gran md y favor recevi con la de vmd. de once del Presente y siempre me sucedera lo mismo y huelgo que se ayan recebido los apuntamientos nuebamte hechos al libro de la noche oscura y al otro

Pacheco had by now received two sets of apuntamientos relating the doctrine of St. John to the propositions of the alumbrados. The indications are, however, that after receiving Hoces's first denunciation Pacheco had undertaken to consult various eminent theologians on the matter. It is to this period that the much-quoted letter of P. Juan de San Angelo refers (Mem. Hist G.6). When asking Antolínez to give his judgement on the denounced work, Pacheco specified that he required a written reply. Antolínez, perhaps because of the pressures caused by his recent election to the office of bishop, declined to give a written answer, but assured the Inquisitor General verbally that

todas aquellas objecciones del Memorial eran injustas y frívolas y sin fundamento, y que los libros del padre fray Juan de la Cruz contenían verdadera, sana y saludable doctrina.

He referred Pacheco to Basilio for a more detailed written reply. The date of the Respuesta, given these circumstances, would be the 11th July 1623. This is without doubt the most important document written in St. John's defence at Pacheco's instigation but not the only one. In the 1630 edition of St. John's works there appears a censura by P. Araujo dated 12th July 1623. The decision to publish this edition, with the inclusion of the Cántico, is not mentioned in the official records of the order until 1628<sup>(24)</sup>, which would suggest that Araujo's censura was not specifically sought for the edition but that it was written for a different reason and merely appropriated by the order to lend weight to the aprobaciones which preceded the new edition. The date and contents of this censura render it almost certain that it was written at Pacheco's request in answer to the charges of Illuminism brought by Hoces's first letter. The complete text of this censura is reproduced below:

Censura del mui Reverendo P. Maestro Fr. Francisco de Araujo de la orden de Predicadores Catedratico de Prima de Teologia en la Universidad de Salamanca.

He visto estas Obras Espirituales, compuestas por el mui Venerable Padre Fr. Ioan de la Cruz, Primer Descalco Carmelita, i no hallo en ellas proposicion que no sea Catolica, i conforme a la dotrina de la Teologia Escolástica, i de los Santos (tan lexos esta de conformar con la de los Alumbrados) si bien el no ser de todos entendidas las frasis de la Teologia Mistica, haze, que a los menos versados en ella, parezcan algo disonantes. Mas como esta Mistica Teologia sea sabiduria secreta, i escondida como el mismo Autor enseña, lib.2.c.8. no es mucho que de algunos no sean entendidas sus frasis. Ni por eso deben ser condenadas, como, aunque las Parabolas de la Sagrada Escritura ocultan el misterio de la verdad a los menos sabios, o menos dignos,

no por eso se han de condenar por inutiles, o contrarias a la verdad. Dize S. Tomas 1.p.q.1.art.9.ad 2. cuyas palabras son: Et ipsa etiam occultatio figurarum utilis est ad exercitiu studiosoru, et contra irrisiones infidelium, de quibus dicitur, Matth.1. Nolite sanctum dare canibus, et c. Con razon las llamo Salomon, Prov.25. mancanas de oro en zelosias, o verjas de plata, segun la version de Galatino: Mala aurea in cancellaturis argenteis, verbum dictu secundu ambas facies. Porque como en estas se ve el oro a deseo, asi en las Parabolas se alcanza co dificultad el verdadero sentido: i lo mismo pasa en las frasis Misticas. Sino es que digamos, que a solos los Teologos bien afectos son sabrosas, cuya Teologia Escolastica no debe tener por contraria la Mistica destes libros, sino es que ya quieran condenar la verdad en Parabolas, i les parezca mal el oro entre verjas de plata, i les sepa mal el Mana celestial por ser manjar de pocos, solitarios, i apartados del Egipto del mundo. I como estos inconvenientes no deben admitirse, tampoco deben condenarse las dichas frasis i modos de hablar de la Mistica Teologia, de que el autor con espiritu acompañado de erudicion usa en estos libros, sin admitir escadalo de algunos, i con aprovechamieto de muchos. Esto juzgo, salvo, etc. En el colegio de Santo Tomas de Madrid, a 12 de Julio de 1623.

El M.F. Francisco de Araujo.

In the first sentence St. John's doctrine is explicitly denied any affinity with that of the alumbrados and it is declared throughout the censura to conform entirely to the precepts of Scholastic Theology. A few phrases permit us to infer that the censura is a response to an attempt to secure a condemnation of St. John's works: "Ni por eso deben ser condenadas", "tampoco deben condenarse las dichas frasis".

In another part we may glimpse the specific charge of lack of utility brought against St. John's works and also answered by Basilio<sup>(25)</sup>: "no por eso se han de condenar por inutiles". Araujo shows signs of having read and accepted Salablanca's apology for St. John's "Frasis Misticas" and so is happy to class St. John's more suspect assertions as "modos de hablar" proper to this branch of theology. Araujo's censura is particularly important since he was an esteemed member of the Dominican order, the most authoritative spokesman for the Thomistic school of theology.

Pacheco may also have pressed Antolínez to commit his opinion to writing since, as we have mentioned above (p. 13) he penned a brief censura on 4th September 1623 (also included in the edition of 1630) which again supports the works of St. John without reserve.

The central work of this series in defence of St. John, Basilio's Respuesta, fits most naturally into this period of consultation by Pacheco. Yet until A.C. Vega no one doubted the date borne by the BNM manuscript, and even P. Eulogio in 1967 shows some perplexity at the clarity of the date at the end of this document. Is it possible that the meticulous P. Basilio Ponce de León could have ended his defence of St. John by putting his signature below a mistaken date? The source of this unease, we believe, lies in Pinta Llorente's attribution to the manuscript of a status it does not deserve. He ends his transcription of the BNM copy with:

Fr. Basilio Ponce de León  
 Cathedrático de prima de Salamanca  
 (Fir. autógrafa)<sup>(26)</sup>

At no time does he detail the criteria he uses in passing this judgement. Careful examination of the manuscript in question has led us to the opinion that he is mistaken. Having been unable to find an attested signature with which to compare this, our belief is based on the following internal indications:

1. The "signature" appears to be written in the same hand as the text, a distinctive flowing style (see Silverio's photographic reproduction of the final page, BMC 10, p. 447). The text shows clear signs of being a copy rather than an original manuscript. P. Silverio refers to the copyist's flaws on p. 398, and on p. 425 transcribes a marginal note from the manuscript which reads "Esta autoridad topé en el dicho autor por estar errados los números de él". The most obvious explanation of this note is that it refers to a correction by the copyist of a mistake in the original.
2. The title at the head of the work, still in the same hand, speaks of Basilio in the third person. It reads as follows:

Resposiones (que) hizo el pe mro. fr. Basilio de Leon  
cathedratico de prima de teologia de Salama. sobre unas  
obiecciones que se pusieron al lib. y docta. de N.B.P.  
fr Juo. de la Cruz por los calificadores del sancto  
oficio.

The similarity between Basilio's name and title copied in the heading and those at the end of the work is particularly striking.

3. St. John is referred to in this heading as N.B.P. = Nuestro Beato or Benerable Padre, a form of reference peculiar to the Carmelite community, which suggests that the copyist was a member of the Discalced order.
4. A note on the title page (f.10) reads "Debe se guardar con cuydado este papel, por q no ay otro traslado". While there are certainly cases of redundant "otro" in the seventeenth century, it is more common for it to have its true semantic value. If this is the case here, then what we have is a first "traslado", or copy, not the original.

5. The document is contained in a cuaderno with other assorted pieces of Carmelite documentation relating to St. John. From the other contents it would appear that this collection was compiled around 1627, when the alumbrados case was still not concluded. It is unlikely in these circumstances that the original document would have been passed on to the Carmelite community from the files of the Inquisition.

The cumulative effect of these considerations, we believe, is to make it more feasible to speak of the Respuesta we know as a copy made from the Inquisition files by a Carmelite monk, a copy, moreover, which mistakenly dated the work 1622 instead of 1623.

By mid-July of 1623, Pacheco had received answers to his diligent inquiries. All three of the consultations we know of had produced strong support for St. John's book. Bearing in mind the censuras contained in the 1618 edition, St. John's doctrine now had the support of the most authoritative theologians of the faculties of Salamanca and Alcalá. On the other hand the Sevillian Inquisition had consistently found his works in the homes of the alumbrados, and was sending Pacheco lists of suspect sections taken from them. Propositions from the book had even found their way, in a paraphrased form, into Pacheco's edict, and had been specifically condemned. What was Pacheco to do under these circumstances? The answer is provided by Domingo de Farfán's Memorial of 4th May 1626, which describes the response of the Sevillian Inquisition, who can only have been acting under Pacheco's instructions, to the first wave of denunciations:

Pero el tribunal de la Inquisicion de Sevilla declaro piadosamente la dicha regla del edito, diziendo que no ay regla que no padezca excepcion, y asi por estar el dicho libro aprobado por toda la universidad de Alcalá de Henares y ser un libro muy

estimado y de un autor muy bien acreditado en virtud y santidad, que se avia de presumir no entenderse el rigor de la dicha regla con un libro come ese, hasta tanto que el libro se calificase todo lo que en el se hallara digno de calidad y censura, y entonces se mandaría por edicto particular lo que pareciese mas conveniente acerca del dicho libro, y en este estado se quedo hasta oy el dicho libro y corre como antes. (27)

The promise of an 'edicto particular' was, in all probability, merely a palliative for those who sought the book's withdrawal from circulation. As Farfán attests, it never materialized, nor is there any indication of its preparation. The Inquisition must have been reluctant by this time to let St. John be drawn once more into the alumbrados case, and there is nothing to show that section 22 of Farfán's Memorial met with any positive response. The edition of 1630 was published with a wealth of precautions but with no apparent opposition.

As well as being the last serious attempt to implicate St. John in the Sevillian outbreak of Illuminism, Farfán's Memorial also provides invaluable material for the early history of this incident and, since the document has never been more than partially used or studied it would be as well to probe it a little more deeply.

The first thing established by Farfán's note is the identity of the 1618 edition of St. John's works with the "noche oscura" referred to in Hoces' letters. Section 22 is entitled "Libro llamado vulgarmente Noche Oscura" and begins:

El dicho libro, aunque vulgarmente le llaman "noche oscura", por un tratado que tiene intitulado "noche oscura", pero el titulo del libro dize asi: "obras espirituales que encaminan una alma a la perfecta union con dios, por el P. Fr. Juan de la Cruz... (28)

Farfán's role goes beyond that of commentator, and evidence contained in the Memorial suggests that he may have been the originator of the whole of St. John's involvement in the case of the alumbrados. In a letter which accompanies Farfán's Memorial and in which he wishes to criticize the handling of the alumbrados by the Sevillian 'fiscal del consejo', Antonio de Figueroa, he first seeks to establish his qualifications with regard to the alumbrados. The first part of this letter is reproduced below, according to the original of AHN Inq. leg. 2.960:

el maestro fray domingo farfan de la orden de sto. domingo morador en el convto. de S. Pablo de Sevilla, y calificador del Sto. Offo. paresco ante V.A. y digo que yo me halle en el descubrimiento de la complicidad de los alumbrados de Sevilla y por orden del tribunal de la inquisicion de aquella ciudad tuve las llaves de los aposentos de los dichos alumbrados, y recogí los quadernos, cartapacios, cartas y papeles, por donde se descubrió la dicha complicidad, y despues por especial comission del dicho tribunal anduve por algunos lugares del distrito de la dicha inquisicion, publicando el edito de gracia, y recibiendo memoriales contra los dichos alunbrados, y e calificado y trabajado en estas materias, desde el principio del dicho descubrimiento hasta aora por todo lo qual tengo inteligencia y noticia de las causas de los dichos alunbrados, y de sus errores y delitos...

Was Farfán alone responsible for the searching of the homes of the alumbrados? He certainly mentions no one else, and uses only the singular forms "tuve las llaves" and "recogí los quadernos". It was during these searches by Farfán that St. John's book consistently turned up, among papers which were to incriminate the leaders of the Seville group:



item el dicho libro se halla en poder de los alumbrados presos en la inquisicion de Sevilla, y entre los papeles que yo recogia en los aposentos de sus casas, quando tuve las llaves de dichos aposentos por orden del tribunal de la dicha inquisicion, siempre se hallava el dicho libro, y por eso lo vine a conocer, que antes no tenia noticia del... (29)

Who more likely than Farfán, then, to bring the book to the attention of the inquisitor Alonso de Hoces? He was also in a position, since he describes himself as a "calificador del santo oficio", to examine the book and submit his judgement on its contents to the inquisitors proper. Is he the author, then, of some of the apuntamientos forwarded by Hoces to Pacheco? This possibility is consistent with the intimate knowledge he displays in his Memorial of both the original denunciation and the reply which Pacheco made to it through the Sevillian Inquisition. It also accords with the tone of personal interest which Farfán shows in his account of the first denunciation.

This account begins in the present tense, as though denouncing suspect passages for the first time:

Y el dicho libro contiene tres proposiciones condenadas en el mismo edito, conviene a saber: la 17 del edito, la 36 del edito, la 43 del edito.

Having compared two exceptionally similar propositions taken from the book and the edict, Farfán proceeds to use past tenses, to reveal that he is dealing with charges specifically brought against St. John's book at an earlier date:

por lo qual, conforme a la regla y mandato del edito, el dicho libro estava prohibido.- Pero el tribunal de la Inquisicion de Sevilla declaro piadosamente la dicha regla del edito...

As we will see later, there is a correlation between the propositions of the edict which Farfán reveals were used to indict St. John's

works and the replies contained in Basilio's Respuesta. The Respuesta, taking its date as 11th July 1623, can only have been a reply to the apuntamientos of 29th May 1623 and not to those sent from Seville on 4th July 1623. Therefore if Farfán did act as a calificador to the works of St. John his contribution was probably included in Hoces's first denunciation to Pacheco. Since Farfán only mentions three propositions, and Basilio replies to forty, it is reasonable to assume some collaboration of calificadores in the production of the first set of apuntamientos. This assumption is corroborated by Basilio's references to "los calificadores"<sup>(30)</sup>. However, the propositions of the edict quoted by Farfán, especially 17 and 43, appear from Basilio's defence to have been central to the indictment of St. John's works.

The fifty propositions mentioned subsequently in Farfán's Memorial seem to be a more recent compilation by him, in the face of the book's continued circulation:

para que se vea claramente lo quo digo, tengo sacadas 50  
proposiciones del dicho libro, las quales e cotejado muy de  
espacio con las proposiciones del edito de gracia de Sevilla...  
De todo lo que e dicho hare la prueba quando se calificquen  
las proposiciones que tengo sacadas del dicho libro.

In conclusion, we can say of Farfán's early involvement with the case that he was almost certainly personally responsible for the notification of his discovery of St. John's book among the papers of the alumbrados, and very probably involved in the first denunciation, of which he shows such a detailed knowledge.

It has never been explained how the essence of a passage from St. John found its way into the 1623 edict. The proposition in question is number 43 of the edict and is quoted below according to Barrantes's edition, based on a copy in Salamanca<sup>(31)</sup>.

43. Que en el estado de perfectos y vida unitiva por amor con Dios, si le dijese Dios formalmente sé bueno, sustancialmente seria bueno, y que en este caso no tiene el alma qué hacer ni querer, (ni) no querer (32) .

The corresponding passage in St. John reads:

Si nuestro señor dijese formalmente al alma: "sé buena", luego sustancialmente sería buena: o si le dijese: "Amame", luego tendría y sentiría en sí sustancia de amor de Dios... Acerca destas, no tiene el alma que hacer... en obrar lo que ellas dicen. (2S:31:1-2)

Although in 1626 he misquotes this passage, Farfán is correct in seeing its close affinity with the proposition of the edict, as well as the inclusion of the work in the Clause which reads:

mandamos á todas las personas referidas... que tuvieren libros, cuadernos cartapacios ó papeles que contengan alguna ó algunas de las dichas proposiciones... los manifiestan y exhiban en el dicho Santo Oficio. (Barrantes p. 370)

When it was specifically denounced to him, we have seen that Pacheco acted with great caution as regards the "noche oscura". Why, then, had he included in his edict a proposition so clearly derived from this book? To shed some light on this question we must look at how the edict was formed.

From his office in Madrid, Pacheco could only know of the happenings in Seville at second hand. The seriousness of the outbreak of Illuminism there prompted him to demand daily accounts of the progress made by the local Inquisition. For the composition of his edict he appears to have relied almost exclusively on material supplied from Seville.

The idea of publishing an edict seems to have arisen as a result of the unsuspected proliferation of the sect throughout Seville, which

was becoming ever more apparent to the Inquisition early in 1623. A letter written by the Sevillian inquisitors on 31st January 1623 contains an account of the current state of the case against the alumbrados, in response to instructions sent by him on 10th January 1623 (leg. 2.960). The inquisitors warn Pacheco that because those already held in the secret prisons "son muchos en numero" they must stop taking new prisoners and be content to continue the collection of testimonies against those already in custody. Possibly in the light of this, there is a note at the head of the letter, added when it was received in Madrid, which indicates an intention to see "si sera bien publicar algun edito o lo q mas conviniere".

It was evidently decided that an edict would be the best way to bring the sect into the open and speed up the conclusion of the affair. With a letter dated 11th April 1623 the inquisitors Hoces and Villavicencio sent to Pacheco "un quaderno y otros papeles con el tanto del hedicto de gracia de Toledo y un borron hecho para la ocassion presente para que VSa lo mande ver y corregir". (leg. 2.960) The material they mention is, we believe, preserved in the Inquisition records of the AHN in caja 2, expediente 14 of legajo 3.716. The outer cover of this expediente is entitled by a later archivist  
 Sevilla (Alumbrados) Relaciones para formar el edicto de gracia, 1623.

Inside, the original heading begins:

Sevilla Año 1623/Quaderno/De algunas Relaciones/ y Papeles  
 Que Paresce/pueden dar Alguna luz Para formar el/ edicto de gracia...

The most surprising feature of this "borron" is the completeness of the material furnished by the Sevillian inquisitors. They go so far as to supply a draft version of an introduction for the edict, which begins on f.1. "Nos don Andres Pacheco..." The "borron"

is extensively annotated by Pacheco himself. The main sections which follow the introduction are outlined below:

1. (f.5-8): A printed copy of an old general edict of Seville, which includes a condemnation of the "seta de alubrados y dexados". All of the relevant section is underlined and Pacheco comments in a note by the side of the text:

Parese que estas proposiciones de este edicto general se podrían poner por caveca supuesto que ay testificacion de todas ellas// y consecutivamente las del edicto de toledo que de las mas o cassi todas ay testificacion// y luego consecutivamente las de Sevilla aora nuevamte descubiertas// advirtienddo que de las unas y las otras se quiten las repetidas// y de las de toledo la calidad.

2. (f.9-17): The Toledo edict of 1525. This again bears notes by Pacheco relating to the composition of the new edict. He repeats the decision to omit the "calidad" or grounds for condemnation which accompanied all of the propositions of Toledo (f.9).
3. (f.18-22): "Proposiciones de los Alumbrados de Sevilla, las quales estan ya calificadas en los processos a donde partenecen." In the main, Pacheco's edict was to be derived from the earlier edicts we have mentioned above, "por ser de una misma enseñaanca y doctrina" (f.2). This third section, however, is taken directly from the teachings of the Seville group. This set of propositions has been edited by Miguel de la Pinta Llorente, although he does not explain the purpose of the document which contains them<sup>(33)</sup>. Bearing in mind his own norm of removing repetitions, Pacheco makes a note of those propositions already condemned in the general edict. These are numbers 1, 4, 16, 21, 25-28, 30, 31, 32. Among those remaining we find the words

derived from St. John (f.20, Llorente p. 101), "37. que en el estado de perfectos y vida unitiva por amor con dios si le dicesse dios a el alma formalmente se buena, luego substancialmente seria buena y que en este casso no tiene el alma que obrar, ny querer, ny no querer, ny que hazer".

The Sevillian inquisitors do not mention the book which was the source of this proposition. It is simply included as one of the heretical teachings which has emerged during their proceedings against the alumbrados. Pacheco had no way of knowing its origin, and since it was not already covered by the earlier edicts he simply included it almost word for word in the new one. This answers our original question of why Pacheco later protected a book which had been condemned by the edict. The Sevillian inquisitors effectively composed the new edict; Pacheco was left simply with the arrangement of the propositions and the omission of inappropriate portions of the older edicts. There are two possible ways in which St. John's words might have emerged from the proceedings against the alumbrados. One is that the paraphrase condemned in the edict might have formed part of their oral teaching, and a testimony to this effect might have been filed against them. The second is that it may have been extracted at this stage from the books found in their possession and its alleged mistakes charged against them. Although it is difficult to choose with any certainty between these two possibilities, some slight indications favour the former interpretation.

1. The section "Proposiciones de los Alumbrados de Sevilla" makes no reference to any books, and for the most part consists of what one or other of the prisoners was known to have taught or practised.
2. The first specific denunciation of the book dates from 29th May 1623, whereas the proposition was remitted with the other material

on 11th April 1623. This suggests that when they sent the "borrón" the Sevillian inquisitors were still unaware of the source of the proposition, since they would be inclined to denounce immediately any book which they suspected of heretical content.

3. The paraphrase of this passage suggests oral dissemination rather than inquisitorial examination, which would tend towards greater precision. Even Farfán's inexact quotation of 1626 follows St. John more closely than the proposition as sent from Seville.

We could add that if the book had been examined much before Hoces' denunciation of 29th May 1623, and a proposition from it deliberately sent for inclusion in the edict, it would seem exceedingly disingenuous of Farfán to say in 1626:

Y especialmente la 43 esta con las mismas palabras y los mismos terminos, de tal suerte, que parece trasladada del libro y puesta en el edito<sup>(34)</sup>.

The zealous Dominican shows no such lack of candour in his other writings.

In the light of these considerations it seems reasonable to allot St. John a place in the oral doctrine of the alumbrados, as well as on their bookshelves. But how extensive was his influence on this sect and, a more important question, how faithfully did they reflect his teachings in their own? These questions can be broached here, although it is useful to remember that since the alumbrados of Seville left no written account of their beliefs our only knowledge of them proceeds from the Inquisition records, and is subject to the entirely hostile interpretation of the Holy Office. Any redeeming features of the sect's beliefs or practices are unlikely to be recorded in the existing documentation, all of which was aimed at securing their condemnation.

The influence of the Discalced Carmelite order is evident in the leaders of the sect. In his trial, Villalpando is described as  
 el Mo. Juan de Villalpando que en su mocedad fue frayle  
 carmelita descalco, y de presente sacerdote, confesor y  
 predicador, y una de las cabeças de los alumbrados<sup>(35)</sup>.

The other main leader of the group, Catalina de Jes s, was apt to compare herself with St. Teresa, believing that just as St. Teresa had reformed the Carmelite order, so she had been sent by God to reform the secular clergy<sup>(36)</sup>. In a letter written by Ortiz de Zarate in 1627 she is described as "Catalina de Jes s, beata carmelita"<sup>(37)</sup>. All of this indicates a Carmelite background which helps to explain their recourse to the doctrines of St. John when formulating their own.

The most coherent guide we possess to the beliefs and practices of the alumbrados is the edict itself, and so, despite its obvious bias, this must be the basis for our investigation. Apart from the proposition we have studied, many more propositions from the edict correspond, with greater or lesser accuracy, to passages in St. John's works. As well as making individual comparisons, we shall attempt to relate propositions and extracts to the overall framework of spirituality taught by St. John and the alumbrados. The propositions from the edict which will be discussed are set out below, according to Barrantes's edition<sup>(38)</sup>.

1. ... que la oracion mental est  en precepto divino, y que con ella se cumple todo lo dem s.
2. Que la oracion es la que tiene valor, y que la vocal importa poco, enti ndese que la oracion mental
9. Que se puede ver y se ve en esta vida la Esencia Divina y misterios de la Sant sima Trinidad, cuando llegan   cierto punto de perfeccion.



10. El Espíritu Santo inmediatamente gobierna á los que así viven.
11. Que solamente ha de seguir su movimiento é inspiracion interior para hacer ó dejar de hacer cualquiera cosa.
13. Que habiendo llegado á cierto punto de perfeccion no pueden ver imágenes de santas ni oír sermones ni palabras di Dios
17. Simple fe. Que en la oracion se recogen en la presencia de Dios y dicen que alli no se han de hacer discursos ni meditar, aunque sea la pasion de Cristo nuestro Señor, ni detenerse en pensar, aunque sea en su santísima humanidad.
36. Perfeccion en gracia. Que puede una persona llegar á tal estado de perfeccion que la gracia anegue las potencias, de manera que no pueda el alma ir atrás ni adelante.
42. Que en el estado de union no se hagan muchos actos de voluntad.
43. Que en el estado de perfectos y vida unitiva por amor con Dios, si le dijese Dios formalmente sé bueno, sustancialmente seria bueno, y que en este caso no tiene el alma qué hacer ni querer, (ni) no querer <sup>(39)</sup>.
45. Que solamente se ha de entender lo que Dios entiende que es á sí mismo y en sí mismo y á las cosas en sí mismo.
58. Que en los arrobos que llaman raptos, ven en esta vida á Dios claramente como se ve en gloria.
63. Que los que siguen su doctrina no han de ir al Purgatorio <sup>(40)</sup>.
66. Que para recogerse en la oracion no hay necesidad de imágenes, que son añagazas.

These propositions refer to two main areas; prayer, or the disposition for Union, and the effects of Union. In the first area we see that the alumbrados advocated mental prayer and deprecated vocal prayer (props. 1, 2). This emphasis is evident in other accounts of their teachings. In the Relacion against Villalpando, for example we find:

En lo que principalmete este Reo puso su intencion y mayor fuerça fue en encarescer mucho la necessidad de la oracion mental, y desacreditar y tener en poco la Oracion vocal... la oracion mental era necessaria para la salvacion... Que nadie se podia salvar sin la Oracion mental<sup>(41)</sup>.

Although St. John's works do not condemn vocal prayer, it implicitly occupies the lowest position in his framework of spirituality, below the discursive mental prayer of meditation. St. Teresa too had insisted that vocal prayer without the attention of the mind was unfruitful and that all worthwhile prayer must involve the Intellect to some degree<sup>(42)</sup>.

However, it is clear from a later proposition of the edict that when the alumbrados said "oración mental" they meant neither St. Teresa's vocal prayer said with an attentive mind, nor meditation. Proposition 17 is a clear reflection of St. John's concept of contemplation, that is to say a supra-conceptual prayer which rises above the discursive exercise of meditation to enjoy contact with God through the "medio proximo" of blind Faith. In St. John's system this higher form of prayer may be impeded by the continued dependence of the soul on "medios remotos" (2S:12:5). The alumbrados, somewhat exaggeratedly, made contemplation the only permissible form of prayer, believing that they could gain immediate access to this higher state by their own efforts and without recourse to any "medios remotos". The phrase "medios remotos" in St. John refers principally to meditation, but St. John also stresses that the soul must not be impeded by external symbols such as statues, but must address itself to the truth they represent (3S:15:2). This teaching was adapted by the alumbrados to become a rejection of all images and a contempt for the external trappings of the Church (props. 13, 66). Proposition 45 can be seen as an inexact reiteration of St. John's teaching on the

rejection of all that is not God on the path to Union, (although it is difficult to tell whether "a sí mismo" refers to God or the individual).

A greater proportion of the doctrine of the alumbrados, as revealed by the edict, is concerned with the effects of Union. The essential question here is whether the soul can see God in this life with the clarity of the Beatific Vision. St. John's works were subject to misinterpretation on this point from other quarters, for in his descriptions of Union so close a contact is revealed between the soul and its Maker that it is difficult to understand what greater heights could be reached after death. In the "Llama de amor viva", however, the soul, already enjoying Union with God, is shown to be impatient for death in order to see Him perfectly (L1:1:31). The alumbrados were either unaware of this passage or chose to ignore it. For them the clear vision of God "como se ve en gloria" was one of the rewards enjoyed by those who had arrived at "cierto punto de perfeccion"(props. 9, 58-62).

Another effect of Union, which had more practical bearing on their behaviour was the "drowning" of the soul's faculties, resulting in the inability of the soul to "ir atrás ni adelante" of its own volition (props. 36, 42). The removal of the Will meant that the soul must follow only the promptings of the Holy Spirit (props. 10, 11). The implication of the soul's impeccability in this state gave rise to the notorious moral abuses of the sect. It is to this end that St. John's teaching contained in Proposition 43 is used; in the interpretation of the alumbrados, the soul was here forbidden to make any effort towards becoming good. In practice they felt licensed to follow their own carnal inclinations while awaiting perfection at God's hand. The basis for their belief in the movement of the soul by the Holy Spirit is not difficult to find in St. John. In the

Subida he says explicitly "las operaciones del alma unida son del Espiritu divino y son divinas" (3S:2:8). In the Llama, speaking in general of the work of the Spirit in leading the soul to contemplation, he warns spiritual directors 'que el principal agente y guía y movedor de las almas en este negocio no son ellos, sino el Espiritu Sancto' (L1:3:46). For those with a poor education or false intentions an eccentric reading of such passages would not be difficult. The same may be said of St. John's teaching on the impeccability of the soul in the state of Union. St. John makes clear his view on this matter in a passage from Noche Oscura which was later to attract the attention of the censors of Seville:

(las) dos porciones de alma, espiritual y sensitiva: las cuales, para poder ella salir a la divina unión de amor, conviene que estén primero reformadas, ordenadas y quietas acerca de lo sensitivo y espiritual conforme al modo del estado de la inocencia que había en Adán (2N:24:2).

To differentiate between the doctrines of St. John and the alumbrados it is necessary to distinguish between 'actual' freedom from sin, as a result of thorough preparatory purgation, and inability to sin, whatever one's actions, as a result of a special spiritual status. Adam, as St. John well knew, was still susceptible to temptation and capable of falling from grace.

A further alleged effect of Union, held out as an inducement to follow the teachings of the sect, was the promise of avoidance of Purgatory (prop.63). This doctrine is firmly based on St. John's teachings, above all on the "Noche Oscura", where the spiritual purgation of those who achieve perfection in this life averts the need for the further cleansing of Purgatory:

aquí se purgan a la manera que allí, porque esta purgación es la que allí se había de hacer; y así, el alma que por aquí pasa, o no entra en aquel lugar o se detiene allí muy poco (2N:6:6) éstos (pocos que son) por cuanto ya por el amor están purgadísimos, no entran en el purgatorio. (2N:20:5)

For the alumbrados it was a logical conclusion of their belief in their own perfection that further purgation after death was unnecessary for them.

The propositions we have quoted from the edict show that in all probability St. John's works played a part in the formation of the doctrines of the alumbrados. What they do not show can only be seen by comparing all of our knowledge regarding the alumbrados with the complete system of spirituality taught by St. John. What is immediately apparent when we make such a comparison is the extreme eclecticism of the use of St. John by the alumbrados. Their interests are in extracting from his works whatever seems to promise something, or to authorize a lack of accountability on the part of the individual. The reverse of the coin in St. John's doctrine is an austere self-abnegation, a true purification of the soul effected jointly by the soul's own efforts and by the grace of God. For St. John progress towards Union with God is impossible without the most thorough self-denial, encompassing not only the abandonment of worldly attachments, but also the rejection of all spiritual comforts. This essential aspect of the soul's preparation for Union is ignored by the alumbrados. In proposition 45 of the edict we find:

Que para la union con Dios en esta vida se requiere la misma pureza que para ver a Dios.

Yet nowhere in the accounts we have of their teachings do we find the means to achieve this "pureza", something which was St. John's

concern in the great majority of his writings. Rather they completely contradict the spirit of his doctrine by their counsel of disobedience to parents and religious superiors, their sensual adherence to "arrobos" and stigmata, their frequent and abusive use of Holy Communion and their gross relaxation of morals. It is fair to assume that not all of the large numbers of followers who were brought into the open by the edict were guilty of all of the charges brought against the group as a whole. But it is difficult to evade the culpability of the sect's leaders.

Despite its inevitable limitations, our study of the doctrine of the alumbrados places us in a better position to evaluate the defence made of St. John's works by Basilio Ponce de León<sup>(43)</sup>. In his introductory section Basilio determines the root of the errors of the alumbrados in their interpretation of St. John, their failure to practise the essential ascetic preparation for contemplation.

Tubieran ellos la pureza de vida, la desnudez de todos los afectos de la tierra y de sí mismos que este libro pide antes de llegar al estado perfecto de la contemplación, y no hubieran caído tan lastimosamente: que quien sin limpiar primero el alma de vicios quiere entrar en este santuario tiene muy cierta la caída en pecados muy grandes (p. 400).

el desacierto de aquellos no se ha de poner por cuenta de este libro, sino de la perversa voluntad de ellos que no quisieron abrazar los medios de la vía purgativa que este libro les enseña, pretendiendo llegar al fin antes que hubiesen dado el primer paso. (p. 402)

To defend the works of St. John, Basilio intends to look at the censured propositions in the context of the whole of St. John's body of doctrine.

para juzgar de la doctrina de un libro o proposición que se halle en él, es menester mirar lo que antecede y se sigue y la doctrina que en otras partes se enseña, porque así se colija el verdadero sentido (p. 400)

This is the familiar recourse of St. John's earlier apologists and, indeed, of St. John himself<sup>(44)</sup>. In other places too Basilio is able to take advantage of St. John's own caution and of Salablanca's editorial interventions.

The first passage from St. John to attract the suspicion of the calificadores of Seville concerns the soul's need to empty itself of all yearnings for things natural and supernatural before it can achieve Union with God. This is quoted below according to Basilio's reply which, naturally, follows the 1618 edition:

Es summa ignorancia del alma pensar podrá pasar a este alto estado de la unión con Dios si primero no vacía el apetito de las cosas naturales y sobrenaturales . en cuanto a él por amor propio pueden pertenecer. (p. 403, 1618, p. 21)

The problem for the orthodox theologian here was that it was then deemed perfectly permissible to aspire to certain supernatural graces, and since St. John's reasons for the rejection of these graces was not properly understood, the idea was linked with the alumbrados' belief that by renouncing the powers of Intellect and Will they could evade responsibility for their actions. Basilio begins his reply by stressing the orthodoxy of the notion of "desasimiento de todo y de amor propio para llegar a la oración de unión" (p. 403). This affirmation is authorized by quotations taken from St. Teresa, Bernardino de Laredo, Alberto Magno, St. Augustine, pseudo-Dionysius and Fr. Bartolomé de los Mártires. Basilio contrasts the traditional view of the necessity of "desasimiento" with the suppression of the Will advocated by the alumbrados:

los que dicen que se ha de desnudar de su querer sujetándose a los movimientos interiores con que abrieron la puerta a la ejecución de sus torpezas... Nada de esto se colige de la proposición de este Padre, que sólo pide el deseo de los desasimientos de todo fuera de lo que no es Dios y por Dios, y negación de todo amor propio; pues dice expresamente en cuanto a él por amor propio pueden pertenecer (p. 404-5).

His insistence on this final clause is significant since it was not written by St. John himself but inserted by his first editor P. Diego de Jesús (Salablanca). If the precautions of the first edition did not pre-empt all attacks, as was their intention, they at least provided subsequent apologists with material with which to refute them. The effect of this particular intervention was to leave intact the possibility of aspiring to certain supernatural graces, a significant alteration to St. John's original statement (see 1S:5:2). It is interesting to speculate as to how successfully St. John would have been defended had the 1618 edition been an exact reproduction of his writings.

The second extract which Basilio defends regards the action of Faith on the Intellect:

Cuando se trata de las maneras de noche que ha de pasar una alma que ha de llegar a esta unión con Dios, dice de la segunda: "Y esta segunda, que es la fe, pertenece a la parte superior del hombre, que es la racional, y por consiguiente más interior y obscura, porque le priva de la luz racional o por mejor decir la ciega (p. 405).

Basing himself substantially on pseudo-Dionysius, Basilio expounds the traditional tenet of mysticism that God, who transcends the natural order, is unknowable by the light of Reason, and that blind Faith alone can guide the soul towards Him. Basilio prefers, however, to



see the natural operation of the Intellect merely dwarfed by the obscure knowledge of God given through Faith, rather than lost altogether. His concern is to avoid creating an opposition between Faith and Reason:

En esta proposición no se dice que la gracia destruye a la naturaleza ni se ciega, que la fe es luz que alumbrá; ni se dice que se pierde la luz de la razón. (P. 406).

This explanation is ideally suited to answering the doubts of the Inquisition, but what it obscures is St. John's development of the traditional view of Faith and the dynamic role it plays in his system in purging the Intellect of its natural operations to bring about Union with God (2S:6:1-2, see Chapter 2 above).

Basilio goes into greater detail to defend the third proposition, taken from the famous signs of the Subida (2S:13). In St. John's scheme these three signs, when observed together, would indicate with certainty that the soul could now leave meditation in favour of contemplation as its normal form of prayer. The concern of the calificadores of this doctrine was that in leaving behind discursive meditation the soul would abandon all natural operation of the Intellect, and be left in the state of passivity and lack of accountability favoured by the alumbrados. The alumbrados had certainly drawn some alarming conclusions from St. John's doctrine. The seventeenth proposition of the edict specifically condemned their teaching on prayer derived from St. John:

17. Simple fe. Que en la oración se recogen en la presencia de Dios y dicen que allí no se han de hacer discursos ni meditar, aunque sea la pasión de Cristo nuestro Señor, ni detenerse en pensar, aunque sea en su santísima humanidad (45),

The alumbrados extended the terms of this doctrine to claim that those who practised contemplation were exempt from all works, "aunque

sean buenas y de precepto" (p. 413). Since they believed in immediate access to this form of prayer, we may assume that all followers of the sect enjoyed this dispensation from good works. Basilio cuts to the root of their errors by explaining that the imageless prayer of contemplation is not freely accessible to all:

Y para que la verdad de todo conste, supongo primero que llegar a tan alto punto de contemplación y oración de unión, no esta en manos de uno ni cae debaxo de diligencia humana, todo es especial misericordia de Dios que pone en este estado al alma que quiere, solamente a ella le toca disponerse con exercicio de virtudes y no hacerse indigna de este bien ni incapaz, poniendo obstaculo a la divina gracia. (p. 407).

The alumbrados lacked both the realization that the higher forms of prayer were more the work of God than the soul and the necessary preparation for this divine intervention. Basilio also makes it clear that mystical writers in general, and St. John in particular, do not exclude good works, but merely say that the Intellect has no need of conscious discourse for the duration of contemplative prayer (p. 413, 415).

For the rest of his defence of this proposition Basilio draws on the traditional teaching of the Church regarding the nature of contemplation and its effects, which, although it effectively refutes the errors of the alumbrados and the suspicions of the Sevillian inquisitors, does not conform in every particular to St. John's own doctrine. For St. John the supernatural theological virtue of Faith empties the Intellect of its natural operation, as Hope and Charity do the faculties of Memory and Will, and supernaturally creates a Union between the soul and its Creator. Basilio sees in contemplation a refined but still natural act of the Intellect rather than the beginning of its supernatural mode of operation in

Faith. So he says that in contemplation the Intellect works "desnudo de las formas imaginarias, sino solamente con imágenes intelectuales" (p. 408) and a little later "allí no discurre el entendimiento sino solamente obra por una simple inteligencia" (p. 409). As in the acquired contemplation of Thomas of Jesus, this prayer is seen to lack the effort of discourse but still to be a natural act of the Intellect. Unlike Thomas, however, Basilio says that the soul cannot place itself in this contemplation (p. 407).

Since Basilio does not perceive contemplation to involve the transition from natural to supernatural modes of operation of the Intellect, he follows St. John's earlier apologists in reducing certain passages to "modos de decir":

De aquí nace que parece a algunos contemplativos que no obra el entendimiento ni la voluntad; no porque no obren... sino porque no tiene operación discursiva ni trabajosa, gozando de una summa quietud. (p. 411).

De aquí también nace lo segundo, que muchos autores digan haberse el alma en esto pasivamente, porque allí es casi todo obra del Espíritu Santo; mas parece que el alma padece, que obra. (p. 412).

Among the authorities on which he draws to reinforce this point are the words of P. Gracián in his commentary on St. Teresa's Conceptos del amor de Dios:

Verdad es que no obra con discurso ni meditación, buscando y colligiendo unas razones de otras, pero está entendiendo con atención; y ésta es la causa por qué algunas veces la Sancta Madre y otras personas espirituales dicen que el entendimiento está atado y no obra, quieren decir: no "discurre", ni medita, ni obra como suele obrar cuando no hay arrobamiento. (p. 410).

St. John was alone in understanding this lack of conscious activity as the supernatural work of Faith in the Intellect rather than a refined form of the natural operation of this faculty.

Basilio concludes his defence of the third proposition with these words:

Heme detenido tanto en esta proposición, porque las más que se califican después se reducen a ésta (p. 416).

He refers back to this section when dealing with many of the later propositions.

The section labelled Proposición 4, 5 y 6 is also one of the more important passages of the Respuesta. As the preceding proposition has been linked with proposition 17 of the edict, so this extract was even more visibly the source of number 43 of the same edict. We have outlined in another part of this chapter the history of the inclusion of this proposition in the edict. The fundamental question it raises concerns the nature of substantial locutions and the soul's response to them. The inquisitors of Seville seem to have been concerned as to whether these locutions involved the passivity of the faculties or even the overriding of Free Will by God. The passage as quoted by Basilio is actually an editorial paraphrase of St. John's words. Interpolations and a significant omission had been made in the 1618 edition by Diego de Jesús. We reproduce below the relevant section of the 1618 edition, underlining the important interpolations and, below this, we give the omitted section, according to the BAC edition:

No tiene el alma qué hacer ni qué querer por entonces de suyo sino hāyase con resignación y humildad en ellas, dando su libre consentimiento a Dios; ni tiene qué desechar ni qué temer. No tiene que trabaxar en obrar lo que ellas dicen, porque con

estas palabras substanciales lo obra Dios en ella y con ella, lo cual es diferente en las formales y sucesivas. (p. 416-17, 1618 p. 217).

Y digo que no tiene que querer ni no querer, porque ni es menester su querer para que Dios las obre, ni basta con no querer para que dejen de hacer el dicho efecto (2S:31:2).

Following his normal method, Basilio divides the extract from the Alcalá edition into four areas: the existence of substantial locutions, the soul's response to them in general, the lack of work on the soul's part in their realization and freedom from demonic interference. In dealing with the first of these Basilio shows clearly that once again he does not exclude activity on the part of the Intellect:

La primera, que hay estas hablas de Dios interiores y substanciales que las llaman los místicos así, no porque sean inmediatamente con la substancia del alma, sin que obre el entendimiento; sino porque las hace Dios inmediatamente, sin que medie criatura alguna, y por la impresión entrañable de los efectos que dexan (p. 417).

He then uses the interpolated text to support the inclusion of the activity of the Will:

La segunda parte dice que entonces no tiene el alma que obrar sino dexarse llevar, dando su libre consentimiento a Dios con toda humildad. Nótese esto contra los que califican, para que se vea que no alcanzaron su sentido. Luego según este autor obra entonces el alma: que consentir y humillarse no es sino obra de la voluntad. (p. 417).

St. John's use of terms relating to the senses of hearing and vision are used to support the activity of the Intellect, since normal vision and hearing involve this faculty. As in dealing with the third

proposition, Basilio reduces the passivity of the soul to the mere exclusion of the discursive exercises of meditation:

Luego no niega este autor haber obras cualesquier en el alma, sino las de discurso y meditaci3n y trabaxo, de que ya hemos hablado en la propon. 3, que en aquella summa quietud pueden ser de estorbo (p. 417).

Whilst recognizing that some theologians believed that the soul's Free Will could be overridden, Basilio inclines to the opposite view:

Aunque porque algunos doctores catholicos son de parecer que en aquel punto de contemplaci3n no obra el alma libremente, podria no merecer; mas para m3 es m3s verdadero lo contrario que all3 est3 libre la voluntad y merece (p. 418).

Although the impotence of the Will in St. John's view is clear from the suppressed section quoted above (p. 130), there is no reason to suppose that Basilio knew of this omission.

In the next paragraph Basilio accepts that it is God who realizes the effects of substantial locutions and supports this from the writings of St. Teresa, St. Bernard and St. Thomas of Villanueva. He continues, however, to speak of the soul as an active, though inferior, partner in this work:

Y desto se sigue, lo primero que dice este autor, que all3 no hay que trabaxar, porque como Dios es el principal3simo agente, obra el alma sin ninguna dificultad ni trabaxo, sino con mucho gusto... (p. 419).

He ends his defence of this proposition by confirming the security of the soul from deception by the devil, reinforcing incidentally his concept of contemplation as "simple apprehensi3n" and "imagen intelectual" (p. 420).

The dependence of Basilio's explanation on Salablanca's textual changes is too apparent to require further commentary. It is

sufficient for the moment to note how the 1618 edition made possible a reading of St. John's doctrine on substantial locutions which was diametrically opposed to the sense of St. John's original.

The next section concerning *sentimientos espirituales* ("Proposición 7a y 8a" p. 420), is quite brief, but again is based on a paraphrase by Salablanca of St. John's words. The purpose of this paraphrase is to exclude the distinction made in the original between two varieties of sentimiento espiritual:

La primera son sentimientos en el afecto de la voluntad;

la segunda son sentimientos en la sustancia del alma (2S:32:2).

Salablanca's concern here was to omit the reference to substantial contact between God and the soul. We have seen that Basilio shared this concern in his explanation of substantial locutions (p. 417, see above p. 131). Both were motivated by their awareness of, and possibly their participation in the current pedantic insistence on a Thomist theory of knowledge. Anything which did not fit the scholastic mould must either be suppressed or explained as a mere "modo de decir".

Proposition 9 is taken from a very clear reiteration by St. John of his doctrine on the necessity of negating the natural operation of the faculties in order for the soul to progress beyond the state of principiante (3S:2:1-2). It has already been defended, claims Basilio, in Proposition 3 and for this reason he merely refers the reader to the appropriate part of his earlier explanation (p. 421-2).

The section dealing with Propositions 10 and 11, also very brief, refers to the same earlier explanation of Proposition 3 and also offers a succinct defence of St. John's assertion of the vanity of seeking after temporal successes such as bearing children (p. 422).

Propositions 12-14 are taken from St. John's words on the correct use of statues and crucifixes. Only the most superficial reading of this

part of his works could lead to the conclusion that St. John condemns their use in general. In fact, through his own precautions, he made Basilio's task here a relatively easy one, by writing a section explicitly condemning the indiscriminate rejection of statuary by the protestant churches (3S:15:2). Nieto has recently suggested that this passage is an interpolation<sup>(46)</sup>. The reason he gives is that the terminology used by St. John in describing the Lutherans as "aquellos pestíferos hombres" "does not harmonize with John's otherwise patient, restrained and humble spirit". We may recall, however, that even that most generous and humble of saints, Teresa, occasionally had harsh words to say about the protestant churches<sup>(47)</sup>. Moreover, the subsequent explanation of the correct use of images conforms completely to other parts of St. John's writings. The use of the terms "medio" and "fin" is particularly characteristic of St. John (compare with 2S:12:5). Of interpolations in general, Nieto has this to say:

Of the works published first in 1618, no one can be certain how much they were revised and interpolated to make them fit the canons of orthodoxy (p. 37).

In fact the existence of modern editions based on authoritative manuscripts makes quite feasible the location of editorial interventions in the 1618 edition, as we have seen in an earlier chapter. The passage mentioned above is not amongst the interpolations which can be located in this way, and is authorized by all of the most reliable manuscripts.

Propositions 15-17 are taken from a passage where St. John teaches that the enthusiastic use of the devotions of the church by principiantes is often of an imperfect nature "porque son movidos a estos ejercicios espirituales por el consuelo y gusto que allí hallan" (1N:1:2-3). At first sight we may wonder why the calificadores



denounced this passage since St. John's doctrine of renunciation of sensible devotion seems directly opposed to that of the alumbrados which was condemned in Proposition 44 of the edict, according to Barrantes's edition (p. 367): "Que los actos son más meritorios quanto hay más devoción sensible". This is a particularly unreliable proposition of the edict, however, since the proposition taken from the trials of the alumbrados and sent by the Sevillian inquisitors to Pacheco on 11th April 1623 says the exact opposite, according to Llorente's edition (p. 101),<sup>o</sup> .

38. Que los actos son más meritorios quanto ay menos deuoción sensible.

Whatever may have been the reason for the reversal of the sense of this proposition in the edict, we can readily appreciate the similarity observed by the Inquisitors of Seville between the proposition from the borrón which they had sent to Madrid and the extract they later took from St. John. To understand the censure attracted by these propositions it must be remembered that at the time it was judged to be quite legitimate, even desirable, to be drawn towards devotions because of the spiritual consolations to be found therein. If someone were to condemn this motive for piety, was there not a danger that the faithful would abandon the devotions of the Church? Basilio makes a compact but eloquent defence of St. John on this point, showing that what is perfectly legitimate for beginners becomes unnecessary as the soul progresses in perfection (p. 424-25).

Basilio goes to greater lengths to explain Proposition 18 (p. 425). This, it would seem, was another passage from St. John which the alumbrados used to their own ends. It refers to the occasional sensual effects which accompany spiritual exercises. In his explanation Basilio takes this to refer to an effect of contemplation, whereas in St. John it is one of the imperfections of beginners which must be

purged before contemplation can be reached. For both Basilio and St. John these effects are due to the weakness of the body rather than being effects of a spiritual exercise "per se". Basilio correctly contrasts this with the attitude of the alumbrados, who surrendered themselves voluntarily to these sensual effects and even made them the sign of a greater spirituality.

Without quoting Propositions 19-23, Basilio refers the reader to his explanation of Proposition 3. Presumably, then, they deal again with the suspension of the soul's faculties and the passivity of the soul during contemplation. This is covered by St. John in Chapter 9 of the first book of the "Noche Oscura", and it is probably this chapter which provided the censured propositions. Since Basilio has already reduced St. John's doctrine on the loss of the natural operation of the faculties to "modos de decir", he declines to cover the same ground again. This is also true of Propositions 25, 31 and 33-39.

Proposition 24, where St. John describes the afflictions of the soul during its purgation in the Passive Night of the Spirit, apparently seemed excessive to the calificadores of Seville. Basilio supports St. John's view with quotations taken from St. Bernard, Fr. Alonso de Orozco and St. Teresa, all of whom agree with St. John on this point.

Propositions 26 and 27 return to the necessity for the perfect purgation of the soul which aspires to Union with God. St. John here says that in order to be united with God both the sensitive and spiritual parts of the soul must be:

primero reformadas, ordenadas y quietas acerca de lo sensitivo  
y espiritual conforme al modo del estado de la inoscienza [ sic ]  
que había en Adán (2N:24:2).

There are two reasons why this passage may have attracted the suspicion of the inquisitors. The first is a slight verbal correspondence between this and a proposition extracted from the trials of the alumbrados (Llorente no. 29, p. 100). More important is the implication that a soul may in this life reach a state of impeccability. Once again Basilio is enabled to defend the doctrine of St. John by virtue of an interpolation by Salablanca. After the quotation reproduced above, the editor of the 1618 edition adds:

no obstante que no queda libre del estado de las tentaciones de la parte inferior (1618, p. 507).

Once more placing the weight of his defence on the interpolated section, Basilio is able to say:

y no porque pide tanta pureza en la parte superior del alma supone que está ya libre el alma de pecados veniales y mortales, pues dexa la parte inferior del alma sujeta a tentaciones en el tiempo de la contemplación.

Salablanca's precautions rendered simple the dissociation of St. John's doctrines from the alumbrados' affirmations of their impeccability, but only at the cost of obscuring once again St. John's true meaning. St. John does not make a dogma of the soul's freedom from temptation in this state, but in his system the thoroughness of the soul's previous purgation and the Union of the Will with God does make sin a practical impossibility and, in his original version, he certainly does assume that before entering into Union the soul is free from "pecados veniales y mortales". We have suggested before now a distinction between the notions of impeccability held by St. John and the alumbrados, but it is our firm belief that, insofar as impeccability is possible in this life, it constitutes an important doctrine of St. John.

In the section entitled *Proposición 28*, Basilio defends St. John's assertion of the greater worth of "actos de amor que el alma hace en esta unión" than of any made before the soul undergoes the transformation of Union. The concern of the inquisitors was that ordinary acts of Charity must not be devalued by this statement, but Basilio suitably stresses the necessity of these ordinary acts in the preparation for unitive prayer.

In proposition 29, as well as seeing another claim of impeccability, the calificadores of Seville inferred the alumbrados' doctrine of the clear vision of God in this life. As we have seen above (L1:1:31) St. John did not hold this belief, and Basilio is content to defend St. John by affirming his conformity to the teachings of St. Augustine, Alonso de Orazco, Gerson, Scotus and Bartolomé de los Mártires. The authority of earlier spiritual writers is also considered sufficient defence for St. John's explanation of stigmata, denounced in Proposition 30.

Proposition 31, quoted according to the 1618 edition, describes the "toque delicado" of the poem "Llama de amor viva":

Este toque es substancialísimo y toca la substancia de Dios en la substancia del alma, a lo cual en esta vida han llegado muchos sanctos (p. 433).

For the passivity of the soul under the influence of this "toque" Basilio refers the reader to his defence of Proposition 3. However, he seems to relent in his determination to exclude the possibility of substantial contact between God and the soul:

pues no es improbable en la theologia la opinión que pone un íntimo ilapso con el alma, y su probabilidad la muestra un autor grave de estos tiempos (p. 433).

The phrase "no es improbable" is hardly a wholehearted endorsement of this view, and the evasiveness of "un autor grave" is untypical

of Basilio's normal precision in the use of authorities. Having opened the door, in theory, for the most obvious reading of this passage from St. John, he then closes it by announcing:

pero para declarar y defender este autor no habemos menester  
recurrir a aquella doctrina (p. 433).

In fact Basilio falls back on largely the same definition of "substantial" as he gave in his defence of Propositions 4, 5 and 6, that is to say "sine media creatura", which no doubt sufficed to reply to the doubts of the Inquisition, but falls far short of St. John's "la substancia de Dios en la substancia del alma". In fairness to Basilio it must be conceded that suspect propositions were not best defended with the aid of the latest theological inquiries, and he was perhaps wise not to lean too heavily on any contemporary support for an "íntimo ilapso" between the soul and God. He knew that members of the Inquisition were not chosen for their progressive outlook in theological matters.

Propositions 32 and 33 cover St. John's teaching regarding spiritual directors. Since he demanded that they should have suitable experience before attempting to guide souls in the ways of mystical prayer, the inquisitors were concerned that this could create a separate school of spirituality which believed itself outside the jurisdiction of the Church hierarchy, as had the sect of the alumbrados. Basilio's reply consists for the most part of support for the need of competent spiritual direction drawn from the works of St. Teresa and other writers. He adds a significant palliative for the Sevillian inquisitors:

este autor no niega que la theología mística sea examinada  
por la especulativa... (p. 434).

Something of the tenor of the denunciations from Seville may be glimpsed in Basilio's reply to Propositions 34-37. These are taken from a passage in the Llama where St. John compares the transition

of the soul to contemplation with the journey of the Israelites to the promised land (L1:3:38). For the justification of the doctrinal implications of the passage Basilio refers the reader once again to Proposition 3, but he says of the passage, evidently with its denunciation before him, "No sé por qué sea locura, temeridad, erronio, blasfemio, contumelioso y herético" (p. 435).

Proposition 40 refers very briefly to a section of the Subida, here paraphrased by Basilio, in which St. John again stresses the need for emptying of the soul (2S:4:2). Basilio tells us that this time St. John is not referring to the negation of the natural operation of the Intellect, but rather to the purging of all worldly attachments from the Will (p. 435). For a further defence of this need for self-denial, Basilio refers to paragraph 9 of his introduction (p. 400-02).

In his conclusion Basilio quotes at length from Fr. Luis de León's defence of St. Teresa in order to answer the general accusations of:

poca utilidad de los escritos, dificultad en la doctrina, daños que se han seguido en que anden estos libros en manos de mujeres. (p. 436) .

For his own part, Basilio once again stresses the main factor in St. John's works which is lacking in the doctrine of the alumbrados, the preparation necessary before contemplation is possible:

este autor en el primer libro trata doctísimamente la materia de la abnegación de sí mismo para llegar a este linaxe de contemplación y de unión; yaunque otros authores han tratado de la abnegación exterior, pero de la interior ninguno como aqueste B. Padre, y con documentos más ciertos y para el punto de evitar el engaño en revelaciones, cosa que da tanto en qué entender a varones espirituales y a maestros de espíritu.

Ningún libro se ha escrito hasta hoy que pueda compararse con éste... (p. 437).

Basilio here picks up a strand of St. John's defence which had been used in the censuras of the 1618 edition. St. John's doctrine on the rejection of visions and other supernatural phenomena must have weighed in his favour, since pseudo-visionaries presented one of the Inquisition's most ubiquitous and persistent problems.

Basilio also seems to recognize that doctrinal considerations were not the only arguments likely to influence the Inquisitor General. He made it clear in his introduction that to condemn this book would be to reject outright the opinion of the theological faculty of Alcalá, expressed in the censura of the 1618 edition (p. 396-97). His final paragraph, reproduced below, appeals even more directly to political considerations:

Concluyo esta censura con decir que el recoger este libro es materia muy grave y que puede ser que se atraviere pérdida de la reputación de la Sancta Inquisición de España. Porque como la Orden Carmelita descalza trata agora de la beatificación de este B. Padre, para lo cual es todo la pureza de la doctrina, junto con la pureza de la vida, si el Santo Oficio de España mandase recoger este libro, es verisímil acudir la Religión a Roma a la Sancta Sede Apostólica; y si allí aprobasen este libro, como aquí le aprobó la Universidad de Alcalá y le aprobaran otras muchas que bien sienten, sería falta de reputación de la Sancta Inquisición de España que lo que hacen se lo deshiciesen en Roma, y aun sería abrir la puerta a que hubiese recurso a Roma en semexantes materias, y se pusiese en plática ordinaria, que todo obliga a caminar en este negocio con más tiento. Así lo siento, etc. (p. 439).

Since the Council of Trent, and especially since the case of Carranza's catechism, the Spanish Inquisition was not in such a strong position that it could afford to come into conflict with Rome. Nor did they wish to "abrir la puerta" for the Holy See to intervene in Spanish affairs or reverse decisions of the Tribunal, as they had done in the case of Carranza<sup>(48)</sup>.

Viewed in its totality, the Respuesta must stand as a very effective reply to the Sevillian denunciations of St. John's works. Basilio's most accurate contribution in this respect was the clarification of St. John's teaching on the ascetic preparation for the mystical life. This treatment in itself is sufficient completely to dissociate St. John from the errors of the alumbrados. Basilio also speaks with the voice of St. John when he insists that the soul cannot make the transition to contemplative prayer through its own efforts. But when he deals with the nature of contemplation in his defence of Proposition 3 Basilio displays an understanding of this form of prayer which differs markedly from St. John's teaching. Contemplation is made a natural act of the Intellect which only excludes the conscious imaginative and discursive exercises of meditation. For St. John the Intellect can only work naturally through the use of these "formas y fantasías", none of which can unite the soul to God:

porque, si hablamos naturalmente, como quiera que el entendimiento no puede entender cosa si no es lo que cabe y está debajo de las formas y fantasías de las cosas que por los sentidos corporales se recibe(n)... no se puede aprovechar de la inteligencia natural  
(2S:8:4).

In St. John's scheme, contemplation is impossible without the supernatural operation of Faith in the Intellect. This discrepancy between Basilio and St. John is not limited to the defence of Proposition 3. Fifteen subsequent propositions are defended entirely or largely by



reference to this earlier explanation. We have also seen several cases where Basilio misrepresents St. John through his inevitable dependence on Salablanca's edition of 1618. This affects particularly those sections dealing with the suspension of the natural operation of the faculties during contemplation and the impeccability of the soul in the state of Union.

All of this does not call into question Basilio's integrity. As we have said before, he was probably unaware of Salablanca's editorial interventions and, in any case, his brief was not to expound St. John's doctrine in all of its fullness, but merely to reply to the specific objections raised by the Sevillian calificadores, all based on the 1618 edition. Basilio answers their suspicions fully with the aid of that same edition. But the usefulness of the Respuesta in the specific circumstances of its composition does not obviate the flaws we have discovered in its interpretation of St. John. This is not, we must conclude, a reliable guide to the complete understanding of St. John's doctrine.

When the Inquisitor General's consultations produced nothing but unqualified support for St. John's works, he appears to have taken Basilio's advice to proceed "con pies de plomo" in the matter. There is no evidence to suggest that the Sevillian Inquisition ever saw Basilio's reply. Farfán's Memorial of 1626 suggests rather that Pacheco promised to look into the matter further and publish an "edito particular" at a later date<sup>(49)</sup>. This seems to have been a compromise between condemnation of the book, against which Pacheco's consultations had strongly advised him, and outright approval, which would certainly have scandalized the Sevillian Inquisition. In this state of compromise, then, the matter rested. Farfán's attempt to reopen the subject in 1626 seems to have met with no response from the Inquisition in Madrid, which appears to have been content to allow St. John's implication in the alumbrado heresy to be committed to oblivion.

From our study of documents appertaining to St. John we can construct a calendar of his implication: in the case of the alumbrados of Seville. The list we give below charts the major events of this history.

11.4.23 Hoces and Villavicencio send Pacheco a draft for an edict. Included among the propositions taken from the trials of the alumbrados are several derived by the alumbrados from St. John's works.

9.5.23 The edict is published, and contains propositions which derive ultimately from St. John, notably no. 17 and no. 43.

29.5.23 St. John's works having been discovered in the homes of the alumbrados, Hoces now sends a copy to Pacheco, with a set of notes made by censors in Seville.

6.6.23 Pacheco replies to Hoces, saying that he will look into the matter.

4.7.23 Hoces sends another set of notes dealing with St. John's works to Madrid.

11.7.23 Basilio completes his reply, written at Pacheco's request, to the first denunciation of St. John.

12.7.23 Araujo writes a brief censura favourable to St. John's works, and dissociating them from the doctrines of the alumbrados:

4.9.23 Antolínez, who had already given his verbal support to St. John's works, now commits his opinion to paper in another brief censura.

Pacheco probably waited to receive Antolínez's written reply before sending his verdict to Seville. Otherwise, why insist on receiving a written censura when he already knew Antolínez's opinion? Pacheco's aim was to collect the most authoritative support possible for his policy of inaction.

St. John's works were destined always to promote controversy, but they were never again to come so close to being withdrawn from circulation. Pacheco's compromise disarmed St. John's opponents in Seville, and that his works were not discredited in the eyes of the General Inquisition is sufficiently proven by the appearance of the second edition in 1630.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. The Toledo group has been most extensively studied by Antonio Márquez in Los alumbrados: orígenes y filosofía 1525-1559 (Madrid: Taurus, 1972).
2. According to a letter written by the Inquisitors of Seville dated 31.1.1623 (AHN Inq. leg. 2.960).
3. The autograph version of this biography is held in the BNM, MS 13.460.
4. The mistake of Andrés is readily explicable in the light of the close similarity between the figures 1 and 4 on this page.
5. E.g. Claudio de Jesús Crucificado - see note 10 below.
6. The reasons for this belief are explained later in this chapter.
7. References to documents housed here are abbreviated conventionally, e.g. AHN Inq. leg. 2.963.
8. Obras del místico doctor San Juan de la Cruz (Toledo: Peláez, 1912-14).
9. AA 12 (July 1918).
10. Homenaje de devoción y amor a San Juan de la Cruz (Segovia, 1928), pp. 240-80.
11. Phrasium mystical Theologiae V.P:F: Ioannis a Cruce Carmelitarum exalceatorum Parentis primi Elucidatio (Madrid: Orduña, 1631).
12. The four volumes of Silverio's edition make up volumes 10-14 of the Biblioteca Mística Carmelitana. BMC 10, the volume entitled Preliminares was published in Burgos in 1929 by Monte Carmelo.
13. BMC 10, pp. 396-439, based on BNM MS 18.749 (70), ff. 9r-30v.
14. 'Defensa de San Juan de la Cruz', AA 37 (1932), pp. 161-392 and 38 (1932), pp. 184-95 and 398-406.

15. 'Documentos inéditos interesantes sobre los alumbrados de Sevilla de 1623-1628', EE 11 (1932), pp. 268-84 and 401-18.  
The extract referring to St. John is reproduced on pp. 414-18, according to the original of AHN Inq. leg. 2.963.
16. MC 62 (1954), pp. 41-72.
17. A mistake, presumably a printing error, gives 1627 as the date for the Memorial on p. 46. On p. 44, however, Carmelo gives the correct date of 4.5.1623.
18. (Madrid: El Escorial, 1965), pp. XXVII-XXVIII.
19. EC 18 (1967), pp. 3-48 (p. 14, note 22).
20. 'San Juan de la Cruz y Juan de Santo Tomás, O.P., en el proceso inquisitorial contra Antonio de Rojas', EC 22 (1971), pp. 347-90..
21. The full title of this work is Mystic, Rebel, Saint: A Study of St. John of the Cross (Geneva: Droz, 1979). See pp. 37-39 in particular.
22. AHN Inq. leg. 2.960. Since the disarray of this legajo prevents any more detailed reference, letters will normally be referred to by their date.
23. Hoces's familiarity with Villegas is attested to by a letter dated 18.7.1623, where he addresses him 'como señor y amigo'.
24. See Eulogio, 'Primeras ediciones', pp. 44.
25. BMC 10, pp. 436-38.
26. AA 38 (1932), p. 406.
27. EE 11 (1932), p. 415.
28. EE 11 (1932), p. 416.
29. See note 28 above.
30. See for example BMC 10, p. 400.
31. Aparato bibliográfico para la historia de Extremadura, 3 vols. (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1875-79), vol. 2, pp. 327-72 .

32. Barrantes's version reads 'sino querer'.
33. Aspectos históricos del sentimiento religioso en España (Madrid: CSIC, 1961).
34. EE 11 (1932), p. 415.
35. AHN Inq. leg. 3.716, caja 2, no. 13.
36. Aspectos históricos, p. 94.
37. Aspectos históricos, p. 97.
38. See note 31 above.
39. See note 32 above.
40. This proposition is missing in some copies of the edict.
41. See note 35 above.
42. Camino de perfección in Obras Completas (Madrid: BAC, 1976), pp. 270-71.
43. This will be quoted according to Silverio's edition in BMC 10 pp. 396-439. Page references from this edition will be given in the text.
44. See for example para. 8 of the Subida Prologue.
45. Barrantes, p. 366.
46. See note 21 above.
47. See, e.g., Cuentas de Conciencia 63 in Obras Completas (Madrid: BAC, 1976), pp. 486-87.
48. For a complete account of the inquisitorial proceedings against Archbishop Carranza see José Luis G. Novalin, El Inquisidor General Fernando de Valdés (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1968), pp. 310-70.
49. EE 11 (1932), p. 415.

**CHAPTER 5**

**CONCLUSION**

## CONCLUSION

The first aim of this thesis was to examine the history of the transmission of the ideas of St. John of the Cross in the early seventeenth century. Its exact chronological scope was determined initially by the period between the earliest attempts at preparing a first edition of St John's works and the final appearance of his complete works in Spain in 1630. For reasons other than those originally proposed this period was discovered to be of critical importance with regard to whether St John's works would survive at all, the form in which they would survive and how they would be understood by future readers. The main contribution of this thesis to the first of these areas lay in the discovery and description of new documents detailing the involvement of St John's works with the alumbrados and the Spanish Inquisition. These helped both to adjust the date of Basilio's Respuesta and to place this defence, along with other apologetic works, in the context of a period of consultation by the Inquisitor General which followed the denunciation of St John's works from Seville. The comparison of both the 1623 Edict of Grace and Basilio's Respuesta with the doctrines of St John was also necessary in order to complete the account of his <sup>supposed</sup> excursion into heterodoxy.

Those findings which derive from analysis rather than historical reconstruction may best be defined by contrasting them with earlier assumptions about specific topics. Such assumptions are:

1. Thomas of Jesus was a faithful follower of St. John as regards both understanding and transmission of his ideas.
2. Salablanca amended St John's doctrines mainly for purposes of clarification and to prevent abusive misinterpretation by the alumbrados, not because he considered them mistaken.



3. The doctrines of the alumbrados had little to do with those of St John.
4. St John's works remained in circulation mainly because of an accurate theological defence of his doctrines by Basilio Ponce de León.

My findings on these topics, in broad terms, were as follows:

1. Thomas of Jesus both delayed the textual transmission of St John's works by failing to fulfil his editorial commission and failed to transmit an accurate representation of St John's doctrines in his own works, even when using passages taken almost verbatim from the saint's writings. There are indications that Thomas of Jesus consciously disagreed with St John's ideas rather than misunderstanding them.
2. The scholarly style of Salablanca's Apuntamientos and the coincidence of the themes discussed therein with the areas of the text chosen for amendment suggest that inquisitorial examination was more in Salablanca's mind than either the confusion of the general reader or possible misuse by the alumbrados. Salablanca's personal agreement with St John is also called into question by his alterations to the cornerstones of the saint's system such as the role of the theological virtues and the two dark nights of the soul.
3. The leaders of the alumbrados of Seville show a Discalced Carmelite background which helps to explain their recourse to St John's doctrines when formulating their own. Their assertions as to the nature of prayer and the effects of union are rooted in St John. Their approach to his doctrines appears to have been eclectic (although no more so than that of Thomas of Jesus) and in particular they seem to have neglected St John's

teaching on purgation or the necessary disposition for union. However, religious history, like its secular counterpart, is written by the victors and with only the Inquisition's documentation to draw upon we are unlikely ever to construct a complete and impartial account of this sect.

4. Basilio's defence of St John is most accurate where he is detailing the ascetic preparation for the mystical life or stressing the soul's inability to enter into contemplation through its own efforts. In most other respects the Respuesta, while replying effectively to the censors, is untrue to St John because of its inevitable dependence on the corrupt text of the 1618 edition. However, while it is unlikely that St John's works would have continued in circulation had they been examined or defended on the basis of his original text, I do not believe that either Salablanca's amendments or Basilio's textual analysis were decisive in ensuring their continued circulation. For, as the Inquisitor General was well aware, the alumbrados had derived many of their doctrines from the denounced book and some of these doctrines had been specifically condemned in the Edict of Grace. Books had been withdrawn for far less weighty reasons. Yet there were several political factors in play. One was that the Reform, as a deliberate precaution, had collected numerous authoritative approbations for the first edition: Pacheco himself acknowledges the importance of this consideration in his reply to Alonso de Hoces. The political dimension was also fully exploited by Basilio when he referred to:
- a) the danger of withdrawing a book with such powerful friends;
  - b) the risk of an appeal against withdrawal being lodged in Rome;

- c) the possibility of Rome overturning a Spanish decision and of this opening the door for further Roman interference in the affairs of the Spanish Inquisition.

Basilio not only highlighted the dangers but also offered Pacheco a solution when he advised him to proceed with 'pies de plomo' in the matter, a course of action readily adopted by the Inquisitor General. Some of the minor characters involved failed to appreciate the political considerations. Domingo de Farfán was particularly perplexed at the continued circulation of a book manifestly condemned by the 1623 Edict. Antonio de Rojas naively believed that to defend his own book, denounced in 1630, he had only to point out its derivation from the writings of St John: Antonio's work lacked allies or political significance and was duly banned.

One final conclusion can only be appreciated by taking all of the preceding chapters into account. Had we examined *only* the *actuaciones* of Thomas of Jesus and Salablanca a different conclusion might have been reached. For we have seen Silverio's suggestion of a relationship between the two as between master and disciple and we know of a manuscript of St John's works which passed from one to the other. Salablanca's amendments of St John's text in areas which coincide closely with Thomas's disagreements with the saint might then have been taken as evidence of the influence of Thomas on Salablanca, Thomas providing the criteria which Salablanca would apply to his preparation of the first edition. This possibility remains impossible to discount. Yet such an explanation becomes unnecessary and perhaps a distraction when we discover that both the alumbrados and the censors of Seville fastened on precisely the same subjects when they came to read St John's works. The

BIBLIOGRAPHY1. Manuscript Sources

- AHN INQ LEG 2960 1623 letters from Sevillian Inquisition  
 LEG 2963 Domingo de Farfán's Memorial  
 LEG 3716 Materials to form the 1623 Edict of  
 (caja 2, expediente 14) Grace  
 LIBRO 592 Register of letters from Madrid to  
 local inquisitions
- BNM MS 12738 f. 1447 Letter from Alonso de la Madre de Dios  
 MS 13482 Volume 1 of the Memorias Historiales  
 of Andrés de la Encarnación  
 MS 18749 (70) Basilio's Respuesta

2. Editions Used

- Diego de Jesús (Salablanca), Obras espirituales que encaminan a una  
 alma a la perfecta unión con Dios (Alcalá: Ezpeleta, 1618).
- Jerónimo de San José, Obras del Venerable: Místico Doctor F. Joan  
 de la Cruz (Madrid: Madrigal, 1630).
- Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz, Obras del místico doctor San Juan de  
 la Cruz (Toledo: Peláez, 1912-14).
- Silverio de Santa Teresa, Obras de Santa Teresa, Obras de San Juan  
 de la Cruz, doctor de la Iglesia, 5 vols. (Burgos: El Monte  
 Carmelo, 1929-31).
- Chevallier, Philippe, Le "Cantique Spirituel" de Saint Jean de la Croix  
 (Paris: Desclée, 1930).
- Chevallier, Philippe, Le texte définitif du "Cantique Spirituel"  
 (Solesme: Abbaye St, Pierre, 1950).

José Vicente de la Eucaristía, Obras Completas (Madrid: Editorial de la Espiritualidad, 1957).

Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, Obras completas (texto crítico-popular) (Burgos: El Monte Carmelo, 1959).

Crisógono de Jesús, Matrías del Niño Jesus, Lucinio del SS. Sacramento, Vida y obras de San Juan de la Cruz, 5th edition (Madrid: BAC, 1964).

Pacho, Eulogio, Cántico espiritual: Primera redacción y texto retocado (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1981).

Pacho, Eulogio, S. Juan de la Cruz: Obras completas (Burgos: El Monte Carmelo, 1982).

### 3. Other Works Consulted

Alonso, Dámaso, La poesía de San Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: CSIC, 1942).

Alonso, Poesía española (Madrid: Gredos, 1950).

Alvarado, Antonio de, Arte de bien vivir y guía de los caminos del cielo (Hirache: Matías Mares, 1608).

Antolínez, Agustín, Amores de Dios y el alma, edited by Angel Custodio Vega (Madrid: El Escorial, 1956).

Arintero, Juan G., 'Inanidad de la contemplación adquirida' CT 29 (Jan-June 1924), pp. 331-49 and 30 (July-Dec 1924), pp. 5-27.

Arintero, Juan G., 'Incoherencias y fantasías peligrosas de la contemplación adquirida', CT 30 (July-Dec 1924) pp. 332-56.

Barrantes, Vicente, Aparato bibliográfico para la historia de Extremadura (Madrid: Rivadeneyra, 1875-79).

Bataillon, Marcel, Erasmus et l'Espagne (Paris: Droz, 1937).

Benno a S. Joseph 'Bibliographiae S. Joannis a Cruce, O.C.D. specimen specimen (1891-1940), EC 1 (1947), pp. 163-210, 367-81,

2 (1948), pp. 584-602,

3 (1949), pp. 405-24).

- Brenan, Gerald, St John of the Cross: His Life and Poetry (Cambridge: CUP, 1973).
- Bretón, Juan, Mística theología y doctrina de la perfection evangélica (Madrid: Alonso Martín, 1614).
- Bruno de Jēsus-Marie, Vie de Saint Jean de la Croix (Paris: Plon et Nourrit, 1929).
- Butler, Cuthbert, Western Mysticism, 3rd edition, with Afterthoughts (London: Constable, 1967).
- Campbell, Roy, The Poems of St John of the Cross (Glasgow: Collins, 1979).
- Carmelo de la Cruz, 'Defensa de las doctrinas de San Juan de la Cruz en tiempode los alumbrados', MC 62 (1954), pp. 41-72.
- Chevallier, Philippe, 'Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix, a-t-il été interpolé', BH 24 (1922), pp. 307-42.
- Chevallier, Philippe, Le Cantique Spirituel de Saint Jean de la Croix docteur de l'Eglise (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1930).
- Chevallier, Phillippe, 'Le texte definitif du Cantique Spirituel por fr. Phillippe Chevallier, moine bēnēdictin', Cuadernos Ibero-Americanos 13 (1953), pp. 249-53.
- Cilveti, Angel L., Introducción a la mística española (Madrid: Cátedra, 1974).
- Claudio de Jesús Crucificado, 'La influencia y desarrollo de la autoridad y doctrina de San Juan de la Cruz hasta las controversias antiquietistas', Homenaje de devoción y amor a San Juan de la Cruz (Segovia, 1928), pp. 240-80).
- Córdoba, Sebastián de, Garcilaso a lo divino, edited by G. Gale (Madrid: Castalia, 1971).
- Crisógono de Jesús Sacramentado, San Juan de la Cruz: Su obra científica y su obra literaria (Avila: Sigirano Díaz, 1929).

- Crisógono de Jesús Sacramentado, La escuela mística Carmelitana (Avila: Sigirano Díaz, 1930).
- Díaz, José Simón, Impresos del Siglo XVII, (Madrid: CSIC, 1972).
- Elliott, J. H., Imperial Spain 1469-1716 (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963).
- Elton, G. R., Reformation Europe 1517-1559 (London: Collins - The Fontana History of Europe, 1963).
- Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen, 'La cuestión crítica del "Cántico espiritual", nota bibliográfica', MC 65 (1957), pp. 309-23.
- Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen, 'La crítica sanjuanista en los últimos veinte años', Salmanticensis 8 (1961), pp. 195-246.
- Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen, El "Cántico espiritual" - trayectoria histórica del texto (Rome: Teresianum, 1967).
- Eulogio de la Virgen del Carmen, 'Primeras ediciones del Cántico espiritual', EC 18 (1967) pp. 3-48.
- Ferraro, Joseph, 'Sanjuanist doctrine on the human mode of operation of the theological virtue of Faith', EC 22 (1971), pp. 250-94.
- Florencio de la Cruz, 'Congreso ascético-místico en honor de San Juan de la Cruz', MST 6 (1928-29), pp. 209-14.
- Gabriel a BB. Dionysio et Redemptor, 'The Three Signs of Initial Contemplation', EC 3 (1949), pp. 97-129.
- Gabriel de Sainte Marie-Madeleine, 'La voi contemplative', Études Carmélitaines 18 (1933), pp. 1-38.
- Gicovate, Bernard, San Juan de la Cruz, (New York: Twayne, 1971).
- Hatzfeld, Helmut, Estudios literarios Sobre mística española (Madrid: Gredos, 1955).
- Hervé D'Illac (D. Chevallier), 'Du Cantique primitif au texte définitif' VS - Supplement 23 (1952), pp. 495-99.
- Jerónimo de San José, Dibujo del venerable varón frai Joan de la Cruz (Madrid: Francisco Martínez, 1629).

- Jerónimo de San José, Historia del venerable padre fr. Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: Diego Díaz de la Carrera, 1641).
- Jones, R. O., A Literary History of Spain - The Golden Age: Prose and Poetry (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1971).
- José de Jesús Crucificado, 'El P. Tomás de Jesús, escritor místico', EC 3 (1949), pp. 305-49 and 4 (1950), pp. 149-206.
- Juan de Jesús María, 'La segunda redacción del "Cántico espiritual" y el comentario al mismo de Agustín Antolínez, O.S.A.', MC 53 (1949), pp. 13-37.
- Juan de Jesús María, 'El Cántico espiritual de San Juan de la Cruz y Amores de Dios y el Alma de A. Antolínez, O.S.A.', EC 3 (1949), pp. 443-542 and 4 (1950), pp. 3-70.
- Kelly, Mark, 'The Sonnet "No me mueve, mi Dios" and St John of the Cross', BHS 62 (1985), pp. 281-87.
- Krynen, Jean, Le 'Cantique Spirituel' de Saint Jean de la Croix commenté et réfondé au xvii siècle: un regard sur l'histoire de l'exégèse du cantique de Jaén (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1948).
- Llorca, Bernardino, 'Documentos inéditos interesantes sobre los alumbrados de Sevilla de 1623-1628', EE 11 (1932), pp. 268-84 and 401-18.
- Luis de San José, Concordancia de las obras y escritos del doctor de la Iglesia San Juan de la Cruz (Burgos: El Monte Carmelo, 1948).
- Marie-Joseph du S. Coeur, 'Il existe une contemplation acquise', Études Carmélitaines 5 (1920), pp. 12-18.
- Márquez, Antonio, Los alumbrados: orígenes y filosofía 1525-1559. (Madrid: Taurus, 1972).
- Merton, Thomas, The Ascent to Truth (London: Hollis and Carter, 1951).
- Nicolás de Jesús María, Phrasium mysticae theologiae V.P.F. Ioannis a Cruce ... Elucidatio (Madrid: Juan de Orduña, 1631).



- Nieto, José C., Mystic, Rebel, Saint: A Study of St John of the Cross (Geneva: Droz, 1979).
- Novalin, José Luis G., El Inquisidor General Fernando de Valdés (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1968).
- Ottonello, Pier Paolo, Bibliografia di S. Juan de la Cruz (Rome: Teresianum, 1967).
- Pacho, Eulogio, 'San Juan de la Cruz y Juan de Santo Tomás, O.P., en el proceso inquisitorial contra Antonio de Rojas', EC 22 (1971), pp. 349-90.
- Pinta Llorente, Miguel de la, 'Defensa de San Juan de la Cruz', AA 37 (1932), pp. 161-392 and 38 (1932), pp. 184-95 and 398-406.
- Pinta Llorente, Miguel de la, Aspectos históricos del sentimiento religioso en España (Madrid: CSIC, 1961).
- Poulain, A., Les grâces d'Oraison (Paris: Rétaux, 1906).
- Quiroga, Francisco de, Historia de la vida y virtudes del venerable P. Fr. Juan de la Cruz (Brussels: Juan Meerbeck, 1628).
- Román de la Inmaculada, 'El fenómeno de los alumbrados y su interpretación'. EC 9 (1958), pp. 49-80.
- Ruiz Salvador, Federico, Introducción a San Juan de la Cruz (Madrid: BAC, 1968).
- Saudreau, A., Les degrés de la vie spirituelle (Angers: Germain et Grassin, 1897).
- Scaramelli, G. B., A Handbook of Mystical Theology, abridged and translated from Il direttorio mistico by D. H. S. Nicholson, (London: J. M. Watkins, 1913).
- Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'Un nuevo códice manuscrito de las obras de San Juan de la Cruz, usado y anotado por el P. Tomás de Jesús', EC 4 (1950), pp. 95-148.
- Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'La obra fundamental del P. Tomás de Jesús, ineditada y desconocida', EC 4 (1950), pp. 431-518.

- Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'Tomás de Jesús y San Juan de la Cruz',  
EC 5 (1951-54), pp. 91-159.
- Simeón de la Sagrada Familia, 'Gloria y ocaso de un apócrifo  
 sanjuanista, el "Tratado breve del conocimiento oscuro de Dios  
 afirmativo y negativo"', MC 69 (1961), pp. 419-40.
- Teresa de Jesús, Santa, Obras completas, 5th edition (Madrid: BAC,  
 1976).
- Terry, Arthur, An Anthology of Spanish Poetry 1500-1700 (Oxford:  
 Pergamon, 1968).
- Thompson, Colin P., The Poet and the Mystic: A Study of the Cántico  
 Espiritual of San Juan de la Cruz (Oxford: OUP, 1977).
- Tomás de Jesús, Opera omnia (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1684).
- Tomás de Jesús, Compendio de los grados de Oración, por donde se  
 sube a la perfecta contemplacion, 2nd edition (Madrid: L. Sanchez,  
 1615).
- Underhill, Evelyn, The Mystic Way (London: Dent, 1929).
- Velasco, José de, Vida y virtudes del venerable varón Francisco de  
 Yepes (Valladolid: Jerónimo Murillo, 1617).
- Venard, John, The Spiritual Canticle of St John of the Cross (Sydney:  
 Dwyer, 1980).
- Wojtyła, Karol, La Fe según San Juan de la Cruz, translated by  
 Alvaro Huerga (Madrid: BAC, 1980).

