LEEN SPRUIT

# MAGIC AND THE ROMAN CONGREGATIONS OF THE HOLY OFFICE AND THE INDEX


FIRENZE
LEO S. OLSCHKI EDITORE
MMVII

LEEN SPRUIT

# MAGIC AND THE ROMAN CONGREGATIONS OF THE HOLY OFFICE AND THE INDEX

Flourishing in the shadow of both religion and science, magic's appeal to either faith or reason often met with fierce opposition. Religious and political authorities regularly frowned upon magical practices because they were deemed secretive, anti-social and manipulative, and were associated with demonic powers. This paper discusses the sixteenth-century ecclesiastical censure of magic and magical works. It focuses on the interventions of the Roman Congregations of the Holy Office and the Index regarding the literate segment of society, leaving apart the persecution of popular forms of magic. First, I dwell on the genesis of the normative framework used by the Church to evaluate magic, and then I present a brief analysis of the main proceedings instituted by the two Congregations against authors and works.

## 1. *Magic and early Christianity*

The great change of religion which took place in the Ancient world when Christianity displaced paganism was accompanied by a correspondingly great change in magic. Ancient magic shows a great variety of practices and a mere catalogue would take more space than is here available. Since the Greeks, magic came to have an ambivalent meaning ranging from plain sorcery to esoteric wisdom. In Republican Rome sorcery and divination were kept separate, as they were in Greece. During imperial epoch divination became a part of the magical sciences.[1] I fall back on the tradi-

[1] See, for example, the Greek-Egyptian collections of magical recipes from the third to the

tional distinction into two great classes, namely 'natural magic', which relied on powers supposed to be inherent or revealed in natural objects or events, and 'demonic magic', which claimed to work by invocation or compulsion of various sorts of supernatural beings ranging from ghosts to gods. This distinction was constantly blurred, however, because natural objects were commonly personified. Planets were assigned to or identified with gods, perfumes like myrrh were invoked as a deity and there were spells to be used to secure the good offices of any plant.[2]

Despite the condemnation of magic in the Old Testament, types of magic were practised in the intertestamentary period (examples are in the Dead Sea Scrolls). In the period between the birth of Christianity and the arrival of Constantine and the Christian Empire, magic and miracle were strong competitors for attention. Magic with its miracles was seen by pagans and many Christians alike as a rival of the true miracles of Christ. Early Christians tended to see their spiritual leaders as rivals of the popular magicians. The triumph of Christianity also greatly increased magic, because it classified as magical all pagan rites and so made magicians of the pagans who practised them.

Many Christian stories, teachings, and practices, such as New Testament healings, the invocation of demons, exorcisms and even the ritual of the Eucharist show a striking similarity with practices of Greek-Roman magic.[3] This explains why Christianity was so often identified by ancient writers as magic[4] and was prosecuted accordingly. The similarities did not stop with New Testament times. The later Christian collection of the remains of the martyrs' bodies was suspiciously like magicians' collection of the remains of bodies of executed criminals, whose spirits they wished to control. And the Christians' frequent gatherings around tombs must have been seemed to most pagans an indication of necromancy.

During the first centuries many different positions on magic were found among Christian authors. They stemmed largely from inconsistencies in

---

fifth century A.D., in *Papyri graecae magicae*, eds. K. PREISENDANZ and A. HENRICHS, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1973-74 (second ed.).

[2] *Papyri graecae magicae*, cit., XXXVI.333f; IV.297ff.

[3] Jesus seems to have been a more typical magician than Paul, more concerned with individual cases – cures, exorcisms, and the like – less tangled in administrative efforts and theoretical disputes. See M. SMITH, *Jesus the Magician*, San Francisco 1978.

[4] See the polemics between Origen and Celsus, discussed in L. THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 8 vols., New York 1923-58, I, ch. XIX.

the Old Testament about pagan gods and practices. Moreover, the lack of a clear-cut distinction between the spiritual and the material prevented outright denial of the forces and entities of the magical tradition. In *Deut* 4:19, for example, God assigned the celestial bodies to the gentiles that they may worship them; such worship has therefore divine justification. Elsewhere, the idols of the pagans were seen as the work of man (*Ps* 135:15ff). Between came passages which implied that the pagan gods were living beings, albeit inferior in power.[5] More or less explicit condemnations of magic and divination derived from *Ex* 22:18, *Lev* 20:6 and 27, and *Deut* 18:10-12. In the discussion about magic among Christian authors, also other, more narrative passages played an important role in the developing normative framework for judging magic, divination and sorcery, namely *Exodus* 7 where Moses and Aaron 'defeated' the Egyptian magicians before Pharaoh, I *Samuel* 28 about the story of King Saul visiting the witch of Endor, and the conflict between Peter and Simon Magus in *Acts* 8.[6]

*Exodus* 7 depicts a kind of match between Moses and his brother Aaron and a group of Egyptian magicians, subsequently identified as Jannes and Mambres on the basis of II *Tim* 3:8. In general, Christian authors wondered whether their «prodigia», most noticeably the conversion of sticks into serpents, were real or illusive. Theodore, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure believed in the reality of the serpents, while a host of other interpreters held that the perception of serpents was illusive, that is, due to the intervention of demons or to more down-to-earth tricks.[7]

In I *Sam* 28, Saul, once the persecutor of all necromancers, has to resort to necromancy himself. When on his demand the witch raised Samuel from the death, the prophet tells Saul that he has to die. Now, was Samuel raised by the necromancer, or do we have to understand the Scripture in a different way? There is no reason to suppose that the writer of I *Sam* 28 did not want us to believe that Samuel himself appeared at Endor. Likewise, the author of I *Chron* 10:13f had no doubt whatsoever when he summarised Saul's life. Moreover, in the apocryphal book *Ecclesiasticus* (canonised by the Catholic Church at the Council of Trent) Samuel is praised for

---

[5] See the Septuagint's translation of *Ps* 96:5, «All the gods of the heathen are *daimonia*».

[6] For a general discussion, see *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique contenant l'exposé des doctrines de la théologie catholique, leur preuves et leur histoire*, eds. A. VACANT et E. MANGENOT, vol. IX, Paris 1927, cols. 1510-1550: 1520-1522.

[7] See BENEDICTUS PEREIRA, *Adversus fallaces et superstitiosas artes. Id est, de magia, de observatione somniorum, et de divinatione astrologica libri tres*, Lugduni 1592, pp. 116-123.

having prophesied even after his death (46:23). The early Christian interpretations can be classified in three basic views: (1) Samuel was resuscitated by the woman (Justin Martyr, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine), (2) either Samuel or a daemon in his shape appeared at God's command (John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrrhus), and (3) a daemon deceived Saul and gave him a forged prophecy.[8] The general tendency among early Christian authors is to consider necromancy as a demonic deceit, and therefore the third view became the most authoritative. Mantic is connected with the Devil's works. In the Gospels daemons are prophesying, in Acts the apostles are at war with the demonic powers of sorcery and mantic (*Acts* 8, 13, 16, and 19). A fierce struggle, since Christian miracles and mysteries were often considered by pagans to be magic as well.

Simon Magus, appearing in *Acts* 8, had a shady past: he had previously been a magician and it was his magical prowess which had made his followers believe that he was the Great Power of God.[9] The charge that Simon practised magic, raises a question. The charge is common ancient abuse, applied alike to all sorts of people: Jesus, Apollonius of Tyana, the philosopher Apuleius and the emperor Tiberius. Used of religious leaders like Simon and Jesus it probably means that their fame as miracle workers was well established.[10] Evidently, Simon had a great reputation as miracle worker, which Luke could not deny, but explained by calling him a magician.

Upon the foundation of Christianity, the church soon began to regard the practice of magic as foreign to the spirit of its religion.[11] Origen de-

---

[8] See K. A. D. SMELIK, *The Witch of Endor. I* Samuel *28 in Rabbinic and Christian Exegesis till 800 A.D.*, «Vigiliae Christianae», XXXIII, 1977, pp. 160-179.

[9] *Acts* 8:5-23; for discussion, see H.-J. KLAUCK, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity. The World of the Acts of the Apostles*, Edinburgh 2000, pp. 14-17, 22-23.

[10] The cure of mental illness and exorcisms, in ancient Palestine, were often thought to be effected by magic. Josephus, for example, boasts that the Jews were famous for their skill in this branch of the magical arts. See *Antiquities* 8.46. For discussion, see M. SMITH, *The Account of Simon Magus in* Acts *8*, in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh*, II: *New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic*, ed. S. J. D. COHEN, Leiden 1996, pp. 140-151.

[11] The Council held in Laodicea in 364 forbade clerks and priests to become magicians, enchanters, mathematicians or astrologers (canon 36). It ordered, moreover, that the Church should expel from its bosom those who employed ligatures or phylacteries, because, it said, phylacteries are the prisons of the soul. The Council of Oxia in 525 prohibited the consultation of sorcerers, augurs, diviners, and divinations made with wood or bread (canon 4), while the Council of Constantinople in 692 excommunicated for a period of six years diviners and those who had recourse to them (canon 60). The Council of Tours in 613 decided that priests should teach to the people the inefficacy of magical practices to restore the health of men or animals. See *Encyclopedia of Occultism and Parapsychology*, third ed., Detroit 1978, p. 1001.

clared in the third century that all magic was possible only through the agency of demons. Augustine defined paganism in terms of magic, divination and idolatry, phenomena which he radically separated from the world of true Christian religion. He argued that all magical ritual strives for elevation of the soul and is essentially theurgic, entailing communication with perfidious demons. Thus, magic equals idolatry (see I *Cor* 10:20).[12] But it was orthodox to stress, as Augustine and later, Thomas Aquinas did, that the Devil and his subordinate demons operated only with God's permission. As it was the Devil's aim to spite God and to procure the damnation of mankind, it was a nice question, and a much discussed one, why God should allow him to exercise his evil powers.

With the advent of the Christian empire, intellectual and theological condemnation was joined by institutional repression. Constantine came out against both *magicae artes* and divination (*Codex Theodosianus*, 9.16.1-2; 9.18.4). However, since he had to keep the loyalty of important pagan elements in his court and his army, he prohibited maleficent magic, but permitted medical magic and agricultural rites (*Codex Theodosianus*, 9.16.3). After a generation, in 357 the more radical Constantius lumped divination and magic together and tried to erase both, prohibiting «haruspices, mathematici, harioli, augures, vates, Chaldaei, magi» (*Codex Theodosianus*, 9.16.4). In this legislation, however, magic has not been equated with heresy, and yet more remarkably, it makes no frontal attack on Roman religion generally. Only under Honorius and Theodosius II in 423 it is flatly declared that sacrifices to pagan gods are sacrifices to demons (*Codex Theodosianus*, 9.16.12). Thus, Christianity which previously, by Roman law, was magic, has become the official religion, and the official religion of ancient Rome has become magic. Christianity not only brought with it a new supernatural population of benevolent beings – the Trinity, the Blessed Virgin, the saints – whom Christians promptly pressed into service, but it also gave to magic Satan as supreme ruler of the powers of evil, who attracted to itself and arranged in order the hitherto scattered and unrelated elements of classical magic.

In the Middle Ages many occult arts and practices might still claim exemption from the Inquisition.[13] From the eighth to the thirteenth-century,

---

[12] F. GRAF, *Augustine and Magic*, in *The Metamorphosis of Magic From Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, eds. J. N. BREMMER and J. R. VEENSTRA, Leuven-Paris-Dudley (Ma.) 2002, pp. 87-103.

[13] THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, cit., III.

there does not appear to have been much persecution of the professors of magic. In 1326 the papal Bull *Super illius specula* was merely issued against the very suspect practice of ritual, demonic magic.[14] Magicians were mostly thought of as attempting to coerce demons while remaining good Christians, rather than as recruits of Satan's army.[15] And in general, medieval condemnations of magic only concern individuals (Cecco d'Ascoli, Pietro d'Abano) whose practice was deemed to be one aspect of a much more far-reaching challenge against orthodoxy. In the course of the fourteenth century, however, it became largely accepted that the making of demonic pacts fell within the jurisdiction of the Inquisition,[16] and the life of the magus, although not victimised in the same manner as sorcerers and wizards, was fraught with considerable danger. In the fifteenth century, by a consistent if novel development of their theory of magic,[17] Inquisitors began to press the charge of diabolic pact even against unsophisticated village practitioners of maleficent magic.

## 2. *Renaissance magic and its critics*

During the Middle Ages, magic was rooted mainly in folk traditions, and thus theoretically unsophisticated and essentially practical in intention.[18] During the Renaissance, by contrast, a type of magic developed which depended on a complex theory of the world, in which astrological and alchemical notions were mingled. The early modern Hermetic magician, propagated by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and Marsilio Ficino, believed that the occult virtues, most noticeably the stream of influences emitted by stars and planets, could be exploited to produce results on earth by certain kinds of ceremonies and incantations. Popular magic at the same

---

[14] *Bullarum, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis editio*, 22 vols., Augustae Taurinorum 1857-72, and 5 vols., Neapoli 1867-85, IV, pp. 315-16.

[15] THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, cit., IV, pp. 327, and 329-330.

[16] See NICOLAU EYMERIC, *Directorium inquisitorum*, ed. F. PEÑA, Venetiis 1595, pp. 335-348, for sections «De sortilegis et divinatoribus», and «De invocationibus daemonum».

[17] See NIDER'S *Formicarius* (ca. 1435), the *Errores Gazariorum* (ca. 1450), JACQUIER'S *Flagellum haereticorum fascinariorum* (1450s), MOLITOR'S *De lamiis* (1489), and the famous *Malleus maleficarum* (1487) by INSTITORIS and SPRENGER.

[18] Hermetic magical texts circulated and were studied and commented on; however, Medieval Hermeticism did not have outstanding spokesmen comparable to Pico or Ficino.

time continued to thrive as it has always done, seemingly little indebted to the writings of the learned, though more or less garbled echoes of the thought of Pico or Agrippa occasionally appeared in manuscript manuals of practical magic.[19] As a matter of fact, magical literature circulated at all levels of the Italian population, and not only as elegant codices, but also as loose leaflets. Magical 'knowledge' did not assume any institutional form and was within the reach of illiterates too. Frequently, it was intimately linked with legalised religious practices, such as exorcism, both magicians and exorcists sharing the same demonology.

Hermetic natural magic implied acute trouble to the Church, because the claims of Renaissance magic to perform marvellous feats was considered to be very dangerous to Christian faith since they implied that miracles supposedly performed by God and Christ had been either perfectly natural phenomena or marvellous phenomena brought about by the use of magic and not by divine intervention.[20] Ficino and Pico attempted to draw a neat distinction between Hermetic or Cabbalistic magic, on the one hand, and sorcery, on the other. In his twenty six conclusions concerning magic, for example, Pico began with the admission that all the magic in use among moderns is deservedly condemned by the Church and has no foundation, but that natural magic is licit and not prohibited.[21] It is the practical and most noble part of natural science.[22] Many contemporary theological censors, however, did not accept the subtle distinction between popular and superstitious practices of sorcery and the allegedly 'higher'

---

[19] See F. BARBIERATO, *Nella stanza dei circoli.* Clavicula Salomonis *e libri di magia a Venezia nei secoli XVII e XVIII*, Milano 2002.

[20] Also PIETRO POMPONAZZI's *De incantationibus* (first ed. Basel 1556) in which was proved that all effects in this lower world have a natural cause, represented a similar threat to Christianity. Pomponazzi attempted to rationalise the system of natural magic and astrology, analysing magical and other prodigious phenomena as merely depending upon the manipulation of celestial and astral influences, excluding any possible role of angels, demons and the like. One can perhaps share the amazement of Martin Delrio when in 1600 he wrote how he was totally at a loss to explain why only recently had Pomponazzi's treatise been placed on the Index. See MARTINUS DELRIO, *Disquisitionum magicarum libri sex. Quibus continetur accurata curiosarum artium, et vanarum superstitionum confutatio, utilis Theologis, Iurisconsultis, Medicis, Philologis*, Maguntiae 1617 (first ed. 1599-1600), preface.

[21] GIOVANNI PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, *Conclusiones sive These DCCCC Romae anno 1486 publice disputandae, sed non admissae*, ed. B. KIESZKOWSKI, Genève 1973, p. 78: «Tota Magia, que in usu est apud modernos, et quem merito exterminat ecclesia, nullam habet firmitatem, nullum fundamentum, nullam veritatem, quia pendet ex manu hostium prime veritatis, potestatum harum tenebrarum, que tenebras falsitatis, male dispositis intellectibus obfundunt».

[22] PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, *Conclusiones*, cit., pp. 78-79.

magic. They regarded Hermes Trismegistus and Orpheus as founders of the modern sorcery and argued for the demonic nature of all magic. This position was developed by Silvestro Mazzolini,[23] Bartolomeo Spina,[24] and Paolo Grillandi,[25] who endorsed Aquinas' view that magic involves the intervention of superior spiritual substances and cannot be based on celestial influences only.[26]

Also Protestant scholars, such as Thomas Erastus and Johann Wier, or more or less independent authors, such as Jean Bodin, protested against Hermetic magic. Erastus defended the Biblical basis of all science and attacked the astrological basis of contemporary magic. He defined all magical effects as mere diabolical illusions.[27] Also according to Wier, magic is dependent upon some form of *fascinatio*, that is, a demonic illusion. Hermeticism, which influenced the development of magic in the Greek-Roman world, is seen as demonic too. In Wier's view, Catholic ceremonies are magical practices, and therefore inspired by the Devil. The only 'true' magic is that by Jesus Christ.[28] Bodin, in turn, defended non-magical, divinatory astrology, but attacked Cabalistic and Hermetical magical astrology. The biblical book of *Deuteronomy* forbids all witchcraft and idolatry. As a consequence, no Judaic magic exists. However, magic as such, that is, inasmuch as it is defined as passive contemplation of the truth is innocent. But in active, operative magic the mediation of evil spirits is obvious and therefore all magic involves a pact with the Devil and is destructive.

---

[23] See, for example, SILVESTRO MAZZOLINI (da Prierio), *De strigimagarum demonumque mirandis libri tres*, Romae 1521. For discussion, see P. ZAMBELLI, *L'eredità pichiana in mano agli inquisitori*, in EAD., *L'ambigua natura della magia. Filosofi, streghe, riti nel Rinascimento*, Milano 1996 (first ed. 1991), pp. 177-210: 182-83.

[24] BARTOLOMEO DE SPINA, *Quaestio de strigibus* (1523) and *De lamiis* (1525), in *Malleus maleficarum: de lamiis et strigibus, et sagis aliisque magis et Daemoniacis, eorumque arte, et potestate, et poena, Tractatus aliquot tam veterum, quam recentiorum authorum: in tomos duos distributi*, Francofurti 1600, I, pp. 452-619, and pp. 620-704.

[25] PAOLO GRILLANDI, *Tractatus de hereticis: et sortilegiis omnifariam coitu: eorumque penis*, Lugduni 1547.

[26] See THOMAS AQUINAS, *Liber de Veritate Catholicae Fidei contra errores Infidelium seu Summa contra Gentiles*, III, Taurini-Romae 1961, liber III, caput 104: «Opera magorum non sunt solum ex impressione caelestium corporum».

[27] THOMAS ERASTUS, *Disputationum de medicina nova Philippi Paracelsi pars prima ... pars quarta*, 4 vols., Basileae 1572-1573.

[28] JOHANN WIER, *De praestigiis daemonum, et incantationibus, ac veneficiis, libri V*, Basileae 1563. For discussion, see CHR. BAXTER, *Johann Weyer's* De praestigiis daemonum*: Unsystematic Psychopathology*, in *The Damned Art*, ed. S. ANGLO, London, Henley and Boston 1977, pp. 53-75.

There is no science of operative magic, merely knowledge, embodied in the Old Testament of how God operates. Any other ritual practices than those expressly sanctioned in the Old Testament are a device of the Devil to encourage idolatry, and a belief in non-existent magical properties of substances to expel devils.[29]

Late sixteenth-century Catholic censors, including Benedictus Pereira and Martinus Antonius Delrio admitted the theoretical possibility of a distinction between natural and demonic magic,[30] but in general they condemned all magical practices as superstitious.[31]

## 3. *Sixteenth-century ecclesiastical interventions*

### 3.1. *Prohibitions*

In addition to papal bulls,[32] the Church's chief instruments against magic in the Italian peninsula were the Congregation of the Holy Office and the Congregation for the Index of forbidden books. It is important to inquire to what extent these agencies were actually effective against magic, most of which had long been forbidden by canon law.[33]

Paul III's Bull founding the Roman Inquisition was broadly directed against «omnes et singulos a via Domini et fide catholica aberrantes, seu de eadem fide male sentientes, aut alias quomodolibet de haeresi suspec-

---

[29] JEAN BODIN, *De la démonomanie des sorciers*, Paris 1580. For discussion, see CHR. BAXTER, *Jean Bodin's* De la démonomanie des sorciers*: the Logic of Persecution*, in *The Damned Art*, cit., pp. 76-105.

[30] See PEREIRA, *Adversus fallaces et superstitiosas artes. Id est, de magia, de observatione somniorum, et de divinatione astrologica libri tres*, cit., p. 9; and DELRIUS, *Disquisitionum magicarum libri sex*, cit., pp. 7-9.

[31] See, for example, DELRIO, *Disquisitionum magicarum libri sex*, pp. 6 and 32: «Caeterum *Naturalis* et *Artificosae* Magiae, duo sunt velamina; quibus se occulere solet Magia *Diabolica*. Semper enim vel naturae vim mentitur, ut in iis quae de astrorum influxu, et intemperie hominis superire capite disseruimus: vel mentitur artificium; ut in characteribus, imaginibus et huiusmodi, de quibus disputandum q. sequ.». See also *ibid.* pp. 95-96 for the impossibility of any *magia alba*.

[32] See, for example, INNOCENT VIII, *Summis desiderantes affectibus* (1484), in *Bullarum, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Sanctorum Romanorum Pontificum Taurinensis editio*, cit., V, pp. 296-298.

[33] See, for example, the famous *Canon episcopi*, in *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. A. L. RICHTER & A. FRIEDBERG, Lipsiae 1879, causa XXVI, q. 5, c. 12.

tos, illorumque sequaces, fautores et defensores».[34] The possible forms of *aberratio*, the ways of *male sentiendi de fide*, and the casuistry of heresy were not well defined, however. Implicitly, the bull referred to the theological tradition and the preceding medieval inquisitorial practice. Possible *aberrationes* surely included the magical and divinatory arts or *sortilegia*, such as natural and judiciary astrology, natural and demonic magic, necromancy, chiromancy, geomancy, hydromancy. All of these are mentioned in the first Roman Index (1557):

Libri omnes, et scripta, Chyromantiae, Geomantiae, Hydromantiae, Physionomiae, Pyromantiae, vel Necromantiae, sive in quibus Sortilegia, veneficia, incantationes, Magicae Divinationes, vel Astrologica indicia, circa Geneses, Nativitates, futuros eventus, sive particulares successus, status, vitae, vel mortis cuiusvis hominis describantur.[35]

The general prohibition is reproduced in the Roman Index of 1559,[36] explicitly introducing a prohibition of *books* on magic,[37] and was formalised in Rule IX of the 1564 Index.[38] In the Sixtine Index of 1590 (printed but not officially promulgated), this rule became number XII and its text was modified, stressing the prohibition of judiciary astrology over the prohibition of magic and of the divinatory arts.[39] The 1564 formulation of the

---

[34] *Licet ab initio* of 21 July 1542, in *Bullarum, Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Sanctorum Pontificum Taurinensis editio*, cit., VI, pp. 344-346.

[35] See *Index des livres interdits*, ed. J. M. De Bujanda *et alii*, 11 vols., Sherbrooke-Genève 1980-2002 (abbreviated as *ILI*), VIII, p. 737. See also the note by the commission for the revision of the Index, in *Instructiones nonnullae circa libros nominatim prohibitos in Sancto Indice*, BAV, Vat. lat. 6207, fols. 220*r*-239*v*: 232*v*: «Libri omnes Chiromantiae, Aeromantiae, Hydromantiae, etc. damnati per episcopum parisiensem, Inquisitores, doctoresque utriusque Iu. publica congregatione coactat». See also *ILI*, VIII, pp. 35-37.

[36] *ILI*, VIII, p. 775.

[37] *ILI*, VIII, pp. 291-292, 296.

[38] *ILI*, VIII, p. 818.

[39] *ILI*, IX, p. 797: «Libri omnes, tractatus, & indices astrologiae iudiciariae, seu divinationum de futuris contingentibus, successibus, fortuitisque casibus, ac humanis actionibus è libero arbitrio pendentibus prohibentur omnino: qui verò iudicia, naturalesque observationes navigationis, agriculturae, seu medicae artis iuvandae gratia tractant, permittuntur: item scripta quaecunque, sortilegia, veneficia, magiam, incantationesque continentia, reijciuntur omnino». See also Rule XXI, on p. 799: «Ex libris verò expurgandis, vel corrigendis, delendae sunt omnes, singulaeque propositiones haereticae, sapientes de haeresem [...]. Verba etiam ambigua, & dubia [...] omnia quae docent sacrilegia, superstitiones, somniorum inanes interpretationes, obscaena vitia, & eius generis alia, quibus hominum mentes facile depravantur».

rule was reintroduced in the 1593 and 1596 Indexes.[40] Thus, sixteenth-century indexes contained general prohibitions of magical works and condemned specific works by Arnaldus of Villanova, Pietro d'Abano, Cornelius Agrippa, Giovan Battista Della Porta and Girolamo Cardano.[41] Roman Indexes condemned several works against magic by Protestant authors too, notably Bodin and Wier.[42] Finally, Gödelmann's work on sorcery was examined but not forbidden.[43]

The prohibition of divinatory disciplines, including astrology and magic, had sweeping consequences. Scholastic and Renaissance cosmology made no sharp distinctions between astrology and astronomy. In many universities, the astronomy curriculum included astrology. Divination was taught as a university subject in Bologna, although for a very short period only.[44] Magic did not attain any academic status, but was intimately linked with observation, physical experimentation, alchemical tradition, and natural history. Now, in experimental physics and natural history there was no widely shared theory of the unperceivable properties and actions of substances enabling one to discriminate between those which were real and those which were not. For example, reports of observations and experiments in the works of Cardano and Della Porta have profound magical connotations. Moreover, criteria for distinguishing natural and judiciary astrology or natural and demonic magic were extremely vague. This state of art had far-reaching consequences: (1) many scientific works were prohibited because they were framed in a 'magical' or 'astrological' casuistry, and (2) theologians and philosophers, rather than scientific researchers set

---

[40] *ILI*, IX, p. 857: «Libri omnes, & scripta Geomantiae, Hydromantiae, Aeromantiae, Pyromantiae, Onomantiae, Chiromantiae, Necromantiae, sive in quibus continentur sortilegia, veneficia, auguria, auspicia, incantationes artis Magicae, prorsus reijciuntur. Episcopi verò diligenter provideant, ne Astrologiae iudiciariae libri, tractatus, indices legantur, vel habeantur, qui de futuris contingentibus, successibus, fortuitisque casibus, aut ijs actionibus, quae ab humana voluntate pendent, certi aliquid eventurum affirmare audent. Permittuntur autem iudicia, & naturales observationes, quae navigationis, agriculturae, sive medicae artis iuvandae gratia conscripta sunt». For the 1596 Index, see *ibid.* p. 922.

[41] See *infra*.

[42] See the studies by M. VALENTE, *Bodin in Italia. La* Démonomanie des sorciers *e le vicende della sua traduzione*, Firenze 1991, with large extracts of the censures of Bodin's *Démonomanie* by the Congregation for the Index; EAD., *Johann Wier. Agli albori della critica razionale dell'occulto e del demoniaco nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, Firenze 2003.

[43] See ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, M (II.a.11), fols. 160*r*-162*r*; this *censura* will soon be published in «Bruniana & Campanelliana».

[44] ZAMBELLI, *L'ambigua natura della magia*, cit., pp. 177-178.

out criticisms of astrology and magic. Thus, the Church condemned magic and astrology for theological and ethical reasons, whereas modern science rejected these at a later time and for different reasons, namely inasmuch as they contradicted scientific method and laws.[45]

### 3.2. Censurae *and trials*

Until about 1580, the Roman Inquisition busied itself with combatting Protestantism. Having succeeded in stamping out Protestantism in Italy, or at least driving it underground, the Inquisition turned its attention to eradicating (popular) magic.[46] Since the second half of the sixteenth century, all magical activity, whether harmful or beneficial, came under suspicion as involving , implicitly or explicitly, a pact with demons. Indeed, magic, even without directly invoking demons, drew on forces not controlled or sanctioned by the Church, and hence was superstitious and presumptively diabolical. In this section I examine the Inquisitorial trials against and *censurae* of learned Renaissance authors with clear interests in magic, such as Girolamo Cardano, Giovan Battista Della Porta, Francesco Barozzi, and Giordano Bruno. A fresh and rich documentation gathered in the Archive of the Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith in Rome (ACDF) permits to reconstruct processes and *censurae* in some more detail.[47]

Sixteenth-century Indexes did not only censure or forbid contemporary publications, but also examined (recent) editions of Ancient or medieval authors. Thus, *Heptameron sive Elementa magica* by Pietro d'Abano (ca. 1246-ca. 1320), prohibited already in the indexes of Portugal (1581) and Spain (1583),[48] was condemned also in the Roman index of 1596.[49] And, the expurgatory index of Spain of 1584 condemned seven treatises

---

[45] U. BALDINI, *Le Congregazioni romane dell'Inquisizione e dell'Indice e le scienze, dal 1542 al 1615*, in *L'Inquisizione e gli storici: un cantiere aperto*, Tavola rotonda nell'ambito della Conferenza annuale della ricerca (Roma, 24-25 giugno 1999), Roma 2000, pp. 329-364; ID., *The Roman Inquisition's Condemnation of Astrology: Antecedents, Reasons and Consequences*, in G. FRAGNITO (ed.), *Church, Censorship, and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Cambridge 2001, pp. 79-110.

[46] E. W. MONTER-J. TEDESCHI, *Toward a Statistical Profile of the Italian Inquisition, Sixteenth to Eighteenh Centuries*, in *The Inquisition in Early Modern Europe: Studies on Sources and Methods*, eds. G. HENNINGSEN and J. TEDESCHI, De Kalb (Ill.) 1986, pp. 130-157.

[47] See U. BALDINI-L. SPRUIT, *Catholic Church and Modern Science. Documents from the Roman Archives of the Holy Office and the Index*, I: *The Sixteenth Century*, under the press.

[48] *ILI*, IV, pp. 447-48; VI, pp. 287-288.

[49] *ILI*, IX, pp. 529-530,

from Arnaldus of Villanova's (ca. 1238-1311) *Opera*,[50] while this author was condemned as a heretic in the indexes of Rome (1559, 1590, 1593, 1596), and in those of Parma (1580), Portugal (1581) and Spain (1583).[51] In 1600, the College of consultors of the Congregation for the Index in Padua proposed the prohibition of the above-mentioned seven treatises and two other ones, because these incite to magical arts and thus to superstition.[52]

Cornelius Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia* was prohibited in the indexes of Louvain (1546, 1550, 1558), Portugal (1547, 1551), Paris (1551), Spain (1551, 1559) and Venice (1554),[53] while the author was condemned as a heretic in two Roman indexes (1559, 1564) and in the Portuguese indexes of 1559 and of 1583.[54] Unfortunately, the Archive of the Congregation for the Index does not hold any *censura* of *De occulta philosophia*.

The 1580 Index prohibited the third book of Marsilio Ficino's *De triplici vita*.[55] Francesco Giorgio (1460-1540) is without doubt an author closely linked to Florentine Hermeticism,[56] but his *De harmonia mundi* (1525) is not a magical work, and the analogy between cosmic, musical and human spirits remained without any practical applications whatsoever. Indeed, the extensive *censurae* of his works by the Congregation for the Index did not dwell on magical subjects.[57]

---

[50] See *ILI*, VI, p. 985. The following works are censured: *Remedia contra maleficia*, *Expositiones visionum, quae fiunt in somnijs*, *Liber de iudicijs Astronomiae*, *Rosarius philosophorum*, *Novum lumen*, *Tractatus de sigillis*, and *Flos florum*. The following editions of Arnaldus' works are to be mentioned: Lyon (1504, 1509, 1520, 1522, 1532), Venice (1505, 1514, 1527), Strasbourg (1541), and Basel (1585).

[51] *ILI*, VI, p. 180; IX, pp. 80, 465-466, 802, 864, 933.

[52] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, N (II.a.12), fols. 75*r*-78*r*: 76*r*: «Continet haec pars postrema novem tractatus, quorum p<rimu>s est expositio visionum quae fiunt in somnis, 2.s de iudicijs astrorum etc. 3.s de phisicis ligaturis 4.s rosarius Philosophorum, 5.s Novum lumen, 6. de 12. sigillis, 7 flos florum, 8 de Alchimia ad Regem Neapolitanem, 9. Recepta eletuarij. Qui ferè omnes iudicio meo potius essent expungendi, quam expurgandi nam artem medicam non iuvant (ut profitetur Arnaldus) sed commiculant, et inficiunt, ideo a peritis Medicis nostri temporis praesertim à catholicis flocipendentur. Cum manifeste faveant auguria, auspicia, sortilegia, incantationes, adiurationes, et magicas ligaturas, aperiant viam superstitioni, passim redoleant fatalem necessitatem, et confinia iudiciariae, Medicis permissae, transgrediantur, laedant fidem catholicam, et bonos mores, et bono publico plerumque contrarij sint, quattuor presertim ex novem enumeratis».

[53] *ILI*, II, 131-32; IV, pp. 140, 238; I, pp. 124-125; V, pp. 258, 365; III, p. 283.

[54] *ILI*, III, p. 283; VIII, pp. 517, 550; VI, pp. 390, 404, 423.

[55] *ILI*, IX, p. 154.

[56] For the prohibition of *Libri Hermetis magi ad Aristotelem*, in the indexes of Rome (1559 and 1564), and Spain (1583), see *ILI*, VIII, pp. 593-594; VI, pp. 352-353.

[57] Exception made for a merely side-issue, such as Giorgio's qualifying Moses as magician;

Legal proceedings against Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576) probably did not start before 7 May 1570, when the Inquisitor of Como in a letter to the Inquisition of Bologna, where Cardano lived at the moment, denounced *De varietate rerum* as a heretical work.[58] Cardano was arrested, released after a few months and brought to Rome where he lived in relative freedom until his death in 1576. After the Bologna trial, the Congregation for the Index produced an extensive series of *censurae* of his works. In these detailed examinations, magic is a side issue, however, the attention being directed mainly on doctrinal questions concerning human soul and the free will. Alfonso Chacón, a liberal but very influential consultor, classified Cardano's boasting his magical capacities in *De subtilitate*, book XVI, under the heading *Propositiones suspectae vel heresim sapientes*.[59] Subsequently, an anonymous censor called attention to Cardano's praise of magic in the context of his strictly astrological interests.[60] Also Ambrogio da Asola dwelled on book XVI of *De subtilitate*, recommending a use of astrology and magic within strictly natural bounds.[61] Cardano's *De rerum varietate* and *De subtilitate* were prohibited in several sixteenth-century indexes.[62]

---

see ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, AA (II.a.23), fols. 799*r*-806*r*: 803*r*: «pag. 244. probl. 263. Moysem magiae operam dedisse, deleo. turpe est talem notam sanctissimo viro inurere».

[58] For relevant documents and a reconstruction of the Bologna trial, see U. BALDINI-L. SPRUIT, *Cardano e Aldrovandi nelle lettere del Sant'Uffizio Romano all'Inquisitore di Bologna (1571-73)*, «Bruniana & Campanelliana», VI, 2000, pp. 145-163.

[59] See ACDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, L 7095 (1570-1606), fasc. 4, fols. 17*r*-33*v*, 22*v*: «Praeterea libro eodem .19. pagina 1217 docet, audaces in arte magica daemonum, parum profecisse, sed qui armis, aut eruditione aliqua vigent, progressus in magia facere visi, sicut Petrus Aponensis conciliator, dictus, quem gloriam aeternam consecutum dicit necromantiae auxilio. Alia etiam similia fatuitatibus plena subinfert, quae omnia suspicione haud vaccant [*sic*], et aliena sunt a disciplina et schola christiana».

[60] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, H (II.a.7), fols. 344*v*-368*v*: 347*r*: «*In libro* de varietate rerum in epistola sua nuncupatoria parum longe à medio, Artem Magicam, et Astronomiam hunc in modum commendat et extollit. Quid divinius Astronomicis? et magicis Nature arcanis quid maius?». This passage was highlighted by another censor too; see ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, F (II.a.5), fols. 99*v*-105*r*: 99*v*.

[61] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, N (II.a.12), fols. 47*r*-58*r*, 64*r*: 55*v*: «[...] infr. ita leg. Varias formas refferat, et de his divinare citra Dei revelationem non licet, et si liceat coniectare multa ut dixi, ex naturali scientia seu magia, Astrologia, Nautica, Agricultura, et medicina, ita tamen, ut non simus nimis curiosi, illisque hoc concedamus qui in ijs disciplinis prestantiores fuere, et quorum numero decem etc. 802 del. med.».

[62] *De varietate rerum* in the indexes of Spain (1559, 1583), Portugal (1561, 1581), Parma (1580), Rome (1590, 1593, 1596); see *ILI*, V, pp. 370-371; VI, p. 355; IV, p. 386; IX, pp. 136, 488, 806, 868. *De subtilitate* in the indexes of Paris (1551), Spain (1559, 1583), Portugal (1561, 1581), and Rome (1590, 1593, 1596); see *ILI*, I, p. 168; V, pp. 368-369; VI, p. 354; IV, p. 385; IX, pp. 488, 806, 868.

In the past, the charges formulated against Giovan Battista Della Porta (ca. 1535-1615) during his Roman process (developing between 1574-1578) have been object of various disputes and controversies.[63] In a 1575 letter to the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, the bishop of S. Angelo and Bisaccia concluded that not any 'absolute' heresy is to be detected; moreover, the final verdict of the suit, consisting merely in a *purgatio canonica*, essentially confirms that the charges against Della Porta were not particularly serious. Involved in a cause which regarded (practical) astrology and probably other divinatory disciplines, Della Porta was also condemned for associating with necromantics and for possessing books on this art, in particular the widely spread *Clavicula Salomonis*,[64] as reveal the minutes of the 20 April 1592 meeting of the Holy Office.[65] This explains why on 10 March 1592 he was forbidden by the Congregation for the Index to publish books regarding a similar discipline, namely physiognomics.[66] As is well known, the Congregation for the Index prohibited his *Magia naturalis*, exception made for the corrected 1589 edition.[67]

The encounters of Francesco Barozzi (1537-1604)[68] with the Inquisition are multifaceted. A Venetian nobleman, among the major mathematicians of his time, he not only read magical books (Agrippa, Pietro d'Abano), but realized experiments similar to those carried out by popular witches. Remarkably, in 1586 he denounced his father to the Roman Inquisition on a charge of magic and heresy.[69] During the spring of the following year, he was denied a permission for reading books on judiciary as-

---

[63] For a summary of the historiographical debate on Della Porta's inquisitorial vicissitudes and a new reconstruction, see M. VALENTE, *Della Porta e l'Inquisizione. Nuovi documenti dell'Archivio del Sant'Uffizio*, «Bruniana & Campanelliana», V, 1999, pp. 415-434.

[64] *Clavicula Salomonis* was prohibited in the indexes of Spain (1551, 1559, 1583), and Rome (1559, 1564, 1590, 1593, 1596); see *ILI*, V, pp. 243-244, 435; VI, pp. 248-249, 526; VIII, pp. 289-290, 412-413; IX, pp. 640-641, 808, 869. «Liber Salomonis Magicis superstitonibus refertus» was prohibited in the 1559 Index of Rome; see *ILI*, VIII, p. 773.

[65] ACDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1592-1593, fols. 126*v*, 129*v*; copies in ACDF, SO, *St. st.*, L.3.a, fol. 1230*r* and in ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, O (II.a.13), fol. 359*r* (published in VALENTE, *Della Porta e l'Inquisizione*, cit., pp. 431-432).

[66] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, Z (II.a.22), fol. 559*v*.

[67] The work was prohibited in the indexes of Spain (1583), and Rome (1590, 1593); see *ILI*, VI, pp. 393-394; IX, pp. 389, 417.

[68] For biographical information, see *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, VI, Roma 1964, pp. 495-499.

[69] For the relevant documents, see BALDINI-SPRUIT, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, cit. For a reconstruction of the Venetian trial and for bibliographical information, see F. BARBIERATO, *Nella stanza dei circoli*, cit., pp. 113-116.

trology and in autumn he came under process himself for practicing magic and for the possession of forbidden books. Barozzi is a typical example of the coexistence of (demonic) magic and judiciary astrology with genuine scientific interests.[70] Barozzi lived between Venice and Candia (Crete), where he inherited an extensive estate. In 1587, under the menace of capital punishment, he released a complete confession about his magical experiments, among which the invocation of spirits for obtaining favours. His masterpiece was the successful triggering of a torrential rain storm in Crete after a long period of drought, causing significant damage to his own lands too. Subsequently, he was devoted to manipulative practices in gambling and love affairs, the latter with the aid of two Greek witches. Barozzi was incarcerated *pro forma*, condemned on 16 October 1587 and after the payment of a fine he was released shortly afterwards. On 3 December he would have denounded his own son on the charge of magic.

As is well known, magic was a side issue in Giordano Bruno's trial, and it could not be a major issue, since Bruno's main works on magic were not yet published at that time. Celestino of Verona accused Bruno of defining Moses as a very cunning magician, because he was able to beat Pharao's magicians, and because the law he gave the people of Israel was composed with the aid of magical art. Bruno would have mitigated this statement in the tenth deposition, declaring that Moses was an expert on Egyptian science and thus also in magic. That his skills surpassed even those of Pharao's magicians, was due to the period of forty years of contemplation and solitude in the desert.[71] Bruno distinguished clearly between natural and superstitious magic, however, stressing that the former is just a cognition of the secrets of nature linked to the capacity to imitate the works of nature.[72]

---

[70] Barozzi studied philosophy and mathematics at the University of Padua, where he lectured mathematics since 1559; he translated Proclus's edition of Euclid's *Elements* (Venice 1560) and many other works by Heron, Pappus and Archimedes; in 1585 he published his *Cosmographia* (Venice).

[71] See L. FIRPO, *Il processo di Giordano Bruno*, ed. D. QUAGLIONI, Roma 1993, pp. 274-275.

[72] FIRPO, *Il processo di Giordano Bruno*, cit., p. 275: «In questi propositi credo che Moise poteva, come anco sapeva, oprare secondo la facoltà dei maghi di Faraone e che magicamente ancora poteva oprar più di essi, sendo più gran mago che li medemi, et intendo che tali operationi sono pure fisiche, et o siano demonii, o huomeni, non le possono oprar senza i principii naturali, e non trovo che si possino stimar illecite se non in proposito di maleficio, o di iattantia di potentia divina, per ingannar il mondo sotto questi pretesti. La magia dunque tanto di Moise quanto la assolutamente magia non è altro che una cognitione dei secreti della natura con facoltà d'imitare la natura nell'opere sue, e fare cose maravigliose agl'occhi del volgo: quanto alla magia mathematica e superstitiosa, la intendo aliena da Moise e da tutti li honorati ingegni».

To be sure, it was not Bruno's defence of natural magic that condemned him to the stake. Remarkably, in the numerous and extensive trials that Campanella underwent, magic is not referred to at all.

Also in the censures of Paracelsus' (ca. 1493-1541) works[73] by the Congregation for the Index magic was referred to. An anonymous censor of the *Chirurgia magna*[74] contested any possibly favorable relation between magic and theology.[75] Moreover, the use of images in medicine, as propagated by Paracelsus, did not remain within the limits of a legitimate use as laid down by Caietanus in his comment to Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* and in his treatise on images.[76] Paracelsus' use of images was regarded as superstitious and his recurring references to authors such as Pietro d'Abano, Agrippa and the Abbot Trithemius offended the ears of pious readers.[77] Finally, the censor did not appreciate Paracelsus' railing against theologians, who were not able to do anything without magical arts, because so he detracts those who criticized magic.[78]

A Neapolitan team expurgating in 1598 Johann Jacob Wecker's (1528-1586) *De secretis*,[79] proposed to cancel various references to Della Porta's *Magia naturalis*,[80] and the first 24 chapters of book XV of this work,[81] be-

---

[73] Paracelsus was condemned as a heretic in the indexes of Parma (1580), and Rome (1593, 1596); see *ILI*, IX, pp. 177, 720-721, 902.

[74] This work was prohibited in the indexes of Parma (1580), Spain (1583) and Rome (1590); see *ILI*, IX, p. 163; VI, pp. 546-547; IX, p. 395.

[75] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, H (II.a.7), fols. 416*r*-417*v*: 422*r*: «filosofiae dextra etc. falso dicit theologiam esse dextram magiae quid enim commune Deo, et Belial».

[76] *Ibid.*, fol. 422*r*: «quis ergo magia etc nefas dictu Diabolum, et suos solum improbare magiam, et item fac. 9. ver. 7. ubi dicit nihil non posse tractari in magia non salva conscientia, unde satis patet qualia sint quae sequuntur de occulta philosophia, et de medicina caelesti. nec obstat quae dicit Caietanus in 2.ª 2.ae q. 95ª. art. 5.° et in summula in verbo de imaginibus, ubi videtur dicere posse exerceri absque peccato medicinam caelestem».

[77] *Ibid.*, fol. 422*r-v*: «negromantiam etc an videntur tenenda quae hic tractanda proponuntur: cum praesertim falso inferius in scriptura sacra magicas artes habere fundamentum ultimo versu dicatur: et quae sequuntur facie 34 ubi primum necessariam orationem asserit huic arti, secundò fidem, tertiò imaginationem, quibus mediantibus, et simplicissimis, et brevissimis verbis maiora se facturum pollicetur facie 35 ver. 3. quam Petrus ille Apponensis Agrippa, Abbas tritemius, quorum nomina tantum catholicas aures offendere solent, nedum opera [quapropter] satis patet quam sit Paracelsi de imaginibus praxis et doctrina superstitiosa, et contraria ijs, quae à Caietano in prae alligatis locis de imaginibus dicta sunt».

[78] *Ibid.*, fol. 423*r*: «per totum capitulum nota quae adversus theologos invehitur, quos nihil operari posse dicit nisi magiae fuerint experti; ubi magnum panegyricum magiae adiciit, ac parvum honestè adversus magiae detractores invehitur».

[79] JOHANN JAKOB WECKER, *De secretis libri XVII. Ex varijs authoribus collecti, methodiceque digesti, et tertium iam aucti. Accesserit Index locupletissimus*, Basileae 1592 (first ed. 1587).

[80] ACDF, Index, XXIII.1, fols. 11*v*-12*v*: 11*v*.

[81] WECKER, *De secretis libri XVII*, cit., pp. 679-745.

cause dwelling on the union with God, the invocations of demons, magic and divinatory arts, cabalah, exorcisms and similar issues.[82] Moreover, the magical techniques of the section «Ut equus diutissime duret» were to be cancelled.[83] Also Ambrogio da Asola blamed the explict analysis of suspect and forbidden magical arts.[84] Surprisingly, the book was not forbidden in any sixteenth-century index,[85] and would be condemned only by the Index decree of 17 September 1609.[86]

In the early 1950s, Garin convincingly argued that distinctions between natural and ceremonial magic, between natural and judiciary astrology, and between experimental alchemy and more basically popular recipes were untenable. Also according to sixteenth-century ecclesiastical censors, these distinctions were fuzzy. The consultors of both Inquisition and Index argued that there is no purely 'white' magic, since no magical art is immune from the intervention of demonic powers. Thus, magical art is to be condemned as superstition or idolatry. This view does not entail, however, that (learned) magic was a central concern in their legal proceedings regarding authors influenced by Hermeticism or magical traditions of other kinds. Compared to the rather vivid discussions on astrology in the Congregation for the Index,[87] the debate on magic, also in the pronouncements of the consultors for the new Index and its Rules, remained a minor issue.[88]

---

[82] See ACDF, Index, XXIII.1, fols. 11*v*-12*v*: 12*r*: «fol. 678 dele à principio libri 15 usque ad caput 25 fol. 745 deleantur fol. 747 usque ad caput 31 exclusive».

[83] *Ibid.*, fols. 11*v*-12*v*: 12*r*. Cf. WECKER, *De secretis libri XVII*, cit., p. 283.

[84] ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, N (II.a.12), fols. 58*r*-61*v*, 64*r*: 60*r-v*: «Hic liber usque ad illa ver. ad Prophetiam fol. 755. incl. est del. cap. enim pr.° quod est, qua ratione Deo coniungamur etc. ex Nicolao Taurello habet propositiones suspectas, ut fol. 684 ab illis ver. caeterum ut, usque ad erroribus conspercatum fol. 688 incl. et infr. verb. Deus enim iustus est necessario, ac misericors non item sunt contra scholasticorum doctrinam: sed in fine cap. in illis ver. haec applicatio in hunc modum fit, cum nos scilicet nostram confitentes miseriam, certò credimus hunc mediatorem Iesum Christum pro nobis esse mortum, etc. usque in finem perspicue se Hereticum insinuat. Reliqua quae sequitur doctrina, est de magia, mathematica, venefica, de Goetia, Necromantia, Theurgia, ac prestigijs, ex reprobatis aucthoribus ut Mellantone, Cornelio Agrippa, et Ioanne Wiero, ac ubique propositionibus contra Catholicam Ecclesiam scatet».

[85] By contrast, *Medicinae utriusque syntaxes* was prohibited in the 1580 Index of Parma; *ILI*, IX, p. 157.

[86] *Index librorum prohibitorum*, Romae 1819, p. 332.

[87] See BALDINI, *The Roman Inquisition's Condemnation of Astrology*, cit.

[88] See, for example, the pronouncements and comments on the Rule IX in ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, B (II.a.2), fols. 339*v*-543*v*.