



Paracelsus and Roman censorship – Johannes Faber's 1616 report in context

Lyke de Vries & Leen Spruit

To cite this article: Lyke de Vries & Leen Spruit (2017): Paracelsus and Roman censorship – Johannes Faber's 1616 report in context, Intellectual History Review, DOI: [10.1080/17496977.2017.1361060](https://doi.org/10.1080/17496977.2017.1361060)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17496977.2017.1361060>



© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 14 Sep 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Paracelsus and Roman censorship – Johannes Faber's 1616 report in context

Lyke de Vries^a and Leen Spruit^b

^aCenter for the History of Philosophy and Science, Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands; ^bDipartimento delle Scienze dei segni, degli spazi e delle culture (Department of the Sciences of Signs, Spaces and Cultures), University of Rome "La Sapienza", Rome, Italy

ABSTRACT

This article analyses a central episode in the response of the Catholic bodies of doctrinal control to the emergence of Paracelsianism. More specifically, it discusses the censorial report written in 1616 by the physician Johannes Faber for the Congregation for the Index about the works of Paracelsus. This report was written in a time that Paracelsianism had become increasingly popular, but also a source of fierce debates. The complex context surrounding the report is investigated, with particular attention to the broader social, religious, and scientific aspects as well as the precise historical situation in which it was written. Faber's report and an English translation are provided in separate appendices.

KEYWORDS

Paracelsus; Catholic censorship; Paracelsianism; early-modern medicine; scientific and philosophical controversies

Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (1493/1494–1541), known as Paracelsus, is famous as an innovative physician and philosopher, who developed doctrinal views that were alternative and frequently antithetical, not only to traditional science and philosophy, but also to both Catholic and Protestant theology. He attempted to overthrow the pre-eminent medical authorities, Galen and Avicenna, and to develop a medicine that used chemically prepared cures. He believed that the world was an animated whole and replaced the traditional theories of four elements and humours with his own doctrine of three principles, the *tria prima*, mercury, sulphur, and salt, and, correspondingly, abandoned the traditional concept of disease.

In Paracelsus's view, man is an epitome of the world, and in man as microcosm are present, in reduced form, all the elements and forces of the cosmos; as in the macrocosm, so also in the human body chemical reactions take place continuously. For this reason, a physician must also be an expert in chemistry. The teaching of Paracelsus sparked long-lasting controversies, which continued well into the mid-seventeenth century.

It has become a commonplace that it is difficult to determine exactly the significance of Paracelsus's thought and individual views, in particular from a doctrinal, i.e. philosophical or theological, point of view. What complicates matters is that Paracelsus had written all his works in a German dialect, and only a few of them were published

CONTACT Lyke de Vries  a.devries@ftr.ru.nl

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

during his lifetime. Latin translations of his works, which were a precondition for a larger dissemination, were not available until the 1560s. In the process, pseudonymous tracts were inserted into the authentic corpus of Paracelsian works, adding new alchemical, eschatological, and political dimensions to the Paracelsian *figura*. As a consequence of this publication process, the medical and judicial authorities of the early modern period had difficulties understanding this mysterious physician. The fact that, in the decades after his death, his ideas were adopted by proponents of several different religious and philosophical traditions, rendered him even more elusive and turned him in many quarters into a highly suspect figure. The generally subversive nature of his thought and his heterodox reputation were the reason that Paracelsus's work was placed on several sixteenth-century indices of forbidden books, also on those published and promulgated in Italy.¹

In this study, the focus lies on the investigation of Paracelsus's works by the Roman Congregation for the Index of Forbidden Books in the 1610s, in particular on the assessment by the German physician and papal botanist Johannes Faber (1574–1629). As a German-speaking physician, Faber was doubly qualified to examine the works of Paracelsus. As we shall see in detail below, he seems to have taken a moderate position with respect to the work of the eccentric physician.

A number of recent studies have investigated Faber's role with respect to the Roman courts, Catholic censorship and the Lincean Academy.² This study aims to contribute to this research, first, by investigating Faber's hitherto unpublished report on Paracelsus. Although the report has been referred to previously (notably by Brevaglieri), it has not so far been discussed at length, nor been transcribed or translated. To this end, we will, second, focus on the decades preceding Faber's report, in which the movement called "Paracelsianism" became both increasingly popular and suspect. Finally, we will place Faber's report in the context of early seventeenth-century Rome, and investigate Faber's life in the context of Roman censorship and scientific investigations.

I

In the early 1610s, Johannes Faber obtained a reading permit from the Master of the Sacred Palace for Paracelsus's works.³ In January 1616, he presented an examination (*censura*) of the recent German edition of Paracelsus's works to the secretary of the Index. The *Diari* of that period do not contain a decree attesting to a formal commission of Faber's report by the Congregation for the Index, but the latter's inclusion in the *Protocolli* conferred an official status.

The censors of the Congregation had investigated Paracelsus's works already in the 1580s and 1590s. In 1580, all of Paracelsus's works had been prohibited by the so-called Index of Parma, while the Roman 1596 Index listed several of his works, prohibiting their possession and diffusion "donec corrigatur", that is, until they were corrected.⁴ Surprisingly, Paracelsus's work was not placed on any Index issued outside Italy before 1583, and he was never placed on Indices in France, the Low Countries and Germany, where his works circulated widely. It should be kept in mind, however, that until 1600, the only comprehensive Latin edition of his works was the *Opera latine reddita*, published by Pietro Perna in 1575, while the works that drew the attention of the Roman censors, such as *Chirurgia magna* and *Paramirum*, were only available in German.⁵ It should further be noted

that, until the second half of the seventeenth century, only very few theological tracts by Paracelsus were published.⁶

The examination of Paracelsus's works for the 1596 Index focused primarily on theological and confessional issues, and not on Paracelsus's medicine or alchemy. The passages indicated in the Roman *censurae* as heterodox (and which on the basis of the "donec corrigatur" prohibition had to be corrected in future editions) dealt almost exclusively with either judicial astrology and magic or were attacks against the Catholic faith and ecclesiastics.⁷ The censors had thus analysed Paracelsus's works essentially from a confessional and theological perspective. However, at the turn of the sixteenth century, Paracelsus gained increasingly more followers all over Europe, and he and his work became the cause of irate controversies. In 1603, the best-known works of Paracelsus were collected and published in a new edition of two volumes in Strasbourg, and it seems likely that this was a further reason that Paracelsus's works were investigated anew.⁸

In order to get a clearer picture of Paracelsus, and, perhaps, also of the new movement elicited by his works, Johannes Faber analysed the Swiss physician's vernacular works from a twofold perspective: (a) from a confessional perspective and (b) from the perspective of doctrinal medicine and natural philosophy. On 18 January 1616, he delivered his report. Both the Latin report and an English translation of it are reproduced in the appendix.⁹

From a confessional perspective, Faber began with what would have been of paramount importance for the Congregation for the Index, by stating that "[Paracelsus] was rather of our Catholic faith than of the Lutheran sect." After all, he argued, Paracelsus had publicly distanced himself from Luther.¹⁰ Moreover, Faber continued, Paracelsus neither rejected the doctrine of purgatory nor the invocation of saints, which, in Faber's words, "the Lutherans combat violently". The "virgin nature" of the Blessed Mary was further discussed by Paracelsus "in a most honourable and chaste manner", something, Faber explains, the Lutherans would never do. Paracelsus even appears to Faber to be friendly towards the saints, as he argued that God performs miracles through them.¹¹

On the other hand, Faber found that Paracelsus "explains and distorts the Holy Scripture too boldly according to his own mind and the Swiss spirit".¹² He argued, for example, that the Eucharist ought not be performed, because Satan uses these ceremonies to seduce people.¹³ In other passages, Paracelsus "withhold[s] honour from the saints", especially when he states that the miracles that are performed near their bodies do not occur because of the saints' special status, but simply because dead bodies generate miraculous works.¹⁴ He further assaulted specific, medically relevant, saints by laughing at the idea that St. Anthony should cure St. Anthony's Fire (Ergotism), and St. Vitus the Vitus's Dance (Chorea).¹⁵ Additionally, Faber argues, Paracelsus held "so many absurd opinions concerning the creation of Adam and Eve, that on specific pages not one, but many mistakes are written". For example, Paracelsus was so devious as to argue that the serpent had deceived Eve in the form of Adam with a virile member, and that Eve was so misled by staring at it that the serpent seduced her!¹⁶

To Faber, Paracelsus's natural philosophical theories seem no less ambiguous than his theological views. On the one hand, Faber states that "we can make use of [Paracelsus's] more sensible teachings and his more than necessary medical practice". His "useful preparations" and "new recipes" may be especially helpful with respect to some rare diseases, "for which Galenic and Hippocratic medicines are less effective". On the other hand, Faber

condemned a number of philosophical aspects in Paracelsus's works, such as Paracelsus's theory that the four elements are formed from the three basic principles (*tria prima*), salt, sulphur, and mercury. Moreover, Paracelsus had argued that these *tria prima* originate from a "mother", namely water, from which also all beings originate, a claim that, in Faber's eyes, cannot be true.¹⁷

Faber also deemed the notorious Swiss physician to be repeatedly "suspect of magic", because he defended "corrupt and superstitious opinions" in passages that should be removed. Paracelsus had furthermore argued that there is a spirit in the sun, which, in Faber's opinion, is a "wondrous and absurd fantasy". Paracelsus wrote that this spirit corresponds to man's animal spirit. According to Paracelsus, "if humans live like animals, the sun is driven to rage and whips man with its whiplashes [...] by which sulphur is inflamed in man".¹⁸ In another "fantasy", Paracelsus stated that John the Baptist ate like an angel in the desert, that is, without defecating, and that human beings can still eat this way.¹⁹

Paracelsus could furthermore be suspected of defending fortune-telling. He had argued that physicians should be like "astronomers". According to Faber's (partially erroneous) interpretation of Paracelsus, the four elements each have their own star, thanks to which the physician can predict the future.²⁰ Paracelsus also argued that "a person who predicts the future or reveals things that were not known before, does not have his prophetic force from Satan, nor from the Holy Spirit, but from the light of the Cabalistic spirit".²¹ We should mention here that such magical positions were deemed heretical by the Catholic watchdogs, not least because predictions of future events entailed a deterministic view of them, which in turn suggested that voluntary acts were impossible.²²

Faber's report ended with the conclusion that "numerous other passages are in no way acceptable in Paracelsus, but many are sound, especially where he discusses cures of diseases and preparations of cures, which are especially useful for the medical faculty".²³

Interestingly, two of the texts Faber discussed in his report, *Liber Azoth* and *De pestilente*, are now seen as spurious texts.²⁴ Obviously, Faber was not aware of this, and simply accepted the attribution of these works to Paracelsus. These attributions might have influenced Paracelsus's reputation. In this case, these two works have negatively affected Faber's reading of Paracelsus. Indeed, these texts especially contain the most magical statements discussed by Faber, such as the "absurd phantasy" concerning the spirit in the sun and the statement about John the Baptist. In fact, *Liber Azoth* is filled with "absurd opinions", and contains "many mistakes". Faber offers an extensive list of some of these passages, and they include statements concerning the Creation, Adam and Eve, and other biblical figures. At the same time, it becomes clear that the criticisms of ecclesiastics are especially present (or rather: noted by Faber) in the authentic writings, which, in turn, might shed light on the dissimilarities between authentic and spurious works. Research on the estimation of Paracelsus by officials based on spurious works can shed further light on the influence of the spurious works in the early modern period.

II

As mentioned above, Faber's report on behalf of the Congregation for the Index was preceded by a revival of Paracelsianism. It is impossible here to provide a comprehensive overview of the Paracelsian movement preceding 1610 (if there ever was one), there are

too many aspects and actors involved, but we will touch upon some aspects relevant to Faber's report.²⁵

It was really only 20 years after the death of Paracelsus in 1541 that his work started to become popular.²⁶ From 1560 onwards, the German physician Adam von Bodenstein published 40 works of Paracelsus, which were translated into Latin by Dorn, Forberger, Toxites, and others.²⁷ After 1565, and in only 10 years' time, more than 100 of Paracelsus's works were published, as opposed to the 65 in the preceding 70 years.²⁸ In the years to come, an increasing number of physicians, alchemists, and mystics, generally united under the name of "Paracelsianism", started to publish works on Paracelsus's doctrines. This movement rapidly spread throughout Europe and, by 1600, Paracelsus had gained followers in Spain, England, Denmark, Germany, France, Switzerland, the Low Countries, and also in Italy.²⁹

One of the Paracelsians who contributed prominently to the popularity of Paracelsus was the Danish physician Petrus Severinus (Peder Sørensen 1542–1602).³⁰ In 1571, in Basel, at the same time and place that Bodenstein published Paracelsus's works, Severinus published his *Idea medicinae philosophicae*.³¹ In this work, he combined the less radical aspects of Paracelsus's work with traditional medicine based on the theories of Galen. He defended Paracelsus's theory of the *tria prima*, and even the microcosm–macrocosm analogy, but emphasised that these aspects of Paracelsianism could already be found in Hippocrates.³² By opting for a compromise between two seemingly opposite schools of thought, he rendered Paracelsus's theories more acceptable to the traditional doctors, many of whom praised Severinus's work. In fact, the work was so popular that even the anti-Paracelsian Thomas Erastus (1524–1583) regarded it as the most acceptable face of Paracelsianism, even though the year after, he published a fierce refutation of Paracelsian medicine in his *Disputationes de medicina nova Philippi Paracelsi* (1572).³³

Thanks to such systematising Latin publications and the Latin translations by Bodenstein, Paracelsian works started to spread in academic circles as well. Some physicians at the late sixteenth-century universities of Montpellier and Basel accepted Paracelsian theories.³⁴ In the 1570s, a "Collegium medicorum sectae Paracelsi" was established in Görlitz, which was related to Jacob Böhme, and, thanks to the physician Joachim Tancke (Tanckius 1557–1609), the University of Leipzig became a "Zentrum des Alchemoparacelsismus".³⁵ Paracelsians could even be found in the Catholic universities of Cologne and Salzburg.³⁶ This sudden spread of Paracelsian doctrines led to opposition by traditional (Galenic) physicians and chemists, and conflicts arose in various places. Despite the conciliatory works by Severinus and others, the rise of Paracelsianism was accompanied by numerous controversies in several parts of Europe.³⁷

One of the well-known controversies over Paracelsianism took place in Paris, where the traditional physicians and their Paracelsian adversaries entered into a dispute that eventually spread beyond the borders of France.³⁸ In 1593, King Henry IV returned to Paris, followed by many Huguenot physicians. One of them, Joseph Du Chesne (Querctanus, 1546–1609), became physician to the King. In 1603, he published his *De priscorum philosophorum verae medicinae materia*, which was quickly rebutted in Jean Riolan the Elder's *Apologia pro Hippocratis et Galeni medicina* (1603). Du Chesne had defended chemical cures and the microcosm–macrocosm analogy, which was deemed unacceptable by the Parisian Galenist. In the same year, Théodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573–1655), who later became a well-known physician at the royal court in London, defended Du

Chesne against Jean Riolan. This was only the starting point of a fierce Paracelsian debate that lasted for several years, which drew in even the famous alchemist Andreas Libavius.³⁹ The latter defended Du Chesne and Turquet de Mayerne against the Paris faculty of medicine.⁴⁰

But, the controversies surrounding Paracelsianism were not limited to medicine. Although Paracelsus had never supported Luther, he was often associated with his teachings. He is sometimes even remembered as “the Luther of medicine”.⁴¹ To be sure, Paracelsus had publicly distanced himself from Luther: “Do you mean that I am Luther? [...] I give him and you some work to do!”⁴² In Paris, too, the conflict over Paracelsianism had religious characteristics. In fact, in Didier Kahn’s words:

From 1578, Paracelsianism was in France the occasional object of violent polemics capable of exceeding by far its medical context. [...] Paracelsus’s reception in France, as in Germany, touched upon the latent quarrel of the ancient and the moderns as well as the problem of religious orthodoxy.⁴³

Paracelsus’s theological views are central to his thought. Although none of his theological writings were published during his lifetime, nor in the first years after his death, his theological tracts were copied extensively, especially in heretical groups such as the Schwenckfeldians. Schlesien, nowadays a part of Polen, housed one of the most important theology-collections and originated from a community of Schwenckfeldians.⁴⁴ A further collection of Paracelsus’s writings, including theological texts, could be found in Neuburg, and was in the possession of a man called Ottheinrich, who was “Pfalzgraf bei Rhein”. This is the collection used by Huser for his publications of Paracelsus’s work, as well as by Toxites, Adam von Bodenstein and Alexander von Suchten.⁴⁵ All publishers thus had access to Paracelsus’s religious writings. In addition, Paracelsus’s theological ideas also informed his natural philosophical writings. These works, too, included Paracelsus’s criticism of ecclesiastics.⁴⁶ Equally important is the fact that Paracelsus’s religious ideas flourished among heretical groups. The collection was used not only by the Schwenckfeldians in Schlesien, but also by followers of Johann Arndt (1555–1621), Valentin Weigel (1522–1588), and Jacob Böhme (1575–1624) who all read Paracelsus’s theology. Their philosophies, which included Paracelsian theories, became increasingly influential in the years preceding and during the Thirty Years’ War.⁴⁷ This might further explain why Paracelsus’s writings had come to look so suspicious.

Paracelsianism came to look even more suspect from a doctrinal point of view when, from the 1610s onwards, it became associated with Rosicrucianism, a movement that originated in the German lands. In a swift upsurge, beginning in 1614, Rosicrucianism spread throughout Europe. The *Fama Fraternitatis* and the *Confessio Fraternitatis* were printed at the court of Moritz von Hessen (1572–1632) in Kassel in 1614 and 1615, respectively, the *Chymische Hochzeit* was printed by the famous printer Lazarus Zetzner (1551–1616) in Strasbourg in 1616. In one of the key manifestos, the *Fama*, Paracelsus features as the only genuine historical reference, and it is evident that the views of the Paracelsians and the Rosicrucian manifestos strongly overlap, for example, in their use of the microcosm–macrocosm analogy, their expectation of an imminent *Endzeit*, and their shared distaste for the established educational system.⁴⁸ Additionally, also the manifestos are dismissive of the Pope, and the authors of the *Confessio*, too, called the Pope the Antichrist.⁴⁹

In certain quarters of Europe, this link had become so close that by the beginning of the seventeenth century, a religious trend had come about, the so-called Theophrastia Sancta, which was based on the works of Paracelsus and was also inspired by the Rosicrucian manifestos. Its followers considered Christian Rosencreutz, the alleged founder of the Rosicrucian Brotherhood, and Paracelsus the prophets of a single truth. One of its most passionate proponents, Adam Haslmayr, who already in 1610 had a copy of the *Fama*, secretly published Paracelsian works while being also the first to respond to the Rosicrucian manifestos.⁵⁰ He regarded the Rosicrucians as “those, who are now chosen by God to spread the eternal Theophrastian and divine truth, which has been miraculously preserved until now”.⁵¹ Because of his adherence to Rosicrucianism, Haslmayr was imprisoned and condemned by the authorities to the galleys in 1612, shortly after his *Antwort an die lobwürdigen Brüderschaft der Theosophen von RosenCreutz* was printed.⁵²

Not least because of its anti-papal rhetoric, adherence to Rosicrucianism was not well received by the Catholic authorities, and “Rosicrucians were coming under scrutiny for their religious and political views.”⁵³ This had evident consequences for Paracelsianism. For example, in the early 1620s, orthodox theologians accused the Paracelsian Heinrich Nollius of “Rosenkreuzerei” and demanded his imprisonment, which resulted in an investigation by the ecclesiastical authorities.⁵⁴ Importantly, also in Lutheran and Calvinist countries Paracelsians were investigated for their Rosicrucian links, for example Johann Faulhaber, Georg Zimmermann and Homagius.⁵⁵

Because of such developments and new associations, Paracelsianism was highly controversial, while its founder became an even more elusive figure. Paracelsus – so much seemed clear – had transformed medicine, alchemy and theology, and had clearly become an inspiration for numerous physicians. Over the years, Paracelsianism, at the time ever more strongly associated with heretical groups, became therefore an increasingly pressing concern to the protectors of the Catholic faith. This explains why the first examination of Paracelsus’s works was conducted exclusively from a theological perspective, that is, the censors had only corrected passages in which Paracelsus insulted ecclesiastics or where he deviated from Catholic dogma, while they left his philosophical and medical ideas untouched.⁵⁶ This fate had befallen many physicians and naturalists of the time, including Conrad Gessner, Leonhart Fuchs, Gerolamo Cardano, and Thomas Erastus.

Paracelsians and iatrochemists began working and practicing in Italy later than in northern European countries (notably Germany and France), and also later than in central Europe. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the infiltration of Paracelsianism started to become visible also in Italy, where it linked up with pre-existing chemical and alchemical traditions.⁵⁷ For example, Roman physicians such as Matthias Guttic, Pietro Castelli, Leonardo Fioravanti, and Giacomo Antonio Cortuso used chemical prepared remedies that were also used by Paracelsus, even though no Roman physician from before 1600 ever referred to him explicitly.⁵⁸ Their medical remedies were generally stripped of their original Paracelsian philosophical motives, and they only maintained the use of chemical preparations for medicines.⁵⁹ The delayed diffusion of Paracelsianism in Italy can be explained as the outcome of two factors. The first was the strong influence of humanism and the Galenic tradition; the second was religious censorship. The prohibition of some works of Paracelsus by the Index of Forbidden Books, and the provenance of most printed Paracelsian texts from the foremost Protestant centres of publishing (especially from the press of Pietro Perna in Basel), considerably slowed down the

spread of his works in Italy. In the seventeenth century, however, one encounters a more forceful presence of Paracelsianism in Italy, which now went beyond recipes and included the theoretical underpinnings, such as in the works of Zeferiele Tommaso Bovio, Marco Cornacchini, and Fabrizio Bartoletti.⁶⁰

By the early 1610s, with the wide diffusion of Paracelsianism on the Continent and its association with so many other movements and ideas, Paracelsus works were investigated more thoroughly, this time from a twofold perspective, both confessional and philosophical-scientific.

III

When viewed in this larger framework, the assessment of Paracelsus's work by Faber seems indeed to be fitting these new circumstances. Faber was a physician himself, and it was not uncommon for the Congregation for the Index to ask experts in the field to investigate suspected works.⁶¹ Moreover, Faber was a trusted institutional figure. In 1607, less than a decade before he wrote his report on Paracelsus, he became keeper of the Vatican's botanical gardens.⁶² He regarded himself as a dedicated Catholic and, according to a Protestant pamphlet of the period, he had even attempted to convert travelling Protestants to the Catholic faith on a papal request.⁶³ More specifically, since he was German, he could read all of Paracelsus's works, not only those which had been translated. In the fall of 1615, it would seem that there could hardly have been a more suitable person to investigate the works of a German-speaking medical reformer who was generally associated with Protestantism.⁶⁴ Given all of these circumstances, the moderate tone and balanced judgement of the report come as a surprise. In order to explain this tolerant judgement, we need to know more about the author.

In 1611, Faber was appointed fellow (*socius*) of the famous Accademia dei Lincei in Rome, which had been founded in 1603 by Prince Federico Cesi. Cesi's original aim with the Lincean Academy had been to free "the intellect from all forms of enslavement".⁶⁵ The Lincean Virginio Cesarini explained to a friend, who was interested in joining the Academy, that the rules of the Academy were "freedom of the mind, the love for the truth and confession of ignorance".⁶⁶ This intellectual freedom expressed itself in a noteworthy combination of empiricism and a search for ancient secrets: "[n]ew and direct observations of nature appear in the context of arcane antiquarian researches".⁶⁷ Not wishing to rely on authoritative texts alone, the Linceans investigated nature by means of observations and experiments, exploring for example, the medicinal virtues of plants and animals.⁶⁸ Many of their high-quality pictures are preserved, with which they identified and illustrated the plants and animals they investigated.⁶⁹ The Academy's aim to develop and protect intellectual freedom also expressed itself in their "strong commitment to saving private libraries that were at risk of being destroyed by the intervention of the Inquisition".⁷⁰

A first noteworthy conjunction of Faber's own scientific enterprises with his Lincean affiliation was in the field of astronomy. On behalf of the Academy, Faber maintained connections with patrons back in Germany, where he had been born and where he now promoted the work of the Academy's most famous member, Galileo Galilei, who had been elected in the same year as Faber, in 1611.⁷¹ Like all other members of the Academy, Faber was asked to support Galilei in every way he could.⁷² And so, he helped publish Galilei's *Assayer*, and together with the other Linceans, Galilei and Faber observed the stars

through their telescopes in the period in which the controversy with the Jesuit Christopher Scheiner over the sunspots was to erupt.⁷³

In 1613, the Linceans helped Galilei publish his *Letters on the Sunspots*, letters that had originally been sent by Galilei to another Lincean, Mark Welser.⁷⁴ In these letters, Galilei openly defended the Copernican cosmology – a worldview that in those years was beginning to attract the attention of the Vatican censors, among whom we must count the cardinals Maffeo Barberini and Roberto Bellarmino. Both cardinals were, at first, impressed by Galilei's research. However, over time, their attitude towards Galilei changed, and Bellarmino "became more and more concerned with Galilei's heliocentric implications".⁷⁵ Maffeo Barberini (the future Urban VIII), in turn, warned the Linceans to be cautious in expressing their cosmological views. Of course, they could hypothetically discuss the Copernican theory, but, in Barberini's own words, "it is very necessary to emphasize frequently that one should submit to the authority of those who have jurisdiction over human reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures".⁷⁶

In the end, as is well known, the Vatican decided to take a firm stance. In a decree of February 1616, the Vatican censors judged two propositions in Copernicus's *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium* to be "erroneous in faith" and "formally heretical", namely that the sun is immovable at the centre of the world and that the earth moves around the sun.⁷⁷ As a consequence, Copernicus's *De revolutionibus* was placed on the Congregation's Index of Forbidden Books, "donec corrigatur". Galileo's name was not mentioned in the decree, but a few days after its publication, on 25 February 1616, the Pope ordered Cardinal Bellarmino to warn Galileo against openly defending censored opinions.⁷⁸

Before their interest in astronomy exploded thanks to the appointment of Galileo, the Linceans had above all been interested in medicine, chemistry, and natural philosophy, and – importantly for our current purposes – Paracelsianism in particular.⁷⁹ One of the original members, the Dutchman Johannes van Heeck (1579–1630), for one, was interested in astrology, magic, and medicine. After his appointment to the Academy, his natural philosophy "became a combination of Ficinian, Fernelian and Paracelsian ideas".⁸⁰ Van Heeck met several Paracelsians, including Joseph Du Chesne, who has already been mentioned as one of the Paracelsian proponents in the Paris dispute of the years 1603–1607. When in Prague, van Heeck also met two of the most convinced expositors of the Paracelsian sciences, namely Oswald Croll and Franz Hartmann, and dedicated a book on magic and medicine to Emperor Rudolf II.⁸¹

Van Heeck was, however, not the only Lincean interested in Paracelsianism. Johann Schreck (1576–1630), one of the German fellows of the Academy, also worked on chemistry and natural magic. As a member of the Academy, he wrote a *Compendium* in which he presented several passages on medical matters derived from Paracelsus's works.⁸² These passages, however, dealt, not only with medical issues, but were embedded in the larger context of Paracelsian astrology, magic, and natural philosophy, in which the microcosm–macrocosm analogy and the theory of the *tria prima* played a central role.⁸³ In addition, Schreck produced a lexicon to explain the more obscure Paracelsian terms. Indeed, he was particularly interested in the occult and magical aspects of Paracelsus. Importantly, he discussed the magical ideas contained in the Paracelsian Robert Fludd's *Utriusque cosmi* (1617) with none other than Johannes Faber.

As for Faber himself, he was interested in chemical experiments and anatomical investigations, specifically concerning the anatomy of the reproductive organs.⁸⁴ As one of the

leading physicians in Rome, he practised dissections, and both at La Sapienza and in the Roman hospitals he mentored other physicians while at the same time practising surgery.⁸⁵ Not wishing to rely exclusively on traditional medical authorities, Faber aimed to acquire new insights through observation and experiment. This inclination also brought him in contact with Paracelsian notions and practices as well as the use of chemical remedies. So he corresponded concerning medical matters and the Paracelsian microcosm–macrocosm analogy with Ferrante Imperato, another supporter of the spagyric (i.e. Paracelsian) art.⁸⁶ Partly through Imperato, Faber developed an interest in the chemical sciences and discussed chemical experiments in his *Oratio* on 20 November 1622, especially with respect to solvents.⁸⁷

It is highly significant that, in one of their founding documents and long before Faber was elected to their Academy, the Linceans had described themselves as “most sagacious investigators of the arcane sciences and dedicated to the Paracelsian disciplines”.⁸⁸ Indeed, they experimented with chemically produced cures, and through their chemical experiments aimed to develop an understanding of the invisible causes in nature. The Paracelsian heritage had thus undoubtedly affected the Lincean Academy – and the echo of their sympathies can be heard in Faber’s report.

IV

The year 1616 seems to mark the culmination of several developments. As we have seen earlier, during the years prior to 1616, Paracelsianism had spread all over Europe and, furthermore, had become associated with Protestantism. It had been further radicalised in the Rosicrucian movement. By the early seventeenth century, it also entered Italy.⁸⁹ In Rome, the heart of the Catholic world, the Lincean Academy had already in 1603 defined itself as aspiring to Paracelsian wisdom. Around 1616, several controversies surrounding Paracelsianism peaked, the last of the Rosicrucian manifestos was published, and Libavius penned his uncompromising attack against both these manifestos and the Paracelsians in general, while the Lincean Schreck composed his *Compendium* of passages taken out of Paracelsus’s work⁹⁰ and Fludd defended Paracelsus and the Rosicrucians in his *Apologia compendiaria, fraternitatem de Rosea Cruce ... , veritatis quasi Fluctibus abluens et abstergens*.⁹¹ In 1616, the Jesuit Jean Roberti was to attack the weapon-salve attributed to Paracelsus, being consequently contradicted by Rudolphus Goclenius, who, in his *Synarthrosis magnetica opposita infaustae anatomiae Joh. Roberti D. Theologi et Jesuitae pro defensione tractatus de magnetica vulnerum curatione* (1617), defended the weapon-salve. The interest of the Congregation for the Index in Paracelsus may thus be seen as a response to this forceful presence of Paracelsianism on the intellectual stage. The proponents of that new movement not only interfered in scientific matters (chemistry, medicine, biology), but also in matters of a religious nature over which the Catholic Church understood itself as the ultimate authority.

The year 1616 was also the year in which the Catholic authorities clarified its position on Copernicus. In the first two months of 1616, Galileo was warned by Bellarmino against further discussing Copernicanism as more than a mere hypothesis, and Copernicus’s work was placed on the Index. In precisely the same early months of 1616, Faber delivered his report on the works of Paracelsus. Although this coincidence is devoid of causal connections, it points to the same clash of opposite intentions: on the one hand, there are the

efforts of the Congregation to contain the possibly dangerous consequences of non-Aristotelian modern science, including Paracelsus as well as Copernicus and Galileo, for Catholic theology; on the other, there are the attempts of the Linceans to develop forms of mediation between Catholic faith and modern scientific developments. Faber, papal botanist, member of the Lincei, and consultant to the Congregation for the Index, embodies the tension between these two approaches in an exemplary way.

The historical coincidence becomes even more striking when one realises that two of the cardinals who ordered the investigation of Galileo's work and who placed Copernicus's *De revolutionibus* on the Index, namely Maffeo Barberini and Roberto Bellarmine, had previously been involved as members of the Index in Faber's investigation of Paracelsus's works, when they granted him his reading permit.

In what with hindsight might look like an attempt at finding a middle way, Faber was lenient in his judgement on Paracelsus. Contrary to the sixteenth-century reports, Faber did not simply point to heretical or otherwise deviating passages, which the censors would subsequently have to put on their list of *corrigenda*, but he defended him from the charge of being a Protestant, while also expressing his admiration for Paracelsus's medical innovations.⁹² He thus shifted the censors' attention away from the potentially noxious heretical views towards a scientific and medical evaluation of Paracelsus's works. At a time when Paracelsianism was strongly associated with Protestantism and Rosicrucianism, this shift away from a solely religious evaluation is certainly remarkable. To be sure, this stance may in part be explained by the fact that Faber was a physician himself. But equally important is the fact that he was surrounded by scholars who were interested in Paracelsian medical and chemical practice. Importantly, the practice of expurgating texts allowed one to decide which passages were relevant from a scientific point of view and which were not. Put differently, Faber's report may in fact be read as an attempt to protect Paracelsus's chemical remedies and medical innovations.⁹³

Whereas the Congregation formulated a clear judgment on the Copernican theory, their response to the spread of Paracelsianism remained undecided. It is unknown whether Faber's report pushed the Congregation for the Index to any formal decision, because his report is not mentioned in the extant minutes of the meetings of the Congregation from that period.⁹⁴ As a matter of fact, in the end, the Congregation stuck to the prohibitions of the 1596 Index, and did not deem it necessary to promulgate further restrictive measures concerning the Swiss physician.⁹⁵ Unlike Copernicanism, Paracelsianism was, after all, a very elusive phenomenon, both from a scientific as well as from a religious point of view. In this respect, the report by Faber, reproduced in [Appendix I](#) and translated in [Appendix II](#), shows the intersection of science and religion at the heart of the Catholic institutions in Rome in the fatal year 1616, which would for centuries trouble the relation between theological orthodoxy and the nascent natural sciences.

Notes

1. For these prohibitions, see Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 2166–96.
2. See, for example, Brevaglieri, "Science, Books and Censorship," 133–58; Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine," 175–94.

3. The Master of the Sacred Palace was a papal theologian who had the authority for book censorship in Rome and its surroundings, including the granting of the *imprimatur* and reading permits. At the outset of his assessment, Faber states that he received a “licentia” (licence for the reading of forbidden books) from the Master of the Sacred Palace, who had recently passed away. He most likely referred to the Dominican Luis Ystella, who had died on 5 September 1614; see Quétif and Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti*, vol. 2, 391. Reading permits for Paracelsus’s works were frequently granted. The (fragmentary) documentation kept in the archives of the Roman Congregations attests that in the last decades of the sixteenth century, at least six permits were released, and in the seventeenth century over 50 (without counting his possible inclusion in general requests for medical books); see Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 2596–779; and Baldini and Spruit, vol. 2 (in preparation).
4. Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 2166. The works that were suspended “until corrected” were: *Chirurgia maior*, *Chirurgia minor*, *Paramirum*, *Philosophia magna* and *Epistola de spiritibus planetarum*.
5. Sudhoff, *Bibliographia Paracelsica*.
6. For an introduction to the religious publications of Paracelsus’s writings throughout the centuries, see Gantenbein, *Paracelsus*, especially 37–69.
7. Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 2171–96.
8. Paracelsus, *Opera*.
9. Faber’s as yet unpublished Latin report is kept at the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in the Vatican (abbreviated to ACDF for Archivium Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei), Index, *Protocolli*, BB (II.a.24), fols. 551r–555v. Faber most probably used the 1603 edition of Paracelsus’ works by Johannes Huser (see note 8). When discussing Faber’s report, reference will be made to this edition.
10. Paracelsus, *Columnnarum, liber 4* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 143: “Meint ihr ich sey allein Lutherus? [...] Ich wirdt ihm und euch zu arbeiten geben. Du weist wol, ich lass Lutherum sein ding verantworten, ich will das mein selbst verantworten. Dann er soll mir nicht ein Kincken auffthun in meinen Schuhen”. In the table of contents, the full title of this text is: “Liber quattor columnnarum medicinae (sonst Paramirum genannt)”. However, the work titled “Paragranum” discusses the four pillars of medicine, not “Paramirum”, and the passage itself can be found in the work “Paragranum”, see Weeks, *Paracelsus*, 90. The reference here to “Paramirum” thus seems to be a fallacy.
11. Paracelsus, *Liber De sanctorum auctoritate*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 240. In this section, Paracelsus discusses the powers and signs of the saints through their faith in Christ. Faber refers to page 241: “Dann Gott ist wunderbarlich in seinen Wercken und in seinen Heiligen”. Paracelsus had written several works on Maria, see, for example, Biegger, “*De invocatione beatae Mariae virginis*”; Gause, *Paracelsus*.
12. With “Swiss Spirit”, Faber possibly referred to Geneva, that is, Calvinism, or more generally to the fact that the Swiss Confederation at the time was the home to various Protestant groups, including the followers of the Zurich reformer Ulrich Zwingli (1484–1531).
13. Paracelsus, *De morbis ex incantationibus et impressionibus inferioribus* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 139: “Unnd mocht man durch unsere Weisheit hinzu bringen ein nutzere Ordnung, dann Christus geben hatt, so solls nicht beschehen, dann Ursach, die Sathanische krafft so da eingemischt wirdt. Als das Nachtmahl Christi ist einfaltig beschehen: Nuhn ist ein Elevatio daraus worden: Was ist sie? Ich setz unnd lass bleiben, es sey schooner, hupscher, lieblicher unnd feiner, dann ob dem Tisch sitzen. [...] Dann die Zauberey, Hexerey, Augurey falt darein, die sunst nicht darein fallen mag”. For interpretations of Paracelsus’ view on religious ceremonies, see, for example, Matthießen, “Die Form des Religiösen Verhaltens bei Hohenheim,” Daniel, “Paracelsus on Baptism and the Acquiring of the Eternal Body.”
14. Paracelsus, *Morborum invisibilium, liber 4*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 103–9. According to Faber, this entire section should be removed. The passage to which Faber refers is at page 104: “Ihr wissent, wie der lebendig Leib kan und mag durch die krafft der Arzney die kranken gesund machen: Also sollet ihr auch wissen, dass in einem todten Mumia dergleichen

solchs auch beschehen mag. [...] [U]nd also im nammen der Heyligen die ding für zeichen geacht worden, als ob ein Heylig uber die Natur solchs thue, so aber alles allein naturliche ding geseyn sindt”.

15. Paracelsus, *De origine morborum invisibilium*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 93–4. Paracelsus discusses several diseases that are related to saints. About St. Anthony’s Fire Paracelsus wrote: “Sant [sic] Anthony Feur ein Herr des Feurs, der doch kein Schmidt, kein Eiser nie angeblasen hatt, unnd vergessen dass er auch kein Herr ist der Elementen, unnd so er noch bey leben solte syn, so musste ers entlehnen, oder selbst auff schlagen”.
16. Paracelsus, *Azoth, sive De linga et linea vitae* in *Opera*, vol. 2, 533: “So hatt doch die Schone Gestalt des Adams der Eva also gewaltig gefallen, das sie sich vergaffet hatt mit den Augen. Dann der Sathan ist ihr erschienen in Adams gestalt. Merket wie Adam jetzt ist, also ist ir in solcher gestalt Lucifer erschienen, wie Adam nach dem Fall ausgesehen hatt. Dann Adam hatt für dem Fall keine Virgam Naturae gehabt, darumb sich auch Eva an dem Adam nicht vergaffet hatte. Dann wie der Adam jetzt erscheinet Membro Virili, so ist das an dem Adam ein Monstrosisch Zeichen”.
17. Paracelsus, *De pestilente, tractatus 1, Cabala* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 328: “Der Erdboden, das Wasser, der Lufft, das Feur, haben ihren ursprung auss dreyen Dingen. [...] Diese drey ding haben eine Mutter gehabt, darauss sei beschaffen worden, das ist gewesen die Mutter, nemlich das Wasser. [...] Und werden also diese drey ding mit ihrem rechten Nammen genennet, Sulphur, Mercurius und Sal”.
18. Paracelsus, *De pestilente, quomodo pestis supernaturaliter hominem interficiat* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 343–4. The quotation is from Faber’s report. Paracelsus had written: “[I]n der Sonnen ist ein heymlich und verborgens Evastralisches wesen und Spiritus: Welcher ein grosse und gar mechtige gemeinschaft hatt mit dem Evestro des Thierischen Menschen und noch mehr mit den Plagis. [...] dadurch ihr dann so ein Thierisch Leben führet, welchem Gott feindt ist, und nicht will, dass ihr so Vichisch leben sollet, Inficiert unnd vergiffet werdet. [...] Und wie nach dem Zorn die Streiche gezuckt werden: Also auch Streiche aussgehn von der Sonnen. Solche Streiche, und Giften, und Krankheiten gibt die Sonne den Sternen, uns zu straffen: Als dann giessen die Sterne ihren empfangenen gifft uber uns auss”.
19. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 537: “Nuhn ist Gottes wille gewesen, dass der Mensch essen soll auff Englische weise. Das beweiset Ioannes Baptista [...] Nuhn hatt Ioannes Englisch gessen, im Mundt, und nicht im Magen. Dann er ist nicht zu Stuel gangen, und wir alle können noch also essen, wie der Ioanes gethan hatt”.
20. Paracelsus, *De caducis* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 595. Because diseases come from the heavens, the physician should understand the signs in the heaven and, as such, be an astronomer: “[I]m Wasser [ist] ein Astrum, welchs in aller weiss und form, all Coniunctiones hatt, wie das Feur, dergleichen auch sein Planeten und andern Gestirn. [...] Solches zeig ich darumb an, das ihr bey den eussern dingen der Welt, den Menschen sollen erkennen, durch Geomantiam, durch Hydromantiam, durch Pyromantiam, und durch Necromantiam”. This does not mean, for Paracelsus, that the physician can forecast the future through the stars of the elements. The stars are responsible for the microcosm–macrocosm correspondence. As for Geomancy and other “mancies”, these are only different ways of learning to know the virtues active in the world.
21. Paracelsus, *De morbis somnii*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 141. The quotation is from Faber’s report. Paracelsus had written: “Der rein ist, der ist ein gutter Weissager, natürlich wie die Vogel: und deren Vogel weissagung seindt nicht wider die Natur, sondern auss der Natur, ein jedlicher, wie er dann ist. Diese ding, die die Vogel also verkunden, praesagiert auch der Schlauff: dann es ist der Traum geist, der da ist der unsichtbare Leib der Natur: In dem zu wissen, ist, so ein Mensch weissagt, so redt er nit auss dem Teuffel, nit auss dem Sathan, nit auss dem heyiligen Geist, sondern er redt auss geborner Natur, des unsichtigen Leibs, der dann Magiam lehrt, auss dem der Magus ist. [...] Ist aber das einig und das einig wesen, wie der Traum: da auch keiner nichts probieren kan, dann ohn alle Prob reden: und reden das, so ihm dasselbig Licht des Cabalischen Geist fürhalt, unwissender dingen redt und Weissagt”.
22. See Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 440–69. Baldini and Spruit show the difference between natural astrology and judiciary astrology, explaining

also the difference between a direct *influence* of the stars on the earth, and the mere *correspondence* of what is written in the stars and the events on the earth.

23. Brevaglieri also notes Faber's moderate position, see Brevaglieri, "Science, Books and Censorship," 155.
24. Sudhoff, *Bibliographia Paracelsica*, 381, 406–7.
25. Kühlmann and Telle have published important material on Paracelsianism, see Kühlmann and Telle, *Der Frühparacelsismus*, vols. 1–3.
26. For an introduction to Paracelsus's life and theories, see Pagel, *Paracelsus* and Webster, *Paracelsus*.
27. See especially Kühlmann and Telle, *Der Frühparacelsismus*, vol. 1, 18–19.
28. Sudhoff, *Bibliographia Paracelsica*.
29. For Paracelsianism in England, see Debus, *The English Paracelsians*; for Denmark; Shackelford, *A Philosophical Path*, 23–139; Shackelford, "To Be or Not To Be," 35–70; Grell, "The Reception of Paracelsianism," 78–94; for France, Kahn, *Alchimie et Paracelsisme*; for Germany and Switzerland, Kühlmann and Telle, *Der Frühparacelsismus*, vols. 1–3; for Italy, Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine," 175–94; Zanier, "La medicina paracelsiana," 627–49; Galluzzi, "Motivi paracelsiani," 31–62; Perifano, "Considération," 49–61; Celati, "Heresy, Medicine and Paracelsianism," 5–37.
30. On Severinus and the dissemination of his ideas, see Shackelford, *A Philosophical Path*.
31. Severinus, *Idea Medicinae Philosophicae*. Basel was, in fact, a famous printing centre of Paracelsian (and anti-Paracelsian) works. One of the best-known publishers of Paracelsian works in Basel was the Italian Pietro Perna.
32. For an introduction into a number of Paracelsian debates, see Debus, *The Chemical Philosophy*. For Paracelsian debates in France, see especially Kahn, *Alchimie et Paracelsisme*. For his microcosm–macrocosm analogy, Paracelsus was inspired by Hermes Trismegistus, who already suggested such an analogy in his *Corpus Hermeticum*. Like Paracelsus, some Paracelsians, such as Thomas Tymme and Gerard Dorn, regarded the microcosm and the macrocosm as chemical entities: creation, to them, was thus a chemical separation.
33. Erastus, *Disputationes de medicina*, "Pars prima-quarta". Erastus had, however, also anonymously criticised Severinus views as Manichaean Heresy: Shackelford, "Early Reception," 123–35. See further Grell, "The Acceptable Face of Paracelsianism," 248. See also Debus, "Paracelsianism," 230–1. Other examples of conciliating works are Andernach, *De medicina veteri* and Sennert, *De Chymicorum cum Aristotelicis et Galenicis consensu et dissensu*. All three authors wrote in Latin, and thus intended their work for the scholarly community.
34. Kahn, *Alchimie et Paracelsisme*, 353–93.
35. Kühlmann and Telle, *Der Frühparacelsismus*, vol. 2, 11–12; see also vol. 3, 22.
36. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 6–8.
37. *Ibid.*, vol. 3, 27.
38. An extensive work on Paracelsianism in France is Kahn, *Alchimie et Paracelsisme*.
39. For Libavius, see Moran, *Andreas Libavius and the Transformation of Alchemy*; Hannaway, *The Chemists*; Moran, "Medicine," 135–50.
40. For an extensive overview of the Paris dispute, see Kahn, *Alchimie et Paracelsisme* and Debus, *The French Paracelsians*.
41. Webster, "Paracelsus, Paracelsianism," 9–27.
42. Paracelsus, *Columnarum*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 143: "Meint ihr ich sey allein Lutherus? [...] Ich wirdt ihm und euch zu arbeiten geben". For the title of this text, see note 10. See also Gilly, "Theophrastia Sancta," 151–85. Paracelsus had also rejected the Pope, especially in his *De septem punctis idolatriae christianae* of 1525. He wrote that "The Pope and his party cry out for blood: kill, hang, burn, drown etc. [...]. This is what the Pope does, as is apparent, and Luther, too, as is apparent, that nobody is allowed to speak against them with impunity, but risks being hanged!" The passage is cited by Carlos Gilly – see Gilly, "Theophrastia Sancta," 153. This work was most probably not read by Faber, since it was not included in the Huser edition of 1603, nor was it mentioned in the sixteenth-century reports of the Congregation for the Index.

43. Kahn, "The Rosicrucian Hoax," 275.
44. Gantenbein, *Paracelsus*, 39; Telle, "Johann Huser in seinen Briefen," 159–248.
45. Gantenbein, *Paracelsus*, 38–40.
46. On Paracelsus's theology, see Biegger, "*De Invocatione Beatae Mariae Virginis*"; Daniel, *Paracelsus' Astronomia Magna*; Gantenbein, *Paracelsus*; Gause, *Paracelsus*; the articles in Goldammer, *Paracelsus in Neuen Horizonten*; and Webster, "Paracelsus Confronts the Saints," 403–21. For descriptions of Paracelsus's theology throughout his life and oeuvre, see especially Webster, *Paracelsus*; Weeks, *Paracelsus*.
47. Gantenbein, *Paracelsus*, 38–9; Gilly, "Theophrastia Sancta," 151–85; Gilly, "Johann Arndt und die 'dritte Reformation' im Zeichen des Paracelsus," 60–77; Miller-Guinsburg, "Von Paracelsus zu Böhme," 96–118; Weeks, *Paracelsus*, 185–94.
48. Moran, *The Alchemical World*, 95. See also Edighoffer, *Les Rose-Croix*; Edighoffer, *Les Rose-Croix et la crise de conscience*.
49. *Confessio Fraternitatis*, 33, 41.
50. Haslmayr, *Antwort*. The publisher of this work is unknown. Other proponents of the "Theophrastia Sancta" were, for example, the Paracelsians Karl Widemann and August von Anhalt. See further Gilly, "*Theophrastia Sancta*," 180. See also Gilly, *Adam Haslmayr*.
51. Gilly, "*Theophrastia Sancta*," 167.
52. Gilly, *Adam Haslmayr*, 44–58, especially 58.
53. Shackelford, "Rosicrucianism," 203.
54. Kühlmann and Telle, *Der Frühparacelsismus*, vol. 3, 31–2, 1241–60.
55. Tilton, "The Rosicrucian Manifestos," 138–9.
56. See Section I. See also Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 2166–96. See also Bogner, "Paracelsus auf dem Index," 189–530.
57. See Celati, "Heresy, Medicine and Paracelsianism," 5–37; Clericuzio, "La critica della tradizione," 367–90; Clericuzio, "Chemical Medicine," 59–79.
58. Clericuzio, "Chemical Medicines in Rome," 282–5, 300–2. Clericuzio compares Castelli's position towards Paracelsus's philosophical ideas to both Severinus and Libavius.
59. Clericuzio, "Chemical Medicines in Rome," 282.
60. *Ibid.*, 285–6. On the spread of Paracelsianism in Italian courts and academies, and on the use of spagyric pharmacology in Italy, see also Clericuzio, "Chemical Medicine," 61–78 and Clericuzio, "La critica della tradizione," 375–8 and 383–6.
61. Baldini and Spruit, *Catholic Church and Modern Science*, vol. 1, 57–8; Perifano, "Considération," 49–61; Brevaglieri, "Science, Books and Censorship."
62. For further biographical information, see Gabrieli, "L'Archivio," 61–77; *ibid.*, "Bibliografia lincea IV," 276–334; Brevaglieri, "Science, Books and Censorship." For Faber's library, see Cortesi, "Per la storia," 105–12 and De Renzi, "La biblioteca," 516–24. See also note 3.
63. The pamphlet was written by Francis Broccard, titled "His Alarm to All Protestant Princes," and was published in 1603, see De Renzi, "Courts and Conversions," 429–49.
64. Faber also wrote a brief *censura* of Andreas Libavius's works; see ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, AA (II.a.23), fols. 84r–85r.
65. Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine," 177.
66. De Renzi, "Courts and Conversions," 439; Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine," 177.
67. Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx*, 1.
68. De Renzi, "Medical Competence," 551–68, 561–2.
69. See, for example, the drawings provided in Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx*, 15–64.
70. De Renzi, "Courts and Conversions," 436.
71. De Renzi, "Medical Competence," 561; De Renzi, "Courts and Conversions," 437.
72. After 1611, the main task the Linceans pursued together was supporting Galileo. See Clericuzio and De Renzi, "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy," 194.
73. Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx*, 108; De Renzi, "Courts and Conversions," 438.
74. Galileo, *Istoria e Dimostrazioni*.
75. Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx*, 107.
76. Galilei, *Opere*, vol. 12, 146; Freedberg, *The Eye of the Lynx*, 130.

77. Finocchiaro, *The Galileo Affair*, 146; Fantoli, “The Disputed Injunction,” 118.
78. McMullin, “The Church’s Ban,” 150–3. For more information about the Galileo Affair, see especially Finocchiaro, *The Galileo Affair*. See also the other articles in: Ernan McMullin, *The Church and Galileo*.
79. Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine,” 175.
80. *Ibid.*, 180–1.
81. *Ibid.*, 182.
82. Schreck, *Compendium*; see Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine,” 189–90.
83. Most of the Paracelsian ideas discussed in the *Compendium* can be found in both *Opus Paramirum* and *Volumen Paramirum*, see Paracelsus, “Opus Paramirum,” 1–186; Paracelsus, “Volumen Paramirum,” 168–240. See further Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy,” 189–90.
84. Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine,” 191. See also Clericuzio, “Chemical Medicines in Rome,” 288–90.
85. De Renzi, “Medical Competence,” 563.
86. See Stendardo, *Ferrante Imperato*.
87. Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine,” 191–2.
88. Galluzzi, “Motivi Paracelsiani,” 47; “arcanarum sagacissimi indagatores scientiarum et Paracelsicae dediti disciplinae”.
89. See especially Zanier, “La medicina Paracelsiana,” 627–49 and Galuzzi, “Motivi Paracelsiani,” 31–62.
90. Manuscript in Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de médecine, MS H 461.
91. Andreas Libavius, *Wolmeinenendes Bedencken*; Clericuzio and De Renzi, “Medicine,” 189, n. 78.
92. See Section I.
93. This possibility is suggested by Brevaglieri; see Brevaglieri, “Science, Books and Censorship,” 154–5.
94. See ACDF, Index, *Diari*, 2, fols. 122v–138r (the minutes of the meetings from January to June 1618).
95. See, for example, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 152.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the two anonymous referees, Antonio Clericuzio, Didier Kahn, and Christoph Lüthy for their helpful suggestions and comments on this paper.

Notes on contributors

Lyke de Vries is a PhD candidate at the Center for the History of Philosophy and Science (Nijmegen), where she also teaches philosophy. She is currently writing her dissertation on the eschatological aspects of Rosicrucianism and Paracelsianism.

Leen Spruit received his PhD from the University of Amsterdam (1987), and is professor of Intellectual History at Radboud University. His publications include *Species Intelligibilis. From Perception to Knowledge*, 2 vols., (Leiden: Brill, 1994–1995) and *Catholic Church and Modern Science. Documents from the Roman Archives of the Holy Office and the Index*. Vol. 1: *The Sixteenth Century*, 4 vols. (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009).

Bibliography

Primary sources

Andernach, Günther von. *De medicina veteri et nova tum cognoscenda, tum faciunda commentarii duo*. 2 vols. Basel: Henricus Petrus, 1571.

- Andreae, Johann Valentin (?). *Confessio Fraternitatis*. Reprinted by Richard van Dülmen. Stuttgart: Calwer, 2000.
- Du Chesne, Joseph (Quercetanus). *Liber de priscorum philosophorum verae medicinae materia, praeparationis modo, atque in curandis morbis, praestantia*. [...] *Quercetani de dogmaticorum medicorum legitima, & restituta, medicamentorum praeparatione, libri duo. Itémque selecta quaedam consilia medica, clarissimis medicis Europaeis dicata*. Geneva: apud haeredes Eustachij Vignon, 1603.
- Erastus, Thomas. *Disputationes de medicina nova Philippi Paracelsi*. Pars prima-quarta. Basel: Pietro Perna, 1571–73.
- Fludd, Robert. *Anatomiae amphitheatrum*. Frankfurt: J.T. De Bry, 1623.
- Fludd, Robert. *Apologia compendiaris; fraternitatem de Rosea Cruce suspicionis et infamiae maculis aspersam, veritatis quasi Fluctibus abluens et abstergens*. Leiden: Apud Godefridum Basson, 1616.
- Galilei, Galileo. *Istoria e Dimostrazioni intorno alle macchie solari e loro accidenti comprese in tre lettere scritte all'illustrissimo signor Marco Velsari Linceo Duumviro D'Augusta ... dal signor Galileo Galilei Linceo*. Rome: Giacomo Mascardi, 1613.
- Galilei, Galileo. *Opere: Le Opere di Galileo Galilei*. Edited by Antonio Favaro. 20 vols, vol. 7. Florence: Tipografia Barbéra, 1890–1909.
- Goclenius, Rudolphus. *Synarthrosis magnetica opposita infaustae anatomiae Joh. Roberti D. Theologi et Jesuitae pro defensione tractatus de magnetica vulnerum curatione*. Marburg: Apud Jonam Saurium, 1617.
- Haslmayr, Adam. *Antwort an die lobwürdige Brüderschafft der Theosophen von RosenCreutz N.N. vom Adam Haselmayr [...] Ad Faman Fraternitatis einfeltigst geantwortet*. Hall: 1612.
- Helmont, Van Joan Baptista. *De magnetica vulnerum curatione*. Paris: Apud Victorem le Roy, 1621.
- Index librorum prohibitorum Alexandri VIII Pontificis Maximi iussu editus*. Rome: Ex Typographia Reverendae Camerae Apostolicae, 1664.
- Libavius, Andreas. *Analysis Confessionis Fraternitatis de Rosea Cruce*. Frankfurt: excudebat Nicolaus Hoffmannus, impensis Petri Kopfij, 1615.
- Libavius, Andreas. *Examen philosophiae novae*. Frankfurt: Excudebat Nicolaus Hoffmannus, Impensis Petri Kopfij, 1615.
- Libavius, Andreas. *Wolmeinendes bedencken von der Fama und Confessio der Bruderschafft des Rosen Creutzes*. Frankfurt: S.I., 1616.
- Paracelsus. *Bücher und Schrifften*. Edited by Johannes Huser. Basel: Conrad Waldkirch, 1589–91.
- Paracelsus. *Opera, Bücher und Schrifften: so viel deren zur Handt gebracht: und vor wenig Jahren, mit und auss ihren glaubwürdigen eigener han[d]geschriebenen Originalien collacioniert, verglichen, und verbessert, und durch Ioannem Huserum Brisgoium in zehen unterschiedliche Theil in Truck gegeben; jetz von newem mit vleiß ubersehen auch mit Tractaten gemehrt*. 2 vols. Strasburg: Lazari Zetzner, 1603.
- Quétif, Jacques, and Jacques Echard. *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis illustrati*. Vol. II. Paris: Ballard et Simar, 1719.
- Riolan, Jean, the Elder. *Apologia pro Hippocratis et Galeni medicina*. Paris: apud Hadrianum Perier, 1603.
- Roberti, Jean. *Goclenius Heautontimorumenos, id est curationis magneticae et unguenti armarii ruina*. [...] *cum fide descripsit* [...]. Luxemburg: excudebat Hubertus Reulandt, 1618.
- Sennert, Daniel. *De chymicorum cum Aristotelicis et Galenicis consensu ac dissensu*. Wittenberg: Apud Zachariam Schurerum, 1619.
- Severinus, Petrus. *Idea medicinae philosophicae fundamenta continens totius doctrinae Paracelsicae, Hippocraticae & Galenicae*. Basel: ex officina Sixti Henricpetri, 1571.

Secondary sources

- Baldini, Ugo, and Leen Spruit. *Catholic Church and Modern Science. Documents from the Roman Archives of the Holy Office and the Index*. Vol. I: The Sixteenth Century, 4 vols. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009.
- Biegger, Katherina. "De invocatione beatae Mariae virginis": Paracelsus und die Marienverehrung. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1990.

- Bogner, Ralf Georg. "Paracelsus auf dem Index: Zur kirchlichen Kommunikationskontrolle in der frühen Neuzeit." In *Analecta Paracelsica: Studien zum Nachleben Theophrast von Hohenheims im deutschen Kulturgebiet der frühen Neuzeit*, edited by Joachim Telle, 489–530. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994.
- Brevaglieri, Sabina. "Science, Books and Censorship in the Academy of the Lincei. Johannes Faber as Cultural Mediator." In *Conflicting Duties: Science, Medicine and Religion in Rome, 1550-1750*, edited by Maria Pia Donato and Jill Kraye, 133–157. London: Warburg Institute, 2009.
- Celati, Alessandra. "Heresy, Medicine and Paracelsianism in Sixteenth-Century Italy: The Case of Girolamo Donzellini (1513-1587)." *Gesnerus* 71, no. 1 (2014): 5–37.
- Clericuzio, Antonio. "Chemical Medicine and Paracelsianism in Italy (1550–1650)." In *The Theory and Practice of Reform*, edited by Margaret Pelling and Scott Mandelbrote, 59–79. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Clericuzio, Antonio. "Chemical Medicines in Rome. Pietro Castelli and the Vitriol Debate (1616–1626)." In *Conflicting Duties: Science, Medicine and Religion in Rome, 1550-1750*, edited by Maria Pia Donato and Jill Kraye, 281–302. London: Warburg Institute, 2009.
- Clericuzio, Antonio. "La critica della tradizione: medicina paracelsiana e farmacologia spagirica." In *Le scienze nel Rinascimento*, edited by Antonio Clericuzio and Germana Ernst, 367–390. Vicenza: Angelo Colla editore, 2008.
- Clericuzio, Antonio, and Silvia De Renzi. "Medicine, Alchemy and Natural Philosophy in the Early Accademia dei Lincei." In *Italian Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by D. S. Chambers and F. Quiviger, 175–194. London: Warburg Institute, 1995.
- Cortesi, Fabrizio. "Per la storia dei primi Lincei. Brevi notizie sulla Biblioteca di G. Faber, primo Segretario dell'Accademia dei Lincei." In *Atti del III Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani. Roma 1934–1935*, 105–112.
- Daniel, Dane T. "Coping with Heresy. Suchten, Toxites, and the Early Reception of Paracelsian's Theology." In *Chymists and Chymistry. Studies in the History of Alchemy and Early Modern Chemistry*, edited by Lawrence M. Principe, 53–62. Sagamore Beach: Watson Publishing International, 2007.
- Daniel, Dane T. "Paracelsus' Astronomia Magna: Bible-Based Science and the Religious Roots of the Scientific Revolution." Diss., Indiana University, 2002.
- Daniel, Dane T. "Paracelsus on Baptism and the Acquiring of the Eternal Body." In *Paracelsian Moments: Science, Medicine & Astrology in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Gerhild Scholz Williams and Charles D. Gunnoe, Jr., 117–134. Kirksville: Truman State Press, 2002.
- Debus, Allen. *The Chemical Philosophy. Paracelsian Science and Medicine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Mineola: Dover, 1977.
- Debus, Allen. *The English Paracelsians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Debus, Allen. *The French Paracelsians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Debus, Allen. "Paracelsianism and the Diffusion of the Chemical Philosophy in Early Modern Europe." In *Paracelsus. The Man and His Reputation, His Ideas and Their Transformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, 225–244. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Debus, Allen. "Robert Fludd and the Use of Gilbert's De Magnete in the Weapon-Salve Controversy." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 19, no. 4 (1964): 389–417.
- De Renzi, Silvia. "Courts and Conversions: Intellectual Battles and Natural Knowledge in Counter-Reformation Rome." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 27, no. 4 (1996): 429–449.
- De Renzi, Silvia. "La biblioteca di Johann Faber linceo." In *Bibliothecae selectae: da Cusano a Leopardi*, edited by E. Canone, 516–524. Florence: Leo Olschki, 1993.
- De Renzi, Silvia. "Medical Competence, Anatomy and the Polity in Seventeenth-Century Rome." *Renaissance Studies* 21, no. 4 (2007): 551–567.
- Edighoffer, Roland. *Les Rose-Croix*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1991.
- Edighoffer, Roland. *Les Rose-Croix et la crise de conscience européenne au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Dervy, 1998.
- Fantoli, Annibale. "The Disputed Injunction and Its Role in Galileo's Trial." In *The Church and Galileo*, edited by Ernan McMullin, 117–149. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

- Finocchiaro, Maurice E. *The Galileo Affair: A Documentary History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Freedberg, David. *The Eye of the Lynx. Galileo, His Friends, and the Beginnings of Modern Natural History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Gabrieli, Giuseppe. "Bibliografia lincea IV. Scritti di G. Faber linceo." In *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, s. VI, no. 9 (1933): 276–334.
- Gabrieli, Giuseppe. "L'Archivio di S. Maria in Aquiro o 'degli orfani' in Roma e le carte di Giov. Faber linceo." *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia patria* 51 (1928): 61–77.
- Galuzzi, Paolo. "Motivi Paracelsiani nella Toscana di Cosimo II e di Don Antonio dei Medici Alchimia, medicina, 'chimica' e riforma del sapere." In *Scienze, credenze occulte, livelli di cultura*, edited by Giancarlo Garfagnini, 31–62. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, for Istituto nazionale di studi sul Rinascimento, 1982.
- Gantenbein, Urs Leo. *Paracelsus. Theologische Werke I. Vita Beata – Vom seligen Leben*. New York: De Gruyter, 2008.
- Gause, Ute. *Paracelsus (1493–1541). Genese und Entfaltung seiner frühen Theologie*. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr, 1993.
- Gilly, Carlos. *Adam Haslmayr. Der erste Verkünder der Manifeste der Rosenkreuzer*. Amsterdam: In de Pelikaan, 1994.
- Gilly, Carlos. "Johann Arndt und die 'dritte Reformation' im Zeichen des Paracelsus." *Nova Acta Paracelsica. N.F.* 11 (1997): 60–77.
- Gilly, Carlos. "'Theophrastia Sancta'. Paracelsianism as a Religion in Conflict with the Established Churches." In *Paracelsus. The Man and His Reputation, His Ideas and Their Transformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, 151–185. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Goldammer, Kurt. *Paracelsus in neuen Horizonten*. Vienna, Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1986.
- Grell, Ole Peter. "The Acceptable Face of Paracelsianism: The Legacy of Idea Medicinae and the Introduction of Paracelsianism into Early Modern Denmark." In *Paracelsus. The Man and His Reputation, His Ideas and Their Transformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, 245–267. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Grell, Ole Peter. "The Reception of Paracelsianism in Early Modern Lutheran Denmark: From Peter Severinus, the Dane, to Ole Worm." *Medical History* 39, no. 1 (1995): 78–94.
- Hannaway, Owen. *The Chemists and the Word: The Didactic Origins of Chemistry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Kahn, Didier. *Alchimie et Paracelsisme en France (1567-1625)*. Geneva: DROZ, 2007.
- Kahn, Didier. "The Rosicrucian Hoax in France (1623-4)." In *Secrets of Nature. Astrology and Alchemy in Early Modern Europe*, edited by William R. Newman and Anthony Grafton, 235–344. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.
- Kühlmann, Wilhelm, and Joachim Telle. *Der Frühparacelsismus. Corpus Paracelsisticum. Dokumente Frühneuzeitlicher Naturphilosophie in Deutschland*. Vols. 1–3. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2001–04.
- Matthießen, Wilhelm. "Die Form des religiösen Verhaltens bei Theophrastus von Hohenheim." In *Paracelsus*, edited by Udo Benzenhöfer, 157–219. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993.
- McMullin, Ernan. "The Church's Ban on Copernicanism, 1616." In *The Church and Galileo*, edited by Ernan McMullin, 150–190. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.
- Miller-Guinsburg, Arlene. "Von Paracelsu zu Böhme: Auf dem Wege zu neuen Bestandsaufnahmen in der Beeinflussung Böhmens durch Paracelsus." *Salzburger Beiträge zur Paracelsusforschung* 21 (1980): 96–118.
- Moran, Bruce T. *The Alchemical World of the German Court. Occult Philosophy and Chemical Medicine in the Circle of Moritz von Hessen (1572-1632)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991.
- Moran, Bruce T. *Andreas Libavius and the Transformation of Alchemy. Separating Chemical Cultures with Polemical Fire*. Sagamore Beach, MA: Science History, 2007.

- Moran, Bruce T. "Medicine, Alchemy, and the Control of Language: Andreas Libavius Versus the Neoparacelsians." In *Paracelsus. The Man and His Reputation, His Ideas and Their Transformation*, edited by Ole Peter Grell, 135–150. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Möseneder, Karl. *Paracelsus und die Bilder. Über Glauben, Magie und Astrologie im Reformationszeitalter*. Frühe Neuzeit, volume 140. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2009.
- Pagel, Walter. *Paracelsus. An Introduction to Philosophical Medicine in the Era of the Renaissance*. Basel: Karger, 1982.
- Perifano, Alfredo, "Considération autour de la question du Paracelsisme en Italie au XVI^e siècle: Les Dédicaces d'Adam de Bodenstein au Doge de Venise et à Côme I^{er} de Médicis." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 52, no. fasc. 1 (2000): 49–61.
- Pfister, Kathrin. "Die Weissagungen des Paracelsus." In *Paracelsus und Salzburg. Vorträge bei den Internationalen Kongressen in Salzburg und Badgastein anlässlich des Paracelsus-Jahres 1993*, edited by Heinz Dopsch and Peter F. Kramml, 355–368. Salzburg: Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde, 1994.
- Rudolph, Hartmut. "Einige Gesichtspunkte zum Thema 'Paracelsus und Luther'." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 72 (1981): 34–53.
- Rudolph, Hartmut. "Theophrast von Hohenheim (Paracelsus). Arzt und Apostel der neuen Kreatur." In *Radikalen Reformatoren. 21 Biographische Skizzen von Thomas Müntzer bis Paracelsus*, edited by Hans-Jürgen Goertz, 231–242. München: Beck, 1978.
- Schneider, Wolfgang. *Paracelsus – Autor der Archidoxis Magica?* Stuttgart: Deutscher Apotheker, 1982.
- Shackelford, Jole. "Early Reception of Paracelsian Theory: Severinus and Erastus." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 26 (1995): 123–135.
- Shackelford, Jole. *A Philosophical Path for Paracelsian Medicine. The Ideas, Intellectual Context and Influence of Petrus Severinus: 1540–1602*. Copenhagen: Museum of Tusculanum Press, 2004.
- Shackelford, Jole. "Rosicrucianism, Lutheran Orthodoxy, and the Rejection of Paracelsianism in Early Seventeenth-Century Denmark." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 70 no. 2 (1996): 181–204.
- Shackelford, Jole. "To Be or Not to Be a Paracelsian: Something Spagyric in the State of Denmark." In *Paracelsian Moments: Science, Medicine & Astrology in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Gerhild Scholz Williams and Charles D. Gunnoe, Jr., 35–70. Kirksville: Truman State Press, 2002.
- Sudhoff, Karl. *Bibliographia Paracelsia. Besprechung der unter Hohenheims Namen 1527–1893 erschienenen Druckschriften*. Berlin: Reimer, 1984, reprint: Graz 1958.
- Telle, Joachim. "Johann Huser in seinen Briefen. Zum schlesischen Paracelsismus im 16. Jahrhundert." In *Parerga Paracelsica. Paracelsus in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, edited by Joachim Telle, 159–248. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991.
- Telle, Joachim. *Parerga Paracelsica. Paracelsus in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1991.
- Tilton, Hereward. "The Rosicrucian Manifestos and Early Rosicrucianism." In *The Occult World*, edited by Christopher Partridge, 128–144. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Webster, Charles. "Paracelsus Confronts the Saints: Miracles, Healing and the Secularization of Magic." *Social History of Medicine* 8 (1995): 403–421.
- Webster, Charles. *Paracelsus. Medicine, Magic and Mission at the End of Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Webster, Charles. "Paracelsus, Paracelsianism and the Secularization of the Worldview." *Science in Context* 15, no. 1 (2002): 9–27.
- Weeks, Andrew. "Paracelsus." In *The Occult World*, edited by Christopher Partridge, 99–106. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Weeks, Andrew. *Paracelsus. Speculative Theory and the Crisis of the Early Reformation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Yates, Francis. *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment*. London: Routledge, 1972.
- Zanier, Giancarlo. "La medicina paracelsiana in Italia: Aspetti di un'accoglienza particolare." *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 40, no. 4 (1985): 627–649.

Appendices

Appendix I. Annotated edition and translation of Johannes Faber's report on Paracelsus, 1616

Johannes Faber, *Censura* of the German works (Rome, ante 18 January 1616). ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, BB (II.a.24), fols. 551r-555v.¹

[551r] Prohibitorum librorum animadversio, et quidem Ioannis Fabri de Theophrasto Paracelso censura²

Quantum mihi ex Paracelsi lectione cuius licentiam per sexennium a R.^{mo} Magistro Sacri Palatij proximè demortui, obtinui, constare potuit, observavi illum fuisse Religionis potius Catholicae nostrae, quam sectae Lutheranae, (quamvis cerebrosus homo multa innovare et pro captu suo explicare tentaverit).

Nam et Purgatorium et Invocationem Sanctorum, contra quae acriter Lutherani pugnant, non abrogare videtur: Et Tomo Germanico 2^{do}, Libro de Sanctorum Beneficijs et vindictis³ inquit: DEUM et in vita et in morte Sanctorum varia miracula edere ut testetur eos sibi amicos fuisse, et vota quae nos illis fecimus teneri solvere.

Quinimo de B. Virginis puritate et Virginitate honestissime et castissime loquitur, quam Lutherani detestantur potius. Lutherum etiam coetaneum suum parvi aestimat, et prae se contemnit. Ceterum inconstans homo est, et de Magia nonnunquam mihi suspectus, et Sacram Scripturam nimis audacter pro suo genio et Helvetico ingenio explicat, et detorquet.

In Theoria quoque sua Medica non [551v] usque adeò satisfacit, nam quicquid ipsi in mentem venit scripsit, et diversimodè de Principijs medicinae locutus est, exceptis paucis libris, praesertim illis ubi de morbis agit qui ex Tartaro proveniunt, in quibus solidè satis philosophatur, et in chirurgicis non indocte speculatur.

Interim tamen stultitiam suam quam in quibusdam novis Theorematis tam philosophicis quam Medicis Mundo propalavit, abunde satis pulcherrimis formulis et compositionibus Medicamentorum, eorumque utilissimis praeparationibus et novis Receptis ut vocant, compensavit, quibus in occultis et abstrusis quibusdam morbis in quibus Galenica et Hippocratica medicamenta minus sunt efficacia humanum genus vix ac ne vix quidem carere potest.

Ut operae precium mihi videretur, si Paracelso lima adhiberetur, quo relictis pravis ac superstitiosis opinionibus, Saniori doctrina et praxi eius Medica plus quam necessaria frui possimus.⁴

[553r] Paracels. com. 1 German: de Caducis⁵ §§ 2 Vult Medicum virum debere esse Astronomum, hoc modo intelligendo, quod 4 elementa habeant sua astra sicut caelum, unde qui per astra aquae aliquid praedicat vocatur Hydromanticus, qui per Terrae astra Geomanticus, qui per Ignem Pyromanticus et qui per Aerem Necromanticus. Praeter has partes Astronomiae, ut ipse vocat, vult etiam necessariam esse chiromantiam. Libro 1 de Podagricis⁶ circa finem et lib. 2 explicat supradictas species quatuor, ad longum et habet multa absurda.

Totus liber 4 Morborum Invisibilium⁷ Tom. 1 Germanice eliminari debet, est enim plenus haeresibus. Quamvis etenim Paracelsus protestatur, se Sanctis nolle honorem suum detrahare, imò quod sciat illos mirabilia in nomine et virtute IESU praestari posse, affirmat tamen toto hoc libro Miracula quae fiunt apud Sanctorum corpora, esse mera miracula Naturae, et quemadmodum in magnete est sua virtus, sic esse in Mumia seu corporibus mortuorum suam vim magneticam, quae homines ad se trahat, et mira quaedam opera edat, quae virtus sit ipsis a constellatione indita, Sanctos enim in quolibet loco posse miracula facere, et non opus esse ad illa peregrinare.

[553v]

Tom. 1 Germ. in fragmentis Medicis Capite de Morbis Somnij⁸ ait Paracelsus, Illum qui futura praedicat, aut praeterita revelat, quae prius non didicit, prophetizare non ex Sathana, non ex Spiritu Sancto, sed ex lumine Spiritus Cabalistici, qui Spiritus praesertim in somno in nobis vigilet et laboret, et idem nobis contingere quod avibus in augurijs, nam ex eodem Spiritu Cabalistico etiam illas futura praedicere.

In ijsdem fragmentis Medicis Titulo de Morbis ex Incantationibus et Impressionibus inferioribus⁹ ait Paracelsus, bonum esse portare coronam precariam in manibus, Item genua flectere ante Imaginem Sancti alicuius. Item DEUM esse laudandum in Sancto illo in cuius morte et sepultura caeci illuminantur, claudi sanantur etc. Item convenientius et pulchrius esse ut fiat Elevatio, quam ut Mensae assideatur, dum sacramentum Altaris tractatur, tamen melius esse ista omnia non fieri, quia Sathan statim his caeremonijs nos tentet seducere et ita multa superstitiosa committantur.

Libro de Origine Morborum invisibilium¹⁰ Tom. 1. Germ. irridet Paracelsus quod S. Antonius debeat curare morbum illum qui vocatur Ignis S. Antonij,¹¹ et S. Vitus alterum illum qui vocatur Saltus sive chorea S. Viti.¹² [554r] Si enim Sancti hi miracula quaedam in vita sua ediderint, non talia esse sed scripta esse in libris Sanctorum.

Tract. 1 de Pestilitate Tom. 1. Germ. sub Titulo Cabala,¹³ ait Paracelsus Terram Aquam Aerem et Ignem in principio facta esse ex tribus Salè nempe Sulphure et Mercurio. Et haec tria esse facta ex una matre ex Aqua nempe ex qua etiam sint facta omnia animalia tam mortua quam viventia.

Tract. 2 de Pestilitate Tom. 1. Germ. Titulo: Quomodo pestis supernaturaliter hominem interficiat,¹⁴ habet Paracelsus miram et ridiculam phantasiam: Nempe in sole esse spiritum quemdam qui habeat magnam convenientiam cum spiritu hominis animali, unde si homines animaliter vivant, Solem ad iram commoveri, et homines castigare per sua flagella quae sint ipsae stellae et radij solis, per quos Sulphur in hominibus accendatur, quod saepius fieret nisi DEUS vim illam stellarum et calorem aliquantulum inhiheret.

In Lib. 4 Columnarum¹⁵ Tom. 1. Germ. circa principium Paracelsus de Luthero loquens, inquit, se etiam Lutherum vocari à suis inimicis, Se autem esse Theophrastum non Lutherum, se sincere Lutherum res suas agere, ipsi videndum esse quid dicat.¹⁶ [554v] Se autem non tanti facere Lutherum, ut sibi sit comparandus, aut ut solvat corigias Calceamentorum suorum, Se ideò verò vocari Lutherum quia inimici putent Lutherum esse comburendum ita et Theophrastum, sed errare ipsos, se enim scire qua morte sit moriturus, non igne quidem. Hoc etiam se scire Lutherum contemni plerumque à malis quibusdam hominibus.

Liber vocatus Azoth sive de Ligno et Linea Vitae¹⁷ scatet tam absurdis opinionibus de Creatione Adam et Eva ut singulis paginis non unus sed multi sint errores. Inquit autem inprimis diversam esse Calvariam nostris primis parentibus, Adamo quidem per lineam rectam in parte anteriori faeminis autem in parte posteriori divisam, quod falsum est.¹⁸ Inquit praeeretea in prima Creatione ante lapsum primorum parentum, Adamum non habuisse membrum virile, nec Evam matricem neque enim ipsis, nisi peccassent his membris opus fuisse, sicut nec puellae, inquit, cum mammillis et matrice nascuntur, sed ipsis postmodum in adulta aetate nascuntur.¹⁹

[552r] Inquit porrò B. Virginem non habuisse Calvariam divisam neque in anteriori neque in posteriori parte quod non subiecta fuerit Legibus aliarum faeminarum, de cuius puritate, sanctitate, castitate et privilegijs quibus Deus ipsam donavit, adeò alioquin honorifice et cum tanta reverentia loquitur ut nihil supra, ut illam etiam absque omni macula conceptam fuisse asseverarit.²⁰ Vult etiam Adamum fuisse conceptum ab Anima Mundi maioris, in matrice maioris Mundi per verbum Fiat.²¹

Inquit DEUM creasse Adamum et Evam in Caelo sedendo in Sua Sede et saltem suam manum extra caelum exporrigendo, sicut et homo, ait, generat hominem non totaliter, sed in matricem faeminae se se immergendo, per partem solummodo aliquam.²²

Inquit DEUM dum Adamum crearet, ex mille et mille alijs partibus totius Mundi ex omnibus nempe creaturis fixis et mobilibus conflasse materiam, seu massam sive limbum [552v] quemdam ut vocat ex quo per verbum Fiat, fecerit Adamum.²³

Inquit, Serpentem dum deciperet Evam, apparuisse Evae omninò in illa forma, in qua post lapsum Adam fuit, hoc est cum membro virili, quo Adam ante lapsum caruerat, et propterea Eva ex ipsius fixo et continuo intuitu decepta fuerit.²⁴

Inquit S. Ioannem Baptistam modo Angelico in deserto comedisse et non deposuisse excrementa ventris, sic primos parentes nostros comedisse, sic nos adhuc comedere posse.²⁵

Inquit Angelos non habere corpora ex carne et sanguine et tamen non esse meros spiritus, sed habere corpus certum aliquod ex materia et essentia caelesti et ex determinato aliquo limbo, de quo se alio loco tractaturum promittit.²⁶

Inquit dum DEUS hominem crearet, hominem media sui parte hoc est superiore fuisse in Caelo, inferiore vero in Aqua, quemadmodum Arbor radice sua figitur in Terra et reliqua parte superiore est in Aere.²⁷

Inquit Moisen non fuisse physicum et creationem Mundi tantum Theologice descripsisse, physicè [555r] quidem particulariter non autem totaliter, mentionem enim ipsum tantum fecisse Terrae, non aquae, non aeris, non Ignis ex quibus Adam creatus fuerit. Sed non mirum fuisse hoc cum Moises tantum Ductor populi Israelitici fuerit non physicus non philosophus.²⁸

Tom. Germ. 2. de Beneficijs et vindictis Sanctorum ait Paracelsus: Quemadmodum Virga Aronis multa miracula coram Pharaone edidit, quae voluerunt imitari malefici, sic S. Gregorium recte missam dixisse, quod alij post ipsum, utpote qui non sunt sancti ut ipse non deberent imitari. Et si dictum est Petro quod possit solvere et ligare, ideò hanc potestatem alijs non esse datam, multa enim Sanctis licere quae alijs non licent.²⁹

Ibidem Paracelsus si Sancti Altaria et templa aedificaverint, non ideò nobis esse licitum idem facere. Sic etiam nos non debere imitari Sanctos in vectitu orationibus et ieiunijs, sed nos debere ad nostram vocationem attendere, cum DEUS aliquos velit per hoc, alios per aliud Sanctos facere, ut S. Ioannem Baptistam voluerit in solitudine esse, Apostolos verò apud homines.³⁰

Ibidem Paracelsus ait DEUM patrem abdicasse gubernationem supra humanum genus, quam Filius [555v] habeat in suis manibus, propterea populum Israeliticum iam esse derelictum ut videat nos esse gratos Filio, et Filium nunc per nostros Sanctos, ea miracula perpetrare, quae olim Pater per Israelitas in veteri Testamento. Loquitur hic Paracelsus de Divinis nimis humaniter.³¹

Circa finem huius Tomi explicat figuras illas quas vocant Abbatis Ioachimi ubi nonnunquam in Ecclesiasticos nimis severe sine ratione pro libitu suo invehitur.³²

Plurima alia sunt in Paracelso minime toleranda sed multa sanè sunt, praesertim ubi de morborum curationibus et medicamentorum praeparationibus agit Medicae facultati apprime utilia.

Quae in Telesio observare potui iam ante triennium R.^{mo} Magistro Sacri Palatij consignavi,³³ quae ibidem in meis animadversionibus videri poterunt, aliud quod addam nunc non habeo. In quibus si quid scriptum à me fuit, quod nostrae orthodoxae religioni (quod tamen minime spero) non congruat id a me indictum et damnatum esto. Si quid autem in alijs porrò libris, qui censura S. Officij nondum tacti sunt, observavero, quod vel bonis moribus vel Religioni Catholicae repugnet id eadem diligentia in scripta referam et Superioribus fideliter consignabo.

Accipi die 18. Iannuarij 1616 ab Illustri Domino Ioanne Fabro.³⁴

Appendix II. Annotated edition and translation of Johannes Faber's report on Paracelsus, 1616

Johannes Faber, *Censura* of the German works (Rome, ante 18 January 1616). ACDF, Index, *Protocolli*, BB (II.a.24), fols. 551r-555v.

Discussion of prohibited works, and a report by Johannes Faber on Theophrastus Paracelsus

To the extent that I could ascertain from a reading of Paracelsus, for which I received a permit for six years from the Most Reverend Master of the Sacred Palace, who recently passed away, I observed that he was rather of our Catholic faith than of the Lutheran sect (although this passionate man tried to innovate much and to explain much according to his own mind).

This is because he does not seem to repeal either purgatory or the invocation of the saints, which the Lutherans combat violently. And in the second German volume, in the *Book on the Benefactions and Salvations of the Saints*, he says that God performs miracles both during the lifetime and after the death of saints, so that it should become evident that they had been his friends, and that he fulfils the vows we made to them.

Indeed, he speaks in a most honourable and chaste manner about the purity and virgin nature of the Blessed Virgin, which the Lutherans rather detest. He also has little appreciation for Luther, his contemporary, and he despises him publicly. But for the rest, he is a fickle person, and he often seems to me suspect of magic. He also explains and distorts the Holy Scripture too boldly according to his own mind and the Swiss spirit.

In his medical theory, he also does not fully satisfy, because he wrote down whatever came to his mind, and he spoke differently about the principles of medicine, except in a few books, especially those in which he treats the diseases that originate from the tartar sediments, where he philosophises quite solidly, and in the chirurgical books his reflections are not unlearned.

In the meantime, however, he has compensated his stupidity which he revealed to the world in some new philosophical as well as medical theorems, by means of very fine formulae and compositions of medications, and by their very useful preparations and what they call new recipes; the human race can hardly do without these in the case of some occult and rare diseases, for which Galenic and Hippocratic medicines are less effective.

The way I perceive the value of the work, if the file were applied to Paracelsus, so that the corrupt and superstitious opinions were removed, we can make use of his more sensible teachings and his more than necessary medical practice.

Paracelsus, in commentary one, in German, *About Epilepsy*, paragraph two, argues that the physician should be an astronomer. This should be understood as follows: the four elements have their own stars, like the heaven. For that reason, someone who predicts something through the stars of water is called an Hydromanticus [fortune-teller by means of water], who predicts something through the stars of the earth is called a Geomanticus, someone who does it through fire a Pyromanticus, and who does it through the air Necromanticus [Necromancer]. Besides these four parts of astronomy, as he himself names it, he also argues that palmistry [*chiromantiam*] is necessary. In book one *About the Gout*, at the end, and in book two, he explains at length the four above-mentioned types, and he holds many absurd positions.

Book four on *Invisible Diseases*, of part one of the German edition, should be removed entirely, because it is full of heresies. Because even though Paracelsus publically declares that he does not intend to withhold honour from the saints, because he knows that they perform miracles in the name and through the power of Jesus, he nevertheless affirms in this entire book that the miracles performed near bodies of saints are nothing but miracles of Nature. And in the same way that a magnet has its own power, similarly a mummy or the bodies of the dead have their own magnetic power, which pulls people towards it, and generates certain miraculous works, this power being planted in them by a constellation; for the saints can perform miracles in any place without it being necessary to travel to them.

In tome one of the German edition, in the medical fragments in the chapter about the *Diseases of the Sleep*, Paracelsus says: A person who predicts the future or reveals things from the past that were not known before, does not have his prophetic force from Satan, nor from the Holy Spirit, but from the light of the Cabalistic spirit. Particularly during our sleep this spirit is awake and works in us, and as such the same happens to us as what happens to the birds in a prediction based on their flight, because they too reveal future events thanks to the same Cabalistic spirit.

In the same medical fragments titled *On the Diseases from Magic Spells and Lower Impressions*, Paracelsus says that it is good to carry in one's hands a rosary, and also to genuflect in front of the image of some saint. He furthermore states that God should be praised in that saint by whose death and burial those who are blind are brought to light, the lame cured, etc. It is moreover more appropriate and better to have the Elevation made rather than sitting at a table while the sacrament of the altar is being performed. However [according to Paracelsus], it is better if none of this happens, because Satan tries to seduce us continually during these ceremonies and so many superstitious things are committed.

In the book *On the Origin of the Invisible Diseases*, part one of the German edition, Paracelsus laughs at the idea that Saint Anthony should cure the disease that is called the "Saint Anthony's Fire", and that S. Vitus should cure that other disease that is called "St. Vitus's Dance". For if these saints have performed miracles during their life, those miracles were not of this nature but they were [merely] such as they are described in the books on the saints.

In the first treatise *On the Plague*, in the first German volume, under the title *Cabala*, Paracelsus states that Earth, Air, Water and Fire were in the beginning made from Salt, Sulphur and Mercury. And these three were formed from one mother, namely water, from which also all animated beings – both dead and alive – were made.

In the second treatise, *On the Plague*, in the first volume of the German edition, which carries the title: *In What Way the Plague Kills People in a Supernatural Manner*, Paracelsus engages in a wondrous and absurd fantasy: namely that there is a certain spirit in the sun, which has a strong correspondence with the animal spirit of man, and as a consequence, if humans live like animals, the sun is driven to rage and whips man with its whiplashes, which are the very stars and the sun's rays, by which sulphur is inflamed in man, which would occur more often if God did not somewhat restrict the stars' force and heat.

In the book *On the Four Pillars*, in the first German volume, at the beginning, where Paracelsus writes about Luther, he explains that even though he himself is also named Luther by his enemies, he is Theophrastus and not Luther, and that he let Luther sincerely go about his business, and that he would have to see for himself what he says. He did, however, not behave so much like Luther to deserve to be compared to him, or for Luther to untie the laces of his shoes. If he was still called Luther, this was because his enemies believed that Luther should be burned, and therefore also Paracelsus. However, they made a mistake, since he [Paracelsus] knew by which type of death he was to die, and certainly not through fire. He also states that he knows that Luther is much despised by certain bad persons.

The book called *Azoth*, or *On Wood of Life and The Life Line*, is filled with so many absurd opinions concerning the creation of Adam and Eve that on specific pages not one, but many mistakes are written. However, first and foremost he states that the skull of our first ancestors was different, with the skull of Adam divided by a straight line in the front part, and that of the woman at the back, which is false. He further maintains that in the first creation, prior to the Fall of our ancestors, Adam did not have a virile member and that Eve did not have a womb, and if they had not sinned, they would not have needed these body parts, just as girls, he says, are not born with breasts and a womb, but acquire these body parts only later in their adult age.

Further, he maintains that the Blessed Virgin did not have a divided skull, neither in the anterior nor in the posterior part, because She was not subject to the same conditions as other women, about whose purity, sanctity and the privileges God gave to Her, he speaks in general so respectfully and with so much reverence that nothing, he states is above Her, so that he declared that She was also conceived without any blemish [*macula*]. He also states that Adam was conceived by the Soul of the Greater World, and that he originated through the Word in the origin of the Greater World, in the womb of the Greater World through the word "Fiat".

He states that God created Adam and Eve while seated in his Seat in the heaven and by merely extending his hand beyond the Heaven, in the same way, he states, that a human being does not produce another human being entirely, but by immersing himself into the womb of the woman, solely by means of one part.

He states that God, when he created Adam, composed a matter, or a mass or a certain *limbus*, as he calls it, from thousands and thousands other parts of the entire World, that is, from all fixed and moveable creatures, from which matter he made Adam through the word "Fiat".

He states that, when the serpent deceived Eve, he appeared to Eve in exactly the same form in which Adam found himself after the Fall – that is, with the virile member, which Adam did not have prior to the Fall – and that Eve by looking at it fixed and continuous was therefore deceived.

He states that Saint John the Baptist ate in the desert like an angel, and that he did not discharge the faeces of his stomach, and that our first parents ate like this, and that we can still eat this way.

He states that angels do not have a body of flesh and blood, and yet they are no mere spirits, but they have a certain body that consists of divine matter and essence, and of a certain *limbus* about which he promised to deal with elsewhere.

He states that when God created man, man was situated with one half, that is, his higher part, in the heaven, but with his lower part in water, like a tree which is attached to the earth by its root and is with its higher remaining parts in the air.

He states that Moses was not a physicist [in the sense of "natural philosopher"] and that he described the creation of the World only in a theological manner, and that he wrote "physically" only in a partial, not a total manner, because he only informs of the earth, not of the water, nor air or fire, out of which Adam was created. But he states that this is not strange, because Moses was the leader of the Israeli people, not a physicist or philosopher.

In the second German volume, in the *Benefactions and Salvations of the Saints*, Paracelsus writes: Just as Aaron's staff produced many miracles in the presence of the pharaoh, which ill-doers wanted to imitate, so Saint Gregory recited the mass correctly, which others, given that they are no saints like him, should not be allowed to imitate after him. And if it is said of Petrus that he can dissolve and bind, on that account this power is not given to others, because many things are permitted to the saints that are not permitted to others.

In the same part, Paracelsus states that if the saints have built altars and temples, this does not mean that we are permitted to do the same. Neither are we permitted to imitate saints in being carried along by orations and fasts, but we should focus on our own calling, because God made some holy in this way, some in another, as he wanted Saint John the Baptist to dwell in solitude, but the apostles to be among the people.

In the same part, Paracelsus states that God the Father resigned from the rule over the human race, which is now in the hands of the Son, for which reason the Jewish people are already abandoned, so that it may be seen that we are grateful to the Son, and that the Son now brings about those miracles through our saints which were once brought about by the Father through the Israelites in the Old Testament. Here Paracelsus speaks all too humanly about divine things.

At the end of this volume, he explains those figures that are attributed to the Abbot Joachim [Joachim of Fiore], where he sometimes attacks priests all too severely, without motive, and arbitrarily.

Numerous other passages are in no way acceptable in Paracelsus, but many are sound, especially where he discusses cures of diseases and preparations of cures, which are especially useful for the medical faculty.

What I could observe in Telesio, I already handed over to the Most Reverend Master of the Sacred Palace three years ago. To what could there be seen in my discussion, I do not now have anything to add. If there is anything in what I wrote there that disagrees with our orthodox faith (which I hope the least), that shall be denied by me and be damned. If, however, I will discover anything else in other books, which the censorship of the Holy Office has not yet touched, and which is opposed to either good behaviour or the Catholic faith, I will report this in writing with the same diligence and I will hand it over to my superiors faithfully.

On 18 January 1616, I have received this text from the illustrious Mr Johannes Faber.

Textual Notes

1. The order of the folios in this document has been confused. Apparently after folios 551–552, the text continues on fol. 555r. But this does not make sense because fol. 555v concludes with the usual formula and an annotation by a functionary of the Congregation. Thus, originally folios 553r–554v came after fol. 551v: in fact, fol. 554v concludes with a reference to the reproductive organs of Eve, while fol. 552r continues discussing those of Mary.
2. In the margin: “Iam prohibitus” (“already forbidden”). It is unclear to which *censura* this refers.
3. Paracelsus, *Liber de sanctorum auctoritate*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 241. In this section, Paracelsus discusses the powers and signs of the saints through their faith in Christ, and Faber paraphrases the first paragraph. Paracelsus writes: “Dann Gott ist wunderbarlich in seinen Wercken und in seinen Heiligen. Also wissen nuhn fürhin den anfang der Lebendigen Heiligen, und ihren Zeichen und Wesen und am letzten von den Todtes, das ist, von denen so todt sich beweisen”.
4. This seems to be the end of the introduction, with its conclusion that Paracelsus was a Catholic, though a strange one, and that some parts of his medicine are mad, but others sound and necessary, and that it is necessary to apply the file to his work. What now follows are the passages to be corrected.
5. Paracelsus, *De caducis*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 595. Because diseases come from the heaven, the physician should understand the signs in the heaven and, as such, be an astronomer: “Solches zeig ich darumb an, das ihr bey den eussern dingen der Welt, den Menschen sollen erkennen, durch Geomantiam, durch Hydromantiam, durch Pyromantiam, und durch Necromantiam: das sind

die so man jetzt pflegt Astronomos zu heissen: das ist, des Himmels Lauff zu entdecken, nach rechtem grundt des Liechts der Natur. Also erfordert das Liecht der Natur, dass ein Artzt soll ein vierfachter [sic] Astronomus seyn, auff das er in die klein Welt wiss zu bringen, das in der grossen ist, und dasselbig zu erkennen, sonst wirt nichts im grundt da gehandelt”.

6. Paracelsus, *De podagricis*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 569–74.
7. Paracelsus, *Morborum invisibilium, liber 4* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 103–9. In this section, Paracelsus discusses the invisible powers of nature. The passage to which Faber refers is at p. 104: “[...] unnd also in nammen der heyligen die ding für zeichen geacht worden, als ob ein heylig uber die Natur solchs thue, so aber alles allein naturliche ding geseyn sindt. Unnd aber darumb, dass nichts darvon beschrieben ist worden, und unsichtbar ding wunderbarliche wirkung erzeugt hatt: Unnd haben nicht das naturliche exempel betracht, dass der Magnet an sich zeucht ein grossen hauffen Eysen, unnd dass der Mensch auch ein Magnet ist, und zeucht, wie ein Magnet das Eysen, also auch die Menschen an sich”. The same applies to mummies (Paracelsus, *Opera*, 104–5).
8. Paracelsus, *De morbis somnii* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 140–1. Paracelsus discusses diseases of the sleep, and argues that dreams can reveal future events. The passage is at p. 141: “Der rein ist, der ist ein gutter Weissager, natürlich wie die Vogel: und deren Vogel weissagung seindt nicht wider die Natur, sondern auss der Natur, ein jedlicher, wie er dann ist. Diese ding, die die Vogel also verkunden, praesagiert auch der Schlauff: dann es ist der Traum geist, der da ist der unsichtbare Leib der Natur: In dem zu wissen, ist, so ein Mensch weissagt, so redt er nit auss dem Teuffel, nit auss dem Sathan, nit auss dem heyligen Geist, sondern er redt auss geborner Natur, des unsichtigen Leibs, der dann Magiam lehrt, auss dem der Magus ist. [...] Ist aber das einig und das einig wesen, wie der Traum: da auch keiner nichts probieren kan, dann ohn alle Prob reden: und reden das, so ihm dasselbig Liecht des Cabalischen Geist fürhalt, unwissender dingen redt und Weissagt.”
9. Paracelsus, *De morbis ex incantationibus et impressionibus inferioribus* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 138–9. Paracelsus argues that men are not searching for Satan, but for God. However, Satan makes use of this, and uses men’s search for God to seduce them: “Dan was ist die ursach? Allein die Sathanische verführung, so mitlauffen mag, dann ein Pater noster der in der Hand tragen wirt, ist gut: Nun aber so gut ist es nit, besser ist es, es werd nit tragen, dann tragen. Dann es ist ohn Aberglauben nicht Niderknien vor einem Bild, etc. ist nicht böß: Noch besser, es geschehe nicht, dann dass geschicht. Wann ursach, die Augen regieren das Gebett, das soll nit seyn: Das herz soll regieren. Ein Heilig der stirbt, und wirdt vergraben, und in seim vergraben warden gesund alle Lahmen und Blinden, Krancken: Das ist gar ein gross Lob und Dank-sagung Gottes, besser es geschehe nit, von wegen der Aberglauben und des Sathanischen Abgotts, so hiemit inlauft und zufelt. [...] Unnd mocht man durch unsere Weisheit hinzu bringen ein nutzere Ordnung, dann Christus geben hatt, so solls nicht beschehen. Dann ursach, die Sathanische krafft so da eingemischt wirdt. Als das Nachtmahl Christi ist einfaltig beschehen: Nuhn ist ein Elevatio daraus worden: Was ist sie? Ich setz unnd lass bleiben, es sey schöner, hupscher, lieblicher unnd feiner, dann ob dem Tisch sitzen. [...] Dann die Zauberey, Hexerey, Augurey falt darein, die sunst nicht darein fallen mag.”
10. Paracelsus, *De origine morborum invisibilium* in *Opera*, vol. 1, 93–4. Paracelsus discusses several diseases that are related to saints, among which St Vitus’s dance and St Antony’s Fire: “Sant Anthony Feur ein Herz des Feurs, der doch kein Schmidt, kein Eiser nie angeblasen hatt, unnd vergessen dass er auch kein Herz ist der Elementen, unnd so er noch bey leben solte syn, so musste ers entlehen, oder selbst auff schlagen [...]. Unnd ob er schon auff Erden zu seiner zeit ettwas gethan hatt, so ist es diesem kein behelff: dann was beschehen ist durch ihn, wirdt im Buch der Heiligen stehn, unnd nit hin under den Zauberen begriffen. Aber also durch solchen glauben ist es dahin kommen, dass der glaub ein vermeinet Antonium geschmidet hatt, der wol unnd billich Vulcanus soll geheisen warden, derselbig hatt angezündet unnd gefeuret als sey er ein Schmidt unnd legte eisen in esse”. With respect to St Vitus’s Dance, Paracelsus first describes the case of a woman who suddenly started to dance, after

which other women followed her behaviour. Hereafter Paracelsus argues: “Auff die ursach hafftet der glaub, unnd gericht in den Magor, ein Heidnischen geist: aber es blieb nit lang, da ward S. Veit der Glaubengeist, unnd must also hie Abgott werden, unnd empfieng den namen darauff S. Veits danz”.

11. This disease is known as Ergotism, Erysipelas, or Herpes Zoster.
12. Today known as Chorea.
13. Paracelsus, *De pestilitate, sub titulo Cabala in Opera*, vol. 1, 328. Here, Paracelsus describes that all things come from one mother. He further argues: “Der Erdboden, das Wasser, der Lufft, das Feur, haben ihren ursprung auss dreyen Dingen. [...] Diese drey ding haben eine Mutter gehabt, darauss sei beschaffen worden, das ist gewesen die Mutter, nemlich das Wasser. [...] Und werden also diese drey ding mit ihrem rechten Nammen genennet, Sulphur Mercurius und Sal.”
14. Paracelsus, *De pestilitate, tractatus 2, quomodo pestis supernaturaliter hominem interficiat in Opera*, vol. 1, 343–4: “[I]n der Sonnen ist ein heymlich und verborgens Evastralisches wesen und Spiritus: Welcher ein grosse und gar mechtige gemeinschaft hatt mit dem Evestro des Thierischen Menschen und noch mehr mit den Plagis [...] dadurch ihr dann so ein Thierisch Leben fñhret, welchem Gott feindt ist, und nicht will, dass ihr so Vichisch leben sollet, Inficiert unnd vergifftet werdet. [...] Und wie nach dem Zorn die Streiche gezuckt werden: Also auch Streiche aussgehn von der Sonnen. Solche Streiche, und Gifften, und Krankheiten gibt die Sonne den Sternen, uns zu straffen: Als dann giessen die Sterne ihren empfangenen giffit ub̄er uns auss”.
15. Paracelsus, *Columnarum, liber 3* (i.e. the *Paragranum*) in *Opera*, vol. 1, 142–51. The passage is on page 143: “Ich bin nit Lutherus, ich bin Theophrastus, und bin der Theophrastus, den ihr zu Basel Cacophrastum hiessen [...] Meint ihr ich sey allein Lutherus? [...] Ich wirdt ihm und euch zu arbeiten geben. Du weist wol, ich lass Lutherum sein ding verantworten, ich will das mein selbst verantworten. Dann er soll mir nicht ein Kincken auffthun in meinen Schuhen. Warumb thund ihrs? Darumb, ihr verhoffendt, Luther werdt verbrennt, und Theophrastus soll auch verbrennt werden: Und habent damit ewer Einfalt angezeigt, dass ihr nit verstehnde, wass todts Theophrastus sterben soll, oder wohin Theophrastus predestinirt ist: nit zum Feur.”
16. The sentence is corrupt, see the original German words in Paracelsus, *Columnarum, liber 3*, in *Opera*, vol. 1, 143.
17. Paracelsus, *Azoth, sive De ligno et linea vitae in Opera*, vol. 2, 519–43. In this section, Paracelsus discusses the creation of the world, including the creation of Adam and Eve, all human beings, animals and plants. He particularly compares the macrocosm with the microcosm.
18. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 532–3. Paracelsus writes that both Adam and Eve have a “Linea Vitae” going from their left ear to their right ear. He further argues that with respect to Adam, the skull was divided in the front part, and the skull of Eve divided at the part in the back. On page 536, Paracelsus continues by saying that “Eva [hatt] den Spalt [...] hinten, und Adam fornen”.
19. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 523: “Dann die Matrix war der Eva vor dem Fall noch nicht gegeben, gleich wie keine Jungfrau ihre Brüst oder Mammillas nicht mit ihr auff die Welt bringt, auch die Matrix nicht, so zur Geburt gehort, sondern wechselt erst im vollkommenen Alter mit ihr auff, so wol die Matrix als die Mammillae. Also ist die Eva für dem Fall ohn die Matrix, so wol auch Adam in der grossen Matrix, so inen ir Paradeiss gewesen, ganz Necrocomisch, rein, mit solchen Gliedern unbefleckt gewesen: aber nach dem Fall bald in Schneller eyl, ist ihnen alles zur zeitlichen Geburt gewachsen.”
20. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 523: “[...] darumb auch Maria den spalt an irer hirnschalen weder hinten noch vornen am Kopff getragen hat: dann sie hasset die begierlichkeit der

Cagastrischen Natur, dan sie war nit von dem Irdischen Aquastro Verbi Fiat Spiritus Sanctus geboren: Darumb auch ir hirnschalen hinden und vornen zu gewesen ist, verschlossen [...] Also auch der Marien Leib ist Aquastrisch und Necrocomisch, ung gar nit Cagastrisch geboren worden.”

21. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 526: “Aber also sollet ihr unser Philosophieren verstehen, dass wir auss der Englischen und Cabalistischen Scientia euch den Grund fürlegen, dass Adam per animam maioris Mundi ist empfangen worden, von dem verbo Fiat”.
22. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 531: “Dann Got ist auss seinem Stuel in solcher Schaffung nicht gar kommen, (allein seine Hand:). Also auch der Mensch kompt auch nit gar auss seinem Stuel in den Garten oder in die matrix [the womb], allein was da verordnet ist mit der Handt, das ist, Virga Aaronis [Aaron’s rod]”. Pseudo-Paracelsus later repeats that Adam was “made by the hand of God” (“durch die Hand Gottes gemacht ward”).
23. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 531–2. “[...] und Adam und Eva wurden in diesem Himmel erschaffen, auss einem Limbo, der da manigfaltig war auss viel 1000. Stucken Materien, und Kräfften zusammen gesetzt und Componiert, wie oben das Wort aussweiset, das Gott an einem Orthe, von allen orthen der ganzen Welt, auss allen stücken maioris Mundi ein stücke gemacht hat das war Adam. [...] Also nahm Gott von allen Orthen alle kräfften, allerley Lebendigen, Webenden, Fixen und Unfixen Creatures, unnd machte ein ding, eine Krafft, daraus dem Adamo. So waren nuhn dieselben Kräfften alle per Verbum Fiat ein stücke gewesen”.
24. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 533: “So hatt doch die Schone Gestalt des Adams der Eva also gewaltig gefallen, das sie sich vergaffet hatt mit den Augen. Dann der Sathan ist ihr erschienen in Adams gestalt. Merket wie Adam jetzt ist, also ist ir in solcher gestalt Lucifer erschienen, wie Adam nach dem Fall ausgesehen hatt. Dann Adam hatt für dem Fall keine Virgam Naturae gehabt, darumb sich auch Eva an dem Adam nicht vergaffet hatte. Dann wie der Adam jetzt erscheinet Membro Virili, so ist das an dem Adam ein Monstrosisch Zeichen”.
25. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 537: “Nuhn ist Gottes wille gewesen, dass der Mensch essen soll auff Englische weise. Das beweiset Ioannes Baptista [...] Nuhn hatt Ioannes Englisch gessen, im Mundt, und nicht im Magen. Dann er ist nicht zu Stuel gangen, und wir alle können noch also essen, wie der Ioanes gethan hatt”. Paracelsus adds that we can eat this way by using our imagination. On the same page, Paracelsus states that “Verbum Domini Engelbrodt [ist].” On page 534, Pseudo-Paracelsus writes “dass Adam unnd Eva ohne die Scham beschaffen seyn, vor dem Fall, und doch hetten sich mehrnen können, auch essen und trincken und hetten doch keines Stulganges dorffen gebrauchen.”
26. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 539. Pseudo-Paracelsus writes: “Das aber die Engel den Leib Christi essen, das ist nicht von nothen, dann Christus ist nicht für die Engel gestorben, dann sie haben nicht gesündigt, und haben auch keinen Leib zu sundigen. Dann sie haben kein Fleisch und Blut wie der Mensch, und sind doch nit Geister, dann sie haben einen Leib: Aber nicht einen Leib von Fleisch und Blut, sondern sie haben einen Leib auss dem himmlischen Wesen, eines besonderen Limbi.”
27. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 540: “Und da dis geschehen ist, das Adam und Eva gefallen und betrogen seind worden, das ist im Himmel und halb auff Erden geschehen, dann mit dem Kopffe ist Adam im Himmel gewesen, und mit dem obern theil des Leibes: Aber mit dem undern theil ist er, und also auch Eva, in der Matrix maioris Mundi auff dem Wasser gewesen.”
28. Paracelsus, *Azoth*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 542: “Moyses hatt sich keiner Physica understanden, dann er schreibet Particulariter Theologisch. [...] Dann das Donum intelligentiae Creationis hatt er Particulariter gehapt, und nit ganz, wie es seyn soll, nach erheischung der Notdurfft beschrieben: villeicht hatt ers woll nit anders gewust, dann er meldet nichts von keiner Proporz, Qualitet, Prima Materia Limbi Aeterni & Limbi Elementorum, allein zeigt er an die Materiam der Erden, darauss der Mensch, doch nur ein theil: hatt geschwigen drey theil, als Lufft, Wasser,

und Feuer. Dann er ist von Jugend auf kein Physicus nicht gewesen, allein von Gott ist er berufen gewesen zu einem Führer und Vorgänger der Kinder von Israel auf Theologische Weise”.

29. Paracelsus, *Liber De sanctorum auctoritate*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 241: “Gregorius etc. hatt Mess gehalten. Nun ist dieselbige mess nicht zuwerffen, als wenig als Aarons Rutten, die in ein Schlangen verwandelt ward, und die andern Zeichen so Aaron thaten vor Pharaone. Nun aber Gregorio ist das billich geseyn: Dass aber auss dem folgt, dass ein jeglicher Bub, Schuler, Schutz, Bachant, etc. wolle Mess halten, das ist nit. Dieselbigen aber die also darzu geweyhet werden, sind nit anderst zurechnen gegen Gregorio, als die Malefici und Aaron. Was gerecht fromm Leuth thund, dass thund sie hernach [...] Und also auch, darumb Petrus zubinden, zuledigen hatt gehabt, also wollen sie das alle auch han, Und aber es folgt darumb nit hernach, dass sie Petri seyend, aber Buben, das ist, Malefici. [...] Nun sind die auch Malefici, die also wollen Mess halten wie Gregorius, etc. [...] Dann den Heyligen ist mehr zugeben, dann andern”.
30. Paracelsus, *Liber De sanctorum auctoritate*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, “Liber De sanctorum auctoritate,” 242: “Gott hiess auch Alter, Tempel bauen, und war recht, und darumb was [sic] es recht, dass erst geheissen hatt: Dann kein Mensch hatt das zuheissen, als Gott: Heist der Mensch, so ist es unrecht, und nicht recht. Nun auff das folget, dass im Neuen Testament von Gott die Heiligen viel geheissen sind worden, erlaubt und nachgeben, und von Gott zum besten kehrt, darumb so ist es recht”. Paracelsus continues that the same applies to orations and fasts, and that humans have to become holy each in their own way.
31. Paracelsus, *Liber De sanctorum auctoritate*, in *Opera*, vol. 2, 244: “So nun dem Sohn gebürt, dass er auch thue als sein Vatter, und gebürt ihm das Erb seines Vatters zubesitzen, und dasselbig regieren, und sein gewalt zufüren. [...] Dann so der Sohn Christus dermassen sein Heiligen nit offenbar machte, möchten nit die Juden sagen, und die Kinder von Israel, ihr sinds nit, sonder wir sinds. Dass aber die Israelischen nit Kinder sind fürhin mehr, dass beweist Christus, dass er ihm ander ausserwehlt hatt, und Israel hatt lassen fallen. Dadurch zuverstehn ist, das der Vatter nimmern regiert, sonder der Sohn, über die Menschen. Darumb so ist Israel auss: Dann der Vatter im Himmel hatt sich ihr entschlagen, und der Sohn hatt das Regiment in seiner Handt”.
32. Paracelsus discusses the Nürnberger Figures of Joachim of Fiore in *Ein Auslegung, der Figuren/so zu Nurnberg gefunden seyn worden/geführt in Grund der Magischen Weissagung*. See Paracelsus, *Opera*, vol. 2, 574–94, 633. The figures stand in a long tradition, and Paracelsus interprets them, like Osiander, as a prophecy of the decay of the old papacy. Paracelsus does not refer explicitly to Joachim of Fiore, so Faber must have known about the Nürnberger figures, of which Joachim of Fiore was the author. On this prognostication by Paracelsus, see Pfister, “Die Weissagungen des Paracelsus,” 355–68; Möseneder, *Paracelsus und die Bilder*.
33. This examination of Telesio’s works by Faber is not preserved in ACDF.
34. “Accipi [...] Fabro”: annotation by an official of the Congregation for the Index.