

LEONARDO ANATRINI

THE THEOLOGIAN'S ENDGAME.
ON THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED CENSORIAL
REPORT ON GALILEO'S DIALOGUE
AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

ESTRATTO

da

GALILAEANA

Studies in Renaissance and Early Modern Science

2020 ~ a. 17

The reception of Galileo in England and Scotland during the long seventeenth Century. Discovery of a censorial report of the "Dialogue". On the origins of Galileo's famous motto "Eppur si muove"



Leo S. Olschki Editore
Firenze



museo⁺
galileo

Istituto
e Museo
di Storia
della Scienza

GALILÆANA

Studies in Renaissance
and Early Modern Science

Anno XVII - 2020



Leo S. Olschki Editore

GALILÆANA

STUDIES ON RENAISSANCE AND EARLY MODERN SCIENCE

Advisory Board

Andrea Battistini †, Domenico Bertoloni Meli, Filippo Camerota, Maurice Clavelin, Owen Gingerich, Enrico Giusti, John L. Heilbron, Mario Helbing, Michel-Pierre Lerner, Pamela O. Long, Isabelle Pantin, Adriano Prosperi, Eileen Reeves, Jürgen Renn, Thomas B. Settle †, Maurizio Torrini †, Albert Van Helden, Nick Wilding

Editorial Board

Marta Stefani (Managing Editor), Francesco Barreca, Lisa Chien (Copy Editor), Natacha Fabbri, Federica Favino, Susana Gómez, Andrea Gualandi, Luigi Guerrini, Pietro Daniel Omodeo, Alessandro Ottaviani, Carla Rita Palmerino, Salvatore Ricciardo (Assistant Managing Editor), Patrizia Ruffo, Giorgio Strano, Federico Tognoni, Oreste Trabucco

Editors

Massimo Bucciantini, Michele Camerota, Franco Giudice

Amministrazione / Administration

Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki
Casella postale 66, 50123 Firenze * Viuzzo del Pozzetto 8, 50126 Firenze
e-mail: periodici@olschki.it * Conto corrente postale 12.707.501
Tel. (+39) 055.65.30.684 * fax (+39) 055.65.30.214

2020: ABBONAMENTO ANNUALE – ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

PRIVATI

Italia € 78,00 (carta e *on-line only*)

Il listino prezzi e i servizi per le **Istituzioni** sono disponibili sul sito www.olschki.it alla pagina <https://www.olschki.it/acquisti/abbonamenti>

INDIVIDUALS

Foreign € 94,00 (print) • € 78,00 (*on-line only*)

Subscription rates and services for Institutions are available on

<https://en.olschki.it/> at following page:

<https://en.olschki.it/acquisti/abbonamenti>

* Gli articoli (in italiano, inglese, francese, tedesco e spagnolo) devono essere inviati alla redazione di «Galilæana», presso il Museo Galileo, piazza dei Giudici 1, 50122 Firenze.
Non si restituiscono i manoscritti.

*Articles (in Italian, English, French, German or Spanish) should be sent to: Redazione di «Galilæana», Museo Galileo, piazza dei Giudici 1, 50122 Firenze.
Manuscripts are not returned.*



museo⁺
galileo

Istituto
e Museo
di Storia
della Scienza

GALILÆANA

Studies in Renaissance
and Early Modern Science

Anno XVII - 2020



Leo S. Olschki Editore

GALILÆANA

Studies in Renaissance and Early Modern Science

As indicated by its new subtitle – *Studies in Renaissance and Early Modern Science* – the objective of *Galilaeana* is to publish studies on the life and work of Galileo, as well as research not directly pertaining to Galileo, but which nevertheless focuses on related figures and themes from the early modern period. *Galilaeana* is sponsored by the Museo Galileo and is published annually under the auspices of the University of Florence, the University of Padua, the University of Pisa, and the Domus Galilaeana.

An index of all past issues of *Galilaeana*, including the tables of contents of the articles published, lists of the accompanying source material and documentation (manuscripts and printed works, iconographic material), and links to digitalized copies of the material in this archive, may be accessed at the website of the Museo Galileo www.museogalileo.it/galilaeana.html



INDEX

FOCUS: THE RECEPTION OF GALILEO IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND DURING THE LONG SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

FRANCO GIUDICE – NICCOLÒ GUICCIARDINI, <i>Presentation</i>	Pag.	3
FRANCO GIUDICE, <i>Tobie Matthew, Francis Bacon, and Galileo's Letter to Benedetto Castelli</i>	»	7
MICHELE CAMEROTA, <i>Roman Holiday. George Fortescue and Galileo</i>	»	27
MORDECHAI FEINGOLD, <i>An Anatomy of a Religio-Scientific Polemic: The Wilkins-Ross Controversy Revisited</i>	»	51
STEPHEN CLUCAS – TIMOTHY RAYLOR, <i>Kenelm Digby's Two Treatises and the Reception of the Galilean Science of Motion</i> . . .	»	91
SALVATORE RICCIARDO, <i>The «greate Star-gazer Galileo» in mid-seventeenth-century England: the case of Robert Boyle</i>	»	117
CARLA RITA PALMERINO, <i>Galileo 'philosopher geometer' and his influence on Charleton, Barrow and Keill</i>	»	143
ENRICO R.A.C. GIANNETTO, <i>Galileo, Descartes and Newton's Laws</i>	»	167

STUDIES

LUÍS MIGUEL CAROLINO, <i>Between Galileo's Celestial Novelties and Clavius's astronomical legacy: The Cosmology of the Jesuit Giovanni Paolo Lembo (1615)</i>	»	193
---	---	-----

TEXTS & DOCUMENTS

LEONARDO ANATRINI, <i>The Theologian's Endgame. On the recently discovered censorial report of Galileo's Dialogue and related documents</i>	»	219
---	---	-----

ICONOGRAPHY

- MARIO LIVIO, *Did Galileo Truly Say, 'And Yet It Moves'?* A Modern Detective Story Pag. 289

ESSAY REVIEWS

- ORESTE TRABUCCO, «*Io confondo li macchiavellisti e scienziati, che eternano il mondo con Aristotele*». Su una biografia di Tommaso Campanella » 297
- HAROLD J. COOK, *To Descartes' ear? Listening in on Heterodox Natural Philosophy in Germany* » 303
- SEBASTIÁN MOLINA-BETANCUR, *Translating as a manner of appropriation: Granada and Gómez Crespo's transcription of Cédillo's Ydea* » 309
- MAURICE A. FINOCCHIARO, *Facts and fictions, insights and oversights in Galileo's early biographies* » 313

TEXTS & DOCUMENTS

LEONARDO ANATRINI

THE THEOLOGIAN'S ENDGAME
ON THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED CENSORIAL REPORT ON GALILEO'S *DIALOGUE*
AND RELATED DOCUMENTS*

SUMMARY

After a century and a half of research and numerous excellent studies dedicated to Galileo's trial, there are still many unanswered questions about this key episode in the birth of modern science and the history of free thought. Now a dossier found among the collections of the State Archive of Rome (ASR) allows us to shed new light upon one of the crucial moments in the events of 1633 – the censorial analysis of the *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems* – as well as on the negotiations carried out by the House of Medici a few years after the scientist's death in the attempt to obtain a new imprimatur for his prohibited work.

In this paper, an annotated bilingual edition of these new documents will be presented, preceded by a brief introduction aimed at historically contextualising them and providing some hypotheses regarding their authorship and objectives. Particular attention will be focused on the first document in the dossier, a hitherto unknown censorial report ascribable to Pope Urban VIII's personal theologian, Agostino Oreggi. More comprehensive results will be disclosed after further – and necessary now more than ever – archival research, currently hindered because of the ongoing pandemic.

Keywords: Galileo's trial, Inquisition, Agostino Oreggi, Virgilio Spada.

Università degli Studi di Ferrara: ntrld@unife.it

* A number of experts, scholars and friends are accompanying me on this unexpected adventure, and here I wish to thank them: Massimo Bucciantini, for his constant support; Sara Bonechi, Michele Camerota, Marco Ciardi, Paolo Galluzzi, Franco Giudice and Patrizia Ruffo for their advice and many suggestions; Lisa C. Chien, Laura Incollingo and Gennaro Lauro for their careful revision of the English translations, and Gianluca Miele for endless discussions on the history of canon law.

On January 13th of this year, during research aimed at reconstructing the events that led to the publication of the first collected edition of Galileo's writings in Bologna between 1655 and 1656, I came across a curious series of documents contained in one of the miscellaneous volumes of the *Spada Veralli* fonds stored in the State Archive of Rome.¹ As the name suggests, this fonds deposited in 1971 preserves what remains of the private archive of the ancient and aristocratic Spada family of Rome. The volume that I examined in detail during this period (n. 235) forms part of the first section of the fonds, a series of 257 volumes representing the set of documents collected by the various members of the family who undertook an ecclesiastical career over a period of more than three centuries.

Volume 235, which was composed between the second and third quarters of the 17th century, is divided by subject into thematic dossiers containing memoirs, drafts of texts, and sketches of architectural projects by Virgilio Spada (1596-1662), as well as excerpts from his correspondence. He served as Provost of the Congregation of the Oratory between 1638 and 1660 and Papal Almoner for Pope Innocent X (1574-1655) between 1644 and 1655.

This volume presents a coeval page numbering, retains what would appear to be the original limp vellum binding, and shows no signs of any kind of gap or restoration.² Each dossier begins with a leaf that specifies on the recto the subject dealt with, while the verso is blank. The *Galileo* dossier covers pp. 131-180 and consists of:

- 131, title;
- 132-134, blank;
- 135-160, undated and unsigned (possibly by Agostino Oreggi) censorial report on Galileo's *Dialogue* drawn up in two different versions (135-146 and 147-160) – Spada Veralli 235, 1, A and B (see Fig. 1);
- 161-162, blank;
- 163, Letter from Prince Leopoldo de' Medici (1617-1675) to Virgilio Spada (August 6th, 1650)³ – Spada Veralli 235, 2;

¹ For a description of this archival fonds, see MARINA RAFFAELI CAMMAROTA, *Il fondo archivistico Spada Veralli: ipotesi per un inventario*, Roma, Beniamino Carucci, 1980.

² For the above-mentioned reasons, it has not yet been possible to carry out a study on the paper's watermarks.

³ Published in GIUSEPPE FINOCCHIARO, *Il museo di curiosità di Virgilio Spada. Una raccolta romana del Seicento*, Roma, Fratelli Palombi, 1999, pp. 184. The draft letter is preserved as well, in the Galilean Collection of the National Library of Florence, and has been published in ODG *Carteggio*, II, pp. 38-39.

Il Pre^{mo} Reu^{mo} M^{ro} del S^{no} Palazzo
 concessa licenza al sig. Galileo Galilei di
 dar' alle stampe alcuni Discorsi dei due
 sistemi Tolomaeo, e Copernicano, e di
 quest'ultimo trattarne ex hypotesi, per
 facilitare i calcoli, e computi, o posto altr'
 ordine di cose.

Et tal concessione non è lontana dal modo
 del trattare de più graui Autori, ch'habbi
 la Chiesa, i quali trattano se sia possibi:
 le l' Eternità del Mondo, ancorche sij
 cento esser stato fatto nel principio del tempo.
 E delle processioni delle Diuine Persone
 ne trattano, fatto anco alle volte positione
 impossibile, come quella. An si Spiritus
 Sanctus non procederet a Filio, distin-
 gueretur ab illo.

Fig. 1. ASR, Spada Veralli, vol. 235, p. 135.

- 164, blank;
- 165, copy of Leopoldo's letter (unknown hand) – Spada Veralli 235, 2a;
- 166-169, blank;
- 170, outside of Leopoldo's letter, with the recipient's details and a paper seal embossed with the coat of arms of the House of Medici;
- 171-173, autograph draft of Virgilio Spada's letter in reply to Prince Leopoldo (second half of August 1650), with marginalia by two different hands⁴ – Spada Veralli 235, 3;
- 174, blank;
- 175, undated and unsigned (unknown hand) account of meetings held by members of the Congregation of the Holy Office and the Congregation of the Index – Spada Veralli 235, 4;
- 176, blank;
- 177, undated letter (unknown hand) from the *Virtuous Mathematicians* («I Matematici Virtuosi») to the cardinals of the Congregation of the Holy Office – Spada Veralli 235, 5;
- 178-179, blank;
- 180, outside of the *Virtuous Mathematicians'* letter, with a note by the same hand as one of the marginalia found in Virgilio Spada's draft letter.

Even though Prince Leopoldo's letter to Virgilio Spada (Spada Veralli 235, 2) has been known to scholars for over thirty years, it has not yet been possible to clarify the links that connected Leopoldo, who would be appointed a cardinal by Pope Clement IX (1600-1669) in 1667, and the Oratorian father, apart from a shared love of art and collecting, mostly because the only known proof of an epistolary exchange is this very letter. In it, adopting a friendly and informal tone that underlines their consolidated relationship, Leopoldo asks Spada what possible path might be taken to obtain a new imprimatur for the *Dialogue*. The origins of their relationship are unknown, although it can be speculated that they first met during the stay in Rome of Leopoldo and his brother Mattias (1613-1667) at the beginning of 1650 on the occasion of the Jubilee.⁵ Among the reasons that led Leopoldo to turn to Spada, there was perhaps a shared sensibility towards the arts and sciences. It is a known fact, for

⁴ Partially published in FINOCCHIARO, *Il museo di curiosità* (cit. note 3), pp. 184-185.

⁵ An account of the sojourn in Rome of Leopoldo and Mattias is contained in an unpublished travel journal and related letters sent by them to the Grand Duke Ferdinando II (1610-1670), kept conserved in the State Archive of Florence (ASF), *Miscellanea Medicea*, 94, 5; *Mediceo del principato*, 5508, 50-67.

example, that in 1645 the Oratorian father purchased the painting *The Astronomers* by Niccolò Tornioli (1598-1651), in which we can observe a heated cosmological debate being conducted by several personages, including a figure in the background whom some have identified as Galileo himself.⁶ At the same time Leopoldo knew perfectly well that Virgilio was the younger brother of Cardinal Bernardino Spada (1594-1661), Prefect of the Congregation of the Index between 1642 and 1661 and member of the Congregation of the Holy Office since November 19th, 1642, the only institutional bodies empowered to review the condemnation of Galileo's work.⁷

Even more surprising is the readiness with which Spada undertook an attempt to fulfill the requests of his correspondent. In this draft reply, among the reasons that could make the achievement of Leopoldo's objective 'extremely easy' Spada mentions a *voto* (vote or judgment), namely a censorial report, prepared by Cardinal Agostino Oreggi (1577-1635), presenting the possibility of obtaining a new printing licence for Galileo's work.⁸ In my opinion this *voto*, a copy of which Spada even considered sending to Prince Leopoldo, is nothing other than Spada Veralli 235, 1, as I will try to substantiate here.

However, before sending such a letter, Spada – well aware of the necessary precautions that his position required – thought it advisable to show the draft to someone else, as he writes in the first marginalium: «I would not know if this reply is appropriate, hence I submit it to Your Eminence first» (this also explains the existence of a copy of Leopoldo's letter).⁹ The response appears in the subsequent marginal note which, after a series of calligraphic comparisons conducted on two volumes of correspondence preserved in the same fonds of the Rome State Archive, I have concluded was most probably written by Virgilio's older brother, Cardinal Bernardino.¹⁰ This is supported by the fact that the position held by Bernardino Spada is consistent with the appellation of 'Your Em-

⁶ Cf. FEDERICO TOGNONI (ed.), *Iconografia galileiana*, Firenze, Giunti, 2013, pp. 75-76; GIULIA MARTINA WESTON, *After Galileo: The Image of Science in Niccolò Tornioli's Astronomers*, «Art History», 39, 2, 2016, pp. 302-317.

⁷ On the role of Bernardino Spada in the Roman Congregations, see ARNE KARSTEN, *Kardinal Bernardino Spada: eine Karriere im barocken Rom*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001; HERMAN H. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition: Kardinäle und Konsultoren 1600 bis 1700*, Freiburg; Basel; Wien, Verlag Herder, 2017, pp. 572-573.

⁸ See Spada Veralli 235, 3, 13-18.

⁹ See notes XLVII and 113.

¹⁰ ASR, Spada Veralli, 564 and 572; however, further archival research is required in order to provide a conclusive calligraphic analysis.

inence' used by Virgilio, and the author of the second note implicitly claims to be a member of both the Holy Office and the Index.¹¹ Furthermore, in this annotation Spada is advised not to disclose information concerning the deeds of the Holy Office, covered by a requirement of secrecy, with a clear reference to Galileo's trial and Oreggi's *voto*, comparable to a procedural act, since the latter had played both the role of a member of the so-called *Special Commission* of summer 1632 and that of consultor for the censorial analysis of the *Dialogue*. Following this advice, in all probability Virgilio never sent his reply to Leopoldo, resorting instead to an agent of the House of Medici posted in Rome – such as the Auditor for the Ecclesiastical Properties expressly mentioned in the very same note – in order to stay in contact with the Prince.

In the meantime the cardinal would have presented Leopoldo's request to his colleagues in the two Congregations, and I believe that Spada Veralli 235, 4 could represent the result of his efforts. In this brief report, drafted in clear, minute writing in an unknown hand, many important details help us to date its composition. The two members of the Congregations who were asked for an opinion on what to do were Giovanni Battista de' Marini (1597-1669), who is addressed in the document as 'Superior General of the Dominican Order' (a fact that allows us to date the document to after June 5th, 1650, the day of his election), and Cardinal Francesco Albizzi (1593-1684), at the time Assessor of the Holy Office.¹²

While Albizzi underlined the extreme difficulty of the venture, de' Marini argued that if it were possible to convince the Pope to entrust the case to the members of the Congregation of the Index there might be some hope of success. The Superior General spoke from experience, not only because he had served as the Secretary of the Congregation of the Index from 1628 to 1650 (a position that he resigned due to his commitments as General of the Preachers and Consultor of the Holy Office, a position acquired on June 22nd, 1650), but also as one of the signees of the decree of August 23rd, 1634 which placed the *Dialogue* on the Index. There is a further detail useful to date this document; while there is no mention of these events in the meeting reports of the Holy Office (namely the volumes of *Decreta* preserved in the Vatican Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith), somewhat curiously there is a report in the *Diaries* of the Congregation of the Index of a meeting held on September 6th, 1650 (in which, however, the requests made by the Florentine court are not mentioned) that was attended by de' Marini, who apparently had

¹¹ See notes L and 115.

¹² Cf. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7), pp. 378-379, 40-41.

ceased being a member of the Congregation about three months earlier.¹³ All things considered, I am therefore led to believe that Spada Veralli 235, 4 was drawn up during the first half of September 1650.

As for the last document, the undated petition letter signed by the *Virtuous Mathematicians* requesting that a new imprimatur be granted for the *Dialogue*, it is easy to link this to Virgilio Spada's advice given in the draft reply concerning whether it might be possible to:

offer a memoir to the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office – recalling the Decree promulgated on other occasions, the death of the author, and the readiness to remove or change whatever the mentioned Sacred Congregation wants – by writing to the Cardinals of the mentioned Sacred Congregation detailed letters.¹⁴

Although it is plausible to believe that this letter never reached Florence, nevertheless some of the information contained therein, as mentioned above, may have been reported to Leopoldo through one of the Medici's agents in Rome. Considering his position as a foreign prince and a member of the Church, Leopoldo avoided exposing himself in the first person, knowing that he could not approach the cardinals of the Holy Office with the same familiarity with which he turned to Virgilio Spada. Hence the petition letter was signed using a pseudonym, but in all likelihood it never reached its intended recipients. If in fact the documents contained in the *Galileo* dossier have been arranged in chronological order based on when they were written, and if the hypothesized date for Spada Veralli 235, 4 is correct, it can readily be assumed that concurrently with the presentation of Leopoldo's requests by Bernardino to the colleagues of the two Congregations, the Prince – after being fully informed of the situation by the Auditor (or another agent of the Grand Duchy) – was having the letter of appeal drafted, which did not reach Rome in time, as would seem to be confirmed by the note added immediately beneath the recipients' details in the same hand as the long note in Spada's draft (Cardinal Bernardino's, in all probability): «We talked unfruitfully about this matter in one and the other Congrega-

¹³ ACDF, Index, *Diarii*, 5, leaf 2r.

¹⁴ Spada Veralli 235, 3, 31-35. Adopting a literal interpretation of the appellation, it can be speculated that the *Virtuous Mathematicians* might have been a group of clerics regular of the Order of the Piarists (better known as Scolopi), which played an integral role in the cultural policies of the Medici for many years. On the role of the Piarists in the preservation of Galileo's scientific legacy in the mid-17th century, see MASSIMO BUCCIAN-TINI, *Eredità galileiana e politica culturale medicea: il caso degli Scolopi*, «Studi storici», 30, 2, 1989, pp. 379-399.

tion, as we will report in further detail». Furthermore, if the letter had actually reached the cardinals of the Holy Office, it certainly would not have been returned to Virgilio, who had never been a member of either of the two Congregations, and this letter would surely have been conserved somewhere in the Vatican Archives.

After these negotiations, there does not seem to have been any further correspondence between Prince Leopoldo and members of the Spada family, and when the collected edition of Galileo's writings was finally published more than five years later, it was not possible to include the *Dialogue* in it.

I shall now proceed with a brief description and discussion of Spada Veralli 235, 1, by far the most important document in the dossier.¹⁵ To begin, it would be helpful to clarify some points concerning the context of the document with respect to both its author and the period in which it was drafted. As already noted, this report is anonymous and undated. Although it has not so far been possible to determine the date of composition, after careful study I have concluded that this is not a preparatory copy made by Virgilio Spada for Prince Leopoldo, to which reference is made in Spada Veralli 235, 3, but a version coeval with the events of 1633, possibly the original draft.

Starting with the graphic characteristics of the document, two details above all caught my attention. Throughout the text there is a blank space separating most sentences, corresponding on average to 1 to 2 lines of text (which is reproduced in my transcription by means of single lines left blank not included in the numbering). As far as the contents of the document are concerned, these gaps do not appear to serve any purpose, and I therefore believe that they were inserted to allow for the possibility of making additions to the first draft. As for the second detail, three extended passages (A, 26-35, 46-50, 75-86) – which are far too long to be considered sections of the original text initially left out by a distracted copyist – fill three of these blank spaces and run into the surrounding margins (see Fig. 2). With regard to the handwriting, since it has not yet been possible to compare this new source with the most well-known document considered to be autograph, namely Oreggi's official censorial report, for my analysis I used the manuscript copy of the theologian's treatise *De sacrosancto incarnationis mysterio*, kept at the Vatican Library (BAV, Reg. lat.

¹⁵ To date there is only one mention of Spada Veralli 235, 1 in the literature – a sketchy passing reference to the document with no discussion of its context or significance, in FINOCCHIARO, *Il museo di curiosità* (cit. note 3), p. 34, where the author seems to implicitly attribute the document to Virgilio Spada.

e per conseguenza nulla la gratia.
 e per tanto; anuochè nel suo Libro non si
 contenesse cos' alcuna contro le sacre Scrit-
 ture, come impresso senza legitima faul-

tà; restarbbe prohibito, o almeno in tal stato, che non se gli farebbe uenuna ingiuria a
 prohibirlo. Questo è così uero, che ne aneo i Preseuti o di gratia, o di giustizia che s'ino conuitti
 dal Supremo Pontefice, conforme alle leggi, sacri Canon, e stile della Corte suffragano a chi gl'impetra
 facendo quella uerità, che saputa, haurebbe cacciato il Pontefice dal concederli. Il che maggiormente si ueni-
 Con maggior ragione adung, si pota o
 prohibire, o suspendere sin tanto che s'ij con-
 uetto, dando egli gran sospetto di uoler as-
 solutamente prouare il mouimento della Ter-
 ra, e la quiete, et immobilità del Sole.
 fua nelle cause del S. Offitio, doue le cause si
 deuono spedire conforme alla giurisdictione, di-
 spositione, e stile del S. Offitio, e sono nulle tutte
 le sentenze, gratie, et assoluzioni, che si fan-
 no in fauor dei citi, anco dalle uicere Simo-
 mo Pontefice, come nel Moto proprio, Intra
 multiplici, della b. m. di Pio v., se non si
 fanno seruare le sopradiette cose.

Per incominciare dall' auuiso dato a Sertori,
 dice egli, col moto della Terra darli luce
 all' ignoto Problema del flusso del Mare.
 Il che non può essere; porche il flusso del
 Mare à suoi tempi ha reale esistenza.
 Adung, non può dependere da causa

371), including the autograph signatures of the imprimatur's signees and therefore originally used for the printing of the work (Romae, Ex Typographia Vaticana, 1633). While the main text is drafted by an unknown copyist, the handwriting of the corrections and the critical apparatus (consisting in textual references visually resembling those present in the margins of pgs. 136, 141, 145, 147, 153 and 157 of the dossier) matches that of Spada Veralli 235, 1. This apparatus, beside presenting deletions and corrections, fills the blank margins of many pages in a disorderly and chaotic way, a detail that makes me think it to be the work of the author and not of another copyist. I am consequently led to believe that Spada Veralli 235, 1 might be an original draft, written by Oreggi himself.

With regard to the dating, I found no reason to consider Spada Veralli 235, 1 a forgery made by Virgilio Spada on the occasion of Leopoldo's request, and consequently I hypothesized as the self-evident *terminus ante quem* the submission of the three known censorial reports for the trial records that took place around April 17th, 1633 (the date of the drafting of Oreggi's report). Instead, the *terminus post quem* can be deduced from the contents of the document. In fact, the notorious Precept received by Galileo on February 26th, 1616 is explicitly mentioned in it.¹⁶ According to the archival documents that have come to light thus far, the first mention of the discovery of the Precept dates back to September 11th, 1632.¹⁷ Furthermore, in this new report we find what appear to be veiled references to the other two censorial reports drawn up by Melchior Inchofer (1584-1648) and Zaccaria Pasqualigo (1600-1664), as well as the *Special Commission Report (SCR)*.¹⁸ Considering this latter detail, perhaps it would be appropriate to date the drafting of Spada Veralli 235, 1, like the reports of Inchofer and Pasqualigo, to the early months of 1633.

Several details concerning both the content of the text and its discovery allow me to propose an attribution that, while not certain, may at least be considered highly plausible and probable. First of all, it is necessary to understand how Virgilio Spada managed to gain access to a document that, by its nature and content, was intended to be kept in the Inquisition archives, to which the Oratorian father did not have and would have never had access. A first, but extraordinarily unlikely hypothesis could be that Virgilio, aware of the existence of this document, had

¹⁶ Spada Veralli 235, 1, A, 17-21.

¹⁷ OG, XIV, p. 389 (Francesco Niccolini to Andrea Cioli), while the first detailed description of the Precept's content is contained in the *Special Commission Report*, which was drafted a few days later: OG, XIX, pp. 324-330; SERGIO PAGANO (ed.), *I documenti vaticani del processo di Galileo Galilei (1611-1741)*, Città del Vaticano, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 2009² (DV), n. 25.

¹⁸ See Spada Veralli 235, 1, A, 163 and B, 41-45 (notes 46, 60, 61).

commissioned its theft from the aforementioned archives in order to help Prince Leopoldo achieve his objectives. A second, much more probable hypothesis is that Spada discovered the document in the archive of the *Elemosynaria Apostolica* during his appointment as Papal Almoner, because Oreggi too had held this position from August 6th, 1623 to November 28th, 1633 (the day he was appointed cardinal).

To arrive at an attribution based on its content, it is instead necessary to retrace the links between this document and the other censorial reports on the *Dialogue* and the *SCR*. Scholars are in agreement that although this commission, which was established in the late summer of 1632, consisted of three members – namely the Master of the Sacred Palace Niccolò Riccardi (1585-1639), Agostino Oreggi and Melchior Inchofer – only the first two drew up the final report, which was read during the meeting of the Congregation of the Holy Office on September 23rd in the presence of the Pope,¹⁹ as evidenced by the known Oreggi report:

In opere quod inscribitur *Dialogo di Galileo Galilei etc. sopra i due sistemi massimi del mondo, Tolemaico et Copernicano*, tenetur ac defenditur sententia quae docet moveri terram et quiescere solem, ut ex toto operis contextu colligitur, et praesertim ex notatis in scriptura quam, iusu Sanctissimi, R.^{mus} Pr. Nicolaus Riccardius, Sacri Palatii Apostolici Magister, et Augustinus Oreggius, eiusdem S.^{mi} Theologus, Sancti Officii Consultores, obtulerunt Eminentissimis et R.^{mis} Cardinalibus super haeretica pravitae generalibus Inquisitoribus.²⁰

The *SCR* is in essence a report on the events that led to the printing and publication of the *Dialogue*, with a series of elements that were presented as the *corpo del delitto* ('corpus delicti') and whose content anticipated the censorial reports. The main peculiarity of the *SCR* lies in the fact that it presents two versions, albeit overlapping in many parts, of the same events and this is why scholars have generally attributed one version to Riccardi and the other to Oreggi.²¹ Up to now, however, there

¹⁹ OG, XIX, pp. 279-280; DV, n. 130: «Relata serie totius facti circa impressionem libri a Galileo de Galileis Florentiae factam [...]».

²⁰ OG, XIX, p. 348; DV, n. 44.

²¹ Cf. LUCA BIANCHI, *Agostino Oreggi, qualificatore del 'Dialogo', e i limiti della conoscenza scientifica*, in JOSÉ MONTESINOS – CARLOS SOLÍS (eds.), *Largo campo di filosofare. Eurosymposium Galileo 2001*, La Orotava, Fundacion Canaria Orotava de historia de la ciencia, 2001, pp. 575-584; 576; ANNIBALE FANTOLI, *Il processo del 1633*, in M. BUCCIANINI – M. CAMEROTA – F. GIUDICE (eds.), *Il caso Galileo: una rilettura storica, filosofica, teologica. Convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 26-30 maggio 2009*, Firenze, Olschki, 2011, pp. 187-212: 190-191; THOMAS F. MAYER, *The Roman Inquisition: Trying Galileo*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015, pp. 147-156. See also FRANCESCO BERETTA, 'Omnibus Christianae, Catholicaeque Philosophiae amantibus. D.D.'. *Le Tractatus syllepticus de Melchior Inchofer, censeur de Galilée*,

has been no certainty as to who was the author of which version due to the simple fact that they are not signed and both refer to Riccardi in the third person.

Incredibly enough, in Spada Veralli 235, 1, among the eight elements making up the *corpo del delitto*, seven are treated in a more or less clear way. The only point not discussed is the first, relating to Galileo's use of Riccardi's imprimatur without his *placet* and without having advised him of the publication of the work.²² However, this first point is missing for a clear reason; concerning the lawfulness of the use of the imprimatur and, more generally, of the publication of the work itself, the author of Spada Veralli 235, 1 lays a charge of fraud against Galileo based on a specific regulatory violation. Moreover, together with the 'second version' of the SCR and Galileo's second deposition of April 30th, 1633, Spada Veralli 235, 1 is the only known source that mentions the possibility of granting a new imprimatur for the *Dialogue* (on the condition that a number of corrections were made).²³ Not to mention the many occasions (no less than seven) on which the author of this new document recalls the notorious 'argument' of Urban VIII (1568-1644) on the consequences of divine omnipotence (originally disclosed by Oreggi in 1629 in his *De Deo uno tractatus primus*), with the explicit aim of illustrating its epistemological weight and superiority over all of Galileo's scientific hypotheses and assertions, and in general stating the absolute supremacy and coordinating power of religion (specifically the system of revealed truths codified by the Catholic Church) over science.²⁴

What makes Spada Veralli 235, 1 a unique source is the fact that it is divided into two parts that are not complementary, but alternative to each other. They constitute two separate, almost irreconcilable versions of the same censorial report. The reports of Inchofer and Pasqualigo as well present a bipartition that is both conceptual and graphic – although the various parts are absolutely complementary – but for reasons that

«Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie», 48, 3, 2001, pp. 301-327, in which the thesis is suggested that the Special Commission never actually existed.

²² OG, XIX, p. 326; DV, p. 52: «1. Aver posto l'imprimatur di Roma senz'ordine, e senza partecipar la pubblicazione con chi si dice aver sottoscritto».

²³ Spada Veralli 235, 1, B, 194-198 (note 107).

²⁴ In addition to the extracts cited in this essay, other passages from Spada Veralli 235, 1 that are in substantial agreement with the contents of several works published by Oreggi are indicated in the footnotes to the translation. For an interesting and convincing interpretation of the Pope's 'argument' as exploited by Galileo in the *Dialogue*, see L. BIANCHI, 'Mirabile e veramente angelica dottrina'. Galileo e l'argomento di Urbano VIII, in *Il caso Galileo* (cit. note 21), pp. 213-233.

can be traced to the instructions given by the members of the Holy Office for their drafting. As can be observed in Inchofer's report, two *vota* (votes, judgements)²⁵ were requested in order to clarify whether in his work Galileo taught, defended and held the stillness of the Sun at the centre of the Universe and the motion of the Earth, transgressing the Precept of February 26th, 1616 and the Anti-Copernican Decree of March 5th:

Rationes secundi voti, de statione, quiete seu immobilitate solis, et quod sit centrum universi circa quod planetae et terra moveantur, sunt per singula capita eadem quae sunt allatae pro primo voto, de conversione terrae.²⁶

Oreggi's report, on the other hand, is much more concise. Even though it is exhaustive and in line with the opinion of Inchofer and Pasqualigo (and with version A of Spada Veralli 235, 1), stating that Galileo's violations were evident «ex toto operis contextu», it is rather unusual in its brevity and in the fact that, regarding the actual censorial analysis of the *Dialogue*, it refers to the *SCR*.²⁷ However, the two versions of this new report do not correspond to the two *vota* requested from Pasqualigo and Inchofer, but to two opposing possibilities. The purpose of version A is, in fact, to prohibit the *Dialogue* and condemn its author, while version B proposes the correction and the new publication of the *Dialogue*, accompanied by an admonishment, however harsh and peremptory, directed at the author. It is immediately clear that the two versions represent alternative judgments and that, taken together, they would have been considered incompatible and therefore inadmissible by the cardinals who were called upon to adjudicate Galileo's case.

At this point I must recall who Agostino Oreggi was, underlining the importance of his role in the events surrounding the trial. In addition to being Almoner and Consultor of the Holy Office since 1624, as well as one of the most prominent theologians of his days and a well-known and respected expert in both civil and canon law, he was first and fore-

²⁵ Thus, employing a sort of synecdoche, the censorial reports are usually called censorial votes as well.

²⁶ OG, XIX, p. 349; DV, n. 45, p. 80. This aspect stands out more clearly in Inchofer's report, while in Pasqualigo's the thorough censorial analysis is preceded by two distinct, but almost identical introductory notes.

²⁷ As has already been noted by other scholars, for example WILLIAM R. SHEA, *Melchior Inchofer's 'Tractatus syllepticus': A Consultor of the Holy Office answers Galileo*, in PAOLO GALLUZZI (ed.), *Novità celesti e crisi del sapere. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi galileiani*, Firenze, Giunti-Barbèra, 1984, pp. 283-292: 288; and BIANCHI, *Agostino Oreggi* (cit. note 21), p. 576.

most one of the most loyal members of the inner circle of Urban VIII, being his personal theologian and chamberlain (*Cubicularius intimus*).²⁸ Wishing to provide the Pope with the entire range of possibilities regarding the resolution of the Galileo affair, it is plausible to hypothesise that Oreggi, in derogation from the current inquisitorial praxis, drafted this document for the exclusive use of the Pope who, during the trial, would have established which specific ideas of truth, law and order were to be observed.²⁹ Such a scenario would bear out the observation of Thomas F. Mayer (1951-2014), according to whom: «The Roman Inquisition belonged to the Pope [...]. It reflects better than any other papal institution the long-term tendency to concentrate power in the Pope's hands».³⁰ A brief description of the divergent aims of the two versions will clarify this specific aspect.

Version A provides for the prohibition of the *Dialogue* and the condemnation of the author. In it two different charges are laid against Galileo – one of fraud and the other of suspicion of heresy (with the implicit possibility of formulating an accusation of formal heresy as well). The content of the 1616 Precept is substantially ignored, while legal grounds are provided by the simple existence of the incriminating document. It declared that a judgment had been passed on Galileo by the Holy Office, but since he concealed this fact when requesting a rescript (the printing licence for the *Dialogue*), he was guilty of perpetrating a fraud consisting in the submission of a surreptitious request, which made the granted licence null and void and, by extension, the circulation of his work illegal.³¹ This was enough to justify prohibiting the work.

To condemn Galileo, the author of Spada Veralli 235, 1 resorted instead to a subtle legal and doctrinal device. Traditionally, heretics were defined as those who denied and doubted the revealed truth, according to legislation established since the time of the *Decretals* of Gregory IX

²⁸ Cf. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7), pp. 435-437.

²⁹ Another interesting aspect of Spada Veralli 235, 1 is that its author, enumerating the 'Patristic' sources on the basis of which it was possible to affirm the motion of the Sun and the stillness of the Earth in conformity with the Scriptures (see note 5, texts), quotes some quite unusual works, such as the *Letter to Polycarp* by Pseudo-Dionysius (5th-6th century CE) and *De mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae* by Augustinus Hibernicus (fl. c. 655 CE), which most remarkably are quoted by Galileo as well in his *Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina* (OG, V, p. 344). All things considered, this report could consequently be interpreted also as a reply to the epistemological argumentation initially formulated by Galileo between 1613 and 1615.

³⁰ THOMAS F. MAYER, *The Roman Inquisition: A Papal Bureaucracy and Its Laws in the Age of Galileo*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012, p. 9.

³¹ Spada Veralli 235, 1, A, 17-35.

(c. 1170-1241).³² Hence the caution with which Pasqualigo and Inchofer, while accusing Galileo of having violated the Precept concerning the teaching and defence of Copernicanism, affirmed only the strong suspicion, but not the certainty, that the scientist held it to be true, because a direct accusation would have been equivalent to a charge of formal heresy. The author of Spada Veralli 235, 1 did the same thing, while relying on other sources of canon law, quoting first the *Liber Extra* and then a distinctly more restrictive legislation, the papal bull *Apostolici regiminis* that was promulgated in 1513 by Leo X (1475-1521) during the Fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517).³³ It was created to neutralise any philosophical speculation contrary to the Holy Scriptures regarding the immortality of the soul, and affirmed the principle according to which no truth could be considered as such if it was in contradiction to the revealed truth:

Cumque verum vero minime contradicat, omnem assertionem veritati illuminatae fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse diffinimus: & ut aliter dogmatizare non liceat, districtius inhibemus. Omnesque huiusmodi erroris assertionibus inhaerentes veluti damnatissimas haereses seminantes per omnia ut detestabiles & abhominabiles Haereticos & infideles, Catholicam fidem labefactantes, vitandos & puniendos fore decernimus. Insuper omnibus & singulis Philosophis in Universitatibus Studiorum generalium, & alibi publice legentibus districte praecipiendo mandamus, ut cum Philosophorum principia aut conclusiones: in quibus a recta fide deviare noscuntur, Auditoribus suis legerint, seu explanaverint. Quale hoc de Animae mortalitate, aut unitate, & mundi aeternitate, ac alia huiusmodi, teneantur eisdem veritatem religionis christianae omni conatu manifestam facere, & persuadendo pro posse docere: ac omni studio huiusmodi Philosophorum argumenta, cum omnia solubilia existant, pro viribus excludere, atque resolvere.³⁴

Recourse to such legislation presented enormous dangers for Galileo. Firstly, because as a papal bull promulgated during an Ecumenical Council it had far greater authority than the Anti-Copernican Decree

³² A source expressly quoted *ibid.*, A, 94-97.

³³ *Ibid.*, A, 154-158.

³⁴ LEO X, *Bulla seu Cedula in materia fidei* [...], [Rome, Marcello Silber, 1513], leaves [2]v-[3]r. See also ERIC A. CONSTANT, *A Reinterpretation of the Fifth Lateran Council Decree Apostolici regiminis (1513)*, «The Sixteenth Century Journal», 33, 2, 2002, pp. 353-379; RICHARD J. BLACKWELL, *Behind the Scenes at Galileo's Trial*, Notre Dame (IN), University of Notre Dame Press, 2006, pp. 166-167; L. BIANCHI, *Pour une histoire de la "double vérité"*, Paris, J. Vrin, 2008, pp. 150-155; GEREON WOLTERS, *The Silence of the Wolves, Or, Why It Took the Holy Inquisition Seventy-Three Years to Ban Copernicanism*, in WOLFGANG NEUBER – THOMAS RAHN – CLAUDIUS ZITTEL (eds.), *The Making of Copernicus. Early Modern Transformations of the Scientist and his Science*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2014, pp. 42-63: 59-61.

of March 5th, 1616. Secondly, it established much clearer boundaries than the Precept, which remained a norm *ad personam*. According to the latter, it could be reasonably demonstrated that with his book Galileo taught a doctrine condemned by the Church, but due to two stratagems adopted by the scientist – in his note to the reader, the work is described as a *tractatio ex hypothesi* and the text itself was structured using the literary, semi-fictional framework provided by the dialogical form of the text – it would have been much more difficult to substantiate the allegation that he held true and defended Copernicanism. To achieve this goal, a manifest regulatory violation had to be demonstrated, and the *Apostolici regiminis* offered exactly this possibility. A literal interpretation of the bull provided that those who ventured to discuss even *ex hypothesi* matters contrary to the *truth* were then required to trace the roots of all their speculations back to the one *truth*, being «obliged to devote all their efforts to clarify for their listeners the truth of the Christian religion», under penalty of being «punished as detestable and abominable heretics and infidels who undermine the Catholic faith». Quantitatively speaking, in the *Dialogue* the rejection of ‘truths contrary to the truth’ was evident only in the note to the reader, thanks to the reference to the discussion *hypothetico more*, and in the few lines dedicated to the exposition of the ‘argument’ of Urban VIII at the end of the work.³⁵ Thus, it was possible to lay a virtually indisputable charge of heresy against him that might range from vehement suspicion to formal heresy.³⁶ By adopting this legal approach, Galileo would not have been condemned so much for teaching, defending and holding Copernicanism, but because he was undoubtedly guilty of not convincingly defending the doctrine of geocentrism in accordance with the Sacred Canons and the ‘official’ interpretation of the Bible.

Version B aims instead at pardoning Galileo and his work. Its author, being unable to find a way around the accusation of *petitio subreptitia* based on the fact that Galileo had concealed from (or did not know that he was supposed to inform) Riccardi of the existence of the Precept, behaves as if this manner of crime had never been formally codified by canon law and, consequently, he never mentions the Precept itself. The accusation adopts the same arguments and passages from the *Dialogue*

³⁵ OG, VII, pp. 29-30, 488.

³⁶ Surprisingly, the hypothesis that the *Apostolici regiminis* offered the doctrinal justification for Galileo’s condemnation has been put forward in recent years; cf. F. BERETTA, *Melchior Inchofer et l’hérésie de Galilée: censure doctrinale et hiérarchie intellectuelle*, «Journal of Modern European History», 3, 1, 2005, pp. 23-49: 40.

used and quoted in version A, charging Galileo with not having followed the provisions of the Anti-Copernican Decree, discussing the heliocentric theory not just hypothetically but trying to prove its verity. The tone of the text is, however, very different from that of version A, so much so that it seems to attempt to attribute Galileo's shortcomings and errors to little more than vanity, arrogance and vaguely blasphemous attitudes (also mentioned in version A and previously in the *SCR*).³⁷ The suspicion that the scientist had tried to substantiate statements contrary to the revealed truth is mentioned with the citation of the 1513 bull,³⁸ but to get around this obstacle the author of the report suggests the possibility of rebalancing the relation between potentially heretical statements and the subjugation of scientific hypotheses to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, by demanding a more rigid adherence to the clauses of the *tractatio ex hypothesi* (possibly accompanied by the deployment of a research method epistemologically conformable to the 'argument' of Urban VIII) together with a complete refutation of Copernicanism in a hypothetical *Fifth Day* of the *Dialogue*.³⁹

In conclusion, I will present here a hypothesis, based exclusively on already known archival documents, regarding how Spada Veralli 235, 1 (or at least its contents) might have circulated during the crucial days of the trial, between the submission of the censorial reports and the handing down of the sentence. First, however, it is necessary to pose a question that, given the current state of research, is impossible to answer exhaustively: Why does it appear that there is no trace of this new censorial report in any form among the known records? Although in recent decades more than one scholar has speculated on the possibility that certain documents may have been removed from the records of Galileo's trial sometime between the 18th and 19th centuries, it is my considered opinion that Spada Veralli 235, 1 was never intended to be shared with the Cardinal Inquisitors assigned to judge Galileo's case. Rather, I believe that once the task with which he had been entrusted by the Pope was completed, Oreggi limited himself to adjusting his 'official' opinion to conform with that of his colleagues, leaving to the Pope as much room for manoeuvre as possible.

The immediate reasons for this would be at least two. On the one hand, there was the problem of the contestability of the charges brought against Galileo. After all, to accuse him of not respecting a precept of

³⁷ See especially note 102.

³⁸ Spada Veralli 235, 1, B, 176-180.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, B, 194-199.

which even the recipient seemed to retain only vague memories, or of having transgressed a decree promulgated by the Congregation of the Index was one thing. Quite another thing would have been to accuse him of violating a law established through a papal bull issued during an Ecumenical Council, the highest and most solemn source of canon law (together with the Apostolic Constitutions). To provide the Cardinal Inquisitors with such a weapon would have risked making the situation even more complicated. Some of the cardinals, for example, could have even gone so far as to request the death sentence. If, however, during the trial the only person informed of the contents of Oreggi's report had been the Pope himself, he could have asserted his authority over the Congregation even as the proponent of this subtle and cunning strategy, which was in utter derogation of current inquisitorial legislation. Such an attitude would be perfectly consistent with the character and objectives of Urban VIII, whom historiographic tradition tends to represent as a political animal and a reformer of the Pontifical State who «princeps potius videri voluit quam Pontifex, rector quam pastor».⁴⁰

Setting aside these intriguing speculations in favour of a careful analysis of the archival documents, it is possible to hypothesise that once Oreggi had concluded his duties as a censor, he discussed the contents of Spada Veralli 235, 1 with his colleagues. For example, such an opportunity may have arisen on April 21st, 1633, according to a letter sent the following day by the Commissioner of the Holy Office Vincenzo Maculano (1578-1667) to Francesco Barberini (1597-1679), Cardinal Secretary of the same Congregation:

Già facessimo hieri la Congregatione sopra il libro, e fu risoluto che in esso si difenda e s'insegni l'opinione riprovata e dannata dalla Chiesa, et però che l'autore si renda sospetto anco di tenerla; stando questo si potrà più presto ridurre la causa in stato di spedizione nella quale attenderò il senso di V. E. per obedire pontualmente.⁴¹

The circumstance may have been all the more appropriate since a few days later, on April 27th, Maculano undertook an extrajudicial measure and paid a visit to Galileo in the hope of convincing him to confess:

Et per non perder tempo, hieri dopo il pranzo mi posi a discorrere col Galileo, e dopo molti e molti argomenti e risposte passate fra noi ottenni, per gratia

⁴⁰ ALEXANDRO BASTIAANSE, *Teodoro Ameyden (1586-1656): un Neerlandese alla corte di Roma*, 's-Gravenhage, Staatsdrukkerij, 1967, p. 359.

⁴¹ DV, n. 137, pp. 191-192; OG, *Appendice*, IV, p. 247.

del Signore, l'intento mio, che gli feci toccar con mano l'error suo, sì che chiaramente conobbe di haver errato et nel suo libro di haver ecceduto; il che tutto esprese con parole di molto sentimento, come che si trovasse consolatissimo della cognitione dell'error suo, e si dispose a confessarlo giudicialmente [...].⁴²

On the basis of its contents, it is easy to detect a link between Spada Veralli 235, 1 and the addendum of Galileo's second deposition of April 30th, where the scientist, in a final attempt to save his work, offered to add 'one or two more days' to the *Dialogue*, dedicating them to a detailed refutation of the Copernican theory, thus picking up the closing lines of Spada Veralli 235, 1, B.⁴³ And perhaps we now find ourselves able to agree with Antonio Beltrán Marí (1948-2013) who, more convincingly than anyone else, illustrated how the events that led to Galileo's confession, in which the Commissioner was directly involved, may have been guided by the Pope's personal agenda.⁴⁴

As for the outcome of the trial, the contents of Spada Veralli 235, 1 could provide a legal and doctrinal explanation for the sentence. Firstly, Galileo was in clear violation of the Precept, based both on its terms and on the fact that, as the recipient, he was forbidden to hide its existence when requesting a printing licence for his work (hence the charge of a surreptitious request). Secondly, the scientist could be charged of vehement suspicion of heresy, by virtue of the legislation established by the bull *Apostolici regiminis*, for having held and tried to prove the truthfulness of assumptions that could only be hypothesised, since they contained propositions deemed contrary to the truth revealed in the Holy Scriptures and therefore condemned by the Church as heretic (stillness of the Sun at the centre of the Universe) and erroneous (motion of the Earth). A possible confirmation of this interpretation might be found in another important and often neglected document, the letter in which on July 2nd, 1633 the Cardinal Secretary ordered all local inquisitors and apostolic nuncios to read in public Galileo's sentence and abjuration in the presence of 'all the professors of mathematics and philosophy':

Benché dalla Congregazione dell'Indice sia stato sospeso il trattato di Nicolò Copernico *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, perché in quello si sostiene che la terra si muova e non il sole, ma questo sia centro del mondo, opinione contraria alla Sacra Scrittura; e sia stato proibito da questa Sacra Congregazione del

⁴² OG, XV, p. 106; DV, n. 181, p. 234.

⁴³ OG, XIX, p. 344; DV, n. 38, p. 74.

⁴⁴ ANTONIO BELTRÁN MARÍ, *Talento y poder: historia de las relaciones entre Galileo y la Iglesia católica*, Pamplona, Laetoli, 2006, pp. 562-587.

Santo Officio più anni sono a Galileo Galilei di Fiorenza di tenere, difendere, insegnare in qualsivoglia modo, in voce o in scritto, la detta opinione; non dimeno il medesimo Galileo ha ardito di comporre un libro intitolato Galileo Galilei Linceo, e, senza palesare la detta proibitione, ha estorto licenza di porlo in stampa, come ha posto; e supponendo nel principio, mezzo e fine di quello, di voler trattare ipoteticamente della sudetta opinione di Copernico, ha con tutto ciò (benché non ne potesse trattare in modo alcuno) trattatone in guisa tale, che si è reso vehementemente sospetto di haver tenuto tale opinione: onde, inquisito et carcerato in questo Santo Offizio, per sentenza di questi Eminentissimi miei SS.ⁿⁱ è stato condannato ad abiurare la detta opinione et a stare nella carcere formale, ad arbitrio delle Eminenze loro, et a fare altre penitenze salutari [...].⁴⁵

One last detail, which I believe it is crucial to highlight, could prove that the contents of this new document were known at the time of the trial. This detail lies in the work published by Inchofer in late 1633 and dedicated to the defence of geocentrism, the *Tractatus syllepticus*. Although it is not dazzling in its argumentation and the parts affirming the compatibility between a Ptolemaic-Aristotelian cosmos and the Biblical account of creation are little more than an exercise in style, a most extraordinary datum lies in the fact that the textual authority on which the refutation of heliocentrism rests is not derived from the Scriptures or the Church Fathers, but from a source of canon law – the papal bull *Apostolici regiminis*⁴⁶ – which is not mentioned in any of the known trial records, including Inchofer’s censorial report.

The questions that a document such as Spada Veralli 235, 1 generates are as countless as the tantalizing new scenarios that it offers, and remain unanswered for the time being. On this occasion, I have solely wanted to introduce to the academic community a new starting point for a dialogue that has already lasted for more than four hundred years. For now, quoting a passage from Seneca that was particularly dear to Antonio Favaro (1847-1922), the only certainty is that «etiam cum multum actum erit, omnis tamen aetas, quod agat inveniet».⁴⁷ Research goes on, whatever it takes.

⁴⁵ OG, XV, p. 169; DV, n. 113, pp. 158-159 (emphasis added).

⁴⁶ MELCHIOR INCHOFER, *Tractatus syllepticus* [...], Romae, Excudebat Ludovicus Grignanus, 1633, pp. 56-58, 91-92.

⁴⁷ *Naturales Quaestiones*, VI, 5, 3. Cf. e.g. the unforgiving review of the (tentative) edition of the documents concerning Galileo’s trial preserved in the Archive of the Archbishopric of Florence: ANTONIO FAVARO [Review of:] M. CIONI, *I documenti galileiani del S. Ufficio di Firenze*, «Archivio Storico Italiano», 42, 252, 1908, pp. 451-469: 451.

GALILEO

(ASR, Spada Veralli, vol. 235, pp. 131-180)

Critical edition & annotated translation

It does not happen very often to come across new documents concerning Galileo's trial and related matters. Thus, for the edition of the following texts, I have adopted an experimental approach, a sort of testing ground for a broader and more thorough investigation to devote, in the years to come, to the archival sources concerning the troubled relationship between the great scientist and the Church.

I opted for a bilingual edition, where a semi-diplomatic transcription is followed by an annotated English translation. The only normalized elements of the vernacular texts concern punctuation and some conjunctions and prepositions that, in modern Italian, have a different meaning (e.g. *ne* → *né*, *de* → *de'*).

In the footnotes of the first document can be observed several cross-references to the other censorial reports on the *Dialogue*, as well as some quotes from the printed works of Agostino Oreggi, used to strengthen my attribution hypothesis. The Biblical references are always based upon the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, while those of ecclesiastical authors rely on the editions used by Oreggi, when tracked down. The English translations of quotes from Galileo's *Dialogue* are taken from the unexcelled version of Stillman Drake (Berkeley-Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1967²).

LEGEND

/.../ = starting of a new page

<...> = parts of text added after the first draft

^...^ = interlinear addenda

~~Dialogo~~ = ruled out text

Dialogo = underlined text

[...] = editorial corrections and addenda included to improve the text fruition

M (text footnotes) = marginalia

Ad M (translation footnotes) = explanatory note on a specific marginalium

/ (text footnotes) = starting of a new line (transcriptions of marginalia)

Lit. (translation footnotes) = literal variant (when the translation is interpretive)

Emphasis is always added

CONTRACTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS (IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE)

Pre Rev.^{mo} Mro del Sacro/Sac. Palazzo (Padre Reverendissimo Maestro del Sacro Palazzo) = Right Reverend Father Master of the Sacred Palace

sig.^r/S./s. (signor) = Mr

ord.^e (ordine) = order

Sacra/S. Cong.^{ne} del Sant'Off.^o/S. Off.^o/S.^tOff.^o (Sacra Congregazione del Sant'Uffizio) = Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office

b. m. (beata memoria) = blessed memory

egualm.^{te} (egualmente) = equally

Santiss.^a/S.^{ma} (Santissima) = most holy

assolutam.^{te} (assolutamente) = absolutely

q.^ali (quali) = that/which

S.^{ta} di N. S.^{re}/S. S.^{ta} (Santità di Nostro Signore/Sua Santità) = Our Lord, His Holiness

XRO (Christo) = Christ

q.^ella/q.^elli/q.^ello/q.^a/q.^{ta}/q.^{to} (quella/quelli/quello/questa/questo) = that/those

Molt'Ill.^{re} (Molto Illustre) = Most Illustrious

M.^{to} Rev.^{do} (Molto Reverendo) = Most Reverend

Monsig.^{re}/Mons.^r (Monsignore) = Monsignor

pubblicat.^e (publicatione) = publication

universalm.^{te} / universalm.^e (universalmente) = universally

Pre Leopoldo (Principe Leopoldo) = Prince Leopoldo

hum.^a (humilissima) = most humble

V.A/AA.VV. (Vostra Altezza/Altezze Vostre) = Your Highness/Highnesses

nond.^o (nondimeno) = nonetheless

francam.^e (francamente) = frankly

faciliss.^a/difficiliss.^a (facilissima/difficilissima) = extremely easy/difficult

Maffeo Barb.^o (Maffeo Barberino) = Maffeo Barberini

Sacre Scritt.^e (Sacre Scritture) = Holy Scriptures

alm.^o (almeno) = at least

commissa.^o (Commissario) = Commissioner

d.^a/d.^o/sud.^e (detta/detto/sudette) = above-mentioned

a prop.^{to} (a proposito) = appropriate

p.^a (prima) = first/before

V. Em./EE.VV. (Vostra Eminenza/Eminenze Vostre) = Your Eminence/
Eminences

correspond.^e (corrispondente) = correspondent

alc.^e dilig.^e (alcune diligenze) = some verifications

a eff.^o (a effetto) = in order to/aiming at

V.R. (Vostra Reverenza) = Your Reverence

Dom.ⁿⁱ (Domenicani) = Dominican friars

neg.^o (negotio) = deal/affair

protestat.^{ne} (protestatione) = assurance

emendat.^{ne} (emendatione) = emendation

lic.^a (licenza) = licence (imprimatur)

nec.^{no} (necessario) = necessary

sentim.^{to} (sentimento) = feeling

risolut.^{ne} (risoluzione) = resolution

facilm.^{te} (facilmente) = easily

prohibit.^{ne} (prohibitione) = prohibition

serv.^{re} (servitore) = servant

Papa Urb.^o 8.^o (Papa Urbano VIII) = Pope Urban VIII

malam.^{te} (malamente) = badly/ill

particol.^e (particolarmente) = particularly/in detail

Spada Veralli 235, 1
(Censorial report on Galileo's *Dialogue*)

VERSION A

/135/ Il Pre Rev.^{mo} Mro del Sacro Palazzo concesse licenza al sig.^r Galileo Galilei di dar'alle stampe alcuni Discorsi dei due Sistemi Tolemaico, e Copernicano, e di quest'ultimo trattarne ex hypotesi, o per facilitare i calculi, e computi, o posto altr'ordine di cose.

E tal concessione non è lontana dal modo del trattare de' più gravi 5
Autori, ch'habbi la Chiesa, i quali trattano se sia possibile l'Eternità del Mondo, ancorché sij certo esser stato fatto nel principio del tempo. E delle processioni delle Divine Persone ne trattano, fatto anco alle volte
posizione impossibile, come quella: An si Spiritus Sanctus non procederet a Filio, distingueretur ab illo.¹ 10

/136/ Adunque, ancorché in quest'ord.^e di cose il Sol si mova, e la Terra stia ferma, come n'insegnano le Scritture Sacre^a conforme al comun sentimento de' Padri^b,^m nondimeno in altr'ord.^e di cose non è impossibile il Sistema Copernicano; e trattare di quello, che seguirebbe in tal'ord.^e non sarebbe contro le divine rivelationi. 15

Ma perché il sig.^r Galileo ha transgredito l'ordine prescrittogli dal P. R.^{mo}, e quello che più importa, nell'adomandare la facultà di stampare questi suoi Dialogi non fece mentione, che dalla Cong.^{ne} del Sant'Off.^o, la quale dichiarò per heresia la quiete del Sole, e per erroneo il movimento della Terra, gl'era stato prohibito in qualsivoglia modo trattare del 20
Sistema Copernicano, conforme a' Sacri Canoni, essendo stata la facultà ottenuta con tacer cosa necessaria da esprimersi, fu la petitione subreptitia; /137/ e per conseguenza nulla la gratia.

¹ A, 5-10 = B, 18-23.

^m M: a: *Iosue cap. 10. 4. Reg. 20 / Job 9. Ecclesiastes 1. ^Ecclesiastici 48. ^Isa: 38.*

^m M: b: s. *Dionys. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes hom. 30. in Matth. / s. Ambros: l. 1. Hexam. c. 6. / Nazian. orat. 19. / s. Hieronym. in tradit. 2. Para- / lip. 32. et in c. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug: l. 21. de Civ. Dei c. 8. / Auctor Mirabil. Sacrae / Script. l. 2. c. 28. tom. 3. / Operum s. Aug:ⁱ / Theodor. in Ps. 20.*

E per tanto, ancorché nel suo libro non si contenesse cos'alcuna contro le Sacre Scritture, come impresso senza legitima facoltà, resterebbe proibito, o almeno in tal stato, che non se gli farebbe veruna ingiuria a prohibirlo. E questo è così vero, che né anco i Rescritti o di gratia, o di giustizia che sijno, concessi dal Supremo Principe, conforme alle leggi, Sacri Canoni, e stile della Corte suffragano a chi gl'impetra tacendo quella verità, che saputa, havrebbe ritenuto il Principe dal concederli. Il che maggiormente si verifica nelle cause del S. Offitio, dove le cause si devono spedire conforme alla giurisditione, dispositione, e stile del S. Off.º, e sono nulle tutte le sentenze, gratie, et assoluzioni, che si fanno in favor dei rei, anco dall'istesso Sommo Pontefice, come nel Moto proprio, Inter multiples, della b. m. di Pio V., se non si fanno servate le sopradette cose. >

Con maggior ragione adunque si potrà o prohibire, o sospendere sin tanto che sij corretto, dando egli gran sospetto di voler'assolutamente provare il movimento della Terra, e la quiete, et immobilità del Sole.

E per incominciare dall'avviso dato a' lettori, dice egli, col moto della Terra darsi luce all'ignoto Problema del flusso del Mare.^{iv} Il che non può essere, poiché il flusso del Mare a' suoi tempi ha reale esistenza. Adunque non può dependere da causa /138/ non esistente, finta, et imaginaria; e da hypotesi falsa, parlando assolutamente di quello che è, e non di quello, che sarebbe in altr'ord.^e di cose. Poiché d'effetto esistente non si può assegnare se non causa, ch'opri, o habbi oprato in quel modo, che ricerca l'esistenza dell'effetto «assoluto;»^v ancorché il puro relativo possa seguire egualm.^{te} dalla mutatione dell'uno, e l'altro estremo: e così da hypotesi falsa, ma possibile possono riuscir giusti i computi, e calcoli, o che si ponga il moto diurno, et annuo nel Sole, o nella Terra; e l'istesso vale per salvare l'apparenze celesti. >

A carte 96. paragonando l'intelletto humano col Divino, dice, ch'intende alcune cose così perfettamente, e n'ha così assoluta certezza, quanto n'habbi l'istessa natura, cioè Dio.^{vi}

Il che non è ammesso dalle Scole de' Teologi, i quali parlando della cognitione, che dell'istessa cosa ha un Beato in Dio, la fanno simile alla cognition chiara di mattina; e quella con la quale conoscono l'istessa

^{iv} OG, VII, p. 30.

^v A, 36-46 = B, 46-52, 60-62.

^{vi} OG, VII, pp. 128-129.

cosa in se stessa, e per le proprie specie, la dicono cognitione di sera; delle quali /139/ cognitioni è tanto più perfetta la cognitione di Dio, quanto è più perfetto l'infinito del finito.

Adunque, né pura Geometria, né Aritmetica di qualsivoglia minima 60
cosa può in perfezione aguagliarsi alla divina cognitione, la quale è l'istesso Dio. E le cognitioni di Geometria, et Aritmetica se sono conclusioni, et hanno certezza dependente da' principij, e per conseguenza, essendo cognition dependente [i.e. cognitioni dependenti], non possono
^possono^ in perfezione esser'eguali all'intendimento di Dio, ch'è la 65
sostanza, et essenza dell'istesso Dio.^{vii}

I principij poi di pura Geometria, et Aritmetica o sono petitioni, o definitioni, o Assiomi; né questi hanno tanta certezza, che non la possano haver maggiore.

Et essendo di pura Geometria, et Aritmetica /140/ Oggetto la Quantità continua, e discreta, l'essenza, e ragion formale delle quali ancora non si sa perfettamente da' Filosofi, non so come cognitione di pura Geometria, et Aritmetica in perfezione si possa aguagliare all'intender di Dio, ch'è se stesso, et in sé comprende con semplice intuito tutte le cose, le loro essenze, principij, cause, proprietà, et effetti, i quali non
può conoscer quello, che non intende perfettamente l'essenza del suo
Oggetto, dal quale dipende la connessione di tutti i predicati, che dell'istesso Oggetto si possono dimostrare. Né si può capire in che modo, chi non ha perfetta cognitione del subietto, e predicato, possa perfettamente intendere la connessione, che è fra di loro. 80

Chi adunque non conosce perfettamente l'essenza della Quantità, e ragion formale del numero, che sono Oggetto di tutta la Geometria, et Aritmetica, non può havere assolutamente perfetta cognitione di qualsivoglia propositione ^nonché^ a paragone di della Dio Divina ^che^{viii}
che, comprensivamente conosce Dio tutto quello, che è, è stato, sarà, et 85
è possibil che sia.>^{ix}

Nel principio del 2.^o Dialogo a carte 100. ~~initia~~ protesta di non voler concludere propositione alcuna, ma portar le ragioni dell'una, e l'altra parte con le solutioni, lasciando poi la decisione all'altrui giuditio.^x

^{vii} A, 51-66 = B, 65-81.

^{viii} An illegible word (ruled out) follows.

^{ix} A, 67-86 = B, 82-95.

^x OG, VII, p. 133.

Se questo giuditio pendente, e dubbio vol che sij da' lettori ^deter- 90
minato, e ^ deciso, adunque non ha per definito il moto diurno, e con-
seguentemente annuo (o sia uno, o più moti) del Sole, e la quiete della
Terra.

/141/ Il che la Sacra Cong.^{ne} conforme all'opinione de' Padri^{a xi}
suppon definito per Scritture^{b xii} espresse. Del senso delle quali dubitare 95
contro il sentimento de' Padri, e della Chiesa non è men'errore^{c, xiii} che
negarle: perché non men ripugna all'infinita scienza, e bontà di Dio il
poter dir falso, che dirlo, levando l'uno, e l'altro egualmente la veracità
di Dio dall'intelletto di quelle, che nega, o dubita delle cose rivelate.

A carte 164. L'errore d'Aristotile, di Tolomeo, e di Ticone, vostro, e 100
di tutti gl'altri, ha radice in quella fissa, e inveterata impressione, che la
Terra stia ferma, della quale non vi potete, o sapete spogliare, né anco
quando volete filosofare di quel che seguirebbe posto che la Terra si
movesse.^{xiv}

/142/ E da questo luogo si comincia a scorgere, che vogli assolu- 105
tamente provare il movimento della Terra, e quiete, o imobilità del Sole,
e screditare quegl'Autori, de' quali già gran tempo si servono i primi
Dottori, e Lumi della Chiesa: e col burlarsi d'un finto Simplicio, vogli
anco burlarsi della Chiesa stessa.^{xv}

L'una, e l'altra di queste cose provano i seguenti luoghi. Pag. 317. 110
scrive queste parole: Non domando dei Peripatetici, domando d'Aristoti-
le medesimo, che quanto a quelli so benissimo quello che risponderbbero:
essi come reverentissimi, et humilissimi Mancipij d'Aristotile neghereb-
bero tutte l'esperienze, e tutte l'osservationi del Mondo, e recusarebbero
anco di vederle per non le havere a confessare, e direbbero, ch'il Mondo 115
sta come scrisse Aristotile, e non come vole la natura: perché toltogli
l'appoggio di quell'autorità, con che vorreste che comparissero in cam-

^{xi} M: a: s. Dionys. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes hom. 30. in Mattheum / s. Ambros: lib. 1. Hexam. cap. 6. / Nazian: orat. 19. / s. Hieron. in tradit. 2. Paralip. 32. / et in c. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug: lib. 21. de Civ. Dei cap. 8. / Auctor Mirabil. Sac: Script. l. 2. / c. 28. tom. 3. Operum s. Aug.ⁿⁱ / Theodoret: in Psal. 20.

^{xii} M: b: Iosue cap. 10. 4. Reg. 20 / Job 9. Ecclesiastes 1. ^Ecclesiastici 48. ^Isa: 38.

^{xiii} M: c: Cap. 1. de Haereticis.

^{xiv} OG, VII, pp. 196-197. A, 87-104 = B, 96-113.

^{xv} A, 105-109 = B, 122-126.

po? E però ditemi pure quel che voi stimate, che fosse per fare Aristotile medesimo.^{xvi}

/143/ L'altra parte si scorge evidentemente nella pag. 325. Voi vi maravigliate, che così pochi siano seguaci dell'opinione de' Pitagorici; et io stupisco come si sia mai sin qui trovato alcuno, che l'habbi abbracciata, e seguita: né posso a bastanza ammirare l'eminenza dell'ingegno di quelli, che l'hanno ricevuta, e stimata vera, et hanno con la vivacità dell'intelletto loro fatto forza tale ai proprij sensi, ch'habbino possuto antepor quello, ch'il discorso gli dettava, a quello che le sensate esperienze gli mostravano apertissimamente in contrario. E poco doppo. 120 125

Come habbia possuto in Aristarco, e nel Copernico far la ragione tanta violenza al senso, che contro a questo ella si sia fatta padrona della loro credulità. Et alcune righe più a basso. Siamo; e tanto evidenti, e sensati, che se senso superiore, e più eccellente dei communi, e naturali non s'accompagnava con la ragione, dubito grandemente, ch'io ancora sarei stato assai più ritroso /144/ contro al Sistema Copernicano di quello, che stato non sono doppo che più chiara lampada, che la consueta m'ha fatto lume.^{xvii} 130 135

Di qui apertamente si conosce, che l'Autore non vole altrimenti ex hypotesi parlare del Sistema Copernicano; posto altr'ord.^e di cose, possibile all'infinito sapere, e poter di Dio. Ma di quello, che nell'ord.^e già delle cose create da Dio si ritrova: poichè delle cose, che non sono né esperienza, né ragione alcuna superiore all'esperienza le può provare.^{xviii} 140

/145/ Da queste, et altre simili cose, delle quali è pieno il libro del sig.^r Galileo evidentemente si scorge, ch'egli non da zelo di difendere il Decreto della Sacra Cong.^{ne}, come disse nell'avviso a' Lettori, s'è mosso a scrivere i presenti Dialogi; ma da zelo ^{fine} di difendere ^{il Sistema Copernicano} contro l'istessa Sacra Cong.^{ne}, ~~il Sistema Copernicano~~ comun consenso de' Padri^a,^{xix} et espresse Scritture^b,^{xx} rese almeno evidentemente credibili ^{anzi certissime} dalle sensate espe- 145

^{xvi} OG, VII, p. 348.

^{xvii} *Ibid.*, pp. 355-356. A, 110-135 = B, 127-152.

^{xviii} A, 136-140 = B, 153-158.

^{xix} M: a: s. Dionys. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes hom. 30. in Mattheum / s. Ambros: l. 1. Hexam. c. 6. / Nazian: orat. 19. / s. Hieronym. in tradit. 2. Paralip. / 32. et in c. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug: lib. 21. de Civ. Dei c. 8. / Auctor Mirab. Sac. Script. l. 2. / c. 28. tom. 3. Operum s. Aug.ⁿⁱ / Theodor. in Psal. 20.

^{xx} M: b: Iosue cap. 10. 4. Reg. 20 / Job 9. Ecclesiastes 1. / ~~Isa: 38.~~ / [^]Ecclesiastici 48. Isa: 38. [^]

rienze, concesse, e tenute per tali dal principio del Mondo [da tutti],^{xxi}
 eccettuatone alcuni pochi, ch'egli seguita,^{xxii} qual Sistema Copernicano
 è repugnante al senso, et alla Fede, per la quale crediamo con somma 150
 certezza l'Altissimo Mistero della Santiss.^a Trinità, l'unione hypostatica
 del Verbo con l'umanità Sant.^{ma} di XPO, e l'ineffabile mistero del Sacra-
 mento dell'Eucharistia.^{xxiii}

Per tanto è troppo ingiurioso alla Fede chi contro le sensate espe-
 rienze fa forza ai sensi nelle cose rivelate da Dio, contro le quali non si 155
 /146/ possono addur ragioni, alle quali non si risponda, conforme al Sa-
 cro Concilio Lateranense sotto Leon X. alla sess: 10 [i.e. 8.] non potendo
 una verità esser contraria all'altra verità.^{xxiv}

Contenendo adunque questo libro tutto quello che contiene di male
 il Copernico senza l'utilità per l'aiuto de' computi, e calculi; per i quali 160
 giova il Sistema Copernicano, e trattando assolutam.^{te}, et non ex hypo-
 tesi, si cerca pche cosa si deva determinare.

Et pro alijs.

^{xxi} Cf. B, 8-9.

^{xxii} A, 144-149 ≈ B, 5-10.

^{xxiii} A, 149-153 ≈ B, 169-172.

^{xxiv} A, 156-158 ≈ B, 178-180.

VERSION B

/147/ Il sig.^r Galileo Galilei ha proposto nel principio de' suoi Dialogi di trattare sopra i due Massimi Sistemi del Mondo, Tolemaico, e Copernicano per via di ragioni naturali, e filosofiche.

Ma perché in questi Dialogi si tratta del movimento della Terra in maniera tale, che si nega il moto diurno, et annuo del Sole; il che assolutamente parlando è contro il Decreto della Sacra Cong.^{ne} dell'Indice, fondato in espresse Scritture^a,^{xxv} comune interpretatione de' Padri^b,^{xxvi} e in sensate esperienze, concesse dal principio del Mondo [e ritenute]^{xxvii} tali da tutti e dotti, e indotti, levatone alcuni pochi, che il Copernico seguita, et altri, che seguono l'istesso Copernico.^{xxviii}

E perché non è impossibile all'infinita sapienza, e potenza di Dio disporre le cose con altr'ordine, fu concessa licenza dal Pre Rev.^{mo} Mro del Sacro Palazzo trattare del Sistema Copernicano al sig.r Galileo ex hypotesi, cioè, dato che non ci /148/ fosse rivelato da Dio, che la Terra stia ferma, et il Sole si mova, o posto altr'ordine di cose, se ci sono ragioni, per le quali si possa naturalmente provare esser possibile il sistema Copernicano.

E tal concessione non è lontana dal modo del trattare de' più gravi Autori, ch'habbi la Chiesa, i quali trattano se sia possibile l'Eternità del Mondo, ancorché sij certo esser stato fatto nel principio del tempo.

E delle processioni delle Divine Persone ne trattano fatto anco alle volte positione impossibile, come quella: An si Spiritus Sanctus non procederet a Filio, distingueretur ab illo.^{xxix}

Maggiormente adunque pare che si deva concedere il trattare del Sistema del Mondo, del quale non c'è stato rivelato se non alcune cose

^{xxv} M: a: *Iosue cap. 10. 4. Regum 20. Job 9. / Ecclesiastes cap. 1. Isa. 38.*

^{xxvi} M: b: s. *Dionys: Areop. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes hom. 30. in Mattheum / s. Ambros: lib. 1. Hexam. cap. 6. / Nazian: orat. 19. / s. Hieron: in tradit. 2. Paralip. 32. / et in cap. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug: lib. 21. de Civ. Dei cap. 8. / Auctor Mirabilium Sacrae Script. l. 2. / cap. 28. tom. 3. Operum s. Aug. / Theodor. in Ps. 20.*

^{xxvii} Cf. A, 147-148.

^{xxviii} B, 5-10 = A, 144-149.

^{xxix} B, 18-23 = A, 5-10.

universalmente nelle Sacre Scritture, e quanto era a sufficienza per distinguere giorni, mesi, Anni.

Non esplicato il modo intieramente della dispositione, ordine, distanza, grandezza, e numero delle parti, che compongono la gran Fabbrica del Mondo: anzi nelle Scritture Sacre ciò si mostra tanto difficile, 30 che chi lo /149/ dicesse impossibile all'intendimento humano, non si scosterebbe dal vero senso delle Scritture. Né sin qui è stato ritrovato da' Filosofi modo d'esplicare tale, che persuada universalmente a tutti il numero de' Cieli, et esattamente renda ragione di tutte l'apparenze, che in quelli si fanno: anzi che tal volta da suppositioni false son stati aiutati i 35 calcoli, e computi, anco per quello che s'aspetta alle cose Ecclesiastiche, come apparisce dal Decreto della Sacra Cong.^{ne}, che permette il Sistema Copernicano ex hypotesi, ancorché assolutamente falso.

Ma perché il sig.^r Galileo par ch'habbi transgredito l'ord.^e prescrittogli; et assolutamente pare, che vogli provare il moto della Terra, et 40 immobilità del Sole contro il vero senso delle Scritture, andrò notando alcune cose, le quali rendono sospetto quest'Autore, et accennerò i rimedij, rimettendomi a quello, che per ciò è stato notato dalli Em.^{mi} P.P.P. e R.R.R.R.R.P.P.P.P.P. designati dalla S.^{ta} di N. S.^{re} per l'essame de' presenti Dialogi. 45

/150/ Et incomincerò dall'avviso dato a' lettori, con il quale il sig.^r Galileo deve regolare tutta la sua opra, levatone quello, che lo può render sospetto, ch'egli vogli assolutamente provare il movimento della Terra, e quiete del Sole; e le parole, che rendono dubbiosi i lettori sono quelle, dove pare, che l'Autore dal moto della Terra vogli dar luce 50 all'ignoto problema del flusso del Mare. Il che non può essere; poiché il flusso del Mare a' suoi tempi ha reale esistenza; adunque non può dependere da causa non esistente, finta, et imaginaria, e da hypotesi falsa, qual è il movimento della Terra.

Queste parole adunque o assolutamente si devono levare, o di maniera tale esplicarle, che anco posto da Dio altr'ord.^e delle cose, e concesso il moto della Terra, com'egli poteva, il flusso del Mare non era ripugnante a tal'ord.^e, e sistema, qual è il Copernicano, se Dio l'havesse voluto far tale; e così d'effetto possibile darebbe la causa, ch'attualmente ha potenza di produrre un effetto in più maniere, e modi. Ma d'effetto 60 esistente non si può assegnar causa o che non opri, o non habbi oprato in quel modo che ricerca l'esistenza dell'effetto.^{xxx} Né i Filosofi cercano

^{xxx} B, 46-52, 60-62. = A, 36-46.

la causa, che possa dar l'essere al flusso del Mare; /151/ ma quale veramente sij quella, che ci dà l'essere.

A carte 96. paragonando l'intelletto humano col Divino, dice, che 65
intende alcune cose così perfettamente, e n'ha così assoluta certezza,
quanto n'habbi l'istessa natura, cioè Dio.

Il che non è ammesso dalle Scole de' Teologi, i quali parlando della 65
cognitione, che dell'istessa cosa ha un Beato in Dio, la fanno simile alla
cognition chiara di mattina. E quella con la quale conoscono l'istessa 70
cosa in se stessa, e per le proprie specie, la dicono cognitione di sera: del-
le q.^{ali} cognitioni è tanto più perfetta la cognitione di Dio, quanto è più
perfetto l'infinito del finito.

Adunque, né pura Geometria, né Aritmetica di qualsivoglia minima 75
cosa può in perfettione aguagliarsi alla divina cognitione, la quale è l'i-
stesso Dio. E le cognitioni di Geometria, et Aritmetica o [i.e. sic] sono
conclusioni, et hanno certezza dependente da principij, i quali sono o
petitioni, o definitioni, o Assiomi. Adunque le conclusioni di Geometria,
et Aritmetica non si possono in perfettione, e certezza /152/ aguagliare
alla scienza di Dio, la quale è intuitiva, e comprensiva, e indipendente da 80
qualsivoglia principio, essendo l'essenza dell'istesso Dio.^{xxxI}

Né anco le petitioni, definitioni, o Assiomi hanno tanta certezza, et
evidenza, che non ne possino haver maggiore.

Non si deve dunque, in modo veruno concedere, che le pure Mate- 85
matiche cognitioni di Geometria, et Aritmetica sijno in perfettione egua-
li alla cognitione, che dell'istesse cose ha Dio, il quale intende perfettis-
simamente l'essenza della Quantità, e numeri, la quale qual sia ancora
si disputa da' filosofi, né si sa qual sij il più vero modo d'esplicare. E
s'è vero, che dall'evidenza, e certezza dell'essenza degl'obietti depende 90
l'evidenza delle Conclusioni, non so come possino i Matematici, o Geo-
metri, o Aritmetici che sijno, presumer tant'evidenza, certezza, o perfet-
tione nelle sue speculationi, quant'è nella cognitione divina; all'intelletto
del quale sono nude, et aperte l'essenze di tutte le cose, le q.^{ali} né meno
in genere i Matematici sanno perfettamente della Quantità continua, o
discreta.^{xxxII} 95

/153/ Nel principio del 2.^o Dialogo a carte 100. mentre protesta
di non voler concludere propositione alcuna, ma portar le ragioni dell'u-

^{xxxI} B, 65-81 = A, 51-66.

^{xxxII} B, 82-95 = A, 67-86.

na, e l'altra parte, con le solutioni, lasciando poi la decisione all'altrui giuditio.

Se questo giuditio pendente, e dubbio vol che sij da' lettori deciso, 100
adunque non ha per definito il moto diurno, e consequentemente annuo
(o sia uno, o più moti) del Sole, e la quiete della Terra.

Il che e la Sacra Cong.^{ne} conforme all'opinione de' Padri^{a xxxiii} sup-
pone definito per Scritture^{b xxxiv} espresse. Del senso delle quali dubitare 105
contro il sentimento de' Padri, e della Chiesa non è men'errore, che negar-
le; perché non men ripugna all'infinita scienza, e bontà di Dio il poter
dir falso, che dirlo, levando l'uno, e l'altro egualmente la veracità di Dio
dall'intelletto di quello, che nega, o dubita delle cose rivelate.

A carte 164. L'errore d'Aristotile, di Tolomeo, di Ticone, vostro, e di
tutti gl'altri, ha radice in q.^{ella} fissa, e inveterata impressione, che /154/ 110
la Terra stia ferma, della quale non vi potete, o sapete spogliare, né anco
quando volete filosofare di quel che seguirebbe, posto che la Terra si
movesse.^{xxxv}

In questo luogo non si può negare, ch'il sig.^r Galileo non parli ex
hypotesi. Nondimeno perché l'errore l'attribuisce all'impressione, che la 115
Terra stia ferma, il che essendo verissimo, non può esser causa d'errore
assolutamente in questo stato, et ordine di cose.

Però si desiderarebbe, che s'aggiungesse doppo quelle parole, che
la Terra stia ferma, come veramente sta, per levare ogni dubbio, ch'egli 120
parli assolutamente.

E così levarebbe in parte il dubbio, ch'egli ha eccitato nelle menti di
chi ha letto il suo libro, che vogli assolutamente provare il movimento
della Terra, e screddare quegli Autori, de' quali già gran tempo si servo-
no i primi Dottori, e Lumi della Chiesa, e che col burlarsi d'un Simplicio
finto, che fa parlare a suo modo, dir scioccherie, e cose poco fondate, 125
vogli sostituire in luogo non solo d'Aristotile, ma anco di tutta la Chiesa.^{xxxvi}

E parte di questo ch'ultimamente s'è detto, si prova dalla /155/ pag.
317. dove scrive queste parole.

^{xxxiii} M: a: s. Dionys. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes hom. 30. in Mattheum / s. Ambros. l. 1. Hexam. c. 6. / Nazian. Orat. 19. / s. Hieron. in tradit. 2. Paralip. 32. / et in cap. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug. l. 21. de Civ. Dei cap. 8. / Auctor Mirabil. Sac. Script. l. 2. / c. 28. tom. 3. operum s. Aug. / Theodoret. in Ps. 20.

^{xxxiv} M: b: Iosue c. 10. 4. Regum 20. / Job 9. Ecclesiastes 1. Isa. 38.

^{xxxv} B, 96-113 = A, 87-104.

^{xxxvi} B, 122-126 = A, 105-109.

Non domando dei Peripatetici, domando d'Aristotile medesimo, che quanto a quelli so benissimo ciò che risponderrebbero: essi come reverentissimi, et humilissimi Mancipij d'Aristotile negherebbero tutte l'esperienze, e tutte l'osservationi del Mondo, e recusarebbero anco di vederle per non le havere a confessare, e direbbero, ch'il Mondo sta come scrisse Aristotile, e non come vole la natura; perché toltogli l'appoggio di quell'autorità, con che vorreste che comparissero in campo? E però ditemi pure quel che voi stimate, che fusse per fare Aristotile medesimo.^{xxxvii} 130 135

L'altra parte si scorge evidentemente nella pag. 325. Voi vi maravigliate, che così pochi siano seguaci della opinione de' Pitagorici,^{xxxviii} et io stupisco come si sia mai sin qui trovato alcuno, che l'habbi abbracciata, e seguita: né posso a bastanza ammirare l'eminenza dell'ingegno di q.elli, che l'hanno ricevuta, e stimata vera, et hanno con la vivacità dell'intelletto loro fatto forza tale ai proprij /156/ sensi, ch'habbiano possuto antepor quello, ch'il discorso gli dettava, a q.ello che le sensate esperienze gli mostravano apertissimamente in contrario. 140

E poco doppo. Come habbia possuto in Aristarco, e nel Copernico far la ragione tanta violenza al senso, che contro a questo ella si sia fatta padrona della loro credulità. 145

Et alcune righe più a basso. Siamo; e tanto evidenti, e sensati, che se senso superiore, e più eccellente dei communi, e naturali non s'accompagnava con la ragione, dubito grandemente, ch'io ancora sarei stato assai più ritroso contro al Sistema Copernicano di q.ello, che stato non sono, doppo che più chiara lampada, che la consueta m'ha fatto lume.^{xxxix} 150

Di qui apertamente si conosce, che l'Autore non vol'altrimente ex hypotesi parlare del Sistema Copernicano, posto altr'ord.^e di cose, possibile all'infinito sapere, e poter di Dio; ma di quello, che nell'ord.^e già delle cose create da Dio si ritrova; poiché delle cose, che non sono, né esperienza, né ragione alcuna /157/ superiore all'esperienza le può provare.^{xl} 155

^{xxxvii} M (unknown hand): *E nondimeno a car. 325 / il far forza a' sensi l'attri- / buisse a gran sapere et / intendimento del Copernico / et suoi seguaci.*

^{xxxviii} M (unknown hand): *Ne' Pitagorici è gran / lode far con la ragione / violenza a' sensi / e, quelli, che nel movimento / del Sole contradicono / alle sue imaginate, et estra- / nee, et ancho remote / ragioni /156/ et forse impertinenti / esperienze, a car. / 317 gli fa riveren- / tissimi, et humilissimi / Mancipij d'Arist[otele].*

^{xxxix} B, 127-152 = A, 110-135.

^{xl} B, 153-158 = A, 136-140.

È necessario dunque, che l'Autore di questi quattro Dialogi distingua l'ord.^e delle cose presenti dal possibile; e che del Sistema Copernicano ne parli come cosa possibile, e non esistente; e del movimento del Sole, e quiete della Terra ne parli come di verità certa, catolica, vera, et infallibile, conforme al Decreto della Sacra Cong.^{ne}, fondata nel comun senso de' Padri^a,^{xli} aderente alle Scritture Sacre^b,^{xlii} nelle quali si trova somma verità, procedendo dal Padre dei Lumi Dio, ch'è somma verità, et infinito sapere. 160
165

E se qualche cosa ha contro Aristotile, Tolomeo, e tutti gl'altri, che seguitano Aristotile, impugni i lor detti, disposizione, e ordine, ch'hanno finto nelle cose create; ma stij sempre fermo, e certo quello, che per Scritture, e traditioni è stato rivelato alla Chiesa, la quale credendo gl'ineffabili Misterij della S.^{ma} Trinità, dell'Incarnatione dell'[i.e. del] Verbo Eterno, e dell'ineffabile Sacramento dell'Eucharistia,^{xliii} deve all'Autore in cosa tanto evidente al senso comune di tutti poter persuader quello, ch'ella conforme al vero senso delle Scritture ha sempre creduto, e crede. 170
175

/159/ L'Autore dei presenti Dialogi deve per verità infallibile supporre nell'ordine delle cose presenti il moto diurno, e consequentemente annuo del Sole, e l'immobilità della Terra; e sciogliere tutte le difficoltà, che sono contro questa verità; non potendo esserci contro se non ragioni apparenti; non essendo una verità contraria all'altra verità.^{xliiv} 180

In altr'ordine di cose può mostrare, che sij possibile il Sistema Copernicano: ma non può già mai servendosi dell'hypotesi d'altr'ord.^e delle cose, assegnar quella causa d'effetto attualmente esistente in quest'ord.^e di cose.

Quarto, deve parlare di maniera tale contro il finto Simplicio, Aristotile, Tolomeo, Ticone, et altri, che seguitano l'opinione di questi, ch'evidentemente si conosca, ch'egli non impugna il movimento del Sole, e immobilità della Terra; ma il modo /160/ d'esplicare, e le ragioni loro. 185

^{xli} M: a: s. Dionys. ep. ad Polycarpum. / Origenes Hom. 30. in Matth. / s. Ambros: l. 1. Hexam. cap. 6. / Nazian: orat. 19. / s. Hieron: in tradit. 2. Paralip. 32. / et in cap. 7. et 38. Isa. / s. Aug: l. 21. de Civ. Dei c. 8. / Auctor Mirabil. Sac. Script. / l. 2. c. 28. tom. 3. Operum s. Aug. / Theodoret. in Ps. 20.

^{xlii} M: b: Iosue cap. 10. 4. Reg. 20. / Job 9. Ecclesiastes c. 1. Isa. 38.

^{xliiii} B, 169-172 = A, 149-153.

^{xliiv} M: Con[ciliu]m Later[anensem], sub Leone X. sess: 10 [i.e. 8]. B, 178-180 = A, 156-158.

Perché si veda chiaramente, che lui non si burla della Sacra Cong.^{ne}, della Chiesa, e delle Scritture sacre, postponendole a' proprij capricci, i quali chiama ragione, e lume superiore alle sensate esperienze: e c'è chi dubita, alla divina rivelatione. 190

Non si loda anco l'Autore nel voler screditare quei Dottori, che sono seguitati da primi Dottori, e lumi della Chiesa.

Sarebbe ben lodato, se facendo una Quinta giornata, mostrasse le fallacie delle ragioni, che sono contro il Decreto della Sacra Cong.^{ne}, che così s'intenderebbe, ch'egli autentica il suo Decreto, e non se ne burla, come comunemente ogn'un crede: e nel suo libro si scorgerebbe qualche utilità. Et egli havrebbe anco mostrato contro quelli, che dicono delle scioccherie, quanto contro di loro vaglino le sue ragioni. 195

/161/-/162/ [blank]

Spada Veralli 235, 2

(Letter from Prince Leopoldo de' Medici to Virgilio Spada, August 6th, 1650)

/163/ Molt' Ill.^{re} e M.^{to} Rev.^{do} Monsig.^{re}. Sono di tal sorte l'opere lasciate dal Galilei, che non ostante quel che possa esservi di repugnante, pare che la pubblicazione di esse possa alli studiosi universal^{m.}^{te} apportare non poco profitto. Et desidererei però di intendere se, col fare a' principio qualche protestazione, o vero con resecare o variare qualche cosa, potesse sperarsi licenza di ristamparle. Prego però V.S., alla cortesia della quale ricorro sempre con ogni confidenza, che si compiaccia di dirmene qualche cosa; poiché, secondo quello, che sentirò da lei, si governerà, chi haverebbe questo pensiero. Et fra tanto con la mia parziale et affettuosa volontà resto pregando a V.S. ogni desiderato bene. 5 10

Di Fiorenza 6 Agosto 1650.

Al Piacer di V.S.
Il Pre Leopoldo

Mons.r Virgilio Spada

/164/, /169/ [blank]

/170/ [outside of the envelope]^{xlv}

Spada Veralli 235, 2a

(Letter from Prince Leopoldo de' Medici to Virgilio Spada,
August 6, 1650 – Copy)

/165/ Molt' Ill.^{re} e m.^{to} Rev.^{do} Mons.^r. Sono di tale sorte l'opere lasciate dal Galilei che non ostante quel che possa esservi di repugnante pare che la publicat.^e di esse possa alli studiosi universal^{m.}^e apportare non poco profitto. Et desiderarei però d'intendere se col fare a' principio qualche protestatione ovvero con resecare o variare qualche cosa, potesse sperarsi licenza di ristamparle. Prego però V.S. alla cortesia della quale ricorro sempre con ogni confidenza che si compiaccia di dirmene qualche cosa perché secondo quello che sentirò da lei si governerà chi haverebbe 5

^{xlv} Recipient's details: *Al Molt' Ill.^{re} e M.^{to} Rev.^{do} Monsig. / Virgilio Spada / Roma.*

questo pensiero, e fra tanto con la mia parziale, et affettuosa volontà
resto pregando a V.S. ogni desiderato bene.

10

Di Fiorenza 6. Agosto 1650

Al piacer di V.S.
Il P. Leopoldo

Mons.^r Virgilio Spada

/166/-/168/ [blank]

Spada Veralli 235, 3

(Draft letter of Virgilio Spada to Prince Leopoldo de' Medici,
August 1650)^{XLVI}

/171/ V.A.^{XLVII} mi ha honorato con l'hum.^a sua de' [6]^{XLVIII} del cadente^{XLIX} di ~~procurare per mezzo mio di sapere~~ ^apoggiare alla mia debolezza l'indagare^{^L} che strada si potrebbe tenere per ^haver lic[en]za. di^ stampare l'opera del famoso Galileo intorno il moto della terra col resecare quelle cose che hanno dato e ponno dar fastidio. 5

Dunque E se bene sono scorsi pochi giorni nond.^o applicati all'essame^{LI} di questa proposta parmi nond.^o poterli^{LII} dire francam.^e che il pensiero è di faciliss.^a riuscita considerata la natura della dimanda ma per accidente^{LIII} forse difficiliss.^a e forse impossibile. 10

Ho detto che per la per natura della cosa dovrebbe essere facilissima primo perché imparo che altre volte fu resoluta concessa tale licenza dalla Cong.^e dell'Indice.

2° perché mi è capitato alle mani un voto^{LIV} d'uno che fu Card. della Cong.^e del S. Off.^o dal quale si può raccogliere che anche in quella Cong.^e

^{XLVI} In this transcription some variations are adopted with respect to what established in the edition of the letter draft included in FINOCCHIARO, *Il museo di curiosità* (cit. note 3, intro), pp. 184-185, in which all the marginalia are omitted. The different lectiones of this previous edition are mentioned in the following footnotes, preceded by an 'F'.

^{XLVII} M (Virgilio Spada's hand): *Non saprei se sia a prop.^{to} / q.^{ta} risposta però / la mando p.^a a V. Em.*

^{XLVIII} In the draft can be found a space left blank in place of the number.

^{XLIX} Hence it is clear that Spada wrote this draft during the second half of August 1650.

^L M (Bernardino Spada's hand): *Dubito che n[on] sia bene / venire a' diversi / individui compresi / in q.^{ta} minuta, se non / in voce con qualche / agente o corrispond.^e de' Pr[inci]pi. / Dio sa che ne la Cong.^e dove / si trattò già questa materia non vi fusse / il segreto e perciò non convenga / ~~salte[m]~~ che si possa vedere che / [s]e [i.e. a partially illegible word due to a paper loss] la mandi ~~invo~~ in volta. / Meglio forse sarebbe il dire per / adesso che V.R. ha incaminate / alc.^e dilig.^e per le Cong.^e del S. Off.^o / e de l'Indice a eff.^o d'explorare / ciò che si possa sperare e che a / suo tempo avvisarà. / Et in S. Off.^o io segnalerò in l'una / e l'altra Cong.^e come prima / vi sarò. / Frattanto V.R. vedrà da l'incluso / [...t]to [i.e. a partially illegible word due to a paper loss] l'esito dele dilig.^e che / ha fatte per mezzo de l'Aud.^{re}.*

^{LI} F: *esame.*

^{LII} F: *poterli.*

^{LIII} F: *accidenti.*

^{LIV} F: *scorzo.* However, this lectio is incompatible with the spelling of other words with the 'sc-' root, such as *scorsi* (line 6), *scoglio* and *Scritture* (line 19), as well as with the spelling of the 'z', as can be seen, for example, with *licenza* (line 11) and *repugnanza* (line 19). Also, although the rendering of the 'v' is slightly different from all the other occurrences, I am led to read *voto* since, when Spada says "also saying that the vote was made" (*dicendoli anche che il voto fu fatto*; line 16), the tone of the statement suggests that the document has already been quoted as such (i.e. "il voto" *lege* "such / this vote").

/172/ non si urtava in grandi difficoltà, et prendo ardire di trasmetterlo 15
all'A.V., dicendoli anche che il voto^{LV} fu fatto dal S. Card. Oreggi mentre
era semplice teologo del Card. Maffeo Barb.^o quale^{LVI} era della Cong.^e
del S.^o Off.^o.

3^o perché ~~h~~s l'unico scoglio della repugnanza^{LVII} alle Sacre Scritt.^e si
toglie^{LVIII} col discorrere ex hypotesi.^{LIX} 20

4^o l'esser morto l'autore qual è.

Ma quello che rende impossibile o alm.^o difficiliss.^a l'impresa^{LX} è l'im-
pegno de la Cong.^e della Inquisiz S. Offitio alla quale converrebbe hoggi
pichiare.^{LXI}

2^o Il genio di S. S.^{ta} alieno dall'innovare, e niente meno dalle cose 25
matematiche, delle quali non fa verun^{LXII} conto.

3^o L'essere di [^]tal[^] Cong.^e il s. Card. Maculano che fu l'altra volta in sto-
to di commissa.^o, o seg[retar]io^{LXIII} di esso contrarijssimo,^{LXIV} et il s. Card. de
Lugo come Gesuito^{LXV} quali s'intende che furno anche essi contrarijssimi.

/173/ Tuttavia chi volesse provare se la ~~imp~~ difficoltà arivi a quel 30
segno che Aristotile^{LXVI} confonde con l'impossibilità, si potrebbe porge-
re un memoriale alla Cong.^e del S. Off.^o rappresentando il decreto altre
volte fatto da la Cong.^e dell'Indice, la morte dell'Autore, e la prontezza a
levare o mutare tutto ciò che paresse^{LXVII} a d.^a S. Cong.^e, col scriversi alli
Sig.ⁱ Card.^{li} lettere di d.^a S. Cong.^e lettere particolari [^]dall'AA.VV.[^], che 35
sarebbe quel più che si potesse^{LXVIII} fare per [^]ben[^] condurre q.^a impresa.

/174/ [blank]

^{LV} F: caso.

^{LVI} M (Virgilio Spada's hand): Non so se q.^o sussisti.

^{LVII} F: delle repugnanze.

^{LVIII} F: coglie.

^{LIX} M (Virgilio Spada's hand): O volsero mortificare.

^{LX} F: difficilissimo l'imprimatur primo.

^{LXI} F: sulla quale converrebbero hoggi più chiarezze.

^{LXII} F: nesun.

^{LXIII} F: capitano.

^{LXIV} F: contrarissimo.

^{LXV} F: hesercito.

^{LXVI} F: Aristotele.

^{LXVII} F: parisce.

^{LXVIII} F: che servirebbe quel più che ci parisce.

Spada Veralli 235, 4

(Summary of the meetings of the Congregations, September 1650?)

/175/ Il Padre Marini Generale de Dom.^{mi} dice, ch'essendo q.^{to} neg.^o dell'opere del Galilei passato anco per la Cong.^{ne} del S.^o Off.^o, in q.^{ta} bisognerà trattarne; e che essendo hoggi mutate le cose, non ha per impossibile, che facendosi qualche protestat.^{ne}, o emendat.^{ne}, si possi ottenere la lic.^a di ristampare, e pubblicare le sud.^e opere; ma che stima nec.^{io}, 5
che se ne facci parola prima d'ogn'altra cosa con N. S.^{re}, sì per sentire di che sentim.^{to} sia, sì anco per che potrebbe forse rimetterne la risolut.^{ne} alla Cong.^{ne} dell'Indice, dove più facilm.^{te} si potrebbe superare ogni difficoltà.

Ma mons.^r Assessore del S.^o Off.^o è d'opinione, che, non ostante qual si voglia protesta, difficilissimam.^{te} potrà ottenersi la sud.^a lic.^a, perché 10
molti furono i rispetti, che mossero la Cong.^{ne} del S.^o Off.^o a farne la prohibit.^{ne}; e che quando hora si concedesse la sud.^a lic.^a, non mancherebbe, chi attribuisse la prohibit.^{ne} non alla mala qualità dell'opere, ma a qualche mala volontà di Papa Urb.^o 8.^o contro l'Auttore per essere serv.^{re}
di Casa de' Medici. E tanto più l'ha per difficile, quandoché ^{LXIX} di presente 15
è uscito fuori un libro d'un certo Cusetti francese, che tratta dell'istessa materia, e parla malam.^{te} della Corte di Roma; et il Padre Maestro di Sac. Palazzo non ha voluto, che si publichi.

/176/ [blank]

^{LXIX} The lectio for this adverb (translatable as 'when', 'since' or 'given that') is hypothetical because the word results to be scarcely readable.

Spada Veralli 235, 5

(Petition letter from the *Virtuous Mathematicians*
to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, September 1650?)

/177/ Emin.^{mi} et Rev.^{mi} Sig.^{ri6}

Essendo stato da cotesta Sacra Cong.^{ne} prohibito sino dell'anno 1633. il libro di Galileo Galilei sopra i sistemi del mondo Tolemaico, e Copernicano, e contenendosi in d.^o libro grandi eruditioni matematiche, I Virtuosi di tal professione supplicano l'EE.VV. a permetterne la ristampa con quelle correzioni che più le piaceranno, come si è sempre costumato 5 di qualunque opera di autore non dannoso, che saranno tenuti pregar Dio sempre per l'EE.VV. Quam Deus etc.

/178/-/179/ [blank]

/180/ [outside of the envelope]

Alli Emin.^{mi} et Rev.^{mi} SS.^{ri} li SS.^{ri}
Card.^{li} della Cong.^{ne} del S. Offitio^{LXX}

Per

I Virtuosi Matematici^{LXXI}

^{LXX} M (Bernardino Spada's hand): *Se n'è parlato ne l'una e ne l'altra / Congreg.^e senza frutto come più / particul.^e si dirà.*

^{LXXI} M (unknown hand): S.V.

Spada Veralli 235, 1
(Censorial report on Galileo's *Dialogue*)

VERSION A

/135/ The Right Reverend Father Master of the Sacred Palace granted Mr Galileo Galilei a licence to print certain Dialogues concerning the two Systems, Ptolemaic and Copernican, discussing the latter *ex hypothesi*, either to facilitate calculations and measures or given a different order of things.¹ And such permission is not far from the way held by the most important authors of the Church, who wonder whether the eternity of the world is possible, although it is certain that it was made at the beginning of time.² And they discuss the processions of the Divine Persons [as well], sometimes even given an impossible stance, like [this]: *An si Spiritus Sanctus non procederet a Filio, distingueretur ab illo.*³

¹ This expression (*postò altr'ordine di cose*), repeated several times in the report (A, 11-15, 41-44, 136-140; B, 11-17, 55-60, 159-161, 181-183), is derived from the famous 'argument' of Urban VIII about the epistemological consequences of divine omnipotence. By virtue of it, a hypothesis in contradiction with the Holy Scriptures is defined as unreal and false, since incompatible with the revealed truth, but possible, since nothing is impossible for God, whose *potentia et scientia* are not limited to the reality perceived and investigated by man (cfr A. OREGGI, *De Deo uno tractatus primus*, Romae, ex Typographia Rev. Camerae Apost., 1629, pp. 194-195). To give a different order of things therefore meant, for Oreggi, to advance a hypothesis which, assuming the lack of a divine revelation, had to be considered nevertheless possible by virtue of divine omnipotence. However, *ex hypothesi* discussions concerning scientific matters foresaw a striking difficulty, namely the impossibility of tracing back actual, observable phenomena to hypothetical causes in contradiction with what was stated in the Holy Scriptures, since this would have represented an attempt to validate the hypothesis, prefiguring, in the specific case of the heliocentric theory, the violation of the Decree of March 5th, 1616.

² Cf. Inchofer's report: «Quaerunt etiam philosophi, utrum mundus potuerit esse ab aeterno; nemo tamen Christianus dicit, fuisse ab aeterno, sed tantum, posito quod fuisset ab aeterno, haec et illa necessario vel probabiliter erant secutura. Ita Galilaeo non erat absolute probandum terram moveri, ut se contineret in pura hypothesi mathematica, sed tantum imaginarie concipiendum, et non phisice ponendum, moveri, ut, hac ratione accepta, explicarentur phaenomena caelestia et motuum numerationes ducerentur» (OG, XIX, p. 353; DV, n. 45, p. 85).

³ With reference to the theological controversy concerning the unity of Trinity, dating back to the 4th century CE and crystallized during the Middle Ages in the study of Trinitarian theology. Oreggi's hypothesis presents the structure of a quodlibetal question aimed at refusing the Eastern Orthodox Trinity doctrine related to the Holy Spirit's *modus agendi*; cf.

/136/ Therefore, even though in this order of things the Sun moves and the Earth stands still, as the Holy Scriptures⁴ teach us by common agreement with the Fathers,⁵ in a different order of things the Copernican system is not impossible nonetheless, and to discuss what that order would imply would not be against the divine revelations. But since Mr Galileo transgressed the order given to him by the Right Reverend Father, and – most importantly – requesting permission to print his Dialogues, he did not mention that the Congregation of the Holy Office (which declared the stillness of the Sun as heretical and the motion of the Earth as erroneous) had forbidden him to discuss, in any manner, the Copernican system,⁶ in accordance with the sacred canons, the request was surreptitious /137/ and, consequently, the grace [granted] is null and void because he obtained the permission⁷ omitting necessary information.⁸ Hence, even if his book did not contain anything contrary to

A. OREGGI, *De individuo Sanctissimae Trinitatis mysterio*, Romae, ex Typographia Rev. Camerae Apost., 1630, pp. 112-117 (*An Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Filio*). This work by Oreggi, for structure and topics, falls within the tradition of commentaries on the *Libri quattuor sententiarum* (see I, 11, *Quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio*) by Peter Lombard (c. 1096-1160).

⁴ Ad M: *Joshua* 10:12-13; *4 Kings* 20:8-11; *Job* 9:7; *Ecclesiastes* 1:5; *Ecclesiasticus* 48:26; *Isaiah* 38:8.

⁵ Ad M: PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS, *Epistola VII. Polycarpo Pontifici (Sancti Dionysij Areopagitae Opera omnia quae extant [...]*, Lutetiae Parisiorum, apud Michaellem Sonnum, 1615, pp. 284-288: 286-287). ORIGENES, *Homiliae in Mattheum*, 30; unclear reference, since such a work does not seem to exist, while Origenes wrote an extensive *Commentarius* and a series of *Scholia in Mattheum*. Here Oreggi might refer to one of the following works by Origenes: *Commentarius in Mattheum*, XII, 34; *Homiliae in Jesu Nave*, I, 5 and XI; *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, IX, 3. AURELIUS AMBROSIUS, *Hexameron*, I, 6, 22. GREGORIUS NAZIANZENSIS, *Oratio XVIII. In laudem Sancti Cypriani martyris (Sancti Gregorij Nazianzeni, cognomento theologi, Opera [...]*, Lutetiae Parisiorum, Typis Regiis, apud Claudium Morellium, 1609-11, I, pp. 274-286: 281 B). HIERONYMUS, *Vulgata*, *2 Chronicles*, 32:24; *Commentaria in Isaiam*, III, 106 and XI, 469 (ad *Isaiah* 7:11 and 38:8). AUGUSTINUS, *De civitate Dei*, XXI, 8, 2. AUGUSTINUS HIBERNICUS, *De mirabilibus Sacrae Scripturae*, II, 28 (Oreggi refers to an unspecified edition of the Louvain version of St Augustine's works). THEODORETUS, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, XX [i.e. XIX, 4 and XXI, 3].

⁶ With reference to the notorious Precept that Galileo received in the presence of Cardinal Bellarmino from the General Commissioner of the Holy Office Michelangelo Seghizzi (1565-1625), by order of the Pope and the Congregations, on February 26th, 1616: «P. Commissarius [...] Galileo [...] praecepit, et ordinavit [...] ut supradictam opinionem, quod sol sit centrum mundi et immobilis et terra moveatur, ominino relinquat, nec eam de caetero, quovis modo, teneat, doceat, aut defendat, verbo aut scriptis; alias contra ipsum procedetur in S.^o Officio» (OG XIX, p. 322; DV, n. 21, pp. 45-46).

⁷ *Lit.* «having been the faculty obtained» (*essendo stata la facoltà ottenuta*).

⁸ In canon law, the terms subreption (concealment or omission) and obreption (alteration or falsehood) concerning information or facts, were used to define a particular kind of fraud by which a rescript could be obtained, as originally shown in *Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX. Compilatio*, I, III, 20: «Exprimens falsum, vel tacens verum in rescripto, si malitiose, caret prorsus impetratis. Sed si per simplicitatem vel ignorantiam aut obtinuisset vero expresso, et suppresso falso saltem literas in forma communi, et delegatus procedit

the Holy Scriptures, since it was printed without legitimate permission, it would remain prohibited, or at least [in a state] such as not to give any offence by prohibiting it. And this is so true that not even the rescripts of the Supreme Prince [i.e. the Pope] for the granting of favours or the administration of justice, issued following the laws, sacred canons, and manners of the court, protect those who make requests⁹ omitting truths that, if known, would have led the Prince to deny them [i.e. the rescripts]. This is all the more so in the cases of the Holy Office, where legal actions have to be pursued in accordance with the jurisdiction, disposition, and manners of the Holy Office. [Therefore,] are null all the verdicts, favours and acquittals granted to people found guilty, including those of the Supreme Pontiff, (as [established] with the *motu proprio Inter multiplices* by Pius V of blessed memory), if the above-mentioned things are not observed.¹⁰ Therefore, a fortiori, [Galileo's work] may be prohibited or suspended until it is corrected since he is greatly suspect of wanting to prove the veracity¹¹ of the motion of the Earth and the quietness and stillness of the Sun.¹²

servato iuris ordine, et non speciali forma rescripti; secus, si nullo modo literas habuisset». Consequently, the first alleged offence signalled by Oreggi is a surreptitious request (*petitio subreptitia*), that made null and void the related grant (*gratia nulla*) represented by a rescript, namely the printing licence issued for the *Dialogue*.

⁹ *Lit.* «support who request them» (*suffragano a chi gl'impetra*).

¹⁰ The *motu proprio Inter multiplices curas* had been promulgated by Pope Pius V (1504-1572) on December 21st, 1566 to establish that the acquittals granted even by the Pope to defendants already judged and condemned by the Inquisition, were to be considered null and void. In these cases, only the Inquisition had the authority to review a sentence or retry a defendant. Here Oreggi wants to emphasize that, beyond the offence of fraud (in the form of a *petitio subreptitia*) of which Galileo was accused for not having informed the Master of the Sacred Palace about the Precept, the latter would not have been able to grant the imprimatur before the Holy Office had reviewed and set aside the Precept itself. Consequently, the fact that Riccardi ignored its very existence protected him (and, by extension, all the other signatories of the imprimatur) from potential allegations of misconduct.

¹¹ *Lit.* «wanting to prove absolutely» (*di voler assolutamente provare*). Cf. Inchofer's report: «Promittit Galilaeus, se acturum ex hypothesi mathematica: sed non est hypothesis mathematica quae conclusionibus physicis et necessariis stabilitur [...]. Si Galilaeus hypothetice volebat agere, tantum afferre debebat rationes quae videntur suadere motum terrae, sed, iis deinde solutis, contrarium aut supponere aut probare, aut certe non confutare. Et haec quidem dico si non pure mathematice agatur, sed, quemadmodum Galilaeus facit, physicae disputationes interserantur; alioqui mathematico sufficit sola suppositio, absque ulla probatione rei quae supponitur et accipitur» (OG, XIX, pp. 352-353; DV, n. 45, p. 85); Pasqualigo's report: «e benché si protesti di parlar *sub hypothesi*, nel provar però la sua opinione exclude l'ipotesi, perché da antecedenti assoluti e che *de facto* sono veri, almeno secondo il suo sentimento, ne cava la conclusione assoluta, come apparisce in tutte le ragioni che apporta [...]» (OG, XIX, p. 359; DV, n. 46, p. 99).

¹² Cf. the list of elements considered as 'corpus delicti' (*corpo del delitto*) in the so-called *Special Commission Report*, drafted in September 1632 by Riccardi and Oreggi (*SCR*):

Starting from the note to the readers, he affirms that, with the motion of the Earth, [is possible] to shed light on the unresolved issue of the sea's flux, which is impossible, since the sea's flux, in his days, actually exists.¹³ Therefore, it cannot depend on an inexistent, /138/ fictitious, and imaginary cause, and on a false hypothesis – speaking in absolutes¹⁴ of what is, and not of what would be in a different order of things –, because to an existent effect cannot be assigned but a cause which works or worked in such a way as to define the existence of the real effect,¹⁵ even though what is purely relative might equally follow from the mutation of either of the two ends [i.e. a hypothesis can be based upon the alteration of both causes and effects known as truthful]. Thus, from a false yet possible hypothesis correct measures and calculations may turn out, given the daily and yearly motions of the Sun or the Earth, and the same holds [true] to save the celestial appearances.

At p. 96, making a comparison between human and divine intellect, [Galileo] affirms to understand certain things perfectly, and to be so absolutely sure of them as nature itself, namely God, is.¹⁶ But this is not allowed by the schools of theologians, who, speaking of the cognition of a thing manifested by a Blessed,¹⁷ represent it as similar to the

«3. Mancarsi nell'opera molte volte e recedere dall'ipotesi, o asserendo assolutamente la mobilità della terra e stabilità del sole, o qualificando gli argomenti su che la fonda per dimostrativi e necessari, o trattando la parte negativa per impossibile» (OG, XIX, p. 326; DV, n. 25, p. 52). See A, 36-38, 105-106, 161-162; B, 4-10, 39-41, 46-49, 114-117, 121-123.

¹³ Lit. «unknown issue of the sea's flux, which cannot be, since the sea's flux, in his days, has real existence» (*ignoto Problema del flusso del Mare. Il che non può essere, poiché il flusso del Mare a' suoi tempi ha reale esistenza*); G. GALILEI, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems - Ptolemaic and Copernican*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1967², p. 6. Cf. SCR: «8. Haver mal ridotto l'esistente flusso e reflusso del mare nella stabilità del sole e mobilità della terra, non esistenti» (OG, XIX, p. 327; DV, n. 25, p. 52). Cf. also Pasqualigo's report (*ibid.*, pp. 358, 360; DV, n. 46, pp. 96, 100): «e perciò dal moto di esse macchie [i.e. the sunspots] raccoglie il moto della terra. Et si va sforzando di mostrare che, stando l'immobilità della terra et il moto del sole per l'eclittica, non si può salvare il moto apparente de tali macchie. E questa ragione essendo fondata in un antecedente *quod de facto est*, inferisce la conclusione che *de facto sit* [...]. [Galileo] dice haver fatto giudizio (che non è altro che acconsentire), che se la terra si moveva, bisognava che in virtù di detto moto si scorgessero alcuni particolari accidenti nel moto delle macchie solari, et poi soggiunge haver ritrovato con l'osservatione che appunto tali accidenti corrispondevano, e di nuovo da tali accidenti, già provati, secondo esso, con l'esperienza, arguisce il moto della terra» (referring to *Dialogue*, p. 347; OG, VII, p. 374).

¹⁴ Lit. «speaking absolutely» (*parlando assolutamente*).

¹⁵ Lit. «searches the existence of the absolute effect» (*ricerca l'esistenza dell'effetto assoluto*).

¹⁶ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 103. Cf. SCR: «6. Asserirsi e dichiararsi male qualche uguaglianza, nel comprendere le cose geometriche, tra l'intelletto umano e divino» (OG, XIX, p. 327; DV, n. 25, p. 52).

¹⁷ Lit. «speaking of the cognition of a thing that a Blessed has» (*parlando della cognitione, che dell'istessa cosa ha un Beato in Dio*).

clear, morning cognition, while the one with which they know the same thing through itself and connatural species, is called evening cognition. Among these /139/ cognitions, God's cognition is all the more perfect as infinite is more perfect than finite.¹⁸ Therefore, neither pure geometry nor the arithmetical [rendition] of the littlest thing can equal in perfection the divine cognition, which is God himself. As for geometrical and arithmetical cognitions, if they are conclusions, their certainty depends on principles. Consequently, being dependent cognitions, cannot, in perfection, be equal to God's understanding, which is the substance and essence of God himself. Moreover, principles of pure geometry and arithmetics are petitions, definitions, or axioms, which have not so much certainty to not being able to have more.

/140/ Since the object[s of study] of pure geometry and arithmetics are the discrete and continuous quantities, the essence and formal reason of which are yet to be perfectly defined by the philosophers,¹⁹ I ignore how geometrical and arithmetical cognitions can, in perfection, equal the comprehension of God, who, with a simple intuition, realises himself and all the things, their essences, principles, causes, properties, and effects in themselves,²⁰ which cannot be known by who does

¹⁸ With regard to St Augustine's doctrine of primary and secondary levels of knowledge. The primary (*cognitio matutina*) makes an object knowable in its principle or cause (God), and the secondary (*cognitio vespertina*) reaches an object in itself. Oreggi's aim is to emphasize how human knowledge, investigating things through themselves (thanks to *cognitio vespertina*), is inferior and incomparable with the *cognitio matutina*. Moreover, according to the relevant theological tradition, the possession of both cognitions is a typically angelical feature. Cf. OREGGI, *De Deo uno* (cit. note 1), pp. 105, 130: «Per speciem expressam sit intellectus actu, & formaliter intelligens, & cognoscens: non potest autem intelligere, seu cognoscere intellectus, nisi per cognitionem, vel terminum cognitionis, quae in ipso sit: nam cognitio est actus vitalis, qui essentialiter dependet a vita in genere causae efficientis, & materialis; atque ita ab intellectu esse, & in intellectu recipi debet cognitio intellectiva; & ideo debet esse illius forma cognitio, per quam intellegit: si non sit illius substantia; quod solum divinae convenit cognitioni, quae sicut Deus ipse, per essentiam existit [...]. Quare a Theologis, ex Divo Augustino, creaturae dicuntur in Deo vel in Verbo cognosci cognitione matutina, in se ipsius vespertina», where the theologian refers to AUGUSTINUS, *De Genesi ad litteram*, IV, 23 (but see IV, 22-35 *passim*). See also ID., *De civitate Dei*, XI, 29; THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 58, a. 6 co.; *Questiones disputatae de veritate*, q. 8, a. 16 co. and q. 8, a. 16 ad 9.

¹⁹ Lit. «yet to be perfectly known by us thanks to the philosophers» (*ancora non si sa perfettamente da Filosofi*). Cf. A. OREGGI, *Tractatus philosophicum praeludium*, Romae, Ex Typographia Manelphi Manelphij, 1637, cols. 73-122 (*Tractatus tertius. De quantitate continua*, esp. cols. 73-90, *De natura, et essentia quantitatis continuae*).

²⁰ Cf. ID., *De Deo uno* (cit. note 1), pp. 239-240: «At vero Deus, cum sit ens per essentiam existens, uno simplicissimo actu, qui est eius voluntas, & essentia, vult & finem propter se ipsum, & media propter finem. Sicut ex eo, quod in se ipso intelligat omnia, unaque simplicissimo actu intellectus intelligat & causas, & effectus; non est in illo cognitio discursiva.

not understand perfectly the essence of the object [of study], on which depends the connection of all its demonstrable predicates.²¹ And [we] cannot either understand how who does not possess a perfect cognition of subject and predicate might perfectly understand the connection between them. Therefore, who does not know perfectly the essence of the quantity and the formal reason of the number, which are the very object of geometry and arithmetics, cannot absolutely possess a perfect cognition of whatever preposition, and least of all compare [themselves] with God,²² who comprehensively knows all that is, has been, will be, and might be.

At the beginning of the second Dialogue, at p. 100, [Galileo] claims to have no desire to conclude any proposition [i.e. to affirm the veracity of either cosmological system], while [he wants] to present the arguments of both sides, with the [relevant] solutions, leaving the [final] decision to the judgement of others.²³

If he wants this pending and dubious judgement to be determined and resolved by the readers, then he has not [presented] as defined the daily and, consequently, the yearly motions – either one or many motions – of the Sun, and the stillness of the Earth.²⁴ /141/ [Yet this is a matter] that the Holy Congregation²⁵ presumes defined by given Scriptures,²⁶ in accordance with the position of the Fathers.²⁷ To doubt their meaning [i.e. of the Holy Scriptures] against the sentiment of the Church Fathers is not less erroneous than deny them,²⁸ since it is not

Nec cognitio principiorum, & causarum est causa cognoscendi effectus, vel cognitionis eorum effectuum».

²¹ Lit. «the connection of all the predicates (of the object itself) that can be demonstrated» (*la connessione di tutti i predicati, che dell'istesso Oggetto si possono dimostrare*). Cf. *op. cit.* note 19, cols. 103-116 (*De relatione, seu de iis, quae ad aliud dicuntur*).

²² Lit. «let alone in comparison with God» (*nonché a paragone di Dio*).

²³ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 107. The non-definitive nature of Galileo's observations is reaffirmed at p. 356 (OG, VII, p. 383), where the author however states that 'others' shall decide, «since one of the arrangements must be true and the other false». On this point, cf. Inchofer's report (OG, XIX, p. 355; DV, n. 45, p. 92): «Convenendo una delle due costituzioni esser necessariamente vera e l'altra necessariamente falsa, impossibil cosa è che (stando però tra i termini delle dottrine humane) le ragioni addotte per la parte vera non si manifestino altrettanto concludenti quanto le in contrario vane et inefficaci».

²⁴ Cf. SCR: «4. Tratta la cosa come non decisa, e come che si aspetti e non si presupponga la definizione» (OG, XIX, p. 326; DV, n. 25, p. 52).

²⁵ The Congregation of the Index (referring to the Decree of March 5th, 1616).

²⁶ See note 4.

²⁷ See note 5.

²⁸ Ad M: *Decretalium D. Gregorii Papae IX. Compilatio*, V, VII, 1 (*Infidelis est qui non habet certitudinem fidei, et infideli non est credendum in preiudicium alterius*): «Stephanus Papa omni-

less repugnant to the infinite science and goodness of God to make false statements than [falsely] state about the revealed things that he [i.e. Galileo] doubts and denies, for both [i.e. doubt and denial] refuse²⁹ God's veracity [i.e. the veracity of God's revelation] to their intelligibility [i.e. of the revealed things].

At p. 164: «Aristotle's error, and Ptolemy's, and Tycho's, and yours, and that of all the rest, is rooted in a fixed and inveterate impression that the Earth stands still; this you cannot or do not know how to cast off, even when you wish to philosophize about what would follow from assuming that the Earth moved».³⁰ /142/ From this moment on we realize³¹ that [Galileo] wants to prove absolutely the motion of the Earth and the quietness and stillness of the Sun, discrediting those authors of whom the first Doctors and Lights of the Church have been making use for a long time.³² [Moreover,] by mocking a fake Simplicio he seems to want to mock the Church itself as well.³³

One and the other thing is proven by the following loci. [At] p. 317 he writes these words: «I am not asking the Peripatetics; I am asking Aristotle himself. As for the former, I know very well what they would reply. They, as most reverent and most humble slaves of Aristotle, would deny all the experiences and observations in the world, and would even refuse to look at them in order not to have to admit them, and they would say that the universe remains just as Aristotle has written; not as nature would have it. For take away the prop of his authority, and with what would you have them appear in the field? So now tell me what you think Aristotle himself would do».³⁴

/143/ The other part [i.e. concerning the demonstration of the Copernican system] can be clearly observed at p. 325: «You wonder that there are so few followers of the Pythagorean opinion, whereas I am as-

bus Episcopis. Dubius in fide infidelis est, nec eis omnino credendum est, qui fidem Veritatis ignorant, [nec rectae conversationis vitam ducunt etc.]».

²⁹ Lit. «omitting» (*levando*).

³⁰ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 171.

³¹ Lit. «from this point we start to glimpse» (*da questo luogo si comincia a scorgere*).

³² Cf. SCR: «5. Lo strapazzo de gl'autori contrari e di chi più si serve Santa Chiesa» (OG, XIX, p. 327; DV, n. 25, p. 52).

³³ (OG, XIX, p. 326; DV, n. 25, p. 52): «2. [...] aver posto la medicina del fine in bocca di un sciocco, et in parte che ne anche si trova se non con difficoltà, approvata poi dall'altro interlocutore freddamente, e con accennar solamente e non distinguer il bene, che mostra dire di mala voglia» (referring to *Dialogue* – cit. note 13 –, p. 464; OG, VII, pp. 488-489).

³⁴ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 320. Cf. Inchofer's report (OG, XIX, p. 354; DV, n. 45, p. 89): «[Galileo] dice li Peripatetici esser mancipii d'Aristotele, et dirrebbero che il mondo sta come scrisse Aristotele, et non come vuole la natura».

tonished that there have been any up to this day who have embraced and followed it. Nor can I ever sufficiently admire the outstanding acumen of those who have taken hold of this opinion and accepted it as true; they have through sheer force of intellect done such violence to their own senses as to prefer what reason told them over that which sensible experience plainly showed them to the contrary». ³⁵ And shortly after: «[there is no limit to my astonishment when I reflect that] Aristarchus and Copernicus were able to make reason so conquer sense that, in defiance of the latter, the former became mistress of their belief». And a few lines below: «We are, and such obvious and sensible ones that were it not for the existence of a superior and better sense than natural and common sense to join forces with reason, I much question whether I, too, should not have been much more recalcitrant /144/ toward the Copernican system than I have been since a clearer light than usual has illuminated me». ³⁶

From this passage, ³⁷ we realize that the author does not want to speak otherwise *ex hypothesi* of the Copernican system, given a different order of things possible for the infinite wisdom and power of God, but of the one [i.e. cosmological system] that in the very order of things created by God is found, since the things that do not exist can be proven neither by experience nor by any reason superior to experience.

/145/ From these and other similar things, of which Mr Galileo's book is full, can be clearly inferred ³⁸ that he does not bother upholding the Decree of the Holy Congregation, as he affirmed in the note to the readers, [stating that this was the reason why] he decided to write these Dialogues. He gives instead [the impression that] his aim is to defend the Copernican system against the Holy Congregation by common agreement with the Fathers ³⁹ and given Scriptures, ⁴⁰ [which are] made at least

³⁵ Cf. SCR: «7. Dar per argomento di verità che passino i Tolemaici a' Copernicani, e non *e contra*» (OG, XIX, p. 354; DV, n. 25, p. 52): Inchofer's report: «Dolet subinde Galilaeo quod haec opinio a paucis sit percepta, quod inveteratae opinioni nimis sint addicti, eamque ob causam conatur Simplicium dedocere, et sub huius nomine omnes Perpatheticos, si possit, in suam sententiam pertrahere. Agit nimirum ex sollicitudine diligentis magistri, qui discipulos habere et proficere optet» (OG, XIX, p. 351; DV, n. 45, p. 82).

³⁶ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 328. Cf. Inchofer's report: «[Galileo] mostra che sono stati di eminente ingegno che hanno abbracciata l'opinione di Copernico, seguendo il discorso contra le sensate esperienze, et che in questo la ragione ha fatto violenza al senso [...]. Dice il Salviati che egli ancora havrebbe creduto a' Peripatetici, si senso superiore et più eccellente de' communi e naturali non s'accompagnava con la ragione» (OG, XIX, p. 355; DV, n. 45, p. 90).

³⁷ Lit. «From here» (*Di qui*).

³⁸ Lit. «is evidently seen» (*evidentemente si scorge*).

³⁹ See note 5.

⁴⁰ See note 4.

plainly reliable – most certain, actually – by sensible experiences, granted and considered as such⁴¹ from the beginning of the world [by everyone] except a few [authors] that he follows. [Thus,] the Copernican system is repugnant to the reason and the faith by virtue of which we believe with supreme certitude in the most profound mystery of the Holy Trinity, the hypostatic union of the Verb with the Most Holy humanity of Christ and the ineffable mystery of the Blessed Sacrament. Therefore, is too injurious to the faith he who, against the sensible experiences, abuses the senses⁴² in[vestigating] the things revealed by God, against which cannot be /146/ given reasons not complying with [what established by] the Sacred [Fifth] Lateran Council under Leo X during the tenth [i.e. eighth] session, being impossible for one truth to contradict the other truth.⁴³

Consequently, [considering that] this book contains every evil contained in Copernicus['] book], lacking the usefulness of measures and calculations for which the Copernican system benefits [the study], and discussing [the Copernican system] as truthful⁴⁴ and not *ex hypothesi*, we are trying [to decide] how to deliberate.⁴⁵

*Et pro aliis.*⁴⁶

⁴¹ The expression 'considered as such' may imply a pun, since the adjective *sensato* means both 'sensible' and 'reasonable'.

⁴² To «abuse the senses» (*fare forza ai sensi*) is the act of question what is sensorially perceived as evident and truthful.

⁴³ *Lit.* «being one truth unable to be contrary to the other truth» (*non potendo una verità esser contraria all'altra verità*). Referring to the Papal bull *Apostolici regiminis*, promulgated by Pope Leo X (1475-1521) on December 19th, 1513, during the Fifth Lateran Council. According to it, the second alleged offence signalled by Oreggi is Galileo's statement of a truth in contradiction with the revealed truth, prefiguring the possibility to lay the charge of formal heresy.

⁴⁴ *Lit.* «treating absolutely» (*trattando assolutamente*).

⁴⁵ *Lit.* «we search what is to be determined (*si cerca che cosa si deva determinare*). Similarly to the statements of Inchofer and Pasqualigo about the strong suspicion (and not the certainty) that Galileo held Copernicanism to be true, here Oreggi dissimulates the awareness that the second alleged offence prefigured a possible charge of formal heresy, consequently ending the first version of his report simulating uncertainty as to what to do (cf. *infra*, p. 232).

⁴⁶ Sentence not easily understandable. Supposing that *aliis* is an ablative plural masculine form, a plausible translation might be: «[We are] in accordance with [what established by] the others», *lit.* «And in favour of the others», referring to the reports of Inchofer and Pasqualigo. Even though this wording, with the use of the pronoun *aliis* referring to other authorities, is particularly informal, it is important to note that in the closing sentence of Inchofer's censorial report, such pronoun is employed to indicate the Cardinal Inquisitors who would have tried Galileo: «Hae sunt rationes quae me ad eiusmodi censuram ferendam, veritatis amore, permoverunt, quas nihilominus meliori aliorum iudicio libenter permitto et submitto» (OG, XIX, p. 356; DV, n. 45, p. 92).

VERSION B

/147/ Mr Galileo Galilei proposed, at the beginning of his Dialogues, to discuss the two chief world systems, Ptolemaic and Copernican, by means of natural and philosophical reasons. However,⁴⁷ in these Dialogues, the motion of the Earth is discussed so as to deny the daily and yearly motions of the Sun,⁴⁸ which, absolutely speaking, is against the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, founded on given Scriptures,⁴⁹ the common interpretation of the Fathers,⁵⁰ and the sensible experiences granted from the beginning of the world [and considered] as such by everyone, learned and unlearned, except a few that Copernicus follows and others who follow Copernicus himself. But since⁵¹ it is not impossible for the infinite wisdom and power of God to give a different order of things, a licence was granted to Mr Galileo by the Right Reverend Father Master of the Sacred Palace to discuss the Copernican system *ex hypothesi*, which is to say: assuming that God /148/ did not reveal us that the Earth stands still and the Sun moves, or given a different order of things, [we wonder] if there are reasons for which the Copernican system might be naturally proven [i.e. demonstrated] as possible.

Such permission is not far from the way held by the most important authors of the Church, who wonder whether the eternity of the world is possible, although it is certain that it was made at the beginning of time.⁵² And they discuss the processions of the Divine Persons [as well], sometimes even given an impossible stance, like [this]: *An si Spiritus Sanctus non procederet a Filio, distingueretur ab illo.*⁵³

⁴⁷ Lit. «But since» (*Ma perché*).

⁴⁸ Lit. «in a way that the daily and yearly motions of the Sun are denied» (*in maniera tale che si nega il moto diurno, et annuo del Sole*).

⁴⁹ See note 4.

⁵⁰ See note 5.

⁵¹ Lit. «And since» (*E perché*).

⁵² See note 2.

⁵³ See note 3.

Therefore, a fortiori it seems [necessary] to allow the system of the world to be discussed, [for nothing] has been revealed of it apart from a few things universally [revealed] in the Holy Scriptures; just enough to distinguish days, months and years. The method [adopted] for the disposition, order, distance, size, and the number of the parts constituting the great design of the Universe⁵⁴ has not been explained, in fact, this results to be so difficult in the Holy Scriptures that who would affirm it /149/ to be unintelligible⁵⁵ for human understanding would not deviate from the true meaning of the Scriptures.⁵⁶ [Similarly,] so far, the philosophers have not found an explanation that universally convinces everyone [concerning] the number of heavens and exactly do justice to all the appearances occurring in them.⁵⁷ On the contrary, sometimes [the philosophers observed] that calculations and measures have been supported by false speculations, even in what pertains to ecclesiastical matters, as appears from the Decree of the Sacred Congregation, which allows the Copernican system *ex hypothesi*, albeit absolutely false.

However, since Mr Galileo seems to have transgressed the command given to him,⁵⁸ and absolutely seems that he wants to prove the motion of the Earth and the stillness of the Sun against the true meaning of the Scriptures,⁵⁹ I am going to point out a few things – which make the author suspect – and mention the remedies, deferring to what in this respect has been pointed out by the Most Eminent Fathers⁶⁰ and Thrice

⁵⁴ Lit. «the great construction of the world» (*la gran Fabrica del Mondo*).

⁵⁵ Lit. «impossible» (*impossibile*).

⁵⁶ Cf. A. OREGGI, *De opere sex dierum tractatus quartus*, Romae, Ex Typographia Vaticana, 1632, pp. 15-16: «Verum cum de his philosophari, quae longissime a nobis absunt, difficile sit, nemo est qui aliquid certo affirmare possit praeter ea, quae aut ex Scripturis revelata sunt, vel ad cognitionem eorum perducunt, quorum nobis sunt sidera signum; & ad quae dignoscenda illa nobis dedit Deus. Haec autem quae sint ex Sacro Textu habes; cui quanto magis adhaeremus, tanto propinquius ad veritatem accedimus. Quae tamen nobis per Scripturas revelata non sunt, Mathematicorum magis observationes requirunt, quam Theologorum contemplationem, quorum diligentiae ac studio reliquenda videntur, dummodo ea, quae per Scripturas nobis revelata sunt tanquam certa, verissimae supponentes, nihil asserant, quod illis adversetur. Nulla enim tam diligens potest esse observatio, quae quod Deus dixit, qui suum est esse, & intelligere, vel corrigere, vel redarguere possit».

⁵⁷ Lit. «made in them» (*che in quelli si fanno*).

⁵⁸ With reference to the discussion *ex hypothesi* of the Copernican system.

⁵⁹ See notes 11 and 12.

⁶⁰ If the third 'P' in 'P.P.P.' is not a typo, this should be intended as a reference to three different members of the Church, possibly those who, together with Oreggi, analyzed Galileo's *Dialogue*: Riccardi (as a member of the 1632 *Special Commission*), Inchofer and Pasqualigo.

Most Reverend Fathers⁶¹ designated by His Holiness for the examination of the present Dialogues.

/150/ I will start from the note to the readers, with which Galileo must regulate his whole work, removing⁶² what might make him suspect of wanting to prove the truthfulness of the motion of the Earth and the stillness of the Sun. And the words that make the readers doubt are those with which⁶³ seems that the author, assuming the motion of the Earth,⁶⁴ wants to shed light on the unresolved issue of the sea's flux, but this is impossible, since the sea's flux, in his days, actually exists.⁶⁵ Therefore, it cannot depend on an inexistent, fictitious, and imaginary cause, and a false hypothesis such as the Earth's motion. These words, then, are either to be removed completely⁶⁶ or to be explained in such a manner that, although given by God a different order of things, and granted the motion of the Earth – as he could –, the sea's flux would not be repugnant to such an order and system (as the Copernican) if God would have wanted to make it so. In this way, from a possible effect [Galileo] would infer the cause that, thus, could potentially produce an effect in many manners and ways.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, to an existent effect cannot be assigned but a cause which works or worked in such a way as to define the existence of the real effect. The philosophers [likewise] do not search for the cause that might make the sea's flux exist,⁶⁸ /151/ but which [cause] actually is the one that proves to us⁶⁹ the existence [i.e. of tides].

At p. 96, making a comparison between human and divine intellect, [Galileo] affirms to understand certain things perfectly, and to be so absolutely sure of them as nature itself, namely God, is.⁷⁰ But this is

⁶¹ A formulation showing great deference, extremely rare in early modern ecclesiastical documents. In this way, Oreggi conceivably wanted to acknowledge the authority of his two colleagues acting as censorial consultants, and the worth of their work, while he was presenting a report antithetical to theirs, since it features the possibility of granting a new imprimatur to Galileo's work.

⁶² Lit. «removed from it» (*levatone*).

⁶³ Lit. «where» (*dove*).

⁶⁴ Lit. «from the motion of the Earth» (*dal moto della Terra*).

⁶⁵ GALILEI, *Dialogue*, p. 6 (cit. and see note 13).

⁶⁶ Lit. «absolutely» (*assolutamente*).

⁶⁷ Lit. «Thus, from a possible effect [Galileo] would give the cause, that currently has the power to produce an effect in more manners and ways» (*e così d'effetto possibile darebbe la causa, ch'attualmente ha potenza di produrre un effetto in più maniere, e modi*).

⁶⁸ Lit. «that might give existence to the sea's flux» (*che possa dar l'essere al flusso del Mare*).

⁶⁹ Lit. «that gives us» (*che ci dà*).

⁷⁰ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 103. See note 16.

not allowed by the schools of theologians, who, speaking of the cognition of a thing manifested by a Blessed, represent it as similar to the clear, morning cognition, while the one with which they know the same thing through itself and connatural species, is called evening cognition. Among these cognitions, God's cognition is all the more perfect as infinite is more perfect than finite.⁷¹

Therefore, neither pure geometry nor the arithmetical [rendition] of the littlest thing can equal in perfection the divine cognition, which is God himself. As for geometrical and arithmetical cognitions, if they are conclusions, their certainty depends on principles, which are petitions, definitions, or axioms. Therefore, geometrical and arithmetical conclusions cannot, in perfection and certainty, /152/ be equal with God's science [i.e. knowledge], which is intuitive, comprehensive, and independent from whatever principle, being the essence of God himself.⁷² Furthermore, petitions, definitions and axioms have not so much certainty to not being able to have more. Hence, we must not in any way allow pure mathematical cognition of geometry and arithmetics to be [considered], in perfection, equal to God's cognition of the same things, for he understands most perfectly the essence of quantity and numbers, [while] which is this [essence] is still a [matter of] dispute among the philosophers, and [they] do not even know which is the most truthful way to explain it [i.e. the essence]. And if it is true that the evidence of the conclusions depends on the evidence and certainty of the essence of the objects [of study], I do not know how [whoever,] be they mathematicians, geometers or arithmeticians, can presume as much evidence, certainty or perfection in his [i.e. Galileo's] speculations as is in the divine cognition, in front of whose [i.e. God's] intellect the essences of all things are exposed and open, [while] the mathematicians do not clearly⁷³ know even generally [the essences] of continuous and discrete quantities.⁷⁴

/153/ At the beginning of the second Dialogue, at p. 100, [Galileo]⁷⁵ claims to have no desire to conclude any proposition [i.e. to affirm the veracity of either cosmological system], but [that he wants] to present the arguments of both sides, with the [relevant] solutions, leaving the [final] decision to the judgement of others.⁷⁶ If he wants

⁷¹ See note 19.

⁷² See note 21.

⁷³ *Lit.* «perfectly» (*perfettamente*).

⁷⁴ See note 20.

⁷⁵ *Lit.* «while [Galileo]» (*mentre*).

⁷⁶ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 107. See note 23.

this pending and dubious judgement to be determined and resolved by the readers, then he has not [presented] as defined the daily and, consequently, the yearly motions – either one or many motions – of the Sun, and the stillness of the Earth.⁷⁷ [Yet this is a matter] that the Holy Congregation, in accordance with the position of the Fathers,⁷⁸ presumes defined by given Scriptures.⁷⁹ To doubt their meaning [i.e. of the Holy Scriptures] against the sentiment of the Church Fathers is not less erroneous than deny them,⁸⁰ since it is not less repugnant to the infinite science and goodness of God to make false statements than [falsely] state about the revealed things that he [i.e. Galileo] doubts and denies, for both [i.e. doubt and denial] refuse⁸¹ God's veracity [i.e. the veracity of God's revelation] to their intelligibility [i.e. of the revealed things].

At p. 164: «Aristotle's error, and Ptolemy's, and Tycho's, and yours, and that of all the rest, is rooted in a fixed and inveterate impression that /154/ the Earth stands still; this you cannot or do not know how to cast off, even when you wish to philosophize about what would follow from assuming that the Earth moved». ⁸² Here we cannot deny that Galileo is not talking *ex hypothesi*, especially because he attributes the error to the impression that the Earth stands still, which, being most certain, cannot absolutely be a cause of error in this state and order of things. However, we would want, after those words, to be added [a statement concerning the fact] that the Earth stands still, as it truly does, to dispel any doubt about [the fact that] he speaks absolutely [i.e. he considers the Copernican system truthful].

Thus, he would in part remove the doubt provoked in the minds of who have read his book, [namely] that he wants to prove the veracity of the Earth's motion, discrediting those authors of whom the first Doctors and Lights of the Church have been making use for a long time.⁸³ [Moreover,] mocking a fake Simplicio, that [Galileo] makes talk as he pleases, telling nonsense and far-fetched things, [he seems] to want to replace not only Aristotle but the entire Church too.⁸⁴

⁷⁷ See note 24.

⁷⁸ See note 5.

⁷⁹ See note 4.

⁸⁰ Without mentioning the *Liber Extra*; cf. note 28.

⁸¹ *Lit.* «omitting» (*levando*).

⁸² GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 171.

⁸³ See note 32.

⁸⁴ See note 33.

And part of what we just said is proven by /155/ p. 317, where he writes these words: «I am not asking the Peripatetics; I am asking Aristotle himself. As for the former, I know very well what they would reply. They, as most reverent and most humble slaves of Aristotle, would deny all the experiences and observations in the world,⁸⁵ and would even refuse to look at them in order not to have to admit them, and they would say that the universe remains just as Aristotle has written; not as nature would have it. For take away the prop of his authority, and with what would you have them appear in the field? So now tell me what you think Aristotle himself would do».⁸⁶

The other part [i.e. concerning the demonstration of the Copernican system] can be clearly seen at p. 325: «You wonder that there are so few followers of the Pythagorean opinion,⁸⁷ whereas I am astonished that there have been any up to this day who have embraced and followed it. Nor can I ever sufficiently admire the outstanding acumen of those who have taken hold of this opinion and accepted it as true; they have through sheer force of intellect done such violence to their own /156/ senses as to prefer what reason told them over that which sensible experience plainly showed them to the contrary».⁸⁸ And shortly after: «[there is no limit to my astonishment when I reflect that] Aristarchus and Copernicus were able to make reason so conquer sense that, in defiance of the latter, the former became mistress of their belief». And a few lines below: «We are, and such obvious and sensible ones that were it not for the existence of a superior and better sense than natural and common sense to join forces with reason, I much question whether I, too, should not have been much more recalcitrant toward the Copernican system than I have been since a clearer light than usual has illuminated me».⁸⁹

From this passage,⁹⁰ we realize that the author does not want to speak otherwise *ex hypothesi* of the Copernican system, given a different order of things possible for the infinite wisdom and power of God, but of the one that in the very order of things created by God is found, since

⁸⁵ Ad M: «and besides, at p. 325, he attributes [the act of] abusing the senses to a great knowledge and understanding [shown] by Copernicus and his followers».

⁸⁶ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 320. See note 34.

⁸⁷ Ad M: «Among the Pythagoreans it is worthy of praise to abuse the senses with reason. [As for] those who, concerning the Sun's motion, contradict his [i.e. Galileo's] assumed, extraneous and even remote reasons (and maybe impertinent [i.e. unrelated] experiences), at p. 317 he makes them most reverent and most humble slaves of Aristotle».

⁸⁸ See note 35.

⁸⁹ GALILEI, *Dialogue* (cit. note 13), p. 328. See note 36.

⁹⁰ *Lit.* «From here» (*Di qui*).

the things that do not exist can be proven neither by experience nor by any reason /157/ superior to experience.

It is, therefore, necessary that the author of these four Dialogues distinguishes the given order of things⁹¹ from the possible [ones], and that he speaks of the Copernican system as something possible but inexistent.⁹² [Moreover, it is necessary that he] speaks of the motion of the Sun and the stillness of the Earth as a certain, catholic, veridical and infallible truth, in accordance with the Decree of the Sacred Congregation, based on the common interpretation of the Fathers⁹³ and adhering to the Holy Scriptures,⁹⁴ in which supreme truth is found, proceeding from the Father of Lights, God, who is supreme truth and infinite knowledge.

[Firstly,]⁹⁵ if he has something against Aristotle, Ptolemy and all those others who follow Aristotle, he has to challenge their claims, disposition and order feigned in [discussing] the things created. However, what has been revealed to the Church by way of the Scriptures and tradition, [in his writings] must always remain steadfast and certain, [for the Church], believing in the mysteries of the Most Holy Trinity, the Incarnation of the eternal Verb, and the ineffable /158/ Blessed Sacrament, must be able to persuade the author, in something such evident to everyone's common sense, [to believe] in what it believes and has always believed in compliance with the true sense of the Scriptures.

/159/ [Secondly,] the author of the present Dialogues must assume as infallible truth, in the given order of things,⁹⁶ the daily and consequently yearly motions of the Sun, and the stillness of the Earth, and resolve the difficulties opposing this truth, as there are no reasons against it but ostensible [ones, and] as there is no truth contrary to the other truth.⁹⁷

[Thirdly,] in a different order of things he can show that the Copernican system might be possible, but he can never, hypothesising a different order of things,⁹⁸ assign to a cause an effect⁹⁹ that actually exists in this order of things.

⁹¹ Lit. «the order of the present things» (*l'ordine delle cose presenti*).

⁹² Lit. «and not existent» (*e non esistente*).

⁹³ See note 5.

⁹⁴ See note 4.

⁹⁵ Here starts a list of corrections deemed necessary to grant a new imprimatur for the *Dialogue* (of which only the fourth point is indicated as such).

⁹⁶ Lit. «in the order of the present things» (*nell'ordine delle cose presenti*).

⁹⁷ Ad M: «[Fifth] Lateran Council, under Leo X, tenth [i.e. eighth] session». See note 43.

⁹⁸ Lit. «exploiting a hypothesis of a different order of things» (*servendosi dell'hypotesi d'altr'ordine delle cose*).

⁹⁹ Lit. «assign that cause of effect» (*assegnar quella causa d'effetto*).

Fourth[ly], he has to speak against the fake Simplicio, Aristotle, Ptolemy, Tycho and others who follow their opinion so as to make clear that he does not challenge the Sun's motion and the stillness of the Earth, but the method they employ /160/ to explain their reasons.¹⁰⁰ [He should do this] in order to make clear that he does not mock the Sacred Congregation, the Church, and the Holy Scriptures, postponing them to his own whims, that he affirms to be a reason¹⁰¹ and light superior to sensible experiences and – someone doubts –¹⁰² to divine revelation. The author is not to be praised even for he wants to discredit those Doctors that are followed by the first Doctors and Lights of the Church.¹⁰³

[Lastly,] he would be well praised if, writing a fifth dialogue,¹⁰⁴ showed the fallacies of the reasons against the Decree of the Sacred Congregation. Thus, it would be understood that he endorses¹⁰⁵ its Decree and does not mock it, as everyone generally believes, and some utilities would be found in his book. [In this way] he would also show, against those who speak nonsense,¹⁰⁶ what is the worth of his reasons against them.¹⁰⁷

/161/-/162/ [blank]

¹⁰⁰ Cf. SCR: «si fece risoluzione dal Maestro di Sacro Palazzo che si rivedesse il libro e si riducesse ad ipotetico [...], disegnando questo modo di procedere e prescrivendolo a tutta la disputa da farsi anche contro il sistema Tolemaico *ad hominem* solamente, e per mostrare che la Sacra Congregazione in riprovar il Copernico haveva sentite tutte le ragioni» (OG, XIX, p. 325; DV, n. 25, p. 51).

¹⁰¹ *Lit.* «which he calls reason» (*i quali chiama ragione*).

¹⁰² Unclear hint, yet certainly referring to more than one of the churchmen involved in Galileo's trial, Oreggi himself included, who, for example, seems to be the only one insisting (in both versions of the report) on Galileo's blasphemous attitudes (A, 51-53 *et seq.*; B, 65-67 *et seq.*).

¹⁰³ See note 32.

¹⁰⁴ *Lit.* «making a fifth day» (*facendo una Quinta giornata*).

¹⁰⁵ *Lit.* «authenticates» (*autentica*).

¹⁰⁶ A curious turn of phrase, since Oreggi here seems to allude to those who accused Galileo of heresy.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. SCR: «Tutte le quali cose [i.e. the elements of crime] si potrebbero emendare, se si giudicasse esser qualche utilità nel libro, del quale gli si dovesse far questa grazia» (OG, XIX, p. 327; DV, n. 25, p. 52); Galileo's second deposition (April 30th, 1633): «E per maggior confirmatione del non haver io né tenuta né tener per vera la dannata opinione della mobilità della terra e stabilità del sole, se mi sarà conceduta, sicome io desidero, habilità e tempo di poterne fare più chiara dimostrazione, io sono accinto a farla. E l'occasione c'è opportunissima, atteso che nel libro già pubblicato sono concordi gl'interlocutori di doversi, dopo certo tempo trovar ancor insieme per discorrere sopra diversi problemi naturali, separati dalla materia ne i loro congressi trattata: con tale occasione dunque, dovendo io soggiungere una o due giornate, prometto di ripigliar gli argomenti già recati a favore della detta opinione falsa e dannata, e confutargli in quel più efficace modo che da Dio benedetto mi verrà sumministrato. Prego dunque questo S. Tribunale che voglia concorrer meco in questa buona risoluzione, col concedermi facoltà di poterla metter in effetto» (OG, XIX, p. 344; DV, n. 38, p. 74).

Spada Veralli 235, 2

(Letter from Prince Leopoldo de' Medici to Virgilio Spada, August 6th, 1650)

/163/ Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor.

The works left by Galileo are such that, despite what might be repugnant [in them], it seems that their publication could bring universally a great deal of profit¹⁰⁸ to scholars. Therefore, I would like to understand whether – by adding assurances at the beginning, or by censoring¹⁰⁹ or modifying something – one could hope [to obtain] a new licence to reprint them. Thus, I beseech Your Lordship, to whom I always turn with all confidence, to be pleased with letting me know something, since, depending on your answer, orders will be given to who plans [to reprint Galileo's works].¹¹⁰

In the meantime, with a favourable and affectionate will, I continue to wish Your Lordship every good.¹¹¹

From Florence, August 6th, 1650

To the pleasure of Your Lordship,
Prince Leopoldo

[To] Monsignor Virgilio Spada

/170/ [outside of the envelope]¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ *Lit.* «no small profit» (*non poco profitto*).

¹⁰⁹ *Lit.* «cutting off» (*con resecare*).

¹¹⁰ *Lit.* «who has this thought [i.e. to reprint Galileo's works] will be ruled» (*si governerà, chi haverebbe questo pensiero*).

¹¹¹ *Lit.* «I keep on praying for every wish of Your Lordship [to be fulfilled]» (*resto pregando a V.S. ogni desiderato bene*).

¹¹² Recipient's details: «Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor Virgilio Spada [in] Rome».

Spada Veralli 235, 3

(Draft letter of Virgilio Spada to Leopoldo de' Medici, August 1650)

/171/ Your Highness¹¹³ honoured me with his most humble [letter] of the [6th] of the falling [month, with which you expressed the desire] to rely on me¹¹⁴ to investigate¹¹⁵ which is the best way to take in order to obtain¹¹⁶ a licence to reprint the work of the famous Galileo concerning the motion of the Earth, censoring¹¹⁷ those things that caused or may cause trouble.

Even though I have spent [only] a few days examining your proposal,¹¹⁸ nonetheless it seems [possible] to me to say frankly that your idea might be of extremely easy success considering the nature of the request, but extremely difficult by accident, and maybe impossible.

I have said that considering its nature, this should be extremely easy because, firstly, I have known¹¹⁹ that, on other occasions, such licence was granted by the Congregation of the Index.¹²⁰

¹¹³ Ad M: «I would not know if this reply is appropriate, hence I submit it to Your Eminence first».

¹¹⁴ Lit. «lean on my weakness» (*apoggiare alla mia debolezza*).

¹¹⁵ Ad M: «I do not think it is [a] good [idea] to turn to the different people mentioned in this draft, unless verbally with some agent or correspondent of the Princes. God knows that in the Congregation where this matter was discussed [the obligation of] secrecy was observed. Therefore, it is better not to show [that someone is trying] to bypass it [i.e. the Congregation of the Holy Office]. Maybe, for now, it would be better to inform [Prince Leopoldo] that Your Reverence [i.e. Virgilio Spada] has undertaken a few verifications concerning the Congregations of the Holy Office and the Index in order to find out what can we hope for, and that you will let [him] know in due time. And I will report to one and the other Congregation as early as I am there. Meanwhile, Your Reverence will see in the [...] attached the outcome of the verifications carried out [by order of Virgilio Spada?] thanks to the Auditor». A possible reference to Alessandro Vettori (1586-1661), who held the position of Auditor from 1631 until his death. The Auditor for the Jurisdiction and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Grand Duke (or Auditor for the Ecclesiastical Properties) was responsible for coordinating relations between civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in defence of the rights of the Grand Duke against the Roman Curia and the religious institutions of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. Among his many prerogatives, there was also that of issuing imprimaturs, although in this particular duty he was subject to the authority of the local Inquisitor. The nature of his work led him to frequent journeys between Rome and Florence and required a profound knowledge of both civil and canon law, a likely reason for his choice as executor of these 'verifications', the content and results of which are unfortunately unknown because the above-mentioned annex is now lost.

¹¹⁶ Lit. «to have» (*haver*).

¹¹⁷ Lit. «cut off» (*resecare*).

¹¹⁸ Lit. «And even though just a few days passed, spent in examining your proposal» (*E se bene sono scorsi pochi giorni applicati all'essame di questa proposta*).

¹¹⁹ Lit. «I learn» (*imparo*).

¹²⁰ Rather than the imprimatur of the *Dialogue*, here Spada seems to allude to the

Secondly, because I came across a vote by a late Cardinal of the Congregation of the Holy Office, by which can be deduced that even in that Congregation /172/ no great difficulties were found [for the granting of a new licence], and I take the liberty¹²¹ of transmitting it to Your Highness, also saying that the vote was made by Cardinal Oreggi while he was [appointed] simple theologian of Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, [who was] a member of the Congregation of the Holy Office.¹²²

Thirdly, because the only obstacle [identified] as repugnant to the Holy Scriptures would be removed discussing [the Earth's motion] *ex hypothesi*.¹²³

Fourthly, because the author is dead.¹²⁴

What instead makes this venture impossible, or at least extremely difficult, is [firstly,] the commitment of the Congregation of the Holy Office, to which it would be better to ask.¹²⁵

Secondly, the mindset of His Holiness, averse to innovation and mathematical matters alike, of which he takes no consideration.

Thirdly, [the fact that] a member of that Congregation is Cardinal Maculano, that the last time [i.e. during Galileo's trial] was Commissioner or Secretary,¹²⁶ who was totally against it [i.e. the possibility of granting a new imprimatur for the *Dialogue*], [together] with Cardinal de Lugo,¹²⁷ Jesuit,¹²⁸ who [i.e. the Jesuits], as I can understand, were totally against it.

/173/ However, who wants to prove if the difficulty reaches that point that Aristotle equates to impossibility,¹²⁹ might offer a memoir to

printing licences granted to works suspended *donec corrigantur* after the censorial requirements were fulfilled.

¹²¹ Lit. «I dare to» (*prendo ardire di*).

¹²² Ad M: «I do not know if this holds up». This note points out that Spada was not sure of the position held by Barberini – who was Pope for almost ten years – at the time of Galileo's trial. The error is probably caused by the fact that Spada, when drafting this letter, was not remembering the very year of the trial, or, less likely, the year of ascension of Maffeo Barberini to the Papal throne.

¹²³ Ad M: «Otherwise, they wanted to humiliate». A personal judgement, plausibly emphasizing the fact that Virgilio Spada thought that Galileo's judges raged against him.

¹²⁴ Lit. «be the author dead, as he is» (*l'esser morto l'autore qual è*).

¹²⁵ Lit. «to knock» (*pichiare*).

¹²⁶ The Dominican friar Vincenzo Maculano was in fact General Commissioner of the Holy Office between 1632 and 1639; SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7, intro), p. 363.

¹²⁷ Referring to Juan de Lugo y de Quiroga (1583-1660).

¹²⁸ Lit. «as Jesuit» (*come Gesuito*).

¹²⁹ This does not seem to be an actual quote, but a reference to the fact that in the

the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office – recalling¹³⁰ the Decree promulgated on other occasions,¹³¹ the death of the author, and the readiness to remove or change whatever the mentioned Sacred Congregation wants – by writing to the Cardinals of the mentioned Sacred Congregation detailed letters from Your Highnesses¹³² because this would be the best [thing] to do in order to succeed in this venture.

/174/ [blank]

works of Aristotle often occurs the expression ‘difficult if not impossible’ (*χαλεπὸν ἢ καὶ ἀδύνατον / ἀδύνατον ἢ χαλεπὸν*), e.g. *On Soul*, 1.406b23-24; *Politics*, 8.1340b24.

¹³⁰ *Lit.* «representing» (*rappresentando*).

¹³¹ See note 120.

¹³² Prince Leopoldo and, allegedly, the Grand Duke.

Spada Veralli 235, 4

(Summary of the meetings of the Congregations, September 1650?)

/175/ Father Marini, Superior General of the Dominican Order,¹³³ says that, since this affair of Galileo's works was dealt with in the Congregation of the Holy Office, it is necessary to discuss it in this [Congregation]. [Besides,] given that today the things have changed, he does not judge it impossible to obtain a licence to reprint and publish the mentioned works by giving some assurances or making emendations. He nonetheless considers it necessary, first and foremost, to mention this [affair] to His Holiness, both to know how does he feel about it and because, maybe, he could [decide to] entrust the Congregation of the Index with the resolution, where any difficulty might be overcome more easily.¹³⁴

However, Monsignor the Assessor of the Holy Office¹³⁵ thinks that, regardless of whatever assurance, it is extremely difficult for the above-mentioned licence to be obtained, because many were the reasons that led the Congregation of the Holy Office to prohibit [Galileo's works]. [Therefore,] if the above-mentioned licence is now granted, someone would not fail to attribute the prohibition not to the bad quality of the works but to some malicious intent of Pope Urban VIII towards the author for being a servant of the House of Medici.¹³⁶ He also consid-

¹³³ Giovanni Battista de' Marini was elected Superior General of the Dominican order on June 5th, 1650 and appointed consultor of the Holy Office on June 22nd of the same year, just after resigning from the position of Secretary of the Congregation of the Index, held since August 14th, 1628; cf. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7, intro), pp. 377-380.

¹³⁴ A further confirmation of the broad interpretability of the norms of canon law. De' Marini states that, since Galileo had been tried and sentenced by the Holy Office, the request for a new imprimatur for the *Dialogue* (or for a collected edition of his works) had to be submitted to this Congregation, also by virtue of regulations such as the *motu proprio Inter multiplices curas* mentioned by Oreggi (see Spada Veralli 235, 1, A, 30-35). However, immediately afterwards, the Superior General suggests to bypass the very Congregation of which he had recently become a consultor, pointing out that the Pope could have entrusted the case to the Congregation of the Index. De' Marini probably believed that, since Galileo had been passed away for eight years, the only restriction still in place was the prohibition of the *Dialogue*, ratified by the decree with which it had been put on the Index, signed by de' Marini himself on August 23rd, 1634.

¹³⁵ Francesco Albizzi (1593-1684), Assessor of the Holy Office from July 18th, 1635 to March 2nd, 1654; cf. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7, intro), p. 41.

¹³⁶ A crucial detail, emphasizing the possibility that the granting of a new imprimatur for Galileo's works would have spread the rumour that his trial and condemnation were the consequence of political retaliation, a personal vendetta orchestrated by Pope Barberini. Before the discovery of this document, the earliest mention of such an interpretation was

ers difficult [to obtain a new licence] because a book recently came out, by some Frenchman [named] Cusetti,¹³⁷ dealing with the same matters and speaking ill of the Court of Rome. The Father Master of the Sacred Palace did not want it to be published.¹³⁸

/176/ [blank]

supposed to be the one included in the semi-legendary *Life of Galileo* by Thomas Salusbury (d. 1666); cf. NICK WILDING, *The return of Thomas Salusbury's "Life of Galileo" (1664)*, «British Journal for the History of Science», 41, 2, 2008, pp. 241-265: 259-260.

¹³⁷ Here the mystery deepens, because nothing is known about this alleged French cosmology scholar, whose name sounds similar to that of the famous Cysat family. However, among the members of the Cysats, who were Swiss and not French, the only one who dealt with similar topics seems to have been the Jesuit father Johann Baptist (c. 1587-1657). Further archival research will follow.

¹³⁸ The Dominican friar Vincenzo Candido (1573-1654), Master of the Sacred Palace from July 1645 until his death; cf. SCHWEDT, *Die römische Inquisition* (cit. note 7, intro), pp. 162-165.

Spada Veralli 235, 5

(Petition letter from the *Virtuous Mathematicians*
to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, September 1650?)

/177/ Most Eminent and Most Reverend Lords

The book of Galileo Galilei concerning the two systems of the world, Ptolemaic and Copernican, has been prohibited by the¹³⁹ Sacred Congregation since 1633. However, considering that this book contains great mathematical teachings, the Virtuous of such profession beseech Your Eminencies to allow its reprint, with all those corrections you deem appropriate,¹⁴⁰ as it has always been [done] with any work by a non-malicious author. [Thus, the Virtuous Mathematicians] will always pray God for [the good of] Your Eminencies. *Quam Deus*.¹⁴¹

/178/-/179/ [blank]

/180/ [outside of the envelope]

To the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Lords,
The Lords Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office¹⁴²

By
The Virtuous Mathematicians

¹³⁹ *Lit.* «that» (*cotesta*).

¹⁴⁰ *Lit.* «that you like most» (*che più le piaceranno*).

¹⁴¹ *Lit.* «As God [wants]», i.e. «We surrender to God's will».

¹⁴² Ad M: «We talked unfruitfully about this [matter] in one and the other Congregation, as we will report in further detail»; plausibly referring to Spada Veralli 235, 4.

FINITO DI STAMPARE
PER CONTO DI LEO S. OLSCHKI EDITORE
PRESSO ABC TIPOGRAFIA • CALENZANO (FI)
NEL MESE DI OTTOBRE 2020

ISSN 1971-6052