

Literary Censorship: The Case of the *Orlando Furioso* by Jennifer Helm

Di proibire Orlando [Innamorato e Furioso], Orlandino [del Folengo], cento novelle [Decameron] et simili altri libri più presto daressemo da ridere ch'altrimente, perché simili libri non si leggono *come* cose a qual si habbi da credere, ma *come* fabule, et *come* si leggono anco molti libri de' gentili *come* Luciano, Lucretio et altri simili. Nondimeno se ne parlerà nella congregatione dei teologi et poi a Sua Santità et alli Reverendissimi [...]¹.

These words of Michele Ghislieri, commissar-general of the Roman Inquisition (later to become Pope Pius v) are frequently quoted. They stem from a letter by Ghislieri to the inquisitor of Genoa in 1557. On the one hand, they suggest that Ghislieri finds the texts indicated above sinful, erroneous or even heretical. On the other hand, they seem to question whether texts that are read as «fabule» ought to be censored, for, as «fabule», they do not endanger faith. This latter perspective will be considered below.

What is interesting is that in four instances it is the *way* – «come» – texts are read that is the focus of Ghislieri's concern. At first glance, it seems as if the way of reading a text, or of perceiving a literary genre, could protect a text from prohibition or an expurgatory intervention. Ghislieri's doubts raise the question as to what would happen if these texts were read in a different way, that is, if one believed in the stories or if one sought heterodox ideas in their semantic structures. The files of the Congregation for the Index show that there were censors who were well aware of the potential dangers of poetical texts. For this reason, the expurgation of a text did not only serve to punish or even purge an author's soul². It also served to control the reception of ideas on faith and morality. This same policy is evident in fifteenth-century judgements, for instance on the *Divina Commedia*³. In the case of Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* the reception became more important in the second half of the sixteenth century when, in the world of books, censorship regulations were tightened, and in daily life the persecution of witchcraft and superstition became again more and more prominent.

In the 1570s and again between 1597 and 1600, censors instructed by the Congregation for the Index examined the *Orlando furioso*. Yet, rather than focusing on the immoral eroticism of the text, their criticism concentrates on passages concerning the Catholic doctrine. In 1600 the Congregation for the Index ordered the expurgation of the work. Fortunately, some documents relating to the case of the *Furioso* have been passed down to us and are identified among the files of the Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (ACDF). Of these documents, some are hitherto unknown and will therefore now be introduced and examined. I will pick up on Ghislieri's thoughts and the aspect of the reception of literary texts and endeavour to investigate and understand the censors' reading in order to show how they perceived a profane literary text. Particular attention will be paid to the difficulties they encountered while judging the *Furioso*, to their reading strategies, as well as to aspects they neglected, consciously or unconsciously. In addition, I will include a document on the expurgation of Simon Fónari's *Spositione sopra l'Orlando furioso*, through which I would like to present another form of censorship and intellectual control, namely the control of the reception of poetry and of the writing of such.

In 1572 the *Orlando furioso* was reported to the Congregation for the Index and denounced by Gabriele Paleotti, archbishop of Bologna and from 1580 member of that same Congregation. In his letter Paleotti includes some book titles he could not find on the *Index librorum prohibitorum* and which he deemed in need of expurgation – among them the *Furioso*. Paleotti gives only a brief reason for the denunciation, referring to two episodes. At first glance, these two episodes suggest that the most important aspects of this denunciation were the mingling of the sacred and the profane and the criticism of moral and spiritual decadence among the religious, in other words, two criteria common to Counter-Reformation censorship⁴.

The first episode indicated is the journey to the moon undertaken by the English knight Astolfo and Saint John in canto 34. On the hippogriff, Astolfo flies to the Earthly Paradise, where he encounters Saint John (OF, 34.54), the patriarch Enoch (34.59.2) and the prophet Elijah (34.59.3)⁵. Saint John explains to Astolfo that he has been sent there by God in order to cure the knight Orlando, who has been punished by God with the loss of his wits (34.62.5-8). As Orlando's wits are stored in a jar on the moon, Astolfo and Saint John fly there in Elijah's chariot of fire to recover them. On arrival in the lunar world, Saint John explains to Astolfo that everything they see has been lost on earth, such as wealth, vain honours, unfortunate loves, dishonest alms and prayers, as well as mankind's wits preserved in bottles, among which those of Orlando's are to be found (34.83).

The second episode censored by Paleotti is the visit of Saint Michael the archangel to a monastery (14.79 ss.): Charlemagne prays to God to help the Christian army in their fight against the Saracens. God grants this support and in order to facilitate the Christians' fight he instructs Saint Michael to bring Silence (Silenzio) to the Christian army and Discord (Discordia) to the enemy (14.75.5-77.6). First searching for Silence, the archangel flies to a monastery where, instead of Silence, he finds other allegories, personifications of vices and capital sins: Gluttony (Gola), Avarice (Avarizia), Wrath (Ira), Pride (Superbia), Envy (Invidia), Sloth (Inerzia), Cruelty (Crudeltade) as well as Discord (Discordia) (14.81) and Fraud (Fraude), with whom he also engages in conversation (14.86-90).

The files do not reveal the outcome of Paleotti's denunciation. Up until now no document has been found that explicitly sheds light on further measures taken by the Congregation for the Index in order to verify Paleotti's criticism.

The 1570s were difficult years for profane literary texts. Paolo Constabile, Master of the Sacred Palace and member *ex officio* of the Congregation for the Index, was instructed with their supervision and expurgation. Together with his *socius* Damiano Rossi da Cento he examines various works and publishes new lists (*avvisi*) of prohibited and suspended books from May 1574 in order to update the Roman *Index*. No *romanzo* is listed, however, on these *avvisi*. They condemn for instance Pietro Bembo's *Rime*, Andrea Calmo's complete works, the works by some novelists, Sperone Speroni's *Dialoghi*, the edition of the *Decameron* of the year 1573 and even texts of certain poetic genres and with a certain moral nature, that is, dishonest and lascivious *canzoni* and madrigals («canzone [*sic*] dishoneste et lascive cioè in canto di nessuna sorte», «madrigali, dishonesti et lascivi»), dishonest comedies («comedie dishoneste di nissuna sorte») as well as love letters («lettere amorose di nessuna sorte, non si permettono, così anchora quelle scritte da Autori dannati»)⁶. However, there is a letter written by Damiano Rossi da Cento to Eliseo Capys, inquisitor of Bologna, on 21 March 1576, in which Rossi instructs the inquisitor to prevent the publication of stories, comedies and other books about love («storie, commedie et altri libri d'innamoramenti, che purtroppo si vitia il Mondo da se stesso, quivi in Roma se vano destrugendo»), explaining that in Rome booksellers «hanno comandamento di non ne far venire più, et i stampatori de non stamparne»⁷. As Gigliola Fragnito suggests, this instruction may also refer to the *romanzi*⁸. In another letter dated 17 July 1576 Rossi adds: «Dell'Ariosto già abbiamo avvisati i librari che non ne facciano più venire»⁹. This information is not very precise, but it may refer to Arioso's *Satire* that figure among the *Libri parte sospesi fin a novo aviso dalla S. Romana et Universal Inquisitione et parte dal tutto*

*prohibiti*¹⁰. However, as is evident from the files of the Congregation for the Index of subsequent years, it is feasible that, in this context, Rossi speaks of Ariosto's complete works («opere»), including the *Furioso*. The *Diarii* of the Congregation for the Index show that during a congregation in 1609, Ludovico Ystella, then Master of the Sacred Palace, asks whether the printing of the *Furioso* may be permitted in Rome, and the Congregation's answer is affirmative («affirmative»)¹¹. Ystella's question is of course crucial as it clearly suggests that the work must have been prohibited or at least suspended some time ago. This suspension could be the work of 1576 ordered by Rossi to impede the publication of works by Ariosto. In this context, I would like to point out that the number of print editions of the *Furioso* diminishes considerably from the 1570s, and even more so from the 1590s¹². Among other factors, this could be due to censorship.

There is another document on the *Furioso* that likewise stems from the 1570s. Gabriele Barrio, priest of the Order of the Minims, collates a list of passages of the text which he deems particularly dangerous¹³. Employing a method well-known to Counter-Reformation censorship¹⁴, Barrio seeks to assess Ariosto, the person, on the grounds of his poem:

Ludovicus Ariostus, vanissimus et spurcissimus homo, Petrarcam magistrum suum sectatus in suo *Furioso* inque sua furia multa obscoena ac vana scribit et sacris prophana miscet¹⁵.

In a few words, the two aspects – «multa obscoena ac vana» and «sacris prophana miscet» – sum up the problems Barrio found with the text. But more importantly these factors are also two principal criteria of the censorship of the *favole* as well as of profane and religious literary texts in general. However, the most serious accusation according to which Ariosto was infected by the Lutheran heresy is launched only at the end of the judgement¹⁶.

The censorial criticism of contents classed as obscene and vain implies an idea that is formulated for instance in the seventh rule of the *Index* of 1564, that is, the protection of the good morals (*buoni mores*) and the faith (*fides*), as expressed in most of the sixteenth-century judgements of literary texts. Indirectly, it likewise involves the criterion of the utility (*utilità*) of a book. Barrio does not elaborate on his criticism, merely pointing to the first canto and several others («Canto primo et multis aliis»)¹⁷. He may have refrained from an explanation, as the number of passages concerned was too large, due to shame, or because other aspects appeared more important to him. In connection with lascivious love, however, he adds a brief observation to canto 31 and similarly to other passages («et alibi»). Barrio discerns that Ariosto ascribes to sinful,

carnal love an inappropriate (spiritual) joy («*felicitem in venereo amore ponit*»)¹⁸. He does not indicate which verses apply but, for instance, in the first lines of canto 31 the poet says:

Che dolce più, che più giocondo stato / saria di quel d'un amoroso core? / che viver più felice e più beato, / che ritrovarsi in servitù d'Amore? / se non fosse l'uom sempre stimolato / da quel sospetto rio, da quel timore, / da quel martir, da quella frenesia, / da quella rabbia detta gelosia (31.1).

Nor does Barrio define this idea from the theological or philosophical point of view. Yet, his *censura* of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, which he probably submitted to Guglielmo Sirleto, prefect of the Congregation for the Index, together with the one of the *Furioso*¹⁹, may elucidate this judgement²⁰. In this *censura*, he criticises sonnets 191 and 193 because the lover, in Barrio's view identical with Petrarch the person, describes his experience of contemplating Laura and compares it to the *visio Dei beatifica* that, occurring as and at the culmination of human existence, may have deserved a less profane application. Moreover, Barrio believes to identify the custom («mos») of Epicurus and Aristippos of Cyrene in such a thought. He explains that Petrarch seeks his beatitude and joy in lust («voluptas») – which according to Epicurus, however, means «ataraxia» and is not to be found in libido²¹ –, because Petrarch compares “his” beatitude to the celestial one²². Therefore, if Barrio observes that in the *Furioso* Ariosto imagines joy to be found in lascivious love, he seems to suggest that the spiritual dimension of joy is ignored, or that what is implied by spiritual joy here is in fact carnal joy. From this perspective this *censura* would likewise address the criterion of the mingling of the sacred and the profane. There is another *censura*, more precisely, an *Avvertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo e del Sannazaro*, well-known by now, which may help us to understand Barrio's position and in which an anonymous censor criticises poetic comparisons between the experience of carnal love and of eternal life. This censor maintains such comparisons can be found not only in the *Rime* of the three poets Bembo, Ariosto and Sannazaro mentioned in the title of his judgement but in vernacular poetry in general²³. Barrio is thus not the only censor to pronounce such a criticism. And the *Furioso* is not the only work, whether by Ariosto or by others, criticised because of such an idea. Perhaps it is then no coincidence that such comparisons between earthly life and transcendence disappear from poetry in Italy in the second half of the sixteenth century.

The theme of the mingling of the sacred and the profane determines to a large extent the subject matter of Barrio's *censura*. It is related to an issue most vital to the treatment of literary texts. Not even four months

after the opening of the Council of Trent, and roughly twelve years before the promulgation of the *Index* by Pope Paul IV, the council fathers decreed that words and sentences taken from the Sacred Scripture be not abused and distorted «ad scurrilia scilicet, fabulosa, vana, adulationes, detractationes, superstitiones, impias et diabolicas incantationes, divinationes, sortes, libellos etiam famosos»²⁴. In the *Furioso* there are several passages that could have been censored on the grounds of this decree. The fact that Barrio refers to the separation of the sacred and the profane right from the beginning of his *censura* suggests that he is well aware of the significance of this decree. Yet his motivation for doing so seems even more important, since through the examples given in his subsequent argumentation, and the way they are presented, he draws attention to potential dangers that in his view could arise from such a mingling.

Barrio assembles some critical depictions of figures of the biblical history and religious life as well as of rituals of the Catholic faith. They show that, in his view, the mingling of the sacred and the profane is also used to communicate heterodox ideas close to Protestantism in an indirect way. In other words, from his judgement emerges a censor's sensitivity for meaning veiled in the literary and figurative sense of a text. Significantly, among his examples are the two episodes denounced by Paleotti: Astolfo's journey to Earthly Paradise and the lunar world in canto 34, and Saint Michael's visit to the monastery in cantos 14 and 27.

To begin with, in canto 34, Barrio highlights different points. In Ariosto's Paradise, Saint John, Elijah and Enoch offer Astolfo fruits of such an extraordinary sweet taste that the knight comes to the conclusion that it must have been almost impossible for Adam and Eve to refrain from eating the prohibited fruit:

De' frutti a lui del paradiso diero, / di tal sapor, ch'a suo giudicio, sanza / scusa non sono i duo primi parenti, / se per quei fur sì poco ubbidienti (34.60.5-8).

Barrio paraphrases these lines in his censorship, concluding with: «Quasi Deus iniuste eos punieret»²⁵. Thus Barrio focuses on the very idea that Adam and Eve deserve to be excused for their sin, and relates it to the theme of divine justice, ultimately suggesting that the poet is questioning the latter. The idea of divine *in*justice would imply that, in judging the first parents, God did not weigh the circumstances, that is, the sensory cause («sapor») of the act. Hence Barrio may well have suspected Ariosto of doubting the divine choice in matters of salvation. He may furthermore have understood the first parents as an example or a means to express a religious idea contravening the Catholic faith and, for instance, interfering with the doctrines of predestination and *liberum arbitrium* with which he

deals thoroughly in his censorship of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* in the same file. Whatever the case, in Barrio's view the idea expressed here is suspect, probably close to Protestantism, and it is not the only one, since his *censura* points to other ideas similarly close to Protestantism.

The judgement of canto 34 deals as well with Saint John's explanation of the spilt soup:

Di versate minestre una gran massa / vede, e domanda al suo dottor ch'importe.
/ – L'elemosina è – dice – che si lassa / alcun, che fatta sia dopo la morte
(34.80.1-4).

The apostle explains that the spilt soup represents alms left by sinners for the purification of their sins, to be submitted after their death. Barrio assesses this explanation to be a derision of the *suffragia*²⁶, which he may well have considered typical of Protestant propaganda. As Barrio has some experience with literary texts, he may understand the alms as an example and a *pars pro toto* alluding to the abuse of deeds, rituals and ceremonies "undertaken without true faith". In this case, he may have discovered another link to Protestantism. And the subsequent lines (34.80.5-8), containing a criticism of the abuse of the Donation of Constantine, may have provided Barrio with confirmation of his view. Yet there is even more to be learned from his interpretation of canto 34.

This *censura*, analogous to that of Tommaso Galletti, shows that some censors are familiar with techniques of poetic composition. In other words, the censors not only considered poetic expression; they also attempted to discern possible motivational aspects behind the text and base their judgement accordingly. For example, Barrio considers the distribution of the figures' roles. He recognises that it is not the English knight Astolfo, under suspicion from the start, being English, nor the poet who expresses the heterodox ideas, but the apostle Saint John: «Idque tantum apostolum dixisse nugatur»²⁷. Again, this observation is not explained. On the one hand, Barrio may have of course felt that the apostle is abused for profane ends. But it is in fact possible that he, a priest working at the heart of the Roman censorial authorities, knew of the meaning and importance of the apostle in Protestant thought. Saint John who introduces himself to Astolfo as «colui che l'evangelio scrisse» (34.57.8) is the apostle mostly appreciated by Martin Luther in his book on the bondage of the will, *De servo arbitrio*, that denies free will, which was subsequently condemned by the Roman Church together with all the other writings by Luther²⁸. In spite of the problems inherent in Barrio's "lettura" of the *Furioso* it seems worth mentioning that Barrio opens a perspective on the *Furioso* that has not yet been explored by philological research.

The censorship of the moon-episode presents one difficulty, however, as it does not become clear whether Barrio considers the difference in scenery between Earthly Paradise and the lunar world. Neither the moon nor the journey is explicitly mentioned. After criticising Astolfo's doubts about the punishment of Adam and Eve, Barrio immediately heads on to the description of woods, hunting nymphs, lovers' sighs, vows and tears, and of the spilt soup, indicating that he found them «there» («ibi»)²⁹. Thus, he apparently believes the nymphs, mythological deities, and all the other things described as part of the lunar world to be in fact part of this fictional Paradise. Of course, in his view this would mean that, again, Ariosto mingles the sacred and the profane. Also his preceding observation that Saint John shows and explains to Astolfo all the places of Paradise is incorrect. In Paradise, Saint John explains to Astolfo the reason for his journey, but it is in the lunar world where he explains to him all the places and things they see. In fact, the judgement Barrio had published in *Pro lingua Latina* some twenty years earlier supports this interpretation, for in it he had concluded his observation by asking Ariosto if he were ignorant of the fact that, after the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, God had stationed Cherubim at its entrance so that no one could enter³⁰.

It is therefore possible that Barrio, who favours ancient poetry, does not understand the idea underlying the lunar world that draws on Lucian's *Ikaromenippos*. In the *Ikaromenippos* the lunar world is employed to utter, from a distance, harsh criticism of philosophers. Consequently, Ariosto may have intended to direct the reader's attention to an inherent criticism of social groups of people or attitudes of his time through an analogy to this work. However, as Barrio's notes show, his misunderstanding did not prevent him from recognising the criticism of the abuse of rituals.

Barrio makes it clear that it does not suffice to observe that Ariosto employs elements of the Catholic religion, biblical names or religious language, in order to ornate a poem. He shows that Ariosto uses them to filter suspect ideas of the faith and criticism of Catholic piety and doctrine. So his reading is anything but formal or superficial. It is an examination that does not only put together words, *verba*, that are abused in a profane context, but seeks to explore their meaning. His concern is the connection between *verba* and *res*, and he understands that the meaning is hidden in the semantic structure of the text and identifiable through anchors in the literal sense such as religious language and names and elements of the Catholic religion and history.

In addition, Barrio is suspicious of the comic nature of the text. Three times he observes that in canto 34 Ariosto jests («nugatur»)³¹, and on each occasion it is Saint John who is the subject of these *nugae* – and in whose

speech Barrio discovers heterodox ideas. It may be thus no coincidence that, in so doing, Barrio draws attention to the fact that Ariosto's *nugae* constitute potential dangers to his readers because at a glance they seem trivial and innocent, but after a closer look they express dangerous insinuations. Through the connection between the comic nature of the text and its dangerous undertones, Barrio alerts his addressees to treat this work with caution and not be deceived by its comic appearance. To put it more precisely, Barrio informs them of a writing strategy that could be used by other authors. So, if it is true that Ghislieri's words quoted at the beginning of this study question the danger of the *favole*, then Barrio stands in opposition to that.

Another example offered by Barrio in cantos 14 and 27 concerns the second episode denounced by Paleotti, Saint Michael's visit to the monastery, where the archangel is confronted with allegories of the vices and sins:

Gola, Avarizia et Ira, / Superbia, Invidia, Inerzia e Crudeltade. / Di tanta novità
l'angel si ammira: / andò guardando quella brutta schiera, / e vide ch'anco la
Discordia v'era (14.81.4-8).

Barrio immediately recognises the criticism of the religious: «multa adversus religiosos viros scribit»³². He points to the idea that the archangel Michael finds Discord only «in monasteries», and indeed, it is not *a* monastery (27.37.1) but *in monasteriis*, among religious men and women («inter religiosos viros ac mulieres»). Therefore, from the depiction of the vices, probably also from Saint Michael's hope to find Silence in churches and monasteries («in chiese e in monasteri», 14.79.4), Barrio concludes that Ariosto aimed to express a general judgement of monasteries. He observes that there are only vices not virtues in monasteries, and he clearly perceives these vices as personifications, but one should remember that in his view such vices and sins stand for diabolic seduction in the first place. It is no surprise, therefore, that Barrio also points to Ariosto's description of the monastery as a new hell («nuovo inferno», 14.82.5), which conforms to his interpretation, and through which the poet reinforces his criticism and alludes to the punishment of sins and to divine judgement³³.

Barrio's censorship of this scene offers only a brief summary but no comment. Certainly he does not miss the fact that such a picture of Saint Michael does not conform to the Tridentine decree *Insuper eadem sacrosancta* of 8 April 1546 (*sessio* IV) and does not respect "Catholic truth"³⁴. It is a profane and satiric distortion of the archangel's figure as described in canonical texts. As Barrio assesses the mingling of the sacred and the profane to be a fundamental problem in the text, it is probable

that through his very brief summary he merely intended to highlight the lack of faithfulness to the canonical texts. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to say what else he may have found in these lines. And yet one should expect that Barrio, as a priest, was familiar with certain connotations of the archangel, such as Saint Michael as guardian of Israel (Dan. 12.1) or as fighting against the devil and the rebel angels in *Revelation* (Rev. 12.7-8). Thus in this one episode he may have found allusions to the biblical fight between the angels through the connotations of Saint Michael's figure. In this case, the idea of the opposing, combating angels is projected onto the encounter between Saint Michael and the vices in the monastery, in the «nuovo inferno». This seems even more plausible if one considers Barrio's suspicion raised by ideas close to Protestantism. And one should be aware that we do not know what else the priest found in other passages.

Concluding his *censura*, Barrio seeks to demonstrate the danger this *romanzo* poses to its readers. In general, he did not consider the allegorical interpretation of profane poetry necessary, nor was he willing to accept its significance³⁵. The fact that in spite of this position he deals with passages of the poem that have a rich figurative meaning indicates that he nevertheless understood that it was inevitable that interpretation should be considered in the practice of censorship. One reason for his being open to an interpretive stance is revealed at the end of his *censura*. There he refers to two readers, both clerics, who dedicated themselves to the allegorical reading of poetical texts, namely of the *Furioso* and Petrarch's love verses. It seems noteworthy that it is in this context that he accuses Ariosto of having been a Lutheran heretic: «qui in Lutheranam haeresim lapsus»³⁶. Combining the interpretation of the poem and the poet's faith, Barrio seeks to demonstrate and underline the danger inherent in this text. He understands that other readers as well, be they laypeople, religious or clerics, who delve into the interpretation of this poem will detect the same insinuations, possibly more. It is particularly for this reason that Barrio assesses the *Furioso* as dangerous and demands that it be suppressed, and likewise other similar vernacular books³⁷. Thus the reception of the poem, the way of reading it, emerges as a central aspect to his *censura*.

After Barrio's *censura* and Constabile's instructions concerning the suspension of the publication of the *romanzo*, twenty years pass in which we find little trace of discussion about the *romanzi* in the files of the Congregation for the Index. Yet in Portugal, the *Catalogo dos livros que se prohibem nestes Regnos et Senhorios de Portugal* (1581) lists the *Furioso* among the books in need of correction. The entry states that the poem contains scandalous and dishonest passages in cantos 7, 14 and 27, and that they shall be expurgated³⁸.

In the 1590s changes are to be seen in Rome. Under the pontificate of Pope Sixtus V the Roman *Index* is to be reformed. While engaged in this work, Vincenzo Bonardo, secretary to the Congregation for the Index, writes in his *Discorso intorno all'Indice da farsi de libri proibiti* that the Congregation intends to add to the *Index* «molti libri de romanzi, battaglie, canzoni, historie, barzellette». He confirms that «molti di loro sono pieni di errori (per non dire heresie), superstitioni, essempii cattivi et altre impertinenze». But as these books have already been widely distributed, and thus their prohibition would have serious consequences for booksellers and authors, Bonardo declares it would be almost impossible to prohibit them³⁹. Nonetheless, this theme is again brought up within the circle of the Congregation for the Index during the subsequent reform of the *Index* in 1592 under the pontificate of Clement VIII. Robert Bellarmine, *consultor* to this Congregation, then makes an attempt, suggesting that the *romanzo* should be explicitly («nominatim») prohibited. The reason: the *romanzo* is read everywhere («passim»), causing extensive damage («magno detrimento») to readers' souls⁴⁰. The expression *nominatim* may confirm that the poem had been prohibited previously, as is suggested as well through the question, posed by the Master of the Sacred Palace to the Congregation, as to whether the *Furioso* should be printed in Rome⁴¹.

On 6 June 1597, Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santori, inquisitor-general of the Roman Inquisition, receives a denunciation from Tommaso Galletti⁴², priest of the Congregation of the Oratorio di san Filippo Neri, doctor of civil and canon law (JVD) and *consultor* to the Congregation for the Index from 1601, and he passes it on to this Congregation⁴³. On 3 December 1599, one of its members, Cardinal Agostino Valier, instructs the inquisitor of Ferrara, Fra Giovan Battista Scarella:

Con varii consultori insieme con Monsignor Vescovo attenderete a far censurar tutte l'opre del Ariosto, e mandarne copia autentica di detta censura acciò conforme a quella si possino emendare e stampare⁴⁴.

On 23 January 1600, Galletti submits the first part of his judgement, *Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto*. His *Censura sopra la seconda parte e intorno ai Cinque canti* must have arrived shortly afterwards. It contains, over and above that, an examination of the love lyrics by Luigi Gonzaga detto Rodomonte, *Stanze in lode della sua donna*, published in the edition of the *Furioso* used by Galletti⁴⁵. A month later, the Congregation asks Scarella to provide for the censorship of Ariosto's and Francesco Alunno's works («ut curet fieri censuras Ariosti et Alunni»⁴⁶). On 1 March, Valier informs Scarella of the cardinals' satisfaction with his diligence in having sent a note regarding certain books («la diligenza usata nel mandar la nota de libri»). Likewise, he expresses the cardinals' hope that Scarella

may show his efficiency in censoring Ariosto's and Alunno's works («che mostrarete il valor vostro in effettuare la censura dell'opere dell'Ariosto e anco dell'Alunno»⁴⁷). The Congregation would receive the correction (*Correttione*) of the *Furioso* a few months later, probably in October, 1600⁴⁸, for on 10 October it expresses its gratitude to Scarella. He is then instructed to launch the expurgation of the *Satire*, which should have been carried out three years previously, and also of «Alunno», that is, Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare sopra il Boccaccio*⁴⁹.

In his thorough judgement, Galletti outlines a vast spectrum of problems that include the mingling of sacred and profane⁵⁰: the distortion of “Catholic truth”, the rendering of “superstitious” elements, heterodox ideas as well as the distortion of good morals and the severe criticism targeting the immoral performance of the prelates and religious.

Among the passages censored, we find the archangel's visit to the monastery (14; 27) as well as Astolfo's journey to the moon (34-35), both denounced by Barrio. However, Galletti presents a slightly different approach or strategy toward reading. He concentrates more on the assessment of figures – their performance, speech and emotions. Stanzas 81 and 82 of canto 14, describing Saint Michael's encounter with the vices, are classed as «cotanto ingiuriose al nobilissimo stato di religiosi» and therefore shall, at the very least, be purged. Galletti explains that it is «un pensier temerario» to show Saint Michael in conversation with the vices and, discovering him once more in canto 27, he elaborates on Saint Michael's emotional outburst. There, Ariosto describes the archangel's reaction when he recognises that Discord did not obey God's instruction. He loses his temper, he blushes. He hits and kicks Discord and even breaks the handle of a crucifix («un manico di croce») while using it to hit her.

Nel viso s'arrossì l'angel beato, / parendogli che mal fosse ubidito / al Creatore,
e si chiamò ingannato / de la Discordia perfida et tradito. / [...] / Al monister,
dove altre volte avea / la Discordia veduta, drizzò l'ali. / Trovolla ch'in capitulo
sede / a nuova elezion degli ufficiali; / e di veder diletto si predea, / volar pel
capo a' frati i brevali. / Le man le pose l'angelo nel crine, / e pugna e calci le
diè senza fine. / Inde le roppe un manico di croce / per la testa, pel dosso e per
le braccia (27.35.1-4; 27.37.1-38.2).

Galletti underlines the human emotions demonstrated by the angel. Ariosto makes the angel perform like a human being. Galletti defines this emotional outburst as «affetti sciocchi», explaining them to be the outcome of the archangel's shame «d'esser poco ubbidito». He deems the outburst to be affects of mythological deities and improper for Christians. For this reason, he advises that the line «nel viso s'arrossì l'angel beato»

be deleted, adding that it is «[un] fatto indegnissimo che s'attribuisca lo spezzare un legno di Croce tanto venerabile stendardo, a un spirito celeste, a un difensor della Chiesa»⁵¹.

The *Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto* ends with canto 30, while the *Censura* concerning the «seconda parte» of the *Furioso* commences with canto 35, where Saint John reappears (here 35.20 ss). Thus there is no mention of canto 34 in these documents. This is curious, particularly if one considers the care with which Galletti approaches other matters, among them, the figure of Saint John in canto 35. Dealing with Saint John in canto 35, Galletti again concentrates on his performance. More precisely, it is the apostle's speech that captures his attention. Galletti seeks to judge its register and content, describing it as: «[un] parlar [...] molto bassamente parole molto strane». It is possible that he sought to understand the exact meaning of the words, but he offers no interpretation. Instead, he recommends the substitution of Saint John by another character⁵², either to protect the saint's dignity or to delete an element necessary to the understanding of the speech. Of course such a substitution would have had serious consequences for the composition and meaning of canto 34 as well.

Thus Barrio and Galletti treat the same episodes in different ways, according to their capacity to understand and deal with literary texts. It becomes clear how difficult it may have been for the censors to judge poetic texts, since much experience was needed in order to penetrate the complex system and the mechanisms of the semantic structure: in brief, the strategies of writing. This can be inferred as well from Galletti's comment on two lines of canto 17: «Il giusto Dio, quando i peccati nostri / han di remission passato il segno» (17.1.1-2). These lines remind Galletti of the heresy of the Novatians, that is, of the Cathars⁵³, and he admits to being unsure of their meaning. He therefore advises his addressees «to interpret» the lines carefully: «Il principio del canto 17 ha bisogno di destrissima interpretatione, imperoché molto favorisse (almeno in vista) l'eresia de' Novatiani»⁵⁴. One possibility for gaining insight into Galletti's suspicion is to consult Barrio's *censura*. Showing no doubts whatsoever about his understanding of these lines, Barrio states that Ariosto believes divine mercy to be limited⁵⁵.

Nevertheless, the two censors share another interest: namely, the reception of the poem by the reader. While Barrio judges it in the context of the potential danger of ideas approaching Lutheranism, Galletti points out, for instance, immoral scenes he defines as «malvagi e dishonorati esempi». The latter adds that Ariosto did not stop at merely contaminating hearts by dishonest accounts («contaminare i cuori con le molte sue dishoneste narrationi»), since he makes «persone di autorità»,

such as Rinaldo, criticise «le leggi contrarie alla libidine, e conservatrici della pudicitia» and promote freedom of the libido⁵⁶. Galletti makes it clear that he expects the figure of Rinaldo to fit the image of a Christian knight and to fulfil an exemplary function. As Galletti speaks explicitly of «esempi», he seems to expect poetry as well to fulfil such a function, as in the medieval *exemplum*, thus indirectly recalling the censorial attention to the utility of a text.

Another poetic element concerning the reception of the poem is the *marvellous*, which is an essential characteristic of the *romanzo* genre and the *Furioso*, where it functions mostly through elements of the “superstitious” world. The relevant passages show, however, that indeed this censorship concerns not only the introduction of “superstitious” elements, but also the way of describing and presenting them. According to Galletti, it is inappropriate to place superstition on a par with Christian religion⁵⁷. He does not recognise the efficacy of occult prayers directed to pagan deities. This position leads him to censor the scene in which the pagan Medoro invokes the moon as goddess («dea») (18.183.5-185.4)⁵⁸. Furthermore, the supernatural power of figures such as the magician Malagigi is criticised, who is said to be able to stop the sun in its path (26.128.4). Galletti declares that such power should not be ascribed to a magician, thus implying that poetic figures of the pagan world should conform to the Christian faith⁵⁹. For this reason, Galletti does not accept that the poet, attempting to write a eulogy of the Este family, prays to Phoebus for the capacity to predict the future so that he may tell their destiny (3.1-2). Likewise, the depiction of the ghost of the magician Merlin from the legend of King Arthur is criticised, as the magician is said to be capable of predicting the future and is therefore called a prophet («profeta», 3.13.8; 3.22.6). Galletti does not tolerate pagan deity being likened to God, naturally considering prophecy to be a divine gift alone. He thus distinguishes between prophecy and divination, the latter having been prohibited in medieval canon law in accordance with Sacred Scripture. Consequently this prohibition is also expressed in the first Roman *Indexes*⁶⁰. For this reason, the figure of Merlin the magician represents a crime against religion that implies the adoration of demons and signifies idolatry. By calling the magician a prophet, Ariosto attributes a role to him that he definitely does not deserve.

Moreover, Galletti censors Alcina's enchantments and transformations of several knights. For instance, Astolfo, transformed into a myrtle bush capable of speaking, appears to Ruggiero and warns him of her. Galletti recognises that in this episode the poet invents something that does not necessarily conform to his faith or his idea of “reality”. Thus he clearly understands that such scenes are fictional, and he explicitly makes that

observation («fingono i Poeti Christiani»). Nevertheless, he admits that such stories nourish superstition among readers⁶¹.

At this point one should consider what such severe literary censorship meant for literary creation. That is, for the poets, the separation between sacred and profane concerns not only poetic vocabulary, but also the freedom to create figures – their gestures, their speeches – as well as the entire action. Indirectly, it thus touches on the poetic principle of verisimilitude (*verosimiglianza*), where this verisimilitude would be defined by Catholic faith.

The inquisitor of Ferrara, Fra Giovanni Battista Scarella, probably submitted the *Correttione* to the *Orlando furioso* together with that of the *Cinque canti* to the Congregation in October, 1600⁶². One difference between this correction and the preceding *censurae*, apart from its being a correction rather than a *censura*, is that at first glance it seems rather moderate. The principal aim appears to be to protect the reputation of the Roman Church and its practices. It is the type of correction most known to scholars of censorship: it recommends in particular the elimination of critical words, figures of Christian history and religious language, while nevertheless accepting almost all the lascivious scenes⁶³. Moreover the “superstitious” elements criticised by Galletti are almost completely accepted but are nonetheless purged of religious language. What is missing from this particular expurgation, however, is any suggestion as to how to fill in the blanks left by the deletions.

Often this type of correction, observed by scholars in cases such as that of the *Decameron* and the *Cortegiano*, is explained as having been caused by a neglect of morality⁶⁴. It has also been observed that the practice of sixteenth-century Counter-Reformation censorship was incoherent and subjective. This may well account for the differences between the *Correttione* and the other *censurae*. However, on the grounds of the documents relating to the *Furioso*, I would like to consider these differences from another perspective.

Having received the *Correttione*, the Congregation for the Index asks Fra Giovan Battista Scarella to undertake the expurgation of Ariosto's *Satire*. They instruct him to delete as little as possible in order that the story is not interrupted, by changing certain words, and to ensure that the substitutions or corrections are proportionate and reasonable («aver considerazione nel censurare che si levì meno che si può per non interrompere il senso, variando alle volte le parole, con far che siano proporzionate e ragionevoli»)⁶⁵. If such an instruction determined the treatment of works less important and precious than the *Furioso*, such as the *Satire*⁶⁶, it is to be assumed it also played an important part in the correction of the *romanzo*. This procedure can certainly explain the acceptance of

lascivious scenes. If this is the case, other expurgations that accept immoral content, for instance, concentrating only on criticism of clerics or religious, cannot easily be explained either as examples of neglected morals or as carelessness. Instead, one should consider them as possible cases of compromise that show, if in part, tolerance of poetic licence as well as respect toward a precious literary work and to the booksellers. Nevertheless, Scarella's *Correttione* would have had serious consequences for the *Furioso* and thus would have been difficult to effect.

The *Correttione* demands that canto 34, where Astolfo's journey to the Earthly Paradise and the lunar world is described, be completely deleted. This of course means the suppression of the account of the recovery of Orlando's wits – and thus a central element of the story. Thereby the semantic structure that is created around the figure of Saint John and also important for the understanding of Astolfo's role and ideas relating to the Catholic doctrine is to be erased as well. In addition, the verses and stanzas relating to Saint Michael's visit to the monastery are to be suppressed, among which 14.79.1-82.8 and 27.37.1-38.2⁶⁷. Small wonder that these corrections are among the most radical interventions concerning contents recalling Protestant ideas and are coherent with all three preceding judgements. Even if Paleotti's and Barrio's brief comments do not deal with the entire work but rather indicate only a few problems in the text, it is interesting to note that, nonetheless, there are analogies between them.

At Piacenza, two years later, on 1 March 1602, an episcopal congregation of Bishop Claudio Rangoni begins to censor and purge a commentary on the *Furioso*, Simon Fónari's *Spositione sopra l'Orlando furioso* (1549-50)⁶⁸. The expurgation of the *Spositione* proves the Congregation's interest in the control of the reception of the *romanzo* and is another way of effecting it other than censoring the poetical work itself⁶⁹. In the case of the *Spositione*, this step seems even more plausible if one considers that, among other things, Fónari addresses ideas regarding the themes *liberum arbitrium* and grace that are vital to Barrio's *censurae*, as well as during the sixteenth-century controversy between Catholics and Protestants⁷⁰. Other corrections take into account the use of religious language, the interpretation of marvellous elements, allusions to historical persons, and the unmasking of historical facts in the text.

The expurgation of a commentary on a literary text draws attention to an important phenomenon of the sixteenth-century literary world. More and more editions of literary texts at the time were accompanied by paratexts. It is well-known that the editions of the *Furioso* were often published with an exegetical apparatus, including, for instance, *Allegorie*, *Annotazioni*, *Dechiarationi*, *Apologie* and a *Vita dell'autore*, which were

elaborated and refined in the course of the century⁷¹. Explaining the medieval spiritual *allegoresis* of profane literary texts, Klaus Hempfer points out its apologetic function⁷². In the case of the *Furioso*, such a function becomes manifest in the moral interpretation offered by such exegetical texts. The anagogic *allegoresis* that we find in Fórñari's *Spositione*⁷³, however, did not prevail, perhaps because in this case it would mingle the sacred and the profane. Certainly there may be several reasons for such a development of the paratexts, but in the context of the reception of literary texts one should remember that they present a work, that they direct the way in which it is read and shape an image of its author. In so doing, such texts could become an indirect instrument of censorship, even if involuntarily, and even if they were created to protect a work. One should thus consider whether the exegetical texts may have influenced the *Correttione* of Ferrara and thus contributed to a more moderate result⁷⁴, and eventually even protected the *Furioso* from being printed in a purged version according to the *Correttione*.

As the *Correttione* of the *Furioso* was worked out in order to print a new amended version of the poem⁷⁵, the question emerges as to whether this project was at all realised. Such an edition is not yet known to the scholarly world⁷⁶. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the Master of the Sacred Palace, in suggesting to resume the printing of the *romanzo* in Rome, is speaking of an amended version⁷⁷. In order to establish the outcome of the case of the *Furioso*, research must be continued, as in the example of Fórñari's *Spositione*. Certainly the files of the Congregation for the Index, held in the ACDF, relating to subsequent years may offer an answer.

Counter-Reformation cultural politics had a considerable impact on the sixteenth-century literary world. Several names of renowned authors figure in the first Roman *Index*, and even more are silently included in the general rules of the *Index* – particularly in those published together with the *Index* of 1564. Of course, the application of such an instrument as censorship under threat of penalty for violation influenced the creation of literary texts. In the second half of the sixteenth century, certain themes and motifs, largely exploited in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, disappeared from the literary landscape or were transformed, while other themes and motifs emerged, in particular those of religious and moral natures. Poetic genres were altered, new styles were even developed, many marked by the aesthetic imprint of the Counter-Reformation, either following Counter-Reformation aesthetics or distancing themselves from it. One example is the stylistic variety produced by Mannerism and the Baroque.

Thus, even if at first sight the censorial issue of the *Furioso* does not appear to have had serious consequences, I would suggest considering it as an example and symptom of a development in the literary world that began several decades before Galletti's censorship. And if the results presented here emerge from a study in progress⁷⁸, the case of the *Furioso* with its documents may nonetheless benefit research even beyond the study of the works of Ariosto, so that not only Counter-Reformation censorship but also related literary works and developments can be more clearly understood.

Notes

1. See Ghislieri's letter (27 June 1557), in *Index des livres interdits*, dir. J. M. de Bujanda, Centre d'Études de la Renaissance, Éditions de l'Université de Sherbrooke, Droz, Genève 1985-2002, vols. I-XI, vol. VIII, p. 32 (my italics), and V. Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice. La censura ecclesiastica dal Rinascimento alla Controriforma*, Morcelliana, Brescia 2006, pp. 77-8. My thanks go to Morris Helm for assistance with matters of style in English.

2. See Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, cit., pp. 271-8.

3. See Saint Antoninus, *Chronica, sive opus historiarum*, Nicolaus Kessler, Basel 1502, pars 3, tit. 21, cap. 5, par. 2.

4. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6191, ff. 246r-247r, f. 246v, and P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597)*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Roma 1959-67, p. 238.

5. Quotations from L. Ariosto, *Orlando furioso e cinque canti*, edited by R. Ceserani and S. Zatti, UTET, Torino 1997, vols. 1-2.

6. See for instance Paolo Constabile, *Aviso alli librari, che non faccino venire l'infrascritti libri et ritrovandosene havere, che non li vendino senza licenza* (22 May 1574), in *Index des livres interdits*, cit., vol. IX, pp. 746-7.

7. See A. Rotondò, *Nuovi documenti per la storia dell'Indice dei libri proibiti (1572-1638)*, in "Rinascimento", s. 2, 3, 1963, pp. 145-211, doc. 5.

8. G. Fragnito, *Proibito capire. La Chiesa e il volgare nella prima età moderna*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2005, p. 163, note 40.

9. See Biblioteca dell'Archiginnasio di Bologna, b. 1860, n. 237 (17 July 1576) and A. Samaritani, *Religione cittadina, autoriforma cattolica, malessere ereticale a Cento nel secolo XVI tra Estensi e Controriforma*, Corbo, Ferrara 1997, pp. 136-7, and Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, cit., p. 162.

10. See Constabile, *Ex Vercellis. Libri parte sospesi fin a nuovo avviso dalla S. Romana et Universal Inquisitione et parte dal tutto prohibiti* (22 May 1574), in *Index des livres interdits*, cit., vol. IX, pp. 756-7, p. 757; see also the manuscript G. Dei, *Index authorum, qui vel aperte haeretici sunt, aut certe de haeresi valde suspecti esse videntur; aut contra bonos mores, vitaeque pudicitiam aliqua continent. Postremo etiam addita sunt opera sanctorum doctorum sive etiam prophanorum, quae ratione impressionis, aut interpretis, sive quod scholia, atque annotationes haeretici alicuius authoris contineant minus probanda videntur*, Roma 1576, in ACDF, *Index*, XIV, see «Libri volgari sospetti» under the letter «S». On this catalogue see *Index des livres interdits*, cit., vol. X, pp. 825-6, and for a manuscript catalogue of the Master of the Sacred Palace (September 1576), *ivi*, pp. 826-39.

11. See ACDF, *Index, Diarii*, II, f. 10r. According to Girolamo Baruffaldi, the government of Rome ordered to destroy samples of the edition published in Rome by Antonio Blado in 1543; G. Baruffaldi, *La vita di m. Lodovico Ariosto*, Bianchi e Negri, Ferrara 1807, p. 299; M. G. J. Ferrazzi, *Bibliografia ariostesca*, Pozzato, Bassano 1881, p. 70; G. Agnelli, G. Ravegnani, *Annali delle edizioni ariostee*, con CXIV tavole fuori testo, Zanichelli, Bologna 1933, vol. I, p. 64. Also Fragnito mentions a burning of the *Furioso* at the end of the century;

Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, cit., p. 160, note 62. On Ystella see J. Quéatif, J. Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, J. B. Christophorum Ballard-N. Simart, Paris 1719-23; reprint Burt Franklin, New York 1960, vol. II, p. 1: 1499-1639 A. D., p. 391.

12. See K. W. Hempfer, *Diskrepante Lektüren: Die Orlando-Furioso-Rezeption im Cinquecento*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1987, pp. 48-9.

13. See G. Barrio, [s. t.], in BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, ff. 146r-v, f. 146v. See the transcription of the document in M. A. Passarelli, *Petrarca scelestus auctor in una censura (non più anonima) di Gabriele Barri (ms. Vat. lat. 6149), ff. 142r-150v*, in "Critica del testo", VI, 1, 2003, pp. 177-220. This *censura* is part of a document that contains judgements on the *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* by Petrarca, on the *Arcadia* and *De partu Virginis* by Sannazaro and on the *Divina Commedia* by Dante. It reproduces, with slight changes, judgements Barrio had published in 1554 in *Pro lingua Latina* with a printing privilege and *motu proprio* by Pope Julius III, Barrio, *Pro lingua Latina, De aeternitate Urbis, De laudibus Italiae*, apud D. Hieronymum de Cartulariis, Roma 1554 and for another edition from which I am quoting: in aedibus populi Romani, Roma 1571, pp. 421-2. The document is anonymous and has been attributed to Barrio by Passarelli. The addressee is unknown. According to Passarelli, *Petrarca scelestus auctor*, cit., p. 180, Barrio was a *familiare* of Guglielmo Sirleto, prefect of the Congregation for the Index. Thus it is probable that he submitted his judgements to Sirleto. Related documents in the same file suggest that Barrio's *censura* dates back to the first half of the 1570s, as Passarelli has correctly observed, p. 182. The *censura* could therefore date from the same period in which Paleotti made his denunciation. It is even feasible that Barrio was charged with it by Sirleto, probably after Paleotti's denunciation, because he had already examined the *Furioso*.

14. Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, cit., pp. 317-8.

15. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146r.

16. *Ivi*, f. 146r-v.

17. *Ivi*, f. 146r.

18. *Ibid.*

19. See above note 13.

20. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, ff. 142r-150r, f. 148r.

21. *Ibid.* For Epicurus and Aristippos see for instance M. Hossenfelder, *Epikur*, C. H. Beck, Munich 1991.

22. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, ff. 142v, 148r.

23. See *Avvertimento sopra le rime dell'Ariosto, del Bembo e del Sannazaro*, in BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6207, ff. 59r-61r. Through the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime*, a model of Petrarchist lyric poetry, the Master of the Sacred Palace also banned, even if in theory and only to intimidate contemporary poets, other works that contain errors and sins similar to those that led to the prohibition of Bembo's *Rime*. In other words, this prohibition had consequences not only for this work but for several forms of Petrarchism, that is, for a way of writing. Only a part of this document has yet been published, and therefore a complete transcription of the document will be reproduced in my forthcoming book *Censorship in Counter-Reformation Italy*.

24. See *Insuper eadem sacrosancta*, Concilium Tridentinum (8 April 1546), in *Dekrete der ökumenischen Konzilien*, vol. 3, *Konzilien der Neuzeit*, edited by J. Wohlmuth, Schöningh, Paderborn 2002, pp. 664-5, p. 665.

25. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146r.

26. *Ibid.*

27. *Ibid.*

28. *Ibid.*, and on Saint John and Luther see for instance M. Luther, *De servo arbitrio/Vom unfreien Willensvermögen*, transl. by A. Lexutt, in Id., *Der Mensch vor Gott*, Latin-German, edited by W. Härle, Evang. Verl.-Anst., Leipzig 2006, pp. 435-7, 539-41, 625-7, 631-7, 641-9.

29. BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146r. See also Barrio, *Pro lingua Latina*, cit., pp. 421-2.

30. See Barrio, *Pro lingua Latina*, cit., p. 421.
31. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146r.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. See *Insuper eadem sacrosancta*, cit., p. 665.
35. See Barrio, *Pro lingua Latina*, cit., p. 403.
36. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, ff. 146r-v. One of the two readers to whom Barrio refers appears to be Antonio Sebastiano Minturno; A. S. Minturno, *L'Arte poetica*, Giovanni Andrea Valvassore, Venezia 1564, reprint Fink, Munich 1971, his dedication to the Accademia Laria della città di Como.
37. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146v.
38. See *Catalogo dos livros que se prohibem nestes Regnos et Senborios de Portugal, por mandado do Illustrissimo et Reverendissimo Senhor Dom Iorge Dalmeida Metropolitano Arcebispo de Lisboa, Inquisidor Geral, &c.*, Antonio Ribeiro impressor de sua Illustrissima et Reverendissima Senhoria, Lisbon 1581, in *Index des livres interdits*, cit., vol. IV, p. 695. See also the instruction regarding the Orlando Innamorato, *ibid.*
39. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli B*, ff. 507r-511r, ff. 508v-509r; also Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice*, cit., pp. 382-3; Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, cit., pp. 142-3.
40. P. Godman, *The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index*, Brill, Leiden 2000, p. 158; see Fragnito, *Proibito capire*, cit., p. 159.
41. See above note 11.
42. See Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 158, and *Catholic Church and Modern Science. Documents from the Archives of the Roman Congregations of the Holy Office and the Index*, edited by U. Baldini and L. Spruit, Libreria editrice Vaticana, Roma 2009, I, 4, Appendix.
43. See Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 158.
44. ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 113r.
45. See Galletti's letter of 23 January 1600 in ACDF, *Index, Protocolli S*, ff. 217r-v; *Censura sopra alcune rime dell'Ariosto*, ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, ff. 306r-308v, and *Censura sopra la seconda parte e intorno ai Cinque canti, ivi*, ff. 305r-v.
46. See ACDF, *Index, Diarii*, I, f. 130v.
47. See ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 121r. Godman finds evidence that on 5 July 1600 the *Cinque canti* were deemed «insignificant»; Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 158.
48. See ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 113r, *Index, Diarii*, I, f. 130v.
49. See ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 132v, *Index, Diarii*, I, f. 23r (25 June 1587) and S. O., St. St. Q3-d, f. 112r (17 October 1578).
50. Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 159.
51. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 308r.
52. *Ivi*, f. 305r.
53. See Augustine, *De haeresibus, ad Quodvultdeum*, liber unus, in *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De fide rerum invisibilium, Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate, De catechizandis rudibus, Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo, Sermo de disciplina Christiana, Sermo de utilitate ieiunii, Sermo de excidio Urbis Romae, De haeresibus*, edited by R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beukers, Brepols, Turnhout 1969, chap. 38, pp. 306-7.
54. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 307r.
55. See BAV, Cod. Vat. Lat. 6149, f. 146r.
56. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 306v. On the censorship of erotic contents see f. 307r. See Galletti's letter (June 1597) to Cardinal Santori, in Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., doc. III, 69.
57. See the general rules in the third class (under «L») of the *Indexes* of 1557 (not promulgated), p. 737, and 1559, p. 775 and *Regula IX* of the *Index* of 1564, p. 818, in *Index des livres interdits*, cit., vol. VIII.
58. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 307v. I would like to correct my interpretation of

this part of the *censura* that was due to an incomplete transcription of the document, in J. Helm, *Annäherung an die römisch-katholische Lesart volkssprachlicher Poesie in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts – ein Einblick in die gegenreformatorische Zensur, in Zeichen setzen – Konvention, Kreativität, Interpretation*, Beiträge zum 24. Forum Junge Romanistik, Tübingen 14. bis 17. Mai 2008, Romanistischer Verlag, Bonn 2009, pp. 415-34.

59. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 307v.

60. See above note 57.

61. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 307r.

62. See *Correttione dell'Orlando Furioso di Lodovico Ariosto, fatta nell'Inquisitione di Ferrara l'anno 1600 conforme alla stampa di Gioliti in Venetia l'anno 1552*, in ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, ff. 314r-316v; ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 132v (10 October 1600), approved and signed by the inquisitor, the bishop of Ferrara, Giovanni Fontana, and two theologians. This *Correttione* also includes the correction «Nelle stanze poste doppo il quarantesimo sesto et ultimo canto, quali seguitano al canto trigesimosecondo [si describe la Roina di Roma et d'Italia dal tempo di Costantino per insino a la nostra età]».

63. On this type of correction see e. g. N. Longo, *Fenomeni di censura nella letteratura italiana del Cinquecento*, in *Le pouvoir et la plume: incitation, contrôle et répression dans l'Italie du XVI^e siècle*, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris 1982, pp. 275-84, pp. 282-3. V. Cian, *Un episodio della storia della censura in Italia nel secolo XVI: l'edizione spurgata del Cortigiano*, in "Archivio Storico Lombardo", s. 2, 14, 4, 1887, pp. 661-727.

64. See above note 63.

65. ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 132v (10 October 1600).

66. See also the case of the *Decameron* in A. Coseriu, *Zensur und Literatur in der italienischen Renaissance des XVI. Jahrhunderts*. Baldassar Castigliones Libro del Cortegiano als Paradigma, in A. Noyer-Weidner (hrsg.), *Literatur zwischen immanenter Bedingtheit und äußerem Zwang. Zwei Studien zum Cinquecento*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen 1987, pp. 77, 80-1.

67. See ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, f. 315v.

68. S. Főrnari, *La Spositione di m. Simon Főrnari da Rheggio sopra l'Orlando Furioso di m. Ludovico Ariosto*, Lorenzo Torrentino, Firenze 1549, contains Id., *Della espositione sopra l'Orlando furioso parte seconda*, Lorenzo Torrentino, Firenze 1550. A copy of this expurgation is held in the ACDF, *Index, Protocolli N*, ff. 295r-300v; Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 158, and M. A. Passarelli, *Ein Beispiel für die Zensur volkssprachlicher Texte: Simone Főrnaris Kommentar zum Orlando furioso*, in H. Wolf, *Inquisition, Index, Zensur: Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit im Widerstreit*, Schöningh, Paderborn 2001, pp. 279-91, p. 283 (reproduces parts of the document). Without giving any explanation Passarelli and Godman attribute this document to the Congregation for the Index or a commission created by the same Congregation. I would like to express my gratitude to Vittorio Frajese who has rightly questioned the provenance of this document. From ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 129v (2 July 1600) it is apparent that the Congregation for the Index charged the bishop of Ferrara and inquisitor of Piacenza with the expurgation; see *Ind.*, XI, 1, p. 575. On the members of this episcopal congregation see Passarelli, *Ein Beispiel*, cit., pp. 284-5.

69. See Godman, *The Saint as Censor*, cit., p. 158, where he explains that the Congregation for the Index gave more importance to the interpretation of the poem than to the poem itself because the interpretation was written for an educated audience.

70. See Passarelli, *Ein Beispiel*, cit., pp. 282-3, 286-7.

71. See Agnelli, Ravegnani, *Annali*, cit., *passim*.

72. See Hempfer, *Diskrepante Lektüren*, cit., p. 261.

73. *Ivi*, pp. 278-9.

74. According to the *Correttione* from Ferrara, the censors used an edition of the *Furioso* published by Giolito in 1552. This is not the edition I consulted, but it may contain moralising *Allegorie* at the beginning of each canto, as preceding editions; Agnelli, Ravegnani, *Annali*, cit., pp. 86-91.

75. See ACDF, *Index*, v, f. 113r (3 December 1599).

76. For instance, there is no Roman edition dating from the seventeenth century mentioned in Agnelli, Ravegnani, *Annali*, cit., pp. 180-97 nor in Baruffaldi, *La vita*, cit., p. 303.

77. See ACDF, *Index, Diarii*, II, f. 10r.

78. The documents relating to the case of the *Furioso* will be published in my forthcoming book *Censorship in Counter-Reformation Italy*.