

Introduction

María José Vega

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Julian Weiss

King's College London

La experiencia enseña y los sabios lo escriben,
que los hombres se hacen tales cuales son los libros que leen.
(Juan Bernal Díaz de Luco, *Aviso de curas*, 1543)¹

The printing press ushered in the birth of the public sphere in the modern state, through the dramatic multiplication and public circulation of texts and ideas. These were the conditions in which emerged a pressing need to create institutional and ideological mechanisms that would help shape public opinion and beliefs. Of course, censorship as such has its roots in Antiquity, but it is only systematically organized on a large scale following the first papal attempts in 1487 to control the circulation of books.² Although initially they had only local application, by 1515 mechanisms were put in place to control the universal Church. The Lutheran Reform, and the offensive against Lutheran writings, required a more coherent response, and it was this that inspired the first systematic indices, which continued well into the xxth century. Book censorship can be understood as one of the first and most direct mechanisms for the control of the public sphere: a way of moulding the thoughts of individual readers by intervening in the texts they read; a way of regulating, simultaneously, texts and social conduct. Book censorship, therefore, is more than a means of eradi-

1. «Experience teaches and wise men write that men become exactly like the books they read».

2. On censorship in Antiquity, see Cramer (1945) and Gil (1961; 2nd ed. 1984); for the censorship of Latin literature in the High Middle Ages, see Godman (2000); on the compilation of the first *Indices*, and the institutionalization of their procedures, see Febvre & Martin (1958), Brambilla (2000), Frajese (2006). Histories of censorship started to be

written, albeit in summary and fragmentary fashion, in the xvith century inspired by the need to provide ideological support for the control of book production. Early examples can be found in the *De libris comburendis* by the theologian Conrado Bruno, and more generally in the various treatises *adversus haereses*. The first attempt at a panoramic overview, again written from an apologetic standpoint, is the *Storia polemica della proibizione dei libri* (1777) by Francesco Antonio Zaccaria.

cating dissent, whether by assimilating or suppressing oppositional and alternative views. As it strives to exercise this form of control, it also participates in the broader process of defining and propagating a complex matrix of cultural, religious and political practices.

This collection of essays, based on the papers of an exploratory workshop funded by the European Science Foundation and held in Barcelona 2007, examines the multifaceted fashion in which early modernity approached the problems and possibilities of book censorship. The contributors consider the moral, religious, political and literary dimensions of censorship, approaching it not only as an institutional practice, but also as a discourse which plays a constitutive role in setting the conceptual and practical limits of freedom of conscience and expression in a variety of domains. In both respects, the institutional and the discursive, this volume builds upon recent (and not so recent) research into early modern censorship. Its focus is Catholic Europe—Spain, Portugal, Italy, and France— but at several points it draws on, and we hope feeds back into, scholarship on a much broader geographical range.³ Since the 1980s studies into censorship in early modern England, for example, emphasize how censorship entails more than the outright repression of ideas by an outside authority; it can become internalized within a particular discourse, which is to say that it is not experienced as conscious self-censorship, but naturalized as the right limits or the decorum of a discursive practice.⁴

This approach gives full weight to the idea that censorship straddles the private and the public spheres. But our understanding of its public or institutional dimension has been much enriched by recent archival research. In the ten years that followed the opening of the archives of the Holy Office in 1998, we have learned a great deal more about the history of censorship and the books that were included in the Indices. This archival material has given us a much sharper picture of the vast array of ideas and texts (from narrative fiction to history, from devotional literature to lyric poetry) that were expurgated or subject to prohibition. We now have at our disposal much more information about the delays, inefficiency, conflicts and difficulties that beset, at various times and places, the plan to develop effective censorship; moreover, we should never confuse ideological aspiration with practical reality.⁵ Even so, the poli-

3. The bibliography on literature and censorship in Counter-reformation Europe is substantial; selected examples include Révah (1960), Russell (1978), Régo (1982), Domergue (1996), Alcalá (2001), Prosperi (2003), Rozzo (2005). We shall return to some of these, and refer to others, in the course of the following discussion.

4. Representative examples of these studies include the monographs of Patterson (1984), Burt

(1993), Clare (1999), Halasz (2003) and more recently Raz-Krakotzkin (2007). For further discussion of these trends, see the essay by Weiss in the present volume.

5. Fragnito (2001a), Frajese (1998, 2002), McKitterick (2003). For a pioneering reinterpretation of the supposed effects of censorship on profane literature in post-Tridentine Spain, see Russell (1978).

cies of the Papacy and ecclesiastical and civil authorities dramatically altered the European cultural landscape. Their continued and systematic attempts to prohibit, expurgate and generally control the circulation of books conditioned the cultural habits and intellectual framework of Europe from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards.

As we have mentioned, historical research into the censorship and expurgation of books took a new turn in 1998, when the Archives of the *Congregazione dell'Indice* were opened up to academic scholars. This move regenerated interest into the institutional structures of censorship and the Church's intervention in the dissemination of both manuscript and printed books. In addition, it encouraged scholars to rethink the ways people wrote during periods of intolerance and persecution, and to look again at the practices of dissimulation, self-censorship and ambiguity. The principal historical monographs on censorship —from the nineteenth-century classics by Reusch (1885) and Hilgers (1904), to those of Luigi Firpo (1950), Rondò (1963), López (1972) and Grendler (1981)— were obviously written without full access to this vast storehouse of documentary evidence. The proceedings of the Friuli conference on censorship, compiled by Ugo Rozzo (*La censura libraria nell'Europa del secolo sedicesimo*, 1997), illustrate the state of scholarship on the subject on the eve of the opening of the Rome archives, and the volume contains a thorough review of previous work. In the same year, Gigliola Fragnito published her fundamental monograph, *La Bibbia al Rogo*, which examines the censorship of vernacular Scriptures and the cultural impact of Bible burning in the Catholic world (especially Italy, Spain, France, and Portugal). In addition, in 1996 the Geneva publishing house Droz completed the monumental ten-volume edition of the *Index des livres interdits* (1984-1996), under the direction of Jesús Martínez de Bujanda: the documentation provided by these detailed lists, together with their critical apparatus, has been of enormous help to literary and cultural historians alike.

Since 1998, the discovery of new documents relating to the planning and execution of these indices has continued to enrich our understanding of the history of forbidden books, and work on them demonstrates beyond doubt that scholarship on early modern censorship has entered a new era. The main changes are seen in those studies that concern the broad impact and implications of censorship, particularly its dynamic involvement in the construction of the modern *polis*, in its political, cultural, and social dimensions. New documentary evidence allows for a clearer understanding of the organizational aspects of Church administration in Catholic countries, the precise hierarchies within the Inquisition and the conflicts between the Holy Office and the Congregation of the Index. New light has also been shed on the procedures governing the granting of licences to, or the prohibition and expurgation of, scientific, philosophical and legal works, as well as the

treatment of a whole spectrum of texts —particularly vernacular fiction and Judaic writings— that were felt to threaten true faith and piety.⁶

In short, the most significant recent trends in scholarship enable a more supple conception of censorship, and dwell not simply on its negative and repressive aspects (based on a simple dichotomy between repression and freedom), but on its constitutive role in the construction of civic life. Even a heterodox like Jean Bodin, writing in his influential *Six livres de la république* (1576), could defend censorship on the grounds that laws alone could not guarantee ethical conduct: censorship could (he seems to imagine) reach into the very intimate recesses of the individual citizen's conscience.⁷ The desire to recuperate the Roman institution of the civil censor emerges clearly in political theory of the second half of the sixteenth century and the early years of the seventeenth, between Bodin's *De republica* and the *Politica methodice digesta* by Althusius; and it is no mere antiquarian gesture. New approaches to works like these reveal how at the heart of the doctrines and practices of censorship lay some of the key ideological tensions of modernity, such as the ambivalent relation between the «individual» and «society», or the blurred boundaries between «liberty» and «licence». In addition to the centrality of censorship to modern notions of the state, recent studies also paint a more complex picture of events, one that recognizes resistance to centralizing authority, systemic inefficiencies, and internal debates over jurisdiction. These complexities have become much clearer, for example, in the case of civic institutions such as universities: scholars now talk of the complicity of intellectuals turned expurgators, whose methods reshaped many literary texts and redefined the boundaries of right reading for centuries to come. These activities have produced a spate of important studies on the censorship of literary texts, particularly fiction, during the Counter-Reformation (see for just one example Rozzo's 2005 analysis of the *novelle* by Bandello).

Prominent on these renewed scholarly agendas is the concept of *dangerous literature* and, in particular, an approach to censorship that recognizes how dominant ideologies are not just imposed from above but legitimized from below through a process of self-censorship and subject-construction or identity formation. Approaches to what we might call «diffuse» or «soft» censorship—for example the studies by Fragnito (1999a; 2001b) or Prospero (1995; 1996)—were carried out independently from the New Historicist School pioneered by Anglo-American scholars of (mainly) Renaissance England to which we referred above, but they share an interest in the constitutive role of censorship. Dealing in particular with its impact on vernacular books, Fragnito

6. For representative studies, see the collective volumes by Stango (2001) and Fragnito (2001). On the censorship of Judaic writings, especially the Talmud, see Parente (1996,

2001) and Raz-Krakotzin (2004).

7. On this aspect of Bodin's thought, see Serano (1992), Quagliani (2001), and Bianchini (2005).

and others reveal how formal censorship and expurgation were allied to new confessional practices promoted by the Church after 1559, which encouraged penitents to denounce sin. In this way the Inquisition (a public institution) and confession (a private act) became indissolubly linked in an alliance of temporal and spiritual powers whose ideological effect was to bind individual conscience—inner and outer lives—more closely to the Church and State. Private conduct and conviction were thus subjected to, and shaped by, a climate of denunciation and suspicion, in which self-regulation, or self-censorship, operated in tandem with formal punitive and preventative measures. It affected all areas of social life, especially in fields where books were a professional necessity (students, professors, editors, jurists, etc). Professional men of letters, when confronted by censors and inquisitors, inevitably sought compromises in an attempt to carve out a limited degree of autonomy, in a process that was, *mutatis mutandis*, similar to that described by Burt in his 1993 monograph, *Licensed by Authority*. What might be termed «collaborative» freedom entailed practices and strategies that could range from outright self-censorship to the clandestine dissemination of books and ideas.⁸ These practices, the direct result of formal, punitive censorship, redefined the nature of books, reading, and the reading subject in the early modern period.

Moreover, punitive censorship also works to generate new texts through a process of substitution. This is particularly important in the case of spiritual and devotional literature. As Caravale (2003) has shown, the Church's large-scale prohibition of spiritual texts not only influenced the conduct of believers (and editors); it also brought into being new kinds of devotional text, which catered to the (imagined) religious requirements of the unlettered laity, who, as Prospero put it, were cast in the role of *eterni bambini* (1996: 627; see also Fragnito 2005: 22-26). Thus, the control of lay religiosity took effect not only through the prohibition but also through the carefully managed production of reading matter.⁹ One of Fragnito's key works (*Proibito capire*, 2005) illustrates how ecclesiastical censorship of Latin and vernacular works, both secular and religious, helped to induce amongst lower echelons of society a state of distrust towards the printed book.

Recent research, including the present essays, clearly demonstrates how these problems transcend national boundaries, however much they are shaped by local conditions. The mechanisms and guiding principles of ecclesiastical and political censorship were international in scope and implicated the whole of Catholic Christendom, as well as the colonial empires of the great European powers. Suffice it to note that many of the *Indices of Forbidden Books* aspired to

8. Chartier (1998).

careers of individual religious writers, see Pérez

9. For the effects of censorship on the literary

García (2006).

be *universal* indices, and all of them, whether they were Roman, conciliar, or compiled by university theologians (like those of Paris or Louvain) or national authorities, were closely linked or cumulative. It is true that national indices (such as Munich 1582 or the slightly earlier one printed in Antwerp) were particularly concerned with texts in the local vernacular. It is equally true that the actual textual effects of censorship could vary significantly from place to place, especially with respect to the Bible and works of lay piety. Even so, all these regional variations are firmly predicated on a common core of principles, however flexibly they could be applied according to specific political or religious circumstances. Literary texts suffered a similar fate: the appearance of a particular work on a universal index meant that it could be added to all the national ones, within a short space of time: the fate of Boccaccio's *Decameron*, with its many translations into other European languages, is one instance amongst many.¹⁰ Heretical works or authors were universally condemned throughout the Catholic world, and there were also prohibitions *a futuro*, which aspired to control not only works already in existence but even hypothetical ones, yet to be written.

A broad European perspective, which goes over and above the disciplinary boundaries imposed by national literary traditions, is also required to appreciate the workings of the international book trade (with its editorial centres in Venice, Paris, Basle, Antwerp, Rome, Coimbra, Salamanca, etc) and the shared use of Latin as the intelligentsia's *lingua franca*. The theorization of censorship in particular was generally formulated in Latin, whether in treatises devoted specifically to the subject (such as *Theotimus*, see below), theological, political, or legal works, commentaries on the classics, or in the numerous papal and episcopal edicts. Future research will probably show how although the underlying vocabulary of censorship in vernacular language may share a common foundation, it will be marked by regional and temporal variations which can be appreciated only through comprehensive comparative analysis.

That future scholarship should be comparative in nature is also demonstrated by the geographical distribution of the first indices of forbidden books that were produced between 1544 and 1564, the two decades that preceded the publication of the immense and influential Index of prohibited books compiled at the Council of Trent. During this period we find six indices published at the University of Paris (between 1544 and 1556), three at the University of Louvain (1546, 1550 y 1558), the indices of Venice (1549), Milan (1554) and Florence (1554), those of the Portuguese Inquisition (1547-1551), and the Spanish Inquisition (1559), as well as the first Roman indices (1557, 1558, and especially 1559, which was possibly the most repressive of all, as far as devotional and literary texts are concerned). No single national or regional perspective would suffice

10. See Sorrentino (1935: 143-220), Brown (1974), Chiecchi & Troisio (1984).

to appreciate the scale of this geography of repression and its political, cultural, and religious consequences for Early Modern Europe. In spite of certain local variations, the primacy of Rome and the need to determine common principles for the systematic censorship of books required the authorities themselves to adopt an international outlook. Modern scholars need to follow their panoramic gaze if they are to assess the scale of their ambitions.

And what ambitions they were: in the first fifty years of operation, the Indices of forbidden books affected 1946 European authors; indeed, the complete works of 1411 of these were condemned without exception. There are more than 2000 works categorically banned, with no possibility of correction, and they are included in all the European indices of this period.¹¹ Though impressive, this quantitative data gives only partial insight into the nature of intolerance and its impact on European cultural life and its legacy. Also of prime importance are the ideological underpinnings of this movement, which can be effectively assessed only by interpretative approaches that adopt comparatist perspectives. Such an approach will identify the universalizing aims of the censors, but also throw them into relief by measuring them against the local realities of censorship, where we find ample evidence of contestation, dissimulation and refractory interpretative communities.

Although the present volume is predicated on the need for comparatist approaches, it also recognizes that a panoramic comparatist overview is beyond the grasp of a single scholar, and that the best way forward is through collaboration, a collaboration that strikes a balance between studying local particularities and uncovering the overarching principles and practices that governed pan-European censorship and shaped its geographical contours in early modernity. Thus, although the following essays are self-contained studies, inevitably they intersect. As editors, we have adopted a grouping that highlights just one possible pattern of intersections, but there are others, and we suggest some of them at the end of this introduction.

We begin with four essays that illustrate, from various perspectives, the Catholic Church's attempts to regulate printing and reading in the two cultural fields that appeared to produce the most anxiety: secular fiction (especially, though by no means exclusively, amorous romances) and works of lay piety (notably Bible translations and popular catechism). The first essay, by Donatella Gagliardi, introduces the most significant theoretical defence of censorship to have been written in sixteenth-century Europe: *Theotimus, sive de tollendis et expungendis malis libris*. This treatise in dialogue form was written by the Benedictine Gabriel Du Puy-Herbault (Putherbeus, in Latin) and it was published in Paris in 1548. The date is significant. It appeared just at the time when

11. De Bujanda (1996: 33-34).

the Theology Faculty of the Sorbonne, with royal support, was attempting to consolidate its authority as the arch-censor of the Catholic world. Du Puy-Herbault's merciless attack on writers who threatened public morals (his most famous target was Rabelais), thus drew ideological support from both Church and State. Although the importance of *Theotimus* has been widely recognized by specialists, it remains a poorly understood work, in part because of the lack of modern editions. Gagliardi's recent edition (2008) compensates for this, and her present essay is part of her continuing research into the significance and European influence of the work. Her account shows that while Fray Gabriel bears a clear affinity with earlier moralists, such as Juan Luis Vives, his approach is far more radical and intransigent. Profane literature is not merely the prelude to immorality: it opens the door to impiety. For him, lust and heresy go hand in hand. Fifteen years later the dual dangers of obscenity to morals and faith were also recognized in the *regula* VII of the Tridentine index.

Gigliola Fragnito's pioneering studies into early modern ecclesiastical censorship lay the foundations for her review of the Vatican's attempts to control the lay person's reading in two areas of vernacular publishing: devotional and profane literature (specifically chivalric romances). Fragnito's essay helps to understand the vehemence and ultimate futility of Du Puy-Herbault's treatise; she points to the lack of uniformity and success in the Church's attempts to intervene in the laity's reading and book-collecting habits. Though these internal fractures have been broadly noted before, Fragnito argues that there is still much to learn about the precise details of ecclesiastical censorship (e.g. the control of «minor» forms of devotional literature), as well as some of its broader cultural implications (e.g., the influence of censorship on primary schooling).

Fragnito's essay forms a neat pairing with the contribution of Giorgio Caravale. Both scholars contextualize current scholarship in their field, outline new areas of research, and argue for a transnational approach. Moreover, Caravale is also interested in the Church's attempts to control devotional reading in sixteenth-century Italy, with regard not to the cultural elite, but to the beliefs and practices of the unlettered masses. Focussing on the desire to purge the laity of any taint of heterodoxy and superstition, he examines responses to the problems posed by Lutheranism, mysticism, and popular piety. His essay also contextualizes the frantic idealism of the *Theotimus*, by pointing out instances of discord between Church and State across the national boundaries of Spain and Italy.

The moral and spiritual dangers posed by profane reading are also the theme of Emilio Blanco's analysis of the literary attitudes of the Franciscan Antonio de Guevara (c. 1481–1545). Guevara is especially pertinent to a volume on reading and censorship for two obvious reasons. His essays and treatises provided some of the most popular reading matter of sixteenth-century Europe; translated into numerous European languages, his moral essays became best-sellers. But Guevara also worked for the Inquisition. Blanco examines the evaluative and

prescriptive comments found in the prologues to his works (whether dedicated to royal princes, courtiers, or religious novices). One finds here the expected censure of idle literature of entertainment, which affiliates him with Vives and Du Puy-Herbault; at the same time, however, Blanco detects a deeper motive embedded in Guevara's negative criticism of secular literature. He suggests that Guevara was driven not simply to be an arbiter but an *auctor*, a writer whose practice had the moral and aesthetic authority to establish models for others to emulate.

Guevara's prologues are a bridge, so to speak, between two domains: the Church and the evolving discourse of the literary. With the next three essays, by Julian Weiss, Robert Archer, and José Augusto Cardoso, we move fully into the domain of literature, with its constituent ideas of the author, the classic, and the reader. In one respect, of course, the move simply entails a shift in perspective. Underlying the first four essays—especially Caravale's account of the Church's preoccupation with prayer—is the ecclesiastical and monarchical fear of autonomous thought. The next three essays tackle the ways in which changes in the very idea of literature itself both empower and channel the individual freedoms of writers and readers. The limited autonomy of the literary domain is the central subject of Julian Weiss's account of the emerging discourse of the vernacular national «classic». Weiss argues that the classic requires a particular subject position from which to read it, based on a dynamic whereby the reader moves across time and space, sets the past in dialogue with the present, and acquires a panoptic and critical view of the text and the world of which it forms a part. While the reader was encouraged to exercise creativity and independence of thought, this freedom had its limits. The ideal reader was both critic and censor.

Weiss's raw material comes from Iberia, with the glosses and commentaries on two of the three recently constituted Spanish classics, the late medieval Castilian poets Juan de Mena (1411–1456) and Jorge Manrique (c. 1440–1479). The third fifteenth-century poet to be raised to the status of the classic was the great Valencian lyric poet Ausiàs March (c. 1397–1459). Like Weiss, Robert Archer also studies the connection between canon formation and cultural control, but he considers one particular instance of what appears to be censorship. Among his 128 poems Ausiàs March penned a ferocious invective against a woman who, along with the man with whom she is having an affair, is actually named. Yet in one of the most important manuscripts of the poet's *oeuvre* there is evidence that someone has ripped out the folios on which the poem was probably copied. In a later manuscript, a marginal note records the allegedly common opinion that the poem cannot be attributed to March. As he reflects upon the implications of this evidence, Archer speculates that this particular poem was an inconvenience within the move to raise March to the status of an Iberian Petrarch. The desire to compile his complete works, which were scattered through a large number of manuscripts, and to document his

unique poetic voice, competed with the desire to make his verse conform to the ideological model of a Petrarchan *canzoniere*.

Another perspective on the intersection between censorship and early modern notions of the author is provided by José Augusto Cardoso. Cardoso's overview of the literary career of the Portuguese dramatist Gil Vicente (1465–1537) highlights the writer's complex relationship to institutional power. Since his first appearance before royalty in 1502, Gil Vicente adopted a range of authorial voices and guises, from «lettered shepherd» to disillusioned philosopher. These guises were part of Vicente's continuing attempts to test the limits of social, moral and political critique, and to create for himself a degree of relative autonomy as a writer. At the heart of Cardoso's analysis is an examination of how Gil Vicente's literary persona was shaped by his ideological negotiations with the institutions he served; but he also describes his posthumous fate, as an author figure. When his complete works were gathered together in the second-half of the sixteenth century, they would be heavily censored by the Inquisition; much later, in the nineteenth century, when his place in the Portuguese literary canon was being consolidated, his voice would continue to be appropriated, though for different ideological agendas.

Although it overlaps with the work of Weiss and Archer, Cardoso's research into Gil Vicente's veiled authorial voices also connects with the following two essays, by Rosa Navarro and Emily Butterworth. Their research explores inter-related ideas and practices of self-censorship, principally self-imposed restraints of rhetorical decorum, anonymity and literary pseudonyms. Hiding one's authorial identity behind the cloak of anonymity is an extreme form of veiling, made necessary when there is no self-censorship to link author and censor in tacit pact. Such is the case of the Spanish humanist Alfonso de Valdés (c. 1500–1532), according to Rosa Navarro. The dialogues of Valdés, which circulated in manuscript form and also anonymously, were subject to official censure by the Inquisition. Anonymity, however, could never provide absolute protection. Using the example of Baldessare Castiglione's correspondence with Valdés, Navarro shows what happens when the veil of secrecy falls. Castiglione's vicious personal attack on Valdés's *converso* origins «reveals» a potential heretic; at the same time, the papal *nuntio* and author of *Il cortegiano* defends the anonymity of the satirist's target (especially if he is a Pope). Anonymity, therefore, marks the discursive boundary between the sayable and unsayable. By way of conclusion, Navarro advances a bold claim: the famous picaresque novel, *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554) was in fact also the work of Alfonso de Valdés. This novel, whose anti-clerical satire was expurgated in 1573, illustrates how after Philip II's edict of 1558 prohibiting the publication of anonymous books, the pseudonym became the writer's favoured form of veiling.

Castiglione's attack on Valdés shows how censorship could be justified by its suppression of libel. The fine balance of moral decorum provides a focal point for Emily Butterworth's discussion of the French humanist printer Robert Es-

tienne (1503–1559), and the essayist Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592). On the basis of a semantic analysis of *censure* in early modern France, Butterworth explains how the two men illustrate the duality at the heart of the censorship, since *censure* could embrace both critical evaluation and suppression. Butterworth's findings are further proof of the need to situate early modern censorship within matrix of discourses and social values. It derives meaning from the fear of vicious slander on the one hand, and the desire for potentially salutary correction on the other, and entails both the sanction of public opinion and the thoughtful interpretation of individual readers. Thus, at a discursive level censorship stands at the intersection of multiple discourses; those studied here are the rhetorical conventions and ideals of Christian fraternal correction and scholarly debate. In both cases, the reader's role is crucial. The emerging conception of the author as a figure legally responsible for their text is thus accompanied in this period by the concomitant figure of the reader, rival and accomplice in the author's self-construction, one who illustrates both the hopes and the anxieties that surrounded the role of the censor.

The volume closes with a pair of essays that give centre stage to the writer's creative imagination, the ability to imagine other worlds. Although Marie-Luce Demonet's essay on early modern theories of fiction draws many of its literary examples from France, she situates the censorship of imaginative literature within a much broader European philosophical context. Besides the conventional moral justifications that stretch back through the Middle Ages to late Antiquity, she shows philosophers developing other defences for literary fiction. According to some thinkers (such as the Spanish Jesuit philosopher and theologian Francisco Suárez, 1548–1617), works of the imagination could possess a valid social and political function, as well as metaphysical legitimacy. The power to conceive things not as they were but as they could be (what Suárez called the *ens rationis*) need not be devoid of reason and proportionality. Demonet concludes with the recognition that the imaginative space opened up by romances, dialogues, novels and drama could not always be defended, philosophically or morally: what moralists, theologians and philosophers feared was chimeric excess. But by the same token they also recognized another limitation: their own inability to enter into the minds of readers to curb the power of the imagination.

Historically, Demonet argues that a crucial turning point in attitudes towards imaginative fiction was reached in the early seventeenth century. The final paper in the volume, by Roger Chartier, deals with one of the most notorious free-thinkers from this period, Cyrano de Bergerac (1619–1655). Cyrano's two works of proto-science fiction, the *Etats et Empires de la Lune* and its sequel *Histoire comique des Etats et Empires du Soleil* illustrate the continuing struggle of royal and ecclesiastical censors to control the creative imagination. Around one hundred years after Du Puy-Herbault's tirade against the corrupting profanities of fiction, Cyrano's scathing satire and religious parody initially escaped censorship because he initially circulated his texts in manuscript form. How-

ever, when *Etats et Empires de la Lune* was prepared for the press in 1657, it had been radically cut (by about 20%) and carefully rewritten in order to transform the narrator into a firm defender of Christian orthodoxy. Drawing on his well-known studies on the social history of the book, Chartier speculates upon the origins of this censorship (authorial or editorial?), and describes the material forms it took while the books were being produced. Chartier correctly emphasizes that manuscript publication was not simply a means to avoid institutional censorship; yet his discussion of what happens to a work in its passage from limited to public circulation also throws into relief the limitations and the reach of the early modern censor.

This account, along with our choice of organizational structure, simply serves to illustrate some of the ways in which these essays may be read together to bring out certain common themes. Our aim is not to be programmatic. Future research could develop a more chronological approach, in order to offer a more finely calibrated account of the modes and practices of censorship before and after the formal constitution of the Index. Numerous essays stress the connections and discontinuities in censorship across the Catholic world. They illustrate the lack of uniformity in the approach to, and application of, institutionalized prohibition and expurgation, and how censorship varies according to literary genre, reading public, and historical moment. As we have already emphasized, more research needs to be done to extend this comparatist approach to include both northern Europe and the New World. Further disciplinary connections should also be made, linking the findings and approaches of scholars who work mainly on Italy, Iberia, and France with those who have done so much to elucidate, for example, the case of early modern England (for some illustrations, see the bibliographies by Weiss and Butterworth). In short, no single approach to the problem of the cultural control of reading in early modernity is possible, in large measure because the problem itself is so multifaceted. Direct censorship is but one form of control and future research will necessarily continue to examine it within a broad web of cultural conflicts, ideologies and discourses. Needless to say, such an interpretative agenda must be enriched by continuing archival work, with the creation of digital and printed databases, catalogues, inventories and editions of primary sources.

Bibliography

- ALCALÁ, Ángel, *Literatura y ciencia ante la Inquisición española*, Madrid, Ediciones del Laberinto, 2001.
- BIANCHIN, Lucia, «*Dove non arriva la legge*»: dottrine della censura nella prima età moderna, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2005.
- BRAMBILLA, Elena, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio. Penitenza, confessione e giustizia spirituale dal medioevo al XVI secolo*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2000.
- BROWN, P. M., «The rassetatura of the Decameron», in *Lionardo Salviati. A Critical Biography*, New York-London, Oxford University Press, 1974, pp. 160-182.
- BURT, Richard, *Licensed by Authority: Ben Jonson and the Discourses of Censorship*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1993.
- CARVALE, Giorgio, *L'orazione proibita. Censura ecclesiastica e letteratura devozionale nella prima età moderna*, Firenze, Olschki, 2003.
- CHARTIER, Roger, «Le manuscrit à l'âge de l'imprimé (XVe-XVIIIe siècles). Lectures et réflexions», *La Lettre clandestine*, 7 (1998) 175-193.
- CHIECCHI, Giuseppe & TROISIO, Luciano, *Il Decameron sequestrato. Le tre edizioni censurate nel Cinquecento*, Milano, Unicopli, 1984.
- CLARE, Janet, *Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*, 2nd ed., Manchester, Manchester University Press, (1990) 1999.
- CRAMER, F., «Bookburning and Censorship in Ancient Rome: A Chapter from the History of Freedom of Speech», *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 6.2 (1945) 157-196.
- DE BUJANDA, Jesús Martínez, *Thesaurus de la littérature interdite au xvie siècle. Auteurs, ouvrages, éditions*, Genève, Droz, 1996.
- DOMERGUE, Lucienne, *La censure des livres en Espagne à la fin de l'Ancien Régime*, Madrid, Casa de Velázquez, 1996.
- FEBVRE, Lucien & MARTIN, Henri-Jean, *L'apparition du livre*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1958.
- FIRPO, Luigi, «Filosofia italiana e Controriforma», *Rivista di Filosofia*, 41 (1950) 150-173, 390-401; 42 (1951) 30-47.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, *La Bibbia al rogo. Censura ecclesiastica e volgarizzamenti biblici (1471-1605)*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1997.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, «'Li libbri non zò rrobba da cristiano': la letteratura italiana e l'indice di Clemente VIII (1596)», *Schifanoia*, 19 (1999a) 123-135.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, «L'applicazione dell'indice dei libri proibiti di Clemente VIII», *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 59 (2001a) 107-49.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, ed., *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, «'In questo vasto mare de libri prohibiti et sospesi tra tanti scogli di varietà et controversie': la censura ecclesiastica tra la fine del Cin-

- quecento e i primi del Seicento», *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia tra Cinquecento e Seicento*, a cura di Cristina Stango, Firenze, Olschki, 2001b, pp. 1-35.
- FRAGNITO, Gigliola, *Proibito capire. Chiesa e volgare nella prima età moderna*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2005.
- FRAJESE, Vittorio, «La Politica dell'Indice dal tridentino al clementino (1571-1596)», *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, 11 (1998) 269-355.
- FRAJESE, Vittorio, «La congregazione dell' Indice negli anni della concorrenza con il Sant' Uffizio (1593-1603)», *Archivio italiano per la storia della pietà*, 15 (2002) 179-220.
- FRAJESE, Vittorio, *Nascita del Indice. La censura ecclesiastica dal Rinascimento alla Cronroriforma*, Brescia, Morcelliana, 2006.
- GIL, Juan, *La censura en el mundo antiguo*, Madrid, Revista de Occidente (1961), 1984.
- GODMAN, Peter, *The Silent Masters: Latin literature and its Censors in the High Middle Ages*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000.
- GRENDLER, Paul F., *Culture and Censorship in Late Renaissance Italy and France*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1981.
- HALASZ, Alexandra, review of *Dictionary of Literary and Dramatic Censorship in Tudor and Stuart England* by Dorothy Auchter, *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* by Andrew Hadfield, *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* by Cyndia Susan Clegg, and *Elizabethan News Pamphlets: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe and the Birth of Journalism* by Paul J. Voss, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 56 (2003) 888-894.
- HILGERS, J., *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher in seinem neuen Fassung dargelegt und rechtlich-historisch gewürdigt*, Freiburg, Herderische Verlagshandlung, 1904.
- LÓPEZ, Pasquale, *Sul libro a stampa e le origini della censura ecclesiastica*, Napoli, Luigi Regina, 1972.
- McKITTERICK, David, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- PARENTE, Fausto, «La Chiesa e il *Talmud*. L'atteggiamento della Chiesa e del mondo cristiano nei confronti del *Talmud* e degli altri scritti rabbinici con particolare riguardo all'Italia tra xv e xvi secolo», in C. Vivanti, ed., *Storia d'Italia, Annali vol. XI: Gli Ebrei in Italia*, Torino, Einaudi, 1996, pp. 521-643.
- PARENTE, Fausto, «The Index, the Holy Office, the Condemnation of the *Talmud* and Publication of Clement VIII's Index», in Fragnito, Gigliola, ed., *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 163-198.
- PATTERSON, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, 2nd ed., Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, (1984) 1990.

- PÉREZ GARCÍA, Rafael M., *La imprenta y la literatura espiritual castellana en la España del Renacimiento*, Gijón, Trea, 2006.
- PROSPERI, Adriano, «Penitencia e Riforma», *Storia d'Europa*, vol. IV, *Letà moderna. Secoli XVI-XVIII*, a cura di M. Aymard, Torino, Einaudi, 1995, pp. 183-257.
- PROSPERI, Adriano, «Censurare le favole» in *L'inquisizione romana. Letture e ricerche*, Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2003, pp. 345-384.
- PROSPERI, Adriano, *Tribunali della coscienza. Inquisitori, confessori, missionari*, Torino, Einaudi, 1996.
- DU PUYHERBAULT, Gabriel, *Theotimus sive de tollendis et expungendis malis libris*, (Parisii, apud Ioannem Roigny, 1549); edición facsimilar con un estudio introductorio de Donatella Gagliardi, Barcelona-Madrid-Vigo, Seminario de Poética Europea del Renacimiento (UAB), Instituto Lucio Anneo Séneca (Universidad Carlos III Madrid), Academia Editorial, Colección «Bibliotheca Sphaerica», 2008.
- QUAGLIONI, Diego, «Conscientiam Munire: Dottrine della censura tra Cinque e Seicento», in Cristiana STANGO, ed., *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia tra Cinquecento e Seicento*, Firenze, Olschki, 2001, pp. 37-54.
- RAZ-KRAKOTZKIN, Amnon, «Censorship, Editing and the Reshaping of Jewish Identity: The Catholic Church and Hebrew Literature in the Sixteenth Century», in Allison P. COUDERT & Jeffrey S. SHOULSON, eds., *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, Philadelphia, 2004, pp. 125-155.
- RAZ-KRAKOTZKIN, Amnon, *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- RÉGO, Raúl, *Os índices expurgatórios e a cultura portuguesa*, Lisboa, Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa, 1982.
- REUSCH, Franz Heinrich, *Die Indices librorum prohibitorum des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen, Litterarischer Verein in Stuttgart, 1885.
- RÉVAH, Israël, *La censure inquisitoriale portugaise au xviiè siècle*, Lisboa, Instituto de Alta Cultura, Centro de Estudos de Psicologia e de História da Filosofia, 1960.
- ROTONDÒ, Antonio, «Nuovi documenti per la storia dell'Indice dei libri proibiti», *Rinascimento*, 3 (1963) 145-211.
- ROZZO, Ugo, ed., *La censura libraria nell'Europa nel secolo XVI*, Udine, Forum, 1997.
- ROZZO, Ugo, *La letteratura italiana negli 'Indici' del Cinquecento*, Udine, Forum, 2005.
- RUSSELL, P. E., «El Concilio de Trento y la literatura profana: reconsideración de una teoría», *Temas de 'La Celestina' y otros estudios: Del 'Cid' al 'Quijote'*, Barcelona, Ariel, 1978, pp. 441-478.
- SERRANO GONZÁLEZ, Antonio, *Como lobo entre ovejas. Soberanos y marginados en Bodin, Shakespeare, Vives*, Madrid, Centro de Estudios Constitucionales, 1992.

- SORRENTINO, Andrea, *La letteratura italiana e il Sant'Uffizio*, Napoli, Perrella, 1935.
- STANGO, Cristina, ed., *Censura ecclesiastica e cultura politica in Italia tra Cinquecento e Seicento*, Firenze, Olschki, 2001.
- ZACCARIA, Francesco Antonio, *Storia Polemica delle Proibizione de' Libri*, Roma, Generoso Salomoni, 1777.