

Sforza Pallavicino

Intersections

INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES IN EARLY MODERN CULTURE

General Editor

Karl A.E. Enenkel (*Chair of Medieval and Neo-Latin Literature*
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
e-mail: kenen_01@uni_muenster.de)

Editorial Board

W. van Anrooij (*University of Leiden*)
W. de Boer (*Miami University*)
Chr. Göttler (*University of Bern*)
J.L. de Jong (*University of Groningen*)
W.S. Melion (*Emory University*)
R. Seidel (*Goethe University Frankfurt am Main*)
P.J. Smith (*University of Leiden*)
J. Thompson (*Queen's University Belfast*)
A. Traninger (*Freie Universität Berlin*)
C. Zittel (*Ca' Foscari University of Venice / University of Stuttgart*)
C. Zwierlein (*Freie Universität Berlin*)

VOLUME 83 – 2022

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/inte

Sforza Pallavicino

A Jesuit Life in Baroque Rome

Edited by

Maarten Delbeke



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON



This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited. Further information and the complete license text can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The terms of the CC license apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources (indicated by a reference) such as diagrams, illustrations, photos and text samples may require further permission from the respective copyright holder.

The Open Access license was funded with support of the Chair of Architectural History and Theory, ETH Zürich.

Cover illustrations: (central image) Pietro da Cortona, detail of the frontispiece of Sforza Pallavicino, *Storia del Concilio di Trento* (Rome, 1656–1657); (background image) Gianlorenzo Bernini, Portrait of Sforza Pallavicino (Yale University Art Gallery).

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Delbeke, Maarten, editor.

Title: Sforza Pallavicino : a Jesuit life in baroque Rome / edited by Maarten Delbeke.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2022. | Series: Intersections, 1568-1181 ; volume 83 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022027959 (print) | LCCN 2022027960 (ebook) |

ISBN 9789004462021 (hardback ; acid-free paper) |

ISBN 9789004517240 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Pallavicino, Sforza, 1607-1667—Criticism and interpretation. LCGFT: Literary criticism. | Essays.

Classification: LCC PQ4630.P134 Z87 2022 (print) | LCC PQ4630.P134 (ebook) | DDC 858/.509--dc23/eng/20220810

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022027959>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022027960>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1568-1181

ISBN 978-90-04-46202-1 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-51724-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2022 by Maarten Delbeke. Published by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Hotei, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

Koninklijke Brill NV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Dedicated to the memory of Eraldo Bellini



Contents

- Acknowledgements IX
List of Figures x
Note on the Editor XI
Notes on the Contributors XII
Abbreviations XVII
Note on the Translations XVIII
- 1 Sforza Pallavicino: A Jesuit Life in Baroque Rome 1
Maarten Delbeke
- 2 City, Church, and Court: Roman Culture in the Age of Sforza
Pallavicino 32
Maria Pia Donato
- 3 'Before the Explosion of the *Novatores*' Ideas': Sforza Pallavicino
Lincean 51
Federica Favino
- 4 'The Great Friendship that Exists between Us': The Correspondence
between Sforza Pallavicino and Fabio Chigi (1629–1651) 73
Irene Fosi
- 5 The Challenge of the Poem: The Classicism of *I fasti sacri* 97
Silvia Apollonio
- 6 The 'Paths of Parnassus' in the Literary Thinking of Sforza
Pallavicino 109
Pietro Giulio Riga
- 7 Language and Idiom in Sforza Pallavicino's *Trattato dello stile
e del dialogo* 126
Eraldo Bellini
- 8 'With Ultramarine Hues': Sforza Pallavicino and Baroque Poetics 173
Jon R. Snyder

- 9 Pallavicino the Optimist 191
Sven K. Knebel
- 10 Pallavicino's God in Part and Whole 225
Anselm Ramelow
- 11 Sforza Pallavicino and the Condemnation of Jansenius's
Five Propositions 253
Chiara Catalano
- 12 Writing the History of the Council of Trent 275
Stefan Bauer
- 13 Intellect and Imagination in Pallavicino's *Arte della perfezion cristiana*:
A Close Reading 288
Alessandro Metlica
- Bibliography 297
- Index Nominum 327

Acknowledgements

Intended as a biography of Sforza Pallavicino, this volume collects essays by specialists in the fields and disciplines that cover both Pallavicino's activities as a scholar, author and Jesuit, and his place within the Roman social, political and religious elite of his times. Shorter contributions focus on a single work or episode, while longer essays situate Pallavicino with regard to more general themes and their context. As a whole, the collection aims to offer an English-reading public access to the considerable academic literature in various fields touching on Pallavicino. At the same time, the volume organises the historiography on a range of topics relevant to Baroque Rome around a single figure, thus highlighting his contributions to a variety of fields while providing a point of intersection between the cultural, political, religious and academic aspects of his era.

My first debt of gratitude is to the authors of the volume, for accepting my invitation and writing essays that encapsulate the intended aim and spirit of the book. I also thank them for their patience.

Irina Oryshkevich provided translations of the essays by Federica Favino, Irene Fosi and Eraldo Bellini. All essays have been copy-edited by Lenore Hietkamp and Tim Flight. Crucial assistance in checking the document and extracting the bibliography was provided by Désirée Noser, Mattia Lorenzi, Chiara de Libero, and Fabienne Girsberger. Linda Stagni and Noelle Paulson helped to usher the volume to completion.

The first colleague I contacted to discuss the project of this book was Eraldo Bellini. He very much encouraged me to pursue it, but on account of his ailing health declined to write a new essay. Since a volume on Pallavicino would be incomplete without his contribution, he graciously allowed me to edit and translate the article "Linguistica barberiniana. Lingue e linguaggi nel *Trattato dello stile e del dialogo* di Sforza Pallavicino", first published in *Studi Secenteschi* in 1994. Thanks to Davide Conrieri, the director of the journal, for authorising its re-publication.

Much of this volume is fundamentally indebted to Eraldo Bellini's work, not just because of its quality and depth, but also because of Eraldo's unstinting generosity. He passed away before this volume reached completion, but may it stand as a testimony to his scholarship and personality.

Figures

- 1.1 Gianlorenzo Bernini (attr.), Crucifix, bronze, Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto (Maggie Nimkin Photography) 2
- 1.2 Gianlorenzo Bernini, Bust of Alexander VII, marble, 1657, private collection, Siena and Rome (Lensini Photography) 4
- 1.3 Pietro da Cortona, frontispiece of Sforza Pallavicino, *Storia del Concilio di Trento* (Rome, 1656–57) (author) 5
- 1.4 Gianlorenzo Bernini, Portrait of Sforza Pallavicino, pencil and red wash on paper (Yale University Art Gallery) 7
- 1.5 Mattia de' Rossi, Tomb of Sforza Pallavicino, Sant'Andrea al'Quirinale, Rome, ca. 1670 (Soprintendenza dei beni culturali di Roma) 14
- 1.6 Carlo Bovio, *Rhetoricae Suburbanum. Pars prima, cuius libri tres exhibent [...]* (Rome, Franciscus Tizzoni: 1676) 110 17

Note on the Editor

Maarten Delbeke

holds the Chair of the History and Theory of Architecture at the Department of Architecture at ETH Zurich. He researches and teaches the history and theory of art and architecture in Europe from the 17th century to the present, and is active as an architecture critic. He is particularly interested in the mediation of architecture in print, be it in text or image, digital or analogue. His recent publications include *The Art of Religion: Sforza Pallavicino and Art Theory in Bernini's Rome* (2012, second edition 2016) and, as a co-editor, *gta papers 5: The Cornice* (2021, with Erik Wegerhoff), *Cultures du spectacle baroque. Cadres, expériences et représentation des solennités religieuses entre Italie et anciens Pays-Bas* (2019, with Ralph Dekoninck, Annick Delfosse, Caroline Heering, and Koen Vermeir), and *Proportional Systems in the History of Architecture: A Critical Reconsideration* (2018, with Matthew Cohen).

Notes on the Contributors

Silvia Apollonio

is Adjunct Professor of the History of Criticism and Literary Historiography at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan, from 2019–2020, and was formerly Adjunct Professor of Italian Literature at the same university. Her principal research interest is the Italian literary culture of the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries, focusing in particular on Barberini Rome in the early decades of the 17th century. She has written on Sforza Pallavicino, Giovanni Ciampoli, and Agostino Mascardi, and published a critical edition of Pallavicino's *I Fasti Sacri* in 2015. Her current project is a critical edition of Ciampoli's *Poetica sacra*. She also studies epistolography and criticism in the transition between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with a particular focus on Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, Roberto Titi, and Malatesta Porta.

Stefan Bauer

is a Lecturer in Early Modern World History at King's College London. He is an intellectual and cultural historian of early modern Europe; his research interests cover humanism, religious polemic, church history, and censorship. He previously taught at the University of Warwick, the University of York, and Royal Holloway, University of London. Bauer was also a Marie Curie Fellow at York, and a Researcher both at the German Historical Institute in Rome and the Italian-German Historical Institute in Trent. His books include *The Censorship and Fortuna of Platina's "Lives of the Popes" in the Sixteenth Century* (2006) and *The Invention of Papal History: Onofrio Panvinio between Renaissance and Catholic Reform* (2020). Bauer is currently co-editing (with Simon Ditchfield) *A Renaissance Reclaimed: Jacob Burckhardt's "Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy" Revisited*.

Eraldo Bellini

was Professor of Italian Literature at the Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia at the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Milan. His research dealt with Italian literature from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, with studies on Sforza Pallavicino and the milieu of Barberini Rome, the dialogue between literature and science in the ambit of Galileo, as well as Milanese romanticism and the work of Italo Calvino. His numerous publications included *Il vero e il falso dei poeti. Tasso, Tesauero, Pallavicino, Muratori* (1990, with Carlo Scarpati), *Umanisti e Lincei. Letteratura e scienza a Roma nell'età di Galileo* (1997), *Agostino Mascardi*

tra 'ars poetica' e ars historica' (2002), and *Stili di pensiero nel Seicento italiano. Galileo, i Barberini, i Lincei* (2009).

Chiara Catalano

was *ancienne pensionnaire étrangère* at the École Normale Supérieure de Paris, International Scholar at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (2010–2011) and Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Salento (Lecce), where she collaborated on an online edition of Descartes's Letters (directed by Giuseppe Belgioioso) and the *Nouvel Index Scolastico-Cartésien* (forthcoming, ed. Igor Agostini). Her research interests include Jansenius and his criticism of philosophy and stoicism, scholasticism, Jesuit thinkers (Garasse, Suárez, Vasquez), Pascal, and Descartes. Her book, *Philosophie et philosophes dans l'Augustinus de Cornélius Jansénius*, was published in 2016.

Maria Pia Donato

is CNRS Research Professor at the Institut d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine in Paris, and was formerly Associate Professor in Modern History at the University of Cagliari, Italy. Her research focuses on early modern Rome, the history of science and medicine in the Catholic context, and cultural history. Her publications include *Conflicting Duties: Science, Medicine and Religion in Rome, 1550–1750* (2009, ed. with Jill Kraye), *Sudden Death: Medicine and Religion in Eighteenth-century Rome* (2014, translation of the original Italian edition of 2010), *Medicine and the Inquisition in the Early Modern World* (ed. 2018 and 2019), and *L'archivio del mondo. Quando Napoleone confiscò la storia* (2019), which was recently translated into French (2020).

Federica Favino

is Assistant Professor at the Department of History Anthropology Religions Art History, and Performing Arts at the Sapienza University in Rome. Her research concerns scientific culture in early modern and modern Rome, with a special focus on the world of the Curia, the academies, the university, and the religious orders, and the relations between gender, culture, and knowledge. She is the author of *La filosofia naturale di Giovanni Ciampoli* (2015), *Donne e scienza nella Roma dell'Ottocento* (Rome 2020), and co-editor of *Copernicus Banned. The Entangled Matter of the Anti-Copernican Decree of 1616* (2018, with Natacha Fabbri).

Irene Fosi

was formerly Professor of Modern History at the Dipartimento di Lettere, Arti e Scienze Sociali, Università 'G. D'Annunzio', Chieti-Pescara. She was an Alexander

von Humboldt-Stiftung Fellow at the universities of Marburg, Tübingen, Freiburg im Br., and Berlin, respectively. Her main research topics are related to justice and society in early modern Italy, diplomatic and cultural relations between the Roman court and the Holy Roman Empire, and religious conversion in early modern Europe. Her publications include *La società violenta. Il banditismo nello Stato Pontificio nella seconda metà del Cinquecento* (1985), *All'ombra dei Barberini. Fedeltà e servizio nella Roma barocca* (1997), *La legazione di Ferrara del cardinale Giulio Sacchetti (1627–1631)*, 2 vols. (ed. 2006), “La peste a Roma 1656–1657”, special issue of *Roma moderna e contemporanea* (ed. 2006), *La giustizia del papa. Sudditi e tribunali nello Stato Pontificio in età moderna* (2007, translated into English as *Papal Justice. Subjects and Court in the Papal State, 1500–1750*, 2011), *Papato e Impero nel pontificato di Urbano VIII (1623–1644)* (2013, ed. with Alexander Koller), *Convertire lo straniero. Stranieri e Inquisizione a Roma in età moderna* (2011, translated into English as *Inquisition, Conversion, and Foreigners in Baroque Rome*, 2020).

Sven Knebel

is a freelance researcher and former Privatdozent at the Institut für Philosophie der Freien Universität Berlin (2000–2013). He is a historian of philosophy and theology, and his publications include *Wille, Würfel und Wahrscheinlichkeit. Das System der moralischen Notwendigkeit in der Jesuitenscholastik 1550–1700* (2000), *Suarezismus. Erkenntnistheoretisches aus dem Nachlass des Jesuitengenerals Tirso González de Santalla (1624–1705)* (2011), and *Scientia Media. Der Molinismus und das Faktenwissen* (2021).

Alessandro Metlica

is Associate Professor of Comparative Literature at the Department of Linguistic and Literary Studies (DISLL), University of Padova. He is a former Marie Curie CO-FUND Fellow (2013–2015) and FNRS *chargé de recherche* (2015–2018) at the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium. His research focuses on the representation of power in early modern Europe, both as regards subversion (libertinism, free thinking) and containment (eulogy, praise literature, propaganda). His publications include editions of Pallavicino Ferrante's *Libelli antipapali: la Baccinata e il Divorzio celeste* (2011) and Casti Giovan Battista's *Il poema tartaro* (2014), and the edited volumes *Il fantasma dell'Unità. Riletture del Risorgimento tra Grande Guerra e Fascismo* (2013, with Pellegrino Favuzzi), *Canzonieri in transito. Lasciti petrarcheschi e nuovi archetipi letterari tra Cinque e Seicento* (2015, with Franco Tomesi), “Paris baroque. G.B. Marino et la France”, special issue of *Les lettres romanes* (2016, with Agnès Guiderdoni). Recently, he wrote *Le seduzioni della pace. Giovan Battista Marino, le feste di corte e la Francia barocca* (2020).

Anselm Ramelow

is Professor of Philosophy at the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, Berkeley, California, and has been a Senior Fellow of the Berkeley Institute since 2016. He is a former Visiting Professor at the Hochschule für Philosophie, Munich, and Adjunct Professor at the University of San Francisco. His current research interests are Thomas Aquinas, Free Will, philosophical aesthetics, the philosophy of language, faith and reason (including the philosophy of miracles), the concept of personhood, and family rights. His publications include *Gott, Freiheit, Weltenwahl. Die Metaphysik der Willensfreiheit zwischen Antonio Perez, S.J. (1599–1649) und G.W. Leibniz (1646–1716)* (1997), *Beyond Modernism?—George Lindbeck and the Linguistic Turn in Theology* (2005), *God: Reason and Reality* (editor and contributor, 2014), and a translation and edition of Thomas Aquinas's *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate* 21–24 (2013).

Pietro Giulio Riga

is a research fellow at the Department of Modern Letters and Cultures at Sapienza Università di Roma and a former research fellow at the Università degli Studi di Bergamo. His research focuses on various aspects and issues of Italian literature from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, particularly Southern Baroque, the relationship between politics, diplomacy, and literary communication, and the genres of lyric poetry, satire, and epistolography. His publications include *Giovan Battista Manso e la cultura letteraria a Napoli nel primo Seicento. Tasso, Marino, gli Oziosi* (2015), *L'elogio del Principe. Ritratti letterari di Eugenio di Savoia-Soissons* (2019), an annotated edition of Pietro Metastasio's letters to Giuseppe Bettinelli (2021), and a collected edition of Giovan Battista Marino's works (2017, with Lorenzo Geri).

Jon R. Snyder

is Research Professor of Italian Studies and Comparative Literature at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He has served as Professor at the University of California, San Diego, as well as Visiting Professor at the universities of Turin and Macerata, respectively. He has published widely on early modern and modern literature, art, and culture, with a special focus on Baroque Italy. His publications include a translation of Gianni Vattimo's *The End of Modernity* (1988), *Writing the Scene of Speaking: Theories of Dialogue in the Late Italian Renaissance* (1989), *L'estetica barocca* (2005), *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* (2009), a translation and bilingual edition of Giambattista Andreini's 1622 play, *Love in the Mirror* (2009), and "Italy and the Sacred", special issue of *California Italian Studies* (2014).

Along with numerous articles and studies, he has published translations from the French and Italian of plays, stories, essays, and books. Some of Jon's most recent work is available in the open-access online journal, *California Italian Studies*, of which he is a co-founder. He is currently completing an edition/translation of Vincenzo Corrado's *Del cibo pitagorico* (1781).

Abbreviations

AAV	Archivio Apostolico Vaticano
ACDF	Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede, Rome
APUG	Archivio della Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Rome
ARSI	Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome
BANLC	Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana, Rome
BAV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City
BC	Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome
BNCR	Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Rome
CSEL	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum</i> (Vienna – Vindobonae: 1866–)
DBI	<i>Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani</i> , 94 vols. (Rome: 1960–) https://www.treccani.it/biografico/index.html
DThC	Vacant A. et al. (eds.), <i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique: Contenant l'Exposé des Doctrines de la Théologie Catholique, leurs Preuves et leur Histoire</i> , Encyclopédie Des Sciences Ecclésiastiques, 15 vols. (Paris: 1899–1950)
OG	Galilei Galileo, <i>Opere</i> , ed. A. Favaro, 20 vols. (Florence: 1890–1909; 2nd ed., Florence: 1968)
RHE	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>

Note on the Translations

The essays by Federica Favino and Irene Fosi were translated by Irina Oryshkevich, and Eraldo Bellini's essay by Irina Oryshkevich and Maarten Delbeke. All other translations are by the authors, but have been checked for consistency.

Words like *ingegno*, *concetto*, or *fantasia*, as crucial to seventeenth-century discourse as they are lacking in a univocal English equivalent, have been retained in the text together with the author's preferred translation.

‘Before the Explosion of the *Novatores*’ Ideas’: Sforza Pallavicino Lincean

Federica Favino

1 The Last of the Linceans*

On January 29, 1629, in one of their final collective actions, Federico Cesi’s companions decided to nominate Sforza Pallavicino, Pietro della Valle, and Lukas Holste to the Academy of the Linceans.¹ According to Giuseppe Gabrieli, it was Cesi himself—founder and head of the Academy—who gathered the biographical notes to be jotted down on the minutes of the meeting by the Secretary Johannes Faber.²

All three nominations were founded on a trust in the future development of the men’s activities. Cesi extolled the virtues of the erudite polyglot Lukas Holste—Greek and Latin poet, geographer, bibliophile, and philologist—from whose “exertion with the pen” (“lavoro di penna”) “the most beautiful works” (“bellissime fatighe”) were expected. According to the prince, della Valle deserved membership for his “thoughtful diligence of observations” (“studiosa diligentia d’osservazioni”) during his voyage to the Orient, for his personal erudition, and for his kindly disposition toward men of letters. As for Pallavicino, when summarizing his early scholastic and academic endeavours, Cesi portrayed him as a child prodigy, whose great *ingegno* (“ingegno grande”), relentless will (“volontà indefessa”), and his familiarity with writing (“l’amicitia

* This research received funds from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 799769.

1 Gabrieli G., “Verbali delle adunanze e cronaca della prima Accademia Lincea: 1603–1630” (1927), in idem, *Contributi per la storia dell’Accademia dei Lincei*, vol. 1 (Rome: 1989) 497–550, at 547.

2 Gabrieli G., “L’orizzonte intellettuale e morale di Federico Cesi illustrato da un suo zibaldone inedito”, in *Rendiconti della Reale accademia nazionale dei Lincei* 6.14 (1938) 27–77, at 65. The minutes of the meeting are preserved in BANLC, *Archivio Linceo-Accad.* 12, fol. 274r. Gabrieli attributes the notes of eulogy to Federico Cesi in “La Germania lincea: ovvero Lincei e linceabili tedeschi della prima Accademia: in particolare di Teofilo Müller”, in idem, *Contributi* 311–330, at 323. This is also true according to Martin Fogel’s notes of the history of the Academy, see Fogel M., *Lynceorum historia: le schede lincee di Martin Fogel*, eds. Camerota M., Ottaviani, A., Trabucco O. (Rome: 2021) 357.

stretta della penna”) held promise “of even greater things” (“di cose tuttavia maggiori”) in the future.³

The choice to nominate three such characters for the Academy—men without manifest interest in scientific investigation, but above all perfectly assimilated into the “uniform horizon of the inclusive patronage of the Barberinis”—has been read as a sign of Cesi’s renunciation to claim the realm of science as the specific purview of his Academy.⁴ If examined from another angle, however, these same considerations provide proof of the fact that Cesi’s was a politically opportune choice, made with foresight by the prince at a time when his health continued to decline. Plagued by kidney problems since 1626, in September 1628 he wrote to Galileo that he was feeling somewhat better, after a long crisis: “... something else remains for me [to do], and that is to explain the reasons behind my long silence. Your Lordship can imagine, in addition to the health shock of a kidney ailment for the last three years, from which I have partly recovered.”⁵ According to surviving sources, in the year 1629 Cesi wrote one single letter, with birthday wishes to Cassiano dal Pozzo.⁶

I would go further. To me it seems that each of the three final nominations represents three different ‘souls’—which could behave like different pressure groups, when necessary—that coexisted within the Academy at that moment. The final appointments ensured that each of the parties would have the possibility to direct and negotiate the appointment of the prince’s successor, and prefigured three different scenarios for the post-Cesi era. In January 1629, the German proselyte Holste had been in Rome for two years, as secretary to the cardinal nephew, a position he assumed the same year in which Francesco Barberini was named Vatican librarian. Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc had recommended him to the Barberini, after hearing good things about him from the Dupuy brothers in Paris, where Holste had served as librarian to the president of Parliament, Jean-Antoine de Mesmes, a friend of the two scholars.⁷ A figure

3 See note 1. On Sforza Pallavicino, see Favino F., “Pallavicino, Francesco Maria Sforza,” in *DBI*, vol. 80 (2014) 512–518, [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/francesco-maria-sforza-pallavicino_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/francesco-maria-sforza-pallavicino_(Dizionario-Biografico)).

4 Bellini E., “Il papato dei Virtuosi! I Lincei e i Barberini,” in idem, *Stili di pensiero nel Seicento italiano: Galileo, i Lincei, i Barberini* (Pisa: 2009) 109–157, esp. 136–138.

5 Federico Cesi to Galileo Galilei, Rome, 9 September 1628, in Gabrieli G., *Il carteggio Linceo* (Rome: 1996) 1180. See also Cesi’s letter to Galileo of 28 January 1628 in *ibid.* 1158 and note.

6 Gabrieli, *Il Carteggio* 1206–1207.

7 See note 1. On Holste, see Almagià R., *L’opera geografica di Luca Holstenio* (Vatican City: 1949); Lejay P., “Lucas Holstenius,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 7 (New York: 1910) (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/07397a.htm>.) and Visceglia M.A., “La Biblioteca tra Urbano VII (15–27 settembre 1590) e Urbano VIII (1623–1644): Cardinali bibliotecari, custodi, scriptores,” in Montuschi C. (ed.), *La Vaticana nel Seicento (1590–1700): Una biblioteca di biblioteche*

of international stature and a member of the Republic of Letters, who engaged in dialogue with the Academy through Cassiano dal Pozzo and his epistolary network, according to my reading of the events, Holste could have played a role in the succession of the Academy's leadership and guaranteed its future. He may have served as a personal link to patrons capable of relocating the Academy to the Barberini court and thus placing it under the most powerful form of protection, while circumventing inconveniences (such as the requirement that the prince resides at the Academy) that would have prevented the cardinal nephew from assuming its leadership.⁸

Della Valle, meanwhile, would have been the natural candidate from that group of Linceans still working on the publication of the *Tesoro messicano*.⁹ Talk of his nomination had been circulating since May 1626, several months after della Valle had arrived in Naples from his long voyage to the East (from Greece to Persia, then India, and returning via Mesopotamia).¹⁰ Della Valle had developed close ties with the "Neapolitan colony" of the Academy prior to, during, and after this voyage. From 1614 on and throughout his long absence from Italy, he maintained a rich correspondence (fifty-four descriptive letters) with Mario Schipano, the archiater of the Hospital of Santa Annunziata in Naples. Schipano held public readings of his letters to several of the city's men of science, including Fabio Colonna, Colantonio Stigliola, and Ferrante Imperato, who also got in contact with della Valle.¹¹ This epistolary exchange allowed the

(Vatican City: 2014) 77–123. On the 'system' of scientific academies in Barberini Rome, see Favino F., "Marvellous Conjunction? The Academy of Maurizio di Savoia between Politics and 'New Science'", in Donato M.P. – Krays J. (eds.), *Conflicting Duties: Science, Medicine and Religion in Rome, 1550–1750* (London – Turin: 2009) 135–155.

- 8 On these obstacles, see De Angelis G., "Notizie inedite sulla prima giovinezza di Federico Cesi: una conferma delle fonti francescane della spiritualità cesiana", in Battistini A. – de Angelis G. – Olmi G. (eds.), *All'origine della scienza moderna: Federico Cesi e l'Accademia dei Lincei* (Bologna: 2007) 17–105. According to De Angelis, however, common residence and the public use of the library would have been 'maximum security' provisions inserted by Cesi into the *Praescriptiones Lynceae Academiae* precisely with the aim of thwarting Barberini's possible succession as head of his Academy (19–20).
- 9 Cadeddu M.E. – Guardo M. (eds.), *Il tesoro messicano: libri e saperi tra Europa e Nuovo Mondo* (Florence: 2013), with earlier bibliography, and Brevaglieri S., *Natural desiderio di sapere: Roma barocca fra vecchi e nuovi mondi* (Rome: 2019).
- 10 Salvante R., *Il pellegrino in Oriente: La Turchia di Pietro Della Valle (1614–1617)* (Florence: 1997) 46. See also Micocci C. – La Via S., "Della Valle, Pietro", in *DBI*, vol. 37 (Rome: 1989), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-della-valle_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pietro-della-valle_(Dizionario-Biografico)), Ben-Zaken A., "From Naples to Goa and back: a secretive Galilean messenger and a radical hermeneutist", *History of Science* 47 (2009) 147–174, and *Diario di Pietro della Valle di alcune cose memorabili*, ed. G. Venditti (Rome: Bardi, 2019).
- 11 Salvante, *Il pellegrino in Oriente* (see previous note), Cardin C. (ed.), *Appendice e passim; La porta d'Oriente: lettere di Pietro Della Valle: Istanbul, 1614* (Rome: 2001); Brevaglieri S., "Il cantiere del Tesoro Messicano tra Roma e l'Europa. Pratiche di comunicazione e strategie editoriali nell'orizzonte dell'Accademia dei Lincei (1610–1630)", in

Lincaeans in Naples direct confrontations with the distant, unknown natural world that Della Valle was exploring in person, confrontations that were to emerge in Fabio Colonna's later *Adnotationes* to the *Tesoro messicano* (that is, in the commentary on the Mexican flora that Nando Antonio Recchi's text covered).

An echo of these relationships with Neapolitan learned men seems to resound in Cesi's reference to the "kindly disposition" that Della Valle had displayed towards the Lincaean *litterati*. Indeed, he had willingly let himself be gently steered, from a distance, away from the objects that attracted his diletantism, toward more precise and detailed research of the natural world and more rigorous ways of collecting and conserving.¹² Also after his return to Rome in the spring of 1627, he had made himself available on multiple occasions to relate what he had witnessed, with regard to the task of completing the Mexican annotations pursued by Colonna.¹³ It was during this trip—as Colonna himself noted—that Della Valle offered evidence of his ample financial means, resources that could in fact have secured the fate of universal knowledge if they had been allocated to objectives of a scholarly kind.¹⁴ In short, in 1629, thanks to his financial means and his sensitivity to the study of nature, "the pilgrim of the East" would have permitted the Academy not only to survive, but also to complete the work that stood as the "emblem of Lincaean activity," as it illustrated the team work of the Academy and represented the outcome of the academic commitment to spreading knowledge and the fame of the society through books.¹⁵

If such a reading is valid, then to what party can Pallavicino's candidacy be traced? And what fate would have befallen the Academy had he succeeded Cesi as its prince?

Brevaglieri S. – Guerrini L. – Solinas F., *Sul Tesoro Messicano e su alcuni disegni del Museo Cartaceo di Cassiano dal Pozzo* (Rome: 2007) 23–36.

12 Brevaglieri, *Il cantiere* 28 and note.

13 Ibid. 31–36.

14 Gabrieli, *Carteggio* 1117–1118, as cited in Salvante, *Il Pellegrino* 45–46: 'se vi fossero molti che volessero et potessero spendere et fare in suo genere diverso di curiosità quello che lui ha fatto, beato il mondo, che si comunicaria in breve ogni cosa per tutto' ('if there were many who wished and were able to spend and do the same thing that he did, even if of a different kind of curiosity, blessed [would be] the world, because everything would be transmitted everywhere in a short time'). See also Brevaglieri, "Il cantiere del Tesoro Messicano" 24.

15 Raimondi E., *Il romanzo senza idillio. Saggio sui Promessi Sposi* (Turin: 1974) 26–35, 237.

2 'Dimidium mei'

Biographies of Pallavicino, even the most apologetic ones, make no mystery of the close friendship that bound him, from the time of his youth, to Monsignor Giovanni Battista Ciampoli. The anonymous author of the earliest biography of Pallavicino, in *Vite dei Cardinali* [*Lives of the Cardinals*] compiled by Alfonso Chacón, writes:

Some of his father's friends introduced Giovanni Ciampoli to him almost like the smartest man among the learned men ('prince of the *ingegni*'). In fact, Ciampoli had an admirable mind, even if boastful and brash. Following Ciampoli's guide [...] Pallavicino started an open and harsh struggle against the Aristotelian Philosophy.¹⁶

The passage alludes summarily to events in Sforza's life prior to his departure for the governorate in 1632, under circumstances to which we shall return.¹⁷ In the years in which he was completing an "official" trajectory of study in anticipation of his entry into the prelacy—a degree in philosophy at the Collegio Romano (1625), a degree *in utroque* at the Sapienza (1625), and a doctorate in theology, likewise from the Jesuits (1628)—the young Pallavicino did in fact pursue a sort of extra-institutional instruction in anti-Aristotelianism from his friend Giovanni Battista Ciampoli. Situated at the intersection between the "school" of Galileo and the environment of the Roman Curia, Ciampoli (1589–1643) is a key figure for understanding the relationship between science and religion in the age of the Counter-Reformation. A descendant of an impoverished branch of the Cavalcanti family, Ciampoli had been raised by the maecenas and madrigalist Giovan Battista Strozzi the Younger (1551–1634). Endowed with a prodigious talent for composing verse, he frequented the court of the Grand Duke Ferdinand de' Medici from his youth and became a close friend of Prince Cosimo. In the summer of 1608 he met Galileo at the

16 Ciaconius Alphonsus O.P. – Oldoinus Augustinus S.J., *Vitae et res gestae pontificum romanorum et S.R.E. Cardinalium*, vol. 4 (Rome, Tip. De Rossi: 1677) cols. 737–41, at 738: 'cum [...] auctoritatem sequeretur Ioannis Ciampoli eidem Urbano ab epistolis, quem sibi nonnulli paterni amici quasi Principem ingeniorum colendum proposuerant, quique ut erat magni quidem & admirabilis, sed ambitiosi, praecipitisque ingenii, atrox et apertum Peripateticae Philosophiae bellum indixerat'. The author of Pallavicino's biography may have been Oldoini himself, or else Agostino Favoriti, the secretary of the Cardinal College during the pontificate of Alexander VII, and Pallavicino's personal friend.

17 Favino F., "'Quel petardo di mia fortuna'. Riconsiderando la 'caduta' di Giovan Battista Ciampoli", in Montesinos J. – Solís C. (eds.), *Largo campo di filosofare. Eurosymposium Galileo 2001* (Orotava: 2001) 863–882.

villa of the Grand Duke, and became his loyal disciple and advocate for the rest of his life. Established by Strozzi in a curial career after receiving his degree in jurisprudence in Pisa in 1614, and through patronage ties with some of Rome's most powerful families, he rose to the position of secretary of secret briefs to princes, first under the Ludovisi Pope, Gregory XV in 1621, then under the Barberini Pope, Urban VIII in 1623.¹⁸

By this time Ciampoli shared with Pope Urban (and by extension—through their friendship—with a still “downy-chinned” Pallavicino)¹⁹ a close knowledge of and adherence to the ethics and literary aesthetics of the so-called Barberini circle: moralizing but nonetheless open to Marinism. As a matter of fact, in the early thirties, Ciampoli published a manifesto of this aesthetics in his *Poetica sacra* (“sacred poetics”), which he wished to see built upon scriptural and hagiographic foundations.²⁰ At the same time, his confirmation as secretary of briefs in 1623 was the seal of protection accorded by Urban VIII

-
- 18 Biographical notes in Ciampoli D., *Un amico del Galilei: monsignor Giovanni Ciampoli*, in *Nuovi studi letterari e bibliografici* (Rocca San Casciano: 1900) 5–170; Favaro A., “Amici e corrispondenti di Galileo. Giovanni Ciampoli”, *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti* 62.2 (1902–1903) 91–145, now in Favaro A., *Amici e corrispondenti di Galilei*, vol. 1, ed. P. Galluzzi (Florence: 1983) 133–189; De Ferrari A., “Ciampoli, Giovanni Battista”, in *DBI*, vol. 25 (Rome: 1981), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-battista-ciampoli_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giovanni-battista-ciampoli_(Dizionario-Biografico)).
- 19 APUG, ms. 132, fol. 5v: ‘Un anonimo biografo di Pallavicino, che gli fu sicuramente molto vicino in vita, ricordava a proposito della sua precocissima vocazione intellettuale come persino “quel literatissimo principe e insieme serissima pontefice Urbano VIII non riputò disdicevole d’ammetterlo, tutto che giovane di prima lanugine, alla sua familiare conversatione, chiamandolo insieme con mons.r Ciampoli assai frequentemente a’ passar seco in eruditi discorsi l’ore più noiose del dopo pranzo, che tal’era quell’onesto rilassamento che dalle cure d’un mondo si prendea quel savio principe’. (‘An anonymous biographer of Pallavicino, who was definitely very close to him in life, recalled apropos his highly precocious intellectual calling, how even “that most highly literate prince and simultaneously most severe pope, Urban VIII did not deem it improper to admit him, still very young and with a downy chin, to his private conversations, inviting him along with Mons.r Ciampoli quite frequently to spend the most tedious hours of the afternoon in learned discourse with him, as such was the upright escape that that wise prince took from the cares of the world”).
- 20 Bellini E., *Umanisti e Lincei. Letteratura e scienza a Roma nell’età di Galileo* (Padua: 1997) 90–145. On Ciampoli’s poetry, see Apollonio S., “Per una lettura dei *Fasti sacri* di Sforza Pallavicino”, in Pallavicino Sforza, *I Fasti sacri. Edizione critica e commento*, ed. S. Apollonio (Lecce: 2015) 45–46, 109–111 and *passim*, Geri L., “Le ‘Meditazioni davidiche’ di Giovanni Ciampoli”, in Pettinelli R.A. et al. (eds.), *La Bibbia in poesia: volgarizzamenti dei Salmi e poesia religiosa in età moderna* (Rome: 2015) 227–250, and Apollonio S., “Ciampoli Giovanni”, in Ballarini M. (ed.), *Dizionario biblico della Letteratura Italiana* (Milan: 2018) 259–261. For a fine-tuned literary history, see also Russo E., “Sul barocco letterario in Italia. Giudizi, revisioni, distinzioni”, *Les Dossiers du Grihl* 2 (2012) (<https://>

to the Lincaean Academy, into which Ciampoli had been accepted thanks to Galileo in 1618.²¹

It remains unclear who were the “paternal friends” the early biography in Ciacon’s *Lives* refers to who introduced the young man to monsignore Ciampoli as a “Prince of the *ingegni*”.²² One may presume, however, that they were erudite aristocratic members of Rome’s “Farnese clan,” whom the Marquis Alessandro Pallavicino naturally found himself joining after seeking refuge in the city.²³ As the widower of cardinal Odoardo Farnese’s natural daughter, and bound through a second marriage to a descendent of Paul III, Alessandro belonged to this clique by right.²⁴ Until 1622, when the cardinal moved to Parma to deal with dynastic feuds on behalf of the young Duke Odoardo, the common home of the group’s descendents had been the palazzo that “Duarte” (Cardinal Odoardo) had inherited from the “great Cardinal” Alessandro, his uncle.²⁵

journals.openedition.org/dossiersgrhl/5223 [accessed July 8, 2022]). See also the contributions by Apollonio, Riga and Metlica in this volume.

- 21 De Ferrari, *Ciampoli* 149 n17.
- 22 Ciaconius – Oldoinus, *Vitae* col. 738.
- 23 Favino F., “Le ragioni del patronage: i Farnese di Roma e Galileo”, in Bucciantini M. – Camerota M. – Giudice F. (eds.), *Il caso Galileo: una rilettura storica, filosofica, teologica. Convegno internazionale di studi, Florence, 26–30 May 2009* (Florence: 2011) 163–185.
- 24 The personal fortunes of Alessandro Pallavicino di Zabello, a fascinating character of the late Renaissance, intersect with those of his fiefdom. See Ghizzoni V., “Soprusi dei Farnese ai danni dei Pallavicino nella seconda metà del Cinquecento”, *Archivio storico per le province parmensi* 9 (1967) 149–161; Boscarelli M., “La conquista farnesiana dello Stato Pallavicino”, *Archivi per la storia* 1 (1988) 185–197. Alessandro’s first marriage was to Lavinia Farnese (d. 1605), the illegitimate daughter of Duke Ottavio, with whom he had a daughter, Vittoria Eufrosina, born in Parma in 1587, and a son, Francesco Maria (b. in Salò in 1597, and dead before 1607); see Litta P., “Pallavicino”, in *Famiglie celebri italiane* (Milan: 1819) table XXVII. In 1607 he took as his second wife Francesca Sforza di Santa Fiora (1573–1621), by then the widow of the Marquis Ascanio della Corgna, lord of Castiglione del Lago. Scipione Tolomei, the court secretary, described her to her first husband as ‘tall rather than short, thin rather than fat [...] who would seem mediocre among beauties and a beauty among the mediocre’ (*Lettere* [Perugia, nella Stampa Augusta: 1617] 47). The marriage produced nine children: Sforza Pallavicino’s ‘uterine brothers’ Duke Fulvio Alessandro (1589–1647), Marcantonio Federico (b. 1590, prelate), and Diomede Prospero (b. 1596); the twins Porzia Maura and Margherita Laura (b. 1598, both of whom entered a convent in 1610); Vittoria (b. 1599) and Margherita (b. 1600). To these could also be added Giuseppe (later bishop of Caserta, Squillace, and Orvieto), and Fabio, a painter (Donati-Guerrieri M.G., *Lo Stato di Castiglione del Lago e i della Corgna* [Perugia: 1972] 236–238).
- 25 For a biographical portrait of Odoardo Farnese, see Robertson C. – Zapperi R., “Odoardo Farnese, duca di Parma e di Piacenza”, in *DBI*, vol. 45 (Rome: 1995), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/odoardo-farnese-duca-di-parma-e-di-piacenza_\(Dizionario-Biografico\);](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/odoardo-farnese-duca-di-parma-e-di-piacenza_(Dizionario-Biografico);) Zapperi R., *Eros e Controriforma: preistoria della galleria Farnese* (Turin: 1994) *passim*.

In 1611, on the occasion of his trip to Rome to demonstrate the telescope, it was in palazzo Farnese that Galileo had made the acquaintance of several members of this clan, showing them how to observe new things in the sky through the instrument, but also seizing the opportunity to “suggest” to them that the heliocentric theory had acquired the status of “absolute truth” thanks to the discovery of the Medicean planets and phases of Venus.²⁶ Odoardo had owned a telescope—a gift from Galileo—since the fall of 1610, and had used it in the countryside to “change his mind (*‘discredersi’*)” about the nature of celestial bodies.²⁷ Meanwhile, Lotario Conti, the Duke of Poli and son of Torquato and Violante Farnese,²⁸ had, after meeting Galileo, begun working on a personal solution to the cosmology of Genesis on the assumption of the existence of the heliocentric structure that he had learned from Galileo.²⁹ At Palazzo Farnese, Galileo also became personally acquainted with Cardinal Carlo Conti, Lotario’s brother, from whom in the summer of 1612 he requested a theologically qualified opinion on the actual conformity of Aristotle’s cosmological system to the dictates of the Holy Scriptures.³⁰ This was likely the setting in which the future Lincean Virginio Cesarini had his first opportunity to establish personal and direct ties with the scientist. The nephew, on his father’s side, of Clelia Farnese, who was the natural daughter of Cardinal Alessandro, Cesarini was studying at the Collegio di S. Rocco in Parma in 1611, and living with his brother Alessandro in the palazzo of the duke Ranuccio Farnese, his cousin.³¹ His presence is not recorded

On the *gran cardinale*, see Andretta S. – Robertson C., “Farnese, Alessandro”, in *DBI*, vol. 45 (Rome: 1995), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/alessandro-farnese_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/alessandro-farnese_(Dizionario-Biografico)); Robertson C., *‘Il Gran Cardinale’: The Artistic Patronage of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese* (New Haven: 1992); Fragnito G., *Storia di Clelia Farnese. Amori, potere, violenza nella Roma della Contoriforma* (Bologna: 2013) *passim*.

26 Camerota M., *Galileo Galilei e la cultura scientifica nell’età della Controriforma* (Rome: 2004) 254–255.

27 Odoardo Farnese to Galileo, Rome, 24 December 1610 (OG, x, 494–495).

28 Andretta S., “Conti, Lotario”, in *DBI*, vol. 28 (Rome: 1983), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lotario-conti_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lotario-conti_(Dizionario-Biografico)). Violante was the illegitimate daughter of Duke Odoardo I.

29 Favino, *Le ragioni del patronage* 175–181.

30 On the correspondence between Carlo Conti and Galileo, see Poppi A., “La lettera del cardinale Carlo Conti a Galileo su cosmologia aristotelica e Bibbia (7 luglio 1612): l’approdo galileiano alla nuova ermeneutica biblica”, *Atti e Memorie dell’Accademia Patavina di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Parte III: Memorie della Classe di Scienze Morali, Lettere ed Arti* 109 (1996–1997) 131–158; Galilei Galileo, *Scienza e religione. Scritti copernicani*, ed. M. Bucciattini and M. Camerota (Rome: 2009) ix.

31 Bertoni L., “Cesarini, Alessandro”, in *DBI*, vol. 24 (Rome: 1980) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/alessandro-cesarini_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/alessandro-cesarini_(Dizionario-Biografico)); Mutini C., “Cesarini, Virginio”, in *DBI*, vol. 24 (Rome: 1980), <https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/virginio-cesarini>

in Galileo's chronicles of his sojourn in Rome. However, it is easy to imagine the conversations between the young Cesarini and Robert Bellarmine, a close friend of Cardinal Farnese, at the court of "Duarte." According to the biographers of Cesarini, at that time Bellarmine would have attempted to direct Cesarini towards a "peripatetic philosophy" more "orthodox" than the one he had picked up in Parma, and urged him to reconsider, through the composition of a treatise, the grave problem of the soul's immortality.³² As for Alessandro Pallavicino, he had been an admirer of Galileo from the outset. Already in 1596, as an exile on the Riviera di Salò, where he had repaired after the expropriation of his portion of the Pallavicino State due to the maneuvers of his father-in-law, he had tried to engage the scientist as a private tutor for his oldest daughter.³³

When Giovanni Ciampoli arrived in Rome in 1614 to enter the prelacy, and before the "affair" of 1616 had chilled relations between the Farnese in Rome and Galileo, he must have had easy access to the Farnese entourage. From 1616 onward, the correspondence certainly portrays Ciampoli as being steadily at the side of Virginio Cesarini, who was back in Rome by this point, particularly after Ciampoli moved to Cesarini's home in the capacity of secretary and assistant, at the time when Cesarini's ill health was so unpredictable. The different stages and important implications of the friendship between the two "Lincaean prelates," which crossed the border between "two cultures"—the literary and the scientific—are now well known.³⁴ They shared an interest in Galileo's intellectual "brilliance" and diplomatic efforts to sustain his cultural battle within the Curia, that led them both to join the Linceans in 1618.

_(Dizionario-Biografico). The origins of this branch of the Cesarini family and its kinship with the Farnese are described in Fragnito, *Storia di Clelia Farnese, passim*.

32 The information is documented in Gottifredi Alessandro, *In funere Virginii Cesarini* (Rome, Apud Alexandr. Zanettum: 1624) 19–20. On sources, see Bellini, *Umanisti e Lincei* 245ff. and Guardo M., "Iustus Riquius e la Vita Virginii Caesarini. Fonti, tematiche e stile", in Corradini M. – Ferro R. – Girardi M.T. (eds.), *Dal 'mondo scritto' al 'mondo figurato': Studi di letteratura italiana per Eraldo Bellini* (Pisa: 2021) 41–53.

33 Bettoni F., *Storia della riviera di Salò* (Salò: 1880) 215. In the following century, the palazzo passed into the estate of the Counts Martinengo of Brescia. It was precisely in this palazzo, 'in the same sack with other similar documents pertaining to the Pallavicini family of Parma', that Antonio Favaro found an autographed letter from Galileo—dated in Padua, 14 June 1596—to an anonymous recipient, whom he suggested be identified as Alessandro Pallavicino or perhaps his father Alfonso (OG, x [1934] 66–67).

34 Bellini, *Umanisti e Lincei, passim*; idem, *Stili di pensiero, passim*. See also Gabrieli G., "Due prelati lincei in Roma alla corte di Urbano VIII: Virginio Cesarini e Giovanni Ciampoli", *Atti dell'Accademia degli Arcadi e scritti dei soci* 13 (1929/1930) 171–200, now in Gabrieli, *Contributi* 763–785.

Despite the significant differences,³⁵ they shared a literary ethic in which the lyrical poetry of love yielded to the praise of moral virtue celebrated with a pronounced neo-stoic accent, and to sacred history, as well as an aesthetic in which classicism was polemically opposed to the “Baroque frisson,” yet without renouncing the “verbal ordeals of a perplexing *conzettismo*.”³⁶

For a short time, this intellectual friendship also involved the very young Pallavicino. Indeed, a much later recollection of the Arcadian Raffaele Fabretti depicts Pallavicino, along with Giovanni Ciampoli, Agostino Mascardi, Fulvio Testi, John Barclay, and Giulio Strozzi, participating in the conversation led by Cesarini in a period that can reasonably be dated to 1620–21.³⁷ A text composed by Ciampoli in the years of his exile—the *Dialogo Logica* or *De Intellectione*—documents the group’s intense work on the gnosiological, ethical, and political implications of a resurgent skepticism.³⁸ An echo of Pallavicino’s participation in these discussions lingers in his youthful oration, “Se sia più nobile l’intelletto o la volontà” (“On whether the intellect or the will be the more noble”), recited at the assembly of the Academy of Cardinal Prince Maurice of Savoy on December 30, 1624. In it, Pallavicino, still a student at the Collegio Romano, reaffirmed the autonomy and value of the will in the various spheres of human action, in controversy with the theory of the rational choice sustained by the Aristotelian philosophers.³⁹ The work dates only a few months prior to the sole

35 Apollonio, *Per una lettura* 26.

36 Raimondi E., “Alla ricerca del classicismo”, in his *Anatomie secentesche* (Pisa: 1966) 41. On Cesarini’s activity as a poet, see Bonaccorsi T., “*Clausum rerum aperire sinus*. L’esperienza di un poeta linceo: Virginio Cesarini”, *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 7.1 (2001) 51–76; Ardisino E., “*Pietas, curiositas et poesis* nell’attività dell’Accademia dei Lincei. Intorno a Virginio Cesarini”, in Battistini – De Angelis – Olmi (eds.), *All’origine della scienza moderna* 147–173.

37 Favino F., *La filosofia naturale di Giovanni Ciampoli* (Firenze: 2015) 43–44. The report regarding Cesarini’s private conversations is discussed by Domenico Riviera, author of *Vita di Raffaello Fabretti urbinata [...] trasportata dal testo latino [...], nel nostro volgare dal can. Gio. Mario Crescimbeni [...]* among *Le vite degli Arcadi illustri*, ed. Crescimbeni Giovanni Mario (Rome, Antonio de’ Rossi: 1708) 104.

38 Favino F., “Scetticismo ed empirismo: Ciampoli linceo”, in Battistini – De Angelis – Olmi (eds.), *All’origine della scienza moderna* 175–203. The dialogue has now been published in Favino, *La filosofia naturale* 183–249.

39 Favino, *La filosofia naturale* 52–56. On the academy of Maurice of Savoy, erroneously identified as the Accademia dei Desiosi, see Merolla R., *L’Accademia dei Desiosi* (Roma: 2008) with essays by Laura Alemanno, Stefano Arena, and Debora Vagnoni; and Favino F., “Marvellous Conjecture?” The oration was later published in *Saggi accademici dati in Roma nell’Accademia del Serenissimo Principe cardinal di Savoia da diversi nobilissimi ingegni, raccolti e pubblicati da monsignor Agostino Mascardi* (Venice, Bartolomeo Fontana: 1630) 50–70.

document of his involvement in the cosmological discussions that occupied the Linceans in those years. According to the testimony of the Florentine patrician Mario Guiducci, in June 1624, Pallavicino, along with his uncle Virgilio Malvezzi, dissuaded the Jesuit Orazio Grassi, on the grounds of his obviously inferior argumentative skills, from entering into a polemic with Galileo regarding the latter's theory on "secondary qualities" expounded in the *Saggiatore* (*Starry Messenger*).⁴⁰ By this point, however, Cesarini had died, at age 29, from complications arising from chronic tuberculosis.⁴¹ From the late 1620s on—when documents next become available—Pallavicino seems to have recreated the same rapport with Ciampoli that the latter had enjoyed previously with Cesarini.

In keeping with the classical and particularly stoic concept of friendship that continued to imbue intellectual relationships among male scholars in the seventeenth century, Pallavicino henceforth became Ciampoli's favorite associate, sharing intellectual activity and inspiration, a beloved companion whom he met daily, to foster mutual moral betterment from their fond familiarity.⁴² Furthermore, as the social ranks of Pallavicino, an aristocrat, and Ciampoli, a prelate of lesser birth, were asymmetrical, the relationship could be transformed, if necessary, to one of patronage, as had already happened in the past between Ciampoli and Cesarini. In 1628, when speaking about his doctoral thesis in theology to his friend Paganino Gaudenzi, a lector in rhetoric in Pisa, Pallavicino mentioned Ciampoli, whose verses had provided him respite from those long and demanding sessions, and called him "my other half" ("dimidium mei").⁴³ As we have seen, on 27 January 1629, Pallavicino was inducted into the Academy of the Linceans. In Galileo's letters and in the correspondence of Roman and Florentine scholars between August 1629 and January 1632, Pallavicino always appears at Ciampoli's side at the meetings of the "continuous enviable conversation ... in which the discussion always revolves around

40 Mario Guiducci to Galileo Galilei, Rome, 23 June 1624, O.G., XIII, 186.

41 Mutini, "Cesarini".

42 Lochman D.T. – Lopez M. – Hutson L. (eds.), *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1700* (Aldershot: 2011). On Lincean friendship in particular, see Biagioli M., "Knowledge, Freedom, and Brotherly Love: Homosociality and the Accademia dei Lincei", *Configurations* 3.2 (1995) 139–166.

43 Sforza Pallavicino to Paganino Gaudenzi, 22 December 1628, BAV, *Urb. lat.* 1629, f. 20r. For biographical and bibliographical information on Gaudenzi, see Brunelli G., "Gaudenzi, Paganino", in *DBI*, vol. 52 (Rome: 1999), [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/paganino-gaudenzi_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/paganino-gaudenzi_(Dizionario-Biografico)). On his activity as a historiographer, see also Callard C., *Le Prince et la République. Histoire, pouvoir et société dans la Florence des Médicis au XVII^e siècle* (Paris: 2007).

literature” (“continua invidiabil conversatione ... dove sempre si ragiona di lettere”), which the secretary regularly held at his lodgings in the Vatican Torre dei Venti (Tower of the Winds).⁴⁴

3 Which Kind of Academy? Galileo in Power

Ciampoli’s gatherings were not simply some late humanist literary circle; its composition reveals other objectives. It was a private academy open to literary philosophers—either residents of Rome or foreigners passing through—who clearly sided with the “new” faction. Among those who participated occasionally were the philosopher Tommaso Campanella and the mathematician Benedetto Castelli, as well as Galileo’s Florentine patrician fans, Vincenzo Capponi and Orazio Ricasoli Rucellai. Those engaged more regularly included the Scottish cleric George Conn, a polemical theologian and a secret chamberlain of Francesco Barberini, and Antonio Grimani, the secretary’s chamber musician and castrato. Inevitably present were Pallavicino and Andrea Conti, the youngest son of Lotario mentioned earlier.

At this time, Pallavicino and Conti had many things in common—first and foremost their age. Although the latter’s birthdate is not recorded,⁴⁵ we know for certain that Conti received his doctorate in philosophy from the Collegio Romano in 1627, only two years after Pallavicino did, during a ceremony that was just as sumptuous as Sforza’s.⁴⁶ Around twenty years Ciampoli’s juniors, Pallavicino, who was born in 1607, and Conti were the two most brilliant graduates of the Collegio Romano of their generation. Pallavicino has already been discussed here; as for Conti, the single trait that distinguished him within his family’s genealogies is a pronounced tendency towards intellectual speculation.⁴⁷ In 1634, by which time “the ideas of the innovators had exploded,” Ciampoli, writing to Giovanni Battista Strozzi from exile, presented Conti (then governor of Fermo) as “my pupil who had participated regularly

44 See Favino F., “A proposito dell’atomismo di Galileo: da una lettera di Tommaso Campanella ad uno scritto di Giovanni Ciampoli”, *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 3,3 (1997) 265–282; idem, *La filosofia naturale* 92–96, for a discussion on the information below. On Grimani, see Rismondo P.A., “Antonio Grimani ‘musicista galileiano’ tra Venezia e Roma”, *Recercare* 31, 1/2 (2019) 103–128.

45 See Dionigi Marco, *Genealogia di casa Conti* (Parma, per gli eredi d’Erasmus Viotti: 1653) 175; Cascioli G., *Memorie storiche di Poli con molte notizie inedite della celebre famiglia Conti di Guadagnolo* (Rome: 1896) 177; Weber C. (ed.), *Legati e governatori dello Stato Pontificio (1550–1809)* (Rome: 1994) 592.

46 Avviso di Roma, 20 January 1627, BAV, *Urb. lat.* 1097, fols. 36r–36v. More space is granted to the ceremony celebrating Pallavicino’s graduation in the Roman *Avvisi* (see those of September 6 and 10 1625, in BAV, *Urb. lat.* 1095, fols. 538r, 546r).

47 Dionigi, *Genealogia* 175; Cascioli, *Memorie* 177.

in my discussion group in Rome."⁴⁸ Clearly, in Ciampoli's mind, his discussion group was intended as an actual school, founded to direct the best minds of future rulers toward a view of nature, man, society, and the state that was no longer dictated by Aristotle and St. Thomas through the mouthpiece of the Jesuits. According to language borrowed from the religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants and likewise adopted by the Lincaeans when describing the recruitment of new members,⁴⁹ Ciampoli's academy intended to 'convert' the *crème de la crème* of Rome's young aristocrats to "re-mold" their mental attitude. These aristocrats, Ciampoli believed, would one day provide a substantial portion of the papal bureaucracy, of the college of cardinals, and thus perhaps lead to a pope capable not only of revoking the anti-Copernican decree, but also of keeping the Church in step with the challenges of modernity.

But what were the teachings of this school? What was the worldview that Ciampoli wished to forge in the minds of his young listeners in the hope of seeing it translated into government action one day? As noted, we have no direct evidence about these matters. Indeed, Ciampoli formulated his system of thought only in the years of his exile, which began in 1632. He committed it to a series of texts in prose left incomplete at his death in 1643, prose that censorship proceeded to render even more riddled with lacunas. As I have shown elsewhere on the basis of the inventory of Ciampoli's possessions and letters as well as textual correlations, his texts must have consisted of three parts: a first—the earliest one—devoted to "political and sacred matters";⁵⁰ a second of a largely mechanical nature, inspired by Galileo's *Discorsi e dimostrazioni matematiche* (*Discourses and Mathematical Demonstrations*), which was already available by 1640;⁵¹ and a third on natural philosophy, written in dialogue form and begun only after 1641, and which drew on a stock of experiences from before his exile.⁵² What remained of the first two was published in the seventeenth century in three different posthumous anthologies, two

48 Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, *Magliab.* VIII.1399, fol. 5v.

49 De Renzi S., "Courts and Conversions: Intellectual Battle and Natural Knowledge in Counter-Reformation Rome", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 21.4 (1996) 429–434.

50 Giovanni Ciampoli to Caspar Schopp, 11 November 1638, in *Lettere di monsignor Giovanni Ciampoli. Con l'aggiunta in questa terza impressione di altre molte lettere del medesimo, e d'vna sua canzone non piu' stampate, insieme con la vita dell'autore, descritta dal sig. Alessandro Pozzobonelli* (Venice – Macerata, Grisei and G. Piccini: 1666) 66.

51 Francesco Stelluti to Cassiano dal Pozzo, 2 August 1640, in Nicolò A., "Corrispondenza inedita di Francesco Stelluti a Cassiano dal Pozzo nel carteggio putaneo dell'Accademia dei Lincei", *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei* 37 (1982) 91–99.

52 All that survives of this third work are the dialogues entitled *Logica* or *De Intellectione* and *Del Sole e del fuoco*, now published in Favino, *La filosofia naturale*, passim.

of which (1649, 1667) were conceived and edited by Pallavicino himself with the intention of preserving the memory of his mentor-friend. He stripped Ciampoli's writings of their most compromising aspects and at the same time erased any record of his own heterodox youth.⁵³ Though fragmentary and reconstructed without philological rigor, these writings make it possible to discern the unified vision of nature and man that Ciampoli intended to cultivate in his illustrious pupils.

In concert with Galileo and the Linceans, Ciampoli insisted on the philosopher's freedom to philosophize about nature (*libertas philosophandi in naturalibus*). In his thinking, the philosopher had a right to this freedom for at least two reasons. First, the philosophical-theological system (Scholasticism) that theologians and censors insisted on imposing was not necessary, but was rather the product of a random historical encounter of the only philosophy that had survived the collapse of the Roman Empire with a Catholic theology still theoretically naive.⁵⁴ Second, any connection between theology and philosophy needs to be rejected, since Nature and Scripture both derive from God and therefore possess the same degree of legitimacy and authority. If, then, the laws of nature discovered through an inquiry unconstrained by subordination to theology diverge from those expounded by the exegetes of the Bible, then, because Nature and the Scriptures are incapable of contradicting each other as both are manifestations of God's will, the former must undoubtedly be the true laws of nature, since a natural fact is the word of God and as such takes precedence over any textual commentary.⁵⁵

Up to this point, Ciampoli repeats the message of Galileo's *Lettere copernicane* (Copernican letters), albeit with significant differences (for example, the instrumental rather than substantial role of mathematics).⁵⁶ In contrast to Galileo however, in Ciampoli's work this claim forms part of a revindication of the rights of Nature—its autonomy, its legitimacy vis à vis the spiritual and

53 For a detailed reconstruction of this initiative see Favino F., "Sforza Pallavicino editore e 'galileista ad un modo'", *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana* 6.20 (2000) 280–315. On this subject, see also Baffetti G., "Un problema storiografico: Giovanni Ciampoli e Sforza Pallavicino", in *I primi Lincei e il Sant'Uffizio. Questioni di scienza e di fede* (Rome: 2005) 125–139.

54 Ciampoli G. B., "Libro primo della filosofia naturale", in *Dei Fragmenti dell'opere postume di Monsignor Giovanni Ciampoli* (Bologna, Presso Giovanni Battista Ferroni: 1653) 40–46. See Torrini M., "Giovanni Ciampoli filosofo", in Galluzzi P. (ed.), *Novità celesti in e crisi del sapere: Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi Galileiani* (Florence: 1983) 267–275, at 268, 270.

55 Ciampoli, "Libro primo della filosofia naturale" 40–46.

56 Galilei, *Scienza e religione*, passim.

religious realm—that endows not only “scientific” inquiry, but also all aspects of human activity, especially politics, a key interest of Ciampoli.

Even the science of the State, such as gnosiology, ought in Ciampoli’s opinion to be constructed *ex notioribus*, that is, from direct evidence provided by the natural aspect of man. As the limits imposed by the senses do not allow man to attain knowledge of transcendent reality but merely of the phenomenal world,⁵⁷ so his carnal and corruptible nature (which accounts for the original state of nature and a vision of the State as born of natural law)⁵⁸ does not allow him to reach the beatitude on the Earth, which belongs to the Kingdom of Heaven, but only whatever happiness that is possible, namely, that which the pursuit of the relative good prescribes to men by means of law.⁵⁹ Even within this ethical-political sphere, no contradiction can be presupposed between Nature (or humanity’s “common understanding” of that which is good,⁶⁰ a concept that the prince’s wise counselor discovers by induction through a comparison of the customs of people of all times and places) and the Scriptures (or that which God reveals *ab aeterno* as Good in itself). While the first is dictated by natural reason (*fama publica*, or public repute), the second is eternal and revealed in the Bible and through the voice of the pope. Yet, since a spark of divine intelligence remains in man despite original sin, it follows that the philosopher-legislator, by mandating through law that men respect the good pursued by universal reason, does nothing else than set them on the path to happiness: “Born in Heaven, [the law of Rome] does not forget that we live on Earth: and while it procures that happiness possible down below for those who observe its precepts, it promises them absolute happiness above the stars.”⁶¹

57 Ciampoli, “Libro primo della filosofia naturale” prop. 1–3.

58 Ciampoli, “Della robustezza” (dedicated to his most Reverent and Eminent Cardinal Girolamo Colonna, at the request of Giovanni Casoni Libraro in Parione), in *Prose di Monsignor Giovanni Ciampoli* (Rome, Nella Stamperia di Manelfo Manelfi: 1649) 234–236.

59 Ciampoli Giovanni, “Il Zoroastro”, in *Prose di monsignor Ciampoli* (Rome, Fabio di Falco: 1667) 1–6.

60 “Potenza della fama publica”, in Ciampoli, *Prose* (1649) 329.

61 Ciampoli, *Il Zoroastro* 1–6: ‘essendo nata in Cielo [la legge di Roma] non si scorda che noi viviamo in terra: et agli osservatori de’ suoi precetti, mentre procura qua giù la felicità possibile, promette sopra le stelle la felicità totale’. Elsewhere he writes: ‘concludiamo dunque così: siamo composti di corpo e di anima: se abbiamo l’intelletto non siamo senza il senso; e però doviamo coltivar la naturalezza e implorar la gratia. Dunque, chi nell’istruire il mondo, mescolando le lettere secolari con l’ecclesiastiche, subordina la dottrina alla fede, ci benefica nella terra per beatificarci nel cielo’ (‘Let us thus conclude in this manner: we are composed of a body and a spirit; if we possess intellect we do not lack sense; and for this reason we must cultivate candour and beg for grace. Then, he who in teaching the world, mixing secular and ecclesiastical letters, subordinates doctrine to

Drawing on diverse readings and traditions, Ciampoli intended to propose an original and moderate compromise between Catholicism and modernity—scientific and political modernity—as an alternative to the one proposed by the Jesuits, which dominated both these spheres at the time. On the scientific level, he pursued a philosophy that denied subordination to theology, that replaced substantial forms with corpuscularianism and constructed a Copernican universe from the emanation of solar light, both physical and spiritual. On another level, with respect to persistent theocratic ideals but also to Jesuit anti-Machiavellism,⁶² he proposed a vision of Christian politics that did not altogether reject the reason of the State (religion is the “instrument of Rule,”⁶³ its political anthropology being based on what humans are rather than what they should be),⁶⁴ and supported a clear separation of spiritual and temporal power. The Christian prince, in his view, does not derive his power from the Creator, but rather indirectly, from the force of the sun, and directly, from the natural reason of people. His power, therefore, is not technically subordinate to that of the pope, but develops parallel to and in accordance with it toward a goal (happiness on Earth, identification of the true good) that is both complementary and preparatory to heavenly bliss. In sum, as he governs according to what all of humanity recognizes as its own good, the Christian prince does nothing else than putting in place the laws of the Lord.

4 ‘Uno nato principe’

But let us turn to our original question: what fate would have befallen the Academy had Pallavicino succeeded Cesi as its prince? In January 1629, Pallavicino was Ciampoli’s natural candidate to be nominated for the Lincean Academy, and as such, a representative of the academic group most tightly bound to the Curia and closest to Galileo. This group, in which Virginio Cesarini, Mario Guiducci, Francesco Stelluti, and even Cesi himself had taken

faith, helps us on Earth to beatify ourselves in heaven’). “Delle lettere sacre e profane”, in Ciampoli, *Prose* (1649) 117.

62 I.e., to the relationship between spiritual and temporal power prefigured in the theory of the pope’s indirect power, as articulated by Bellarmine (that is, the prerogative of the Roman See to judge and sanction the actions of sovereigns, even those pertaining to civil matters if they touch on the maintenance of faith). For more on this matter see Motta F., “Nature, Faith and the Judge of Faith. Some Considerations on the Historical-Political Context of Copernicus’ Condemnation”, in Fabbri N. – Favino F. (eds.), *Copernicus Banned. The Entangled Matter of the Anti-Copernican Decree of 1616* (Florence: 2018) 57–100.

63 Ciampoli, “Della novità”, in *Prose* (1649) 142.

64 Ciampoli, “Delle lettere sacre e profane”, *Ibid.* 117.

part over time, had already stood by Galileo in his disputes with the Jesuits over solar spots (1612–1613) and comets (1619–1623). The group was now getting ready to support him in the publication of the *Discourse on the Tides* (*Dialogo del flusso e riflusso*).⁶⁵ In the post-Cesi era, Pallavicino's potential succession as the Academy's head would have guaranteed the continuation of both the anti-Aristotelian battle under the direct protection of the pope (with whom at the time Pallavicino was very close)⁶⁶ and also the powerful aristocratic clique to which the young man belonged. Conversely, for Ciampoli, Pallavicino's mentor and "great champion," this possibility would have assured a platform that was far more stable and visible than those that had been hitherto used (the private "conversation," the Academy of Maurice of Savoy)⁶⁷ to wage the battle for a theologically redeemed natural philosophy and policy. And for a moment, Ciampoli's project came close to succeeding.

As is well known, due to Cesi's poor health, the last three Linceans to be nominated were unable to receive the Lincean rings that he himself had engraved with their names. After Cesi's death in August 1630, neither the pleas of the Lincean secretary and dean, Francesco Stelluti, nor the good services of Cassiano dal Pozzo, Academy member and foremost secretary in Cardinal Francesco Barberini's household, could make the cardinal nephew—the most illustrious figure in the group—agree to officiate in the induction ceremony for the three new members.⁶⁸ It was not until a year later that the cardinal,

65 Redondi P., *Galileo eretico* (Turin: 1983); Camerota M., *Galileo Galilei e la cultura scientifica nell'età della Controriforma* (Rome: 2004); Galluzzi P., *Libertà di filosofare in naturalibus: i mondi paralleli di Cesi e Galileo* (Rome: 2014).

66 APUG, ms. 132, fol. 5v.

67 It can easily be demonstrated that Ciampoli conceived if not wrote the oration inspired by Galileo's *Starry Messenger* that was delivered at the Academy of Savoy by one of the pope's familiars, Giuliano Fabrizio, on Maundy Thursday. See Favino, "Marvellous Conjunction" 142–151. This reading of events does not underestimate the fact that the beginnings of Ciampoli's *conversatione* (August 1629) coincide with the pause in the activity of the Linceans because of Cesi's illness.

68 See letter from Stelluti to Cassiano dal Pozzo, Acquasparta, 17 August 1630, in Gabrieli, *Il carteggio* 1222 n5: 'già vi sono tre anelli fatti per il Sig.r Marchese Pallavicino, per il Sig.r Pietro della Valle e per il Sig.r Luca Olstenio; et io dissi all'Eminentissimo Sig.r Card.l Barberino che il Sig.r Principe nostro voleva darli, et si contentò; ma bench'io più volte glie n'habbia fatta istanza, a che seguisse questa ascrizione [...] con tutto non n'havevo risposta alcuna, ma solo mi guardava tutto dolente e taceva [...] Hora, parendo al Signor Cardinale, potrebbe S. Eminenza ciò fare, già che per non essere in Roma il Sig.r Fabio Colonna viceprincipe non può da lui farsi: e poi conforme alle nostre regole eleggere il nuovo Principe' ("Three rings have already been made for the Lord Marquis Pallavicino, for the Lord Pietro della Valle, and for the Lord Lukas Holste; and I told the Most Eminent Lord Cardinal Barberino that our Lord Prince wished to give them to them, and he was satisfied; but although I have implored him that this enrolment be carried out many times

once again pressured by Stelluti, agreed that a successor to Cesi be nominated, provided that he was “a born prince.”⁶⁹

Scholarship has construed Barberini’s reticence on both occasions as nothing more than a sign of the cardinal’s ill will towards the Academy’s future, and agree that he did what he could as arbitrator to procrastinate and stall the institution’s fate.⁷⁰ According to the current historical narrative, Barberini was to blame for imposing this condition on Cesi’s succession (the designated academician had to be born a prince) in the absence of any “statutory provision that was enshrined and proclaimed, that is to say that was brought into the public domain.”⁷¹ The “Lynceographum”—still in manuscript form but hardly unknown to the brethren—in fact set forth detailed rules for the election of new members. When compared to these rules, Barberini’s condition is less arbitrary than it appears at first glance.⁷² The “Lynceographum” was no less concerned with the qualities of the candidate for the directorship than was their patron Barberini (or Cesi himself), and demanded that such a subject possess “extraordinary means [that is, wealth], connections to princes and powerful individuals, [and] competence [expertise] in negotiating affairs.”⁷³ In a word, given the high profile of the enterprise (no attachment to public institutions, financial self-sufficiency), the future prince (like Cesi) had to be independent in his actions and generous in terms of financial outlay. In the ancien régime, however, all these conditions would have been relevant solely to a “born prince.”⁷⁴

[...]this notwithstanding I have received no response, he merely looks at me with great sadness and remains silent [...]. Now, if the Lord Cardinal agrees, Your Eminence could do this because the vice-Prince Lord Fabio Colonna cannot do it himself as he is not in Rome; and then according to our rules, to elect a new prince’).

69 OG, XV, 292–293.

70 See, for instance, Gabrieli G., “Come e quando precisamente ebbe fine la prima Accademia lincea” (1942), in idem, *Contributi* 617–632: 622.

71 Ibid. 621.

72 BANLC, *Archivio Linceo-Accad.* 4, fols. 171v–176v; Nicolò A. (ed.), *Lynceographum: quo norma studiosae vitae Lynceorum philosophorum exponitur* (Rome: 2001) 151ff. On the developments of the academic constitutions, see Guardo M. – Orioli R. (eds.), *Cronache e statuti della prima Accademia dei Lincei. Gesta Lynceorum, “Ristretto” delle Costituzioni, Praescriptiones Lynceae Academiae* (Rome: 2014).

73 Odescalchi B., *Memorie storico critiche dell’Accademia de’ Lincei e del principe Federico Cesi secondo duca d’Acquasparta fondatore e principe della medesima* (Rome: 1806) 236–237.

74 On relations between intellectuals and power in Rome in this period, see Merolla R., “Lo Stato della Chiesa”, in *Letteratura italiana: storia e geografia, L’età moderna*, vol. 2 (Turin: 1988) 1019–1109; Rosa M., “La chiesa e gli stati regionali nell’età dell’assolutismo”, in *Letteratura italiana. I. Il letterato e le istituzioni* (Turin: 1982); Boutier J. – Marin B. – Romano A. (eds.), *Naples, Rome, Florence: une histoire comparée des milieux intellectuels*

However, because of Cesi's foresight, the Academy's personnel could still have easily met the condition Barberini imposed in August 1630. Among its members in Rome alone, at least two were members of the nobility—Della Valle and Pallavicino—both of whom were first born, hence heirs to the title and property of their families,⁷⁵ of which the latter's ranked higher. The Della Valle family were Palatine counts of relatively recent nobility, historically bound to the Curia, the Colonna, and the Imperial party. Until the family's entry into the Roman aristocracy, brought about by the marriage of the papal archiater Paolo with Sabella Savelli in the first half of the Quattrocento, at least until the early fifteenth century their economic fortune had been bound with their activity as *bovattieri*, that is, merchants of agricultural commodities and livestock.⁷⁶

The Pallavicino marquises, however, belonged to one of Europe's oldest families, a holder since 1249 of a signory of imperial investiture, the jurisdictional autonomy of which had been respected for centuries by the Visconti and reconfirmed by popes. Despite the periodic divisions over the centuries caused by the application of Lombard hereditary law and more recent devolutions brought about by marriages, in the mid-sixteenth century these jurisdictions as a whole still constituted a political unity—the so-called Pallavicino "State"—sealed by common statutes dating back to the fifteenth century but still extant in effect in a good many of the manors.⁷⁷ For complex dynastic reasons, and due to strong Farnese pressure on feudal vassals within their duchy, the Zibello branch, to which Sforza belonged, became in the 1580s the sole heir to the Fiorenzuola, Cortmaggiore, and Busseto branches, that is, to the most conspicuous part of the Pallavicino State to which the young Lincean Pallavicino, as eldest son, would become heir.⁷⁸

italiens, 17.–18. Siècles (Rome: 2005). Proving that the social hierarchies permeated even the dynamics within the academy is the fact that between 1620 and 1624, the person who exercised the function of the prince and president during Cesi's absence was Virginio Cesarini (Gabrieli, *Contributi* I 787–817), not on account of his age but rather his noble birth.

75 Della Valle had only a sister, Silvia. Left an orphan in 1587, he assumed the title and leadership of his paternal estate when he reached legal age after a long tutelage (Rome, Arch. Storico Capitolino, Arch. della Valle del Bufalo, Categoria III, sez. 1, tomo 7, fasc. 1A, c.n.n.).

76 Venditti G., *Archivio Della Valle-Del Bufalo. Inventario* (Vatican City: 2009); Gatta B., "Dal casale al libro: i Della Valle", in Miglio M. (ed.), *Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento: Atti del 2° Seminario*, 6–8 May 1982 (Vatican City: 1983) 629–652, at 637–638.

77 Seletti E., *La città di Busseto, capitale un tempo dello Stato Pallavicino*, vol. 1 (Milan: 1883) 33.

78 *Ibid.* n25.

Notwithstanding the disparity in rank, it was certainly Della Valle who had the most solid financial profile at this time. In 1650, the revenue generated by his property holdings amounted to 5,184 scudi.⁷⁹ Things stood quite differently for Pallavicino. Because the lawsuit filed by Alessandro Pallavicino against the Farnese after the expropriation of his hereditary fiefdoms languished for years in the court of the Rota, the marquis and his family found themselves greatly impoverished. In 1633, lacking the money required to continue the lawsuit, Alessandro would have been compelled to accept an agreement with the Farnese that was no doubt disadvantageous to his lineage.⁸⁰ In 1637 it was once again the economic situation of Sforza Pallavicino's father that would have been the principal problem requiring resolution before Sforza could enter the Company of Jesus.⁸¹ Nevertheless, by August 1631, Pallavicino's name was the only one being suggested as Cesi's possible successor. "Regarding [...] the matters of the Academy," wrote the secretary of Stelluti to Galileo,

I was able to discuss them no earlier than last week with the Eminent Sir Cardinal Barberini, who feels that a new leader must be selected but nonetheless would like him to be a born prince; and as there is no subject to propose, he ordered me to write here and to Naples, so that their Lordships may see whether there exists such a subject and refer him. Here there is the Lord Marquis Pallavicino, but he's already joined the prelacy, and the prince should be a layman; for which reason your Eminent Lordship can still think about it and state your consent.⁸²

If one excludes the possibility of bad faith, the cardinal nephew's imposition of the requirement of nobility upon the succession to the Lincean leadership can now easily be explained. This was no arbitrary and restrictive measure imposed by Cardinal Barberini to destroy the Academy, but rather a prerequisite suggested by Ciampoli to Barberini to guarantee Pallavicino's succession without

79 Rome, Arch. Storico Capitolino, Arch. della Valle del Bufalo, Categoria III, sez. 1, tomo 7, fasc. 1C, c.n.n. [sic!].

80 Poggiali C., *Memorie storiche della città di Piacenza* (Piacenza: 1931) 238–239.

81 Rome, ARSI, *Instit.* 135, fols. 163–164; Johannes de Lugo, *Consultazione morale sul luogo di entrare in religione*.

82 OG, XIV, 292–293: 'Circa [...] le cose dell'Accademia, non prima della settimana passata ho potuto parlarne con l'Emin.mo Sig.r Card.le Barberino, il quale è di senso che si faccia il novello principe, ma però vorrebbe uno nato Principe; e perchè in Roma non ci è soggetto a proposito, mi ordinò che ne scrivessi costì et a Napoli, acciò vedano le ss.rie loro se vi è tal soggetto e lo riferiscano. Qui v'era il Sig.r Marchese Pallavicino, ma s'è già messo in prelatura, e il principe vorrebbe esser secolare; onde potrà pensarci ancora V.S. e dire il suo assenso'.

rivals, and his own directorship over the institution's future cultural politics. The plan would have succeeded had it not been for a significant change that occurred during the interminable workings of bureaucracy (selecting the successor of the Lincean leadership was one of many and certainly not the foremost of Francesco's concerns). Between Ciampoli's hypothetical suggestion to Barberini and the conversation between the cardinal nephew and Stelluti in August 1631, Sforza had entered into the prelacy (in March 1631) as referendary of the two Signatures and a member of the congregations of Ecclesiastical Immunity and De bono regimine.

Due to the selective requirement probably suggested by Ciampoli but definitely imposed by Barberini, Pallavicino's entry into the prelacy spoiled Ciampoli's plans but also indirectly decreed the end of the Academy. According to the extant evidence, the letter of August 1631 is the final document related to the institutional fate of the first Academy of the Linceans; the last documented meeting of Ciampoli's gatherings dates to January 1632. After March of that year, complaints voiced by cardinals of the Catholic League regarding the lack of support from the pope at a delicate moment in the Thirty Years War made it impossible for Urban VIII to continue guaranteeing freedom of expression to cultural dissent, even of a relative and local kind. Accused of treason, both in the exercise of his functions and in his more private guise as mediator of the imprimatur of Galileo's *Dialogues*, Ciampoli was dismissed from his position in May 1632 and sent from Rome on a government assignment in November.⁸³ His "pupils" were likewise sent away, admonished for sympathizing with "the ideas of the innovators," but by the same token protected from further compromising dealings with a favorite who had fallen into disgrace. Andrea Conti left for the government of Camerino.⁸⁴ Punished for trying to intercede for his friend before the pope, Pallavicino was sent to Jesi.⁸⁵ Aside from the observance of the formalities and the prestige of the assignment, it was in effect "an honorable exile" for the young man, as his uncle Virginio Malvezzi clearly wrote.⁸⁶

83 Favino, "Quel petardo" *passim*.

84 Andrea Conti was the governor of Camerino (1632), Fermo (1634), and Campagna (1638) (Weber, *Legati e governatori* 592).

85 There he became the local governor. Favino, "Pallavicino" 513.

86 Virginio Malvezzi to Fabio Chigi, Rome, 19 June 1632, in Virgilio Malvezzi, *Lettere a Fabio Chigi*, ed. C. Crisafulli (Fasano: Schena 1991) 117. Likewise Pallavicino, after stating his satisfaction with the nomination in conventional phrases, wrote to Chigi on June 4 in clear language: 'Vorrei poter in un'altra materia scrivere abbondantemente a V.S. Ill.ma, ma con legami invisibili mi si lega la mano' ('I would like to be able to write freely to your most Illustrious Lordship, but my hand is bound by invisible bonds') (BAV, *Chigiano* A.III.53, fol. 274v).

Because of Pallavicino's career as an irreproachable "intellectual cadre"—first at the Company of Jesus, then in the Church—his exile and the record of his involvement in the cultural situation prior to 1632 left no stain on his curriculum vitae. After his death, his biographers were even able to count his faithfulness to Ciampoli among the proofs of his virtue:

We heard the old Sforza candidly confess this [i.e. his juvenile heterodoxy] about himself and declare that, once he reached the most mature age, after the *novatores'* ideas exploded, he reconciled with Aristotle ... that, in fact, he had followed his [i.e. Ciampoli's] doctrine to please others, later he was forced to follow his fate by his own perseverance.⁸⁷

87 Ciaconius – Oldoinus, *Vitae et res gestae* 739: 'Id de se ipso candide confitentem', one reads in Chacon's *Vitae*, 'Sfortiam iam natu grandem audivimus, affirmantemque, se ubi primum ad robustiorem aetatem pervenit, explosis Novatorum opinionibus, cum Aristotile in gratiam redijsse [...] Verum cuius doctrinam aliena facilitate secutus fuerat, coactus postea est constantia sua etiam sequi fortunam'.