

Chronology

21 March 1688

In a 'spontaneous appearance' (*sponte comparens*, or unsummoned appearance) before the Court of the Neapolitan Holy Office, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi denounces himself and three other persons – Giacinto De Cristofaro, Basilio Giannelli, and Filippo Belli – for entertaining heretical ideas. These heretical ideas are a peculiar mix of heterodox views, regarding sacred history and dogmatic theology. First, there is the idea that before Adam the world had been inhabited by men and animals which were composed of atoms. Men started to build houses, castles, and cities, and to develop a political organization and a social hierarchy. The most judicious among these men was viewed as the son of a deity. A similar hierarchy triggered veneration, and by consequence the prosecution and expansion of power. The message and life of Jesus Christ is to be reinterpreted accordingly: he was ambitious and declared to be the Son of God. However, Christ not being the Son of God, the authority of St. Peter and his successors in the Catholic Church lacks any foundation, and thus the popes cannot excommunicate dissidents, issue edicts or pretend obedience in matters either temporal or spiritual. Sacraments or dogmas simply do not exist, while the entire New Testament is senseless. In sum, atomism leads to the denial of creation, and the denial of the existence of God, Hell, Purgatory, Paradise, and miracles.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 338r-340v (incomplete original on fols. 1r-2r).

7 April 1688

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome is deliberating on Manuzzi's accusation against Giannelli and De Cristofaro. The Cardinals have decreed that information be gathered about Manuzzi and the two suspects to determine whether his actions were motivated by enmity toward his acquaintances.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1688, fol. 74v.

10 April 1688

The Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome have taken note of the spontaneous appearance by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi. Card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, orders Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, to check the 'quality' (that is, the moral consistency) of Manuzzi and of those accused by him, and to investigate any possible enmity between them.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 3r.

5 June 1688

An earthquake occurs in the late afternoon in the province of Benevento, and its effects also reach Naples. The magnitude has been estimated at 7 in the Mercalli scale. It severely damaged numerous towns and villages across a vast area, destroying Cerreto Sannita and Guardia Sanframondi. The exact number of victims is unknown; it has been estimated at about 10,000. It was among the most destructive earthquakes in the history of Italy.

9 June 1688

Based on the pronouncements of the consultors, the Cardinals of the Holy Office condemn Manuzzi to an abjuration *de formali* (which entails that formal heresy has been proved) with salutary penances; they also order the arrest of Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli, as well as searches for books and manuscripts in their lodgings.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1688, fols. 136v-137r.

12 June 1688

Cardinal Alderano Cybo instructs Giuseppe Nicola Giberti to search the house of Manuzzi and his accomplices for books and writings. Additionally, Giberti is to arrest the others involved. Manuzzi is required to abjure *de formali* and is condemned to salutary penances.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 4r.

12 June 1688

Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, instructs Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, to conduct a thorough interrogation of Manuzzi. The aim is to establish a detailed understanding of the origin and spread of the heretical doctrines and propositions involved in the accusation. Bernini reiterates the order to arrest the accomplices and search their lodgings.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 5r-6v.

17 June 1688

In a deposition before the Holy Office in Naples, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi confirms his earlier accusations and now also implicates Francesco Sterlich. Basilio Giannelli also attempted to convince Domenico Di Tomaso of the validity of his heretical ideas but without success. Manuzzi does not know who taught the false doctrine to Giannelli, Belli, and De Cristofaro. They are merely asserted to have read the incriminating propositions in poetical and historical works.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 10r-13r.

17 June 1688

The Neapolitan Holy Office passes sentence in Francesco Paolo Manuzzi's trial, basing the verdict on the aforementioned propositions.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 7r-8r; copy on fols. 340v-344v.

17 June 1688

Francesco Paolo Manuzzi abjures, rejecting the heresies and suspect views that he has entertained previously.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 9rv; published in Rak 1973, 61-2.

30 June 1688

The letter written on 19 June by the minister Giuseppe Nicola Giberti is read to the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome. Giberti informs the Congregation that he failed to carry out the order to arrest Basilio Giannelli and Giacinto De Cristofaro, because many persons had left the city after the earthquake on 5 June, among them Basilio Giannelli. To his question as to whether he should wait for Giannelli's return in order to arrest the three men – Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli – at the same time, the Congregation answers in the affirmative.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1688, fol. 151rv.

3 July 1688

Cardinal Alderano Cybo writes to Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, informing him that the Cardinals have read his letter. As mentioned in Giberti's letter, the general flight from the city after the earthquake prevented the simultaneous arrests of Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli. Cybo orders that these arrests be carried out as soon as possible after their return.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 14r.

21 July 1688

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the denunciation of Stefano Cusano by Ignazio De Biagio by whom he is accused of atheism; De Biagio also accuses himself of the same crime. De Biagio is condemned to a formal abjuration and it is decreed that Cusano should be under observation.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1688, fol. 169v.

Summer-Autumn 1688

Probably with the aid of Antonio Torres, Giuseppe Nicola Giberti gathers information (compiled in documents later labeled *Informo*) in support of De Cristofaro's moral stature among clerics of impeccable conduct, prompting the minister to drop De Cristofaro's case. The names of these "gravissimi huomini" can be made up from later documents: Fulvio Caracciolo, Abbot Vincenzo Magnati, consultor of Neapolitan Inquisition, canon Nicola Cirillo, consultor of the Holy Inquisition of the Archbishop's Court, the priest Emanuele Ciccattelli, and the priest Onofrio Bizzarro, De Cristofaro's ordinary confessor. Never, during the six years of his trial, did De Cristofaro succeed in obtaining copies of these attestations.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 272r-273v; more information under "October-November 1691"; for Antonio Torres's role, see ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 309v (cf. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 264v).

20 October 1688

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the letter by Giberti dated 9 October in which he provides information about meetings in private houses, thus constituting an academy with permission by the Collaterale Council. The group involved is composed of over thirty persons, who are "de religione suspecti", and among whom are mentioned Giacinto De Cristofaro, Nicola Caravita, Stefano Biscardi, Giovan Vincenzo Gravina, Emanuele Ciccattelli, Carlo Porpora, Francesco d'Andrea, and Francesco Sterlich. The minister is asked to remain vigilant. In a letter written on the same day, Giberti reports that members of this academy plan to print "il Sistema del Gallileo" in the vernacular or vulgar tongue.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1688, fols. 248v-249r, 252rv.

22 March 1689

In an official declaration in the Court of the Neapolitan Curia, made on the advice of Nicola Cirillo, Giacinto De Cristofaro states that he has engaged in discussions with friends about philosophical matters, including the views of ancient philosophers and politicians. He emphasizes that his enemies (whom he qualifies as *malevoli*) – and of whom he compiles a list – have deliberately distorted the context and content of these discussions. Among his enemies he mentions Domenico Di Tomaso, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, (the brothers) Nicola, Giuseppe, and Filippo Di Domenico, Nicola Bagnulo, Saverio Panzuti, Gian Vincenzo Gravina, Carlo Cornelio (nephew of Tommaso), and Nicola Amenta.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 141rv (cf. fol. 170r for Cirillo's advice); copies on fols. 423r-424r, and in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 221r and 231rv.

26 March 1689

At the Neapolitan Holy Office, Basilio Giannelli makes a voluntary appearance (*sponte comparens*), that is, without being summoned to the Court. He declares his innocence and provides a list of his enemies (*malevoli*), including Paolo Manuzzi, Giuseppe Manuzzi, Giovanni Antonio Mastrocinque, Domenico Di Tomaso, and Giovan Vincenzo Gravina. This deposition is sent to Rome on 29 April 1690.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 15r; copy on fol. 140r (signed by vicar general Sebastiano Perissi).

27 March 1689

At the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli voluntarily presents himself to the Court, declares his innocence, and specifies his enemies, among whom are Manuzzi, Felice Pisano, Domenico Di Tomaso, Cosmo di S. Lorenzo, and Gaspere Paragallo. This deposition is likewise sent to Rome on 29 April 1690.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 16r; copy on fol. 519rv.

14 August 1689

Pietro Di Fusco is again elected as representative of the 'popular' seat in the municipal council (the first election occurred on 29 June 1685).

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 272; cf. 128, for the election in 1685.

20 August 1689

Gerolamo Basilio accuses Matteo Vitale of corrupting Giuseppe Prato, the son of Antonio (in whose house Vitale worked as a tutor), with discussions about atomistic philosophy.

Osbat 1974, 193, which cites an uncataloged manuscript in ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, entitled *Processus contra Mattheum Vitale et Carolum Rosito, Josephum Riccio*, volumen secundum 1690.

8 October 1689

Pietro Vito Ottoboni is elected pope and assumes the name Alexander VIII.

29 November 1689

With a letter dated 19 November, Giuseppe Nicola Giberti reports that theses about Descartes's philosophy have been discussed in the palace of the Viceroy. In their reply, the Cardinals refer to earlier decrees regarding atomism (issued on 29 November 1673 and 26 January 1689), and they order that the writings should be assessed by Giulio Maria Bianchi, secretary of the Index. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1689, fol. 372r; the decrees referred to are in *Decreta*, 1673, fol. 395r, and 1689, fol. 24r.

Before the end of 1689

Giuseppe Nicola Giberti retires as minister of the Holy Office in Naples.

13 January 1690

The Calabrian cleric Ilarione Musaci denounces Giovanni Legitimo, who works in the shop of the chemist Carlo Rosito, accusing him of atheism.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 93r; cf. Osbat 1974, 192-3.

16 March 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses Musaci's denunciation of Giovanni Legitimo made on 13 January. Musaci claims that Legitimo convinced him to accept atheism, and that he maintained this conviction for twenty days. The Cardinals decree an "abjuratio de formali" with salutary penances. In the case against Legitimo, it is decreed that the two youths mentioned by Musaci should be interrogated.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 93r.

5 April 1690

Francesco d'Andrea is appointed fiscal lawyer of the Regia Camera.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 287.

10 April 1690

Lorenzo Casoni is appointed Apostolic Nuncio in Naples; he will resign in January 1702, when he is appointed Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome.

<http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bcasoni1.html>.

29 April 1690

The depositions made in the Neapolitan Holy Office by Basilio Giannelli and Filippo Belli, on 26 and 27 March 1689 respectively, are sent to the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 15r, 16v.

3 May 1690

Giuseppe Scalona accuses Giovanni Legitimo as a "presumed atheist".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 173r; see also under "13 January 1690" and "16 March 1690".

10 May 1690

In a meeting of the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, a summary is read of the Neapolitan proceedings regarding Basilio Giannelli, Giacinto De Cristofaro, Filippo Belli, Stefano Cusano, and Ignazio De Biagio, all accused of atheism and heretical propositions in the Neapolitan Holy Office. The Cardinals decree that interviews should take place and that witness testimonies be taken.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 164v.

Ante 13 May 1690

Referring to the depositions by Basilio Giannelli and Filippo Belli (see under "29 April 1690", *supra*), Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, writes instructions to be transmitted to Giovanni Battista Giberti for the interrogations of Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli, as well as for that of Manuzzi, the complainant.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 18rv.

13 May 1690

Giovanni Battista Giberti, bishop of Cava de' Tirreni, takes office as minister of the Holy Office in Naples. Officially, he will remain in service until 22 October 1696, but he is suspended from 25 September 1691, retiring initially to Gaeta. In 1696, he will be appointed bishop of Fano. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1 (register of Giberti's letters).

13 May 1690

In a letter to Giovanni Battista Giberti, card. Alderano Cybo presents the instructions written by Pietro Filippo Bernini; the Cardinals of the Congregation expect an authenticated copy of the proceedings.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 17r.

17 May 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the accusation against Giovanni Legitimo, brought by Giuseppe Scalona on 3 May at the Neapolitan Holy Office. The Cardinals decree that Legitimo should be arrested, and his lodgings searched.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 173r.

20 May 1690

The Holy Office has ordered the arrest of Giovanni Legitimo.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 5r and 325r.

24 May 1690

The Congregation in Rome discusses a letter by Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, who retired as minister of the Holy Office. He asks for financial assistance, citing the *infirmities* due to which he is unable to work.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 176v.

24 May 1690

Gennaro d'Andrea, brother of Francesco and regent of the *Consejo de Italia* (Council of Italy) in Spain, leaves Naples for a voyage to Spain; he is accompanied by Basilio Giannelli. www.treccani.it/biografico, entry "Gennaro d'Andrea".

End of May 1690

Francesco Paolo Manuzzi leaves Naples, and after two stops, in Gaeta and Genoa respectively, he reaches Alicante in Spain on 15 June. From Genoa onwards he has traveled in the same naval convoy with Gennaro d'Andrea (see "24 May 1690" above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 352v-353r; in this text, Manuzzi is mistaken about the year (1689).

4 June 1690

Carlo Rosito is denounced for heresy to the Holy Office in Naples.

BNN, XI.E.15, fol. 232r.

10 June 1690

In a letter to the Congregation of the Holy Office, Giberti relates that Gennaro Caruso has also accused Carlo Rosito and Giovanni Legitimo of atomism. He reports, moreover, that Legitimo has already been arrested. Simultaneously, Giovanni De Magistris has accused the same

individuals of not believing in Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, asserting that they hold the views that Christ was a real man, and that the world is composed of atoms. Fearing arrest, Rosito has relocated to Rome, where he presents himself voluntarily before the Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 209v; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 8v; Osbat 1974, 193 (see also “13 January 1690”).

15 June 1690

Carlo Rosito delivers a ‘spontaneous’ deposition in the Holy Office in Rome.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 209v; BNN, XI.E.15, fol. 233r.

20 June 1690

At a meeting of the Roman Holy Office, Carlo Rosito’s spontaneous deposition is read. In it, Rosito confesses to heretical propositions related to atheism and the doctrines of the atomists. He attributes his adoption of these views to the influence of Giovanni De Magistris, Nicola Galdieri, Giuseppe Ricci, and a certain Gaspare (whose surname, Villamagna, was probably not yet known or had yet to be mentioned); they, in turn, had derived these ideas from Antonio Barra. Subsequently, Giberti’s letter dated 10 June (referenced above) is also read. The Cardinals decree that Rosito’s spontaneous deposition be transmitted to Giberti for use in proceedings against the others mentioned earlier. They request of Giberti that he should keep them informed.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 209v.

24 June 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office orders Minister Giberti in Naples to initiate proceedings against those mentioned in Carlo Rosito’s denunciation (see “10 June 1690”).

SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 326r.

28 June 1690

In his first deposition delivered in Naples, Giovanni Legitimo accuses Giovanni De Magistris, Carlo Rosito, Nicola Galdieri, as well as Gennaro and Francesco d’Andrea.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi, Processus contra Mattheum Vitale*, ms. n.c., fols. 27v-32r, cited in Osbat 1974, 194.

28 June 1690

Carlo Rosito requests of the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome that he be given permission to return to Naples. The Cardinals grant permission on bail and with the obligation that he presents himself *toties quoties* to the minister in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 216r; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 12rv.

29 June 1690

Pietro Di Fusco is again elected representative of the ‘popular’ seat (see “14 August 1689”).

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 297.

1 July 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office has granted Carlo Rosito “sigurtà giuratoria” (a sort of promise of bail) to return to Naples, where he should transform this ‘security’ in “sigurtà pecuniaria” (by finding someone to guarantee the bail).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 326v-327r.

26 July 1690

Carlo Rosito has returned to Naples, but he informs the Congregation that the minister does not accept a layman to vouch for him; instead, the minister insists that he should be vouched for by a secular priest. The Cardinals leave the decision regarding this request to the minister in Naples. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 240r.

End of July 1690

Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, who has joined the company of Gennaro d'Andrea and Basilio Giannelli during his travel to Spain, arrives in Madrid. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 353rv.

25 August 1690

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Domenico Di Tomaso declares himself to be acquainted with Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Basilio Giannelli. He denies ever having heard any of the alleged propositions about Christ, the existence of Hell, Paradise, Purgatory, and God, which were denounced by Manuzzi. He admits, however, that he occasionally heard someone – apparently Giannelli (“se mal non mi ricordo”) – entertaining the idea of the mortality, or more precisely, the materiality and fiery nature of the soul. This discussion, he notes, was solely in reference to a passage in Vergil (namely, *Aen.* 1.92-101). Di Tomaso's deposition is sent to Rome the next day, on 26 August.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 19r-21v.

26 August 1690

In a letter to the Congregation in Rome, Giberti outlines how things stand in the trial against the so-called atheists in Naples. Manuzzi cannot be interrogated again because he has left for Spain on a mission by order of his employer. Giannelli has also traveled to Madrid in the company of Gennaro d'Andrea. Giuseppe de' Medici, Prince of Ottaiano, initially considered appointing Giannelli as his agent in Madrid but abandoned this idea upon learning that Giannelli was suspected of atheism. Belli serves as the Governor of one of the fiefs of the Prince of Avellino. De Cristofaro seeks protection from possible persecution with the help of clergy friends – namely, Nicola Cirillo and Vincenzo Magnati. To the best of his ability, the Jesuit Giovanni Berardi has made inquiries in the parishes of the suspects, but has failed to uncover any useful information. In the meantime, Giberti has been able to question Di Tomaso (see *supra* and *infra*). He has also discovered that many of those described by De Cristofaro as ‘enemies’ are, in fact, good Christians. This has led Giberti to suspect a malicious diversionary tactic.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 18v-19v.

6 September 1690

During the initial interrogation, Di Tomaso proved to be very cautious, stating that it was challenging to recall events from a long time ago. When called to testify, and likely having been sternly admonished in the interim, he now remembers many details of conversations with Belli and other young students. He heard Belli pronounce (other) heretical propositions, featuring the denial of Paradise, Hell and Purgatory, and expressing the view that Christ was an impostor. Di Tomaso even recites an old irreligious sonnet he claims was composed by Belli, as well as a sonnet in reply that he himself composed. He also reported some suspicious conversations involving Aniello Belli, Filippo's uncle, De Cristofaro, Giannelli and a Father Giovanni Battista Giordano. Despite this, Di Tomaso maintains the view that Belli was nevertheless a good Christian, only occasionally expressing heretical ideas. Di Tomaso did not find it necessary to promptly denounce Belli because the tone of the latter's discussions on these sensitive matters varied between seriousness and jest. The deposition detailing these accounts was sent to Rome on 9 September.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 22r-25v.

14 September 1690

In the Holy Office in Rome, the case against Legitimo, Rosito, Galdieri, Ricci, Gaspare N. (that is, Villamagna), and Barra is discussed, and the summary of the proceedings is read. The Cardinals decree that Galdieri, Ricci, and Gaspare should be arrested as soon as their lodgings have been searched. Barra's lodgings should be searched too, and he should be immediately arrested when evidence is found, but not before the first interrogation of the aforementioned defendants. If it happens that Rosito can deliver only a *iuratoria cautio* (that is, an oath as a guarantee), he should be arrested too, and his case should be pursued.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 292r.

23 September 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office writes a letter to the minister Giberti in Naples with the decisions taken on 14 September.

Another letter contains an order for the arrest of Giovanni Legitimo.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 314v; SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 328v.

27 September 1690

Giovanni Battista Ferace, a physician from the diocese of Benevento who had already been accused of heretical propositions in 1686, appears before the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples to defend himself against possible malevolent interpretations that could be given to his judgments on Tommaso Cornelio and Lucretius.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1686, fol. 123v; BNN, XI.AA.22, fols. 247r-248r; Amabile 1892, 2: 59; Osbat 1974, 197.

14 October 1690

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office, informs card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, that the Viceroy is unwilling to help secure the arrests of those suspected of atheism without prior knowledge of their identities.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 105r.

18 October 1690

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the letter written by Giberti on 7 October in which he outlines the possibility of simultaneously arresting Nicola Galtieri, Giuseppe Ricci, and Gaspare N. (i.e., Villamagna). Giberti seeks clarification on whether he is obligated, should he choose to involve the secular arm, to communicate the names of the *carcerandi* to the political authorities of the Vice Kingdom beforehand. The Cardinals respond that Giberti should seek the assistance of the archbishop and the Nuncio (who will be informed by the Congregation). He must also emphasize to the Viceroy that disclosing names before the arrest would violate the secrecy to which the Inquisition Tribunal is bound.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 314rv.

21 October 1690

Card. Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, writes to Giberti, minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office, advising him to solicit the support of the ecclesiastical authorities (archbishop and Nuncio) for the arrest of Nicola Galdieri, Giuseppe Ricci, Gaspare N. (i.e., Villamagna), and Antonio Barra, because "inquisiti di ateismo e proposizioni ereticali".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 101r.

28 October 1690

Card. Cybo has read Giberti's letter dated 14 October, and he is thus informed that the Viceroy has withheld his assistance in the arrest of Antonio Barra. He insists, however, that the minister should ask for help from the political authorities.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 105r.

8 November 1690

In a letter dated 28 October, Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, informs the Congregation that he may have the option to appeal to the secular arm without involving the bishop and the Nuncio. The Cardinals ask him to proceed with the other orders given previously.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 328r.

9 November 1690

In a letter dated 4 November, Giberti reports that Galdieri, Ricci, Villamagna, and Barra are – with great suspicion – closely monitoring the developments surrounding their potential arrest. Barra has relocated his residence to a Spanish military base and has moved his belongings outside the city. Giberti expresses the hope of acquiring one of Barra's writings, enabling an arrest without the need for a search. After a visit to the Viceroy, he believes he has persuaded the latter to employ the secular arm during arrests, even without prior disclosure of names. The bishop is interested in knowing whether any past agreements exist between ecclesiastical and political authorities in Naples regarding the arrest of Inquisition Tribunal suspects. The Cardinals reiterate their instructions for Giberti to carry out the previously given orders, emphasizing the arrest of Barra outside his home and the Spanish base, if 'incriminating' writings are found.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 333r.

22 November 1690

A meeting of the Holy Office in Rome includes a discussion of the case against Francesco d'Andrea, suspected "de pluribus propositionibus censurabilibus". Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, is asked to continue the examination of the witnesses, both those not yet heard and those already examined by his predecessor Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, bishop of Cava.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 343r; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 691r.

December 1690

A Jesuit father informs his *confrère* Domenico Jameo about the dissemination of the Italian translation of Lucretius in Naples; as one of the readers, he also mentions Matteo Vitale, who has been implicated in the atheism trial.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, 270 (ancient numeration), unnumbered fascicle.

2 December 1690

It continues to prove difficult to arrest Barra; Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, asks Giberti to wait for further instructions from the Congregation.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 229r.

6 December 1690

In a letter dated 25 November, Minister Giberti seeks clarification from the Congregation regarding the agreement allegedly concluded during Urban VIII's pontificate regarding restrictions on the arrest of laymen and limits on their extradition to the central seat in Rome. He also requests information about any correspondence on this matter between the Court in Madrid and the Viceroy in Naples, aiming to ensure a successful conclusion to the arrests of Galdieri, Ricci, Villamagna, and Barra. The Cardinals reiterate that Giberti must adhere to previously given orders and consult with the archbishop and the Nuncio; his other inquiries do not elicit a response.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1690, fol. 354r.

23 December 1690

Card. Alderano Cybo writes to Giberti that he may choose the moment to arrest Barra.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 235r.

23 December 1690

Alessandro Speroni conveys the letter by Cybo to Giberti.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 236r.

3 January 1691

The letter by Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, dated 16 December 1690, is discussed in the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome. Giberti came to know that Giuseppe Valletta possessed a book written by Joachim Burser; in this book, the soul was viewed as material and divisible, surviving only in virtue of God's grace. The Congregation orders an investigation to discover whether Valletta possessed a reading permit for this work.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 8v; see Burser 1652, 2: 33-42.

23 January 1691

The Congregation orders the minister Giovanni Battista Giberti to search Antonio Barra's house and to arrest him when evidence for his guilt has been found.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 72r.

27 January 1691

In a letter to the Congregation, Giovanni Battista Giberti reports that he was unable to arrest Antonio Barra on the accusations of atheism, because the other defendants (Galdieri, Ricci, Villamagna) have not yet been interrogated and Barra has meanwhile gone out of his mind ("furiosus devenit"), burned most of his writings, and is now kept in a mental asylum.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 58v.

27 January 1691

In another letter on the same date, Giberti informs the Congregation in Rome that the Jesuit Giovanni Berardi, dean of the consultors of the local Holy Office, "possesses one of the writings dictated by Doctor Antonio Barra to his pupils". He has ordered Berardi to assess this manuscript and, if possible, also other works.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.i, fol. 72r.

3 February 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti writes a letter to the Congregation in Rome, informing them that Barra “has been cured of his madness, and has returned from the hospital of the Incurabili, where he was, to his home, but has not yet resumed teaching”. Copies of his writings made by his students have been examined by Giovanni Berardi, who concluded that they do not contain anything against the Catholic faith.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 73rv.

13 February 1691

Giberti reassures the Congregation that – based on newly acquired information – Burser’s book was not in the library of Valletta; the latter is qualified as “an upright and pious man”.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 56r.

14 February 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the letter by Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, dated 27 January. The Cardinals – who have obviously not yet received Giberti’s letter written on 3 February – advise against arresting Antonio Barra for the time being; they also advise that more information be gathered.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 58v.

17 May 1691

In the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, the summary of the trial concerning Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli is read; the Cardinals reiterate the order to arrest Belli and De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 164r.

19 May 1691

Tommaso Maria Bosio, Commissioner of the Holy Office in Rome, writes to Giovanni Battista Giberti imparting that, having considered the deposition by Di Tomaso against Filippo Belli, the Congregation orders the arrest of Belli and De Cristofaro, as well as the search of their lodgings.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 26r.

19 May 1691

Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, writes to Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples; he orders the arrest of De Cristofaro and Belli, and the search of their lodgings.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 27r.

12 July 1691

Antonio Pignatelli is elected Pope and assumes the name Innocent XII.

13 July 1691

In an official declaration before the Neapolitan Holy Office (made on the advice of Giovanni Berardi), Giacinto De Cristofaro admits to having had discussions with friends about literature, politics, and philosophical issues, but he expresses fear of being unjustly maligned as a result of these discussions; among his “principal enemies”, he includes Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, Felice Pisano, Basilio Giannelli, Filippo Belli, and Domenico Di Tomaso. Furthermore, he characterizes the friendship between Manuzzi and Pisano as lascivious and illicit. His deposition is sent to Rome on the following day, 14 July.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 28rv (see fol. 170r for Berardi’s advice); for an analytical list of the enemies of the four main defendants, see Osbat 1974, 84-6.

14 July 1691

In a letter to the Congregation in Rome, Giberti provides an update on the case against Barra, Galdieri, and Villamagna (Villamaina). Barra, who was previously deemed insane, has now recovered, and has left the hospital. Giberti expresses a reluctance to proceed with house searches now due to the significant unrest in the city, which he attributes to the ongoing currency crisis (“l’alteratione della moneta”),¹ and the fear of a new outbreak of the plague. In addition, the analysis of the reports of Barra’s lessons did not confirm the heresy suspicions (see “3 February 1690”). Giberti reports that Barra had visited him a few days previously in the middle of the night. The visitor was in a state of utter confusion, and for this reason Giberti referred him to Berardi. As regards Nicola Galdieri, Giuseppe Ricci, and Gaspare (Villamagna), Giberti is unable to proceed and needs more time.

In a second letter, Giberti announces the imminent arrest of Belli and De Cristofaro. He suggests that De Cristofaro is protected by “principal ministers and knights”, while Belli is protected by the Prince of Avellino (then, Marino III Caracciolo, 1668-1720) and the Duke of Maddaloni. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 142r-144r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 225v-226r.

21 July 1691

Alessandro Speroni, notary of the Holy Office in Rome, informs Giovanni Battista Giberti that the Congregation has received “all the scriptures, and information, which his Most Illustrious Lordship has sent about the trials of Belli and his accomplices, and of Barra and his accomplices”, all of which will be discussed in the Congregation.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 290r.

23 July 1691

Giacomo Cantelmo is elected archbishop of Naples.

HC, 5: 283; <http://www.gcatholic.org/hierarchy/data/cardAL8-1.htm#16211>.

25 July 1691

The letter from Giovanni Battista Giberti dated 14 July is read in the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome. Giberti outlines some of the challenges with which he is confronted: De Cristofaro is attacking his enemies among the complainants and is protected by the ‘princes’. Following consultation with the Pope, the Cardinals decree that the minister should collaborate with the archbishop. The order for the arrests of Belli and De Cristofaro is reiterated.

As to the cases of Barra, Galdieri, Ricci, and Villamagna, the Cardinals admonish the minister that he should try harder, and that – with an exception made for Barra – he should at least arrest the other three, asking the assistance of the archbishop and the nuncio for the intervention of the secular arm.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 223rv, 225v-226r.

28 July 1691

Alessandro Speroni, notary of the Holy Office in Rome, informs the minister Giberti that the Congregation has discussed the information he transmitted and that the Cardinals are urging the rapid arrest of Antonio Barra, Giacinto De Cristofaro, Filippo Belli, and accomplices.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 284rv; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 380rv.

¹ In 1691, the Viceroy’s government decided to use a royal edict to increase the value of the locally minted coins by 20 per cent, because an increase in the price of silver meant that the intrinsic value now exceeded its nominal value. The added value, it was decided, should benefit the Reggia Zecca (the Royal Mint), and not the local banks and their customers. In effect, the Zecca paid off its hefty debt to the banks all in one go. Needless to say, this decision quickly led to dissatisfaction, riots, and revolt. See also ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 72r, in “Documentation”.

28 July 1691

In a letter to Giovanni Battista Giberti, card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office, insists on the arrest of Belli and De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 29r.

4 August 1691

In a letter to the Congregation, Giovanni Battista Giberti confirms that he will prepare and carry out the arrest of Belli and De Cristofaro, in collaboration with the archbishop and the Nuncio.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 153r-154r.

10 August 1691

In Naples, Giuseppe Ricci is arrested.

Bulifon 1932, 278.

11 August 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, writes to the Congregation in Rome with information about the arrest of Giuseppe Ricci. Nicola Galdieri, however, managed to evade arrest by fleeing over the rooftops when officers arrived at his door.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 156v-157v; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 260v.

13 August 1691

Giacinto De Cristofaro² is arrested in the rooms of the Vicaria Tribunal in Naples. The arrest is confirmed in an official note by Giovanni Selvaggi, notary of the Holy Office in Naples. Filippo Belli is not in town; he could not be captured, moreover, because he is under the protection of the prince of Avellino.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 32r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 270v-271r (see below "18 August", "29 August"; cf. "11 September 1692").

13 August 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti asks Francesco Antonio Genoino, consultor of the Holy Office in Naples, to carry out the perquisition of De Cristofaro's house at the same time as his arrest (see also "18 August"), assisted by Orazio Orazi, fiscal lawyer of the Neapolitan Holy Office.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 33r (for the report, see *infra*).

13 August 1691

In his journal, Antonio Bulifon reports the arrest of Giacinto De Cristofaro, Giuseppe Ricci and "some others". Nicola Galdieri and Gaspare Villamagna escaped before being caught, while Nicola De Crescenzo, Francesco Cuoco and others were threatened with arrest. Bulifon comments as follows:

L'on voit une persécution grande de ces jeunes philosophes, qui pretendaient de se faire connaitre pour savants en niant beaucoup de choses qui étaient aprouvées d'autres, aucun desquels dans des discours se faisait connaitre de n'être guere bon catolicque, a ce que disent les moines.

Bulifon 1932, 278.

² In a deposition made on 11 September 1692 (ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 169v), De Cristofaro stated that he was arrested on Monday 12 August 1691, an obvious error given the fact that 12 August was a Sunday.

13 August 1691

Francesco Antonio Genoino, a consultant of the Neapolitan Holy Office, reports on the search of De Cristofaro's house conducted today at noon and the seizure of his books and manuscripts. Several suspicious books were confiscated and placed in a sealed bag for examination. Books and reports will be discussed on 17 August.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 34rv.

14 August 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti's letter dated 4 August about the imminent arrest of De Cristofaro and Belli (see above) is read in the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome. The Cardinals again advise that collaboration be sought with the archbishop and the apostolic Nuncio.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 256r.

14 August 1691

Matteo Vitale presents himself voluntarily in the Holy Office of Naples and confesses several errors: 1. God's existence cannot be proved *naturaliter*; 2. there are no real accidents in the Eucharist; 3. the immortality of the soul cannot be proved *naturaliter*; 4. creation cannot be proved *naturaliter* (consequence of 1); 5. by consequence, the world is not governed by divine providence, but *à casu*; 6. Saint Nicholas's myrrh (kept in Bari) is not miraculous, although it cannot be denied that the saint may effect miracles; 7. religion and divine cults are introduced by politics. Finally, he affirms that, through faith, he has always believed the teachings of the Holy Mother Roman Catholic Church.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 195r (the reconstruction of Vitale's case in 1693; see "18 July 1693").

16 August 1691

In his journal, Domenico Confuorto reports upon the arrest of De Cristofaro:

Some citizens have been imprisoned in the prisons of San Domenico by the Court of the Holy Office, including Dr. Giacinto Di Cristofaro, son of Dr. Bernardo; many others escaped. They followed the sect of the Epicureans or atheists, holding the soul to die with the body.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 359.

17 August 1691

In the presence of Giovanni Battista Giberti, bishop of Cava and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, and of Giacinto De Cristofaro, "eductus è carceribus", Michele De Notari and Giacomo Sansone make a deposition concerning the inventory of Giacinto's house and his library. The list of books seized includes those examined by Tommaso Pisacane (see "23 September 1691" below); the list is signed by Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 34v-38r.

17 August 1691

In an official deposition before notary Scipione Lacorcia, Donato Vulturale, priest and fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in Naples, confirms that he discussed with Giacinto De Cristofaro philosophical, ethical, and legal issues, but that the latter never uttered any proposition that contradicted orthodox faith, its individual dogmas, or the Catholic Church.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 313rv.

18 August 1691

In a letter to the Congregation, Giberti provides information on the arrest of De Cristofaro. Given his delicate state of health, De Cristofaro asks to be kept in a more comfortable room in the convent of San Domenico. Filippo Belli could not be arrested without the secular arm, because he is now based in Terra Atripalda, protected by the Prince of Avellino.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 160r-161r (summarized by the Assessor Filippo Bernini in *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 39r); cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 270v-271r.

18 August 1691

In a second letter to the Congregation in Rome, Giberti discloses that Gaspare Villamagna could not be arrested either, having fled his house before any attempt could be made to detain him.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 162r.

18 August 1691

Domenico Confuorto records in his journal:

The tribunal of the Holy Office is secretly trying to imprison more people who follow the infamous Epicurean sect; and it is said that the monsignor inquisitor went to the Viceroy to obtain license to arrest some of the royal ministers involved in the same sect. And rumors have arisen that these are the counselor and fiscal lawyer of the Royal Chamber Francesco d'Andrea, the president Don Cesare di Natale and the counselor Don Francesco Marciano. But the Viceroy did not want to grant it, saying that he could not imprison ministers without the order of His Majesty, and that therefore he [i.e., the minister of the Holy Office] should write to the Court.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 359.

20 August 1691

In a deposition in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Paolo D'Acunto refers to a meeting in a library where Lucio Capozzuti, Peppe Fasani, and Giacinto De Cristofaro discussed atomism and theological issues. They particularly quarreled about whether *remota fide* could be equated with *remota veritate*. Remarkably, De Cristofaro argued that drawing an equivalence between the two concepts was heretical.³ The deposition is sent to Rome on 25 August.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 39r-40v; then referred to in the interrogation on 27 September 1692.

20 August 1691

Francesco Antonio Pedulli, consultant of the Holy Office in Naples, writes to the Holy Office in Rome that Bernardo De Cristofaro is committed to organizing and supporting the expulsion of the Holy Office from Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 420r.

³ According to Luther, in fact, *remota fide* was equivalent to *remota veritate* because the Christian theologian cannot speak of God and His own individual and collective being *remota fide* or *remoto Christo*. This view must be understood in the context of the refusal by the great reformers of the Catholic-style natural theology, in which one could *remota fide* prove the existence of God, and some of His main properties.

20 August 1691

Giuseppe Migliore, guard in the Neapolitan Tribunal of the Holy Office, has been ordered to search for Filippo Belli. After making several inquiries, he hears from Belli's uncle that Belli has been active as governor in Castel Baronia (province of Avellino) for four months.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 44r.

22 August 1691

Official protest is transmitted by an *imbasciata* (envoy) from Francisco de Benavides, Viceroy in Naples, to the minister Giberti, concerning the recent arrests. The document highlights that – officially – there is no Tribunal of the Inquisition in Naples and that the arrest of laymen accused of matters regarding the Holy Office should be agreed upon with the political authorities. The Viceroy fears that the arrests by the minister of the Holy Office may cause riots in town, as one possible outcome of the widely shared intention to summon the *piazze*, that is, the noble and popular 'seats' or representative bodies.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 601r-602r.

22 August 1691.

The Congregation of the Holy Office discusses the letter by the minister in Naples, dated 11 August, about the arrest of Ricci and the flight of Galdieri.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 260v.

22 August 1691

Francesco Montecorvino, notary of the vice-regal government, conveys an oral message (*imbasciata*) from the Viceroy to Giovanni Battista Giberti, expressing an objection to the recent arrests made without vice-regal permission. Giberti requests confirmation of the message in writing, and receives this on the following day.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 514rv.

23 August 1691

Official attestation of the transmission by Francesco Montecorvino of the Viceroy's objection (in the aforementioned *imbasciata*) against Giberti's recent arrests. In extremely polite and bureaucratic terms, and with extensive references to precedence, the minister is told that his method of arresting laymen goes against traditional norms and conventions. He is strongly urged to transfer his prisoners to the archbishop's prison. Giberti then provides a reply, which eventually elicits a counter-response by Montecorvino.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 518r-520r (the *imbasciata*), 520r-521v (Giberti's reply) and 521v-523v (Montecorvino's counter-response); see also fols. 601r-602r, under "22 August", and Casoni's letter under "25 August".

23 August 1691

Having examined the manuscripts found in De Cristofaro's rooms, the Minim friar Francesco Antonio Pedulli, consultor of the Holy Office in Naples, declares that they concern canon law, the sacraments, and mathematics; none contains anything liable to theological censure.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 45r.

25 August 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, transmits a report by Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, for Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome (most probably in the same codex as the letter here referenced, on fols. 512r-517v), about some recent arrests and the consequences. A central issue regards the Inquisition's presumed right to carry out arrests without preliminary permission from the Viceroy. Casoni claims that he has spoken with the Viceroy:

And I did not fail to speak effectively to His Excellency, representing to him the bitterness that would have been produced in Our Lord's paternal heart to see such a strange pretension at the beginning of his Pontificate, that is, the intention to deprive the Minister General of the Holy Office of the freedom he had always enjoyed to carry out all those imprisonments which were ordered to him by the supreme Inquisition for the preservation of the purity of the faith in a Kingdom which has such a relationship with Rome, and continues to be happily under the rule of the Crown of Spain, which has consistently taken pride in relinquishing significant territories rather than allowing them to be tainted by heresy.

However, with his envoy (referred to as *imbasciata* at "22 August 1691" above), the Viceroy did not intend to introduce any novelty but simply to quell the rumors and riots in town. The Viceroy emphasized that one of the lessons to be learned from past revolts (such as those under Pedro of Toledo in the sixteenth century and, more recently, against Monsignor Piazza in 1661) is that harsh repression does not pay.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 427r-429r (copy of the letter is on fol. 600r).

25 August 1691

In a lengthy letter to Cardinal Alderano Cybo, Giovanni Battista Giberti discusses the recent envoy (*imbasciata*) from the Viceroy (see "22 August" and "23 August" above) conveyed through Francesco Montecorvino. The Viceroy had expressed his concerns about the unrest following the recent arrests ordered by Giberti and aims to limit the latter's authority, requesting advance notice of any imminent arrests of laymen and ordering that defendants be transferred to the archbishop's prison. Giberti, citing past practices, defends the legitimacy of his method and firmly rejects these requests. Currently, he cannot arrest Filippo Belli as the Nuncio cannot provide an arrest unit to apprehend the fugitive in Atripalda, where he now works. Giberti assures Cardinal Cybo that the rumors about the riots in Naples are likely exaggerated. Lastly, he rejects the request from individuals in Rome to 'habilitate' Giacinto De Cristofaro, as he has not yet been interrogated and is suspected of serious crimes.⁴ 'Habilitating' him would imply admitting that he was indicted for minor crimes, or "that he was incarcerated without evidence, and that the case is not serious at all".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 512r-517r (copies on fols. 604r-609r and in HH.1.l, fols. 163v-170r); cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 288v-289r.

26 August 1691

Donato Vulturale releases an official declaration, in which he confirms his acquaintance and friendship with Scipione De Cristofaro, with his son Bernardo, and with Giacomo, Gennaro, and Giacinto, sons of Bernardo. He expresses a positive assessment on Giacinto's character, knowing "very well that the said Giacinto is a man fearful of God, of good morals, attending the holy sacraments".

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 322rv.

26 August 1691

In his journal, Domenico Confuorto reports that Bernardo De Cristofaro has convinced the representatives of the *piazze* (both noble and popular seats) to ask the Viceroy to dislodge the Tribunal of the Holy Office:

Doctor Bernardo di Cristofano, a very petulant and reckless man, for having his son imprisoned in the prisons of the Holy Office, under investigation for being an atheist, is moving the city to resent this Court. Indeed, he pushed the elected of the People as well as the

⁴ The term 'to habilitate' (translation of *habilitare*, which has no equivalent in English) was used to indicate the granting of more favorable conditions of detention; 'habilitation' could consist of a more comfortable cell or of house arrest.

deputies of the *piazza*: the former to go with many people to the Viceroy in the Palace to ask him to drive away from this city and Kingdom this Court of the Holy Office of the local bishop; and the latter to assemble the representatives of the *piazza* for the same cause. And, in effect, the elected of the popular seat convinced the Viceroy to adjourn the Collaterale Court on this issue. Moreover, the Viceroy sent an embassy to Monsignor Inquisitor to refrain from imprisoning other persons under investigation, until the decision of the Supreme Pontiff was communicated, to whom would be written a note.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 360-1.

Post 26 August 1691

In a declaration before the Holy Office in Naples, Diego Di Lauro affirms that the mathematical, poetical, and astrological works confiscated in De Cristofaro's rooms do not contain anything against the truth and doctrine of the Church, except for Ptolemy's *Centiloquium*, an astrological treatise which, although not judiciary, is written by an author included in the Index of prohibited works (see '23 September 1691').

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 46r.

29 August 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses Giberti's letter dated 18 August. In a later summary (after 27 September), Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, provides a summary of this letter, accompanied by sarcastic comments on De Cristofaro's health:

And he added that he was a very pusillanimous man, and that he had been seen crying, like a little boy, and almost fainting from the palpitations of the heart, from which he claims to suffer, and having requested to be examined by medics, and having allowed him, the doctors attested by certificate that he was afflicted by hypochondriacal passions, which caused him dizziness, fainting, sour fistulations, hoarseness, spit of blood, fever. These evils all aggravated him in the few days of prison and presumably may become life-threatening.

With the attestation of his poor health, De Cristofaro asks to be transferred to another room in the convent of San Domenico Maggiore, *prævia fideiussione*.

Giberti also reports that Belli is now in Terra Atripalda and cannot be arrested without the aid of the secular arm.

The Cardinals decree that the minister examines the witnesses, and that he will arrange the transfer of De Cristofaro, on condition of bail and isolated from other prisoners.

Finally, as for Belli, the Minister must strive for his arrest "pro eius prudentia".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 270v-271r; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 39rv (Bernini's summary of Giberti's letter of 18 August), and 142r (summary of recent events).

30 August 1691

In a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome, the letters by the Nuncio Lorenzo Casoni and the minister Giberti are read. The Cardinals order that communication be made with the archbishop of Naples, as the latter should explain to the representatives of the middle class and the nobility that the recent arrests are necessary. The minister deserves praise for his actions, while the Nuncio in Naples should explain to the Viceroy that similar arrests should not be impeded. The Assessor is asked to contact the Spanish ambassador in Rome and the Apostolic Nuncio in Madrid.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 431v (not recorded in *Decreta*, 1691).

31 August 1691

From Massa Lubrense (on the Sorrento coast), Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, writes to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, on the “poison of atheism” in Naples. He complains about the lack of collaboration between the archbishop’s Tribunal and that of the minister of the Holy Office; the minister contends that it cannot provide him with information about ongoing trials without the approval of the Congregation in Rome. A closer cooperation, claims Cantelmo, could eliminate “many confusions and mistakes”.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 290rv.

1 September 1691

Card. Alderano Cybo writes to Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples. The Cardinals of the Congregation have granted De Cristofaro a comfortable room in the convent of San Domenico, but separated from other prisoners. They further urge the arrest of Filippo Belli. Furnishing instructions for the interrogations of the defendants and witness testimonies, Cybo strongly suggests that persons who are only mentioned by defendants as enemies should not be interrogated, unless they are also mentioned in the testimonies of the fiscal lawyer.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 30r (letter), 31rv (instructions); cf. SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.l, fol. 389rv.

1 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, writes to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, on the subject of the audition he had with the Viceroy in the morning for the purposes of explaining the arrests by the minister. The Viceroy has reconfirmed that he did not intend to introduce any judicial novelty with his envoy to the minister Giberti, but that he simply wished to prevent further revolts in the town. Casoni replies that the minister should be able to carry out the orders given by the Congregation in Rome.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 433r; copy on fol. 610r.

1 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, writes to card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, informing him about the attempts by members of the Collaterale Court to expel him from the City of Naples. He also reports on continuing riots in the streets and upheavals in the prisons, orchestrated by Bernardo De Cristofaro and Girolamo Acquaviva. Additionally, Giberti shares confidential information that he received from the secretary of the Capoana seat, revealing the spread of false reports that the Inquisition Court consisted of about a thousand persons, while in reality, there are around twenty-four (scribes, notaries, consultants, guards). He further reports on riots and insurrections in prisons, quelled with the assistance of the Nuncio and the archbishop. Giberti emphasizes the need for at least two trusted jailers who do not accept bribes from prisoners. He details, moreover, a visit to Archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo, then residing in Massa Lubrense on the Sorrento Peninsula. During their discussion, they addressed the arrest of Filippo Belli, as ordered by the Congregation on 18 August. Both Giberti and Cantelmo want to see a public abjuration of those accused of atomism, aiming to eradicate the poison of atheism through exemplary ‘public punishment’ (“castigo pubblico”).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 434r-436r; copy in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.l, fols. 178v-181r.

3 September 1691

The representatives of the noble seats (*piazze nobili*) decide almost unanimously – the exception being the *piazza del Nido* – to establish a *Deputazione perpetua per le cose pertinenti al Santo Officio* (modeled after the delegation that handled a similar crisis in 1661). This initiative aims – in matters of faith, according to the privileges and customs of the city –, to entrust

jurisdiction to the *ordinario*, meaning the local (arch)bishop. Each seat has elected three representatives for this Deputation. The *piazza del popolo* also adheres to this initiative. The Deputation for the Holy Office thereafter remains active until its abolition in 1800.

Bulifon 1932, 280 (the *voto* of the Nido seat is in the manuscript BNN, X.F.51, fol. 109r); Carafa 2005, 85-7; Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 360-1.

3 September 1691

The general frustration with the Inquisition persists, as is evident in popular protests and demonstrations in the streets of Naples. The Deputation therefore requests that the Viceroy ban Minister Giberti and the Inquisition altogether. Fearing serious repercussions in other parts of the Kingdom and acknowledging the weakness of his government, the Viceroy seeks the opinion of the Collaterale Court.

Carafa 2005, 94-7.

4 September 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Lorenzo Casoni provides information about the imminent meetings of the Neapolitan seats (*piazze*).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 440r.

5 September 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses a request by Giuseppe Ricci, only sixteen years old but implicated in the case against Musaci, Legitimo, Rosito, Barra and others investigated for atheism. Considering his delicate state of health, Ricci asks for house arrest. The Cardinals order that a letter be written to the minister in Naples requesting more information.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 283r.

6 September 1691

According to a later reconstruction (see “Ante 12 March 1692”), Giacinto De Cristofaro is today given a more comfortable room in the prison of San Domenico in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 668r (habilitated 24 days after his arrest); see also “1 September 1691”.

6 September 1691

In a letter to the Holy Office in Rome dated 25 August (see above), Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, reports that Bernardo De Cristofaro has incited the noble and popular seats against the Inquisition. The representative of the popular seat asked the Viceroy to convene the seats to halt the ‘abuses’ by the Inquisition. In response, the Viceroy stated that for future arrests by the Inquisition, he should be informed in advance. Additionally, he ordered that the defendants be transferred to the prisons of the archiepiscopal Curia. The Cardinals decide to write to the archbishop, urging him to negotiate with the popular seat and noblemen favorable to him. They emphasize the necessity of such arrests for “saving souls”. They issue an instruction, moreover, that a letter should be written to the Nuncio in Naples to negotiate with the Viceroy and request that he not obstruct these arrests. For the same purpose, the Assessor is tasked with speaking to the Spanish ambassador in Rome. Lastly, through the Secretary of State, the Assessor is to write to the Nuncio in Spain to share information about the correspondence with the authorities in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 288v-289r.

6 September 1691

The popular seat has elected six representatives to the Deputation for the Holy Office: Serafino Biscardi, Pietro Di Fusco, Giuseppe Costantino, Giacinto de Mari, Antonio Pistone, and Francesco Sernicola.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 362.

8 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, writes an extensive letter to card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, regarding the meetings of the 'seats' and the riots that erupted after the recent arrests. He relates that Bernardo De Cristofaro and Girolamo Acquaviva played a leading role in this revolt, doing everything they could to fuel hatred for the Holy Court of the Inquisition. Giberti confirms that Giacinto De Cristofaro has, in the meantime, been 'habilitated', meaning he will be moved from the 'formal prison' to a separate room in the convent of San Domenico Maggiore. Finally, he suggests that the Congregation orders the arrest of Basilio Giannelli and conducts an interview with Manuzzi (both in Spain) since their interrogations could strengthen the evidence against De Cristofaro. The letter is discussed in Rome on 13 September (*infra*).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 524^{rv}, 533^r (includes on fols. 525^{rv}, 527^r a letter by Girolamo Acquaviva; and on fol. 531, the 'voti' of Piazza Nido and Piazza Capuano, dated 3 September 1691); a copy is in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.l, fols. 184^r-186^r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 296^v-297^r.

11 September 1691

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanni Battista Giordano recalls meeting Filippo Belli in 1688, shortly after the earthquake in June. Belli had expressed his intention to denounce Giacinto De Cristofaro for heretical propositions, but Giordano is unable to specify the nature of these propositions, even when strongly urged to do so by the judges. This deposition is sent to Rome on 15 September.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 41^r-43^v.

11 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti informs the Congregation that the riots (*tumultus*) in town caused by the arrest of De Cristofaro are ongoing. Seditious representatives of the *piazze* intend to incite the local population, proclaiming aloud that they want no other tribunal of the Inquisition than that of the archbishop. There are rumors of an imminent assault on the inquisitorial prisons. Giberti has also learned that it has been requested of the Viceroy that he no longer allow lay people to be arrested by the Inquisition without his explicit permission.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 535^{rv}, 540^r.

11 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni informs Fabrizio Spada about the imminent meetings of the 'seats' in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 612^r-613^r.

12 September 1691

In response to the letter of 31 August by archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo (*supra*), the Cardinals order the minister of the Holy Office in Naples to share with the archbishop all future proceedings "pertinentes ad materias atomorum, et praetensorum atheistarum".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 290^v.

13 September 1691

In response to Giovanni Battista Giberti's letters of 1 September and 8 September (*supra*), the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome issue an instruction that a letter be written to archbishop Cantelmo insisting again on the coordination of the efforts of the political and ecclesiastical

authorities in the battle against atheism. The archbishop is tasked with explaining the gravity of the situation to the Viceroy, emphasizing that the *salus animarum* is at stake. The same message is to be conveyed to the Nuncio in Naples. Subsequently, the Cardinals instruct that a letter be written to Minister Giberti, requesting that he refrain from making further arrests without explicit support from the authorities. Lastly, they order the Nuncio in Spain (then Giuseppe Mosti) to safeguard the Holy Office, transmitting relevant judicial deeds regarding Basilio Giannelli so that he may turn himself in.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 296v-297r; draft in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 432r.

13 September 1691

The political authorities decree that both Girolamo Acquaviva and Bernardo De Cristofaro be kept under house arrest on charges that they have incited the popular and noble seats against the Inquisition:

On 13 [September], Thursday, it was decided that Dr. Bernardo di Cristofano and Mr. Don Girolamo Acquaviva of the house of Nardò should remain under house arrest rather than going to prison, for reasons that not only had been the cause of the convocation of the *piazze* to remove from this Kingdom the tribunal of the Inquisition, but also for having aroused the people to resent the Court of the City in San Lorenzo, and protesting that the said tribunal of the Inquisition should be removed. All this was mainly caused by the said Bernardo, because the inquisitor imprisoned his son as an atheist.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 363; Bulifon 1932, 283.

14 September 1691

The Deputation for the Holy Office convenes in the church of San Lorenzo, discussing an account related to the establishment of the Deputation in 1661. This Deputation was established in response to the novelties introduced at that time by Camillo Piazza, the then minister of the local Holy Office. The 1661 account harshly criticized the role of ecclesiastical leaders in local tensions and assessed the relationship with the vice-regal government. During the meeting, riots break out in the square outside the church, sparked by protesters against the minister and his servants.

Bulifon 1932, 283; Carafa 2005, 88-94.

15 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, transmits the medical declarations regarding Giuseppe Ricci to the Holy Office in Rome.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 52v; see also “27 October 1691” below, and fols. 139v and 142r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 305r (“26 September 1691”).

15 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, updates Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, on the recent events in Naples. He provides a detailed account, delving into historical details, of the conflicts of jurisdiction between the Tribunal of the Inquisition and that of the archbishop in cases of heresy. The efficiency and secrecy of the former have aroused the envy of the latter. Recently, Giberti was offered help by a consultant from the archbishop’s Court, considering the complexity of the current situation and the turmoil created in the city by the arrests and the lengthy investigation. The minister declined this assistance, however, primarily because he sees himself as the foremost defender of faith in the Kingdom.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 297r-299r.

15 September 1691

The delegates of the Neapolitan Deputation of the Holy Office pay a visit to the Viceroy to discuss their requests.

Bulifon 1932, 284.

15 September 1691

After bitter protests from the aforementioned Deputation for the Holy Office, the Viceroy amended the order of (house) arrest for Girolamo Acquaviva and Bernardo De Cristofaro, commuting it to a precept not to leave the city. The Viceroy also orders the prevention of new imprisonments and promises to refer the matter of the Holy Office to the Collaterale Court.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 364-5; cf. Galasso 1982, 446-7.

15 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, updates Cardinal Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, on recent events – specifically, the revolts (“tumulti in città”) following the arrest of De Cristofaro. Informed by Casoni of concerns that the mob, incited by Bernardo De Cristofaro and Girolamo Acquaviva, might attempt to violently liberate the prisoners, the Viceroy had pledged to do everything within his power to pacify the conflicting parties. He also reiterated that the Court in Spain had instructed the minister to inform them about future arrests.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 294r-295v.

15 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, updates Filippo Bernini on the position of the Neapolitan Holy Office and its relations with Rome and the local archbishop, providing a historical reconstruction. He highlights the envy that the Holy Office has provoked within the archbishop’s Tribunal, and lists several objections to leaving all cases of heresy solely to the archbishop’s Court. One objection pertains to the case against Giacinto De Cristofaro; it does not seem appropriate to entrust it to the Court of the archbishop, given that its fiscal lawyer is a close friend of De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 297r-299r.

15 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, informs card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, that he has convinced the Viceroy to search the houses of Girolamo Acquaviva and Bernardo De Cristofaro. The danger of new disturbances appears to have been averted, as the Viceroy has instructed the captains of the streets to disperse any gatherings. The Deputation of the Holy Office convened one day earlier in San Lorenzo, emphasizing the need for a single tribunal of faith (presumably that of the archbishop). Subsequent to the sudden death of Duke Francesco Caracciolo, a well-known opponent of the Holy Office in Naples, many noblemen, however, had begun to express themselves in a more ‘Christian’ manner.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 320rv.

15 September 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome has decided to send a copy of the proceedings against the Neapolitan atheists to the Nuncio in Madrid. They have requested that the Nuncio deliver these documents to the General Inquisitor, who will then proceed to an interrogation of Manuzzi and Giannelli.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 672v.

18 September 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, provides an update on the organization of his archive and announces the forthcoming transmission of documents regarding earlier revolts against the Holy Office in Naples (1628-33 and 1661). He emphasizes that revolts usually stem from the nobility rather than the common people. Currently, the most seditious individuals are still Acquaviva and De Cristofaro Sr. The assurance that the Viceroy will be informed of future arrests has not reassured the nobles who fear that the Viceroy's involvement could lead to asset confiscations in cases of arrest. Giberti fears being banned and further reports strong suspicions that information is being leaked from the Holy Office in Naples to the ministers of the Viceroy; these suspicions arose due to one of the consultors being 'agitated' by the arrest of De Cristofaro. Giberti believes he knows "who the mole is" – described as a person boasting powerful friends in Naples and Rome, including cardinals – but he is not completely certain. In a later autograph annotation, written a few days later because the letter could not be transmitted on 18 September, Giberti reveals that the 'traitor' is Vincenzo Magnati, who boasts of his friendship with Prior Liberati (likely Francesco Liberati, 1616-1703) in Rome.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 377r-380r; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fols. 212v-216v.

18 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni writes to Fabrizio Spada about the meetings of the seats (*piazze*) in Naples. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 543rv, 546rv (includes on fols. 544r-545r: "memoria per Sua Eccellenza della Deputazione fatta circa le novità introdotte da Monsignor Vescovo della Cava"); copy on fols. 615r-616v.

18 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni transmits a letter by Giovanni di Santa Maria to Fabrizio Spada; the letter describes the decisions of the Collaterale Court and the meetings of the *piazze*.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 614r.

19 September 1691

Reading Giovanni Battista Giberti's letter of 11 September (*supra*), the Cardinals of the Congregation in Rome reply that he should persist in his policy. In addition, they decide to write to the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, asking that he proceed in the case against Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Basilio Giannelli, then on a mission in Spain.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 299r.

21 September 1691

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, informs Filippo Bernini that Bernardo De Cristofaro and Girolamo Acquaviva continue "to spread seditious thoughts around the city".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 385r-387r.

22 September 1691

Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, has received the order to contact Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, who is tasked with writing to the Nuncio in Naples. The Nuncio should be provided with the text outlining the origin and history of the Holy Office in Naples, which he is then to transmit to the Viceroy. This is intended to convince the Viceroy of the gravity of the accusations against De Cristofaro and Belli, particularly with regard to their views on Christ and the composition of humans from atoms. Antonio Barra, who supports "the opinion of Democritus of the atoms", is also mentioned among those implicated in the case. Additionally, the Nuncio is to propose that Minister Giberti, as bishop of Cava, should be sent back to his

own diocese. Lastly, in case of extreme necessity, the Nuncio should consider the possibility of transferring the prisoners of the Holy Office, particularly De Cristofaro and Ricci, from the archiepiscopal prisons to those of the Nunciature.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 307r-308v; official decree on fol. 322v (*infra*).

22 September 1691

In a letter to card. Alderano Cybo, Giovanni Battista Giberti reveals that he has had a premonition of imminent banishment: “they will give me the eviction, to quiet, as they say, this tumultuous and threatening people”. He seeks guidance from the cardinal on whether to leave his position immediately or to await a banishment through an official edict. Giberti hopes to remain in the city until his fate is determined but stresses that he is, and will remain, the Minister of the Holy Office. He asserts that he will not resign unless explicitly requested to do so by the Pope and the Congregation. As he composes the letter, he receives word from Archbishop Cantelmo, who plans to come from Massa Lubrense to Naples on the following day to address the matter with the Viceroy. Giberti is under few illusions, recognizing that the Viceroy is unlikely to set aside the decision of the Collateral Court. The Viceroy appears, moreover, to be displeased with Giberti for the latter’s insistence on continuing to fulfil his duties (including interrogatories, examinations, etc.).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 366r-367v.

22 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni writes to Fabrizio Spada on the meetings of the seats (*piazze*).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 621rv.

22 September 1691

In a letter to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Lorenzo Casoni states that he will be entrusted with the role of minister of the Holy Office after the imminent departure of Giovanni Battista Giberti. He hopes to be able to fulfil this function without further disorders in town.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 623r.

22 September 1691

In a decree by the Holy Office, the Cardinals order the Secretary of State to write to the Nuncio in Naples and transmit to him the documents concerning the origin and history of the Holy Office in Naples. The Nuncio is instructed to pass this documentation to the Viceroy, along with information about the serious charges against Giacinto De Cristofaro and Filippo Belli, including details of their views on Christ and atomism.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 322v (not recorded in *Decreta*).

23 September 1691

Giovanni Selvaggi, the Neapolitan Holy Office *mastrodatti* (‘master of acts’, an official in charge of drafting and keeping public and private documents; a notary), transfers an inventory of the proceedings to the Dominican Tommaso Corrado, archivist of the Holy Office in the convent of San Domenico in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 211r; inventory on fols. 215r-240r; see also “6 October 1691”.

23 September 1691

Tommaso Pisacane presents his assessment of the books seized in De Cristofaro’s house. He found three printed books: *Rime* by Giulio Cortese; a work by Achille Tazio, *Dell’amore di Leucippe, et di Clitophonte*; and an edition of Ptolemy’s *Centoloquium*. Only the latter is prohibited, not explicitly, but under Rule IX of the Index which bans all works on judiciary astrology. Then, he found three manuscripts: the first contained a disputation on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, in addition to disputations on virtues, sundials, mechanics, the sphere, and on Aristotle’s

Meteorology; the second manuscript is partially written in an alphabet unknown to the censor, it is falsely attributed to Hieronymus, and it contains superstitious views on the (magical) force of the Psalms and of religious orations, in addition to expressions against war, sickness, and the devil; the third manuscript contains the prophecies of Nostradamus, which the censor considers an erroneous and audacious work banned by the bulls against astrology issued by Sixtus V (*Coeli et terrae*, 1588) and Urban VIII (*Inscrutabilis*, 1631).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 47r-50r.

25 September 1691

In a letter from Massa Lubrense to Cardinal Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, Archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo provides a report on his visit to the Viceroy in Naples. He urged the Viceroy to suppress the local rebellion more vigorously and to resist the decision to remove Minister Giberti from Naples. Cantelmo argued that such a measure would not only displease the Holy See but would also incur the displeasure of His Majesty, the King of Spain:

That this violent and irreverent manner towards the Apostolic See would have contracted the indignation of God, who deigned to warn him with more scourges not yet appeased, and would reasonably have greatly moved the most pious soul of His Catholic Majesty, which he would have considered with great detriment not less of the divine, than of one's own service.

The Viceroy responded that his actions were aimed at averting further turmoil and maintaining public peace; the minister's departure, he contended, would pacify the situation and, simultaneously, allow the Holy Office to continue its activities.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fols. 64r-67r.

25 September 1691

Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, writes to card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome. He tells the cardinal that he has followed archbishop Cantelmo's advice not to present himself to the Viceroy in person, but has instead sent two of his consultors, Giovanni di Santa Maria, and Giovanni Battista Capano. He has asked the Nuncio, moreover, for eight days to organize the archive. In a post scriptum, he reveals that the Viceroy has ordered his departure from Naples that very night.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 344r-345r.

25 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs card. Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, that he spoke two days ago with the Viceroy regarding the request of the noble seats to ban Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples. Casoni conveyed the disapproval of the Holy See and the proposal from the Congregation that the minister be moved to his Church in Cava and that the prisoners from the San Domenico convent be transferred to the prisons of the Nunciature. The Viceroy was apprehensive, however, that a refusal to yield to the deputies of the seats might lead to new disorders. He awaited, meanwhile, the resolutions of the Collaterale Court. Subsequently, the Court approved the ban on Giberti and the transfer of the prisoners from San Domenico to the archiepiscopal prisons. Thus, the next day, Giberti would leave for Gaeta.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 500r-502v; cf. 625r.

25 September 1691

Confuorto comments the recent events:

At 25 [September], Tuesday, monsignor inquisitor was ordered to leave the office he holds as an inquisitor and to go to his residence in the bishop's church of Cava [de' Tirreni]

(being bishop of that city). And also, orders have been sent to monsignor Nuncio to exercise ad interim the office of inquisitor, perhaps because the Pontiff thought that not the tribunal, but the minister was hateful to the city and therefore, by removing him from the ministry, the spirits of those who reject said tribunal would be quieted. In carrying out this order, the following night he [i.e., Giberti] has left this city. However, it is said that he did not go to his bishopric, but that he went to Gaeta, to stay there waiting for the Pontiff's order, to see how the affair was going to finish. The Supreme Pontiff sent these orders, to show his (partial) appreciation of this city, which had begged him through its deputies, added to the prayers of the Viceroy, to remove this Court from this City and Kingdom, because the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the local bishop would suffice for the punishment of delinquents. We will see what follows.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 365.

26 September 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the letter by Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, dated 15 September, attesting the physical infirmity of Giuseppe Ricci, implicated in the cases of Ilarione Musaci, Antonio Barra, and other defendants accused of giving credence to views “on atomism and atheism”. The Cardinals allow house arrest, on condition that the medical attestation can be trusted. The letter to Naples is written on 29 September.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 305r; SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 142r (annotations).

26 September 1691

In the early morning, Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, departs the city for Gaeta, a town near the border of the Ecclesiastical State. There, he will await the Pope's orders to determine whether he must proceed to Rome or another destination. Nuncio Lorenzo Casoni has been temporarily entrusted with the functions of the minister of the Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 326r (cf. fol. 625r); cf. Galasso 1982, 447, and Osbat 1974, 113-14.

26 September 1691

Having written to the Holy Office in Rome (a letter referenced at “25 September” above), Giacomo Cantelmo sends a copy of this letter to cardinal Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome. He expresses significant doubts about the concerns that led the Viceroy to remove the minister from Naples. Cantelmo suggests that the Viceroy should have waited for advice from Spain instead of being influenced solely by his own ministers in the city.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fols. 69r-70r.

26 September 1691

After having reviewed a letter from Minister Giberti, the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome decide to grant house arrest to Giuseppe Ricci. As the minister has been removed from his post in the meantime, however, the order is not executed.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 52v (see an annotation by the Assessor to Ricci's petition on fol. 47r; see “27 October 1691”).

26 September 1691

Bulifon reports on two meetings of the Deputation of the Holy Office.

Bulifon 1932, 285.

Ante 27 September 1691

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro states that he is now in the prison of the archbishop, but that he does not derive any benefit from the ‘habilitation’

(a more comfortable room) granted by the Congregation on 29 August (see above); because his “infirmity of cardiac affections continues with salty spit with blood, with an evident danger to life”, he asks for house arrest.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 41r; cf. fol. 39rv (summary by Filippo Bernini).

Ante 27 September 1691

In another petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro repeats the same request, expressed this time in a different wording, specifying the amount of 3000 *scudi* as bail. He asks to be allowed to defend himself in the Roman Congregation, and to prove his innocence.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 42rv.

27 September 1691

In a letter to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Bernardo De Cristofaro advocates the case of his son with an emotive appeal, including Giacinto’s petitions (*supra*).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 46r.

27 September 1691

The Deputation of the Holy Office meets once again in Naples.

Bulifon 1932, 285.

27 September 1691

In an official letter to the “elected of this noble city”, Antonio de Retes, Court functionary, announces that the Viceroy intends to meet the demands of the noble seats. He further informs his readers that Giberti, bishop of Cava, has already left the city.

Privilegj 1719, 217.

27 September 1691

Tommaso Maria Corrado, archivist of the Holy Office, finishes a dissertation on the history of the Holy Office in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 276r-286r.

27 September 1691

The City of Naples expresses its gratitude to the Viceroy for the expulsion of Giberti.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 365.

28 September 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo expresses his regret that his efforts to petition the Viceroy were unable to prevent the expulsion of Minister Giberti. He then strongly contests the claims of the Deputation that one should proceed in cases of heresy according to the ‘ordinary way’ (*via ordinaria*), instead of following the canons established in papal bulls and apostolic constitutions.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fols. 72r-73r.

28 September 1691

In an extraordinary meeting of the Holy Office in Rome on Friday,⁵ the Cardinals order that the Spanish ambassador be summoned to face vigorous protests against the Viceroy’s expulsion of the minister of the Holy Office in Naples. The arrest of some suspects by the minister, without prior notice to the vice-regal authorities, was simply the execution of orders from the

5 The Congregation usually met on Tuesday, Wednesday and/or Thursday.

central Court of the Inquisition; it does not justify the expulsion of the minister or, as some now suggest, the expulsion of the Holy Office itself from the city and the Kingdom. The cardinals also decree that the archbishop and the nuncio in Naples should be informed about these decisions by the Secretary of State.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 389v.

29 September 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, writes to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, indicating that, with Giberti having left Naples on 26 September, he himself will assume the responsibility for the transfer of the prisoners of the Holy Office from the San Domenico convent to the archiepiscopal prisons. He awaits further orders.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 326rv.

29 September 1691

In another letter to Fabrizio Spada, Lorenzo Casoni writes that he has ordered the officials of the Holy Office not to keep prohibited arms in their houses. He further provides information about the archive of the local Holy Office (which returned to the convent of San Domenico), and the transfer of prisoners (among whom are De Cristofaro and Ricci). The Viceroy insists that Giberti, now in Gaeta, should leave the Kingdom of Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 328r.

29 September 1691

In a letter to Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office, Lorenzo Casoni informs the Congregation about the transfer of the archive of the Holy Office to the convent of San Domenico. He enquires about the appropriate response to the Curia's request for the files from the atheism case.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 334r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 319v.

29 September 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giovanni Battista Giberti, the recently exiled minister of the Holy Office in Naples, reconstructs the details of his expulsion from Naples. He expresses regret that he, who had made the persecution of heretics his vocation, has now been expelled as a heretic: "So I left Naples, as if I had preached heresies there, and errors so pernicious to Religion and to the Republic itself, that I tried to extirpate". He learned that the Deputies against the Holy Office had decided to send two knights to escort him to the borders of the Kingdom, and that the representative of the People's seat was instructed to burn the Holy Office archive. Before his departure, he entrusted the Nuncio with his archive and the transportation of the prisoners. Additionally, he strongly suspects that his removal is intended to favor the case of Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 504r-505v.

Autumn 1691

The Deputation of the Holy Office in Naples presents a petition to the Viceroy entitled *Memo-ria per Sua Eccellenza della Deputazione fatta circa le novità introdotte da Monsignor della Cava*.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, 368r-369r.

Autumn 1691

Giuseppe Valletta, the well-known lawyer and erudite, is asked by the Deputation for the Holy Office to write a treatise on the Tribunal of faith in Naples.

Comparato 1970, ch. 4; Osbat 1974, 28.

Ante 1 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni transfers the prisoners from the inquisitorial prison in the San Domenico convent to the prison in the archiepiscopal palace. Among the 'atheists' transferred, there is mention of De Cristofaro, Ricci, and Legitimo.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 199v; see fol. 324r for the charge of atheism, and fol. 336r for the prisoners which have not been transferred; cf. Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 366, for an extensive report.

1 October 1691

The Cardinals of the Holy Office decree that Giberti, now in Gaeta, is forbidden to leave that city.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 583v.

2 October 1691

Against his will, Giacinto De Cristofaro is transferred from the convent of San Domenico to the prison in the archiepiscopal Curia. He then presents a legal challenge as he has been illegally deprived of his 'habilitation' in the convent, while other prisoners with the same privilege (among whom he will later list Bartolomeo Rossi, Geronimo Nicolò Carafa, and Tommaso del Cilento) are allowed to stay.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 171r; cf. fol. 125v.

2 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, about the transfer of the prisoners from one prison to another; three of them are classified as 'atheists' – namely, Giacinto De Cristofaro, Giovanni Legitimo, and Giuseppe Ricci.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 267r-268v (copy on fols. 555r-557r); see also the declaration by the vicar general on fol. 559rv, with a list of prisoners, dated 1 October and an official annotation made on 2 October.

Post 2 October 1691

Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, provides an update on Giacinto De Cristofaro's situation. Although initially 'habilitated' to a more comfortable room in the San Domenico convent, he has since been moved to the prison in the archiepiscopal Curia. Lacking a more comfortable room in this prison, he is now requesting house arrest.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 39rv; summary on fol. 139r.

3 October 1691

The Deputation of the Holy Office decides to send Francesco Sernicola, member of the Deputation and elected in the board of the popular 'seat', as a representative to Spain to support its requests.

Bulifon 1932, 285 (original manuscript in BNN, ms. X.F.51, fol. 130r).

3 October 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, expresses his intention to facilitate the re-establishment of the Holy Office Tribunal in Naples without making significant commitments. However, he notes that: "The difficulties will be made not by the *piazze*, but by those Royal ministers who have stirred up the storm in order to take advantage of it".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 1rv.

4 October 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, underlining that he has been forcibly banned.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 146r.

6 October 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Orazio Florati relates that the City of Naples has decided to send Francesco Sernicola to Spain to present the Neapolitan objections against the presence of the Holy Office in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 253rv.

6 October 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo, the archbishop of Naples, discloses that he has received notice from Nuncio Casoni that a formal protest is to be transmitted from the Holy See to the Viceroy regarding the exile of Minister Giberti. Cantelmo also provides information about Francesco Sernicola's mission to Spain in support of the Deputation's reasons for eliminating the Tribunal of the Holy Office from Naples and for entrusting cases of heresy solely to the archiepiscopal Curia.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fols. 77r-79r.

6 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni writes to Fabrizio Spada, relating the fact that he has petitioned the Viceroy, protesting against the expulsion of Minister Giberti.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 549rv, 552rv.

6 October 1691

Giovanni Selvaggi, *mastrodatti* ('notary') of the Holy Office in Naples, hands over a copy of the inventory of the proceedings by Minister Giberti to the Nuncio in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 198r (inventory on fol. 199rv, dated 1 October 1691; a list of trials appears on fols. 201r-213v; further lists of *scritture* appear on fols. 215r-240r).

7 October 1691

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Bernardo De Cristofaro expresses his dissatisfaction that his son Giacinto, who had previously been 'habilitated' (that is, granted a more comfortable accommodation) by the Congregation to a single room in the convent of San Domenico (apparently with a bail of 3000 *scudi*), has now been transferred with other prisoners to the archiepiscopal palace. When attempting to discuss the matter in Massa Lubrense with Archbishop Cantelmo and his Vicar, Bernardo was redirected to the Nuncio. The latter replied to the Vicar that the incident could not be prevented by the Congregation: "In sum, we are deceived and are disappointed".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 154rv.

7 October 1691

Francesco Sernicola leaves Naples for his mission in Madrid.

Amabile 1892, 2: 55; Galasso 1982, 448.

9 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, transmits to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome the petition by Bernardo De Cristofaro, dated 7 October.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, 152v.

10 October 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office discusses the letter by Lorenzo Casoni written on 29 September (see above), regarding the vacancy for the role of minister in Naples. He asks how to respond to the request by the Curia for the files from the atheism case. The Cardinals strongly recommend an exchange of information “in causis Atheismi, et Atomorum”, and thus a collaboration between the Curia and the local Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 319v.

Ante 12 October 1691

The Pope writes a letter to the Viceroy, expressing his displeasure at the expulsion of the Inquisitor. He admonishes the Viceroy, suggesting that he is being ill-advised by his counselors. Bulifon 1932, 286.

13 October 1691

Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, informs Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Spain, of recent events in Naples, including the expulsion of Giberti and the transfer of prisoners. He mentions the imminent arrival in Spain of Francesco Sernicola. Bernini adds that the Nuncio in Naples has been instructed not to deliver the case files of the prisoners, even those who have been ‘habilitated’, to the archiepiscopal Curia.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 243r-246r.

13 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni provides information to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, about the mission of Francesco Sernicola in Spain. The Viceroy has kept the Court of Madrid apprised of recent events, and now awaits further instructions. Meanwhile, peace has returned among the *piazze*.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 163r; cf. fol. 563rv.

16 October 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Lorenzo Casoni ponders the possibility of raising an interdict (*interdetto*) against Naples in response to the expulsion of Minister Giberti.

Confuorto 1930-31, 1: 312-13.

17 October 1691

The Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome discuss the petition by Bernardo De Cristofaro (transmitted by Lorenzo Casoni) and decree that Bernardo should address the Nuncio in Naples for the issue of the ‘habilitation’ of his son.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, 152v (not recorded in *Decreta*).

Ante 18 October 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, reports that he has been visited by a brother and the father of Giacinto De Cristofaro

to ask me that I should let his son enjoy the same ‘habilitation’ in the archbishopric, which he enjoyed in the Convent of S. Domenico by order of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. I replied that I had already made this appeal known to the Vicar of that Curia, and that I had been ordered by him to say that the same Giacinto was in a comfortable room, most similar to the cell in which he was ‘habilitated’ in S. Domenico. But now he [Bernardo] rebutted that I should have him [Giacinto] transported back to the same Convent or should have allowed him to be ‘habilitated’ in the archbishop’s Seminary. To which I replied that I felt a particular displeasure at not having the power to console

him, using every other demonstration of courtesy in such a way that he showed that he departed from me satisfied.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 136r, 137v (with the annotation: “Die 18 Octobris fuit remissum originale ad Secretariam Status”).

19 October 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo mentions that he is considering the possibility of placing a ban (*interdetto*) on the City of Naples as a reaction to the expulsion of Minister Giberti. He believes that applying pressure on the Court in Spain might influence the Deputation to adopt a less radical stance.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fols. 86r-87r.

20 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni explains to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, that he has this morning had a conversation with the Viceroy. However, the Viceroy is unable to implement the requested ‘reparations’, specifically allowing the Bishop of Cava (Giberti) to return to town, without receiving orders from the Royal Court of Spain in this regard. Casoni endeavors, moreover, to persuade Spada that the ‘moral majority’ (“la più sana parte”) of the nobility remains faithful to Rome and the Pope.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 173rv.

21 October 1691

In Madrid, the regents of the Council of Italy propose a set of guidelines for the Court in Madrid to avoid jeopardizing the delicate situation in Naples caused by Giberti’s lack of inclination to collaborate with the civil authorities. The regents emphasize that the names of the persons to be arrested should have been transmitted to the civil authorities. Giberti’s behavior “could cause very considerable fires and not easy to extinguish, as experience has shown”.

AGS, *Fundo de instituciones de Antiguo Regimen, Consejo de Italia, Secretaría de Nápoles*, Legajo 192, fols. 1r-3r; see Serpico 2016, 45-6.

27 October 1691

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, Giuseppe Ricci, seventeen years old and implicated in the case against Antonio Barra, asks to be ‘habilitated’ for reasons of health. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 47rv, with a declaration by a physician on fol. 49r; an annotation appears on fol. 52v, by the Assessor (who specifies the age of Ricci as 18).

27 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, that Bernardo De Cristofaro and the father of the cleric Giuseppe Ricci do not intend to approach him for the ‘habilitation’ of their sons, as suggested by the Congregation in Rome. Instead, they have contacted the deputies of the noble seats and the royal ministers. Casoni learned this morning that Bernardo De Cristofaro did not want to openly approach him, for fear of incurring the indignation of the royal ministers.

Casoni adds the following remarks regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro:

As to Giacinto di Cristofaro, I would dare to believe that every facility could be used, not so much in regard to the father, who is the man who has aroused and may foment the present upheaval, but because so far there is only one witness against him.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 38rv, 53rv; summary on fol. 171rv.

27 October 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, also informs Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, that he failed to convince Bernardo De Cristofaro and the father of Giuseppe Ricci to approach him – the Nuncio –, instead of the Congregation.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 171rv.

28 October 1691

The Spanish ambassador is summoned to the Holy Office in Rome and is asked to give explanations regarding the expulsion of Giberti, minister of the Holy Office, from Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 346r-348r.

October-November 1691

A petition is submitted, probably by Bernardo De Cristofaro, for the ‘habilitation’ of Giacinto De Cristofaro to the Deputation of the Holy Office in Naples. This document marks the first mention of the *informo*, which, in the summer-autumn of 1688, Antonio Torres had compiled for Giuseppe Nicola Giberti in support of De Cristofaro’s moral standing among clerics of impeccable conduct. This information had influenced the minister’s decision to dismiss De Cristofaro’s case:

Monsignor di Teano, his predecessor, dropped this alleged case, since he had been informed of the good quality of Doctor Giacinto by very serious men, among whom were the Reverend Don Fulvio Caracciolo, the Abbot Don Vincenzo Magnati, consultor of said Inquisition, the canon D. Nicolò Cerilli at the time Consultor of the Holy Inquisition of the Archbishop’s Court, the priest D. Emanuele Ciccattelli, and the priest D. Honofrio Bizzarro, his [i.e., De Cristofaro’s] ordinary confessor, making up from this ‘informo’ the illegitimacy of this case, De Cristofaro’s innocence, and the ignorance and malice of his ill-wishers.

During the six years of his trial, De Cristofaro never succeeded in obtaining copies of these attestations.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 272r-273v; this *informo* is also mentioned in De Cristofaro’s interrogatory of 15 September 1692 (ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 175v-176r) and in later documents (BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 266r, 169r, 125r, 133r; ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 414r, 422r, 472v); for Antonio Torres’s role, see, ASDN, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 309v (cf. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 264v, 348r).

3 November 1691

Lorenzo Casoni informs Fabrizio Spada that Bernardo De Cristofaro has not heeded the advice of the Viceroy regarding the ‘habilitation’ of his son but has instead approached the noble and popular ‘seats’. Casoni anticipates receiving instructions on how to respond to the petitions from De Cristofaro and Ricci.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 3r.

3 November 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo indicates that he has relocated from Massa Lubrense to Naples in order to closely monitor developments around the Holy Office and to intervene more effectively.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 56, fol. 89rv.

6 November 1691

In a letter to the Holy Office in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs the Congregation that a certain Stefano Pizzari, released from prison and granted house arrest, has requested permission to travel to Rome, where he wishes to provide information to the Supreme Tribunal about the case against the atheists, the revolts against Giberti, Bishop of Cava, and the opposition to the local Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 352r.

7 November 1691

In the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, the Cardinals are informed about the petition by Bernardo De Cristofaro for the 'habilitation' of his son, as well as the petition on behalf of Giuseppe Ricci presented by his father. Bernardo is advised to discuss the case with the Nuncio, Lorenzo Casoni. The Cardinals order that the Secretary of State must write to the Nuncio, advising that the prisoners on bail be 'habilitated'; the Viceroy is asked, moreover, to consult his conscience because he is delaying the arrest of Belli.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 345v-346r; copy in ADDF, So, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 56v.

8 November 1691

Giuseppe Mosti, titular archbishop of Nazianze, and Nuncio in Spain, writes to card. Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, informing him of the discussions that were taking place in the Council of Italy in Madrid about the recent events surrounding the Holy Office in Naples. He reports the arrival of Francesco Sernicola (see "3 October" onwards) and stresses that the Council of Italy intends to maintain the Holy Office in Naples in the form established in the period after Paul IV, eliminating possible abuses.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 457r-458v.

8 November 1691

Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, has been ordered to ask Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, to write to Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, and interim minister of the local Holy Office, to summon Bernardo De Cristofaro and the father of Giuseppe Ricci, and to 'habilitate' their sons – Giuseppe Ricci to his house, and Giacinto to a more comfortable room in the convent of San Domenico.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 54r.

13 November 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, writes that the physician of the Holy Office in Naples has found Ricci and De Cristofaro in perfect health. The "declarations begged from their partial doctors" have therefore been exposed as untrue, with the result that there is no reason for any 'habilitation'. They are not without good care, because they are visited each day by the *mastrodatti* and the *avvocato dei poveri*, and the apothecary of the prison provides all the medicines needed.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 80rv, 85rv.

14 November 1691

The Congregation in Rome discusses the letter by Casoni dated 6 November (*supra*); Stefano Pizzari is granted permission to travel to Rome and the Nuncio is asked to transmit a copy of the proceedings of Pizzari's case.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 352r.

17 November 1691

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, relates that – contrary to the advice of the Congregation in Rome – he had not been visited

or addressed by Bernardo De Cristofaro. Casoni heard, however, that Bernardo had spoken to the *mastrodatti* of the Holy Office in Naples, “complaining in a certain way to him that the Cleric Ricci might be granted habilitation in his own home, and his son in S. Domenico”. Then, yesterday Casoni was visited by Angelo Barone who came to ask the answer to Ricci’s petition, and who most likely works in concert with Bernardo, Giacinto’s father.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 81r, 84v.

20 November 1691

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, that he still has not heard anything from Bernardo De Cristofaro:

I discover more and more that the prisoners proceed with tricks and deception to see if they can succeed in being freed without recognizing in me the general ministry of this Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 82rv, 83v.

26 November 1691

From Gaeta, Giovanni Battista Giberti writes to the Holy Office in Rome with reference to several issues: he has left his role and wants to transmit the proceedings of the trials still in progress to his successor. He specifies that De Cristofaro and Ricci have not been ‘habilitated’.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 5rv.

27 November 1691

Former Minister Giberti, currently out of service, writes from Gaeta to Filippo Bernini in Rome. While refraining from any formal acts, he remains engaged in the affairs of the Neapolitan Holy Office, maintaining involvement, for instance, through ongoing communication with the *mastrodatti*.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 449r.

28 November 1691

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome is informed about Casoni’s letters dated 13, 17, and 20 November. The Cardinals examine De Cristofaro and Ricci’s requests for house arrest, but eventually decide to reject the medical certificates of the two defendants on the basis of the fact that the certificates were not signed by physicians affiliated with the local Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fol. 368v.

4 December 1691

Giovanni Selvaggi, *mastrodatti* in the Neapolitan Holy Office, reveals to Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, that there have been fights among prisoners in the archiepiscopal prisons. The prisoners of the Holy Office are divided into two opposing groups; one group is led by Giacinto De Cristofaro, “who, as is well known, has demanded the abolition of the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Kingdom”. De Cristofaro’s group also includes Giuseppe Ricci and Giovanni Legitimo among its members.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 14r-15v, 16v.

4 December 1691

In a letter to card. Alderano Cybo, Lorenzo Casoni informs the Congregation about the recent fights in the archiepiscopal prisons.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 13r.

5 December 1691

The Congregation discusses a letter by Natale Regina, first *cursor* ('guard') of the Holy Office in Naples having been in post for seventeen years. Feeling threatened after the uprising that followed the arrest of De Cristofaro, Regina requests a weapons license. The danger of new revolts is confirmed in a letter by Nuncio Casoni (dated 17 November), read in the same meeting. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1691, fols. 374v, 375r.

6 December 1691

In a letter from Madrid to the Secretary of State, then transmitted to the Holy Office, Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Spain, provides information about the Neapolitan affairs discussed in Madrid. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 446rv.

12 December 1691

In the Congregation of the Holy Office, the letter by Selvaggi dated 4 December is read; the Cardinals instruct the Nuncio to resolve the matter with the archbishop to prevent a scandal. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 16v.

14 December 1691

Francesco Paolo Manuzzi presents himself to the Spanish Inquisition in Madrid, and delivers a new deposition, which again heavily implicates Basilio Giannelli, Giacinto De Cristofaro, and Filippo Belli, accusing them of disseminating "erroneous teachings".

He recalls that he became acquainted with Giannelli in 1684, in the legal firm of Carlo Cito, where both were working as interns. Later, in 1686 or 1687 (Manuzzi changed his version several times), Giannelli attempted to free him from prejudice – that is, he tried to convince Manuzzi of the materiality, and thus mortality, of the soul, of the uselessness of the articles of faith, sacraments, miracles, and obedience to the Pope. Ultimately, he tried to persuade Manuzzi that Christ was a "pure man". Subsequently, Manuzzi discovered that Giacinto De Cristofaro and Filippo Belli likewise shared the same erroneous and heretical opinions.

In the years to follow, the numerous contradictions between this deposition and the earlier 1688 depositions will fan the flames of the fierce and enduring opposition to both De Cristofaro and Belli. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 90r-98r (Spanish with Italian translation; Spanish original on fols. 65r-72v); copy of the Italian translation on fols. 344r-352v, and in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 4r-6v; Spanish original published in Osbat 1974, 262-8.

16 January 1692

In a petition to the Congregation of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro, once again emphasizing his poor health, has submitted another request for house arrest. The Cardinals instruct him to communicate with the Nuncio.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 21v.

18 January 1692

In his initial deposition in Madrid, Basilio Giannelli elaborates on his reading of ancient authors, including Lucretius. In the work of the latter, he encountered the idea that the soul was mortal, and from a work by Leonardo Di Capua, he inferred that Aristotle also held this opinion.⁶ He also discussed these issues with others in Antonio Bulifon's bookshop. The news of De Cristofaro's arrest in the previous August reached him in Spain and prompted him to make a voluntary appearance and self-report before the Spanish Inquisition.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 116r-118r (Spanish); fols. 128r-129v (Italian); cf. copy BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 55v-59v.

6 The reference is to Di Capua 1689, in particular ch. 8, where Di Capua dwelled upon Aristotle's errors, among which his belief in the mortality of the soul.

18 January 1692

The Viceroy informs the King in Spain that there is great concern spreading in the City of Naples over the arrests of Giannelli and Manuzzi in Spain, because there is a widespread fear that Francesco Sernicola risks arrest too.

Amabile 1892, 2: 57.

22 January 1692

Francesco Paolo Manuzzi delivers a second deposition in Madrid, in which he reconstructs the story and the motivation of his journey in Spain with Gennaro d'Andrea. He also explains the decision he and Giannelli made to come and testify again here in Spain. Furthermore, he provides a reconstruction of his 'heretical past', similar to the deposition made on 14 December, but with errors in indicating the dates of his 1688 depositions in Naples.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 72v-84r (original Spanish); on two columns in Spanish and Italian on fols. 98r-110v; a copy of the Italian translation appears on fols. 352v-361v; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 6v-10v.

24 January 1692

In his journal, Domenico Confuorto writes a report on the mission of Francesco Sernicola in Spain, and the arrests in Spain of Giannelli and Manuzzi. Confuorto believes that the attempts to remove the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples and to entrust the cases of heresy to the local bishop are frowned upon in Spain, where the deputies have sent Francesco Sernicola to implore the King for his protection and to support their pretensions. For this reason, it is said that there was a consultation in the Council of Italy debating whether to imprison the said envoy as soon as he arrived at the Court. Also from Spain, news arrives that two Neapolitans known as atheists – Manuzzi and Giannelli – have been imprisoned at the request of the Apostolic Nuncio who resides in Court. His Majesty duly wants to know if the aforementioned 'pretensions' are shared by the entire City of Naples or if they are limited only to a minority of its citizens.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 1-2.

24 January 1692

In his third deposition in Madrid, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi specifies that the mortality of the soul was not taught by Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli as a primary truth but as a statement derived from the falsity of all religions. He also recalls that Giannelli had conveyed the same view to other youths, although he does not recall specific details of that teaching. Furthermore, he notes that Gennaro and Francesco d'Andrea also entertained the idea of the mortality of the soul.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 84v-86v (original Spanish); on two columns in Spanish and Italian on fols. 110v-113v; a copy of the Italian translation appears on fols. 361v-365r; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 10v-11v.

28 January 1692

In his fourth deposition in Madrid, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi confirms his accusations against Giannelli, De Cristofaro, and Belli.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 87r-89v (original Spanish; note on transmission to Rome on fol. 89v); on two columns in Spanish and Italian on fols. 113v-115v; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 11v-12r.

30 January 1692

In his second deposition in Madrid, Basilio Giannelli mentions other members of the 'heretical' circle he attended in Naples, among whom were Aniello di Napoli, Domenico Di Fusco and Geronimo De Filiago.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 118rv (Spanish); fols. 129v-130r (Italian).

30 January 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro has asked either for his case be concluded or for ‘habilitation’ to house arrest, but the Cardinals of the Holy Office dismiss his request.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 34v.

Ante 31 January 1692

From a later letter by Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Madrid, to card. Fabrizio Spada in Rome, it can be inferred that after several interrogatories Manuzzi has been released in the meantime.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 587r (see “13 March 1692”).

4 February 1692

In his third deposition in Spain, Basilio Giannelli focuses solely on a conflict in Naples between the clergy and the nobility regarding the decorations in churches.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 119rv (Spanish); fol. 130r (Italian).

5 February 1692

Domenico Confuorto reports on the new petition, including its full text, to be presented to the King of Spain with the aim of removing the Holy Office from Naples:

In recent days a petition has been formulated, addressed to His Majesty at the request of the most faithful people of Naples, which the captains of the *octines* [the 29 districts of the city] will have signed [...] As well as another of the same tenor, but addressed, however, to the lawyers and procurators of the Courts, the subscription of which is entrusted to Serafino Biscardi and Giuseppe Costantino. This petition is meant to show to His Majesty that it is not just a few discontented citizens, but the whole community that refuses this Court.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 2-3 (with the text of the petition); Bulifon, in BNN, X.F.51, 4 February 1692.

9-11 February 1692

Domenico Confuorto reports that a petition (to be transmitted to Sernicola in Spain) is now signed by 8000 members of the ‘popular seat’ (*Piazza del Popolo*); soon it will be submitted to the ‘noble seats’ as well.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 4-5; the original documents of the petition are in AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, leg. 193 (cf. Osbat 1974, 119 fn. 48).

24 February 1692

In a letter to card. Alderano Cybo, Lorenzo Casoni relates that Cantelmo has requested copies of the proceedings regarding those “investigated for atoms and atheism”. Casoni does not, for the moment, intend to forward the proceedings regarding De Cristofaro:

Considering that in the present conjunctures it could be that such a request arises not from need, but from the mere curiosity of some official of the Episcopal Curia. It does not seem good to me to give out the process of Giacinto di Cristoforo, so that it does not become known that against him there are so few clues.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 666rv.

3 March 1692

In his fourth deposition in Spain, Basilio Giannelli returns to his readings of Lucretius and his entertaining the idea of the mortality of the soul, which pushed him to fundamental doubts

about the Catholic faith. His reading of Plato subsequently convinced him of the immortality of the soul. He also recalls that Manuzzi told him that all things are made of atoms, and that the same philosophy was taught by Nicola Galizia.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 119v-121v (Spanish); fols. 130v-131v (Italian).

4 March 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome is informed about a letter by Lorenzo Casoni (see “24 February” above) in which he claims he will transmit as soon as possible the proceedings in the case against those investigated “in materia Athomorum”. Casoni specifies that these proceedings do not include the case against De Cristofaro, because it is still in progress; if De Cristofaro’s case were included, it would become known that the fiscal lawyer has *parva indicia* against him.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 74v-75r.

4 March 1692

In his fifth deposition in Spain, Basilio Giannelli explains that Manuzzi had introduced him to the ‘philosophy of atoms’ by Lucretius, whom he considered a great philosopher. He elaborates on further discussions with Manuzzi and De Cristofaro regarding atomism. Giannelli acknowledges that he talked to others in Naples about the mortality of the soul, although he did not personally adhere to that belief. He admits to concealing this view in previous interrogations out of fear of being condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Lucretius’ view on the mortality of the soul led Giannelli to harbor doubts about the Catholic faith, the presence of Christ in the host, and the authority of the Pope.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 121v-123r (Spanish); 132r-133r (Italian).

5 March 1692

In Madrid, the Council of Italy takes note of the will of the noble and popular seats that responsibility for cases of heresy be removed from the minister of the Holy Office to be entrusted instead to the local bishop.

AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fols. 45r-46v (Osbat 1974, 124).

Ante 12 March 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a petition to the Pope, in which he asks to be ‘habilitated’ anew (as he was granted on 6 September 1691), or for his trial to be concluded within a reasonable duration of time.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 668r, 669v.

12 March 1692

The petitions by De Cristofaro and Ricci, requesting that the case against them be brought to a swift conclusion, are read in the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome; the Cardinals subsequently dismiss both petitions.

The same meeting includes a discussion of the recent depositions by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, transmitted by the Spanish Inquisition to Rome. The Cardinals order a letter to be written to the Grand Inquisitor of Spain (then Diego Sarmiento de Valladares, 1615-1695), expressing their gratitude for the transmission of the proceedings, and requesting him to keep the Congregation informed about any further developments concerning Manuzzi and Giannelli. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 85v, 88v. Details about Manuzzi’s trial can be read in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 670r-672v, 689r-690r; the summary (*ristretto*) is on fols. 686r-687v. On Manuzzi’s deposition in Spain and on his encounters with Giannelli while in Spain, see Osbat 1974, 134-9.

12 March 1692

In Madrid, the Council of Italy advises the Crown to agree to the requests made by the Deputation, because discontent with the Holy Office was not limited to a few isolated individuals (as some ecclesiastics wanted to believe) but was shared by large sections of the Neapolitan population.

AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fols. 67-68 (Osbat 1974, 124-5).

12 March 1692

The Council of Italy asks King Carlos II to intercede with the Inquisitor General of Spain to secure Giannelli's release.

AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fols. 71r-72r (Osbat 1974, 141).

13 March 1692

Giuseppe Mosti, the Nuncio in Madrid, writes a letter to Cardinal Spada, the Secretary of State in Rome, claiming that, upon his receipt of the Neapolitan proceedings against Giannelli and Manuzzi, he promptly transmitted them to the General Inquisitor. Within one week, he learned about the arrests of Giannelli and Manuzzi; then, on 31 January, he was informed that Manuzzi had been released. He subsequently became aware of Giannelli's trial, which he sought to transfer to the Roman Holy Office since the case had originated in the Holy Office of Naples. Mosti also reports that Francesco Sernicola had arrived in Barcelona a month ago. Upon hearing about the arrests of Manuzzi and Giannelli, Sernicola feigned illness, presumably out of fear of being arrested himself.

AADF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 587rv, 592rv.

21 March 1692

In his sixth and final deposition in Madrid, Basilio Giannelli once again openly discusses Lucretius, the mortality of the soul, Democritus, and Epicurus. He reaffirms that reading Plato and Aristotle had changed his mind.

He is condemned to an abjuration, salutary penances, confiscation of property (later rescinded), and exile from Madrid and Naples (for four years). Also: "He will be assigned a theologian of the Tribunal to instruct him in true belief, and to make him aware of his errors".

Shortly afterwards, Giannelli is released; he then returns to Italy and retires to Vitulano.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 123v-127v (Spanish), 133r-135v (Italian); Spanish original published in Osbat 1974, 269-75; for the letters written on 13 and 27 March, and on 10 April by the Nuncio in Spain regarding Giannelli's trial and condemnation (with further details about the condemnation), see under the respective dates.

25 March 1692

In an official letter, the King of Spain instructs the Viceroy in Naples to collaborate with the archbishop in implementing the decisions proposed by the Collaterale Court. The King also directs the Viceroy to ascertain whether the repugnance against the inquisitors was widespread throughout the entire city or merely held by individual persons, as the Nuncio had suggested.

Privilegj 1719, 217-18; cf. Amabile 1892, 2: 57.

27 March 1692

In response to the letters from the Viceroy dated 18 and 30 January, the King of Spain reassures the Viceroy that Sernicola is not in danger of being arrested and that the lawsuits against Manuzzi and Giannelli are nearing conclusion.

Privilegj 1719, 218-19; cf. Amabile 1892, 2: 57.

27 March 1692

In a letter to Cardinal Fabrizio Spada, the Secretary of State in Rome, Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Madrid, transmits the details of the condemnation of Giannelli. Having spoken with the secretary of the General Inquisitor, Mosti was told that the significant reduction of the sentence (from perpetual prison and confiscation of all assets to only exile from Madrid and Naples) was brought about as a result of a letter from the King to the Inquisitor. His Majesty “demanded neither the condemnation nor the acquittal of Giannelli, but only urged him [i.e., the Inquisitor] to conclude his case, in order to be able to settle the turmoil in Naples more easily”.
ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 585rv.

10 April 1692

In a letter from Madrid to the Secretary of State, Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Spain, provides information about the mission of Francesco Sernicola in Spain. Sernicola has requested that the King establish a special committee on the affairs of Naples, but the impression given in Mosti’s letter is that the issue should be handled by the Council of State and the Council of Italy.
ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 444rv (receipt confirmed on fol. 445v); cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 165v.

10 April 1692

With another letter, Mosti informs the Congregation about the condemnation of Giannelli to abjuration, salutary penances, confiscation of his assets, and exile from the City of Naples and the Spanish dominions for a period of four years. Mosti adds that “at present, the said Giannelli walks freely in Madrid”.
ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 596r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 165v.

12 April 1692

Confuorto reports that the Council of Italy in Spain has decided that the function of inquisitor (“potestà d’inquisitore”) should be entrusted to the local bishop in Naples.
Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 11.

12 April 1692

In a note, Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, outlines plans to ask Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, to forward a request to the Nuncio in Spain for the transmission of an authenticated copy of the proceedings against Basilio Giannelli in Spain.
ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 589rv.

12 April 1692

From Madrid comes the news that Francesco Sernicola has fallen ill, but the Spanish sovereign has accepted the pleas of the city and approved what had been decided by the Viceroy and the Collaterale Court. The King’s decisions were contained in two letters, one dated 25 March to the Elected of the City (the representatives of the seats), and the other dated 17 March to the Viceroy. These letters effectively marked a complete endorsement of the city’s stance that the inquisitorial role be assigned solely to the bishops in the entire Kingdom of Naples.
Privilegj 1719, 217-19.

16 April 1692

The Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome decide to wait for news from the Nuncio in Spain, probably regarding the case of Francesco Manuzzi in Madrid.
ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 584r (not recorded in *Decreta*, 1692).

29 April 1692

Heeding the suggestion by the Nuncio in Spain, the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome decide to wait for the letters from the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, likely concerning the proceedings of Manuzzi's trial.

Addf, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 584r (not recorded in *Decreta*, 1692).

29 April 1692

Through the mediation of a courtier, the Viceroy informs Archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo about the decisions of the Council of Italy and the King (see "12 April"). He invites the bishop to work towards preventing the imprisonment of those accused on grounds of faith, since their imprisonment could be used as a pretext for new tumults and disorders in the city.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 57, fol. 77rv; cf. Osbat 1974, 126.

Spring 1692

After his return from Spain, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi is nominated governor of Nardò by Dorothea Acquaviva d'Atri.

Osbat 1974, 144-5.

14 May 1692

The two letters by Giuseppe Mosti, Nuncio in Spain, dated 10 April 1692 and concerning the condemnation of Basilio Giannelli and Francesco Sernicola's mission in Madrid, are read in a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome. The Cardinals decide to inform the Nuncio that his letters have duly arrived. As to the petition delivered by Sernicola to the Spanish King, the Nuncio should use the instructions he had previously received from the Assessor of the Holy Office.

Addf, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 165v.

Summer 1692

Basilio Giannelli returns to Vitulano, where he lives under the protection of card. Vincenzo Maria Orsini, archbishop of Benevento (later to become Benedict XIII).

Osbat 1974, 145.

July 1692

When news reaches Naples that the Apostolic Nuncio in Madrid has urged the King for a full restoration of the Inquisition in Naples, the nobility express their concerns to the Viceroy and ask for the liberation of the prisoners.

Galasso 1982, 450-1.

7 July 1692

In Madrid, the Council of Italy deliberates on the protests from Rome against the decisions of the Crown (see "12 April 1692"). The Council advises the Pope not to proceed too rigorously, as it is now proven that the antipathy towards the Inquisition Tribunal and Giberti is not limited to a few individuals but encompasses the entire city. Radical attitudes, if adopted, could potentially harm the Church itself and disturb the peace for the entire Italian population.

AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fols. 116r-120r.

12 July 1692

In an official declaration, Nicola Salernitano recalls a meeting at the end of August 1691 in the house of Fulvio Caracciolo. Caracciolo deemed Giacinto De Cristofaro "a God-fearing person, and good Christian, Roman Catholic, as well as [being possessed] of excellent qualities,

customs, and an exemplary life". In the past (probably in 1688 or 1689) and at the request of Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, bishop of Teano and then minister of the Holy Office in Naples, Caracciolo had likewise presented a positive report on Giacinto.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 307r.

14 July 1692

Confuorto reports that the Nuncio in Spain has warned the Spanish Court that they will be on the receiving end of a papal interdict regarding Naples unless the function of minister of the Holy Office is fully re-established. The Deputation intends to discuss the issue with the 'seats' on 16 July.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 24.

16 July 1692

Confuorto reports on the meeting of the Deputation and the *piazze* in San Lorenzo, and represents in some detail the radical options proposed, ranging from the expulsion of the Holy Office Tribunal to the expulsion of the archbishop himself, and the forced release of the prisoners kept in jail by the Inquisition. Some of those present even suggested turning Naples into a 'London' or a 'Geneva'. They discussed the option of freeing the prisoners with the Viceroy, who managed to persuade them not to proceed.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 25.

18 July 1692

Confuorto reports the decision of the 'seats' to ask the Viceroy to remove the Tribunal of the Holy Office, entrusting the bishop with all trials of heresy. Informed of this decision, the Viceroy entrusts the issue to the Collaterale Court and the managers of the other tribunals.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 25-6.

19 July 1692

The president of the Sacro Regio Consiglio has met archbishop Cantelmo and discussed the release of the prisoners accused of crimes of faith. According to reports of their meeting,

the cardinal replied that, to have the prisoners, it was not necessary to report to him, because he was nothing more than a depositary, holding them in the name of the supreme pontiff. They [that is, the deputies of the seats] should address him [the Pope] or else the Nuncio, who in the name of the pontiff had placed them there.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 26.

22 July 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo informs Fabrizio Spada of the agreement he reached in recent days with Felice de Lanzina y Ulloa, president of the Sacred Royal Council. Referring to the Viceroy's requests, the archbishop reports that he has hinted at the possibility that Innocent XII – moved by his paternal charity – could take a decision in favor of the prisoners who are kept in the archbishop's palace on charges of faith-related crimes. Such action could have marked the end of the city's unrest and the start of a negotiation that might have calmed tensions and eliminated any fears of new upheavals.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 57, fols. 168r-170r; cf. Osbat 1974, 128, and Galasso 1982, 454.

28 July 1692

On Monday morning, the Roman Congregation holds an extraordinary meeting with the Pope. This meeting is initiated by archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo of Naples, who, in an effort to prevent further upheavals among the Neapolitan population, proposes the release of the prisoners held in the archiepiscopal prison. The Pope and the Cardinals reject this proposal, insisting on the continuation of the trials “habito respectu ad singularum causarum merita, et prout iure”. If sent by the archbishop to Rome for consultation in this matter, a messenger will nevertheless be received “cum paterna charitate”. Through the Secretary of State, the Nuncio in Spain is asked to inform the Spanish King and his ministers about the “paternal intentions” of the Pope, “inclined to avoid tumults prejudicial to the authority of the King, and to the public happiness”.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 250rv; copy in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 640rv.

30 July 1692

The Pope nominates Cantelmo as minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office, effective from 1 August. He further orders the Congregation of the Holy Office to write to the Nuncio in Naples asking that the proceedings of the trials regarding the prisoners kept in the prison of the archbishop and in the convent of San Domenico be transmitted to Cantelmo, and that these should include the proceedings in which Giovanni Legitimo, Giuseppe Ricci, and Giacinto De Cristofaro were involved.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 250v-251r.

2 August 1692

Fabrizio Spada informs Cantelmo that he has been entrusted with the cases of heresy in Naples, including the cases left pending by Giberti.

AAV, *Segreteria di Stato*, Registro di Lettere, vol. 128, fol. 62; cf. Osbat 1974, 129 fn. 69.

Ante 5 August 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, receives the official letter of his nomination as minister of the local Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 269r; cf. Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 27-8, and Osbat 1974, 194.

5 August 1692

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, confirms that he will carry out all the “supreme orders” of Our Lord, as transmitted by Spada, concerning the prisoners incarcerated for cases of the Holy Office which have been entrusted to him by Nuncio Casoni.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 57, fol. 188r.

5 August 1692

In another letter to Fabrizio Spada, Giacomo Cantelmo expresses his gratitude for the transmission of the proceedings of Basilio Giannelli’s trial.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 58, fol. 13r.

5 August 1692

In a letter to Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, reports that he has transmitted the letter of nomination to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop in Naples. The letter addressed Cantelmo’s authority to conclude all cases of the prisoners currently held in his prison for reasons related to the Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 718r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 269r.

5 August 1692

In a letter to the Pope, Giacomo Cantelmo “thanks His Beatitude for his clemency towards the city”, implicitly confirming that he will continue to take a firm line in the interrogation of the suspects.

AAV, *Segr. Card.*, vol. 57, fol. 188r (Osbat 1974, 133).

5 August 1692

In a letter to Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office, Nicola Cirillo, elected bishop of Nicastro one month ago, discusses the recent uprisings in Naples. He recommends letting the case be handled by card. Fortunato Ilario Carafa (1630?-1697), then bishop of Aversa and representative of Spain before the Holy See for the affairs of the Kingdom of Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 751r-752r.

9 August 1692

In a letter to the Holy Office in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, informs the Congregation that the fiscal lawyer of the Neapolitan Holy Office has transmitted all proceedings to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 270r.

13 August 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office is briefed about Nuncio Casoni’s letter dated 5 August, in which he details his negotiations with Archbishop Cantelmo regarding the cases of the prisoners transferred from Holy Office prisons to that of the Curia in Naples. The Cardinals deliberate with the Assessor on the advisability of transmitting the Spanish proceedings concerning Giannelli and Manuzzi to the archbishop. Unable to reach an agreement, they ultimately decide to request that the Assessor transmit the proceedings to the archbishop independently, without an official letter from the Congregation.

A reading takes place of the Nuncio’s letter dated 9 August regarding the transmission of the proceedings of prisoners kept in the convent of San Domenico or under house arrest.

The delegation to Cantelmo to progress current cases of the Holy Office is confirmed.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 269r, 270rv.

15 August 1692

Tommaso Maria Bosio, commissioner of the Holy Office in Rome, confirms the authenticity of the copies of the depositions made in Madrid by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and then transmitted to Rome.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 89v.

18 August 1692

In a deposition delivered to the Neapolitan Holy Office, Felice Pisano accuses Francesco d’Andrea (“basically, an unbeliever”). Pisano extensively discusses his interactions with the De Cristofaro family, specifically regarding Giacinto’s worries about potentially being implicated in an investigation by the Inquisition. However, because of Pisano’s position as secretary within the Inquisition, he was prohibited from divulging to the De Cristofaro family any further information. His efforts, moreover, to persuade Giacinto to voluntarily report to the minister were futile. With Giacinto under arrest, his relatives are now expressing their dissatisfaction with Pisano’s passive role and blaming him for their son’s detention.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 51r-54r.

19 August 1692

In a deposition in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanni Domenico Batangelo, a jurist, reports that Bernardo De Cristofaro and Giacinto's brothers have strong suspicions that Felice Pisano has played an active role in the arrest of Giacinto.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 55r-56v.

19 August 1692

In a letter to the Assessor of the Congregation of the Holy Office, Giacomo Cantelmo confirms that he received a copy of the Spanish proceedings against Manuzzi and now asks also for those against Giannelli, to be used in the case against De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 288r.

19 August 1692

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, reports taking receipt of the files regarding Manuzzi, arrived from Spain, which he then transmitted to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and now delegate minister of the Holy Office in Naples. He suggests transmitting also the Spanish proceedings regarding Giannelli, these possibly being more useful in the Neapolitan case against atheism. Finally, he reports that the archbishop – now minister – needs more precise instructions for those habilitated in San Domenico or under house arrest.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 704rv.

Ante 20 August 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a petition to the Neapolitan Holy Office, with official annotations dated 20 August. Here he complains about his unjust imprisonment thirteen months ago and asks to be released.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 253rv.

20 August 1692

In response to De Cristofaro's petition, the Neapolitan Holy Office decides that his request cannot be granted due to the severity of the charges against him.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 253v-254r.

20 August 1692

In a deposition to the Neapolitan Holy Office, Felice Pisano states that he found out, five years ago, that the daughter of Bernardo De Cristofaro had loudly declaimed her intention to denounce a heretic. Though she did not specify who, Pisano suggests that she openly referred to a married man, and the only person in her small circle who fits that description is her father. Pisano also hints at the De Cristofaro family's acquaintance with the late Tommaso Cornelio and provides a list of several individuals who visited the house of De Cristofaro. Additionally, Pisano dwells extensively on Bernardo's acquaintance with Francesco Paolo Manuzzi.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 57r-61r.

20 August 1692

In an official declaration, Giuseppe Migliore affirms that Filippo Belli resides in Castello della Baronia (province of Avellino).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 44r.

22 August 1692

In a deposition at the Neapolitan Holy Office, Nicola Savino dwells on the enmity that arose between Felice Pisano and the De Cristofaro family after the arrest of Giacinto.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 62r-63r.

23 August 1692

After his return to Italy, Basilio Giannelli submits a detailed statement to the Neapolitan Holy Office, heavily accusing De Cristofaro and Belli, claiming that they entertained the idea of the mortality of the soul and the view of Christ as an impostor. Then, Giannelli recalls that, together with De Cristofaro, he had convinced Francesco Paolo Manuzzi to believe in their heretical ideas.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 136r-139r; copies in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 48r-49v and ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 792r-794r; published in Osbat 1974, 273-5; see Osbat 1974, 155-8, for an analysis.

25 August 1692

Card. Alderano Cybo answers to Antonio di Malta in Naples, who has probably asked him for help in the case against Giacinto De Cristofaro. Cybo replies merely that the Holy Office “proceeds with due care, and justice”.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 368r, 370v.

27 August 1692

The Congregation discusses Cantelmo's letter of 19 August (*supra*), in which he confirms receipt of the Spanish proceedings against Manuzzi, and asks for those against Giannelli, to support the accusations against De Cristofaro. The Pope decrees that a letter be written to the Secretary of State to obtain Giannelli's proceedings from the Spanish Inquisition.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 288rv.

27 August 1692

In a short deposition delivered in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Angelo Barone dwells on Giacinto's acquaintances, among whom are included Emanuele Ciccattelli, Antonio Monforte, Donato Vulturale, Cesare Di Capua (son of Leonardo), and Carlo Cornelio (nephew of Tommaso). He has known De Cristofaro always “as a sober man”.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 142rv; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 60r.

30 August 1692

In a deposition in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Nicola Bagnulo declares: “I know that Mr. Giacinto De Cristofaro was publicly esteemed for a man who did not believe [*huomo che poco ci credesse*], and as a sectarian of the new philosophy of the atoms”.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 143rv; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 64v.

30 August 1692

In a deposition to the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanni Battista Gaetano mentions some of Giacinto De Cristofaro's acquaintances. His brother Domenico declares that he never heard De Cristofaro pronouncing propositions contradicting Catholic faith and doctrine.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 144r-145r; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 67rv and 71rv.

September 1692

A group of thirteen persons professes to have attended the house of Fulvio Caracciolo where they made the acquaintance of Giacinto De Cristofaro “esteemed by us and known as a virtuous young man of letters, with excellent morals, and a good Christian”.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 299rv.

September 1692

Giovanni Battista Giordano writes to Filippo Belli (then governor in Caserta), asking him to come secretly to Naples where he intends to instruct him in what he should testify in the Tribunal of the Holy Office. Belli refuses the invitation, however.

BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 253r.

1 September 1692

Bernardo De Cristofaro writes to (the Assessor of) the Holy Office in Rome, about juridical flaws in the Neapolitan proceedings against his son.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 279r-280r.

1 September 1692

Card. Fortunato Ilario Carafa della Spina (see also “5 August 1692”) replies to Pietro Di Fusco that he has contacted card. di Laurea (that is, Lorenzo Brancati). He explains that the latter is not in the position to recommend Giacinto De Cristofaro, because he is one of the cardinals of the Inquisition. However, Brancati has promised a rapid conclusion of the trial.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 369r; see also “13 December 1692”.

2 September 1692

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Paolo D’Acunto states:

In this conversation I did not deal in particular with any proposition of the Atomists, which they pronounce *remota fide*, but rather I said, that this way of speaking was very pernicious, and that it was the same to say *remota fide* as *remota veritate*. And I gave the example of the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity, which is true and is certain ‘et nullo intellectu cogitanti’, while, as I then said, the truth is truth, even if no one thinks it. And to this Giacinto replied that this was a heretical proposition.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 146rv.

3 September 1692

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Domenico Fontanella accuses Giacinto De Cristofaro of having convinced, in the past, some women living in his neighborhood that there is no Hell, Paradise, or Purgatory. Fontanella further alleges that De Cristofaro claimed sexual intercourse, even between father and daughter, is not a sin, and that the soul dies with the body. Additionally, Fontanella states that some of the books confiscated after De Cristofaro’s arrest were related to sorcery.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 147r-148r; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 74rv.

3 September 1692

In her deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanna Santavenere, the illiterate wife of Giuseppe Sapere, states that she heard from a certain Berardino, a lame servant of the De Cristofaro house, that Giacinto was accused of several suspect and heretical views, including the belief in the mortality of the soul, the belief that sexual intercourse is not a sin, and the denial of Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory. She also heard about books being thrown out of the window or burned prior to the search of De Cristofaro’s lodgings in August 1691. She explicitly denies, however that Giacinto De Cristofaro raped her virgin daughter.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 149rv; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 77v-78v.

3 and 5 September 1692

In his deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Antonio Di Fusco affirms that he has heard from other persons that Giacinto De Cristofaro had been heard to express the hope “that the Turks would come to take a piss in the churches”. He states, moreover, “that it is known in our neighborhood that both the said Giacinto and his father hardly believe”.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 156r-157r; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 101v-102v; see also the undated declaration by Bartolomeo Basile in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 329rv.

4 September 1692

In his deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Nicola Di Domenico states that Cristofaro held several philosophical views contrary to Catholic faith, among which was the belief in the mortality of the soul.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 150rv; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 82rv.

4 September 1692

In his deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Lucio Capozzuti refers to having participated, about one and a half years ago, in a discussion between Paolo D’Acunto and Giacinto De Cristofaro in the bookshop of Carlo Porpora about the equivalence of *remota fide* and *remota veritate* (see “20 August” and “2 September 1602” above), a view which De Cristofaro qualified as heretical.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 151r-152v; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 86v-88v.

Post 4 September 1692

In a legal deposition (qualified as *valitura*, apparently another version of the deposition of 4 September *supra*, but now delivered for the defense of Giacinto De Cristofaro), Lucio Capozzuti again reconstructs the discussion (which he now specifies as having taken place last year) between Giacinto De Cristofaro and Paolo D’Acunto.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 380r.

5 September 1692

In their depositions before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Caterina Mazzocca refers to books hidden or thrown away before the arrest of De Cristofaro; Antonia Santavenera refers to books thrown out of the window before the arrival of the Inquisition officials, and Francesco Capaso claims to have heard De Cristofaro proclaiming that, when they arrive in Italy, the Turks will “piss in the churches”.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 153r-155r; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 91rv, 93r-94r and 97v-98r; see also the undated declaration on fol. 329rv.

6 September 1692

In her deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giuseppa Franzese, wife of Domenico Fontanella, refers to hearsay about De Cristofaro’s denial of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, and about his possession of forbidden books.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 158r-159r.

10 September 1692

In her deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanna Santavenera partially withdraws her declaration issued on 3 September about books thrown out of the window and being burned before the arrest of De Cristofaro, because these books had been retrieved. She never heard De Cristofaro deny the existence of Hell, Purgatory and Paradise, but she only heard someone claiming that the immortality of the soul was denied in the books owned by De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 160rv; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 78v-79r.

11 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro draws up extensive lists of his friends and enemies; he is then asked to acknowledge his earlier depositions delivered on 22 March 1689 and 13 July 1691 (see above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 168r-170v; copies of 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27 September, 2 October 1692 in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 143r-165r; for an analysis of the interrogations in the period September-October 1692, see Osbat 1974, 167-76.

12 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro denies having acquaintances with heretics. He affirms that he is informed about heliocentrism (both the ancient version of Philolaus as well as the modern one developed by Copernicus), but he knows that this doctrine has been condemned as erroneous by the Church. He is not acquainted with persons who have attempted to solve the contradictions between heliocentrism and the Holy Scripture. He then reconstructs his education, and finally denies that he ever doubted the authority of the Pope, the adoration of holy images, and miracles.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 170v-173v.

12 September 1692

In his deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Emanuele Ciccattelli claims not to remember any event that could have incurred denunciation or censure.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 161rv; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 108r.

12 September 1692

In his deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giuseppe Di Domenico recalls as follows discussions with Giacinto De Cristofaro about Copernicus and Galileo Galilei:

Furthermore, I need to say that many times we talked together on the subject of fine letters, and once he spoke to me about the opinion and system of Nicholas Copernicus, supported by Galileo Galilei, whose opinion he referred to me by way of 'history', that is, that the earth moves, and the sun is fixed. But he told me that this opinion was reprobated by the Holy Church, and that said Galileo was investigated in Court by the Holy Office, and that he was forced to abjure.

However, Di Domenico does not remember whether De Cristofaro himself subscribed to this view.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 162r-163v; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 109v-111r.

15 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro confirms his belief in the miracle of the liquefaction of the blood of San Gennaro in Naples.⁷ He never heard anyone cast doubt on the miraculous myrrh of Saint Nicholas in Bari.⁸ De Cristofaro underlines

⁷ San Gennaro is famous for the annual liquefaction of his blood, which, according to legend, was saved by a woman called Eusebia just after the saint's death. It is now kept in the Cathedral of Naples. The Catholic Church has always supported the celebrations, but it has never formulated an official statement on the phenomenon, considering it not a miracle but a 'prodigy'.

⁸ The story goes that, at the time of its transportation from Myra (in modern-day Turkey) to Bari, the urn of St. Nicholas was filled with manna, a transparent liquid, deemed a sacred relic with thaumaturgical properties. The manna is collected annually and distributed among the faithful throughout the world.

the fact that the bishop of Teano, the former minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office, did not want to initiate a case against him upon obtained assurances about his moral standing from Nicola Cirillo, Onofrio Bizzarro, Vincenzo Magnati and Fulvio Caracciolo. He also denies having heard any discussions about the equivalence of *remota fide* and *remota veritate*, and denies having pronounced any such opinion himself. Finally, he openly declares that the idea of the existence of pre-Adamite beings composed of atoms is heretical.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 174r-176v.

16 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro is asked whether he ever heard that animals were composed of atoms; that when men started to build houses, castles and cities, and developing a political organization and a social hierarchy, the most judicious among them was viewed as the son of a deity; that a similar hierarchy triggered veneration, and by consequence the prosecution and expansion of power; and finally, that Jesus Christ was ambitious, declared himself the Son of God, and thus pretended to promulgate laws.

De Cristofaro denies ever having pronounced or heard these or similar propositions. He also denies the following views: that dogmas and sacraments promulgated by Christ should not be followed, because he is an impostor; that there is no Hell, Paradise, or Purgatory; that God does not exist; and that the soul is not immortal. Nor did he ever attempt to convince other persons of these aberrations.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 177r-180r.

17 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro mentions again Francesco Paolo Manuzzi as one of his “capital enemies”. He denies ever having heard that the religions of the world are not true, that the soul is mortal, that Christ is not present in the host (in body and soul). He does not know whether some of the books confiscated on the day of his arrest were prohibited. He never read Ptolemy's *Centiloquium*, the superstitious psalter attributed to Hieronymus, nor Nostradamus's prophecies, books that were found in his house at the time of his arrest.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 181r-182v.

17 September 1691

In a letter to archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo in Massa Lubrense, Giovanni Battista Giberti, minister of the Holy Office in Naples, reports on his negotiations with the Viceroy, and the mediation by the Nuncio Casoni, Giovanni di S. Maria, and even the confessor of the Viceroy.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.1, fol. 210rv.

19 September 1692

Having now been unable for almost a year to leave Gaeta, Giovanni Battista Giberti, remembering the commitment shown and the dangers he risked during his ministry in Naples, humbly asks the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome for economic accommodation.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 582r.

26 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro lists more enemies. Confronted with the accusations already made against him on 16 September, and now attributed to the witness A (that is, Manuzzi), he denies them all with disdain, declaring the witness “a scoundrel, impious, evil, a perverse enemy, and an impostor”.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 183r-185v.

27 September 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro is confronted with another witness (indicated as N.N.) accusing him of the forenamed charges, among which were accusations that he entertained the idea of the mortality of the soul, denied the presence of Christ in the host, and rejected the authority of the Pope. De Cristofaro counters that this is the testimony of an evil person, stressing also that the other witnesses (A, B, C, that is, Manuzzi, Domenico Di Tomaso, Paolo D'Acunto, respectively) are acting out of spite and enmity.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 186r-188v.

October 1692

A group of four lawyers declare Giacinto De Cristofaro to be a "good and faithful Christian of excellent morals, modest and respectful".

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 311rv, 312v.

2 October 1692

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Antonio Maria De Ruggiero claims to have been told that De Cristofaro attempted to have sexual intercourse with Sebastiano Biancardi. This was related to De Ruggiero by Biancardi himself, claiming that De Cristofaro had said that he did not consider sodomy a capital sin.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 164rv; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 114rv.

2 October 1692

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Sebastiano Biancardi is interrogated about the 'new' philosophy of the atomists, mathematics, and astrology. He states that he does not know anybody who entertains the new philosophy or denies Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory, and the immortality of the soul. He fiercely denies being acquainted with persons who defend or practice sodomy, and he further denies all suggestions made by the judges regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 166r-167r; copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 116v-118r.

2 October 1692

In an interrogatory in the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro is asked again to unburden his conscience. He again insists that he is a good and obedient Catholic; all accusations made against him are the result of malice and enmity.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 189r-191v.

8 October 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses a petition by De Cristofaro, in which he has requested a declaration (*fidem*) by Nicola Cirillo, now bishop of Nicastro (once fiscal lawyer in the Neapolitan Holy Office; *infra*), for his defense. The Cardinals transmit the request to archbishop and minister Giacomo Cantelmo in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 336v.

14 October 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro addresses a letter to an unnamed person in Rome, for whom his father Bernardo worked in the past, and who, owing to his connections in the Curia, could intervene for him at the Holy Office. More specifically, he asks if a cardinal of the Holy Office or its Assessor can write to archbishop Cantelmo or to the fiscal lawyer Cavalieri to deal with his case. He also requests support for his request to let mons. Cirillo (see "8 October" *supra*) testify in his trial.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 351r-352v.

16 October 1692

A group of sixteen priests, including Donato Vulturale, living in the same Neapolitan neighborhood (Borgo dei Vergini, now located behind the Archaeological Museum), vouch for Giacinto De Cristofaro as a “good and faithful Christian of excellent morals”.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 309rv.

18 October 1692

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, reports on the request made by Giacinto De Cristofaro that an interview should be sought with Nicola Cirillo, now bishop of Nicastro. In the past, Cirillo served as the fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in the Tribunal of the archbishop in Naples and was involved, during his tenure, in the case brought against those accused of atheism. Cantelmo expresses serious doubts because he suspects that Cirillo might favor the defendant.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 698r-699v.

Ante 29 October 1692

In a petition Giacinto De Cristofaro asks Cantelmo for a new lawyer, proposing Michelangelo Baccalà.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 192r.

29 October 1692

Michelangelo Baccalà is admitted as De Cristofaro’s lawyer.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 192r, annotation; see also “7 November 1692”.

30 October 1692

In a formal deposition before notary Nicola Letizia, Antonia Santavenere declares that she has been seriously menaced and subject to undue pressure in her first interrogatory regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro (see “5 September 1692” above). She now withdraws that deposition.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 301rv.

30 October 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome is informed about the letter that Giacomo Cantelmo wrote on 18 October; the Cardinals praise his interrogation of Giannelli and ask him to push Giannelli to give full testimony regarding his case brought by the Spanish Inquisition.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 699v.

31 October 1692

In a legal deposition before notary Nicola Letizia, the physician Bernardino Clarizio reports on the enmity between Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Giacinto De Cristofaro, with Manuzzi having complained that Giacinto was defaming him as “publico cinedo”, that is, as a ‘public homosexual’.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 318rv.

1 November 1692

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, provides information about the arrival in Rome of Eligio Caracciolo. He further asks for a copy of the depositions made by Basilio Giannelli in Spain because they might be useful in the case against Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 694rv.

4 November 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome has received an anonymous denunciation against archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo. He is accused of protecting a *gymnasium Pansophistarum* and of allowing the circulation of a book by Leonardo Di Capua (that is, the second edition of his *Parere*, which appeared in 1689). The Cardinals ask the Assessor to discuss the issue with the Pope, and they subsequently order an examination of Di Capua's *Parere*.

Alongside a letter, archbishop Cantelmo transmits the copy of the depositions by Basilio Giannelli (probably the one released on 23 August 1692; see ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 136r-139r), and by other defendants suspected of atheism.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 362r and 378r; the text of the denunciation is in ADDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fols. 26rv, 34rv.

7 November 1692

At the Holy Office of Naples, Giacinto De Cristofaro and Michelangelo Baccalà formally request copies of the trial proceedings, including the interrogations of the witnesses and those of De Cristofaro himself. They seek these copies to prepare for the *repetitio* of witness interrogations (i.e., to hear witnesses for a second time). This request is granted by Giovanni Andrea Siliquino, General Vicar of the archbishop of Naples, and the acceptance of this decree is attested to on the same day by Michelangelo Baccalà (“recepti copiam constitutae”).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 193rv.

7 November 1692

Michelangelo Baccalà swears to secrecy on the Inquisition proceedings he may come to know.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 337r; undated copy in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 326r and 345v.

11 November 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples and minister of the Holy Office, arrests Nicola Galdieri, Matteo Vitale, Giovanni De Magistris, and Carlo Rosito, who were already suspected of atheism in 1690 (*supra*).

BNN, XI.E.15, fol. 233v; Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 40 (15 November); cf. Osbat 1974, 187.

12 November 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office discusses again the anonymous denunciation received on 4 November, and the Cardinals decide to commission the Augustinian friar Federico Nicola Gavardi to produce an assessment of Di Capua's work.

On the same date, the Cardinals discuss De Cristofaro's request that an interview be conducted “pro sui defensione” with Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, bishop of Teano and former minister of the Holy Office in Naples. The Cardinals delegate it to the archbishop of Naples to take a decision.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fols. 370v-371r, 374v-375r.

13 November 1692

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses Cantelmo's letter of 4 November. For the arrest of Filippo Belli, the Cardinals allow the bishop to transmit the proceedings of the trial and the depositions of the witness testimonies to the Viceroy with the aim of convincing him of the gravity of the case.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 378r.

15 November 1692

In a deposition delivered in the Holy Office in Naples, Matteo Vitale explains his errors confessed on 14 August 1691 (cf. *supra*): he still affirms the possibility that the liquefaction of the blood of San Gennaro and the exudation of myrrh from the relics of San Nicola may occur *naturaliter*, but he believes them to be miracles. He concludes: “Et de caeteris alijs confessis in sua prima praeventione, numquam ex fide dubitasse sed solum ex naturali discursu”.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 195v (the reconstruction of Vitale’s case; see “18 July 1693”).

22 November 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo informs card. Alderano Cybo that Filippo Belli has been located and that his arrest, with the aid of the secular ‘arm’ (“braccio”), is imminent. In the case against those accused of atheism, he further reports that he has arrested Matteo Vitale, Nicola Galtieri, Carlo Rosito, and Giovanni De Magistris. Additional arrests yet to be carried out are those of Antonio Barra and Gaspare Villamagna. The former, however, (still) feigns insanity, and the latter – being a person of low status – will be easy to arrest even without the aid of the Viceroy.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 771rv.

26 November 1692

Filippo Belli is finally arrested in Campagna (province of Salerno).

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 449r; cf. fol. 452r; Bulifon, *Cronicamerone*, BNN, X.F.52, fol. 73 (cf. Osbat 1974, 188).

Ante 2 December 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro reiterates his petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, asking again for interviews to be conducted with Nicola Cirillo, bishop of Nicastro (from 1692 to 1709), and with Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, bishop of Teano and former minister of the Holy Office in Naples, “to prove his innocence, and because in the past they were ministers of that Tribunal”.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 775r, 776v (receipt in Rome).

2 December 1692

The Cardinals of the Congregation of the Holy Office discuss De Cristofaro’s request for his defense that archbishop Cantelmo be allowed to interview the bishops of Nicastro and Teano, but the Cardinals dismiss the request.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1692, fol. 396v; for this request, see also “18 October” and “12 November 1692”; for a discussion, see Osbat 1974, 177-8.

2 December 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo writes to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, about the recent arrest of Filippo Belli.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 645r.

4 December 1692

In a first deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli declares that he is completely unaware as to the reasons for his arrest, and he specifies, moreover, that he never intended in 1689 to denounce anyone to the Inquisition.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 366r-367r; copy fol. 377rv; for more on the 1689 denunciation, see “11 September 1691” above.

5 December 1692

In a second deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli recalls that he encountered Giacinto De Cristofaro after the earthquake in June 1688. De Cristofaro claimed, at that time, to believe that animals have a rational soul. It was for this reason that Giovanni Battista

Giordano suggested, the day after this meeting, that Belli denounce De Cristofaro to the Holy Office. Belli also asserts that De Cristofaro had defended atomism during a conversation in the bookshop of Bagnulo that likely took place in the winter of 1688-89. Finally, Belli came to know that De Cristofaro read forbidden books, among which was a work by George Buchanan. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 367v-369r; partial copy fols. 378r-380v.

6 December 1692

Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer present the final version of the questionnaire for the cross-examination of the witness testimonies, with questions arranged in 63 paragraphs. The first part contained sections to determine: personal information and reliability (1-5); personal sense of duty (7-10); whether there are acquaintances or friendships with heretics (6, 12, 43); education and memory of past events (11, 16, 18, 22-23); whether there are relationships with other persons linked to the trial (14-15, 19, 44-45); knowledge of or friendships with atheists (17, 20-21); whether there is any acquaintance with sinful people (24-30); and knowledge of atomism or atomists (31-32). The second part is comprised of questions related to: the faith and piety of Giacinto De Cristofaro (33-42, 61); his friends and reputation (46-50); the issue of the equivalence of *remota fide* and *remota veritate* (51); and De Cristofaro's relationship with the neighborhood (52-55, 59). In the third part, the witnesses are asked whether their depositions have been correctly verbalized, whether they had been threatened or put under pressure, and whether there are any other issues related to the trial (56-58, 62-63).

The question no. 31 paragraph reads as follows:

Ask whether the witness knows what an atom is, or the science of atoms, and who are the authors who treat it; if said authors are Catholics or heretics or atheists; if this science has been condemned, by whom was it condemned, the reason why it was condemned, when it was condemned; if there are, in Naples or elsewhere, persons who endorse that science, and whether they are Catholics or heretics or atheists; if they were or are friends, and how the witness knows them; and whether the books treating that science are prohibited.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 194r-200v (final version; published in Osbat 1974, 281-91); copy on fols. 255r-262; draft in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 195r-196v, 197r-201r.

7 December 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo writes to card. Alderano Cybo, expatiating on the arrest of Filippo Belli, and his trifling accusations against De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 644r.

7 December 1692

Giacomo Cantelmo writes to Filippo Bernini about the first depositions delivered by Belli. He also touches upon some views held by De Cristofaro, such as his belief that the world is composed of atoms, and the attribution of a rational soul to animals.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fol. 647r.

13 December 1692

Card. Lorenzo Brancati writes a letter to the Duke of Diana (then: Girolamo Calà, b. Castrovillari, 1632; d. Naples, 1698) in which he claims that he is unable to influence the case of Giacinto De Cristofaro, and that he can only solicit a rapid conclusion of the proceedings.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 370r; for Brancati's role, see also "1 September 1692".

26 December 1692

After a request by Domenico Jameo on behalf of Giacomo Cantelmo, Vincenzo Maria Orsini, archbishop of Benevento (future Benedict XIII), grants permission for an interrogation of Basilio Giannelli to take place in Benevento.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 201r.

27 December 1692

In Benevento, Basilio Giannelli replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. He has studied law, letters, and natural philosophy, and he has also read Gassendi. To question no. 31, he answers:

At first I tried to find out what atomism is and the doctrine of the atomists, but afterwards, when my case was dealt with in Spain, I tried to abolish such doctrine from my mind, and to know nothing more, it being an occasion for my mistake.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 202r-205v, on fol. 204r.

27 December 1692

In a second interrogation in Benevento, Basilio Giannelli is asked for further information about his accomplices Manuzzi, De Cristofaro and Belli. He specifies that when he spoke about Belli in an earlier interrogation, he intended Manuzzi. Beyond Manuzzi, he did not convince any other individuals of heretical propositions or false dogmas.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 206r-208r.

30 December 1692

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli draws up a list of his enemies: Domenico Di Tomaso, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, Giovanni Battista Giordano, Giacinto De Cristofaro, Basilio Giannelli, and Matteo De Roberto. He explicitly states that he has never doubted the authority of the Pope.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 369r-371v.

5 January 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanna Santavenere replies to the questionnaire composed by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. Unsurprisingly, she does not answer the question on atomism.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 225r-229r.

7 January 1693

Filippo Belli is transferred from the 'criminal' to the 'civil' section of the archiepiscopal prison. In the evening, in violation of the prison rules, he "pays a visit" to Giacinto De Cristofaro. Admonished by the guards, Belli is returned to the 'criminal' section.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 238r; cf. fol. 452r.

7 January 1693

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli declares that he has never denied the existence of Hell, Paradise, and Purgatory, or that of God. He also affirms that he did not reject the adoration of the saints and holy images. Furthermore, he claims never to have heard anyone arguing for the existence of men born before Adam and made of atoms. Lastly, he denies harboring the alleged doubts regarding Christ.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 371v-373v; copy on fols. 381v-383v.

9 January 1693

In a deposition before the Holy Office in Naples, Giuseppe Migliore, guard in the archiepiscopal prison, reports that on 7 January (*supra*) Filippo Belli was moved from the penal section (called *criminale*) to the civil section (indicated as *camarone*). Against all prison rules, on the evening of that day, he found Belli in De Cristofaro's cell. During the following days, he was unable to separate the two.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 238rv.

9 January 1693

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto Cava, confined in the archiepiscopal prison, confirms the reconstruction made by Migliore (*supra*).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 239rv.

9, 11, 21 January 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Felice Pisano replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. He does not answer the question on atomism.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 230r-237v.

10 January 1693

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giuseppe Oricchio, ordinary *cursor* ('guard') in the archiepiscopal Curia, declares that Gennaro De Cristofaro and another brother of Giacinto (probably Giacomo) have asked him whether he has called some witnesses for the cross-examination in Giacinto's trial. They asked him, moreover, to transmit the names of the witnesses once these became known to him.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 240rv.

13 January 1693

In Bari, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi corrects the inconsistency between his original deposition in Naples (21 March 1688) and the third deposition made in Spain (see "24 January 1692"), regarding the mortality of the soul. Moreover, two errors are signaled in the copy of the depositions transmitted from Spain to Italy.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 210r-211r.

13 January 1693

From Bari, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi addresses archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo with a petition, explaining the abovementioned errors in his depositions, hoping not to incur further penalties.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 212r-213v.

13-17 January 1693

In Bari, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi replies extensively to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. His answer to question no. 31:

While I was in Naples I studied something of this natural philosophy [...] [and] I understood what an atom is, or science of atoms, consisting in this: now while the Aristotelians say that everything is composed of matter and form, the science of the atoms teaches that the beginning of everything should be called atoms of different species, those which are square, those which are round, those which are hooked, and that they make up the compound of everything. The authors dealing with that science were Gassendi, and Descartes, whom I estimate to be Catholics, because their books are not forbidden. I do not know if this science has been condemned, and I do not think so, because Nicolò Galitio read it publicly, and in Naples it was followed by many, who came there to learn it, and I know them all being Catholics. However, I did not cling to them in friendship, because I knew that it distracted me from legal studies. (fol. 217rv)

When he has replied to the questionnaire, all preceding depositions made in Italy and Spain are read to Manuzzi who – with corrections and additions as to the issue of the mortality of the soul – confirms their content.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 214r-224r; copy BNN, ms. I.AA.32, 12r-23v.

14 January 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office Giovanni Battista Gaetano replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. He does not answer question no. 31 on atomism. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 241r-242v.

15 January 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giovanni Domenico Batangelo replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. He does not answer question no. 31. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 263r-266r.

Ante 17 January 1693

A deposition is made by a person unidentified (owing to the fact that the first part of the deposition is lacking), in which this witness admits having followed lessons in natural philosophy given by Antonio Barra, which were attended also by Gaspare Villamagna, Nicola Galtieri, Simone Barra (brother of Antonio), Matteo Vitale, Domenico Moniaci, and Francesco Coqui. The witness reports that Moniaci and others entertained the 'philosophy of the atoms', and that once, in a discussion held in the apothecary near the gate of San Tommaso d'Aquino, they denied Purgatory, Hell and Paradise, the existence of God, the virginity of Mary, and the incarnation of Christ.

BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fols. 472r-473v.

17 January 1693

Carlo Loffredo, archbishop of Bari, transmits to Giacomo Cantelmo an authenticated copy of the depositions made by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi on 13 and 17 January (see above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 209r.

17 January 1693

Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, transmits to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples and minister of the Holy Office, instructions for the case against Matteo Vitale and Domenico Moniaci. The latter is to be found not guilty as he has only attended to suspect conversations by other defendants. Vitale is guilty, but as *sponte comparens* he is condemned to an abjuration *de vehementi* in a private session. In an annotation, Pietro Filippo Bernini discloses that the Spanish General Inquisitor is ready to transmit the depositions made by Basilio Giannelli. BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fol. 466rv.

17 January-20 November 1693

Several ecclesiastics (canons and priests), citizens, and functionaries from Caserta, Valle, Atripalda, Naples, and Chiusano release attestations on the moral integrity of Filippo Belli. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 506r-514v.

20 January 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Emanuele Ciccattelli replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 267r-269r.

23 January 1693, 4 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giuseppe Di Domenico replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. To question no. 31, he answers:

I have some information, which I have heard from some authors, and I know that Pietro Capano deals with it, but I do not know that this science is condemned, and neither do I know in general whether in Naples there are people who profess that science.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 283r-286v.

Ante 24 January 1693

Giovanni Pasqualone, procurator fiscal of the Roman Holy Office, formulates the charges against Domenico Moniaci. Five years earlier, the latter adhered to the “philosophy of the atoms”, entertained the mortality of the soul, and denied the existence of Purgatory, Hell, and Paradise, the incarnation of Christ, and the virginity of Mary. Eight years ago, he attended lessons on the “philosophy of the atoms” by a teacher who held the same heretical views. BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fols. 468r-469v.

29 January 1693

Italian translations of the depositions by Giannelli in Spain, with annotations, transmitted by the General Inquisitor of Madrid in an authenticated copy, arrive in Rome.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 128r-135v; ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 50r-59v, with an annotation on fols. 59v-60r; AAV, *Segreteria di Stato*, Registro di lettere, vol. 128, fol. 85 (cf. Osbat 1974, 154).

1 February 1693

In an official deposition before notary Nicola Letizia, Sabino Belli, the uncle of Filippo, declares that he has been acquainted with Domenico Di Tomaso for many years. Di Tomaso had told Sabino Belli about the conflicts that had occurred between himself (Di Tomaso) and Giacinto De Cristofaro.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 316rv.

9 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Nicola Savino replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 286v-291v.

11 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giuseppa Franzese replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 270r-272v.

11 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Domenico Fontanella replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 272v-276r.

12 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Aniello and Sabino Belli (uncles of Filippo) provide a declaration to notary Nicola Letizia. Aniello tells of their encounter in August 1692 with Nicola Giordano, *mastrodatti* in the local Holy Office, who informed them that their nephew Filippo was under investigation. Giordano specified that Filippo could mitigate his legal position with a voluntary

appearance before the Holy Office. A few days later, Giovanni Battista Giordano, brother of Nicola, began to visit them frequently, persistently advising the same course of action. Nicola also pledged to discuss the case with the fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office and with Father Eligio Caracciolo (who goes on to be elected bishop of Cosenza in March 1694).

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 297r-298r.

12 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Caterina Mazzocca replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 276v-278v.

14 February 1693

In an official deposition before notary Virgilio Cardinale in Campagna, Giuseppe Correale, nephew of Antonio Miraballo, vicar general of Campagna, declares that, during the lawsuit against a certain Aniello Rapuozzo, uncle of Paolo D'Acunto and condemned to being "arrotato et squartato" (broken on the wheel and quartered), Bernardo De Cristofaro was a guest in the house of his uncle.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 303rv.

[February 1693]

In an official deposition, Scipione Salvi, marquis of Sant'Angelo a Scala, declares that when Antonio Miraballo was vicar general in Campagna (*supra*), Bernardo De Cristofaro attended the execution of Aniello Rapuozzo, who was married to Isabella D'Acunto, aunt of Paolo D'Acunto.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 305r, 306v.

14 February 1693

Pronunciation of the sentences that conclude the cases against Giovanni De Magistris and Carlo Rosito.

BNN, ms. XI.E.15, fols. 226r-235r.

15 February 1693

Giovanni De Magistris and Carlo Rosito are forced by archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo to make a public abjuration in the Cathedral of Naples before a large audience, including not only the officials and consultors of the Holy Office, but also Gaetano Caracciolo (archbishop of Conza), Gennaro Crispino (bishop of Minori), and Francesco Bonesana (bishop of Caiazzo). Rosito confesses to supporting heretical propositions about, *inter alia*, the existence of God, the incarnation of Christ, the virginity of Mary, the denial of Paradise and Purgatory, the mortality of the soul, the adoration of the saints, the idea that the world is composed of atoms, the animation of the celestial bodies, and the existence of a world in the Moon; he confesses also to having denied creation. For these transgressions, he is condemned to a prison sentence of ten years. De Magistris confessed to the same 'crimes', including atomism.

Confuorto reported:

On that day in the morning, abjured publicly in the cathedral church, on a table made for the purpose, in the presence of an infinite number of people of both sexes, who were there to hear the sermon, and [in the presence] of Cardinal Cantelmo archbishop, two of those imprisoned in the Holy Office of the archbishopric as atheists, Carlo Rosito, apothecary of medicine, and the other called Giovanni De Magistris, official of the Banco della Santissima Annunziata – to whom the trial of their errors was read by the *mastrodatti* of the said Court of the Holy Office. And it happened that, instead of the ordinary preacher, who had to preach about the Paradise of the current Gospel, the cardinal archbishop preached from his throne, where he was seated, for the time of half an hour, with great energy, so that he moved the listeners, taking those words as the theme of his sermon:

'Dixit impius in corde suo: non est Deus'. The fine given to the offenders was ten years in prison, which then is usually mitigated, fasting on bread and water every Friday, reciting the third part of the Rosary every day, and receiving Holy Communion four times a year.

BNN, ms. XI.E.15, fol. 236^{rv}; Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 48; Carafa 2005, 103-4; Osbat 1974, 190-1 (other sources); Comparato 1970, 147-50 on charges (among which philosophy and science). Part of the trial of De Magistris and Rosito is in BNN, XI.AA.23, fols. 461^r-476^v.

Cantelmo's sermon is in BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 12073, fols. 10^r-13^r (courtesy of Fiammetta Iovine).

The sentences of Rosito and De Magistris, are in BNN, XI.E.15, fols. 226^r-235^v; their abjurations are in ADDF, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 63^r-64^v and 65^r-67^v, respectively; copies of the sentences are in the same codex, on fols. 69^r-82^v; see also BAV, *Urb. lat.*, 1704, fols. 140^r-143^v.

15 February 1693

In letters to card. Alderano Cybo and to the Assessor Filippo Bernini, Giacomo Cantelmo informs them about the abjurations of Giovanni De Magistris and Carlo Rosito.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 42^{rv} and 43^{rv}; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fols. 56^v, 57^r.

21 February 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Lucio Capozzuti replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer; answering question no. 31, he states: "I do not know, because I have not studied similar sciences; I gathered that Cassendo [*sic*] and other authors deal with this subject". And for the rest he says he does not know.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 278^v-282^v.

21 February 1693

In a meeting of the Deputation for the Holy Office, Pietro Di Fusco proposes the removal of archbishop Cantelmo.

Carafa 2005, 104.

22-23 February 1693

The Deputation for the Holy Office initiates discussions on potential measures aimed directly at Archbishop Cantelmo, expressing objections against the violation of legal principles in the trials conducted by the functionaries of the archbishop's Court. Additionally, they demand the expulsion of Emilio Cavalieri, the fiscal lawyer of the local Holy Office.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 49-52.

25 February 1693.

The journal published by Domenico Antonio Parrino in Naples reports that:

The Deputation of this most faithful City of Naples, considering the prejudices, which result from the Inquisition of the Holy Office, was strongly resentful, because the Most Eminent Cardinal archbishop did not extradite to the secular Court – so that they were dead, and set on fire – the two who recently, as it was written, abjured, while the crimes of the denial of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, of the Incarnation of the Word, and of the Virginity of Our Lady the Immaculate, of which it was said in the abjuration that they had been convinced and which they confessed, could not be forgiven, nor could they be punished with salutary penances even for the first time, as the Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff Paul IV prescribes. In this way it would not have given occasion to the relatives of said defendants to have recourse, and to exclaim, to the aforementioned Deputation, asserting that the offenders had made their confessions erroneously, and not

legitimately, for being illiterate people, and of little understanding, the one being a poor chemist, and the other a scribe of the bank.

BOG, ms. 28.4.1, fol. 75r; published in Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 50.

25 February 1693

In the Roman Holy Office, Cantelmo's letter of 15 February (*supra*) to card. Cybo is discussed, and his work is praised. In another letter to the Assessor (*supra*), Cantelmo advised the Congregation to issue a general edict against atomism and against the schools where it is taught. The Cardinals decide to proceed with caution.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fols. 56v-57r.

27 February 1693

Pietro Di Fusco presents a motion (*voto*) to the Viceroy, in which he fiercely criticizes the abjuration forced upon Rosito and De Magistris, who have been deceived by the fiscal lawyer Emilio Cavalieri and by Pietro Antonio Castaldo, lawyer for the poor, with the promise that they would have been released from prison immediately after an abjuration in the office of the Vicar. He declares Cantelmo "hateful to this City", asking for specific measures to have him removed, and for a strict application of the 'holy canons' in future trials of faith. The Viceroy decides to submit the issue to the Collaterale Court.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 51-4; cf. Comparato 1970, 150; Galasso 1982, 459-60.

28 February 1693.

The noble seats (*piazze*) intend to accept Pietro Di Fusco in one of their seats "for his indefatigable commitment to the Holy Office affair in favor of the city". Confuorto fears, however, that "Di Fusco will fall victim to some reproach and sinister encounter from relatives of the cardinal, to show himself so brazenly ardent against him".

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 54.

2 March 1693

In the Holy Office in Naples, Carlo Rutolo makes a deposition regarding Matteo Vitale and Nicola Galdieri, declaring that they had held discussions with other youths in the bookshop of Carlo Porpora, and in the shops of other booksellers in the Via S. Biagio. He knows that they have been arrested for issues regarding natural philosophy; in another version of this deposition (dated the same day), among the 'other youths' mentioned, he explicitly identifies Aniello Di Napoli, Nicola Galizia, Saverio Panzuti, Basilio Giannelli, and Filippo Belli.

BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fols. 462rv, 463rv (another version); see also Amabile 1892, 2: 62.

2 March 1693

During a meeting of the Collaterale Council, the President of the Court, Felice de Lancina y Ulloa, criticizes the lawyers of the Deputation (who should address the Pope) and argues against the expulsion of Emilio Cavalieri. Other members rail against the "doctrine and new opinions" which produce such bad effects.

ASN, *Notamenti del Collaterale*, vol. 83, fols. 55r-59r.

4 March 1693

The Collaterale Council rejects the request for the expulsion of Emilio Cavalieri and temporarily prohibits the meetings of the seats (*piazze*). It is recommended that the Deputation should address the Pope.

ASN, *Notamenti del Collaterale*, vol. 83, fols. 62v-64v; Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 55-6.

10 March 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Antonio Di Fusco replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, 296r-299r.

15 March 1693

Confuorto reports that the Viceroy is inclined to support the Deputation, “because it is said that in Spain the controversies regarding this matter with the ecclesiastics are not well accepted, and especially in these turbulent times”.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 57.

17 March 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Antonio Maria De Ruggiero replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer; to question no. 31, he answers: “Although I have studied philosophy, it does not occur to me what an atom is”.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 300r-303r.

Post 24 March 1693

Orazio Di Maio, Michele De Notariis, Nicola Letizia, and Nicola Costantino declare that on 24 March they met Antonio De Ruggiero and spoke about the incarceration of Giacinto De Cristofaro. De Ruggiero told them that he had been interrogated by Emilio Cavalieri, fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in Naples, who “suggested many things to report”, but he claimed not to be acquainted with De Cristofaro (see under “2 October 1692”; cf. “17 March 1693”). When pressed whether he was able to suggest possible witnesses against De Cristofaro, he again expressed an emphatic denial. Cavalieri made a second attempt on March 19, but to no avail.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 324r.

26 March 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Sebastiano Biancardi replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, answering question no. 31 as follows: “I have studied another science, and I do not know what this science of atoms is, and I don't know anything else”.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 292r-295r.

28 March 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Paolo D'Acunto replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. His answer to question no. 31 reads as follows:

I know that the atoms are those indivisible points of which all things are composed, and that they are constitutive principle of all things, as several authors say, whether they are gentile or Catholics. The Catholics challenge such science as being against our holy Catholic faith, which I profess.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 304r-306v, on fol. 305v.

29 March 1693

A delegation from Atripalda, including Sabino Del Vecchio, Girolamo Laurenzano, and Andrea Amarena, makes a legal declaration on the enmity of Domenico Di Tomaso with respect to Filippo Belli. They also quote some satirical verses that had been involved in the controversy with Giannelli.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 515r-516v.

29 March 1693

Emilio Cavalieri, fiscal lawyer of the Neapolitan Holy Office, whose removal was requested by the Deputation, is appointed bishop of Fondi (a position he will subsequently renounce; see “16 April”, *infra*).

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 60.

30 March 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Angelo Barone replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer. His answer to question no. 31 is as follows:

I know that atoms are some quantitative but indivisible particles, and the authors who deal with them are different, and in particular Pietro Casseno [*sic*, for Gassendi], Bernardino [*sic*, for Bernardino] Telesio, father Maignan of the Order of Minims of St. Francis, Enrico Regio, Renato des Cartes, and others, which are all Catholics. And the said science as such has not been condemned, and in Naples those who are professors of this science, as I know, are Catholics and many are my friends, and I know that Renato des Cartes is forbidden, donec corrigatur.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 307r-310r, fol. 308r.

1 April 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Antonia Santavenere replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 311r-314v.

2 April 1693

Pietro Di Fusco is officially affiliated to one of the noble seats (*piazze*); the choice of the specific seat is left to Di Fusco himself (he will choose the Capoana seat on 3 April).

ASN, *Notamenti del Collaterale*, vol. 83, fols. 81v-84r; Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 60-1 (with a copy of the official decree).

8 April 1693

Heated discussions develop in the meeting of the seats regarding the Holy Office.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 62-3.

10 April 1693

In Oria (now in Basilicata), Ottavio Fazzi makes a legal deposition in the case against Domenico Moniaci. Asked whether he knows any person entertaining the “new philosophy of the atoms”, he states that he became acquainted with Moniaci in June 1692 in Naples, in the house of Andrea Sisto, brother of the duke of Ceglie, who in his house in the Pizzofalcone region in Naples hosted Moniaci to give philosophy lessons. He did not denounce Moniaci on that occasion, but he did in November 1692 before the archbishop of Naples and the vicar general because Moniaci entertained the idea of the mortality of the soul.

BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fols. 475r-476v.

11 April 1693

Carlo Cuzzolino, bishop of Oria, transmits to Giacomo Cantelmo the deposition by Ottavio Fazzi, testimony in the case against Moniaci.

BNN, ms. XI.AA.23, fol. 474r.

12 April 1693

In a legal deposition before notary Nicola Letizia, Francesco D'Auria declares himself to have known Giacinto De Cristofaro during his studies; six years ago, Giacinto De Cristofaro told him about his hostile relationship with Domenico Di Tomaso. D'Auria claims that "said Domenico led a licentious life and being a handsome young man, he practiced with scandalous people". BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 314rv.

13 April 1693

In a legal deposition before notary Nicola Letizia, the illiterate Giovanna Santavenere gives an account of the pressure imposed on her by Emilio Cavalieri, fiscal lawyer of the Neapolitan Holy Office, during interrogations some months earlier. Cavalieri threatened to let her die in the criminal section of the prison or torture her with the rope, prompting her to plead guilty to whatever he suggested. When her confessor learned of this, he instructed her to retract this 'confession', but upon returning to the Holy Office, she was not granted permission to do so. After persistent attempts, her deposition was eventually read to her, revealing charges she never pronounced or admitted. Consequently, she rectified her initial deposition. Now, uncertain as to whether her corrections have been recorded, she volunteers this latest declaration. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 295r-296v.

15 April 1693

In Madrid, the Council of Italy takes a stand against the seats (*piazze*) and defends the agreement reached between the Court and the ecclesiastics to restore the Holy Office in Naples. It is feared that the attitude of the lawyer Pietro Di Fusco might dangerously disturb the peace of the city.

ASG, *Secreterías provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fols. 191r-192v (Osbat 1974, 199).

16 April 1693

The Deputation for the Holy Office in Naples convenes once again and resolves to appeal to the Pope for the abolition of the Inquisition Tribunal in Naples. Following the meetings of the individual noble seats and the assembly of the middle class ("Piazza del Popolo"), the Deputation begins deliberations on the modalities of presenting their requests to Rome (see also "26 May"). Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 64-5; cf. Amabile 1892, 2: 65-77; Osbat 1974, 201; Galasso 1982, 462-6.

16 April 1693

By 54 votes to 8, the seat of Capoa condemns the work of card. Cantelmo as minister of the Holy Office, and consequently approves a mission to the King in Spain and to the Pope in Rome to support their arguments:

And it was concluded with a majority of votes that complete power was given to their deputies to be able to elect and send persons suitable for this [mission], according to their opinion, to the king our lord and to the supreme pontiff in defense of the reasons of the city, and to act, when necessary, against any person, although placed in supreme dignity, in accordance with the aforementioned vote made by the deputies. Therefore, it seems that this hurts the Cardinal archbishop.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 66.

16 April 1693

In Rome, Emilio Cavalieri has renounced to the bishopric of Fondi.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 66.

18 April 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Francesco Antonio Capasso replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 315r-317v.

21 April 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Domenico Gaetano replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer; to question no. 31, he answers as follows: "I know that atoms are a combination of some particles".

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 318r-321r.

23 April 1693

The noble seat of Montagna approves and joins the decision of the Capuana seat (see "16 April").
Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 67.

23 April 1693

In a legal deposition, Francesco Domenico Di Fusco declares himself to be acquainted with both Giacinto De Cristofaro and Francesco Paolo Manuzzi. He remembers that De Cristofaro greatly reviled the customs of Manuzzi, and that the latter said that De Cristofaro had gossiped about him.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 320r.

24 April 1693

Giovanni Battista Giordano replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 322r-325r.

29 April 1693

Nicola Di Domenico replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer; to question no. 31, he answers as follows: "According to the opinion of Renato and Cassendo, atoms are a combination of particles".

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 326r-329r.

29 April 1693

Francesco Sernicola returns to Naples from his mission in Spain.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 67.

29 April 1693

The seat of Nido approves and joins the decision of the Capoana and Montagna seats (see "16 April" and "23 April").

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 67.

30 April 1693

During the feast of Ascension, a cartoon of Cantelmo is hung in the Nido seat:

At 30 said, Thursday morning, the feast of the Ascension of the Lord, a painted cartoon against Cardinal Cantelmo our archbishop was found affixed to the Seggio di Nido, which consisted of three characters, i.e., on one side was the figure of the Canon Sanfelice, on the other side, Father Giulio Cesare de li Vergini as a missionary. These two were holding their armband in their hand as to play ball, and in the middle stood the Cardinal all curled up, like a ball played by these two.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 67; Galasso 1982, 457.

3 May 1693

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Lorenzo Casoni acknowledges that anyone can appeal to the Pope to seek justice for abuses committed by the Holy Office or by its ministers, but warns that

those same extravagances that had been expressed in all the petitions, conclusions and vows that were given out, i.e., that in this City and Kingdom no other inquisition should be admitted than that of the bishops and *per via ordinaria*

cannot achieve any useful result because it means appealing to Rome against the interests of Rome itself.

AAV, Nunziatura di Napoli, Cifre colla Nunziatura, vol. 116, fols. 113r-114r (Osbat 1974, 202).

4 May 1693

The seat of Porto joins the other seats in their decision concerning the Holy Office.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 69.

5 May 1693

In a letter to Fabrizio Spada, Lorenzo Casoni expresses some doubts about the work of the archbishop Cantelmo, in particular with respect to the abjurations, which Casoni believes should

be semi-public in the hall of the archbishopric and that he should not preach in the way he did, with the reason that this would have been a novelty which could have exposed the function itself to some disturbance.

AAV, Nunziatura di Napoli, Cifre colla Nunziatura, vol. 116, fol. 120r (Osbat 1974, 211).

7 May 1693

Nicola Bagnulo replies to the questionnaire formulated by Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer, without answering question no. 31.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, Processi, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 330r-334r.

13 May 1693

The seat of Portanova joins the other seats in their decision concerning the Holy Office.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 69.

17 May 1693

Francesco d'Andrea leaves his role as fiscal lawyer of the Regia Camera.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 70.

19 May 1693

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli responds to the now well-known accusations leveled by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi regarding: the existence of men made of atoms before Adam; the emancipation of mankind and the rise of religion; the position of Christ; the authority of the Pope; the existence of Hell, Heaven, and Purgatory; the adoration of Saints and images. Similar accusations of heresy were leveled by the witnesses (in crypted code) named B (Domenico Di Tomaso) and C (Paolo D'Acunto).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, Processi, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 374r-376r; copy on fols. 383v-386r; cf. fol. 452r, where Belli reconstructs his trial until March 1694.

20 May 1693

The popular seat in Sant'Agostino joins the noble seats in their decision concerning the Holy Office.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 71.

26 May 1693

The Deputation for the Holy Office in Naples decide to delegate to Pietro Di Fusco and Francesco Capece Mercadante, marquis of Pontelatrone (later substituted by Mario Loffredo), the presentation of their requests to Rome. Confuorto reports:

At 26 said, Tuesday, the gentlemen deputies joined *more solito* in San Lorenzo, and by the power conferred on them by all the seats, they elected the persons of Dr. Pietro Di Fusco, deputy of the People, and of the Marquis of Pontelatrone of Casa Capece, of the nobility class, following the advice of Di Fusco, to go to Rome to the supreme pontiff, to beg him to grant their request by removing the tribunal and minister of the Holy Office from this city and Kingdom, and that those under investigation of similar offense are judged by the local bishop with the ordinary procedure. To each of whom, during their stay in that city, are assigned two hundred *scudi* a month and another five hundred *pro una vice tantum* for current expenses to each of them. And it is believed that they may obtain, if not in all, at least part of what is desired, because it is said that the Supreme Pontiff is not very satisfied with the work in the said affair by the Cardinal archbishop, who has allowed himself to be led astray by his ministers and consultors.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 72; Amabile 1892, 2: 65-77; Galasso 1982, 462-6.

27 May 1693

Francesco d'Andrea is officially dismissed as a fiscal lawyer, and is appointed "consigliere del Sacro Consiglio".

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 79.

28 May 1693

Filippo Belli presents a demand to Giacomo Cantelmo for a lay lawyer ("avvocato laico").

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 464r; cf. fol. 452r.

3 June 1693

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses a letter by Vincenzo Maria Orsini, archbishop of Benevento (the future Benedict XIII), who signalizes the presence of a *secta athomorum* in the Kingdom of Naples. The Cardinals ask him to extirpate the "doctrinam athomorum male sanam".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 170rv.

17 June 1693

When a summary of the proceedings is read in the case against Domenico Moniaci, accused of *pretensum Atheismum* and kept prisoner in the Holy Office in Rome, the Cardinals order that the archbishop of Naples should corroborate the evidence with the interrogation of other witnesses.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 191rv.

18 June 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a petition to the Neapolitan Holy Office. He has been informed that the cross-examination of the witnesses has been completed and he therefore asks for a 'genuine' copy of the witness reports: "ingenuam, ac fidelem copiam repertorum sibi tradi suppressis supprimendis secundum communioem stylum praxis à Doctoribus in huiusmodi causis receptae". Giovanni Andrea Siliquino, vicar general of the archbishop of Naples accedes to this request on the same day. De Cristofaro and his lawyer Baccalà receive a notification of this decision from the cleric Giuseppe Oricchio.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 244rv.

20 June 1693

Pietro Di Fusco leaves Naples for Rome. Mario Loffredo will join him next month (see “5 July” below). In Rome they will start to contact the Spanish ambassador and the Spanish cardinals to prepare the City’s petition to the Pope, which will consist essentially in the demand for ordinary, that is, non-secret proceedings in trials of faith.

ADDF, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 168r-169r, 191rv; Amabile 1892, 2: 61.

Ante 22 June 1693

Filippo Belli presents a petition to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples and minister ad interim of the Holy Office, asking for Giovanni Luciano to be assigned to him as his lawyer of choice.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 464r.

22 June 1693

Filippo Belli and his lawyer Giovanni Luciano receive an official copy of the proceedings they requested.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 387rv; cf. fol. 452r for the precept to prepare the defense within four days; cf. fol. 436rv for the legal challenge against the precept.

22 June 1693

Being unable to accompany Pietro Di Fusco to Rome, Marquis of Pontelatrone is replaced by Mario Loffredo, marquis of Monteforte.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 82-3.

23 June 1693

The Congregation answers a letter dated 11 June from the archbishop of Benevento. They advise that, in the proceedings of his provincial synod, he should not publish their reply (transmitted 6 June) to his earlier letter (see “3 June”) regarding the sect of ‘atomists’.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 195r.

24 June 1693

In Madrid, the Council of Italy recommends moderation both towards the embassy which is about to leave Naples, and towards the Pope and the Roman Curia which is about to receive it.

AGS, *Secreterías Provinciales, Nápoles*, lib. 351, fol. 220r (Osbat 1974, 203).

30 June 1693

Innocent XII, the Neapolitan Antonio Pignatelli, receives Pietro Di Fusco, and he promises to submit his proposed case to a commission of four cardinals of the Holy Office – namely, Fabrizio Spada, Gaspare Carpegna, Bandino Panciatichi, and Girolamo Casanate.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 87-90; for the negotiations of Di Fusco and Monteforte with the commission, see ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.d and HH.1.f.

Ante 1 July 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro receives a copy of the interrogatories made in the period 1688-93 (this copy is now in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 1r-122r).

BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 125v.

1 July 1693

Filippo Belli and his lawyer renounce the opportunity to re-petition the witnesses, “ut tamen celeriter ad expeditionem causae deveniatur, ne diutius in carceribus affligeretur”. By

contrast, at the request of the fiscal lawyer, Belli was served with the precept that he must present the questions for cross-examination within four days, otherwise the attorney would handle it *ex officio*.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 388r-389r (a first draft on fol. 436rv); cf. fol. 452r.

Post 1 July 1693

Filippo Belli and his lawyer Giovanni Luciano present the scheme for the re-petition of the witnesses. The eighteen questions contained in the scheme regard: generalities of identity, education, and acquaintance with Belli (1-3); direct or indirect experience with the Inquisition, heretics, judges or tribunals (4-8); the faith of Belli (9-11); possible enemies, quarrels, moral qualities, irreligion or licentious life (12-14); previous accusations by the witnesses, their acquaintance with or knowledge of heretics and heretical views (15-17); and, finally, the education of the witness and his/her experience of being the target of satirical verses (18).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 390r-393r; copy on fols. 395r-397v.

3 July 1693

Pietro Di Fusco provides the Deputation in Naples with an account of the gracious reception he experienced in Rome.

Carafa 2005, 113-19.

4 July 1693

Pietro Di Fusco presents his case to Innocent XII and to the Cardinals of the Holy Office.

Carafa 2005, 119-22.

5 July 1693

Mario Loffredo leaves Naples for his journey to Rome.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 85-7, with a copy of the Instructions of the Deputation for their two representatives in Rome; another copy of the instructions is in Bulifon's journal, in BNN, X.F.51, fols. 127r-128r.

7 July 1693

The news of Di Fusco's meeting with the Pope on 30 June reaches Naples. The Pope has appointed a commission of four cardinals to examine the issue (see "30 June").

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 87-90 (contains copies of a letter by Di Fusco to the Deputation and of his Oration to the Pope).

Ante 8 July 1693

Having received a copy of his proceedings, Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a petition to the Cardinals of the Roman Holy Office complaining that the copy he received is incomplete. He requests a complete copy of the file to prepare his defense.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 249r.

[Ante 8 July 1693]

An anonymous functionary of the Neapolitan Holy Office comments upon the petition written by De Cristofaro ("Ante 8 July"), and argues that it is based on false presumptions.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 250r-251v.

8 July 1693

The Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome read De Cristofaro's request for a complete copy of the proceedings. They order archbishop and minister Cantelmo to provide De Cristofaro, within the bounds of the *stylus* of the Holy Office, with an integral copy.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 210v.

11 July 1693

Card. Alderano Cybo transmits the petition by De Cristofaro, in which he complains about having received an incomplete copy of the proceedings, to Giacomo Cantelmo, minister of the Holy Office and archbishop of Naples.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 248r.

Post 11 July 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a petition to the Deputation of the Holy Office asking for support for his request for a complete copy of the proceedings.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 349r-350v.

14 July 1693

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples and minister of the local Holy Office, replies to the Cardinals of the Inquisition in Rome, arguing that De Cristofaro's legal challenge (which was read on 8 July) had the "malicious intention" of casting doubt on the legitimacy of the proceedings of the Neapolitan Holy Office in cases of faith.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 188r-189r (see also the comments made by an anonymous functionary in Naples in ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 250r-251v); cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 226rv.

18 July 1693

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop, and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, discusses the cases of Matteo Vitale and Carlo Rosito. Having abjured, the latter now asks to be transferred to a convent. Vitale, considering his poor health, cannot be tortured, and thus Cantelmo proposes to conclude his case with a private abjuration. He also transmits a summary of the proceedings against Vitale, with accusations and related evidence by witness testimonies indicated as document A (see below). The main charges regard his alleged denial of the following truths: the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the incarnation of Christ, the virginity of Mary, the existence of Hell, Paradise and Purgatory, sacraments, the sins of the flesh, and creation (the world is "casu factum, et compositum ex atomis"). In addition, Vitale holds that animals have rational souls, and proposes natural explanations for the miracles of the saints, in particular for the liquefaction of the blood of San Gennaro (Naples) and the production of myrrh by the relics of San Nicola (Bari). Cantelmo attaches two other documents. In document B, he proposes to convert Carlo Rosito's prison sentence to house arrest in a convent or monastery. The second document, indicated as A, is split into two parts: the first regards the charges, a summary of proceedings, and a reconstruction of Vitale's trial; the second argues for a private abjuration and proposes to change his prison sentence to a sentence of confinement under house arrest. ADDF, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 193rv (Cantelmo's letter); fols. 194r-195v (first doc. A); fols. 196r-197r (doc. B); fol. 198rv (second doc. A).

22 July 1693

The Cardinals read Cantelmo's letter of 14 July (see above), and they reply that De Cristofaro's lawyer has the right to receive a copy of the letter by means of which the Holy Office had granted De Cristofaro a more comfortable room in the convent of San Domenico (the much referenced 'habilitation') after his arrest in August 1691.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 226rv.

24 July 1693

Cantelmo's letter of 18 July is read in the Congregation in Rome. As regards the case of Vitale, the Cardinals propose that either Cantelmo should close the case on his own authority or else

send a complete copy of the documents so that – in such a serious matter – a well-considered judgment may be reached in Rome. Rosito's request to be released from prison cannot be accepted. The Cardinals merely advise Cantelmo to treat him with *charitativè*.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 241rv.

28 July 1693

In a legal deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro challenges the copy he received of the proceedings of his trial, because the documents are “mutila, manca et depravata”, in flagrant contravention of the requirements of the sacred canons and papal constitutions. Many documents lack indications of place and time, also where this information does not compromise the anonymity and safety of the witnesses or defendants. *Inter alia*, the copy does not contain: (1) the positive attestations regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro's moral qualities, collected from five witnesses by the former minister of the Holy Office in Naples Giuseppe Nicola Giberti in 1688-89; (2) the Spanish interrogations of Manuzzi and Giannelli; (3) the name of the official in Naples who conducted the interrogatories; (4) the official document of Giacinto's ‘habilitation’ issued in September 1691. He thus asks for complete copies of the proceedings.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 239r-240r (copy on fol. 362rv; earlier versions or drafts: fols. 210r-211v, fol. 218vr [*sic*]).

28 July 1693

Donato Vulturale, fiscal lawyer of the local Holy Office, replies to De Cristofaro's deposition.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 210r-211v (written on the left part of De Cristofaro's deposition).

28 July 1693

The fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in Naples (then Donato Vulturale) declares that De Cristofaro's request is admissible but with the declarations, protests and replies of the Tribunal. Giovanni Andrea Siliquino, General Vicar of the bishopric of Naples, approves this decision.

BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 240r.

Post 28 July 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro continues to address the Holy Office of Naples with depositions (containing requests and petitions), so that he will be given a complete copy of the proceedings, in particular the attestations that could substantiate his thesis on the deceptions by Manuzzi, Giannelli, and Pisano. The ms. BNN, I.AA.32 contains a group of five legal depositions, most probably written in the summer of 1693. They all start with the standard form: “In Reverendo Tribunali Sancti Officij [...] comparens/comparet U. I. D. Hyacinthus Christophorus”. Unfortunately, these documents dwelling on the incomplete copy of the proceedings and the wrongs suffered by De Cristofaro during the incarceration and the trial, are undated. It is not even clear whether all of them have been presented, and it seems, that they have been presented; a succinct summary of each is proposed as follows:

- fol. 219r: in a short note, Giacinto recalls that some days ago he presented a request for a complete copy of the proceedings, addressed to the local Holy Office as well as to the Congregation of the Inquisition in Rome; he now insists on the attestations collected in 1688-89 by Giuseppe Nicola Giberti which substantiate his pleas of innocence and the imposture concocted by Manuzzi and Giannelli. These favorable testimonies include those by Antonio de Torres, Onofrio Bizzarro, and Fulvio Caracciolo; see Bernardo De Cristofaro's reconstruction of the proceedings, on fol. 264v in this codex.
- fol. 222rv: Giacinto analyzes his conflict with the fiscal lawyer Donato Vulturale, and articulates his criticism in several juridical arguments: (1) witnesses should not be recruited among the enemies of the defendant; (2) testimonies should not be extorted with promises or threats; (3) acts should be “clara lucida vera legalia”; (4) witnesses should

be interrogated according to clear rules; and (5) the trial should be set up in accordance with 'holy canons'. He then recalls that in 1687 he was warned by Giovanni Batangelo (for his role, see also the reconstruction of events by Bernardo De Cristofaro in the same codex, on fols. 263v-264r) that in the Holy Office an imposture against him was to be concocted; then, he again reconstructs the details of his good relations with Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, the former minister of the Holy Office in Naples, and the wrongs he suffered at the hands of Nicola Giberti's successor Giovanni Battista Giberti. The text of the document is interrupted at the bottom of fol. 222v.

- fols. 223r-226r: Giacinto has been informed about the annotations by the fiscal lawyer Donato Vulturale to his request for a complete copy of the proceedings, which he had presented on 28 July 1693; he stresses Vulturale's conflict of interest, because the latter once assisted him as a lawyer and is now the attorney in his trial, entailing a clear violation of both human and divine law; he stresses that witnesses (including Lucio Capozzuti, Giovanna Santavenera) have been manipulated and put under pressure; he again emphasizes the positive attestations regarding his person collected by the minister Giuseppe Nicola Giberti and repeats his claims about the incomplete copy of the proceedings.
- fols. 233r-234r: an apparent draft of a final version which is most probably that on fols. 251r-252v; Giacinto again recalls the positive attestations collected by Giuseppe Nicola Giberti from five witnesses; a clear difference with the final version is Giacinto's open indication that it was the homosexual relationship between Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Felice Pisano that triggered his troubles with ecclesiastical justice.
- fols. 235r-236v and 237r-238v: both are drafts with marginal corrections of the deposition on fols. 251r-252v.
- fols. 251r-252v: Giacinto learned that Donato Vulturale, fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in Naples, replied to his request for a complete copy of the proceedings; he calls attention to the anonymity rule for witnesses, which in his view should only apply to cases in which the witness runs some serious risk; then, he gives rather an articulate presentation of the accusation formulated in another document (see fol. 223r-226v) regarding Vulturale's conflict of interest, once being a trusted confidante of the De Cristofaro family, as well as – at least initially – lawyer and juridical adviser to Giacinto.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 218vr [sic], 219r, 222rv, 223r-226r, 233r-234r, 235r-236v, 237r-238v, 251r-252v.

Ante 29 July 1693

Filippo Belli presents a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office. He reconstructs his arrest, imprisonment, and the first interrogatories in the Neapolitan Holy Office. Belli complains that before his arrest, the *mastrodatti* Nicola Giordano and the fiscal lawyer of the Holy Office in Naples attempted to induce him to confess by tortuous and oblique ways. He further laments that, after his arrest in Campagna, he was treated like a criminal – held for six days in a cramped cell, transferred to Naples with chains on his hands, feet, and neck, interrogated on arrival in the middle of the night with intimidation and without due guarantees. Then, after having been interrogated once more, with more threats and intimidation, on the following morning, he was confined for forty days in an obscure *criminale* (a severe individual prison cell). Finally, his renunciation of the opportunity to re-petition the fiscal witnesses, due to the very low quality of the witnesses themselves, was not accepted. The fiscal lawyer of the Tribunal now threatens to proceed with the re-petition *ex officio*, that is, without his consent. ADDF, SO, St. st., HH.1.h, fols. 205r, 206r-207v.

Ante 29 July 1693

In an analytical review and confutation of Filippo Belli's aforementioned petition, an anonymous functionary of the Neapolitan Holy Office rebuts Belli's objections, dividing them into four chapters, concerning the preliminaries of the incarceration, the capture, the first interrogatories, and the juridical aspects of the case.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 264r-269r.

29 July 1693

In Rome, the Cardinals of the Holy Office discuss Belli's request to conclude (*expedire*) his case; they order that the issue be referred to archbishop Cantelmo.

In reply to Cantelmo's letter of 18 July, the Cardinals order that the trial against Vitale be brought to a conclusion, and they ask for an integral copy of his trial. They decline Rosito's request to be transferred from prison to a convent.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fols. 235r, 241rv; an assessment of Belli's petition is in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 264r-269r.

30 July 1693

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro denies several accusations (drawn from Belli's deposition on 5 December 1692): that animals have a rational soul, that the world is composed of atoms, the reading of a book by Georg Buchanan (a forbidden author); he also denies having ever heard discussions about atomism.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 335r-336r.

1 August 1693

Filippo Belli's petition which was discussed in the Roman Holy Office on 29 July (see above), is forwarded to the archbishop in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 207v.

3 August 1693

Confuorto reports a visit by Monteforte and Di Fusco, accompanied by the Spanish ambassador, Luis Francisco de la Cerda y Aragón, Duke of Medinaceli (future Viceroy of Naples), to the Pope in Rome, where they were received with many honors. The first conversation with the cardinals of the Congregation tempered hopes, however:

It is believed here that they will waste time and money in Rome, because having good words, to the use of the Roman Court, but not obtaining the desired intent; because it is said that, when these sent gentlemen delegates informed the cardinals of the congregation, one of them had spoken in the 'Lombard way', that is clearly saying that condescending to the wishes of the City of Naples would be an example to the other princes and cities of wanting the same.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 91-2, on 92.

August 1693

In a legal declaration, the priest Girolamo Cappella attests that in 1684 Donato Vulturale introduced Giacinto De Cristofaro into his legal firm for an internship. He vouches for the latter's moral integrity and describes him as a "God-fearing person, and excellently educated".

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 293rv.

Ante 4 August 1693

In a letter to the Cardinals of the Congregation of the Holy Office, Bernardo De Cristofaro presents an extensive reconstruction of the proceedings against his son Giacinto. He delves into

the contradictions in the witness testimonies of Manuzzi and Giannelli and highlights the questionable role of Felice Pisano. This letter, likely initially submitted to the Neapolitan Holy Office, is forwarded to Rome on 4 August.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 263^rv (letter), 264^r-269^v (reconstruction).

4 August 1693

In a petition to a cardinal of the Holy Office in Rome (probably, Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office, or Girolamo Casanate, member of the commission to negotiate with the Neapolitan Deputation), Giacinto De Cristofaro criticizes the most important witnesses for the prosecution, that is Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Basilio Giannelli, characterizing them as his enemies, and as impostors and perjurers. He asks the addressee, moreover, to receive Pietro Di Fusco, in the hope that he may support his case in Rome.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 366^r-367^r; for Di Fusco's involvement in the case, see ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 473^r (cf. "6 April 1694").

Ante 5 August 1693

Federico Nicola Gavardi, consultant of the Roman Holy Office, composes a *censura* of Leonardo Di Capua's *Parere* (see under "4 November 1692"). He marks Di Capua's defamatory tone against physicians and philosophers, and his praise of Democritus and Epicurus. In his view, Di Capua's atomism, and his reduction of all change to local motion entails a denial of the immortality of the soul and jeopardizes the traditional explanation of the miracle of the Eucharist.

ADDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fols. 36^r-39^v.

5 August 1693

Based on the assessment by Gavardi (see above), the Holy Office in Rome decrees the unconditional prohibition of Leonardo Di Capua's *Parere*.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 249^v.

8 August 1693

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Roman Holy Office, Giacomo Cantelmo warns of De Cristofaro's 'tricks' ("artificij"), "always thinking of overshadowing the operations of the Court with new slanders".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 263^r.

10 August 1693

In an official deposition, Nicola Salernitano recounts the details of a visit that monsignor Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, then minister of the Holy Office in Naples, paid to Fulvio Caracciolo shortly after the earthquake of June 1688. During the visit, Giberti asked Caracciolo for an attestation regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro's life and morals. After Caracciolo reassured Giberti, the minister mentioned that he had also gathered other positive attestations about De Cristofaro. On the same evening, Caracciolo advised Giacinto to present himself voluntarily to the minister of the Holy Office in Naples.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 348^r.

12 August 1693

The Holy Office in Rome transmits six printed copies of the edict of the prohibition of Di Capua's *Parere* to the archbishop of Naples, who confirms receipt on 18 August.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 256^rv; SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fols. 28^r, 32^v.

15 August 1693

Giacomo Cantelmo writes to Orazio Fortunato, bishop of Nardò, requesting the repetition of Manuzzi's testimony in the case against Filippo Belli.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 394r.

19 August 1693

Considering the poor economic conditions of his family, Carlo Rosito asks the Congregation to change his imprisonment into an alternative form of punishment (preferably a transfer to a convent). The Cardinals dismiss his request (see "29 July").

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 258v.

22 August 1693

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, reports to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, that the prohibition of Di Capua's work has given rise to much "ciarle" (chatters) among physicians and lawyers in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fol. 277r.

23 August 1693

In an official deposition before notary Francesco Di Ruggiero, Domenico Di Fusco, physician, attests his own knowledge of the enmity between Giacinto De Cristofaro and Francesco Paolo Manuzzi.

BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 320r, 321v.

24 Augustus 1693

In the Neapolitan Holy Office, Domenico Di Tomaso replies to the questionnaire formulated by Filippo Belli and his lawyer.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 406r-408v.

25 August 1693

In a petition to Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro complains about the incomplete copy of the proceedings: "forensic findings (useless, as most of the writings are lacking) that do not allow my innocence to be made clear". The petition will be forwarded by Cybo to Cantelmo on 5 September (see *infra*).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 246rv.

26 August 1693

Nicola Cirillo, former procurator fiscal of the Holy Office in Naples and now bishop of Nicastro, writes a letter to Gennaro De Cristofaro, informing him that he has been unable to fulfil his request (probably the request made by Giacinto in 1692; see "8 October 1692" and "2 December 1692") because he is not allowed to release attestations without being instructed to do so by the Congregation of the Holy Office.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 374rv.

26 August 1693

In the palace of the bishop of Nardò, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi begins extensive replies to the questionnaire formulated by Filippo Belli and his lawyer. He identifies Giannelli and De Cristofaro as main culprits and affirms that Belli merely listened to and did not participate in their discussions.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 398r-400r.

27-29 August 1693

In the bishop of Nardò's palace, Francesco Paolo Manuzzi continues and completes his replies to Belli's questionnaire.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 400r-405r.

[August 1693]

In a letter to the Cardinals of the Holy Office,⁹ Giacinto De Cristofaro complains about the wrongs he has suffered, and the provision of an incomplete copy of the proceedings. He presents an extensive reconstruction of the witness testimonies, and he asks to be released.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 168r_v (petition), 169r-180r (reconstruction); an earlier draft is in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 191r-194v.

[August 1693]

An anonymous clerk, probably based in Naples because he has the original files at disposition, assesses Giacinto De Cristofaro's reconstruction (*supra*) and presents a detailed confutation.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 360r-361v.

Ca. August-September 1693

An anonymous author (probably De Cristofaro himself) presents a short evaluation of the testimonies 'pro et contra' in De Cristofaro's case and suggests that there were sexual relations between Manuzzi, Pisano and Giannelli; the latter contracted a venereal disease, cured by the physician Domenico Di Fusco.

BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 276r-278v.

[August-September 1693]

In (a draft of) a letter to the members of the Neapolitan Deputation for the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro seeks to draw further attention to the homosexual relationship between Manuzzi, Giannelli and Pisano, and asks for a complete copy of the proceedings.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 382r-383r.

[Summer 1693]

Giacinto De Cristofaro submits a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, requesting a complete copy of the proceedings of his case without the redaction of the names of the witnesses. He points to the fact that many favorable depositions, including those of Fulvio Caracciolo, Antonio Torres, and Onofrio Bizzarro, are missing in the copy he received. He once again alludes to the alleged homosexual relationship between Paolo Manuzzi and Felice Pisano.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 173r-174r; see BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 233r-234r, and 276r-278r for similar accusations against Manuzzi and Pisano.

1 September 1693

Orazio Fortunato, bishop of Nardò, transmits Francesco Paolo Manuzzi's replies to Filippo Belli's questionnaire to Carlo Loffredo, archbishop of Bari.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 420r.

⁹ The date is not certain, but De Cristofaro's reconstruction is based on the copy of the proceedings that he had probably received in the first days of July 1693; see "Ante 8 July 1693".

2 September 1693

The Cardinals of the Holy Office discuss De Cristofaro's petition with a reiterated request for an integral copy of the proceedings and decide to forward this request to the archbishop of Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 273r; the petition is probably the one written on 25 August (*supra*) or the one in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 173r-174r.

5 September 1693

Card. Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office, transmits the aforementioned petition by De Cristofaro (see "25 August") to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, and minister of the local Holy Office.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 245r, 247v.

12 September 1693

In a legal deposition, signed by witnesses and the notary Pietro Capasso in the Carthusian monastery of San Martino in Naples, Carlo Rosito affirms that he never made declarations against the Neapolitan Holy Office and its ministers.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 461r-462r.

25 September 1693

Felice Pisano replies to the questionnaire formulated by Filippo Belli and his lawyer.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 409r-411v.

30 September 1693

De Cristofaro has presented two petitions to the Holy Office in Rome. In the first, he complains that when he finally received a copy of his dossier, he noted that it was only a partial copy and that many defense witnesses had been deliberately ignored (see "28 July"); in the second, he asks again to be released, citing medical reports.

"Praedictis omnibus auditis" the Cardinals order Cantelmo to move him into two other rooms and to treat him with *charitativè*.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 308rv.

5 October 1693

In a legal deposition, Filippo Belli and his lawyer Giovanni Luciano declare that they renounce the opportunity to re-petition the other witnesses.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 490r-491r.

Post 5 October 1693

Filippo Belli presents a petition to Francisco de Benavides, Viceroy in Naples, in which he reconstructs his case, and takes strong exception against the intention of the fiscal lawyer Cavalieri to carry out the cross-examination of the witnesses against his will.

BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 253r-254v.

6 October 1693

Filippo Belli receives a (partial) copy of the proceedings of his trial.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 486r; cf. fol. 452r.

Ante 7 October 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro asks for a more comfortable cell in the archiepiscopal palace, to remedy his physical ailments.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 252r.

7 October 1693

Giovanni Andrea Siliquino, Vicar of the archbishop Cantelmo, signs a concession that allows Giacinto De Cristofaro to reside in the archbishop's palace, with his commitment and that of his brother Gennaro that they will pay three hundred *scudi* as bail.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 252rv.

21 October 1693

In a petition to the Holy Office in Rome, De Cristofaro has complained about his new – dark and humid – rooms in the palace of the archbishop, and he asks for freedom of movement within the entire building. The Cardinals leave the decision to the Assessor.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 323v.

4 November 1693

Giacinto De Cristofaro presents a document entitled *Capita suspitionis [...] contra et adversus Donatum Vulturalem*.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 270r-271r; for a first (undated) draft, see fols. 274r-275v.

14 November 1693

In a letter to the Holy Office in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo informs the Congregation that four of the six cases regarding atheism are ready to be concluded, namely those of Galdieri, Legittimo, Ricci, and Vitale. He still has some doubts about closing the trials against De Cristofaro and Belli. De Cristofaro's last petition, he insists, (probably the petition issued on 21 October) is full of "false representations", and therefore does not merit any reply.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, fols. 356r-357r; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 364r.

18 November 1693

In a petition to the Roman Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro has reiterated his complaints about the lodgings in which he is kept; the Cardinals decide to forward his petition to the archbishop in Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 357rv.

24 November 1693

In reply to Giacomo Cantelmo's letter of 14 November, the Cardinals suggest torturing the defendants accused of atheism, because "negativi non abiurant" (those who deny the charges do not abjure), leaving the final decision to the bishop, however.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 364r.

9 December 1693

In a legal deposition, Filippo Belli and Giovanni Luciano have reconstructed the lawsuit, challenging the biased and contradictory witnesses presented by the prosecution, as well as the partial copy of the proceedings received from the local Holy Office. On the same day, the fiscal lawyer decides that their claim can only be received "cum replicationibus, protestationibus, et declarationibus". These 'replications, protestations and declarations' are handed over to Belli and Luciano who sign for having taken receipt.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 437r-439r; copy on fols. 440r-443r, on the right half of the page; with comments on the left half by the fiscal lawyer; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 212r-214v; other copy on fols. 481r-483r.

9 December 1693

The fiscal lawyer of the Neapolitan Holy Office presents his replies to Belli's petition which on this day is officially accepted (see above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fols. 440r-441v (in the margin of Belli's petition); copies on fol. 451v, and in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 212r-213v; the official, dated version is on fols. 483r-484r.

15 December 1693

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses De Cristofaro's request for house arrest during Christmas, but the request is dismissed (*lectum*).

In the same meeting, the Cardinals discuss Cantelmo's proposal for the conclusion of the cases against De Cristofaro, Legitimo, Belli, Ricci, Galdieri, and others. The cases cannot be concluded "praevia tortura, nisi cum periculo alicuius tumultuationis Parentum dictorum Carceratorum". They therefore let the archbishop decide the details of abjuration; for example, whether this should be granted also to the so-called *negativi*, that is, those who deny the charges; they recommend that the archbishop should respect the 'style' (both ancient and modern) of the Holy Tribunal.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fols. 385v, 386rv.

18 December 1693

During the general visitation of all prisoners at Christmas, Giacinto De Cristofaro requests to 'extend his habilitation' to the entire archiepiscopal palace, in order to be able to attend mass.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 412rv.

19 December 1693

In a letter to Giacinto De Cristofaro, a certain Giacomo (Jakob?) Brand refers to his negotiations with the Congregation concerning De Cristofaro's lodgings in prison, and the incomplete proceedings handed over some months ago.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 377rv.

23 December 1693

In the Roman Holy Office, Domenico Moniaci's case is mentioned among the trials not yet concluded.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1693, fol. 399r.

6 January 1694

Filippo Belli receives a copy of his petition discussed on 9 December and the reply by the fiscal lawyer.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 484r (annotation).

7 January 1694

In the Roman Holy Office, Domenico Moniaci is discharged from prison "acri monitione ut in posterum se absteineat a similibus discursibus".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 7r.

Post 6 January 1694

In a petition addressed to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, Filippo Belli meticulously recounts his fourteen months of incarceration and the injustices he has endured. It has been a week since he received a copy of his petition and the response from the fiscal lawyer, as noted in the margin. And since these replies appear "niggling, unjust, and far from any truth", he appeals to the "innate kindness" of the Cardinals of the Congregation.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 480rv.

Post 6, ante 27 January 1694

Giovanni Luciano writes a first version of a petition by Filippo Belli to the Cardinals of the Holy Office.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 484r-485v; partial draft on fol. 446rv; version in Latin on fols. 486r-489v (see "5 March").

12 January 1694

From the notary of the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli receives a copy of his deposition made on 27 March 1689 to Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, then minister of the Holy Office in Naples.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 444r; the original of the deposition is on fol. 16r.

23 January 1694

Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples, transmits a (partial) copy of Giuseppe Valletta, *Al nostro Santissimo Padre Innocenzo Duodecimo intorno al procedimento ordinario, e canonico nelle cause che si trattano nel Tribunale del S. Ufficio della Città, e Regno di Napoli* (first draft finished in 1693, then elaborated over the years), to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome. AAV, *Nunziatura di Napoli*, Registro di lettere di Mons. Casoni, Nunzio a Napoli, alle Congregazioni e Ministri di Roma dal 1690 al 1701, vol. 130/c, fols. 36-37; cf. Osbat 1974, 15 fn. 8; there is extensive discussion of Valletta's work in Comparato 1970, ch. 4.

27 January 1694

The Cardinals of the Holy Office take notice of the petition by Filippo Belli, which they forward to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 22r.

February 1694

In an extensive summary ("Sommario del Processo, fabricato nel Sacro Tribunale dell'Inquisitione di Napoli"), Michelangelo Baccalà and Giacinto De Cristofaro present a reconstruction of the latter's trial, with a detailed refutation of the contradictory testimonies by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and Basilio Giannelli.

BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 125r-139v; shorter version in BNN, I.AA.32, fols. 287r-290v.

9 February 1694

In a petition to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro again represents his grievances and claims his innocence.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 413rv.

13 February 1694

Giacomo Cantelmo replies to the letter by the Congregation of the Holy Office transmitted after 27 January, with a rebuttal of Belli's petition.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.d, unnumbered folios.

Ante 16 February 1694

Giacinto gathers some information about the famous *Informo* ordered by Giuseppe Nicola Giberti in the summer of 1688 (see under "summer-autumn 1688" and "October-November 1691") and includes it in a letter dated 16 February 1694 to Filippo Bernini (see below). In a note, the attorney of the archiepiscopal Curia stresses that the depositions requested by De Cristofaro have never been inserted in the original file of the trial:

The supposed attestations sworn and received by the Most Illustrious Bishop of Teano, formerly the Minister of the Holy General Inquisition for this Kingdom, were never in

process and do not exist. However, if any of these were perhaps received, they were extrajudicial and verbal, and have never been written down.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 415rv.

16 February 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro dwells on several technical and legal aspects of his case. He stresses that several acts clearing him of any guilt in the trial are not in the copy of the proceedings, namely: (1) the preliminary investigations conducted by Giuseppe Nicola Giberti, bishop of Teano and minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office in 1686-90; (2) five of the fiscal lawyer's witnesses; (3) his 'habilitation' to the convent of San Domenico (in September 1691); and (4) the favorable declarations by several witnesses.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 414rv.

5 March 1694

In a legal deposition before the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples, Filippo Belli offers a rebuttal to the reply by the fiscal lawyer and once again asks for a complete copy of the proceedings. He reconstructs his case in some detail, and he asks to be released, on the basis that the charges against him do not, in his view, legally justify imprisonment.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, 486r-489v; Italian version, with variants, on fols. 452r-454v.

Post 5 March 1694

Filippo Belli transmits a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, with a comment on Basilio Giannelli's deposition made in Spain on 27 December 1692.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 447rv, 449r-450v; a draft is on fol. 451rv.

Post 5 March 1694

After more than fifteen months of incarceration, Filippo Belli addresses Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Neapolitan Holy Office, and comments on the reply by the fiscal lawyer to his petition received and discussed on 9 December 1693 (see above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 446rv; draft on fol. 445rv.

15 March 1694

Filippo Belli receives an official copy of his deposition made on 5 March.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 455r.

23 March 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Roman Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro once again draws attention to legal errors in the proceedings. Among these errors is the fact that he was arrested, despite arrests on the basis of only one denunciation not usually being seen as justified.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 422rv.

Ante 30 March 1694

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, Basilio Giannelli declares that he wishes to become priest, subtly asking them "to dispense him benignly from the incurred irregularities".

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, unnumbered folios.

2 April 1694

In a petition to Filippo Bernini, Filippo Belli calls attention to the numerous errors in the proceedings against him: the incomplete copy of the acts, the depositions of hostile witnesses, the threats made against him by the fiscal lawyer, and the economic damages due to the loss of the governmental office he held.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 474r-475v.

3 April 1694

In a petition to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, Giacinto De Cristofaro asks permission to hear the mass on Easter Sunday.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 463r.

3 April 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Giacinto De Cristofaro reiterates his complaints about the hostility to which he has been subjected from the Neapolitan Inquisition Tribunal.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 471rv.

6 April 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Giacinto De Cristofaro repeats his now well-known protests and requests, and he further underlines that twenty-six witnesses have made voluntary statements in his favor.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 472r-473v.

9 April 1694

Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, forward the petitions by Belli and De Cristofaro to Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop, and minister of the Holy Office in Naples.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 470r.

15 April 1694

In a meeting with the Pope, the Cardinals of the Holy Office discuss Basilio Giannelli's request for dispensation of his formal abjuration, as he wishes to become priest, but his request is rejected.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 120r; see "Ante 30 March 1694".

27 April 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro highlights the challenging economic situation of his family. He urges the Cardinals of the Congregation to examine the original version of his procedural documents.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 459r-460r.

22 May 1694

In three days, between 22 and 25 May, Filippo Belli presents petitions to several cardinals of the Holy Office and to the Assessor of the Congregation, with slight variations. The letter dated 22 May is addressed to card. Galeazzo Marescotti.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.c, fol. 636rv.

Ante 24 May 1694

Filippo Belli and Giovanni Luciano compose a summary of the proceedings involving Belli, which they subsequently send to Rome (ADDF keeps a copy). They particularly emphasize the contradictions and falsehoods in Manuzzi's depositions. Belli references this summary in his letters to Bernini and the Cardinals of the Holy Office, dated 24 May and 25 May, respectively. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 493r-496v; slightly shorter version on fols. 502r-505v; both are signed by Belli, Luciano, and Aniello Palmieri, notary of the Inquisition Tribunal in Naples; copy in ADDF, SO, *St. st.* HH.1.c, fols. 638r-641v.

24 May 1694

The petition addressed to card. Marescotti (see "22 May 1694") is now presented by Filippo Belli to card. Gaspare Carpegna.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.c, fol. 629rv.

24 May 1694

In a petition to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Filippo Belli transmits a summary of his proceedings (see "Ante 24 May 1694"); he also states that, as far as he knows, the proceedings of his trial are now transmitted to Rome. He intends to furnish some further information, that is, attestations of his "good reputation, moral integrity, praiseworthy customs, and frequent operations of a pious and devout Christian".

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 501rv; the attestations are on fols. 506r-514v (see "17 January-20 November 1693").

25 May 1694

In letter to Filippo Bernini, Giacinto De Cristofaro once again proclaims his innocence and complains about the wrongs suffered by the Holy Office in Naples.

Osbat 1974, 300-1, who refers to ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. unnumbered (untraced).

25 May 1694

In a petition to card. Alderano Cybo, Filippo Belli rephrases the petition he addressed to Galeazzo Marescotti on 22 May, and another addressed to Pietro Filippo Bernini and Gaspare Carpegna on 24 May (see above).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 492rv.

26 May 1694

The Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome order that both Di Capua's *Parere* (already prohibited; see "5 August 1693") and *Lettere apologetiche* (containing harsh criticisms of Di Capua's book) by Benedetto Aletino (pseudonym for Giovanni Battista De Benedictis) be assessed by the censors Giovanni Maria Gabrielli and Filippo di San Nicola. The former will present his assessment of Di Capua's book on 7 July (see *infra*); the *censura* by the latter of Di Capua has not been preserved.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 175rv.

End of May 1694

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, Filippo Belli asks the Cardinals to allow the original proceedings of his trial to be transferred to Rome in order to reveal

the falseness of the informers, the stubborn slander, *cum reverentia*, of the fiscal lawyer, the crimes committed by the commissioner general in the examinations, and the so crystal-clear innocence of the petitioner.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 478rv.

End of May 1694

In a petition to the Pope in Rome, Filippo Belli reiterates the complaints formulated in his petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 479rv.

1 June 1694

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop of Naples, informs Alderano Cybo, Secretary of the Holy Office in Rome, that he does not intend to withdraw De Benedictis's *Lettere apologetiche* from sale, as the book is written by an esteemed author, and is extremely useful in the fight against atomism. To withdraw the book from sale at this moment would be to discredit the author.

ADDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fasc. 4, fols. 43rv, 50v.

2 June 1694

The Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome discusses the summary of Belli's trial (see "Ante 24 May 1694"). The Cardinals decide to leave the final decision about closing this case to archbishop and minister Giacomo Cantelmo.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 184rv (copy in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.c, fol. 642v).

29 June 1694

In a letter to the Holy Office in Rome, Giacomo Cantelmo promises to transfer as soon as possible the file of De Cristofaro's trial.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.h, unnumbered folios.

30 June 1694

Alongside a letter, Giacomo Cantelmo transmits copies of the proceedings regarding Giacinto De Cristofaro and Filippo Belli to the Holy Office in Rome.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 253r.

Ante 7 July 1694

In his assessment of Leonardo Di Capua's *Parere*, Giovanni Maria Gabrielli challenges the indiscriminate diatribe against all physicians and medicine, the citing and quoting of suspect and/or prohibited authors (including Nicolaus Copernicus, Bernard Penot, Bernardino Telesio, Giordano Bruno, Galileo Galilei, Michel de Montaigne, René Descartes, Arnau de Vilanova, Pietro d'Abano, Pierre de La Ramée), and the author's full-blown attack on Aristotle's philosophy. The Cardinals confirm the prohibition of the book.

ADDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fasc. 4, fols. 40r-41v, 42v; cf. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 248v.

14 July 1694

During a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome, there is a reading of Cantelmo's letter dated 30 June. The Cardinals ask Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Congregation, to urge the archbishop to bring an immediate stop to the *exclamations* of Belli and De Cristofaro, who by these means (namely, the numerous petitions) are attempting to block the 'course of justice'. They further strongly advise that the instruction transmitted by the procurator fiscal be followed.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 253r.

19 July 1694

In a petition to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Filippo Belli expresses his frustration, noting that none of his pleas has ever been accepted by the Holy Office in Rome. Instead, they have consistently been forwarded to the Court in Naples. Belli extensively discusses the contradictions in Manuzzi's depositions in both Naples and Madrid concerning his alleged active participation in the discussions between Basilio Giannelli and Giacinto De

Cristofaro. These allegations are contradicted not only by Giannelli and De Cristofaro but also by other witnesses, including Felice Pisano and Giovanni Battista Giordano. Belli concludes his petition by stating that: “certainly if I had been taken by corsairs of Tunis, or Algiers, perhaps I would have found more convenience, and humanity than those experienced today by this Commissioner, and Fiscal”.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 476r-477v.

22 July 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro once again draws attention to the needs of his family.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 417r-418v.

27 July 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro draws attention to the difficult economic situation of his family.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 416r.

Summer 1694

A summary (*ristretto*) represents the highlights of the trial against De Cristofaro¹⁰ by carrying out a close analysis of the copies of the depositions released and challenging the accuracy of the individual witness testimonies by comparing their statements. The argument rests principally on the fact that the first report (*informo*) by the former minister Giuseppe Nicola Giberti had revealed no charge of any kind, and that subsequent accusations had been accepted despite being made by those who, like witnesses A (Manuzzi) and H (Giannelli), harbored a “capital enmity” towards the De Cristofaro family. This was evidenced by inconsistencies between the 1688 Neapolitan depositions and those recorded in Madrid in 1692, inconsistencies related above all to the accusation of belief in the “mortality of the soul”, an important theme for a Christian, and not one that could be subject to confusion of any kind. Based on these premises, the defense searched the proceedings for evidence of the perplexity of the inquisitors who were forced by the accumulation of contradictions to prolong the process unnecessarily. ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 425r-429r; see also “Post 28 July 1693” for a much longer reconstruction.

August 1694

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office, Giacinto De Cristofaro once again draws attention to the ‘criminal impostor’ Francesco Paolo Manuzzi and pleads for clemency from the Cardinals.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 421rv.

9 August 1694

In the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples, the fiscal lawyer briefly reconstructs the various stages of the trial against Filippo Belli who is now urged to draw up his defense.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 434rv; copies on fols. 430r and 433rv.

10 August 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro again protests his innocence and draws attention to the declining health of his parents.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 419r.

10 It is written on fol. 429v that Giacinto de Cristofaro has been incarcerated for three years.

12 August 1694

Filippo Belli makes a legal claim (*istanza*) and asks for a complete copy of the proceedings, challenging the deadline set for his defense.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 434v-435v; draft on fols. 430r-431v.

23 August 1694

Filippo Belli receives a copy of the legal challenge made by the fiscal lawyer on 9 August (*supra*).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 432r.

29 August 1694

In a petition to Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, Filippo Belli outlines a protest against the precept to prepare his defense. He highlights the wrongs he has suffered, including the 43 days spent in the criminal prison, two years of undue imprisonment, the witnesses not heard for a second time (the so-called 'repetition'), the incomplete copy of the proceedings, and the total lack of circumstantial evidence.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 467r-468v.

August-September 1694

In a detailed analysis, Giacinto De Cristofaro and his lawyer Michelangelo Baccalà dismantle the depositions by Francesco Paolo Manuzzi, itemizing a host of "varieties, perjuries, anachronisms, vagueness, unlikeliness, etc."

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fols. 287r-290v.

10 September 1694

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Filippo Belli affirms that the prisoners broke down a wall during the earthquake of 8 September, fearing to die under the falling stones. Some attempted to escape, but they were harshly beaten by the guards, and many were wounded, some of them even fatally. Belli is deeply shocked by the apology of one of the guards who seeks to lessen the blame attached to the abuse he meted out by saying that he thought he was beating Belli.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 469rv.

29 September 1694

In the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, the *censurae* of Di Capua's *Parere* (see also "7 July") and Aletino's (De Benedictis's) *Lettere apologetiche* are read. Regarding De Benedictis's book, the censors' judgments diverge somewhat. Gabrielli proposes a solemn condemnation to settle any debate. Despite admitting that De Benedictis was immoderate in some expressions, Gabrielli argues that in his harsh attack on Di Capua, he was basically right. Filippo di San Nicola's judgment is more nuanced; he contrasts De Benedictis's basic views with what he considers as an unnecessarily offensive and counterproductive representation of the views of Di Capua. He also remarks that the Church must adapt to a cultural situation that in recent years has deeply changed: in Northern Europe, Aristotelianism has turned into a subject of derision ("fere abiit in derisum"), and Cartesianism is accepted almost universally ("fere ab omnibus maximo plausu excipitur"). He therefore recommends that De Benedictis's *Lettere* be prohibited with the stipulation *donec corrigantur*. Ultimately, the book was not placed on the Index. ADDF, SO, *Censurae librorum*, 1693-95, fols. 40r-41v (Gabrielli's *censura*), 53r-57r, 58v (Filippo di San Nicola's *censura*); SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 380v.

3 November 1694

Filippo Belli presents a petition, which apparently has not been preserved, but it is mentioned in the petition of 6 December (see below).

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 527r.

4 November 1694

The Neapolitan Holy Office reiterates the precept to Filippo Belli to prepare his defense. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 526r.

26 November 1694

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli pleads his innocence and asks to be released. The Neapolitan Holy Office decrees to prepare a reply, intimating to Belli once again that he should prepare his defense.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 524rv; cf. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 291r.

26 November 1694

Giacinto Silvati, notary of the Holy Office in Naples, attests that on 18 November he received an order from the vicar general of the bishopric to transmit to Filippo Belli and his lawyer Giovanni Luciano the request of the Holy Office to prepare the defense of the defendant.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 291r.

27 November 1694

The Holy Office in Naples issues a decree instructing Belli and his lawyer to prepare the defense.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 525r; cf. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 291rv.

29 November 1694

Giuseppe Migliore, reader in the Neapolitan Holy Office, transmits to Giovanni Luciano the decree issued on 27 November.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 525v; cf. BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 291v.

29 November 1694

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, Filippo Belli reconstructs his case, highlighting the numerous errors, the contradictory statements made by the witnesses, and he protests against his incarceration without circumstantial evidence. He also challenges the precept to prepare his defense, communicated to him this very day.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 465r-466r.

Post 29 November 1694

Giovanni Luciano, Filippo Belli's lawyer, lodges a legal challenge against the precept issued on 27 November.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 526r.

6 December 1694

In a deposition before the Holy Office in Naples, Filippo Belli repeats his complaints. In an annotation, the fiscal lawyer rejects all insinuations.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 527r-528r.

15 December 1694

In the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, the Assessor reads an excerpt from a letter written by Giambattista Nepita, the bishop of Massa Lubrense, addressing the spread of atomistic doctrine. Subsequently, the Cardinals instruct the Assessor to request that the bishop transmit the relevant documentation.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1694, fol. 474r.

5 January 1695

In the Congregation of the Holy Office in Rome, there are readings of letters dated 28 December from the archbishop and the Nuncio of Naples. Subsequently, the Cardinals issue an order directing the archbishop and the Nuncio to send to them in Rome copies of the philosophical writings on atomism circulating in Naples. These writings include a manuscript titled *Excerpta ex Petro Gassendo*. The materials are to be assessed in Rome by Paolino Bernardini – the Master of the Sacred Palace –, along with Lorenzo Fabri and Enrico Noris, both of whom are consultants of the Holy Office.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fol. 1v.

25 February 1695

In a meeting with the Pope, Filippo Bernini reads the letter by Cantelmo, dated 22 February; the Pope approves the decisions taken regarding Giovanni Legitimo.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fol. 39v.

Post February 1695

In a petition to Giacomo Cantelmo, Filippo Belli asks to be released from prison.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 529r.

2 March 1695

During a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome, the sentence of Giovanni Legitimo is reviewed. Taking into consideration three key factors – (1) the lack of a confession from the defendant, (2) the weakened evidence due to contradictory and hostile witnesses, and (3) the defendant's inability, for health reasons, to undergo a 'rigorous examination' (i.e., torture) – Legitimo is sentenced to house arrest. Specifically, he is to be confined to the Dominican convent of Santa Caterina a Formelle in Naples, without being required to abjure.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 446v (the sentence is on fol. 445rv).

19 March 1695

From Rome, Vincenzo Antonio Capoccio writes a letter to one of Giacinto's brothers, declaring his full willingness to do "what I am allowed to do" with the cardinals, the Assessor, and the prelates of the Curia he serves.

BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 375r.

29 March 1695

Filippo Belli is again instructed to make his defenses.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 523rv; draft on fol. 519rv.

30 March 1695

In his reply to the precept of 29 March, Filippo Belli protests again the legal nullity of the proceedings, with a final declaration by his lawyer Giovanni Luciano.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 519v-522v.

6 April 1695

Filippo Belli addresses the Holy Office in Rome with the request to be transferred from his prison cell to a room in the palace of the archbishop, for health reasons, as has been allowed to De Cristofaro. The Cardinals forward this request to the archbishop of Naples.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fols. 77v-78r; Belli's request is in ADDF, SO; *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fols. 285r, 288v.

11 April 1695

In a medical declaration written by Mario Vallo and Felice Stocchetti¹¹ on behalf of Filippo Belli, the latter is said to suffer from “hypochondria, fever”, to an extent that puts his life at risk. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 286rv.

16 April 1695

In a letter to the Congregation of the Holy Office, archbishop Cantelmo advises the Cardinals to transfer Belli and De Cristofaro to a convent. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fols. 284r, 289rv.

27 April 1695

When Cantelmo’s letter of 16 April (above) has been read in the Congregation, the Cardinals decide to reply that it is the Pope’s suggestion that the archbishop should transfer the defendants Belli and De Cristofaro to a fortress (*fortalitium*), separated one from the other. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fol. 93rv; draft in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 289v.

28 April 1695

The Pope approves the decisions taken in the meeting of the previous day. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 289v (decree not recorded in *Decreta*, 1695).

4 May 1695

The Neapolitan seats (*piazze*) decide to recall Pietro Di Fusco and Mario Loffredo to Naples, as the large financial investments for the enterprise have not produced the expected outcome. Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 165.

8 May 1695

Without having achieved any tangible result from his mission in Rome, Pietro Di Fusco returns to Naples. Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 165.

11 May 1695

The Cardinals of the Holy Office decree that Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, should write to Nuncio Lorenzo Casoni, who should ask the Viceroy to find suitable prisons for De Cristofaro and Belli. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 318v (decree not recorded in *Decreta*, 1695).

12 May 1695

In a letter addressed to Fabrizio Spada, Secretary of State, Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, conveys the Congregation’s request to reach out to Lorenzo Casoni, Nuncio in Naples. As De Cristofaro and Belli try in every way to slow down the progress of their trials, the Nuncio should ask the Viceroy for suitable prisons in which the two defendants may be kept apart one from the other. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fols. 316r-317r.

14 May 1695

In a letter to Casoni, Fabrizio Spada communicates that the proceedings of the cases of Belli and De Cristofaro have been transferred to Rome. The examination of their cases had come to a standstill because they had refused to present their defenses and were insisting on an open trial, in the presence of the accusers. New deadlines were assigned to them for the submission

11 Felice Stocchetti was the author of *Ragionamenti intorno alla pressione dell’Aria surgimenti de’ Liquori, et ad altri sollevamenti de’ fluidi entro cannoncelli di svariata figura* (Venice 1705).

of their defense briefs. In the meantime, Casoni had to enquire with the Viceroy, on behalf of Cantelmo, about the possibility of keeping the two individuals locked up in different prisons. This measure aimed to quell the disturbances that could potentially be provoked by their presence in the archbishopric, the Nunciature, or the convents.

AAV, *Nunziatura di Napoli*, Lettere originali della Segreteria di Stato a Monsignor Casoni, vol. 344, fol. 78 (Osbat 1974, 221-2).

17 May 1695

Giacomo Cantelmo, archbishop and minister of the Holy Office in Naples, communicates to Assessor Bernini his gratitude for the decisions taken with regard to the cases of Belli and De Cristofaro.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.f.1, fol. 338r.

1 June 1695

Giambattista Nepita, bishop of Massa Lubrense, reports that two Carmelite friars had signalized the presence of Francesco d'Andrea in a place indicated as *Il Deserto*, that is, the Carmelite hermitage of San Paolo al Deserto, near Massa Lubrense, on the Sorrento peninsula, where D'Andrea had stayed from ca. 17 August 1694; whereupon the Cardinals decree that D'Andrea should be 'observed' and that the Assessor of the Roman Holy Office should discuss his 1690 trial with the Pope in their weekly meeting.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fol. 126v.

8 June 1695

Upon his return to Naples from his mission in Rome, Pietro Di Fusco has been received with honors.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 170.

9 June 1695

Mario Loffredo returns to Naples from his mission in Rome:

Mr. Don Mario Loffredo Marquis of Monteforte came back from Rome, where he spent more than two years of futility with Dr. Pietro Di Fusco, as envoys of this city for the matter of the Inquisition, without doing anything.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 170.

11 June 1695

Pietro Di Fusco informs Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office in Rome, about his voyage from Rome to Naples.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.f.1, fols. 347r-348r.

14 June 1695.

In Naples, Pietro Di Fusco and Mario Loffredo report before the Deputation for the Holy Office on their mission in Rome.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 171.

22 June 1695

Having read a petition by the prisoners of the archiepiscopal Curia of Naples, the Cardinals order the isolation of Filippo Belli and Nicola Brancaccio from the other prisoners, because they are regarded as "personae risosae, inquietae, et malae vitae ob continuas propositiones haereticales, quas divulgant".

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1695, fols. 142v-143r.

2 July 1695

After returning from Spain (see “24 May 1690”), Gennaro d’Andrea is appointed regent of the Collaterale Court.

[www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/gennaro-d-andrea_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/gennaro-d-andrea_(Dizionario-Biografico)/).

23 August 1695

Confuorto reports on the publication of Innocent XII’s Bull *In Coena Domini* (which is, in fact, a recurring bull issued between 1363 and 1770, against heresies, schisms, sacrilege, infringement of papal and ecclesiastical privileges, and other crimes), a publication which provokes serious irritation in Naples. Nicola Caravita is commissioned to compose a reply on behalf of the Deputation.

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 179; Caravita’s reply is in BNN, XV.B.2, fols. 84r-147v, published in print in 1709.

28 August 1695

Bernardo De Cristofaro dies in Naples.

Osbat 1974, 238; cf. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1, fol. 193r.

6 September 1695

In a letter, Giacomo Cantelmo informs Filippo Bernini about the death of Bernardo De Cristofaro, which he describes as having occurred “last week”.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.f, fol. 193r.

11 December 1695

In a deposition before the Neapolitan Holy Office, Filippo Belli again proclaims his innocence and asks for his case to be concluded.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 457r.

Post 11, ante 17 December 1695

In a petition to Giacomo Cantelmo, Filippo Belli asks for his case to be concluded.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 458r.

18 December 1695

In the case against Filippo Belli, the Neapolitan Holy Office passes its sentence. Belli is condemned to an abjuration *de vehementi*, house arrest (in the house of his uncle Aniello Belli), and to salutary penances (confession, attending the Eucharist, prayers).

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 456r; official Italian version on fols. 497rv, 500r; see also the letters by Cantelmo to the Roman Holy Office written on 2 and 7 December, in ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.b, fols. 644r-647r.

18 December 1695

In the Holy Office in Naples, Filippo Belli abjures his heresies.

ASDN, Sant’Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 498-499.

27 December 1695

Archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo informs Filippo Bernini about the conclusion of Filippo Belli’s trial. The latter has been condemned to an “abjura de vehementi” in a private meeting (that is, without an audience), to house arrest (“as the evidence resulting against him has been judged to be of not much weight”), and to several salutary penances (see *supra*). Only the case against De Cristofaro now remains to be concluded.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 131rv.

4 January 1696

In the Roman Holy Office, the Cardinals read Giacomo Cantelmo's letter about the conclusion of Belli's trial (see "27 December 1695").

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 131v.

February 1696

In Naples, there appears a pamphlet entitled *Turris fortitudinis propugnata a filiis lucis adversus filios tenebrarum*, published by Geronimo Fasulo, and containing fierce criticism of the followers of modern science and philosophy. It triggers violent protests. After extraordinarily fast proceedings, the booklet is banned, and its presumed authors exiled (see "21 March 1696").

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, between fols. 17v-18r (only surviving printed copy); Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 199-201; Ruggiero 2003 (with a critical edition, based on the edition in print and the subsequent manuscript tradition).

14 March 1696

In a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome, the charges against Francesco d'Andrea (see "22 November 1690" and "1 June 1695") are elaborated. He is accused specifically of endorsing heretical propositions 'tending to atheism'. Another individual implicated was Andrea Giugno (from Forenza, diocese of Venosa, now in the province of Potenza), who had passed away in November 1694, and was similarly accused of atheism. In a letter dated January 18, the bishop of Massa Lubrense informed the Congregation that D'Andrea had left the Carmelite monastery, leaving behind manuscripts opposing Aristotle's doctrine and supporting "atoms, Epicure, and the philosophy of Descartes, Gassendi, and Tommaso Cornelio". Unfortunately, the friars were unwilling to transmit these manuscripts to the Roman Congregation. The bishop also discovered that, during this period, D'Andrea composed a work on Maria Magdalena (arguing she was not a sinner), which he had sent to Giovanni Battista Pisacane; the bishop also discovered that D'Andrea had retired to 'a solitary life' on the isle of Procida in the bay of Naples. Finally, the bishop conveyed the denunciation by a cleric named Ascanio Lazaro Iasi against the memory of the aforementioned Giugno, citing his alleged atheism and describing his 'horrible' death.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1696, fol. 77rv.

19 March 1696

Gaetano Ivone and Antonio Ageta are condemned as authors of *Turris fortitudinis*; the former is exiled for five years from the Kingdom and sent to a garrison (thus, preventing the possibility of going to Rome), the latter is exiled for two years *extra provinciam*.

Nicolini 1932, 166-7; Ruggiero 2003, 121-8.

27 March 1696

In a letter to Filippo Bernini, Giacinto De Cristofaro advocates for his petition to the Cardinals (see *infra*).

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 87rv; draft in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 376r.

27 March 1696

In a petition to the Cardinals of the Holy Office in Rome, Giacinto De Cristofaro asks to be released from prison to take care of family business after the death of his parents.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 87rv; draft in BNN, ms. I.AA.32, fol. 376v.

4 April 1696

In a meeting of the Holy Office in Rome, the Cardinals discuss De Cristofaro's petition, dated 27 March, and decide to forward it to the archbishop Giacomo Cantelmo.

In the same meeting, the Cardinals discuss the reply by the Carmelite friar Bartolomeo di Santa Caterina to the Procurator general of his Order, transmitted by the latter to the Assessor. This friar frequently discussed with Francesco d'Andrea the 'doctrine of the atoms', and the philosophy of Descartes. He concluded that D'Andrea was a 'great atomist' and an enemy of ecclesiastics. In D'Andrea's writings, however, this Bartolomeo found no wretched ideas (*pes-simum sensum*) about the immortality of the soul or about any other dogma of faith. The Cardinals therefore deem that no further investigation is necessary.

ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1696, fol. 96r.

14 June 1696

Pietro Di Fusco is nominated "regio consigliere".

Confuorto 1930-31, 2: 222; cf. 225, 226.

3 July 1696

Cantelmo informs Bernini that Di Fusco has been elected *consigliere* and that his place as representative of the *Piazza del Popolo* has been taken by Giuseppe Valletta ("di poca dottrina e pregio"), and not, in his words, as "we hoped", by Michelangelo Baccaà, who in that period was the lawyer of De Cristoforo.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 71r.

28 July 1696

Giacomo Cantelmo discovered that Francesco d'Andrea, who then lived on the isle of Proci-da, was writing a *Risposta* to Giovanni Battista De Benedictis's *Lettere apologetiche*. Cantelmo managed to lay his hands on a copy of the first chapters and duly transmitted them to the Cardinals in Rome, recommending that they prohibit an eventual publication of this work. He listed three reasons: (1) Francesco is a brother of Gennaro, royal minister, and the latter's support would lend to this work a greater respectability; (2) D'Andrea praised the suspect Lorenzo Valla, and thus undermined the authority of the Holy Office; and (3) the publication would encourage other authors to publish similar impious works. Cantelmo's letter was read in one of the following meetings and D'Andrea's manuscript was given to card. Enrico Noris for a review.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fols. 36rv, 69rv.

Ante 1 August 1696

Card. Enrico Noris reviewed D'Andrea's response to De Benedictis and found nothing worthy of theological censure. Mindful of the ongoing trial against atheism in Naples, however, he emphasized that the publication of a similar work could potentially spark fresh controversies and raise doubts about the Eucharist and the immortality of the soul.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 37rv.

1 August 1696

After reviewing Noris's report on D'Andrea's work, the Cardinals of the Holy Office decided to communicate with Lorenzo Casoni, the Nuncio in Naples, instructing him to request of the Viceroy that he prevent the publication of the said work. This decision was promptly ratified by the Pope on the following day.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 69v.

7 August 1696

In a letter to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Assessor of the Holy Office, Cantelmo expresses his thanks to the Cardinals for their intervention in the case against Francesco d'Andrea.

ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fol. 33r.

11 August 1696

With a letter to Pietro Filippo Bernini, Cantelmo transmits new chapters of D'Andrea's work. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fols. 32r, 35v.

18 August 1696

Lorenzo Casoni informs the Secretary of State that he had spoken with the Viceroy, who has promised a due intervention regarding D'Andrea's *Risposta* to De Benedictis. ADDF, SO, *St. st.*, HH.1.g, fols. 1r, 3v.

2 January 1697

In the Roman Holy Office, the Cardinals discuss a petition by De Cristofaro, who asks to be released. They decide to transmit his letter to the archbishop Cantelmo in Naples. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1697, fol. 10r.

13 February 1697

The Roman Holy Office discusses De Cristofaro's letter dated 22 January in which he asks to be released. The Cardinals decide to forward his letter to the archbishop Cantelmo in Naples. ADDF, SO, *Decreta*, 1697, fol. 54r.

15 March 1697

The Holy Office in Naples issues a precept to De Cristofaro, ordering him to prepare his defense. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 556r.

16 March 1697

The precept to prepare his defense is handed over to Giacinto De Cristofaro, who on the same date protests against the wrongs he has suffered during his trial. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 556rv.

20 March 1697

In a legal deposition before the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples, Giacinto De Cristofaro vehemently protests against the insufficient time provided for preparing his defense (15 days). ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 552r-555r.

11 April 1697

In a legal deposition before the Tribunal of the Holy Office in Naples, De Cristofaro remonstrates again over the fact that his deposition of 20 March has not been taken into due consideration. He then reiterates his complaints against: (1) the time for preparing his defense being too short; (2) errors in the preliminary investigations ("eccessi commessi in informativo"); (3) the necessity of supplementary proceedings; and (4) the corruption of the witnesses. He thus appeals to the Holy Office in Rome. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 550rv; copy in BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 249rv.

15 April 1697

The Holy Office in Naples condemns Giacinto De Cristofaro to an abjuration "secreto de vehementi" and house arrest. Additionally, he is to hear the mass on all holidays, and attend monthly confession and spiritual exercises. ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 540r.

15 April 1697

In his deposition, De Cristofaro protests the Court's decision to conclude his case without affording him the opportunity to present his defense ("essersi da detta Corte proceduto all'espeditone della sua causa senza difendersi, né essere inteso lui, et suo Avvocato"). He refers to the protests submitted on 20 March and 11 April.

BNN, I.AA.32, fol. 247r.

16 April 1697

In an official oath, Giacinto De Cristofaro accepts the conditions for his release.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 540v.

16 April 1697

In the Holy Office in Naples, Giovanni Andrea Siliquino, vicar general of the archbishop Giacomo Cantelomo, passes sentence in the case against Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fols. 536rv, 539r.

16 April 1697

In the Holy Office in Naples, Giacinto De Cristofaro pronounces his recantation.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 537rv.

2 May 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for the confession made by Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 549r.

28 May 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 548r.

1 July 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 547r.

26 July 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 546r.

8 September 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 545r.

7 October 1697

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 544r.

30 October 1697

In a petition to Giacomo Cantelmo, the archbishop of Naples, Giacinto De Cristofaro requests permission to leave the city to attend to family matters. The permission is granted on this particular occasion.

ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 265, 4030, fol. 541rv.

23 February 1698

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.
ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 542r.

28 April 1698

Pio Massimo De Conciliis releases an attestation for Giacinto De Cristofaro.
ASDN, Sant'Ufficio, *Processi*, ms. 761, fol. 543r.