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CHAPTER 6
Bound by Books
The use of multimodal network representations in historical research

INTRODUCTION

This chapter highlights the importance of books as dynamic actors within the scholarly network by means of multimodal visualizations of epistolary networks. In the previous chapters, a one-mode network representation was employed in order to represent the early modern epistolary community. This type of network implies the existence of nodes and edges, where one node of the graph represents a correspondent, and an edge between a pair of nodes corresponds to a letter exchanged between them. As we have seen, the use of this type of network stands in the tradition of the many projects that have started to map the Republic of Letters digitally. Yet, reducing the complex society of the Republic of Letters to a network in which the actors are connected by one single type suggests a static uniformity that does not take into account the multi-faceted dynamics of epistolary exchange. Instead of looking at a network of correspondents in terms of its volume, intensity and centrality, we also need to consider the way in which the network was held together by the exchange of objects. In fact, in addition to letters, the Republic of Letters was tied together primarily by means of books that dominated the contents of these letters. Therefore, this chapter explores an approach that integrates both letters and books in a unified, dynamic multimodal network representation. As such, the creation of a multimodal network structure will be used to explore how books played a decisive role within the structure of the epistolary network. Specifically, I attempt to show how references to books in letters might provide more insight in the working practices of the early modern scholarly community.

This chapter aims at describing the data collection process that is needed to visualize the rich store of information on books contained in early modern correspondences and at demonstrating the possible use of historical network research. It is organized as follows: the first paragraph points to the historiographic blind spot of current digital scholarship that equates the Republic of Letters with correspondence networks, giving the role of the book short shift. This is the argument advanced by Daniel Stolzenberg, who urged for a computational approach that takes the relationship of books and correspondence into account. Taking up this challenge, in the second paragraph, I propose a method complementary to modal networks that allows us to integrate both books and letters into the same network: the multimodal network. The various advantages and constraints of the multimodal network will be discussed, which is followed by an explanation of the relational database that underpins this study.

and of every other holy law of friendship, I urge Your Illustrious Lordship to conceal the facts from him, for it will not be long before I will take revenge.”

I will show in a concrete manner how such a database is constructed and used in conjunction with network visualizations to map the evolving conversations involving the many hundreds of books mentioned in early modern correspondence. Through the case study of Magliabechi’s correspondence, I show how looking at letters as a corpus of interconnected data brings the book back on the map, providing insights as to how the book played an active role in the creation and the maintenance of Magliabechi’s epistolary network.

1. IS THE BOOK FORGOTTEN IN THE DIGITAL REPUBLIC OF LETTERS?

The Republic of Letters was unquestionably indebted to the circulation of letters, but another sort of regular exchange was necessary to its functioning as well: the circulation of books. Books held the scholarly community together for they fostered the advancement of learning – the ideal aim of the Republic of Letters. This is especially true considering the fact that books were an important medium for the communication of knowledge as well as the output par excellence of scholarly collaboration. Books and letters need thus to be seen as complementary media in the early modern scholarly network, each with their own advantages and constraints. For disseminating knowledge broadly, durably, and in large quantities, the book was without rival. Although the mass printing of texts facilitated the spread of knowledge, it posed also a major threat for the political and religious authorities who quickly realized the potential of the book as a challenge to their influence. Consequently, censorship was introduced for regulating the moral and political consequences and impacts of its circulation. The book did not only undermine the authorities, but individuals as well. Many publications came off the press that were intended to undermine scholarly reputations on a European level. For example, when a book published against Magliabechi was about to ruin his career, he desperately wrote to Cosimo III: “E pure la voce passa subito, e dopo pochi giorni nuno se ne ricorda, dove la stampa va per tutto il Mondo, e dura in eterno.” By contrast, the letter could be delivered with speed, offered a relative greater freedom from censorship, and was of a more personal and private nature than books, all of which made it an excellent medium to engage in long-distance conversations.

Many authors have acknowledged the important role of books in the epistolary network. Franz Mauelshagen, for example, stressed that correspondence should never be studied in isolation from books, stating that “an exchange of objects was directly associated with the interactive potential of correspondence networks”. In addition, most of the letters we now only encounter as sheets of paper in the archive, were actually packaging notes to parcels of books, drawings, poems, natural specimen, and other letters. Similar theses are adopted by Dirk van Miert, who made clear that “a letter should never be studied in isolation, but always as part of a larger apparatus of sources: notebooks, drawings, commonplace books and printed treatises” and Anthony Grafton, who illustrated that the Republic of Letters “existed, first and foremost, as a palimpsest of people, books, and objects in motion”. So, without letters, and the accompanying reciprocal exchange of books and other objects, there would be little to hold such an extensive, geographically separated scholarly community together.

---

830 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 4 February 1684, BNCF, Autografi Palatini, 125, “Rumors go away immediately, and after a few days nobody remembers anything, while print goes all over the world, and lasts forever.”
832 Mauelshagen, ‘Networks of Trust: Scholarly Correspondence and Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Europe’, 18.
Yet, Daniel Stolzenberg has recently pointed out that digital studies concerning early modern communication tend to minimize the importance of printed books.\footnote{Daniel Stolzenberg, ‘A Spanner and His Works: Books, Letters, and Scholarly Communication Networks in Early Modern Europe’, 157–72.} According to him, large scale projects that map the Republic of Letters digitally treat the scholarly community as an equivalent to correspondence networks, while ignoring the role of the book brought about by that network. Why do these digital initiatives fail to apply data visualizations to both books and letters? According to Stolzenberg, the apparent absence of books in the digital realm of the Republic of Letters has been largely due to the constraints and limitations posed by the digital:

"Correspondence lends itself to social network analysis in a way that books complicate. This is especially true when it comes to the most tantalizing new approach to the history of scholarly communication, projects to map the Republic of Letters digitally. Typically, a letter has one sender and one recipient, each with a specified geographic location. As such, a correspondence network can be converted into a database and then analyzed and visualized by existing methods and software. To create an analogous map that would capture how information was disseminated through printed books as well would be vastly more complicated and imprecise, if indeed it is even possible.\footnote{Stolzenberg, 171–72.}

Stolzenberg presents us here an evident gap in digital scholarship. In the past decade, early modern historiography has seen a proliferation of digital network projects that have started to map sections of the Republic of Letters. Within this relatively small field, the best-known projects – including Six Degrees of Francis Bacon of the Carnegie Mellon University, Mapping the Republic of Letters of Stanford University, Circulation of Knowledge/ePistolarium of the Huygens Institute in Amsterdam and Cultures of Knowledge of Oxford University – all focus on connections between early modern scholars. The specifics of these projects were discussed in the fourth chapter of this study. Typically, these projects employ a unimodal network which supports one type of node per network, meaning that the nodes represent correspondents and their incoming and outgoing edges correspond to the exchange of letters between them. This formula presents us already with stimulating new insights in historical research. In the fourth chapter, for example, we have seen that unimodal networks helps us to shed light on the crucial role of information-brokers. Yet, there are situations – especially when dealing with complex humanities data – when this model falls short. The Republic of Letters cannot be adequately reconstructed only through the lens of correspondences when that network was also tied together by means of other objects, like books.

There are studies that have attempted to include books in the digital Republic of Letters. For instance, Dan Edelstein and Glauco Mantegari, have, in the context of the project Mapping the Republic of Letters of Stanford University, visualized the places of Voltaire’s publications – including data on false, fictitious, and unknown imprints – on a geographical map.\footnote{Glauco Mantegari and Dan Edelstein, ‘Linked Data and Early-Modern Networks. An experiment on Voltaire’, in Jake Coolidge (ed.), The Anthology of the Center for Spatial and Textual Analysis at Stanford University (Stanford University, Center for Spatial and Textual Analysis, 2013): 73-77.} By comparing data on publications that were illegally published with networks observed in letters, they could notice, for example, to what extent Voltaire’s correspondence was related to complications in the printing of his editions. Although a geospatial representation of objects presents itself as a promising tool, it does not say anything about the
distribution and circulation of the books in the scholarly community. For this, books and letters need to be integrated in a unified network representation.

A step in this direction is made by Shakeosphere, a digital research tool funded by the University of Iowa. According to its creators, the incompatibility of current digital repositories lies at the heart of this gap in digital scholarship. Datasets as the Short Title Catalogue (STC) or Early Modern Letters Online (EMLO) focus either on books or letters, but ignore the interactions between their data. To solve this, Shakeosphere started to create a union catalogue to bring these data together, making it possible to navigate and study the network in order “to understand the social world that gave us the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries”. This initiative brought for the first time data on books and letters together. Nevertheless, their network is still based on a single-layered approach, in which each node represents a person – a publisher, printer, author or bookseller – whereas the edges represent the printed or manuscript works connecting these nodes. In other words, the books are translated in terms of edges, not as active nodes in the network. This is a limitation if we want to explore questions that regard the active role of books within the connections of the epistolary network.

The following paragraphs take up Stolzenberg’s challenge, offering insights into the practical possibilities for representing books within the early modern scholarly network. In addition to looking at the Republic of Letters as if it were a single entity, a different approach that integrates both books and letters in a unified, dynamic multimodal network representation, is considered here. Different from the previous chapters, we opt here for a qualitative approach that allows us to explore and create datasets and visualize and interact with them in various network configurations. In the next paragraph, the structure of the bi- and multimodal networks will be discussed, focusing in particular on the various advantages and constraints of such a structure.

2. FROM A UNIMODAL NETWORK TO A MULTIMODAL NETWORK

Complex multi-layered or multimodal structures have received much attention from the community of sociologists, but in historical research the implementation of multimodal networks is relatively unexplored to date. As an exception to the rule, attempts to explore the use of multimodality may be found in the work of Matteo Valleriani, in the frame of his research project The Sphere. Knowledge System Evolution and the Shared Scientific Identity of Europe. In this project, the edition history of the Tractatus De Sphaera by Johannes de Sacrobosco is analyzed by means of multimodels of network theory. Specifically, “multilevel networks” are used to investigate how specific commentaries on this text circulated, which actors were responsible for them and what factors supported or hindered the spread of specific kinds of knowledge.

The reason why more complex networks are predominantly used in social sciences is because they present a more accurate description of real systems. The complexity reached by society calls for an approach that takes into account a whole series of different networks in order to understand the bigger picture of its functioning. Research based on unimodal networks would, on the other hand, entail a

---

simplification of the real-world, ignoring the evolving complexity of present-day society. This, of course, applies to both past and present; the only difference is that the past presents us with more fragmentary and uncertain data. Consequently, historical sources render full data integration impossible. Irad Malkin, for instance, urged for the need of new modes of graphic representation that would avoid the “pitfalls of dazzling oversimplification”.

According to Malkin, graphic illustrations of wide-ranging Greek Mediterranean networks in the form of two-dimensional representations turn out to be unhelpful, for they are incapable of offering insights “due to the state of our sources of knowledge”. Because of the fragmented state of historical sources, he calls for an approach that considers the network’s multidirectionality, multidimensionality, and multitemporality.

Especially in the case of Irad Malkin, a historian of antiquity, the application of network concepts becomes problematic for they do not possess enough data to perform a significant mathematical analysis. While sociologists can often study complete uni-modal networks, historians need to rely on the, often incomplete, availability of the sources from the past. Every piece of evidence is meaningful in interpreting history: in the case of early modern correspondence, multiple types of data as scholars, letters, books, journals and academies all work together in the overall communication system. These different types of data lead to a range of different nodes and edges than can only be captured through the use and exploration of bimodal or multimodal networks. In other words, the fragmentation of historical data needs multimodality.

It can be debated whether complexity should be added to a network that in the first place is intended to simplify our perception of society. When the network graph grows in its complexity, it becomes not only more difficult to read the visualization, but also to analyze the network in terms of network metrics. This is the reason why the most common networks being studied are unimodal networks. Unimodal networks can only support one type of node per network. This means that we can either connect books to other books, or the sender and the receiver, or persons that are co-cited together. In other words, it is a structure that cannot accommodate both books and correspondence in the same network. A bimodal network, on the other hand, is a network that consists of two types of nodes (books and letters). Networks with an infinite number of nodes are named multimodal networks. Although preferable, bimodal or multimodal networks are rarely analyzed in their original form because of the incompatibility of its nodes types. That is, you can connect books that influence other books or authors that have influenced each other, but it is a methodological challenge to connect authors and books, let alone connect the author to a book that is cited in a letter. That is comparing apples and oranges. As a result, network scientists have not yet created many algorithms to deal with these complex networks.

So, the more layers we need to describe history, the less characteristics we can get from a statistical or mathematical point of view. In explaining the usability of bimodal networks, Scott Weingart pointed out that “more categories lead to a richer understanding of the diversity of human experience, but are incredibly unhelpful when you want to count things”. In other words, by creating a dataset with a large variety of nodes, it becomes harder to capture the metrics and the structure of the graph. In order to analyze bimodal networks, researchers often reduce the complexity of the network before running any

---


843 Malkin, cit. 19.

844 This is the philosophy behind nodegoat: Geert Kessels and Pim van Bree, “Multimodality in Overdrive: A Dynamic Exploration of Historical Networks”, paper at the at the DH Benelux Conference 2016, Université du Luxembourg, Belval (9 June 2016).


social network algorithm. Bimodal networks can be compressed into unimodal networks consisting of only one type of nodes. This approach is often referred to as projection. For example, if one has a bimodal network of books as one type of node, connected by their edges to their authors and publishers, the other type of node, it is possible to collapse the network into a unimodal network by connecting the people who were involved in the publication of one particular book. The result is a social network that consists of only persons that can be subsequently used to run algorithms on. For instance, the principle of projection is used in the project Shakeospere, which was previously mentioned as an example of a project that integrated both books and letters in the same network. Instead of directly connecting the book to its author and publisher, the book was projected in terms of the edge between the author and the publisher who worked together in the production of that book.

If a complex, bimodal or multimodal network can be projected to a unimodal network, which is less complex and problematic, why should we still consider the use of multimodal networks in historical research? In other words, how can multimodal networks help us in solving historical questions? Although needed for a statistical analysis, projection means also that information gets lost when moving from the full affiliations network to just the projected graph on the set of persons. If the complex society of the Republic of Letters is projected to a network in which the actors are connected by one single type, e.g. correspondence, this will suggest a static uniformity that barely takes into account the multi-faceted dynamics of epistolary exchange. As we have seen in the fourth chapter, Magliabechi was an important information broker, but he accomplished this task through both books and letters. These dynamics are invisible if one considers his correspondence network in isolation.

To improve graphs with the inclusion of objects as active participants is a recurrent theme in the research of the well-known sociologist Bruno Latour. His Actor Network Theory (ANT) considers both human and non-humans as equal parts of the network, commonly named as actors. In other words, Latour urged for an approach that employs the same metrics and descriptive framework when faced with either people, books, ideas, text, societies in the network, wherein their identity is defined through the interaction between them. As such, adherents of the Actor Network Theory continuously use the term “heterogeneous network” in order to consider both humans and non-humans as equal concepts in a system:

“Often in practice we bracket off non-human materials, assuming they have a status which differs from that of a human. So materials become resources or constraints; they are said to be passive; to be active only when they are mobilized by flesh and blood actors. But if the social is really materially heterogeneous then this asymmetry doesn’t work very well. Yes, there are differences between conversations, texts, techniques and bodies. Of course. But why should we start out by assuming that some of these have no active role to play in social dynamics?”

Following the Actor Network Theory, to study any type of system, we need to study all the connections between distinct actors enrolled in the network. The actor network theory can thus be used to better reflect and evaluate multimodal networks.

Exploration is at the heart of this chapter. While most network analysis need to be carried out on unimodal graphs, bimodal or multimodal networks add significant depth and context into historical research. This detail is fundamental because, as noted earlier, a historical source is characterized primarily

847 Graham, Milligan and Weingart, 209.
by the richness of its data, rather than the quantity of it. In other words, historians have to deal with a high amount of multidimensionality in a small set of data. In tackling this multidimensionality, one needs to move beyond simple graphs and investigate more complicated, but more rich historical frameworks. For instance, multimodal networks can help us to intuit and explore interesting patterns within multiple kinds of data. In hybrid networks each different layer represents a separate but, interconnected network from the set of networks that describe the whole set of correspondence. This implies that every layer can be analyzed separately, or in hybrid combinations with other networks, making it possible to add, edit and to remove data where needed. This continuous process of interaction with data allows for more critical readings and levels of interpretation.

The importance of an explorative digital approach is central to the research of Charles van den Heuvel. According to Van den Heuvel et al., “we do not need just networks as static representations, but also networks as interactive interfaces”. He calls here for an approach that consists of dynamic combinations of various layers of networks that are capable of both distinguishing separate historical communities, but also communities that intermingle. As such, the historian can experiment with layers in the network, with graphic and textual zoom and with creating interfaces to layers of meaning of historical sources in various media from multiple perspectives. Inspired by the term “deep maps” coined by David Bodenhamer, Van den Heuvel introduced the concept of “deep networks” to describe this approach.

Such an approach allows the researcher to combine multiple networks of data in a continuous process of interaction and interpretation that allows us to move easily between close and distant reading, mixing traditional historical research with network analysis. The mixing of the traditional and digital stands close to methods of “digital hermeneutics”. Digital hermeneutics, understood as the encounter between classic hermeneutics and digital technology, has challenged the way we interpret historical sources, and, on some level, also ourselves. On facing this challenge, Capurro writes:

“The task of hermeneutics in the digital age is twofold, namely to think digital and at the same time to be addressed by it. The first task leads to the questions about the impact of the digital code on all kinds of processes, in particular societal ones. The second task refers to the challenge of the digital with regard to the self-interpretation of human beings in all their existential dimensions, particularly (…) their understanding of history, their imagination, their conception of science, their religious beliefs.”

Multimodal networks might bring these tasks together. Historical research should switch smoothly between explorative multimodal networks and confirmative unimodal networks in dealing with fragmentary and complex historical data. At first, rich historical data can be efficiently investigated and explored in multiple combinations of layers of networks that can be then manipulated and analyzed individually to assess their influence on the overall structure. In fact, multimodal networks aim to recreate...
an accurate representation of a past society, allowing us to highlight and select patterns of data that are needed to explore specific research questions, while a unimodal network can analytically confirm and substantiate these patterns. In other words, unimodal networks are needed to analyze the workings and dynamics of a system, but its data proceed from a thorough exploration of the multimodal network in the first instance. As a result, algorithm performance can be examined in a more controlled and conscious manner. To sum up, the focus should not be on analytical and statistical methods of network representation alone, but also on an approach that allows us to handle, inquire, and interpret these complex historical data at first.

3. **THE CREATION OF A MULTIMODAL DATASET**

The contents of early modern correspondence are both wide-ranging and complex. Letter contents, for instance, refer to many different books from authors with many different backgrounds. This requires a way to store, organize and annotate letters, that allows both to analyze books mentioned in separate letters, but also to trace and organize similarities between books in different letters, so as to map the contours of the discourse as a whole. I found such a method in the tool nodegoat. At its core there is a relational database management system, and it follows an object-oriented approach. Borrowing from Latour’s actor-network theory, as discussed before, this means that people, events, academies, books and sources are treated as equal in the data model. The hierarchy between these actors depends solely on the composition of the network in terms of the relationships that connects them together.

The tool nodegoat is a web-based database management platform, developed by Lab1100 in the Netherlands, that allows scholars to build datasets based on their own data model and offers relational modes of analysis with spatial and diachronic contextualizations. This means that nodegoat dynamically combines functionalities of a database application with visualization possibilities (like the tool Gephi in the third chapter). By combining these functionalities in one interface, one is able to instantly process, analyze and visualize complex datasets relationally, diachronically and spatially. Such an approach allows us to build up multimodal networks step by step to explore and to interact with our data. As noted earlier, this continuous process of interactions and explorations with data allows for more critical readings and levels of interpretation, highlighting dynamics that would have been possibly overlooked by traditional research. Furthermore, a multimodal dataset as nodegoat enables the researcher to organize rich historical data in a structured way, the importance of which is underlined by Graham R. Gibbs who confirmed that in qualitative research, the use of software primarily has the purpose to organize and manage data:

“The one key advantage that most researchers using the software claim is that the programs help them to keep everything neat and tidy and make it easy to find the material they need later in the analysis. In order to keep a clear mind and not become overwhelmed by the sheer amount of data and analytic writings, the analyst needs to be organized. The bigger the project and the more researchers who are involved, the more sensible it is to use software to support the analysis”.

857 *Ibidem*.
3.1. THE FIRST LAYER: THE EPISTOLARY NETWORK

The first step was to break down the data (and therefore its logical organization) into the smallest viable components and then link those components back together to facilitate complex analysis. This process, known as normalization, helps to keep the dataset free of duplicates. It also means that we step away from the process of storing information in one overview and start storing information in multiple locations. We then make relationships between these locations in order to allow these different locations to communicate with each other. These relationships are defined as logical, relational connections between different objects in the data-model. This means that the object ‘person’ can be related as the author of a book, but also as a member of an academy or as a correspondent. Moreover, the final database will not merely connect authors to books in some generic way, but will reflect the fact that, for example, the author Nicolaas Heinsius created both the *P. Vergilii Maronis Opera* (1676) and the *Publius Ovidius Naso, Opera Omnia* (1676). This is the concept of relationality.

I started my dataset by creating a type correspondence so that I was able to add information about correspondence data and metadata. As shown in the fourth chapter, these data were collected manually as well as through data-mining. An example of this process is represented in figure 33. It regards the correspondence between Nicolaas Heinsius and Antonio Magliabechi which is extent in the collections of the National Central library of Florence as well as in the University of Leiden, as documented in the Card Catalogue of the National Library of Florence as well as in the *Catalogus Epistularum Neerlandicarum*. The senders and the recipients were automatically retrieved and categorized under the type correspondence, and equipped with a relational reference to the type person. Each object of correspondence is further enriched with information about the place and date of sending and/or receipt, the number of letters exchanged and source information. With this information a unimodal network can be created, in which the nodes are the correspondents, whereas the edges represent a letter-communication between them. We have seen that this model served as the foundation for the analysis carried out in the fourth chapter of this study. In total, 11,871 correspondences are included in nodegoat.

---


860 ‘What is a relational Database’, last accessed 4 April 2019, https://nodegoat.net/blog.p/82.m/20/what-is-a-relational-database.

Fig. 33 Example of the type correspondence, leading to the creation of a unimodal network. Tool: nodegoat.

3.2. THE SECOND LAYER: LETTER CONTENTS

In order to perform a more systematic exploration of the specific contents of each individual letter, the type letter has been created. Each letter includes a relational reference to the correspondence it belongs to. This type offers archival transcriptions with additional metadata on these texts, as well as cross-references in the full-text, referring to other types in the dataset. Currently, the dataset consists of 1,778 full-text transcriptions, of which 985 belong to the correspondence of Antonio Magliabechi. This model can best be explained on the basis of an example. In figure 34, a transcription of a letter written by Magliabechi to Nicolaas Heinsius is represented, in which I have tagged references to mentioned people (red), books (blue) and physical locations (yellow), each category displayed in a different color. Each of these citations are equipped with a relational reference to their respective objects person and book.
The letters from Magliabechi to Nicolaas Heinsius constitute thus a rich array of node types: mentioned people and books all connect to each other via a complex network. If we transform all surviving letters of Magliabechi to Nicolaas Heinsius into a network, the result is the following:
Fig. 35 A multimodal network of the contents of Magliabechi’s letters (light-blue) to Nicolaas Heinsius. In these letters, books are mentioned (dark blue), persons (red) and other letters (existing letters in light-blue and lost letters in black). Network created with nodegoat.

The network in figure 35 is enriched by data on books (represented in dark-blue) and persons (red) that are cited in Magliabechi’s letters (light-blue) to Nicolaas Heinsius. Overlap in data shows us books and persons that are mentioned repeatedly in more than one letter and the amount of them mentioned per letter. Visually, we see that there are larger and smaller nodes. The size of these nodes is proportional to the node degree, i.e. the number of connections a node has to other nodes in the network. This means that the bigger a node, the more connections it has within that particular network. As a result, the most cited persons (e.g. Cosimo III, Jacob Gronovius) and the most cited books (e.g. *Inscriptiones epistolae synodali*um […]) appear larger than the other nodes. Likewise, the more references to books, persons and letters a letter contains, the bigger this letter is represented in the network graph.

Furthermore, letters refer to other letters with, if we are lucky, the date when the letter was sent or received. On the basis of this information, a reference can be made to the existing letter in the collection. As such, direct connections are formed between letters and their replies which makes it easier to navigate between letters quickly and compare their contents. For example, figure 36 shows that Magliabechi confirmed the receipt of Le Clerc’s letter of the 10th of October 1709, which has survived in the collections of the National Library of Florence. By clicking on this reference, represented in light-blue, one is able to directly navigate to the respective letter of Jean Le Clerc (see right letter in figure 36). In the case the letters is untraceable in the archive, mentioned letters help us to trace back lost or burned letters. For instance, Jean Le Clerc mentioned in his letter of the 10th of October 1709 (figure 36), the receipt of Magliabechi’s letter dated the 10th of September. This letter has, to date, not surfaced in the archive. As such, Magliabechi’s own letter-network can be reconstructed more precisely. This is important because Magliabechi’s own letters have survived in smaller quantities than those written to
him. In fact, Magliabechi’s surviving correspondence contains 599 letters written by him to his correspondents in the Dutch Republic. This number is a fraction of the correspondence sent to Magliabechi, where 395 sent from the Dutch Republic have survived. Using this method, I was able to record 236 letters that have not come down to us. Moreover, as shown by figure 35, the lost letters are represented as black nodes in the correspondence between Magliabechi and Nicolaas Heinsius. Multimodality is thus able to capture both surviving and missing correspondence in visual representations of a network, enhancing the transparency of historical data in network visualizations. That surviving correspondence provides important information about the letters that have not come down to us is also key to the research carried out by Paula Findlen and Hannah Marcus in the context of the Galileo Correspondence project at the University of Stanford.\(^\text{862}\) Exactly because the correspondence of Galileo has a complicated archival history, involving multiple episodes of both intentional suppression and accidental loss of key documents, they experiment with digital methods combined with a close reading of the letters to “reconstruct his archive and find new ways to understand the fraught archival legacy of Galileo’s letters”\(^\text{863}\).

---
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\[\text{Fig. 36}\] A digital transcription of two letters between Magliabechi and Jean Le Clerc. Transcriptions in nodegoat.
In addition, nodegoat gives the possibility to indicate the nature of relationships (see figure 36, e.g. mandato). As such, one is able to specify why a certain book or person is mentioned in a letter.

In the context of this research, my goal is not just to identify these elements. Rather, these annotations function as a point of departure to dynamically navigate the dataset and thus approach the corpus of letters from different perspectives. It is possible, for instance, to directly navigate from a reference to the book in a single letter to the record of the book, which contains metadata about its publication history (see next paragraph), and from there generate a list of all the letters in which this book is mentioned. This opens up the opportunity to start investigating which contexts feature references to books, and to compare the different reasons why books are mentioned in correspondence, be it a dedication or a gift; a bibliographical reference or a concern. Likewise, it is also possible to directly navigate from a person mentioned in a letter to a bibliographical record, and from there generate a list of all the publications he produced or a list of the people he exchanged letters with. Moreover, one can display all books that are donated or dedicated to Magliabechi, and from there directly navigate to the single letters in which these books are mentioned. Hence, this approach completely changes the way we handle historical data.

3.3. THE THIRD LAYER: METADATA

When creating networks using relational data, we are often confronted with situations where we lack information about the details of their multimodal structures. In such situations, an approach that allows us to integrate and combine different types of data may offer a more complete picture of the network in question. For example, when the name of a book or person is mentioned in a letter, it is the underlying metadata that makes the citation complete. This is especially true in times of censorship where scholars had to be careful when sharing detailed information with others. With regard to these troubled times, questions that book-citations in letters might raise are: what was the occupation of the author of the book? What was the religious affiliation of the author? Was the book prohibited? Is it a theological treatise on faith or rather a book on natural history? In order to tackle these questions, we need to reveal more information about the single nodes in the network. For this reason, every type in the data-model is defined by its biography or publication history. Figure 37 shows that for each person in the dataset (17,658 in total) biographical data are entered, including family name, given name, spelling variations, gender, capacity (e.g. librarian), religion, date and place of birth and death. In addition, each person is linked to a VIAF number.864 The Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) provides authority data on persons and organizations collected from many national libraries. By doing so, I have added external identifiers to my dataset to offer transparency and authority control over each data entry. This helps to disambiguate objects (like persons with similar names) and also enhances the interoperability of a dataset. Both these aspects make it easier to share and re-use my dataset in the future.

Figure 38 shows two examples of the object book which is enriched with metadata about the author, printer and dedicatee (with cross-references to person), subject, language, an external reference to the Short Title Catalogue of the Netherlands865, the year and place of publication, information about false imprints and whether the book was enlisted on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum.866 Each cited book can thus lead to a range of different kinds of nodes and edges that all played a fundamental role in its

866 The monumental work of Jesús Martínez de Bujanda is used to identify prohibited books (Index Librorum Prohibitorum 1600-1966 (Montréal: Mediaspaul; Genève: Librairie Droz, 2002).
circulation. By using the complex web of cross-references it becomes possible to visualize, for instance, connections between the dedicatees of these books and the correspondents of Magliabechi. The multimodal network enables to analyze network configurations at the same moment and at the same time see how its interaction on different layers change over time. Consequently, the multimodal network constitutes a dynamic network in which nodes appear and disappear along the timeline. When new data are added the overlap of the multimodal changes, resulting potentially in new answers and other questions.


Fig. 38 Publication history of Leeuwenhoek's Arcana Naturae Detecta and Bayle's Dictionnaire Historique et Critique. Image titlepage Arcana Naturae Detecta: https://lennonleeuwenhoek.net/content/arcana-naturae-detecta.
Why is metadata important for historical research? Metadata often provide pieces of contextual information that complete the networked structure of the early modern epistolary network. This is especially important when dealing with incomplete, insufficient and uncertain data. The importance of this is shown by the following examples. On the 24th of July 1706, Magliabechi informs Gisbert Cuper in Deventer about the book *Dissertatio de primaris precibus Imperialibus.* About this book, he writes that the name of the author “è assolutamente finto, ma non so chi ne sia il vero Autore.” The underlying metadata of the *Dissertatio de primaris precibus Imperialibus* reveals that the book was written by Pietro Marcellino Corradini (1658-1743). This information enriches the network for it does not derive from the content of the letter, but from the intrinsic network of the content itself. Multimodal networks allow us to include this information in the network so that data in one layer could indicate missing or omitted data in another.

Furthermore, recording the citations of books in letters helps us to investigate the question of loss in a systematic way, aimed at computing the number of books at present undiscovered. If one examines the content of early modern scholar’s letters, one of the most frequent topics was books: detailed information about the latest publications, reports about works in progress, and so forth. Magliabechi’s bibliographical reports are extremely well adapted to trace back lost books or missing bibliographical information. He did not only give full versions of the title, together with details of the author, the publisher, the date and place of publication, but he also provided his correspondents with detailed information about false imprints and anonymous authors, revealing the actual locations and writers of a book. For instance, when he informed Gisbert Cuper about the *Satyrae numero auctae* (1700) written by Lodovico Sergardi under the pseudonym Quintus Sectanus, he noticed that, although it “appariscia stampato in Amsterdam, è veramente impresso in Napoli.” This information helps us to update union library catalogues like *Picarta*, in which the record *Satyrae numero auctae* is ambiguous. Here, the book appears to be printed in Naples or in Rome, which is based on the indications given by Alphonse Willems in his monumental work *Les Elzevier: histoire et annales typographiques.* The overlap of different data-entries provide context and might fill these gaps, which supports the fundamental concept that data should be able to travel between different repositories.

So far I have discussed the ways in which nodegoat offers tools for doing historical research, and for exploring research material so as to make this research more interdisciplinary, more systematic, and – in some way – more attuned to the complexity of the object of research itself. To see how all this worked in practice, several specific cases will be discussed in the next paragraphs. My point will be that books were not passive objects, but influential agents in shaping the epistolary network. But before turning on to these case studies, in the next paragraph a concise literary review will be presented to show the importance of mapping the rich store of information contained in correspondence.

867 Conradi Oligenii J.C. [pseud. Pietro Marcellino Corradini], *Dissertatio de primaris precibus imperialibus: ubi argumentis ex jure canonico deductis, concordatis inclyta nationis Germanica [...] ostenditur illas dirigi a cesarea majestate non possis sine speciali indulto summi pontificis* (Friburgi Briscojae [Freiburg]: Apud Johannes Strasserum, 1706).

868 Magliabechi to G. Cuper, 24 July 1706, KB, KW 72 D 12, f. 148, “is absolutely fake, but I do not know who is the true author”.

869 Other possible approaches to trace back lost books are given in Andrew Pettegree and Flavia Bruni, eds., *Lost Books. Reconstructing the Print World of Pre-Industrial Europe* (Leiden/Boston: Brill Publishers, 2016).

870 Magliabechi to Cuper, 15 August 1701, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 159, “appears to be printed in Amsterdam, it is actually printed in Naples”.

4. THE USE OF BOOK (CO-)CITATIONS

This chapter relies heavily on the work of Yves Gingras, who used methods of network analysis to map the global structure of the early modern intellectual field and its development over time.\footnote{Gingras, ‘Mapping the Structure of the Intellectual Field Using Citation and Co-Citation Analysis of Correspondences’, 330–39.} In particular, he used techniques developed for the (co)-citation analysis of scientific papers to follow the evolution of cited persons over time as recorded in letters. This idea goes back to the research of Eugene Garfield in the 1950s, who initiated a system of citation indexes as a bibliographical tool for the study of the history of science and the humanities.\footnote{Eugene Garfield, ‘Citation indexes for science – new dimension in documentation through association of ideas’, Science 122, no. 3159 (1955): 108-111.} He pioneered citation indexing in the sciences and scholarly journal literature, in which the cited references (footnotes) in each article are recorded and serve as connections between papers, creating as such a network of ideas and concepts that can be navigated over time. It represented a method of clustering author pairs who cited the same papers, the purpose of which is to identify emerging research areas that have not otherwise been characterized. The idea to use citation indexing to study early modern correspondence networks was envisioned more than 50 years later, by the historian David A. Kronick in 2001. He was the first to ask the question whether a variation of citation indexing can be applied to correspondence in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\footnote{David A. Kronick, ‘The Commerce of Letters: Networks and “Invisible Colleges” in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Europe’, The Library Quarterly 71, no. 1 (2001): 28.} Such an analysis, he argued, might reveal additional networks or even invisible colleagues in the early modern period. Kronick left the question for future research, which was carried out by Gingras in 2010.

Gingras mapped the evolution of cited persons in the consecutive correspondences of Marin Mersenne (1588-1648), Henry Oldenburg (1618-1677) and Charles Darwin (1809-1882). With this analysis, Gingras aimed at visualizing the evolving conversations in the intellectual field involving the persons mentioned in their letters.\footnote{Gingras, ‘Mapping the Structure of the Intellectual Field Using Citation and Co-Citation Analysis of Correspondences’, cit. 331.} Besides a citation-analysis, Gingras also performed a co-citation analysis. Originally, co-citation analysis has long been used in the social sciences for identifying co-authorship in scientific papers, defining as such the intellectual structure of a research domain. In this case, a co-citation is formed if two references or authors appear in the same bibliography. If authors are frequently cited together than this can be an indication of the measure of similarity of contents of these two authors. Consequently, this analysis helps for the identification of “invisible colleagues”, or groups of scholars that belong to the same research domain but without being linked by formal organizational ties.\footnote{The concept of invisible college was developed in the sociology of science by Diana Crane, Invisible colleges. Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1972). For more recent work see, for instance Markus Gmür, ‘Co-Citation Analysis and the Search for Invisible Colleges: A Methodological Evaluation’.} According to Gingras, correspondence offers the possibility to map the intellectual structure of the Republic of Letters by providing this measure of proximity between authors, through their being cited frequently together in many different letters. In other words, co-citations appear when two persons are mentioned together in the same letter. In case the number of these co-citations is high, that is if they are cited together in many letters, Gingras suggested that there is a strong link between these persons. The strong link is highlighted by the thickness of the edge, called weight, that is proportional to the number of co-citations. Moreover, based on the idea of co-citations, the University of Luxembourg has developed a tool, Histograph, that can display the interconnections between people that appear together in an image on an interactive graph.\footnote{‘Histograph. Graph-based exploration and crowd-based indexation for multimedia collections’, last accessed 23 January 2019, http://histograph.eu/.}
Building on the work of Gingras, an even more detailed picture can be provided if, in addition to cited persons, also cited books are aggregated in epistolary networks. Instead of seeing each letter as a unique document, one can look at these collected documents as a global corpus of data to be treated as a representation of the evolving conversation going on in the Republic of Letters.\\footnote{Gingras, ‘Mapping the structure of the intellectual field using citation and co-citation analysis of correspondences’, 331-332.} One can, for instance, follow the evolution of cited books over time. Highly cited books give us as clue about which books dominated the discussions and occupied the minds of the early modern scholar. In this way, one also gets an idea of the number of books involved in these exchanges, their emergence and disappearance over time as recorded in their letters. Moreover, this method allows to analyze co-citational pairs of persons and books as well. That means that if certain persons are often referred to together with certain publications (whether they contributed to them or not), this may provide evidence that there is a link between them. Likewise, books that are co-cited with other books, might indicate that there is a connection between these as well. Applying these ideas to this study we can analyze the changing dynamics of book-citations and how this method, which is complementary to the close reading of the detailed contents of correspondence, can help us to highlight the role of books in the early modern epistolary network. Before we turn to this, we need to bring structure in the hundreds of books mentioned by Magliabechi in his correspondence.

5. POWER-LAWS AND STRUCTURE IN BOOK-CITATIONS

In the fourth chapter we have seen that most real-world networks have a statistically significant power-law distribution. According to Barabási, these power-laws rarely emerge in systems completely dominated by a roll of a dice.\\footnote{Barabási, Linked: The Science of Networks, 72.} Does the contents of Magliabechi’s letters obey the power law as well? The answer is yes. If we plot the degree distribution of the book-citation network on a graph, we can see that even the cited books in the correspondence of Magliabechi follow a power-law:
The dynamics in figure 39 provide a first indication about the structure of the content of Magliabechi’s letters and the patterns the information contained in his letters follow. Specifically, the power law distribution in figure 39 confirms that there is a strong concentration of book-citations onto a small proportion of the total number of books mentioned in the letters. This tells us that the majority of the books have only a few links (cited only once or twice) and that these numerous tiny nodes coexist with a few big hubs, books with an anomalously high number of links (frequently cited). The power law distribution as shown in figure 39 shows that the most cited book (*Liber Satyrarum Sexdecim*) is closely followed by several somewhat less cited books, followed by dozens that are cited even less, and so on, eventually arriving at the numerous books that are cited only once. Though much more are cited at least once (504) or twice (134) there are only 49 books cited more than five times. This visualization stands thus as proof of the highly important organizing principles and laws that govern network evolution, which strongly implies that the rich store of information about books contained in intellectual correspondences are more structured than we might expect. In other words, this finding means that there are laws behind the contents of early modern letters, implying that Magliabechi’s bibliographical reports were far from random.

5.1. MAGLIABECHI’S BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REPORTS

What does it mean that his bibliographical reports were far from random? To answer this question, we first need to understand what a bibliographical report is. As described in chapter 3, Magliabechi did not ever turn his knowledge into a publication, but incessantly studied the works of others to keep the scholarly community running. The primary scope of Magliabechi’s correspondence was thus to inform other scholars about the books they needed to carry out their research. As such, he performed a fundamental role in helping knowledge find its way into print by others. This knowledge of books was shared in the shape of bibliographical reports that amounted to bibliographic news, containing lists of worthy publications which had recently appeared in Italy. Moreover, Magliabechi discussed what he and
other scholars thought of these publications, who was working on what and who was quarreling with whom and about what. His vast epistolary network enabled Magliabechi to receive this news.

Magliabechi synthesized the information about books he gathered from his scholarly contacts and structured them into a clearly arranged lists of bibliographical bulletins. His correspondents praised him for this accuracy, and they were right. The accuracy of Magliabechi’s literary reports is reflected in the power-law distribution in figure 39. The pattern implies that hundreds of books (y-ass) were cited only once in his correspondence to the Dutch Republic, meaning that he rarely spoke of the same book in his letters to different scholars. This suggests that the flow of bibliographical news was a very organized and effective system, without unnecessary duplication of titles. Magliabechi mentioned newly published books only once, sometimes twice in case the letter got lost or intercepted, making sure that his news reports were as effective as possible. The reason why Magliabechi could sent unique bibliographical reports to various scholars in the Dutch Republic was because his correspondents passed these reports among each other. This becomes apparent from, for instance, Magliabechi’s letter to Gisbert Cuper dated the 28th of June 1709. In this letter, he informed Cuper that he had forwarded him a letter for the Orientalist scholar Adriaan Reland (1676-1718), unsealed so that Cuper could read the bibliographical news before giving the letter to Reland.

“Non iscrivo questa sera a V.S.Ill.ma le novità Letterarie di Italia perché le potra vedere dalla mia qua inclusa, al signore Relando, che le mando, perché possa vederle, senza sigillare”.

Likewise, Magliabechi informed Jacob Gronovius that he had to turn to Pierre Bayle’s and Antoni van Leeuwenhoek’s letters about the latest news in the Republic of Letters, while the Amsterdam publisher Pierre Huguetan could reach out to Ludolph Küster. As such, Magliabechi avoided redundancy: saying the same exact book twice was a waste of everyone’s time. In fact, Magliabechi continuously implored his correspondents che “l perder tempo, a chi più sa, più spiace”.

The organization and structure of Magliabechi’s bibliographical reports have contributed to his reputation and the credit he received from many contemporary scholars. A confused note of books, indeed, would led in a waste of time and frustration, particularly over long distances. For instance, on the 6th of March 1674, Magliabechi wrote Jacob Gronovius about the wish lists of books of Johannes Georgius Graevius. The list was so messy that Magliabechi did not understand which books Graevius needed. As a result, Graevius had to re-compile and re-send his letter to Magliabechi, which led to a considerable time loss:

“Io di buona voglia glieli [libri] manderò, bramando sommamente di contribuire qualche pietruzza, a così nobile, e bella fabbrica, ma esso mi ha mandato una nota così confusa, che

880 Magliabechi to Cuper, 28 June 1709, KB, KW 72 D 12, ff. 253-254, “This evening I do not write literary news to Your Illustrious Lordship for you can read them in the included letter, to sir Reland, which I send to you, so that you can see them, without sealing”.

881 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 10 September 1705, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 104, “Le nuove Letterarie di Italia, V.S.Ill.ma le vedrà dalla mia qui inclusa, che per tale effetto le mando senza sigillare. Prego V.S.Ill.ma a degnarsi di farla avere al Signore Bayle sicura (The literary news from Italy, Your Illustrious Lordship can see them in the included letter, which I therefore send you unsealed. Please, make sure that this letter securely arrives to sir Bayle)”.

882 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 2 October 1710, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 93, “Quella pel Signore a Leeuwenhoek, la mando a V.S.Ill.ma senza sigillare, perché possa vedere le novità Letterarie (The letter for sir Leeuwenhoek, I sent it to Your Illustrious Lordship unsealed, so you can see the literary news).” Magliabechi to Pierre Huguetan, 6 October 1699, UBL, PAP 15, f. 1, “Solamente per obbedirla, le scriverò alcune novità Letterarie di Italia, poiché mi rendo certo che le saranno già note, avendole io scritte alle settimane passata al signore Neocoro, che me ne prego”.

882 Magliabechi to N. Heinsius, 28 July 1674, UBL, BUR F 7 “the wasting of time hurts most at the ones who know more”.
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non si può da essa sicuramente discernere quali siano quelli che esso abbia, e quali gli manchino. Lo prego per tanto a mandarmi una nota distinta di quelli che gli mancano."

If Magliabechi was sometimes more celebrated than the authors he assisted, that was thus in large measure because he was recognized as playing at least as important a role in helping the scholarly community through his knowledge of books. In fact, Magliabechi was praised by his contemporaries for his encyclopaedic memory, being also called a “bibliothecam viventem”. Correspondence was thus “not merely ancillary to publications, but complementary, meaning that through an effective network of correspondence scholars could gain as much honor as through publications”. On the other hand, the privileged role that Magliabechi had obtained in the Republic of Letters was heavily criticized by many scholars who refused to acknowledge the librarian’s fame merely because he circulated some news items about books. For instance, in his satires, Benedetto Menzini (1646-1704) assailed in acrid terms that Magliabechi “perchè de’ Libri il frontespizio ha letto, si crede esser fra’ dotti annoverato”.

Furthermore, the role of Magliabechi as an information-broker, deciding which books ended up in his news reports or could cross the border, made him a highly respected yet a feared member of the scholarly society. He could break reputations as easily as he could create them. His position allowed him to include those names and publications he deemed worthy, while he deliberately omitted the publications of his foes or put them in a bad light. Take, for example, Magliabechi’s review of the Quinto libro degli Elementi d’Euclide, ovvero Scienza universale delle proporzioni spiegata colla dottrina del Galileo, published by the mathematician Vincenzo Viviani in Florence in 1674:

“Qua finalmente doppo tanti anni quel tristissimo e malignissimo Geometra, ha con l’aiuto di Dio, e delle persone, dato in luce quel Libretto, e sento che tra qualche tempo finirà anche il Libro grande, che ha dedicato al Rè di Francia. Ha durato circa a dodici anni a tirare la provvisione, senza ne anche avergli dedicata una sola riga, che in vero è una cosa vergognissima, non solo per esso, ma anche per la nostra Città. Nel Libro che ha dato fuora adesso, non vi è quasi nulla di suo, essendo quasi tutte cose del Galileo, dei Toricelli ecc. Nel leggerlo V.S. Ill.ma riderebbe nel vedere le grandissime lodi, che al solito da al Dati, allo Stenone, e a costoro, che avevano lodato esso, e così, muli mutuo scabunt.”

883 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 6 March 1674, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 147, “I would love to send them the books [he wishes], craving to contribute small stones to his noble and beautiful building [building blocks of learning], but he has sent me a note so confused that it is impossible to distinguish between the books he already has, and the ones that he lacks. Could you please send me a separated note with those books that he lacks”.


886 Benedetto Menzini, Le satire di Benedetto Menzini con le note postume dell’Abbate Rinaldo Maria Bracci pubblicate da un accademico immobile e del medesimo arricchite degli Argomenti, e di nuove Annotezioni sull’Aggiunta d’un ragionamento epistolare d’Alcito Salajdio P.A. Sopra l’uso della Satire contro il Parere di Pier Casimiro Romolini, ed. by Rinaldo Maria Bracci (Naples: presso Gennaro Rota Stampatore Camerale, 1765): 113, “Having read the title page of books, he thinks that he is ranked among the learned”.

887 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated [April 1674], LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 129, “Here in Florence, finally after many years, that very sad and evil geometer [Viviani], with the help of God and people, published that booklet, and I hear that shortly he will finish his major book, which he dedicated to the King of France [Louis XIV]. For 12 years he kept receiving a pension, without having dedicated one single sentence to the King, which is truly a shameless thing, not only for him, but also for our city. In the book he has published now, there is nothing that comes from him, belong everything to the work of Galileo, Toricelli ecc. Upon reading it, Your Illustrious Lordship would laugh in seeing the high praise he, as usual, gives of Dati and of Stensen, of those who had, in turn praised him, and as such, multi mutuo scabunt [one scratches another, do me a service and I will give you one in return]. From 1664 onwards, Viviani received an annual pension from Louis XIV and dedicated his final work the De Locis solidis secunda Divinatio geometrica in quinque libros Aristaei senioris (1701) to the French King.
5.2. THE THREAT OF LITERARY JOURNALS?

In the literature on the Republic of Letters, there has been some disagreement about whether or not the epistolary circulation disrupted as a consequence of the appearance of learned journals at the end of the seventeenth century. Scholars as Krzysztof Pomian and Ann Goldgar have argued that, although literary journals did not necessarily solve the problem of the need to exchange news, they greatly supplemented and indeed in some way replaced the commerce de lettres as a means of disseminating information quickly. Scholarly letters and journals tended to discuss the same sorts of topics: what was being published, when, and where; what people thought of it; who was working on what. Indeed, stated Goldgar “literary journals simply codified and formalized such conversations and correspondence for wider distribution”. Paul Dibon made a similar, although rather tentative, point, stating that the “exchanges of correspondence remained – at least until the flourishing of journal in the last years of the century – the primary means of coordinating the life of the Respublica literaria”. These arguments are in contrast with the studies carried out by Waquet on the role of journals in the Republic of Letters. According to Waquet, scholarly journals drew information from letters and struggled to provide an updated and unbiased discussion of books. Although Goldgar agreed with Waquet that letters did not lose their importance, she believed that journals became the main source of information for the citizens of the Republic of Letters.

All that we know about the above-mentioned debate is based on traditional historical research: the close-reading of historical documents. However, as the number of historical letters shared online keeps growing, due to projects like ePistolarium, Early Modern Letters Online, Medici Archive Project and RECIRC, it is time to take full advantage of these ever-extending digital datasets and to discover how computational approaches can advance the study and understanding of the Republic of Letters. This paragraph takes a step in that direction, showing how the exploration of multimodal networks that consist of book citations and letter exchanges might provide us with a better understanding of the actual impact of the literary journal within the epistolary network. Indeed, if we look at the evolution of the network of cited books over time, we can clearly see that, although the amount of letters Magliabechi sent to his correspondents in the Dutch Republic remains stable, the number of books he mentioned rapidly declines after the 1690s (figure 40). In these years, several important literary journals were published in the Italian peninsula, in particular the the Giornale de Letterati di Modena (1692-1698) and the Giornale de’ letterati d’Italia (1710-1740), which dominated the contents of Magliabechi’s letters in these years.

---


889 Goldgar, 57.


Fig. 40 Book-citations in Magliabechi’s letters to the Dutch Republic. The visualization on the top focuses on the period 1670-1690, while the image below represents the period 1690-1710. Networks created with nodegoat.
A close reading of these letters reveals that Magliabechi dispensed himself from informing his Dutch colleagues of the books newly printed in Italy, pointing out to Cuper in 1692 that, as a consequence of the appearance of two literary journals in Parma and Modena “si rende adesso quasi che interamente superfluo, lo scriver più le novità Letterarie di Italia”. 895 Yet, Magliabechi continued to spread news about the appearance of books – both published and about to be published – throughout the 1690s. Reason for this was because most literary journals were significantly flawed. He wrote this to Ludolph Küster in 1698:

“Mi pare che nell’altra mia Lettera io scrisse a V.S.III.ma, che in Venezia si stampa un Giornale de’ Letterati, intitolato, La Galleria di Minerva, ma vi è del buono, del cattivo, e del mediocre. Vi sono molto errori, e tal volta sono in esso grandemente lodati Libri inettissimi” 896

Moreover, as already noticed by Waquet, the journal was sometimes to slow to satisfy the scholarly desire for news. Another letter from Magliabechi to Cuper in 1693, for example, reads in part “de’ Libri che scrivo nella mia inclusa all’eruditissimo signore Grevio, fino ad ora, non ne è stata fatta menzione in Giornale alcuno, ma assolutamente la faranno, con qualche tempo”. 895 As this letter makes clear, Magliabechi, although being one step ahead of the scholarly journal, he certainly envisioned its usefulness in the Republic of Letters; as time went on, they would arrive as quickly as letters. Indeed, almost twenty years later, the number of books co-cited with literary journals drastically declines in the contents of Magliabechi’s letters. In these years, he completely adopted to the use of the literary journal. His correspondence makes clear that Magliabechi, now being of age and tormented by severe inflammations of his eyes, could finally find peace, referring to the news covered in the Giornale de’ letterati d’Italia in Venice. For example, when he wrote to Pieter Burman in 1711, he wrote the following:

“Non iscrivo a V.S.III.ma novità letterarie di Italia, sia per il mio male a gli occhi, come ancora, perché in Venezia, appresso all’Herz, alcuni Signori, anno principiato a fare stampare un Giornale de’ Letterati di Italia, nel quale le comprendano quasi che tutte”. 896

One might expect that Magliabechi, who established his fame through the circulation of bibliographical reports, would have raised serious concerns about the arrival of the literary journal. The literary journal could have become, after all, his rival, easily undermining his position in the Republic of Letters. Yet, the contrary was true for a variety of reasons. First of all, the editors of the literary journals depended on

895 Magliabechi to Cuper, 18 October 1692, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 81, “Now it completely does not make sense anymore to write literary news from Italy”. See also Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 25 September 1692, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 21, “Adesso, non è quasi necessario lo scriver novità Letterarie di Italia, si perche escono pochi Libri che sieno digni della notizia de’ dotti, come anche, perche si stampano due Giornali de’ Letterati”.

896 Magliabechi to L. Küster, undated [1698], BNF, Ms fr. 19 645, c. 162 j-k, “I believe that in another letter I wrote to Your Illustrious Lordship that in Venice a literary journal is being printed, entitled La Galleria di Minerva, but there are good things in it, as well as bad and mediocre things. There are many mistakes, and sometimes very bad books are highly praised.”

895 Magliabechi to Cuper, 2 February 1693, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 93, “the books I mention in my attached letter to the highly educated sir Graevius, are, up to now, not mentioned in any journal, but, they will certainly do so, after a while.

896 Magliabechi to Pieter Burman, 2 September 1710 [1711], UBL, Leiden University Library, BUR Q 23, “Non iscrivo a V.S.III.ma novità letterarie di Italia, sia per il mio male a gli occhi, come ancora, perché in Venezia, appresso all’Herz, alcuni Signori, anno principiato a fare stampare un Giornale de’ Letterati di Italia, nel quale le comprendano quasi che tutte” [I do not write literary news from Italy to your Illustrious Lordship, because of the pain in my eyes, as well as that in Venice, several men have begun the printing of a Giornale de’ Letterati di Italy by Herz, which contains them all]. The same message was written to Cuper on the 19th of May 1711, (KB, KW 72 D 12, f. 296) “Non iscrivo a V.S.III.ma nuove Letterarie, si per la mia flussione degli occhi, come anche, perché in Venezia, appresso all’Ertz, si stampa un Giornale de’ Letterati di Italia, che le comprende quasi che tutte”. Likewise, in 1711 he wrote to Jacob Gronovius that “io scriverele novità Letterarie, si rende affatto superfluo, poiché il signore Appostolo Zeno, ed altri Signori, fanno adesso stampare in Venezia, dall’Ertz, un Giornale de’ Letterati di Italia, nel quale si comprendono quasi che tutte.” (Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 23 May 1711, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 248)
Magliabechi’s letters and network for their own information. Magliabechi closely collaborated with the editor of the Giornale de' letterati di Modena, Benedetto Bacchini and with Apostolo Zeno, editor of the Giornale de' letterati d'Italia, informing them about the latest news in the scholarly community. Moreover, he sent them books from the Dutch Republic, as shown, for instance by Magliabechi’s letter to Laurens Gronovius in 1679, in which he informed the latter that he would sent his most recent publication, the Marmorea basis Colossi Tiberio Caesari erecti ob civitates Asiae restitutas (1697), which was dedicated to Cosimo III, to Bacchini in Modena.897 Secondly, in the fourth chapter we have seen that Magliabechi’s brokerage position remains constant throughout the 1690s, despite the apparent proliferation of the scholarly journal. In these years, new correspondents like Pierre Bayle, Jean le Clerc and Pieter Burman joined his scholarly network. Although it is true that they gained most recent news from these journals, Magliabechi could provide them with book-reports tailored for them. He dispensed himself from writing recent literary news, referring to the respective literary journals, and turned his attention to the specific books and manuscripts they needed to carry out their work. The literary journal could thus never replace the vivid subjectivity of Magliabechi, who possessed information that these journals just could not cover.

6. BOOK HUBS IN THE EPISTOLARY NETWORK

The few edges connecting the smaller nodes to each other are not sufficient to ensure that the network is fully connected. As discussed, these edges derive from Magliabechi’s bibliographical reports, in which he enlisted those books that came recently off the press. He mentioned the books only once or twice in all his letters to his Dutch correspondents, who circulated the unique news items among themselves. In addition, the power law in figure 39 formulates in mathematical terms the notion that these numerous tiny nodes coexist with a few large events that carry most of the action. In this context, this implies that the network bears a vast majority of book-hubs that dominate the structure of the network for they are cited frequently in his letters. These book-hubs held the network from falling apart and kept the conversations and discussions going and flowing in the network (see figure 41). This means, for instance, that a particular book from the bibliographical reports aroused the interest of the letter-reader, asking for more information about it in his next letters. It can be a book to which the correspondent attached greater importance or a book that gave rise for serious concern. In any of these cases, these books gave impulse to the commerce of letters. This might also explain why the letter remained throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the means par excellence for the communication about books, even after the arrival of the literary journal.

897 Magliabechi to L. Gronovius, 22 October 1697, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, ff. 42-44, “Il terzo considererò se sia meglio che da parte di V.S.Ill.ma io lo mani al signore Dottore Cinelli, o pure a Modena, al Padre Bacchini, che in quella Città, compone, o da in luce, il Giornale de' Letterati.” Lorenz Theodor Gronovius, Marmorea basis Colossi Tiberio Caesari erecti ob civitates Asiae restitutas: post horrendos terrae tremores (Pieter van der AA: Lugduni Batavorum [Leiden], 1697).
Which books dominated the contents of Magliabichi’s letters? The books that are designated as hubs are shown in table 1. Given that the distribution of citations in Magliabichi’s letters is highly skewed, I have limited the analysis to those book hubs that are mentioned at least 5 times in Magliabichi’s correspondence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Cit.</th>
<th>Roman Index</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liber satyrarum sexdecim. (1703)</td>
<td>Nomi Federigo</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Magliabichi, J. Gronovius, Graevius, Leibniz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdota, quae ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae codicibus (1697)</td>
<td>Muratori Lodovico Antonio</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Magliabichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum: prout supersunt, quos ad libros mss. exegerunt (1706)</td>
<td>Gronovius Jacob</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Domenico Passionei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Biblioteca Volante Di Giovanni Cinelli Accademico Gelato Scanzia Qvarta (1682)</td>
<td>Cinelli Giovanni Calvoli</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burre d</td>
<td>Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliotheca Heinsiana sive catalogus librorum (1682)</td>
<td>Johannes du Vivié</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Magliabichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum libri sex (1698)</td>
<td>Gronovius Jacob</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to Magliabichi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 41 Close-up network of the book-hubs (dark-blue) cited in Magliabichi’s letters to the Dutch Republic from 1673 until 1714. Network created with nodegoat.
<p>| Dissertatio de nomine patriarchae Josephi a Pharaone imposito (1696) | Bonjour Guilielmus | Paris | 9 | Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabechi |
| Vetus Latium profanum &amp; sacram (1704) | Corradini Pietro Marcellino | Rome | 9 | Donated to Magliabechi |
| Giornale de Letterati di Modena (1692) | Bacchini Benedetto | Modena | 9 | |
| Apotheosis vel consecratio Homeri : sive, Lapis antiquissimus in quo poëtarum principis Homeri consecratio sculpta est (1683) | Cuper Gisbert | Amsterdam | 8 | Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabechi |
| L'Italia Regnante (1674) | Leti Gregorio | Géneve | 8 | Roman Index | Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabechi |
| Dictionnaire Historique et Critique (1697) | Bayle Jean Pierre | Rotterdam | 8 | Roman Index | Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabechi |
| Supplementa lacunarum in Ænea Tactico, Dione Cassio et Ariano de expeditione Alexandri (1675) | Gronovius Jacob | Leiden | 8 | Donated, Acknowledgements to Magliabechi |
| Divi Chrysostomi Epistola ad Caesarium monachum (1687) | Bigot Emery | Utrecht | 7 | Roman Index | Dedicated to Cosimo III |
| Arrianou Nikomédeós Anabaseós Alexandrou biblia hepta (1704) | Gronovius Jacob | Leiden | 7 | Dedicated to Cosimo III |
| Marquardi Gudii et doctorum virorum ad eum epistolae […] et Claudii Sarravii epistolae ex eadem bibliotheca auctiores (1697) | Pieter Burman | Utrecht | 7 | |
| Ammiani Marcellini quae supersunt (1693) | Gronovius Jacob | Leiden | 7 | Dedicated to Cosimo III |
| Notizie letterarie ed istoriche intorno agli uomini illustri dell' Accademia fiorentina; parte prima. (1700) | Rilli Jacopo | Florence | 7 | Donated to Magliabechi |
| Beati Ambrosii, abbatis generalis Camaldulensis Hodoeporicon (1681) | Bartolini Niccolo | Florence | 7 | Dedicated to Magliabechi |
| Arcana naturae detecta (1695) | Leeuwenhoeck van Antoni | Delft | 7 | Dedicated to Magliabechi |
| N. Parthenii Giannettasii Bellica. (1699) | Giannettasio Niccolo Partenio | Naples | 7 | Dedicated to Magliabechi |
| Stephani Byzantini Gentilia per epitomen, anthecur de Urbibus inscripta (1688) | Van Berkel Abraham | Leiden | 7 | Donated to Magliabechi |
| Cenotaphia Pisana Caïi Et Lvcii Caesarvm and Dissertationibvs Illvstrata (1681) | Noris Henry | Venice | 7 | Dedicated to Magliabechi |
| Inscriptiones epistolarum synodalium XC. et XCII. inter Augustinianas (1674) | Noris Henry | Florence | 7 | Donated to Magliabechi |
| Epistola de sceleto elephantino, Tonnæ nuper effosso. (1696) | Tentzel Wilhelm Ernst | Gotha | 7 | Dedicated to Magliabechi |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memoria Cossoniana (1695)</td>
<td>Gronovius Jacob</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae (1684)</td>
<td>Moniglia Giovanni</td>
<td>Siena</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De columnna traiana syntagma (1683)</td>
<td>Fabretti Raffaello</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origines linguae italicae (1676)</td>
<td>Ferrari Ottavio</td>
<td>Padova</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectanea monumentorum veterum ecclesiae Graecae et Latinae quae</td>
<td>Zaccagni Lorenzo</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated, Acknowledgements to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haec tenus in vaticana bibliotheca delitterunt (1698)</td>
<td>Alessandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historica dissertatio de uno ex Trinitate carne passo (1696)</td>
<td>Noris Henry</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated, Acknowledgements to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forojuilensis De Antiquitatibus Hortae Coloniae Etruscorum (1708)</td>
<td>Fontanini Giusto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouvelles de la République des Lettres (1684-1687)</td>
<td>Bayle Pierre</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roman Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionnaire historique et critique (1702)</td>
<td>Bayle Jean Pierre</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sota; hoc est, Liber Mischnicus de uxore adulteri suspecta (1674)</td>
<td>Wagenseil Johann</td>
<td>Altdorf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dedicated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmeticae rationalis elementa qvarior (1674)</td>
<td>Mengoli Pietro</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesaurus Graecarum Antiquitatum (1699)</td>
<td>Gronovius Jacob</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osservazioni di Francesco de'Ficoroni sopra l'antichita di Roma (1709)</td>
<td>Ficoroni Francesco</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forojuilensis in Romano archigymnasio […] (1705)</td>
<td>Fontanini Giusto</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La istoria universale : provata con monumenti, e figurata con</td>
<td>Bianchini Giuseppe</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simboli degli antichi (1697)</td>
<td>Francesco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occone (1683)</td>
<td>Mezzabarba Birago</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francesco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De sestertiis sive subsecivorum pecunie veteris Grece et Romanæ libri (1691)</td>
<td>Gronovius Jacob</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jani Rutgersii Venusinae lectiones (1699)</td>
<td>Burman Frans Pieter</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpocrates, sive, Explicatio imagunculae argenteae perantiqueae […] (1687)</td>
<td>Cuper Gisbert</td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliotheca choisie : pour servir de suite a la bibliotheque</td>
<td>Le Clerc Jean</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Roman Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universelle (1703)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuina Stephani Byzantini De urbibus et populis fragmenta (1674)</td>
<td>van Berkel Abraham</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Donated to Magliabechi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schna sive totius hebraeorum juris (1698)  
Surenhuis Willem  
Amsterdam  
5  
Dedicated to Cosimo III, Francesco Maria de’ Medici

Anonymi dialogi tres. I. De constantia in adversis. II. De dignitate tuenda. III. De amore erga repempublicam (1692)  
Bacchini Benedetto  
Modena  
5  
Donated to Magliabechi

Orphei De terrae motibus catalecton (1691)  
Eschenbach Andreas Cristian  
Nuremberg  
5  
Roman Index  
Donated to Magliabechi

Table 1 The most cited books in Magliabechi’s letters to the Dutch Republic

6.1. Dedications and Gifts as a Social Practice

The first thing that one might notice is that a high number of books that were donated or dedicated to Magliabechi appear to be amongst the most cited publications in his correspondence. Magliabechi did not have to give proof of his learning by writing books. According to Eric Cochrane, the high number of authors “who applied to him for information kept his name prominently displayed in the dedications and acknowledgements of half of the books published in Italy during his lifetime”. Likewise, Girolamo Albizzi, editor of the literary journal La Galleria di Minerva wrote that, compared to Magliabechi, “non vi è principe al quale altrettanto ne sieno stati dedicati”. Consequently, in many publications, the name of Magliabechi appeared in huge capitals immediately after the title page and as such, his fame was disseminated throughout hundreds of copies in Europe. The number of books dedicated to Magliabechi has not yet been investigated, mostly because they are difficult to detect in the “multitude of books” that appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some dedications consist of not much more than a single phrase, others are dozens of pages, and still others consist mainly of a picture. Moreover, as argued by Rienk Vermij, it is general reasonably easy to identify the dedications in the work of one particular author, but it is much harder to find all the books that were dedicated to one particular person, as this information is normally not included in catalogues. He urged therefore for a more systematic study of dedications. The present exploratory study takes a tentative first step in this direction. Indeed, a systematic exploration of the contents of Magliabechi’s letters to the Dutch Republic reveals 39 books dedicated to Magliabechi. Naturally, this number will increase if more data from his pan-European correspondence will be added.

Besides identifying dedications, it is even harder to parse the author’s intentions. What did they expect from a dedicatee? According to Vermij, the richness in possibilities makes dedications both a promising and a challenging subject in the history of scholarly life. He underlines that dedications were


899 Girolamo Albizzi (ed.), La Galleria di Minerva overo notizie universali, di quanto e stato scritto da letterati di Europa non solo nel presente secolo, ma ancora ne’ gia trascorsi […] tomo quinto (Venezia: presso Girolamo Albizzi, 1706): cit. 187, “there is no prince to whom an equal number of books is dedicated”.


901 Vermij, cit. 174.

902 Ibidem. One of the few examples of a study that considers a list of books dedicated to one specific patron is Marion Peters, De wijze koopman, Het wereldwijde onderzoek van Nicolaes Witsen (1641–1717), burgemeester en VOC-bewindhebber van Amsterdam (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2010): 446-455.

903 Vermij, cit. 174.
definitely a kind of gift, and as such a medium of exchange, but there is no simple key to their meaning because of their wide variety of functions and goals: dedications meant different things in different contexts and moments. As a consequence, the interpretation of a dedication is not always straightforward. Specifically, argues Vermij, “without additional information in the form of correspondence or otherwise, it is very difficult to parse the author’s intentions”. Vermij’s statement provides an argument in favor of the multimodal network that connects both books and correspondence in the same network. Such a representation enables us to examine how correspondence, book dedications and gifts interacted together, providing a framework to shed light on the author’s intentions.

Historians have studied book dedications mostly as an expression of patronage relationships. In this case, books were dedicated in exchange for specific favors, like protection or financial support. Particularly influential in this field of study is the work of Mario Biagioli, who focused on the role of etiquette and sociability in the construction of patronage relationships between scientific practitioners and princes and aristocrats. Yet, as shown by Vermij, this was not the only reason of existence of book dedications. Dedications and gifts were part of an elaborate and complex circuit of exchanges that also played a crucial role in the maintenance of relationships. Within this framework, the concept of reciprocity prevails. In the fourth chapter, we have seen that reciprocity is a distinctive feature of correspondence as a mode of communication and trust. According to Dena Goodman, “the reciprocity of correspondence both reflected and strengthened the sense of equality that structured relations among citizens of the Republic of Letters”. This reciprocity, however, was not characteristic of correspondence alone: also books could structure relations between scholars. Franz Mauelshagen, for example, pointed out that objects functioned as a medium through which mutual trust could be build and social relationships were sustained. Books, for example, were often sent as gifts that usually encouraged reciprocity in the forms of a response or a counter-gift. In this respect, the communication through books can be considered as reciprocal, similar to the exchange of letters. A similar thesis is adopted by Ann Goldgar, who stressed that the Republic of Letters was a community in which the exchange of gifts was of vital importance to its existence, stressing that it was “exactly that expectation of return that kept the system in cooperation”. Book dedications and gifts opened thus the way to create and strengthen relationships based on mutual respect and reciprocity.

This idea might be further reinforced if we chart the evolution of networks over time. Specifically, by looking at the overlay of citation- and epistolary networks in flux, new opportunities may rise about how to link book dedications and gifts to strategies adopted by scholars in seeking and strengthening relationships in the Republic of Letters. This analysis is facilitated by the orderly manner in which

---

904 Vermij, cit. 197.
909 Mauelshagen, *Networks of Trust: Scholarly Correspondence and Scientific Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, 18.
911 The idea that the gift created the obligation for a return gift was pioneered in the influential work of Marcel Maus, who in his Essay sur le don (1925) examined the concepts of reciprocity and exchanged to analysis gifts. Marcel Maus, ‘Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l’échange dans les sociétés archaïques’, *L’Année Sociologique* 1 (1923-1924): 30-186.
Magliabechi compiled his bibliographical reports, in which he often specified which books were dedicated or donated to him. As such, the number of books dedicated and donated to Magliabechi have been carefully tracked down in Magliabechi's letters to the Dutch Republic, and overlapped with Magliabechi's correspondence data that has been retrieved from the Card Catalogue of the National Central Library of Florence and the Catalogus Epistularum Neerlandicarum.

6.1.1. Dedications and gifts in the context of creating relationships

As early modern correspondents became part of an epistolary exchange, they did not so in some ideal egalitarian society, were anyone could join simply by writing a letter, but in a world regulated by social norms. Dedications, gifts or letters of introduction were needed to get admitted into an epistolary network. By identifying new edges that appear in the network over time, we might understand how to link book dedications and gifts to strategies adopted by scholars to establish a relationship with Magliabechi.

In total, 39 books (appendix 4), written by 35 authors, mentioned by Magliabechi in his letters to the Dutch Republic, are dedicated to him. This book dedication-network is represented in figure 42, showing the authors (red) of the dedicated books (blue) mentioned in Magliabechi’s letters to the Dutch Republic. At a glance, we can see that each of these authors is engaged in a regular correspondence (green) with Magliabechi, i.e. the network is fully connected. This first exploration implies that dedications were an important driving mechanism in the shaping of Magliabechi’s epistolary network and vice versa. Representing this network over time helps us to identify those books that were used as a means to create, maintain and encourage networks.

This explorative analysis offers a systematic way of highlighting significant books and authors and, by implication, specific letters that may merit localized attention and close reading. For two publications – the Arcana Naturae Detecta (1695) of Antoni van Leeuwenhoek and the Orphei De terrae motibus catalepton (1691) of Andreas Cristian Eschenbach – the year of the dedication coincides with the beginning of the author’s correspondence with Magliabechi. For example, in 1695, Antoni van Leeuwenhoek dedicated his Arcana Naturae Detecta to Magliabechi. The year of the dedication coincides with the beginning of the author’s correspondence with Magliabechi. A letter from Leeuwenhoek to Magliabechi dated the 16th of August 1695, for instance, shows that Leeuwenhoek expressed his admiration for the Florentine librarian, informing him that he desired to dedicate his Arcana Naturae Detecta, to him.912 Flattered by the dedication, Magliabechi thanked him effusively in a letter dated the 8th of September 1695 and the two remained in contact until 1705.913

---


913 Magliabechi’s letter was published in the Boekzaal van Europe, the first literary journal in the Dutch Republic founded by the Rotterdam scholar Pieter Rabus (Pieter Rabus, De boekzaal van Europe. Deel 8 (Rotterdam: Pieter van der Slaart, 1699): 376-379. All the other letters from Magliabechi to Leeuwenhoek also appeared in the Boekzaal, under the rubric “Italiaansch Boeknieuws”. For the bibliography concerning the Boekzaal, see Hans Bots (eds), Pieter Rabus en de Boekzaal van Europe, 1692-1702: verkenningen binnen de republiek der letteren in het laatste kwart van de zeventiende eeuw (Amsterdam: Holland Universiteits Pers, 1974).
Fig. 42 Book dedications in the network of Magliabechi. Magliabechi stands at the center of this visualization, who is encircled by green nodes which stand for a correspondence with the author (red) who dedicated a book (dark-blue) to him. Network created with nodegoat.

Besides dedications, 430 books, written by 276 authors, were donated to Magliabechi. From these 276 authors, 182 maintained a correspondence with Magliabechi. For three publications in table 1 – the *Vetus Latium profanum & sacrum* (1704) of Pietro Marcellini Corradini, the *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1697) of Pierre Bayle and the *Jani Rutgersii Venusinae lectiones* (1699) of Pieter Burman – the year of the gift coincides with the beginning of the author’s correspondence with Magliabechi. For example, on the 25th of April 1700, Magliabechi wrote Pieter Burman for the first time to thank him for the *Jani Rutgersii Venusinae lectiones*.

> “Il mio fine si è di riverirla con la penna, come ho sempre fatto col cuore, ed insieme renderle come fo grazzie immortali, della nuova edizione di Orazzio, con le eruditissime lezizioni Venusine del Rutgersio, che alle settimane passate, da parte di V.S.Ill.ma, mi fu consegnata.”

After this first gift, Burman and Magliabechi continued to exchange books and letters until 1711.

Another example of how scholars used books to create links with Magliabechi is illustrated by the *Dictionnaire historique et critique* of Pierre Bayle. The dynamics of the multimodal network surrounding the *Dictionnaire* are shown in figure 43. This visualization adds to the understanding of the archival materials regarding this case-study example by using the complex web of cross-references surrounding this particular node. One can dynamically navigate this network and thus approach and organize the corpus of letters from different perspectives, showing the precise moments when Bayle and his books are involved in the conversations between Magliabechi and his correspondents, as well as his emergence

---

914 Magliabechi to P. Burman, UBL, BUR Q 23, f. 2, “My purpose is to revere you with the pen, as I have always done with my heart, with which at the same time I thank you for the new edition of Horace, with the very learned teachings of Johannes Rutgers, which I have received on behalf of Your Illustrious Lordship last week.”
and disappearance as recorded in these letters. In this way, the network re-enacts the history and circulation of Bayle’s *Dictionnaire* in the network of Magliabechi.

---

**Fig. 43** Multimodal network surrounding Pierre Bayle from 1686 until 1705. Books: dark-blue, people: red, letters: light-blue. In nodegoat, this visualization constitutes a dynamic network in which the nodes and edges appear and disappear among the timeline. As such, the initial contacts between Magliabechi and Bayle through Minutoli, Leti and Cuper will appear first, followed by Bayle’s appearance in the correspondence of Laurens and Jacob Gronovius. Network created with nodegoat.

The initial contact between Magliabechi and Bayle went through a long process, and was filled with misunderstanding and intrigues. Bayle was familiar with the name of Magliabechi as early as in 1686, when the Genovese scholar Vincenzo Minutoli (1639–1709) provided Bayle with a list of the most important scholars in Italy. As the editor and main contributor of one of the first scholarly journals in Europe, the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (1684–1687), Bayle might have used the list, which included the name of Magliabechi, as inspiration for ideas and contributions to his journal. Several months later, it was through the historian Gregorio Leti that Bayle directed his first greetings to the librarian. Magliabechi, in turn, returned his greetings which were passed on to Leti in July.

---


917 Leti to Magliabechi, undated, BNCF, Magl. VIII 752, f. 142, “Il signore Bayle la riverisce”.

918 In the fourth chapter we have seen that these dynamics are related to the concept of triadic closure in networks. For the correspondence between Leti and Magliabechi, nowadays in the National Central Library of Florence, see Luigi Fassò,
Once Magliabechi knew that he got Bayle’s attention, he took a step further and commissioned Gisbert Cuper to show him the book La visiera Alzata of Benedetto Bacchini, which was published in Parma in 1689 and dedicated to Magliabechi. Yet, a correspondence between Magliabechi and Bayle did not get off the ground until almost a decade later.

In 1697, Magliabechi had heard from the Venetian cartographer Vincenzo Maria Coronelli (1650-1718), that Bayle had sent him a copy of his Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, which was intended as a gift for him. Upon hearing this, Magliabechi remained “attonito, e stupefatto” and immediately wrote a letter to Laurens Gronovius to ensure whether Coronelli was right. According to Magliabechi, the Dictionnaire Historique et Critique was too expensive to receive as a gift, having heard from his correspondents in Rome that the book had become a remarkable success, and was sold out immediately at very high prices. He certainly did not deserve to receive such a precious book, especially considering the fact that he did not ever assist or help Bayle in his research. To figure out whether Bayle had indeed sent his Dictionnaire to Coronelli, Magliabechi had come up with a plan for Laurens. He urged him, however, to be very cautious, asking him to immediately destroy the letter after reading, for he did not want that Bayle found out about his doubts. The plan was as follows: Magliabechi would write a letter to Laurens in which he deliberately discussed at length how grateful he was that his name was mentioned in the Dictionnaire. Laurens had then to show the letter to Bayle, who “nel leggere quel che scrivo di esso, da se medesimo, senza di esserne interrogato, dirà se veramente mi ha mandata a donare questa sua Opera”. Once Magliabechi was certain about Bayle’s intentions, he would write a letter to Vincenzo Coronelli in which he deliberately discussed at length how grateful he was that his name was mentioned in the Dictionnaire.
Maria Coronelli to ask him if the *Dictionnaire* had already arrived in Venice. He needed to do so as soon as possible for he was afraid that Coronelli would otherwise sell or give his copy to someone else.

On the 25th of September 1698, Bayle addressed his first letter to Magliabechi. In this letter, Bayle explained the confusions surrounding the *Dictionnaire*. He had met Coronelli in Rotterdam, when the latter was on his way to England with the ambassadors of the Venetian Republic. The meeting was an occasion to talk about Magliabechi and Bayle expressed his desire to send the librarian his *Dictionnaire*. Coronelli also met Reineer Leers (1654-1714), publisher of the *Dictionnaire*, and promised him that he would send several books to him in exchange for the books from Bayle. Leers and Bayle, however, never received anything from Coronelli and decided not to send the *Dictionnaire* in Italy. This is the rule of reciprocity at work. After Bayle had explained in detail the state of play regarding Coronelli, he asked Magliabechi about the safest way that he could send him his *Dictionnaire*. Magliabechi received the book on the 14th of May 1700, answering Bayle of the “si prezzioso regalo” which “non si possono donare senza scomodo, ne ricevere in dono senza vergogna”.

Magliabechi was certainly not surprised about the careless way Coronelli had treated Reineer Leers “poiché anche in Italia, per cose simili, si è grandemente screditato”, as he wrote in confidence to Jacob Gronovius. He also wrote in the same letter that Coronelli is “anche ignorante, essendo solamente versato nella Geografia, nella quale prende non piccoli errori”. After writing these sentences on a small, easy to hide, piece of paper, Magliabechi urged Gronvius to immediately destroy the letter (see figure 44).

---

926 *Ibidem*, “perché se fosse vera, l’Opera non andasse male, poiché mentre che ’l Padre Coronelli vedesse che io non gliela chiedessi, potrebbe o farla ad alcuno altro, o baratterla”.


928 Magliabechi to Bayle, 14 May 1700, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 40, transcribed in Bianchi, 85-87. “so valuable gift”, “cannot be gifted without inconvenience, nor receiving it without embarrassment.”

929 Magliabechi to Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778, f. 6, “because also in Italy, for similar things, he is greatly discredited.” “also ignorant, merely being versed in Geography, in which he makes no little mistakes”.
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6.1.2. Dedications and Gifts in the Context of Maintaining Long-Standing Relationships

The practice of book dedications and gifts clearly illustrates a general habit of scholars to get admitted into someone’s epistolary network. It was, however, not sufficient to introduce oneself by a one-time gift or dedication. The hard part was to upkeep these relationships. Dedications and gifts could also serve the purpose of strengthening ties by emphasizing their previous relationship, used as a token of friendship and mutual respect to ensure that a correspondence would continue. Therefore, upon receiving Bayle’s Dictionnaire, Magliabechi promised Bayle “di mandarle qualche Libretto di Italia”. Magliabechi honors his promise and on the 14th of May 1700, he sent him a publication of Jacopo Rilli about the members of the Accademia Fiorentina, which “forse potrebbe essere di qualche giovamento per l’accrescimento dell’Opera di V.S Ill.ma”. In return, Bayle sent Magliabechi his second edition of the Dictionnaire Historique et Critique (1698). These dynamics are shown in figure 45.

Fig. 45 Multimodal network of the correspondence between Pierre Bayle and Magliabechi. The letters written by Magliabechi to Bayle are represented in light-blue while the answers of Bayle are colored in orange. In these letters, numerous books are mentioned as bibliographical news (dark-blue) written by an author (red). The green node stands for a book donated by Magliabechi, while the black nodes represent the books given by Bayle. Network created with nodegoat.

930 Ibidem, “to send you several books from Italy”.
931 Jacopo Rilli, Notizie letterarie ed istoriche intorno agli uomini illustri dell’Accademia Fiorentina (Firenze: Piero Matin, 1700). Ibidem, “maybe could be beneficial to the enhancement of the work of Your Illustrious Lordship”.
Besides these gifts, the largest part of the letters exchanged between Magliabechi and Bayle concerned the latest news about the output of the Italian and Dutch presses. In his bibliographical reports (shown as dark-blue nodes in figure 45), Magliabechi primarily focused on works on religion and politics, the main interest of Bayle. He mentioned, for example, the Trattato dell’Anima e del conoscimento, de’ Bruti Animali (1701), which “appariscia stampato in Colonia Agrippina, è con tutto ciò veramente impresso in Napoli, o vero in qualche altra Città di quel Regno”. Magliabechi also received the Risposta alla Lettera Apologetica in difesa della Teologia Scholastica from Costantino Grimaldi who published the book “senza il suo nome”. This book, in which Grimaldi set Descartes’s philosophy against the Aristotelian framework, was eventually put on the Index of Prohibited Books in 1726. Other books that Magliabechi mentioned were the Meditazioni Filosofiche of Bernardo Trevisan, printed in Venice in 1704, and Lodovico Marracci’s L’ebreo preso per le buone, overo Discorsi familiari et amichevoli, fatti con i rabbini di Roma intorno al Messia (1701), which Magliabechi defined as a book “contra gli Ebrei”. In return, Pierre Bayle notified Magliabechi with a letter of the 19th of October 1703 about Jean Le Clerc’s journal the Bibliothèque choisie, Graevius’ Thesaurum antiquitatum et historiarum Italic et and the Expeditionis Alexandri Libri septem et historia indica of Jacob Gronovius. In the same letter Bayle also mentions that the Réponse aux questions d’un Provincial has been recently published in Rotterdam, without mentioning however that he is the author of the book.

Books were also the driving force behind the remarkable strong epistolary relationship between Magliabechi and Jacob Gronovius, which lasted no less than 36 years. The exchange of books between them are shown in figure 46. In nodegoat, this network constitutes a dynamic network in which the books and letters appear and disappear along the timeline. As such, we are able to follow the moments when gifts are exchanged and reciprocated. Upon his return in the Dutch Republic, Jacob dedicated Magliabechi his Supplementa lacunarum in Ænea Tactico, Dione Cassio et Arriano de expeditione Alexandri (1675) to thank him for his help during his stay in Florence. In 1698, he dedicated to Magliabechi his Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum libri sex and in 1709 his Origenis Philosophuménon fragmentum Quod ex bibliotheca medicea (1701). Moreover, numerous books were donated by Gronovius. In 1675, Jacob gifted Magliabechi his Supplementa lacunarum in Ænea Tactico, Dione Cassio et Arriano de expeditione Alexandri (1675) and praised him in the preface of this edition. In 1705, he sent Magliabechi his Arrianou Nikomedeos Anabaseos Alexandrou biblia bepta (1704), which he had dedicated to Cosimo III. In 1696, Magliabechi received from Jacob Gronovius his Memoria Cossoniana, which was published in Leiden in 1695, and thanked him for praising his name on several occasions throughout the book. The Memoria Cossoniana was written to commemorate the death of the Dutch merchant Daniel Cousson (1648-1689), who was murdered by Algerian pirates in a village near Smyrne where he worked as the vice-consul of the Dutch trade association. Magliabechi had personally met Daniel in Florence in March 1675, where he stayed for two months before traveling on to the Levant by boat from Livorno. The two remained in contact for several years, but the harsh

932 The Trattato dell’Anima e del conoscimento, de’ Bruti Animali (…), printed in Naples in 1701, was an Italian translation by Gaetano Lombardo of Antoine Dilly’s work on animal consciousness. Magliabechi to Bayle, 17 January 1701, transcribed in L. Bianchi, 88-92 and McKenna, 282-288, “appears to be printed in Colonia Agrippina, but it is nonetheless imprinted in Naples, or in another cities in that reign.”

933 Magliabechi to Bayle, 26 January 1704, transcribed in Bianchi, 98-101, “without his name”.


935 Magliabechi to Bayle, 17 January 1701, “against the Jews”.

936 Bayle to Magliabechi, 19 October 1703, transcribed in Bianchi, 104-106.


938 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 6 March 1675, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777. f. 145, “È stato qua da me un giovane Olandese [Cousson], il quale fu dicepolo del suo signore Padre d’immortal memoria”. Cousson, in fact was a pupil of Jacob’s father,
circumstances in Smyrne eventually disrupted their correspondence in 1680. Vice versa, Magliabechi sent Gronovius numerous books from his Italian colleagues, including Ottavio Ferrari’s *Origines linguae italicae* (1676) and Jacopo Rilli’s *Notizie letterarie ed istoriche intorno agli uomini illustri dell’ Accademia fiorentina* (1700), both listed in table 1.

It was thus expected that a dedication or a gift would be rewarded with an answer, but there are cases in the correspondence of Magliabechi in which these did not result in an answer, or even worse, in a rejection. According to Felicity Heal, the exchange of gifts in the early modern period was a delicate

---

Johannes Fredericus Gronovius at the University of Leiden. See also, Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 30 May 1675, LMU, Cod. 4° Cod.Msc 777, ff. 169-171, “Il signore Cousson è presentemente in Livorno, e andrà alle Smirne col Convoglio. Nel tempo che è stato qua, era quasi ogni giorno da me, ed io non ho mancato di fargli vedere le Pandette, la Libreria di S. Lorenzo, di S. Marco, di S.A.S., ed in somma tutto quello che ha voluto”.

Cousson continiously lamented the communication that existed between him and his contacts, see, for example, A. Cousson to Magliabechi, 13 December 1677, “mi dispiace molto di esser privo della corrispondenza con simili dottissimi Signori, ma ne la distanza de’ paesi permette, ne l’aria di queste contrade favorisce alli studi per li calori intollerabili, di manera che bisogna aver patienza fin al mio ritorno, il quale Dio conceda sia prospero”, in Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti, *Clarorvm Belgarm ad Ant. Magliabehcim nonnullaque alios epistolae*, tomus secundus: 312-313. Yet, Cousson would never return in the Dutch Republic.
process, rather than exclusively a material entity, depending for its success on proper understanding
between the transacting parties. If one of the parties did not properly understand the intentions and
impact of a gift, this could turn into mistrust, or at least disturb the delicate balance in their premature
relationship. Of crucial importance in Heal’s argument is the notion of balance – a recurring theme in
this study. Social network theory assumes that people constantly evaluate their relationships. Within these
relationships, people prefer balance. This balance can be achieved through negotiating between friendly
and hostile relations in a network, as we have seen in the previous chapter, but it can be achieved through
reciprocity as well: a book dedication or gift needs an answer or acceptance to restore the balance in the
network. This means that if a donation is not reciprocated, the relationship might be challenged and
eventually even be unbalanced. Earlier, we have seen that Pierre Bayle did not send his publications to
the Venetian cartographer Vincenzo Coronelli because the latter did not maintain his promise to send
him several books from Italy.

In table 1 appear the *Genuina Stephani Byzantini De urbis et populis fragmenta* (1674) and the *Stephani
Byzantini Gentilia per epitomen, antebac de Urbibus inscripta* (1688), both published in Leiden by the Dutch
classical scholar Abraham van Berkel, known for his critical editions of various classical authors. Despite
being cited frequently in Magliabechi’s letters to Jacob Gronovius and Daniel Cousson, Van Berkel is not
a direct correspondent of Magliabechi. These dynamics are shown in figure 47, in which a direct epistolary
relationships between Magliabechi and Van Berkel is missing. In the previous chapter, we have already
seen that Van Berkel was not on good terms with Magliabechi’s most trusted correspondent Jacob
Gronovius. Consequently, Magliabechi was involved in constant discord between the two. On the one
hand, Magliabechi was obliged to thank Van Berkel for his donations, but on the other hand he could
not engage with his friend’s enemy. He was forced to take sides to restore the balance in his network,
and decided to ignore Van Berkel’s attempts to reach out to him in order to spare his relationship with
Gronovius.

![Multimodal network surrounding the publications (dark-blue) of Abraham van Berkel. The network
shows that, although his publications are often mentioned by Magliabechi in his letters (light-blue), a
correspondence (green) between Magliabechi and Van Berkel did not exist. Network created with nodegoat.](image)

---

6.1.3. BOOKS IN THE CONTEXT OF EXPANDING THE NETWORK

What was the author expected to gain by dedicating or donating a book to Magliabechi? As noted earlier, an important motivation for giving a dedication was the expectation for receiving something in return. This means that book dedications have a slightly compulsory edge to them because it was expected that they would be rewarded. As shown before, Magliabechi rewarded scholars an entry into his network of trans-European scholars, and gave them access to all the contacts, knowledge and books that his network brought about. As such, Magliabechi could provide authors with the means to bring their work to fruition, for example by lending them books and manuscripts. In addition to these rewards, Magliabechi also guaranteed a wide circulation of their work, either in the form of news reports or he physically sent copies of publications to scholars working in the same field. As noted by Alfonso Mirto, this was also the case for prohibited books: scholars intentionally dedicated or gifted controversial publications to Magliabechi, knowing that he could easily circulate these publications throughout Italy.941

That Magliabechi encouraged the circulation of publications is shown by a letter to Gisbert Cuper, in which we read that Magliabechi sent Gisbert Cuper the *Orphei De terrae motibus catalecton* (1691) of Andreas Christian Eschenbach “solo per obbedirla, in riguardo dell’esser dedicato a me.”942 Moreover, it is clear from the way correspondents asked for Magliabechi’s services that they expected a wide circulation of their work. A letter from Leeuwenhoek to Magliabechi in 1695, for instance, emphasized that he dedicated his work to Magliabechi “so that scholars both in Italy as elsewhere may become acquainted with my trifling labours”. In 1706, Jacob Gronovius sent Magliabechi his *Audi Gallii Noctium Atticarum: prout supersunt, quos ad libros miss. exegerunt* (1706), which he had, on the advice of Magliabechi, dedicated to Cardinal Domenico Passionei (1672-1761).943 On the 14th of October 1704, Magliabechi wrote to Jacob Gronovius that it would be clever to consider Passionei as a dedicatee for he could “avere tutto quello che di Roma le bisognerà, per i suoi Studi”.

As shown by table 1, several of the most cited Italian publications in the correspondence of Magliabechi were the *Dissertatio de nomine patriarchae Josephi a Pharaone imposito* (1696) of Guillaume Bonjour, the *Anecdota, quae ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae codicibus* (1697) of Lodovico Antonio Muratori and the *Vetus Latium profanum & sacrum* (1704) of Pietro Marcellino Corradini. Figure 48 shows to what extent these books were part of one or many conversation networks. When we look more closely at this network, an interesting dynamic emerges. The moment a publication is published often coincides with the exact same year Magliabechi mentions it in his letters to his correspondents. For example, the *Dissertatio de nomine patriarchae Josephi a Pharaone imposito* is mentioned in Magliabechi’s letter to Gisbert Cuper, Ruth Ernst d’Ans and Johannes Georgius Graevius on the 20th of June, the 4th of August and the 14th of August 1696 respectively. Likewise, the *Anecdota, quae ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae codicibus*, which was dedicated to Magliabechi, is mentioned on the 28th of July 1697 to Gisbert Cuper, on the 4th of August 1697 to Johannes Georgius Graevius, on the 23rd of March 1697 to Jacob Gronovius and on the 22nd of October

---

941 Mirto, *Stampatori, Editori, Librai Nella Seconda Metà Del Seicento*, 1: 50
942 Magliabechi to Cuper, 5 February 1692, KB, KW 72 D 10, ff. 65-67, “‘Sabato, […] non mi fu possibile il trasmetterle allora l’incluso Opuscolo. Lo mando per tanto adesso a V.S. Ill.ma benché con mio sommo rossore, e solo per obbedirla, in riguardo dell’esser dedicato a me. Come mi pare che io gia le scrivessi, il signore Andrea Cristiano Eschenbachio, e quello che l’ha dato in luce, e con mia confusione, onoratomi a dedicarmelo [Saturday, […] I was unable to send you the included booklet. I send it to Your Illustrious Lordship now because, while I blush, I am obliged to because he dedicated the book to me. As I have already written before, sir Andrea Christian Eschenbachio, is the one who brought the book to light, and to my confusion, he honored me to dedicate it to me]”.
943 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 4 October 1705, LMU, Cod 4° Cod.Msc 777, f. 95, “‘Stimo che l’amicizia, con questo per tutti i capi degnissimo Signore [Passionei], sia per essere a V.S.Ill.ma per l’avvenire di non piccolo utile, per quello che possa bisognarle, dalle Biblioteche di Roma.”
1697 to Laurens Gronovius. Moreover, the *Vetus Latium profanum & sacrum* is mentioned on the 20th of February 1704 to Jacob Gronovius, on the 25th of October 1704 to Gisbert Cuper and in June 1705 to Pieter Burman. These examples show how rapid news flowed through the network of Magliabechi, who was able to satisfy his correspondents’ need for up-to-date information.

Magliabechi’s letters, particularly those containing bibliographical news, were not simply services to scholars needing up-to-date information, but they also forged the creation of new ties. The books that Magliabechi advertised in his letters encouraged contact between the recipients and the authors of the books. Figure 49 shows that, shortly after Magliabechi referred to a certain publication, a correspondence between the author and the recipient takes off. For example, on the 7th of September 1697, Magliabechi sent Cuper the *Anecdota, quae ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae codicibus*, published in Milan by the famous publisher and writer Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672-1750).944 A correspondence between Cuper and Muratori took off in 1697. Likewise, it is certain no coincidence that Gisbert Cuper started a correspondence with, shown in green in figure 49, Wilhelm Ernst Tentzel, Lodovico Antonio Muratori, Johann Christoph Wagenseil, Henry Noris, Pietro Marcellino Corradini, Raffaello Fabretti, Giusto Fontanini, Benedetto Bacchini, Francesco Bianchini, Guglielmus Bonjour and Francesco Ficoroni immediately after Magliabechi advertised their publications in his letters to him.945 Multimodal networks shed light on these dynamics.

---

944 Magliabechi to G. Cuper, 7 September 1697, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 140.
945 The correspondence between Cuper and Tentzel, written between 1698 and 1707, is extent in the National Library of the Netherlands, KW 72 C 23, while the correspondence between Corradini and Cuper is to be found in KW 72 G 23. The letters between Cuper and Wagenseil, written between 1691 and 1699, can be found in KW 72 C 35. The correspondence between Cuper and Noris, which lasted from 1687 until 1696, and the correspondence between Cuper and Fabretti (1684-1699) are both extent in KW 72 D 3, while the correspondence between Cuper and Bonjour (1697-1708) can be consulted in KW 72
Fig. 49 The role of books in the creation of contacts. In this visualization, the correspondence between Cuper and Magliabechi is represented, who exchanged letters (light-blue) to each other in which books (dark-blue) were mentioned written by a certain author. These authors maintained a correspondence (green). Network created with nodegoat.

6.2 BOOKS PUBLISHED OUT OF REVENGE

Table 1 clearly shows that the publication *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* (1703) dominates the contents of Magliabechi’s letters to his Dutch correspondents, being cited 20 times. To understand why, it is necessary to go back to the broader context in which this publication should be placed. As noted before, a co-citation network is based on the fact that two different objects (e.g. people, publications) mentioned together in many different letters strongly suggest the existence of a connection between the two. The co-citation network around the *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* looks like the following:

---

H 20. The letters between Ficoroni and Cuper are extent in KW 72 G 23-24. For the detail of the other correspondents of Cuper see chapter 4, paragraph 5.4. Expanding the Network.
Figure 50 shows a central clique of persons and books that are strongly linked together. The *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* is co-cited frequently with the publications *Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae* (1684) and the *Quarta Scanzia* (1682), two books that are present in table 1 as well. Central persons who are frequently cited together with these books are Federico Nomi, Giovanni Andrea Moniglia, Giovanni Calvoli Cinelli, Ferrante Capponi, Bernardo Ramazzini, Johannes Georgius Graevius and Cosimo III. This visualization is useful as a first index of centers of discussions going on around the *Liber satyrarum sexdecim*, which helps us to direct our attention to connections we might have overlooked. Moreover, it provides a tool to structure our thoughts and sources. Following the citations of these books and persons over time helps us to identify significant patterns on which one could then focus more closely by reading the letters in question. Moreover, contextual histories on the cited or co-cited books and persons shed further light about this particular co-citation network.

In 1682, Giovanni Calvoli Cinelli (1626-1706) published anonymously his *Quarta Scanzia.* It was part of a series of books entitled the *Biblioteca Volante*, a bibliography containing curious and rare information about books. In this fourth part, Cinelli included a passage in which he sided with the physician Bernardino Ramazzini (1633-1714), who was involved in a serious dispute with Giovanni

---

Andrea Moniglia over the Florentine noblewoman Maria Maddalena Bagnesa. In 1681, Ramazzini was called to the bedside of Maria Maddalena, who died during childbirth. After her death, Ramazzini reconstructed a medical report in which he confirmed that, although she had died because the placenta was not expelled, a manual removal of the placenta would not have saved her life. The rapport was read by Moniglia in Florence who argued that Ramazzini would have saved the life of Maria Maddalena if he would have removed the placenta. This disagreement marked the start of a three-year debate that instigated sixteen publications between Moniglia and Ramazzini regarding their respective medical abilities.

In the Quarta Scanzia, Cinelli publicly chose the side of Ramazzini, which obviously did not sit very well with Moniglia. Consequently, he accused Cinelli for publishing a malignant work, who ended up in prison for 93 days. In addition, all copies of the Quarta Scanzia were burned on the 11th of March 1683 in the inner courtyard of the Bargello prison in Florence. Magliabechi discussed Cinelli’s case with his trusted correspondent in the Dutch Republic, Jacob Gronovius:

“Non voglio tralasciare di accennarle, acciocché tanto maggiormente V.S.Ill.ma vegga, in che miserabili tempo qua siamo. Il povero Cinelli, compose la quarta Scanzia, nella quale offese leggerissimamente quell’infamissimo Medico. Non la fece stampare, perché la mando manoscritto a Modena al signore Ramazzini, che fu quello che la fece stampare in Venezia. Non ostante per tanto che avesse offeso leggerissimamente quell’empio, e che non l’avesse fatta stampare, e che non fosse stampata qua, con tutto ciò, fu tenuto tre mesi in sequestro; gli furono dati mille gastighi, a segno, che lo precipitarono affatto, e gli fu il Libretto abbruciato pubblicamente per mano del Boia, col suono della Campana del Bargello, come quando va a impiccarsi qualcuno.”

The publication of the Quarta Scanzia not only got Cinelli in trouble, but Magliabechi as well. One year later, in December 1684, Magliabechi wrote a series of letters to Cosimo III to inform him that he had become victim of a vicious plot against him. With desperate words, Magliabechi wrote the Grand Duke that he was falsely accused to be the author of the Quarta Scanzia in the book entitled Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae, which was published anonymously in Siena. The worst part was that the printing of the publication was approved by the grand ducal ministers:

“Era gran tempo che mi ero accorto che diversi mi vedevano mal volentieri in Firenze, e facevano il possibile per necessitarmi ad andarmene. Per non gli fare tanto maggiormente ridere, mi ero deliberato di soffrire il tutto, come ho sempre fino ad ora fatto, benché mi sia convenuto più e più volte inghiottire bocconi amarissimi. Adesso però è affatto impossibile ch’io possa soffrire di vantaggio, essendo stata lacerata la mia reputazione nel peggior modo che possa mai immaginarsi col pensiero. Quando que’ miei fogliacci di notizie erano in mano de’ miei nemici, supplicai umilmente V.A.S. con più mie Lettere, che le feci consegnare in Pisa in propria mano, che volessi degnarsi di farmi la grazia, di ordinare, che fossero date a vedere, a persona dispassionata, che potesse con ogni verità rappresentare a V.A.S. che in esse non si trovava cosa alcuna di quelle che pretendono che nella Scanzia diano fastidi o. La mia digrizza volle, che io non solo allora non ricevessi tal grazia, ma che in oltre sia stato poco fa stampato con approvazione de’ Ministri di V.A.S. che sia io l’Autore della detta Scanzia, e voglia degnarsi che con sua buona grazia, io possa partirmi di qua, e cercare altrove qualche

948 Carnevale, 213.
949 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778, f. 26, “I do not want to leave out to mention that, so that Your Illustrious Lordship better sees, in what a miserable time we are here. The poor Cinelli composed the fourth Scanzia, in which he moderately offended that infamous physician [Moniglia]. He did not print it, because he sent the manuscript to Modena to sir Ramazzini, who was the one who led it printed in Venice. Although he had slightly offended that villain, and that he did not print it, and that it was not printed here in Florence, all in all, he was held for three months in prison, he was given thousands punishments, which beat him down, and his books were burned in public by the hand of the executioner, with the sound of the bell of the Bargello prison, as when someone is hanged.”
magliabechi vitae. Soon he found out that his letters to Cinelli were in the possession of Giovanni Andrea Moniglia:

“Quando i miei fogli erano tutti nelle mani del Signore Moniglia, io, con molte e molte Lettere, supplicai V.A.S., a degnarsi di ordinare, che fossero dati per qualche tempo a persona disinteressata, la quale potesse rappresentare a V.A.S., che in essi non era cosa alcuna, ne intorno al detto signore Moniglia, ne cerca a niuna altra di quelle che nella Scanzia pretendono che dieno fastidio. Si degni V.A.S. di far trovare le dette mie Lettere, che sono molte, e mentre non sia vero ch’io la supplicassi a far vedere que’ miei fogli, protestandomi che in essi non si sarebbe trovata cosa alcuna di quelle che nella Scanzia danno fastidio, mi faccia gettar giù la testa”.

Fear its being revealed, Magliabechi ended his emotional outburst with the statement that the Grand Duke needed to tear up his letter, “perché essendo in Corte molti poco miei Amici, e molti parzialissimi de’ miei Nemici non capitasse nelle loro mani e tanto maggiormente mi perseguissassero”. Did Magliabechi spoke the truth in his letter to the Grand Duke about him not being the author of the _Scanzia_? Officially, he was not. Yet, he provided Cinelli with the information and books he needed to carry out his research. Almost weekly he sent his observations and notes to Cinelli, which were literally wrapped up in the contents of the _Scanzia_. Some of these observations, as is shown by the above letter, were intercepted by his enemies which led them to the conclusion that Magliabechi was, together with Cinelli, the principal author of the book. Consequently, Magliabechi repeatedly tried to convince the Grand Duke to retrieve his stolen observations out of the hands of his enemies so that he could see for himself that he did not ever write anything that would be upsetting to the author of the _Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae_. From the previous chapter we know that Moniglia and Magliabechi were not on good terms with each other as early as 1673, when Moniglia did not share Magliabechi’s opinion that Jacob Gronovius would make the perfect candidate to fill the vacant chair of Greek at the University of Pisa. Against the will of Moniglia, Magliabechi managed to convince the Grand Duke to offer Gronovius the professorship. Consequently, Moniglia, lashed out in rage, initiated a vicious campaign against Gronovius and managed to get rid of him in less than a year. When Moniglia got hold of Magliabechi’s letters to Cinelli and learned

---

950 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 28 December 1684, BNCF, Autografi Palatini, 122, “For a long time I realized that various men were not very pleased to see me in Florence, and did everything possible to force me to leave. In order not to make them laugh even more, I decided to endure it all, as I have always done until now, because it was better to swallow there bitter mouths. Now, however, it is really impossible that I can suffer for my own benefit, since my reputation has been ripped open in the worst possible way that I could never have imagined to think of. When my papers with notes were in the hands of my enemies, I humbly begged Your Illustrious Lordship with letters, which I had delivered to you in your hands in Pisa, to show them to an impartial person, who could provide Your Illustrious Lordship with the trust that, in those papers, there was none of those things that they argue to be bothersome in the Scanzia. To my misfortune, I did not receive this favor, but they also recently printed, with the approval of the ministers of Your Illustrious Lordship, that I am the author of the Scanzia. I therefore would like your mercy that I can leave from here to find somewhere a place where I can find refuge from these persecutions. Especially because my enemies receive protection and dependencies, while I, as is known to all, am always locked up amongst my books and know almost nobody.”

951 Ibidem, “because there are very little friends of mine in court, and many partials of my enemies, [it is better that this letter] does not end up in their hands so that they will persecute me even more”.

952 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, February 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini, 126, “When all my papers were in the hands of sir Moniglia, I, with many and many letters, begged to your Illustrious Lordship to order that my papers would be given for some time to an impartial person, who can present to Your Illustrious Lordship that in my papers there is nothing that could bother, or sir Moniglia, or something else discussed in the Scanzia. I kindly ask Your Illustrious Lordship to find my papers, which are many, while it is not true that I have begged you to show these letters, protesting that in these papers there would not have been found anything upsetting for those discussed in the Scanzia, I would put my head down”.
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about his obvious involvement with the *Scanzia*, he started to plot his revenge against the librarian. Yet, what could be so powerful to undermine the reputation of one of the most respected bibliophiles of that time? Moniglia knew how to hit him where it hurt most: he fought the librarian’s love for books with a book. In 1684, Moniglia ordered Niccolò Francesco da Barga, whom he had promised a position at the University of Pisa, to compose the work *Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae*, in which he accused Magliabechi to be the principal instigator of the *Scanzia*. The work was printed in Florence by Vincenzo Vangelista, reprinted in Venice, and consequently distributed “come se fosse la Dottrina Cristiana” to use the same words of Magliabechi.953

Moniglia’s plot against Magliabechi worked out perfectly. On the 8th of December 1684, Magliabechi desperately wrote a letter to Cosimo III asking him for his permission to retire from his position as librarian of the Medici collections. In addition, he desired also to get rid of the few books he possessed, which he had obtained during the course of his career “col non mi cavar la voglia di cosa alcuna, e mangiare l'istesse Pasque, e Festività più solenni, una sola coppia d'uovo, e tal volta cosa di meno spesa”.954 Since he collected these books with the sole purpose to honor the Grand Duke, he considered it necessary to burn them all, or to send them anywhere the Grand Duke desired.955 As for the grand ducal library, he desired to show the most precious books to Bernardo Benvenuti, prior of the Benedictine monastery of Santa Felicita in Florence, so that he could identify the books that would have gone missing from the collection following his resignation.956

In following letters, Magliabechi, afraid that his enemies would “trovino la strada d’ingannar anche la Santissima Mente di V.A.S.”, explained the Grand Duke about everything that had happened to him.957 Full disclosure was needed because his enemies were circulating vicious lies in Florence against him. This threat came, most of all, from his own secretary, Apollonio Bassetti:

953 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 1684, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, 131, “as it was the Christian’s doctrine, or
954 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 8 December 1684, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, 123, “To manage not to desire anything but to eat, with Eastern, and the most solemn Festivities, one single couple of egg, and sometimes even something less than that”.
955 Ibidem, “I Libri, ad ogni mezzo cenno, o abbrucierò, o manderò dove da V.A.S. mi sarà comandato, già che la principal cagione che me gl’ha fatti mettere insieme, è stata, di poter con essi, secondo i miei deboli talenti, far maggiore onore a V.A.S., come è mio obbligo il fare”
956 Ibidem, “Perche io possa sempre aver testimoniaia di come lascio la Libreria di V.A.S., e de’ Libri che sono in essa non potendo sapere come le cose doppo di me sieno per andare, supplico umilmente V.A.S. che mi sia permesso una sola mezza giornata avanti a ché io consegna le chiavi a chi V.A.S. mi comanderà ch’io possa mostrarlà diligentissimamente col fargli vedere ad uno ad uno i Libri più rari al signore Bernardo Benvenuti, Priore di S. Felicìa avendone esso qua più cognizione di alcuno altro”
957 Ibidem, “find the way to deceive the holy mind of Your Illustrious Lordship”.
958 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 28 December 1684, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 124, “That my enemies, fill the cities with the rumors, and the world with letters, lies, and the most evil impostures and slander, against me, would not have been the reason that I dare to write you, but hearing from more sides, that the same sir Canon Bassetti, who I have always craved to serve, and never have offended, spread things against the truth, maybe misinformed, and because he had the ear of Your Illustrious Lordship, I believe that it is necessary, that I purge the truth, at least for these only things, that are easy to believe than other things”.
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Moreover, Magliabechi had found out that his handwriting was falsified to make everyone believe that he was the author of the *Scanzia*.\(^959\) Magliabechi is mesmerized by the resentful efforts to undermine his reputation and writes Cosimo with a sarcastic remark that they could even make him the “Autore dell'Alcorano, e del Talmut”.\(^960\) One more time, Magliabechi assured the Grand Duke, that it was not him, but Cinelli who wrote the *Scanzia* and that he was willing to show him “le lettere, ed altre Scritture originali” to prove himself right. With this evidence Magliabechi was certainly not able to restore his reputation, but he hoped that he could at least show that the Grand Duke was deceived by his own subjects, including thus his secretary Bassetti. Yet, the Grand Duke assured Magliabechi that Bassetti would never have said anything that would harm him.\(^961\)

Either way, explained Magliabechi to the Grand Duke, there is a bright side to all this. Many scholars from around Italy and beyond had stood up for him, writing him hundreds of letters and poems of praise to prove his innocence and to restore his reputation. Magliabechi forwarded many of these letters to his correspondents, also to his contacts in the Dutch Republic, to show that he had become victim of this vicious plot.\(^962\) Amongst these letters, there were hundreds of letters written by leading Cardinals, as well as many letters from the Congregation of the Holy Office. These Cardinals found out about the book through the inquisitor of Florence, Francesco Antonio Riveri (1631-1697), who was so horrified that a book like the *I. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae* could have been printed under the eyes of Cosimo that he immediately sent the book to Rome.\(^963\) In Rome, the commissioner-general of the Congregation of the Holy Office, Tommaso Mazza (1616-1688) and the oriental scholar and cardinal Lodovico Marracci (1612-1700), advisor of the *Congregatio pro Indice Librorum Prohibitorum*, were as shocked as Riveri, exclaiming, in the words of Magliabechi, that “Firenze sia peggio che Ginevra” and amazed that “niuno in enormità tali metta le mani”.\(^964\) Magliabechi forwarded their letters to Cosimo, in which he could read that they declared that not the Holy Office but the Grand Duke himself should punish the truly guilty.\(^965\) On the 9th of October 1684, Lodovico Marracci explained that it is the responsibility of the Grand Duke “essendo in materia meramente politica”:

> “Mi disse ultimamente il P. Commissario di questo S. Offizio, che dalla parte della sacra
> Inquisizione si era operato quanto si doveva per conto di quello scellerato libretto, ordinando

\(^{959}\) *Ibidem.*

\(^{960}\) Magliabechi to Cosimo III, February 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 126, “the author of the Koran or the Talmut”.

\(^{961}\) Cosimo III to Magliabechi, 4 February 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 125, “Così subito che dal Padre Inquisitore fu mandato il diabolico Libello infamatorio a Roma, stomacati che in Firenze, sotto g’occhi di V.A.S. fosse stata stampata, e dispensata una si orribile infamità, mi scrissero diversi signore Cardinali. Così scrissi al signore Cardinal Cibo, al signore Bonsi, che da sua parte mi dicesse, e l’essesse anche fece cento, e cento altri. Per non tediare V.A.S., ecco le due sole Lettere, di cento e cento che potrei mandarle, di due Religiosi, insinui per Santità di Vita, e per Dottrina, e cosicché anche per Cariche, e tutti a due della S. Congregazione del Santo Offizioso, anzi uno di essi è Commissario di esso S. Offizio, che come V.A.S. sa, fa quasi il tutto.”


\(^{963}\) Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 131, “Florence is worse than Geneva”, “nobody get his hands on such an enormous case”.

\(^{964}\) Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 21 May 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 127, “Vegga che la S. Congregazione si protesta chiarissimamente, che il gastigio di questa diabolica infamità, tocca a V.A.S., non ad essa.”
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If Cosimo would not believe that their letters were authentic, Magliabechi advised him to show the letter to the inquisitor Riveri who was able to recognize his handwriting with a glance. Magliabechi urged the Grand Duke to reflect on everything what he had learned so far:

“Supplico umilmente V.A.S. a degnarsi di far riflessione, se tollerasse, che fossero dette pubblicamente l’essecrande ingiurie che sono stampate, e mandate per tutto il mondo, contro di me, ad un suo Staffiere, ad un Contadino. Non solo non le tollerrebbe V.A.S. in niuna maniera, che farebbe severamente gastigare quel tale, metterebbe mano alla spada, e si vendicherebbe.

If that was not enough, Magliabechi continued to rub salt in the wound, using rather hard words to the Grand Duke, urging him to impose an appropriate sentence on Moniglia and that the Io. Cinelli et A. Magliabechi vitae should be burned as soon as possible. If the Grand Duke was not willing to grant his request, Magliabechi was forced to resign as a gesture of protest against the injustice that was being done.

While the printer of the publication, Vincenzo Vangelisti was imprisoned, Moniglia was never punished. In his anger, Magliabechi wrote to Gisbert Cuper that “certo in ogni altra parte del mondo gli sarebbe stata tagliata la testa. Qua, non solo non ne ebbe gastigo alcuno, ma premio. O tempora! O tempora! torno a dire.” Moreover, the Grand Duke never gave his permission to Magliabechi to leave the Medici court. Magliabechi, therefore, took justice in his own hands and planned to take his revenge. Together with his friend and poet Federico Nomi (1633-1705) he decided to publish a satirical work against Moniglia.

In his profile of Federico Nomi, Giovanni Bianchini has argued that Moniglia forced Nomi to leave the University of Pisa because he challenged Aristotle’s traditional study of science by advocating the research of the physician Francesco Redi. The correspondence of Antonio Magliabechi sheds further light on the conflict between Nomi and Moniglia, showing how Moniglia managed to convince...

---

966 Lodovico Marracci to Magliabechi, 9 October 1684, BNCF, Magl. VIII 1184, f. 54, “Lately the Commissioner of this Holy Office has said to me, that the holy Inquisitor has righly done what he had to regarding that evil book, ordering that it should be burned. But the punishments of the author [Moniglia] of that book, lies with the secular Prince, because it concerns political matters. This means that Your Illustrious Lordship [Magliabechi] should complain about the minister s of Your Serene Highness [Cosimo III] and not of the ones of the Holy Office. And I truly remain astonished, how this very serious crime has been handled there with so much indulgence.”

967 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, 21 May 1685, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 127, “ed è tutta di sua mano, se V.A.S. ci avesse dubbio alcuno, può mandarla a riconoscere al Padre Inquisitore, che ne avrà certo avuta di esso molte, e riconoscerà la mano benissimo.”

968 Magliabechi to Cosimo III, undated, BNCF, Autografi Palatini Magliabechi, n. 131, “I humbly beg Your Illustrious Lordship to reflect, if you tolerate that these evil insults are printed and sent over all the world, against me, your staff member, a villager. You would not only tolerate this in any manner, but you should also severely punish that one, putting your hands on the sword, and take revenge”.

969 Ibidem, “Se V.A.S. non si degna di far fare la giustizia che si deve, di ua cos’ enorme scelleragine, come mi giova di sperare, che è neccessario che si debbano concderemdi licenza che con sua buona grazzia io vada a ripararmi altrove, dalla tirannide di costoro.”

the Grand Duke to dismiss Nomi from his professorship. In 1703, Magliabechi reported the story to Jacob Gronovius in great secrecy, urging him to tear up the letter immediately after reading. In this letter, Magliabechi explained that Moniglia had commissioned Nomi to give him private lessons at his home for being “tanto asino, e così ignorante, che ne meno sapeva mettere insieme, due parole Latine.”

Over time, Nomi was convinced that he was on good terms with Moniglia, and thought he was doing right to tell him about the sinful life of his wife and daughters, who “erano la favola di Pisa”. Nomi hoped that Moniglia would remedy the situation before it got any worse. Moniglia, however, went straight to the Grand Duke and claimed that “il signore Nomi, o contaminava, o almeno voleva contaminare, la moglia, e le Figliuole”.

Upon hearing this, the Grand Duke dismissed Nomi on the spot. After the incident, Nomi retired to Monterchi, a small village a few kilometers from Anghiari, where he started to work on various publications, including his satirical work against Moniglia.

To teach Moniglia a lesson, all that was needed was someone who shared the same feelings of hatred against him. Naturally, Magliabechi did not need to think long before he understood that Jacob Gronovius was the perfect candidate. He had, after all, suffered the same fate as Nomi twenty years earlier.

In 1695, Magliabechi took his chance and reached out to Gronovius in secret, directing him to tear apart the letter after reading. Since Moniglia had intimidated hundreds of men in Florence and Pisa, it was about time that someone stepped up against him. He believed that the publication of Nomi, in which “è copertamente quello scellerato Medico staffilato”, would fulfil this purpose. Nomi offended Moniglia under the name of Curculione (transl. weevil) which is the same pseudonym as used by Benedetto Menzini in his Satire, who was offended by Moniglia’s definition of his poetry as “piscio delle Muse”.

Magliabechi contacted Gronovius to see if he was willing to help with Nomi’s publication, asking him whether he knew someone who could print the publication. Gronovius replied positively to Magliabechi’s request and offered his assistance. From that moment on, Gronovius provided corrections

973 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated (1703), LMU, Cod 4° Cod.Msc 777, f. 12, “so dumb, and ignorante, that he does not even know how to bring together two words of Latin”.

974 Ibidem, “the joke of Pisa”.

975 Ibidem, sir Nomi violated, or at least wanted to violate, his wife, and daughters”.

976 Ibidem, “Il signore Nomi, faceva interamente le lezioni a Curculione, già ch esso era tanto asino, e così ignorante, che ne meno sapeva mettere insieme, due parole Latine. Curculione, perché il signore Nomi gli componeva le Lezioni, lo teneva a Pisa in Casa sua, anzi l’aveva per dir così fatto Padrone della sua casa, trattandolo luttissimamente, il che poteva fare senza di un minimo suo scomodo, con settecento scudi l’anno, che aveva, o per dir meglio rubava, da quello Studio. Il signore Nomi, che come V.S.Ill.ma sa, è un ottimo signore, vedendosi da Curculione, tanto onorato, e favorito, stimo di dir che non credeva che vi fosse male alcuno, ma che con tutto ciò, era prudenza, il procurare che non nascesse. Curculione, per mezzo di quell’ateo Ministro, lo rovinò, e gli fece perdere la Carica, e licenziare dallo Studio di Pisa, e con questa scellerato calunnia. Diedero ad intendere a S.A.R., che il signore Nomi, o contaminava, o almeno voleva contaminare, la Moglia, e le Figliuole, di Curculione, onde S.A.R. lo fece subito licenziare dallo Studio.”

977 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 30 December 1696, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 39, “Cento, e cento altri ha rovinati con scelleratissime cabale; ed esso anche fu, come V.S.Ill.ma ben sa, che con quell’ateo, operò il tutto per levarla di Pisa.”

978 Ibidem, secretly stirred up that unholy physician.”


980 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778, f. 4, “Di nuovo ritiero a V.S.Ill.ma le mie reverentissime suppliche, perché voglia degnarsi di trovare costà qualche Stampatore, che imprima le suddette Satire, il che a V.S. Ill.ma si renderà facilissimo. Non solamente V.S. Ill.ma farà un favore grandissimo al signore Nomi, ed a me, che siamo suoi cos’gran Servitori, ma ancora a cento, e cento galantuomini, stato o interamente rovinati, o perseguitati, da quello scellerato Medico. Giornalmente mi è domandato da diversi, se sono stampate, e quando si aspettano. Il signore Nomi rimette in V.S. Ill.ma il correggere, e l’emendare, tutte quello che le pare, e se V.S. Ill.ma non vuole la briga, e l’incomodo di correggerle, si degna di farle stampare come stanno, poiche se vi avesse dei errori la vergogna non sarà punto di V.S. Ill.ma, ma dell’Autore. V.S. Ill.ma quando che fu qua, vedde la somma bontà del signore Nomi; ed io in oltre l’assicuro, che è veramente suo grandissimo, ma grandissimo ammiratore, e non mi scrive volto, che il fa spessissimo, che non mi domandi se ho nuove di V.S. Ill.ma, e che non mi imponga di riverirla in suo nome. Mentre che V.S. Ill.ma non potesse, o non volesse farle stampare Ella, la prego a darle o all’ottimo, e dottissimo suo signore Fratello, o a qualche amico, perché le faccia stampare egli.”
to the manuscript and sent them directly to Nomi in Monterchi or passed them on through Magliabechi. Nomi had given Gronovius full consent to change or cancel whatever he did not like.\footnote{Nomi to Magliabechi, 23 January 1699, in Giovanni Bianchini, ‘Sui rapporti tra Federigo Nomi e Antonio Magliabechi (1670-1705) con lettere inedite del Nomi’, 288 (letter XXXIV): ‘Il Signor Gronovio circa le mie Satire faccia a modo suo, perché mi rimetto a un tanto uomo’. See also Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 3 June 1699, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Ms 777, f. 53, ‘Subito che ho mandato il foglio di V.S.Ill.ma al signore Nomi, ho da esso ricevuto l’incluso altro foglio, scritto come vede di sua mano. V.S.Ill.ma però non guardi ad esso, ma corregga, ed emendi, ciò che le pare, come in fine di esso le da l’autorità’.}

Gronovius took advantage of this privilege and insisted, for example, on the deletion of a passage that regarded Gisbert Cuper. In the manuscript, Gronovius noticed that Nomi referred to Cuper as “senatorem Hollandiae”. Annoyed, he wrote to Magliabechi that “no one recognizes that frivolous and impotent men as the senator of Holland”\footnote{J. Gronovius to Magliabechi, 10 October 1698, in Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti, *Clavarium Belgarium ad Aut. Magliabechiurn nonnulliore aliquo epistola*, vol. 1, 205, “Primo nullus illum nugacem, et impotentem Hominem agnoscit senatorem Hollandiae”.} Magliabechi answered Gronovius that “Circa alle Satire del signore Nomi, io non so come il manoscritto, senza nominar punto, ne V.S. Ill.ma, ne me.”\footnote{Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Ms 778, f. 9, “Regarding the Satire of sir Nomi, I did not have observed that piece about sir Cuper. Your Illustrious Lordship can remove it entirely”.}

Although Nomi informed Magliabechi that he did not want to remove the passage about Cuper, in the published *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* the name of Cuper does not appear.\footnote{Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Ms 778, f. 4, “Regarding the evil books and infamous books that was published against me and because of the persecutions against Your Illustrious Lordship, it is not good if Your Illustrious Lordship or I appear to have ordered the printing of the Satire, because it would look like if we had done that out of revenge. The printer, therefore, can write in the Dedication or preface of the book that he did not know how he did receive the manuscript, without mentioning Your Illustrious Lordship and me.”} On the 19th of October 1696, Gronovius informed Magliabechi that the Leiden publisher and bookseller Jordaan Luchtmans (1652-1708) took the job of printing Nomi’s satirical piece.\footnote{Gronovius to Magliabechi, 5 May 1702, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Ms 777, f. 76-77, “Oh how beautiful and noble is the type, the paper, and every other thing!”} On the 5th of May 1702, Magliabechi received the first printed page of the *Liber satyrarum sexdecim*, exclaiming his enthusiasm to Gronovius: “Oh come è bello, e nobile, il carattere, la carta, ed ogni altra cosa!”\footnote{See, Sytze van der Veen, eds., 325 Jaar Uitgeven in Dienst van de Wetenschap (Leiden/Boston: Brill Publishers, 2008); 9-45.}

In addition, Magliabechi had enjoyed reading the printed letter of Jacob Gronovius in the *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* in which he accused Moniglia of his continious harrasments at the University of Pisa.\footnote{Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Ms 778, f. 12, “Ho riso nel vedere, ciò che V.S.Ill.ma nella detta sua elegantissima Lettera scrive, di Curculione”. Dedictory letter of Jacob Gronovius in Federico Nomi, *Liber satyrarum sexdecim* (Leiden: apud Jordanum Luchtmans, 1703): 140, “Quis igitur malus genius et isti Academae invidus excussit inde tantum decoris et ornamenti, quod ex te percipiebat? An in te quoque subdorari debeas valida robustasque fuisse Curculionis calumnias?”}
6.3. Prohibited Books in the Epistolary Network

Throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, the institutions in charge of censorship became gradually more secular and less controlled by church authorities. This explains why papal control played out differently among the Italian states, whose local inquisitions varied in number and secular power. Consequently, the differences in government policy regarding religious or political matters resulted primarily from the divergent preferences of Italian rulers. The Republic of Venice, for instance, imposed severe limits on the jurisdiction of the Roman inquisition within its own territories, maintaining control over most religious matters. As a result, Venice stood out as an oligarchic republic, whose nobility tolerated a rather liberal and flexible climate to stimulate international commerce. Yet, not every authority became more moderate or lenient. The Grand Duchy of Tuscany under Cosimo III is historically regarded as a place of bigotry, where a stringently conservative policy was pursued instead. Here, an even more severe system of censorship and control was in place. A letter from Magliabechi to Jacob Gronovius, for example, reads in part that Cosimo III “non si cura più niente degli Studi, ma della pietà”. He scrabbled these words on a small piece of paper, separate from the main letter, ready to be burned.

Jonathan Israel has argued that Cosimo III, on becoming Grand Duke in 1670, championed the clergy’s claims to supremacy over Tuscany’s intellectual and cultural life, collaborated with the inquisition in censoring books and controlling the book-trade and leaned heavily on the University of Pisa. The studio pisano boasted some eminent professors, but the rigid conservatism and the prohibition on Cartesianism as imposed by Cosimo III, made these academic circles soon disappear. The oppressed character of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in these years is exemplified by the correspondence of Magliabechi, who eased his frustration about the poor state in which he met the scholarly life there. “Lo studio di Pisa va in malora affatto”, he wrote to Jacob Gronovius on the 2nd of February 1674, lamenting the lack of competent university professors.

Despite the apparent laws of censorship in Italy, and in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in particular, Antonio Rotondò has underlined that in the fifty-year period stretching from the 1680s through the 1730s – the peak years of Magliabechi’s correspondence – there had not been a foreign book, even the most controversial one, that had not come to Italy from England, Holland, Germany or France. The numerous great libraries that grew up all over Italy in the seventeenth century are the testimony of “questa stagione di apertura europea della cultura italiana”. Rotondò mentioned, by way of example, the library of cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740) in Rome which, under the influence of librarian Francesco Bianchini (1662-1729), held one of the largest book and manuscript collections in Italy. In Modena, the historiographers Benedetto Bacchini (1651-1721) and, after him, Antonio Lodovico Muratori (1672-1750) took care of the library of the Duke of Modena. The library of Giuseppe Valletta (1636-1714) was one of the most celebrated and famous libraries in Naples. These men, underlined Rotondò, were all

---

992 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated [1676], LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778. f. 8, “does not care about scholarship, but only about mercy”.
993 Prosperi, L’inquisizione Romana. Letture e Richerche, 293.
994 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 2 February 1674, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777. ff. 141-142, “the University of Pisa really goes to hell.”

250
Magliabechi plays a central role in the circulation of prohibited books in Italy. Jonathan Israel has noted that “through Magliabechi, information about and access to prohibited ideas, books, and manuscripts was readily available even in the heart of Cosimo III’s Tuscany.” The many controversial publications listed in table 1, like Jean le Clerc’s Bibliothèque Choixie, Pierre Bayle’s editions of the Dictionnaire Historique et Critique and Gregorio Leti’s L’Italia Regnante, which were all enlisted on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, attest to Magliabechi’s relative openness about these books.

There are several reasons why the books prohibited in Italy ended up in the hands of Magliabechi. Rotondò has pointed out that the Roman Catholic Church had continued to successfully prevent the spread of books coming from across the Alps, but, beyond the control of the whole censorious apparatus, a sort of *zona franca* of scholars had been created, whose quick access to book novelties and condemned books could not be undermined. How so? To answer this question, the view of Simon Ditchfield is fundamental, who has underlined that continuous censorship can have repressive as well as creative effects. In fact, the correspondence of Magliabechi sheds light on the, rather creative techniques and network strategies used by both scholars and booksellers to circumvent the strict control by the inquisition. One of these strategies was to not sent prohibited books through areas tightly controlled by the inquisition.

Before the books were transported to Florence from Livorno, “they had to remain in quarantine for forty days, or sometimes less – in periods with no epidemics or after the intercession of the Florentine librarian Antonio Magliabechi.” After the quarantine, the

996 Ibidem, cit. 1416, “Complex web of epistolary relationships”.
998 Israel, Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750, 45.
1001 Mirto, Stampatori, Editori, Librai Nella Seconda Metà Del Seicento, 52.
books had to be seen by the censors of the inquisition, who, however, were not that strict about the books destined for the Medici court. Therefore, if there was a risk that books might be forbidden, the Combi-La Noù firm often sent the books to well-known scholars of the Medici court to make them look less suspicious. In the 1660s, for example, when Magliabechi was not yet as influential as he would later become, the books were often sent to the Florentine scholar Carlo Dati instead of Magliabechi “acciò l’Inquisitor non facci troppo stranezza nel riveder i libri”.

Rotondò has further argued that the networks of travel and correspondence which grew extensively during the seventeenth century, had become uncontrollable by the inquisition. The inquisitors were unable to oversee the overload of information that flowed through these networks. Magliabechi’s extensive network of booksellers, scholars, merchants and travelers enabled him to receive books from all parts of Europe. Moreover, through Magliabechi, many learned scholar had access to forbidden literature. For instance, Carlo Dati received from Magliabechi the books of Hugo Grotius, while Bernardo Benvenuti, prior of the Benedictine monastery of Santa Felicità in Florence, obtained the works of Gerardus Vossius. In this way books coming from the Dutch territories could reach Italian readers without major constraints.

How, then, was it possible that Magliabechi does not seem to pose a threat to the Inquisition? In large part this was because the inquisitors depended on his help and expertise. As one of the few people that was able to handle the overload of publications coming to Italy, he proved to be a valuable asset. Magliabechi’s relationship with Francesco Antonio Severi, the inquisitor of Florence was stable, even friendly. Severi asked Magliabechi for books (even the various editions of the Index Librorum Prohibitorum) or for information about authors rather than waiting for the news to arrive through official channels. In turn, Severi paid these favors back by giving Magliabechi the liberty to pursue his library career in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. Not only the local inquisitor relied on Magliabechi’s help. The “overload of information” also posed an evident problem for the compilation of the Index Librorum Prohibitorum.

On the first of July 1670, Leopoldo de’ Medici wrote to Magliabechi that the Roman authorities had commissioned him to provide a detailed list of books that were missing in the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, stating the name of the author, and the date and place of publication, so that the Congregation could inspect and judge the books. To fulfill this task, Leopoldo immediately contacted the one person fit for this job: Magliabechi. He ordered him to prepare a detailed list of books, especially those by heretic authors, that needed to be included in the Index. Magliabechi proceeded with caution, and began to send periodically lists of books that he considered heretical to Leopoldo in Rome. Leopoldo subsequently gave these lists to canon Lorenzo Panciatichi, who put them in order and presented them to the Congregation.

Magliabechi not only updated the lists of prohibited books with the most recent publications, he also provided Leopoldo with corrections to the recently printed Index. When Magliabechi received a copy of the Index of 1670, he was blown away by the amount of errors it contained.

---

1005 Mirto, Stampatori, Editori, Librai Nella Seconda Metà Del Seicento, 1:47.
1007 On this subject see, Blair, Too Much to Know, 151-153.
1009 Mirto, Stampatori, Editori, Librai Nella Seconda Metà Del Seicento, 1: cit. 50.
1010 Index librorum prohibitorum Clementis X. Pontificis Maximi Iussu editus (Romae: ex typographia Reu. Cam. Apost, 1670).
“Nell’aprirlo solamente, son restato immobile per l’orrore, vedendo gl’enormi e così spessi errori, de’ quali è per tutto ripieno, il che scrivo con vere lagrime a gl’occhi, non per odio, o disprezzo, di chi che sia. Non sono gl’eretici no, che a piena bocca ci vadano burlando e schernendo, ma i medesimi nostri cattolici, ma i medesimi nostri religiosi, son costretti (benché troppo arditamente lo confesso) ad acclamare, dal dolore e dal zelo, con indignazione e con gemiti.”

In his report to Leopoldo, Magliabechi had nothing but contempt for Vincenzo Fani, secretary of the Index, who did everything wrong that he could possible to do. He misspelled the names of the publications and their authors (il Vossio a carte 174, in Vorsio), was unable to identify anonymous authors (“Che vuol dire quel quidam Auctor, come di persona incognita. Ogni asino sa che ‘l D significa David, il B Blondellus) and forgot books that were already present in previous editions of the Index (Che autorità ha ‘l p. maestro Fani di levar dall’Indice i libri già proibiti, come solamente fa di questo, ma ancora di parecchi altrî?). Moreover, Magliabechi noticed that for those authors to which opera omnia was applied, Fani nevertheless specified several books. This is, naturally, a trivial, rather redundant, mistake. In addition, when Magliabechi came across the title Mare liberum, sive de Iure, quod competit Batavis ad Indicana Commercia, without the author [i.e. Hugo Grotius] of the book, he made the following, rather harsh, remark:

“Chi è quello tanto asino che non sappia, che ‘l detto dotto libretto è del Grozzio, ed in oltre stampato e ristampato, col suo nome mille volte. Che non l’abbiano saputo non ostante che l’abbiano proibito, si cava evidentemente non solo dalla detta pagina, ma anche dalla 185, dalla 209 e da altre nelle quali facendosi menzione di esso, non vi è mai nominato ‘l Grozzio. Di più a carte 153, dove si registrano l’opere proibite del detto Grozzio, questa non vi comparisce. Non mi dà fastidio la loro ignoranza in una cosa tanto nota, ma mi dispiace che in questa maniera si imbrogliano le coscienze, già che la maggior parte si confonderanno e non vi vedendo il nome del Grozzio in luogo alcuno, crederanno che ‘l libro proibito non sia ‘l suo, ma qualche altro”.

The Roman ecclesiastical authorities used Magliabechi’s reports to compile the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, no less, drawing from it an almost complete list of Protestant authors, particularly in theology and philosophy. They could therefore appreciate the efficacy of the method of bibliographical description devised by Magliabechi.

Magliabechi repeatedly asserted that the Inquisitors were in need of this detailed information if they were to identify editions with the greatest bibliographical precision with a view to their possible prohibition. The numerous errors in the Index “non serve ad altro che a generar confusione” and “imbrogliare le coscienze”. As shown by the aforementioned passage, this confusion would increase

---

1012 Mirto, ‘Antonio Magliabechi e Le Sue Note All’Index Librorum Prohibitorum’, cit. 83, “In opening it only, I froze in horror, seeing that it is entirely full of enormous and frequent mistakes, which I write with true tears in my eyes, not out of hate, but out of contempt, towards whoever did that. It aren’t the heretics who with mouth full are messing and mocking with us, but our own Catholics, of our religion, who are obliged (although way too boldly, I confess) to acclaim, out of pain and zeal, with indignity and groans.”

1013 Ibidem, cit. 92.

1014 Ibidem, cit. 117-118, “who is that ass that does not know, that that learned book is from Grotius, which is printed and reprinted with his name thousands of times. That they have prohibited it without even knowing that, can be clearly seen not only from this page, but also from page 185, and 209, and other pages in which it is mentioned, in which no mention is made of Grotius. Moreover, on page 153, where the prohibited works of Grotius are registered, this book does not appear. Their ignorance regarding something very known does not bother me, but I reget that the minds are cheated in this way, because in the most cases one will bring confusion and since the name of Grotius is not present in any place, they will believe that this book is not written by him, but by someone else.”.

1015 Ibidem, “it serves no purpose except in the creation of confusion”; “tricking the mind”. 
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the ambiguity of the books, causing that a publication like the *Mare Liberum* of Hugo Grotius would escape censorship.

Magliabechi’s disdain for the inquisitors, becomes also apparent from the letters he wrote to the Dutch Republic. In a letter to Jacob Gronovius dated the 14th of July 1676, for example, Magliabechi noticed “con ogni segretezza, ma insieme con ogni verità” that “gl’Inquisitori, ed i Vicari, molte volte son persone di pochissime Lettere, onde V.S.Ill.ma non si maravigli che bene spesso diano a rivedere, e ad approvare i Libri a persone di mediocre letteratura.”

To a certain extent it seems as if Magliabechi hid himself behind his infinite bibliographical reports, passing himself off as someone who merely served the Inquisition or the scholarly community by objectively informing his contacts about every publication that came off the press. In this respect, Magliabechi followed the principle of the bibliographer Conrad Gesner (1516-1665), who in his *Bibliotheca Universalis* (1545) attempted an exhaustive listing of all works printed in Latin, Greek or Hebrew in the first century of printing. Gesner’s ambition to be exhaustive required some justification against the charge of including prohibited books. He justified himself as follows: “No author was spurned by me, not so much because I considered them all worthy of being cataloged or remembered, but rather to satisfy the plan which I had set for myself, simply to enumerate without selection all [writings] which happened. We only wanted to list them, and left the selection and judgment free to others.”

Magliabechi sought to do exactly the same, merely serving the scholarly community in dealing with the overload of books in the seventeenth century.

That Magliabechi seemingly hid himself behind the objectivity of his bibliographical reports is shown by the following example. In June 1683, Magliabechi received a letter from his enemy Andrea Moniglia in which he demanded him to distribute his most recent publication to his correspondents. This letter presents a clear and unambiguous picture as to why Moniglia is considered to be “l’adversaire le plus dangereux des modernes dans le dernier tiers du XVIIe siècle”. It bears, in fact, a striking example of some early modern blackmailing practices:

“Alcuni mesi sono, quando io mi lamentai con alcuni amici comuni, che V.S. trasmetteva a’ molti Letterati d’Europa la 4.a Scanzia di Gio. Cinelli, mi risposero ch’ella allegava per sua difesa, che era solita mandare in diverse parti tutte le leggende che venivano alla luce, essendo dunque uscita una dalla stampa nel tempo ch’io mi ritrovava in Siena la quale forse non le sarà capitata ancora sotto l’occhio, ho stimato mio dovere mandarle un’esemplare, acciò ne possa provvedere quanto le bisognino per inviargli a’ suoi medesimi corrispondenti a quali ha fatto venire in mano la 4.a Scanzia, e cordialmente la riverisco.”

As shown by this passage, when Moniglia asked Magliabechi straight out why he had sent the *Quarta Scanzia* to his correspondents all over Europe, Magliabechi replied that he was used to send each single publication that had come off the press, no matter what book it was. Moniglia took advantage of Magliabechi’s answer and left him no choice as to circulate his publication as well, given that Magliabechi was so ‘indifferent’ when it comes to books. An anonymous pamphlet of 8 pages was attached to the letter that was sent to Magliabechi, which discussed the involvement of Cinelli in the controversy between

1016 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 14 July 1676, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 777, f. 193.
1017 Blair, *Too much to know*, 162.
1019 Moniglia to Magliabechi, 23 June 1683, BNCF, Magli. VIII, 1186, f. 75, “Several months ago, when I complained together with some mutual friends that Your Illustrious Lordship had sent the fourth Scanzia of Giovanni Cinelli to many scholars in Europe, you answered me that, in your own defense, that you used to send every story that came to light in various parts, like with the book [scanzia] that was printed while I was in Siena, which would probably not have occurred under my radar. I believe therefore that it is my duty to send you an exemplar of [my] publication, and provide you with as many you need, to send them to the same correspondents that have received the fourth scanzia from you, and I cordially revere you”.
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Ramazzini and Moniglia concerning the death of Bagnesi.\footnote{Anonymous, Relazione di tutto quello, ch’è seguito nella Controversia letteraria, tra li Signori Eccellentissimi Gio. Andrea Moniglia e Bernardino Ramazzini intorno alla malattia, e morte della Signoria Marchesia N. N. (Siena: nella Stamperia del Pubblico, 1683).} Of course, we cannot be certain whether or not Magliabechi listened to Moniglia and circulated his publication. We know, however, that Magliabechi never mentioned Moniglia’s publications in his letters to the Dutch Republic, which leads to think that he ignored Moniglia’s request. This provides further evidence that Magliabechi almost never promoted the circulation of the works of his enemies. Publications of Francesco Redi, Vincenzo Viviani, Giovan Battista Gornia, just to name a few, do not appear amongst the most cited books in his correspondence. Hence, we can conclude that Magliabechi was not so neutral after all. Moreover, Magliabechi did have a severe attitude when it came to dedications to his patrons.

proposal, he argued that the publication would bring the printer fame and profit, all the more because a contested publication would attract the curiosity of the scholarly community. The book, in fact, was much requested in Italy because “questa sua libertà di scrivere farà che l’Istoria sarà anche maggiormente cercata.”

Moreover, Magliabechi promised Gronovius that he would generate widespread publicity for the publication. Once the book had come off the press, he himself would immediately buy 50 volumes—which he would pay in advance too—to circulate amongst his friends. These friends were in a position where they could spread word about the publication all over Italy. Once spread the word, he was convinced that many re-prints were needed to respond to the demand. From this it becomes clear that Magliabechi strategically used his network to guarantee a fast and wide circulation of the book.

However, in the case Gronovius was unable to find a printer, Magliabechi would secretly write to the Amsterdam printer Pieter Blaeu:

“Se V.S.Ill.ma non ha stampatore alcuno al quale voglia far questo servizio, ne scriverò io segretamente al signore Blaeu, il quale so più che certo che la stamperà subito, già che gli sarà di grandissimo utile. Ho detto che gliene scriverò segretamente, perché non voglio che da niuno si sappia che sia stato io che abbia mandato costà il manoscritto, poiché avrei de’ fastidi di Roma dagl’Inquisitori, per quello che nell’Istoria si scrive di Alessando VI.”

Magliabechi’s request to print a controversial manuscript could have serious consequences. It could get him into trouble with the Inquisition. He therefore needed to take measures of secrecy, ensuring that nobody would know that it was him who sent the manuscript to the Dutch Republic. To conceal the message, Magliabechi asked Gronovius therefore to tear up the letter immediately after reading (see figure 51).

Why did Magliabechi took this risk? Magliabechi believed that the De Bello Italico would bring “maggior gloria” to Florence, using the manuscript to restore the degrading scholarly image of Florence. This is certainly a recurring theme throughout this study in general and this chapter in particular. The intellectual climate in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in the late seventeenth century has a bad press. The suppression of anything that transgressed the boundaries defined by the Church, had turned the Grand Duchy of Tuscany into an improper and corrupt society, closed off from developments abroad. The experience of Antonio Magliabechi seems to corroborate this. He continuously lamented the poor distribution of foreign and Italian titles, as well as the mediocre quality of scholarly publications originating from the Italian peninsula. He wrote, for example, to Nicolaas Heinsius on the 28th of July 1674, that he had compiled his bibliographical report “più con le lacrime, che con l’inchiostro” because “qua non ci è si può dire alcuno che studi per la vera strada”.

With the printing of the De Bello Italico Magliabechi must have hoped to put Florence back on the map.

1025 Ibidem, That liberty of writing of his will make the Istoria very looked for”.
1026 Ibidem, “non solo non ne pretendio ne anche un esemplare, ma in oltre mi obbligo di comprarne subito cinquanta, per [donare] ad Amici, e pagherò il danaro di esse avanti. I detti cinquanta esemplari che donerò faranno esitare in Italia tutta l’edizione, e certo che bisognarà ristamparla più volte.”
1027 Ibidem, “If Your Illustrious Lordship does not have a printer who wants to do this service, I will write in secret to sir Blaeu [Pieter Blaeu], who, I am sure about it, will print it immediately, because it will be very profitable for him. I say that I will write to him in secret, so that nobody knows that I have sent the manuscript there, because I would otherwise receive trouble from Rome from the Inquisitors, because of what is written about Alessando VI in the Istoria.”
1028 Ibidem, “La supplico per tutte le sante leggi dell’amicizia, e per le viscere di Gjesù Cristo signore Nostro, a stracciar questa cartuccia, che le scrivo in estrema segretezza, e confidenza, subito che l’avrà letta, e considerata”.
1029 Magliabechi to N. Heinsius, 28 July 1674, UBL, BUR F 8, “more with tear than with ink”, “because nobody here studies on the true path”.
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Fig. 51 The little, easy to be concealed, letter from Magliabechi to Jacob Gronovius requesting the printing of the controversial *De Bello Italico* (LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778, f. 1)

6.3.1. LIMITATIONS TO SCHOLARLY OPENNESS

While the scholarly journal was able to replace most numerous literary items mentioned in Magliabechi’s letters, it did not replace the *commerce de lettres* that revolved around books that deserved more attention or to books that demanded the utmost discretion and privacy. Magliabechi often returns to publications in his letters when they pose a significant threat to his reputation of that of the Medici family. At one level, Magliabechi sat at the center of a pan-European web of learned information and scholarship, managing his status as an independent and relatively free scholar. There is no doubt that Magliabechi wished to be seen as an important and exemplary citizen of the scholarly network, for he continuously spoke of his duty to share his knowledge with others and invoked the importance of books as precious contributions to the common good of all scholars and authors of Europe. Yet, while member of the Republic of Letters, he felt compelled to stay loyal to the Medici family and the Catholic Church, retaining a certain professional dependence on, and responsibility for, the Grand Duke of Tuscany. This entente occasionally made him vulnerable to awkward dilemmas of loyalty and he needed to set boundaries in order to protect himself and the Medici family. His correspondence sheds light on this entente,


examples of which were also discussed in the first chapter of this study. We have seen, for example, that Magliabechi was rather prudent when mentioning a list of Protestant books to Lorenzo Panciatichi, and limited himself to citing only four publications in order to come to terms with his own faith.

An example of how Magliabechi set boundaries to protect the Medici family is also shown by the following case. When Abraham Cousson expressed to Antonio Magliabechi his desire to dedicate Willem Surenhus’ Latin translation of the Mishnah (Schna sive totius hebraeorum juris, see table 1) to Cosimo III and Francesco Maria de’ Medici, Magliabechi immediately wrote a letter to Jacob Gronovius:

“Per le viscere del signore Dio, e per tutte le sante leggi dell'amicizia, supplico V.S.Ill.ma a stracciare questa carta, subito che l'avrà letta, perché mai in tempo alcuno possa esser veduta da anima vivente, scrivendolela io in estrema segretezza, e confidenza. Il degnissimo signore Cosson mi scrive, di aver pensiero di Dedicare due tomi dell'insigne Opera che a sue spese vuol fare stampare, uno al Serenissimo Gran Duca, e l'altro al Serenissimo e Reverendissimo signore Principe Cardinale. Se, intorno a questo non gli rispondo cosa alcuna, prego V.S. Ill.ma a dirgli da mia parte, le due seguenti cose. La prima si è, che se nelle Annotazioni a quell'Opera, come è facile, sieno cose contro di noi Cattolici Romani, non credo che la Dedicatoria al Serenissimo Gran Duca, che è un Principe religiosissimo, sia per piacere. Tanto peggio poi tornerebbe il Dedicare una Opera nella quale fossero cose contro di noi Cattolici Romani, a S.A.Rev.ma, che è Principe non solamente di sangue, ma anche della medesima Chiesa Romana. Secondariamente la prego ad avvisargli, che qua non è l'uso regalare, a far donativi, a chi Dedica Libri.”

Another example sheds light on how scholarly and confessional boundaries intertwined. This example show also that the cross-cultural exchange between the Dutch Republic and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany did not occur without tensions and reservation. In table 1, we see a sharp peak of references to the publication Divi Chrysostomi Epistola ad Caesarium monachum, published in Utrecht in 1687 by the French scholar Emery Bigot. The history of this publication goes back to the sixteenth century, when the theologian Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499-1562) was the first to discover the controversial manuscript of Chrysostom’s letter to Caesarius. This letter to Caesarius, who had become a convert to the Apollinarian heresy, was written to reduce Caesarius to the Catholic faith. The letter contained a passage illustrating Chrysostom’s understanding of Jesus Christ’s presence in the consecrated elements of bread and wine. He maintained that, in opposition to the Apollinarian heresy, there are two complete natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. This remark about the holy Eucharist directly contradicted the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, which was one of the principal points of controversy between the Catholic and Protestant faith.03 Vermigli made a Latin transcription of the letter and carried it with him to England, after he had fled Italy because of his adherence to the Protestant faith. Together with the Protestant reformer Bernardino Occhino (1487-1564), Vermigli delivered the letter to the archbishop.

---

032 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, undated, LMU, Cod 4° Cod. Msc 778, f. 9, “In the bowels of Christ, and in every sacred law of friendship, I beg Your Illustrious Lordship to tear up this paper, immediately after reading it, because it cannot been seen by a living soul, as I am writing it in extreme secrecy and confidence. The very decent sir Cosson writes me, that he is thinking about dedicating the two volumes of the eminent work that he is about to print on his expenses, one to the Very Serene Grand Duke, and the other to the very Serene and Reverend sir prince the Cardinal. If I do not anwer him regarding this, I bego Your Illustrious Lordship to say to him on my behalf, the two following things. The first one is, if in the annotations of this work, which is easy to believe, there are things against us, Roman Catholics, I believe that a dedication to the Serene Grand Duke, who is a very religious prince, is not very pleased. Even worse would turn out the dedication, in the case there is written something against the Roman Catholics, to the Serene and Revered Lord, who is not only a prince by blood, but also of the same Roman Church. Second, I beg you to notify him, that here it is not very common to give gifts to those who dedicate books.”

Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), leader of the English Reformation, who deposited it in his library. After the death of Cranmer, the document got lost and Vermigli was accused of having forged it.\textsuperscript{1034}

Vermigli’s reputation was cleared by the rediscovery of the French scholar Emeric Bigot, who found the letter in 1668 in the San Marco library in Florence.\textsuperscript{1035} When he discovered the manuscript, he was together with Magliabechi who helped him with the copying of manuscripts in the library. In a letter to Cuper, Magliabechi described Bigot’s surprise upon discovering the Chrysostom epistle, who showed him the document “con grandissima allegrezza”.\textsuperscript{1036} Magliabechi had to promise “a non parlarne mai ad anima vivente” so that Bigot “l’avrebbe data a suo tempo in luce”.\textsuperscript{1037} More than 10 years later, on the 21\textsuperscript{st} of November 1679, Magliabechi wrote to Cuper that he had received the first printed sheets of Bigot’s edition of \textit{De vita Johannis Chrysostomi dialogus}, in which he had enclosed the text of Chrysostom’s letter. However, when the book was finally printed in 1680, the professors of the University of Sorbonne in Paris objected to its distribution and ordered the letter to be cut out of every single copy. Unlike the French university professors, Magliabechi was not concerned about Bigot’s discovery. Magliabechi knew that Bigot was himself a Catholic, and would therefore discuss the manuscript in such a way that he would easily transform the contents of the text “in favor nostro”.\textsuperscript{1038}

Then, in 1681, Étienne le Moine (1624-1689), professor of theology at the University of Leiden, urged Laurens Gronovius, who was in Florence at the time, to find out from Magliabechi were Chrysostom’s letter to Caesarius was. As pointed out by Jetze Touber, Le Moine had heard from Bigot himself about the discovery of the manuscript while they frequented together the local academy in Rouen.\textsuperscript{1039} Magliabechi, who had promised Bigot not to tell anyone about his discovery, answered Gronovius that he did not know in which library Bigot had found the document and he discouraged him to look for it. Yet, despite Magliabechi’s refusal to cooperate, Gronovius found the letter in the San Marco library and immediately sent a copy of it to Le Moine. He had done so without letting Magliabechi know. When Magliabechi heard that Le Moine was about the publish the letter, he immediately wrote to Jacob Gronovius:

\begin{quote}
“Sento che l’ottimo signore Monaco, sia per istampare quella lettera a Cesario Monaco. Tal cosa certo dispiacerà sommamente la Gran Duca Serenissimo mio signore, e lo costringerà a non far più la licenza ad alcuno di copiare nella Libreria di S. Lorenzo, ed ad ordinare a questi Religiosi che anno librerie, a non lasciar copiare cosa alcuna a Forestieri. In oltre, il Padron Serenissimo, da V.S. Ill.ma, e dal suo signore Fratello, prenderà questo, e certo se ne sdegherà non poco. La prego per tanto ad operare, che l’ottimo signore Monaco, non voglia, con istampare questa lettera, esser cagione di tanto male. Mi onori di riverirlo in mio nome, e di significargli, che la sua grandissim a fama, non è per accrescersi, per dar fuora la traduzione di quella Lettera, e che ancora io, benché non abbia seco merito d’alcuna sorte, lo prego con ogni maggiore affetto, a tralasciare di stamparla.”\textsuperscript{1040}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1036} Magliabechi to G. Cuper, 28 June 1692, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 73-74, “with great happiness”.
\textsuperscript{1037} \textit{Ibidem}, “Not to speak about it to a living soul”, “would have brouht it to light in good time”.
\textsuperscript{1038} \textit{Ibidem}, “common sense in our favor”.
\textsuperscript{1040} Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 2 September 1681, Rhenen, Archief van de familie Van Asch van Wijck, inventarisnummer 1272, “I hear that the very learned sir Monaco is about to print that letter to Cesario Monaca. That will dissapoint very much the Grand Duke, Our Serene Lord, and it forces him to not give his permission to anybody to copy manuscripts in the Library of San Lorenzo, and to instruct to all religious men who possess libraries, not to let any foreigner copy anything. In addition, Our Serene Lord, will hear that from Your Illustrious Lordship and your brother, and will be disgusted more than a little by you. I therefore beg you to operate that that very learned sir Monaca, does not want to be the reason for something so bad if he prints that letter. You honor me to revere him in my name, and to let him know that his great reputation will not increase...”
Jacob was ordered by Magliabechi to do everything in his power to convince Le Moine not to publish the letter. In the case that Jacob would not manage to stop the printing of the letter, this would have serious consequences for the scholarly community. Magliabechi, in fact, warned Gronovius that Cosimo III would ban all foreigners from copying manuscripts outright, and that he, above all, would blame Jacob and Laurens for everything. The situation seems to have been something of an embarrassment for Magliabechi and the Grand Duke, who were both offended that Laurens had betrayed their trust and benevolence. The Grand Duke had taken the liberty to grant Laurens access to the Florentine libraries, entrusting that, in the case it would happen that Laurens found the manuscript, would ask his permission to copy it:

“It consideri V.S.III.ma come sia per piacere a S.A.S., che avendo dato licenza al suo signore Fratello non solo di copiare il tutto in Libreria di S. Lorenzo, ma anche di maneggiare per tanto tempo le Pandette che non si lasciano vedere ad alcuno, a suo dispetto poi esca quella lettera, ecc. Qualche tempo fa, fu messo in considerazione al Padrone Serenissimo che era bene lo stracciarsela dal manoscritto. S.A.S. non volle che in alcuna maniera si stracciasse, dicendo che non avrebbe creduto che alcuno senza sua licenza si fosse ardito di copiarla, e darla fora.”

If it came to light that Gronovius had sent the manuscript to Le Moine, the Grand Duke would receive a lot of complaints from the Inquisition, which, of course, needed to be avoided. In addition, added Magliabechi, Laurens and Jacob would also betray the confidence of Bigot, who had every right to publish the manuscript before Le Moine. On the back of Magliabechi’s pressing letter, Jacob Gronovius scrabbled the following words: “Als gevreeest hebbe ik en mag sonder consent van Bigot niet gedrukt worden. Syn beloften zijn politijk, verlangen naer antwoord van Bigot.” This remark seems to indicate that Jacob is not worried at all about the Grand Duke’s threats as to the closing of the libraries. Rather, he is more interested in the answer of Bigot, who had to give his permission for the publication. Whether Bigot had given his permission or not, in 1685, Le Moine published the Latin text of Chrysostom’s letter.

Magliabechi also informed Apollonio Bassetti about what had happened in the San Marco Library. On the 12th of October 1681, Magliabechi writes to Bassetti to let him know that he took the liberty to write Jacob Gronovius a letter, in which he explained “acerbissimamente, come ricercava l’atrocità della cosa” why the manuscript of Chrysostom should not be published by a Protestant scholar as Le Moine. In an earlier letter to Bassetti, Magliabechi had already explained that Laurens Gronovius had asked him about the manuscript, which he was trying to locate for someone who intended to “propogare il Calvinismo, e medesimamente far dispetto ad esso”. In this letter, he asked Bassetti by publishing the translation of that letter and because he will not have any credit for it, I beg him, with the greatest affection, to disregard the printing of it.”

---

1041 Ibidem, “Consider Your Illustrious Lordship how much pleasure the Grand Duke will experience, who has given his permission to your brother not only to copy everything in the library of San Lorenzo, but also to handle the Pandette for a long time, which are not shown to anybody, to find out that he betrayed him when the letter is published. Some time ago, the Serene Lord was advised that it was better to tear up the manuscript. The Grand Duke did not want in any way that it would be ripped up, saying that he did not believe that anyone without his permission dared to copy it, and to publish it.”

1042 Magliabechi to J. Gronovius, 15 June 1681, Rhenen, Archief van de familie Van Asch van Wijck, inventarisnummer 1272, “As I feared, it is not allowed to print it without the permission of Bigot. His promises are political, wishing for the reply of Bigot.”

1043 Étienne Le Moine, Varia sacra (Lugduni Batavorum: D. à Gaasbeek, 1685).

1044 Magliabechi to A. Bassetti, 12 October 1681, ASF, MdP, Carteggi dei Segretari, 1526 (1681), “severly, as required by the atrocity of the situation”.

1045 Magliabechi to A. Bassetti, July 1681, ASF, MdP, Carteggi dei Segretari, 1526 (1681), “to stir up the Calvinist faith, and at the same time to spite it”.

---
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what to do, especially because there were differences of opinions if destroying the manuscript would solve everything. From a later letter to Bassetti, it becomes clear that Magliabechi had begged Cardinal Leopoldo de’ Medici not to tear the manuscript apart. Magliabechi was convinced that this was not necessary because if Bigot, or another Catholic scholar, would have published the manuscript “poiché, circa al luogo intorno al SS. Sacramento, che pare così chiaro, e strano, contro di noi, gli potrà dar senso comodo”, 1046

It was not until 1681, that Gisbert Cuper had found out that it was Laurens Gronovius who had equipped Le Moine with the copy of the manuscript. Cuper had read in the Nouveau Voyage d’Italia from the Huguenot François Massimilien Misson, that Cosimo III had expressly forbidden Magliabechi to show the manuscript of Chrysostom to anybody. Reading this, Cuper also noted that there was some confusion about where the manuscript was and whether it was written in Latin or in Greek. To know more about the manuscript and the claims made by Misson, Cuper approached Magliabechi on the 2nd of February 1692. Magliabechi answered Cuper the following:

“Perché vengono moltissimi signori Oltramontani nel passar di Firenze al mio povero Museo, non mi sovviene chi il detto signore Massimiliano sia. Io non gli posso aver detto, se non che l’Epistola Greca di S. Gio. Crisostomo a Cesario, qua in Firenze non ci è, il che è verissimo, essendoci solamente una traduzione Latina. […] Gli posso per tanto aver detto, che qua in Firenze non si trova il testo Greco, ma non già che non ci sia stato, e forse che non si trovi, in qualche libreria del Mondo. Se il signore Misson ha scritto diversamente, certo che non mi ha inteso.” 1047

Cuper, however, was not satisfied with Magliabechi’s explanation and wrote him back for further clarification. Magliabechi responded to Cuper’s inquiry with a certain nuisance, reminding him about the embarrassments he had to face when Laurens Gronovius sent the manuscript to the Dutch Republic without his and the Grand Duke’s permission. He bitterly answered Cuper that he did not know if a Greek version of the manuscript exists because “non ho veduto ne meno i manoscritti di questa sola Città, non che di tutta Europa, che possa asserire che questa Lettera non si trovi”. 1048 Evidently, reluctance on the part of Magliabechi to talk to his Protestant scholarly friends about the controversial text becomes clear from this letter. He clearly equivocates on the point and after repeated other inquiries and various letters from Cuper, Magliabechi suggested him that he could contact Laurens Gronovius about the matter. 1049 It was Gronovius, after all, who had sent north a manuscript which the Grand Duke preferred to keep stored.

1046 Ibid., “Because, that piece regarding the Holy Sacrament, which seems to clear, and strange, against us, he would easily make sense out of it”.
1047 Magliabechi to G. Cuper, 2 February 1692, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 52-53, “Because so many oltramontani (those from over the Alps) came to Florence to see my poor museum, I do not remember who is this sir Massimiliano. I could only have said that the Greek Epistle of Chrysostom to Cesario is not in Florence, which is very true, because here there is only the Latin translation. I could have said to him, that here in Florence one does not find the Greek text, but I have not said that it is not to be found in another library in the world, or that it was ever there. If sir Misson has written something different, it is sure that he has misunderstood me.”
1048 Ibid., “I have not even seen every manuscript in this city alone, let alone in Europe, that I can claim that that letter not exists”.
1049 Magliabechi to G. Cuper, 16 May 1692, KB, KW 72 D 10, f. 63.