

researches, Galluzzi traces an increasing emphasis on the need for mathematics in the study of botany, which “seems in itself to attest the influence of the Tuscan scientist and to legitimize the definition of Cesi as a pioneer of quantitative botany” (423). Did Cesi have any influence on Galileo? According to Galluzzi, Cesi tried to get Galileo to tone down his criticisms of the Catholic Church, and of the Jesuits in particular. As we all know, that ended in failure. Galluzzi maintains Galileo “*had* to fight that battle in the name of the supreme value of truth and of his personal dignity”; he perceives in Galileo “the courage of truth and of confidence in the final triumph over the errors of pseudo-philosophy” (166). From Cesi’s perspective that attitude was dangerous. Though Cesi, too, sought “freedom of thought in natural philosophy,” he tried to reach that goal by establishing “a reserved and protected space, the Lincean Academy, where, sheltered from the suspicions or censure of political and religious authorities, debates and research could be freely conducted” (341). Galileo’s fight with the church threatened that protected space.

Galluzzi places Cesi “one step behind” Galileo in the advance of science (125), but while showing Cesi to be a man of the Renaissance, he presents Galileo as a man of the future. He writes about Galileo’s relationship to astrology as if drawing up horoscopes was merely for his own “material benefits” (69), ignoring that Galileo also drew up horoscopes for himself and his family. He notes that Cesi pointed out the compatibility of Kepler’s elliptical orbits with Galileo’s requirement that nature’s principles “appear elegant, simple and rational to our intellect” (119); Galileo insisted on circular orbits because he maintained that the natural motion of a sphere was circular, even if it required inelegant, complex, and irrational epicycles and eccentrics. Galluzzi also does not point out that Galileo’s telescopic discoveries did not prove the Copernican system; they were equally compatible with Tycho’s geo-heliocentric system. Moreover, while Galluzzi writes extensively about Galileo and tides, he is silent on Galileo’s rejection of the influence of the moon on the tides. Galileo thought he could prove the earth’s motion by the tides. He could not, but the “revolutionary principles of his new science of motion” (302) allowed others to disclose what Galileo failed to prove.

Sheila J. Rabin, *Saint Peter’s University, emerita*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.289

Translating Early Modern Science. Sietske Fransen, Niall Hodson, and Karl A. E. Enenkel, eds.

Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture 51. Leiden: Brill, 2017. xviii + 344 pp. \$149.

This collection of essays is of interest not only to those working on early modern translations into the vernacular but also to scholars of the history of philosophy, applied

technologies, the history of the book, and that of readership. During the last decade, different projects on early modern translations emerged, and previous research focused on linguistic and literary aspects generated theoretical frameworks. This book continues along the lines set out by Burke and Hsia (2007), who focused on translation as a cultural phenomenon and on the role of the translator.

How did translators mediate knowledge between language domains—through interpretation, selection, glossing, explicit citation, or, on the contrary, tacit translation and reworking of other language sources? What can be said about “the process of translation” (8)? The editors bring to our attention the importance of new readership sought by translators, and that of socioeconomic motivations. This is especially the case as translators operated often in the context of scholarly societies and networks (the theme of part 1), which generated translations on demand, sometimes not intended for the printing press and left in manuscript state. Part 2 of the collection is concerned with the translation of so-called books of secrets, which contain practical knowledge used by artisans, while part 3 studies translations of theoretical and philosophical texts.

Themes throughout the whole volume include translation as means to enter a network, the translation of images and ideas on universal language or independent reading (see especially Simon’s essay), and the translator’s auctorial position. How translating not only requires knowledge of two languages but also research into and experience with the subject matter is nicely illustrated by Michael Bycoft’s article on the *Traité des vernis* (1723), a translation of Buonanni’s treatise on lacquer—in which Bycoft is the first to show the work of Charles Dufay. By analyzing the latter’s footnotes to the translation, the author traces three types of additions: those issuing from experiments with recipes, here and there correcting Buonanni’s own translations; those completing the original’s citations and references; and those testifying to the translator’s observations of artisanal practice entailing applied chemistry. These competences as represented by the *Traité des vernis* helped Dufay entering the Académie des sciences in Paris, thus guaranteeing him a scientific career. How, in the early seventeenth century, translations became instrumental to the change of a whole domain of applied sciences is also illustrated by Thomas Morel’s contribution on the introduction of Euclidian excerpts in a group of Saxonian manuscripts on mining. This happened by the intermediary of Christoph Puehler’s vernacular text on geometry (1563), annotated and copied in the following century. More on mathematics, now as part of an editorial project to reach new, popular, readership, is offered by Charles van den Heuvel, on Simon Stevin, and by Richard J. Oosterhoff, in his essay on Charles de Bovelles’s *Livre singulier et utile touchant l’art et pratique de geometrie* (1542, revised in 1547). Joyce van Leeuwen’s analysis of Niccolò Leonico Tomeo’s Latin translation (1525) of Aristotle’s *Mechanics* also reveals an editorial enterprise based on philological activities—as proved by a Vatican codex—and involving the use of diagrams and images for the final, printed version of the translation. The use of images from source into target language is addressed in Meghan C. Doherty’s article, entitled “Visual Translation in

Early Modern Learned Journals.” While Felicity Henderson treats the circulation of translations within the network of Robert Hooke, Jan van de Kamp discusses the role of the seventeenth-century polyglot Theodore Haak within the correspondence circle of Hartlib. Van de Kamp sheds light on Haak’s theological translations in connection with the latter’s interest in science and politics and as embedded in his network. Translation as paraphrase or commentary is exemplified by the cases of Gassendi’s Latin translation of Epicurus (Garau), by Ibrahim Müteferrika’s Copernicus translations into Turkish (Küçük), and by English translations of Galileo (Plescia).

In brief, this is a volume that presents a wealth of new discoveries and offers fresh insights where the articles discuss better-known topics. One might regret the absence of an *Index rerum*, while an *Index nominum* is provided.

Evelien Chayes, *Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2019.290

Editio princeps: A History of the Gutenberg Bible. Eric Marshall White.

Harvey Miller Studies in the History of Culture. London: Harvey Miller, 2017. 466 pp. €120.

As one of the most important landmarks in the history of the book in the West, the Gutenberg Bible has been the subject of many studies, from ca. 1700 onwards, as Eric White demonstrates in his book *Editio princeps*. By writing a history of the Gutenberg Bible as a collectable object based on its historiography, White offers a new and original approach to what has become known as the first printed book.

After a short preface and acknowledgements, White skips the introduction and takes his readers straight to fifteenth-century Mainz and the history of Europe’s first printer and to the printing of the Gutenberg Bible in the first two chapters of his book. In the third chapter, he offers a brief historiography of the Gutenberg Bible and closes part 1 by dividing the history of the Gutenberg Bible into three phases: its enormously important integration into fifteenth-century culture, its complete fall into oblivion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its rehabilitation and canonization from the eighteenth century onwards.

The second part of the book discusses the Gutenberg Bible as an object of historical inquiry, which is the main focus of *Editio princeps*. Here, White describes the history of each extant copy from the moment it was rediscovered and recorded in (bibliographical) literature, scholarly correspondence, or a sales catalogue. Starting with the rediscovery of the copy now in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preußischer Kulturbesitz, around 1700, White works his way up to the twenty-first century, with the actual discovery of a leaf of the Gutenberg Bible in 2017, used as a wrapper for Johann Tungerlarius’s *Analysis Logico-Theologica Omnium Epistolarum Dominicalium*, parts 1 and 2 (1616 and