JANE T. TOLBERT

Censorship & Retraction

Théophraste Renaudot's *Gazette* and the Galileo Affair, 1631-33

In seventeenth-century France, newspapers, which were subject to pre-publication censorship, served as instruments of propaganda for the monarchy, and the Gazette *of Théophraste Renaudot was no exception. But in December 1633, he published a retraction for a public conference he held on the heliocentric system and included the Inquisition's sentence against Galileo and condemnation of the Copernican system, which were unknown to most scholars. This article takes the so-called retraction as a point of departure to examine his purpose in its publication and the flow of information between public and private channels. Letters and conference proceedings suggest he planned to call attention to the astronomical content of future conferences. Furthermore, he placed "privileged information" in the public domain. The possibility of censorship catalyzed French scholars to publish pro-Copernican texts abroad as well as in France by using evasive strategies.*

Théophraste Renaudot (1586-1653) established the *Gazette* in 1631, a French weekly periodical, and is known today as the Father of French Journalism. His friendship with the powerful Cardinal Richelieu assured him a monopoly in printing and enabled him to quash competition, but the support was given with the understanding that he publish only favorable accounts of royalty and French politics. Although Renaudot claimed the paper functioned in the public interest, the prefatory dedication to the king showed it "celebrate[d] the glory of the monarchy."[1] Even more telling, the cardinal penned numerous articles to control public opinion and promote royal policy. Richelieu headed what has been described as an "editorial committee," which reviewed materials and submitted articles,[2] and, on occasion, it stopped the presses in mid-edition to incorporate last-minute changes.[3]

JANE T. TOLBERT is an associate professor in the Department of Humanities and Communication at Florida Institute of Technology. ***This article was part of the research for her dissertation at the University of Florida, and the author would like to thank F. Leslie Smith for his comments and suggestions.***

In addition to establishing the *Gazette* and other newspapers, Renaudot also was a populist, innovator, and convert to Catholicism.[4] He implemented measures such as an employment office and medical dispensary to help indigent populations, and he held public conferences on popular topics—science, medicine, and curiosities—at a time when most information circulated only in private academies. These "innovations" and his status as Richelieu's protégé made him a distrusted figure among members of the emerging scientific community, who maintained esoteric information should not be circulated to the general public.

Most stories in the *Gazette* focused on domestic and foreign news: miracles performed by the king, royal marriages and visits, hunting expeditions, births and deaths, and atrocities from abroad with the occasional mention of a curiosity or presage (e.g., a monstrous birth or the passage of a comet). Military victories were emphasized while news of territorial losses was suppressed.[5]

However, the *Gazette* of December 1633 differed from most of the issues, which generally provided propaganda for the monarchy. After four pages of summaries from abroad, consisting mainly of military news, Renaudot concluded: "So much for the affairs of war. Let's examine another that ended between mathematicians."[6] He used this tone, rife with apology and reprimand, to preface the text of Galileo's sentence of June 22, 1633, issued by the Inquisition in Rome: "In what was discussed at one of the conferences held in the bureau [office] last October 24 and before we knew the

decision by the Holy See, we discussed the movement of the Earth. I believe I am obligated to convey to you the sentence handed down last June 22 [1633] against Galileo, erroneous supporter of this opinion . . . and to prevent further discussion of this question."[7] The sentence outlined the two propositions—a sun-centered world about which the earth moves, which it described as "not only absurd and false in philosophy but erroneous in the faith. . . .That you Galileo have rendered yourself suspect of heresy, having upheld this false doctrine of the movement of the Earth and immobility of the sun as probable after it was declared contrary to the scriptures. . . . And so that your great fault will not go entirely unpunished and that you are made an example in the future, we order that the dialogue be prohibited by public edict and that you be imprisoned by the Holy Office."[8] The text of the sentence mentioned Galileo's other works and the Injunction of 1616, which prohibited the teaching and support of the Copernican doctrine. Following the sentence of 1633, Galileo recanted and remained under house arrest for the remainder of his life.

Renaudot claimed he printed the sentence to prevent further debate of the Copernican propositions at his public conferences, but the use of a "retraction" enabled him to define the Copernican propositions (that the earth moved and the sun was the center of the world). Although he implied he would prevent "further discussion" of the Copernican propositions, he actually held more conferences on this new world view and distributed printed proceedings. The publication of the sentence stunned many scholars who only knew of Galileo's questioning before the Inquisition. The sentence had not been promulgated by the French Catholic Church, nor had news of Galileo's recantation and house arrest reached members of the emerging scientific community.

"In periods [of censorship], writers used strategies of evasion, such as rhetorical ploys, to communicate heretical ideas. In the words of Leo Strauss, 'Persecution . . . gives rise to a peculiar technique of writing . . . in which the truth about all crucial things is presented exclusively between the lines.'"

This article examines Renaudot's strategy in publishing the text of Galileo's sentence.[9] Retractions offered a strategy to introduce a condemned doctrine while maintaining the appearance of upholding status quo, but in this case, most readers were informed of the Copernican propositions and some had copies of Galileo's *Dialogue*. Furthermore, although Renaudot ostensibly apologized for this conference, in reality he signaled similar conferences would follow. In *Making Science Social*, Kathleen Wellman points out that he "avoided dangerous astronomical topics for less than six months" after he printed the text of the sentence.[10] In fact, two months after the October 1633 conference on the earth's mobility, Renaudot held a discussion on the movement of the tides, an argument used by Galileo in Day Four, the last chapter of his *Dialogue*, to prove his views about mobility. Given that the conferences continued to deal with the new astronomy and the heliocentric system, did Renaudot print the retraction only to indicate the more subversive nature of his conferences to members of the emerging scientific community and ensure their attendance? Finally, scholars were shocked by the news of the sentence of a well-known scientist. What were the repercussions of Renaudot's publication? How did information travel between public and private communication channels in a period of censorship?

In these types of periods, writers used strategies of evasion, such as rhetorical ploys, to communicate heretical ideas. In the words of Leo Strauss, "Persecution . . . gives rise to a peculiar technique of writing . . . in which the truth about all crucial things is presented exclusively between the lines."[11] Some individuals indicated that certain documents were "dangerous," implying they should be acquired and read,[12] while others launched a "retraction" or a "passionate attack" on a doctrine, which necessarily included its main tenets.[13] Others obfuscated meaning in dense text, and some presented evidence from which they drew illogical conclusions.[14] And some, like Galileo, wrote in a dialogue format, leaving censors unable to determine the writer's position. Reading "between the lines" of Renaudot's retraction tells a similar story: not an apology for a conference on the Copernican propositions but a strategy to call attention to his future conferences, which dealt with topics condemned by the Roman Catholic Church. His retraction provides a point of departure to investigate the flow of information from public to private channels of communication.

Sources consulted for this study included seventeenth-century newspapers and conference proceedings. The correspondence of magistrate-scientist Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the priest Marin Mersenne, both recognized as important gatekeepers in correspondence networks that linked scholars throughout Europe and the Mediterranean, also were examined.[15] Letters provide access to unfettered discussions that might otherwise be interpreted as heretical exchanges of ideas. The newspapers and correspondence, which are in French, were translated by this author. The conference proceedings are in English.[16]

To place the retraction in the proper context, this article provides background on censorship, Galileo's questioning by the Inquisition, and the use of correspondence networks to evade censors. It proceeds chronologically and includes excerpts from the Inquisition sentence of Galileo as it appeared in Renaudot's newspaper. Then, it examines the French reaction to this news as shown in correspondence and provides summaries of select conference proceedings on astronomy that followed the publication of Galileo's sentence.

This study used a multifaceted approach and a variety of primary sources to reveal a kaleidoscopic exchange of ideas in a period of censorship and the Inquisition. Reliance on primary sources provided insight into networks of power and fiefdoms of information control. Furthermore, this article suggests various roles—both public and private—assumed by Renaudot, whose newspaper was established to promote royal policy; although he provided propaganda, he also introduced information that had repercussions for the scientific community. An examination of the rationale behind his publication of the sentence provides a means of peeling away layers to access undercurrents of thoughts. It might seem contradictory that priests made contributions to the new astronomy in

light of Galileo's sentencing and the condemnation of the Copernican doctrine, but they focused on observational astronomy or cloaked their findings in ambiguous terms. Furthermore, some priests upheld the Aristotelian world view out of obedience to the church, not from belief.[17] Many individuals who held powerful positions in the church and state contributed privately to the emergence of a new empirical approach to science, and this interaction of individuals and groups gave science its shape in a period of censorship.

In seventeenth-century France, censors scrutinized periodicals and books for heresy, loosely defined as any view that threatened the authority of the church, universities (headed by theologians), or the state.[18] In 1618, the Book Guild was established to regulate the quality of materials, number of presses, and guild membership,[19] and Richelieu's control of the flow of information was strengthened by a royal edict of 1626, which targeted the broadsides and pamphlets.[20]

Representatives of the book trade registered works, reported heretical writings, and inspected foreign books. But inspections did not prevent the circulation of censored texts, which continued to be distributed by street vendors and French bookstores, or imported from abroad and circulated through correspondence networks. French publications carried the letters' patent, which indicated the Sorbonne's approval of content as well as the privilege, which granted a monopoly, but rivalries for control between judicial and theological agencies resulted in an inconsistent enforcement of laws governing the book trade.[21] Further confusion stemmed from whether the Roman Catholic Church had jurisdiction over the French Catholic Church, which recognized the king, not the pope, as its head.

Examples of censorship and persecution served as warnings to scholars. Already in 1610, Galileo's published telescopic observations of the moons of Jupiter and the pitted lunar surface provided evidence refuting the traditional conception of the earth as the center of the world, about which all planets revolved, and the perfection of celestial bodies. This publication led to heated debates among theologians.[22] His subsequent observations of sunspots brought him in conflict with the Jesuit Christopher Scheiner. Another work in which Galileo stated that the scriptures were not intended to be interpreted literally prompted Rome to hand down the Injunction of 1616, which prohibited the teaching and support of the Copernican system, condemned one pro-Copernican treatise, and placed Copernicus's book on the Index of Prohibited Books pending changes. Later, in 1632, the Inquisition halted the publication of Galileo's *Dialogue of the Two Chief World Systems* (1632), which had been previously approved by censors, and called him to Rome for questioning. By publishing the dialogues, Galileo openly challenged church doctrine.

Other examples of censorship and persecution occurred in France. Giulio-Cesare Vanini was burned at the stake in Toulouse 1619 for publishing his criticisms of the miracles of the church in a work approved for publication by the Sorbonne.[23] Not long afterward, writers advocating the use of chemical treatments to replace traditional medical remedies (e.g., purges and bloodletting) were exiled from Paris and prohibited from teaching or upholding these doctrines "under penalty of death."[24] However, Renaudot, who benefited from the protection of Richelieu, opened a medical dispensary and advocated these new chemical remedies, which elicited the ire of the medical faculty of the University of Paris. Yet criticisms of Aristotle, published by the cleric-astronomer Pierre Gassendi in Grenoble, seemed to go unnoticed,[25] as did his later observations of the transit of Mercury (1631), which demonstrated that the distance between planets was much larger than held by the traditional conception of a finite world. Thus, the inconsistency in censorship policies and the uncertain status in France of rulings issued by the Roman Catholic Church had a "chilling" effect on scientific communication but did not deter publication completely.[26] However, many scholars preferred to send information only in correspondence or exchanged information in private academies, which were not sanctioned by religious or political institutions. These gatherings preceded the state-supported academies (e.g., the French Academy of 1635, which was established by Richelieu, and the Royal Academy of Sciences of 1666), which controlled not only topics of discussion but membership.

"Examples of censorship and persecution served as warnings to scholars. Already in 1610, Galileo's published telescopic observations of the moons of Jupiter and the pitted lunar surface provided evidence refuting the traditional conception of the earth as the center of the world, about which all planets revolved, and the perfection of celestial bodies. This publication led to heated debates among theologians."

Prior to the establishment of the Royal Academy of Sciences, most scientific discussions took place in the private, patron-supported academies, which represented a departure from university teachings and reliance on traditional textual authorities.[27] Among the more prestigious in France were those led by Jacques and Pierre Dupuy, who were librarians to the king, and the priest Marin Mersenne, all of whom were in Paris, and the magistrate Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc in Aix-en-Provence. Members of these gatherings, which were built on the tradition of earlier Italian alchemical societies (academies of "secrets"),[28] sent scientific information mainly through correspondence networks. Although individuals represented a diversity of allegiances—Protestants and Catholics, Aristotelians, and Copernicans—privately, at least, they respected the need for tolerance in communicating news of scientific investigations.[29] Correspondence generally was not opened and read by authorities but passed through a "gatekeeper," such as Peiresc, who forwarded, adapted, or withheld information. Letters ranged in length from a short message to a lengthy 2,000-word missive and dealt with a diversity of topics: scientific data, personal health, domestic problems, rare books, and royal scandal. Mail traveled fairly quickly–from Paris to the South of France in a week, to Rome in two weeks, and to North Africa between four and six weeks.

Originally established for the exchange of literary news, these

networks increasingly assumed the role of informational retrieval systems. These "new" scholars stressed the primacy of first-hand observation in scientific investigations as opposed to the more traditional reliance on the textual authorities of Aristotle and the scriptures. Hence, this new approach to study of nature threatened the pedagogical and religious framework of society.[30]

In contrast to these private scientific gatherings, Renaudot held weekly public conferences (August 22, 1633, to September 1, 1642), which he said functioned to "rescue the liberal sciences from the bondage of scholastic obscurities [i.e., university teaching], and to render things intelligible without obliging the studious to the unpleasing and perpetual task of first surmounting the difficulties of exotic words."[31] The conferences covered a range of topics but excluded religion and politics, two topics that could lead to charges of heresy.[32] Each Monday afternoon, an estimated forty to fifty participants[33] debated two topics.[34] For example, Conference X dealt with "Of Motion or Rest of the Earth" and the "Two Monstrous Brethren Living in the Same Body," and topics for Conference XLI concerned "Of the Comets" and "Whether Pardon Be Better than Revenge."

Renaudot claimed speakers were not named because he wanted arguments to be evaluated on their own merit, not on the basis of the credibility, or social status, of the speaker.[35] But the risk of censorship likely persuaded participants to seek anonymity for personal safety. Unlike Galileo, whose dialogue thinly veiled his pro-Copernican position and his portrayal of the pope as an Aristotelian simpleton, Renaudot's conferences did not lead to an obvious conclusion, probably as a safeguard against censorship.

The need for anonymity of speakers makes it difficult to ascertain the names of many conference participants. However, scholarship[36] and correspondence indicate that Jean-Baptiste Morin, an Aristotelian and professor of mathematics, attended as did Tommaso Campanella, an eccentric Dominican priest imprisoned for twenty-seven years by both the Spanish and Italian inquisitions for his belief in a plurality of worlds. Ismaël Boulliau, a priest and astronomer who published pseudonymously on the Copernican system, also attended select conferences as did members of the Mersenne and Dupuy circles.[37] Some conferences (e.g., Conference LXXIV, "Of Navigation and Longitudes") attracted numerous elite astronomers.

Although some representatives of this new approach to science attended these public conferences, others derided these discussions as "vulgar."[38] Members of the emerging scientific community distrusted Renaudot because of his close affiliation with Richelieu, who sought to control information flow, and his popularization of science. Scholars did not want esoteric information broadcast to the public as they demonstrated more selectivity in terms of method of inquiry and choice of topic. Peiresc criticized Renaudot as "boastful of wares by which he degrades himself by profaning and divulging his conferences to lowly people."[39] Practitioners of the new science advocated the use of empiricism whereas Renaudot's participants also used specious reasoning or cited traditional authorities, similar to the technique used by Mersenne in his *Theological Questions*, which is discussed later in this article. But the similarity of topics discussed both in public and private suggests these scholars kept appraised of these conferences.[40]

Many scholars remained cautious in communicating with Renaudot, fearing he would publish sensitive information. When Gassendi congratulated Boulliau on January 24, 1634, on his pro-Copernican publication, he warned him to be cautious that Renaudot "does not put you in the *Gazette* and have you henceforth declared and presented in Rome as a heretic."[41]

"Many scholars remained cautious in communicating with Renaudot, fearing he would publish sensitive information. When Gassendi congratulated Boulliau on January 24, 1634, on his pro-Copernican publication, he warned him to be cautious that Renaudot 'does not put you in the* Gazette *and have you henceforth declared and presented in Rome as a heretic.'"

Renaudot, constantly in need of news to fill his paper, solicited the help of key players in the information networks. Peiresc, for example, generally maintained contact with him through a Parisian intermediary.[42] But when Renaudot approached him about sharing information, he refused, explaining to a Parisian friend: "I would be prevented from responding to the good opinion he has of me and my correspondence, which, for the most part, deals only with news of books or antiquities and is not a subject for the gazette. . . . And there is nothing I dislike more than to be considered a gossip."[43] In earlier letters he criticized the use of outdated information and inaccurate news carried in the *Gazette*[44] and Renaudot's inclination to publish sensitive news.[45] But Peiresc's refusal to cooperate with him resulted in a silent but effective retaliation. Peiresc experienced increasing delays in receiving his subscription to the *Gazette* about which he frequently complained to friends.[46] Furthermore, although he received news of Galileo's sentence in mid-July in a letter—news he withheld from most correspondents—he did not have a copy of the sentence, which Renaudot did. For someone like Peiresc who "jealously" guarded his role as a gatekeeper in information networks, this was a decisive blow to self-esteem and reputation.[47]

Renaudot's retraction brought news of Galileo's sentencing into the public domain, and this information also reverberated in private correspondence. Publication of the *Dialogue* in Florence, which began in February 1632, was halted in August, and Galileo was ordered to appear before the Inquisition in October. However, this news had not reached France. On November 22, 1632, Peiresc informed his Parisian friends that he would send them a copy of the *Dialogue* and mentioned that Cardinal Barberini still had not read it.[48] Six months later, the news of Galileo's questioning in Rome had been kept secret. "No one says anything. I have no letters from those who could speak to me [about Galileo], not even from Cardinal Barberini," wrote Peiresc, who had studied under Galileo years earlier and corresponded frequently with Barberini, a nephew to Pope Urban VIII.[49]

Galileo's summons to appear before the Inquisition led to consternation among scholars. Peiresc pointed out that those censors

who had approved the *Dialogue* should have been held responsible.[50] He learned of Galileo's imprisonment in mid-July through a letter he was instructed to forward to Gassendi in nearby Digne and the Jesuit Kircher in Avignon,[51] but he delayed forwarding the information until August 12, 1633, telling close friends that news of Galileo's sentence "should not be divulged . . . because it has kept secret in Rome until now."[52] In a letter of August 16, 1633, to the Dupuys in Paris, Peiresc minimized its importance: "I forgot to tell you I learned from Rome that poor Galileo had to declare solemnly that he did not support the opinion that the Earth moved yet in his dialogue he used strong reasons in its support."[53] In Protestant Holland, René Descartes wrote in February 1634: "I wanted to suppress the treatise that I had done and lose almost all of my work of the past four years to give entire obedience to the church since it prohibited the opinion of the Earth's mobility. Yet I have not seen that the pope or council has ratified this prohibition"[54]

Peiresc questioned how Renaudot had obtained a copy of the text of the sentence, which he had not been able to procure even with his privileged role as gatekeeper. At first he blamed Mersenne for leaking the news, but he later retracted this accusation.[55] Peiresc himself had withheld news of Galileo's sentencing from the French community, possibly because he might have believed it was an affair internal to Rome since the sentence had not been promulgated in France. For a decree issued by the Holy Office to be recognized in France, it had to be sent to the papal nuncio, or representative, in Paris, and then ratified by theologians of the Sorbonne.[56] Research has indicated that in July 1633 the pope sent copies of the sentence to inquisitors, papal nuncios, and university professors in Europe, but the nuncio in France did not communicate the information to the theological faculty of the Sorbonne.[57]

Peiresc feared publication of the sentence might force the French church to take action and ratify the Inquisition's ruling. He stressed that the church often attempted to reconcile positions "carefully and over time rather than carry things to the extreme and possibly involving too many men who looked for obvious contradictions. . . . [S]o many other affairs of great consequence would have amounted to little had one not proceeded with such vehemence."[58] Mersenne, too, wanted to avoid a confrontation between religion and science that would "render the truth of the Holy Scriptures ridiculous to heathens by using reasons which demonstrate nothing other than their [clerics'] ignorance and weakness of imagination and mind."[59] Many scholars such as Descartes hoped the issue would be resolved as the question of the Antipodes, which was condemned in the eighth century.[60] Most scholars attributed Galileo's sentence to his years of rivalries with Jesuits and the Roman Catholic Church, his obvious defiance of the Injunction of 1616 by publishing his *Dialogue*, an endorsement of the heliocentric system as real rather than hypothetical, and his promotion of his theory of the tides as actual proof of the earth's mobility.[61]

Peiresc learned from his correspondents in Rome that the Jesuit Scheiner, who for years had challenged many of Galileo's discoveries, had spearheaded these attacks on the *Dialogue*.[62] Peiresc wrote that he received a letter from Scheiner, who demonstrated his "veneration" for Gassendi, but he was concerned the Jesuit could "not abstain from attacking this poor old man [Galileo was 69] after having brought him to his feet, and had him condemned, in addition to the retraction, to life imprisonment."[63] In the same letter, he noted that the Jesuit Athanasius Kircher said fellow priests, including Scheiner, supported the Copernican system but felt obliged to endorse the traditional world view out of obedience to the church.[64] Descartes, too, said Scheiner's published attacks of Galileo contributed to his sentencing. But he pointed out that Scheiner's recent book on sunspots "furnished so much proof" of a sun-centered world that the Jesuit must support the Copernican opinion.[65] Descartes implied Scheiner disguised his true beliefs by drawing illogical conclusions from evidence.

"The uncertainty of the position of the French Catholic Church with regard to the sentence [of Galileo] from Rome led to circumspection on these matters. Renaudot, however, did not endanger himself by promoting a conference on the earth's mobility. He benefited from the protection of a powerful cardinal, who was already hostile to Rome and might have welcomed the opportunity to hold a public conference on the Copernican system that would antagonize the Roman Catholic Church and the pope."

The uncertainty of the position of the French Catholic Church with regard to the sentence from Rome led to circumspection on these matters. Renaudot, however, did not endanger himself by promoting a conference on the earth's mobility. He benefited from the protection of a powerful cardinal, who was already hostile to Rome and might have welcomed the opportunity to hold a public conference on the Copernican system that would antagonize the Roman Catholic Church and the pope. Thus, Renaudot continued to hold public conferences on the new astronomy, which was introduced by Galileo in his *Dialogue*.

Conference X, the "Motion or Rest of the Earth," took place on October 24, 1633, approximately five months after the sentencing of Galileo and the condemnation of the Copernican propositions. Participants presented evidence for the two competing world views. Supporters of the traditional earth-centered world referenced Aristotle, the hierarchy of being in which all things aspire to the heavens, or God, and evidence based on common sense arguments and biblical references. Arguments in support of a heliocentric world included ancient (e.g., Aristarchus) and contemporary astronomers (e.g., Kepler) to add credibility. Speakers reasoned by common sense, syllogism, or analogy, but the discussion offered no closure,[66] leaving the audience to weigh the evidence on its merits.

The letters consulted for this study carried no mention of Renaudot's conference on the mobility of the earth although cor-

respondents discussed the Copernican system. Interestingly, a letter to Mersenne cited the second topic (on monstrous brothers) discussed at Conference X but made no mention of the Copernican system discussed on that same day.[67] Furthermore, a flurry of communication followed Renaudot's publication of Galileo's sentence, but similar activity in correspondence did not follow his conference.

Although Renaudot's retraction seemed to indicate that he would no longer hold public conferences on the Copernican system, he used this strategy to introduce a series of conferences from May 1634 through December 1635 that provided evidence refuting many traditional conceptions of the world. Conference XLI, "Of Comets," on May 29, 1634, addressed the distinction between sublunar and lunar zones, which was significant because tradition held the zone between the earth and moon was subject to change but the heavens were immutable. But evidence obtained with a telescope, which revealed the pitted lunar surface and sunspots, refuted this position. Speakers also debated the reliability of sensory evidence and its use as proof as well as the problem of distortion with lenses, such as in a telescope. Other conferences (Conference XLV, "Whether the Heavens be Solid or Liquid," June 26, 1634, and Conference XCIII, "Of the Spots in the Moon and the Sun," on December 17, 1635), pitted the traditional biblical authorities against the new science of empiricism much in the same way that Galileo did in his works.[68] These conferences revealed both traditional and contemporary arguments and the problems of reconciling telescopic observations, or empirical evidence, with a literal reading of the scriptures, which were arguments also addressed by Galileo in an earlier work.[69] Renaudot did not draw conclusions but claimed the facts would speak for themselves, but the absence of a conclusion was likely a means of avoiding censure.

"The publication of the sentence by Renaudot had repercussions for future publications as shown in private exchanges. Most scholars used strategies of evasion to communicate pro-Copernican ideas in France and worked with editors in Protestant border states."

The publication of the sentence by Renaudot had repercussions for future publications as shown in private exchanges. Most scholars used strategies of evasion to communicate pro-Copernican ideas in France and worked with editors in Protestant border states. Peiresc, for example, helped arrange the publication in Germany of a Latin translation of Galileo's *Dialogue*.[70] The translation from Italian into Latin made this text accessible to the international community of scholars, most of whom shared Latin as a common language. In a letter on February 11, 1634, Gassendi warned Peiresc that he should not identify himself as the source of these documents.[71]

Other scholars abandoned similar projects to publish pro-Copernican works. Mersenne, who planned a defense of Galileo's *Dialogue* that would respond to Jesuit attacks,[72] instead published *Theological, Physical, Moral, and Mathematical Questions* in 1634.[73] Written in a dialogue format to dissimulate his position, he included summaries of Day One and Day Two of Galileo's condemned *Dialogue*, but he omitted Day Four, the chapter in which Galileo described his theory of the tides, or his so-called proof of the Copernican system. In this book, Mersenne also included a copy of the Inquisition's sentence of Galileo as an "antidote" for persecution.[74] But upon hearing "rumors from doctors at the Sorbonne" that he did not provide enough evidence refuting the earth's mobility, Mersenne used rhetorical ploys, replacing potentially heretical discussions with topics "more appropriate for Rome."[75] For example, he replaced Question 34, "What reasons are there to prove and persuade that the Earth moves around its axis in 24 hours?" with "Can we invent a new science of sound?" And question 37 originally read, "What reasons have we to believe the Earth moves around the sun, which is at the center of the world?" was replaced with "How high above the Earth or Sun do we need to go to see as much space as desired?" He printed two versions of this work: one for Rome and a different edition for France. Interestingly, in his French edition, the "revised" chapter titles appeared in the table of contents but the actual subject matter of the chapters was not changed.

Although the risk of censorship resulted in circumspection in published works, it did not curtail private exchanges. Gassendi described his vision of the sun as a great furnace in the center of the world.[76] Peiresc told the librarian at the Vatican that censors needed to see the "facility and verisimilitude" of the Copernican model.[77] He wrote a missionary priest that upon reading Galileo's *Dialogue* it was no longer possible to believe in traditional conceptions of the world.[78] At the same time he made several private appeals to Cardinal Barberini in Rome for a mitigated sentence for Galileo but was unsuccessful in these attempts.[79] In letters to other correspondents, he requested data on the frequency of tides and geographical coordinates to test Galileo's theory.

Thus, in a period of censorship and the Inquisition, newspapers promoted royal policy and constructed a favorable image of the monarchy.[80] Because Renaudot generally published news supplied by Richelieu or government officials, members of the scientific community were shocked to see the text of Galileo's sentence in the *Gazette* of December 1633 and the *Relation* of January 1634. Often retractions were used to expose condemned doctrines,[81] but in this case, most subscribers to the *Gazette* were educated and familiar with the Copernican propositions and Galileo's *Dialogue*. Hence, his purpose in his retraction was not to outline the components of the condemned Copernican doctrine but to call attention to the scientific nature of his upcoming conferences that raised questions about the traditional views of the world. Since the cardinal sought to manipulate public opinion and to control all exchange of information, his tacit endorsement of Renaudot's conferences may have been intended to undermine private gatherings, which, with correspondence, provided the main forum for these discussions. Furthermore, Richelieu's recognition of the king as the divine appointee and head of the French Catholic Church put him at odds with Rome and its decrees.

To a certain extent, Renaudot opened the floodgates by putting "privileged information" (news of the sentence) in the public domain, and the publication of his retraction had implications for the exchange of information in numerous channels. Peiresc lost control of privileged information, which he tried to withhold even

from members of the scientific community.[82] While his action suggested he did not want to force the French Catholic Church to promulgate the Roman decree, he and other scholars nevertheless scurried to arrange to have a Latin translation of the *Dialogue* published in Germany. And, he made a personal appeal to Cardinal Barberini for a mitigated sentence for Galileo. Mersenne changed his plans to publish a defense of Galileo's work and instead published a dialogue on a series of questions. Although he included a copy of Galileo's sentence to prevent attacks by theologians, comments by the Sorbonne made him change publication strategies. Furthermore, his table of contents only disguised the true substance of the French edition.

Most scientists were priests or magistrates who outwardly upheld church doctrines but privately pursued the new science and the search for truth. They published abroad or dissimulated their views in correspondence to avoid problems with the Inquisition. But although Renaudot proclaimed in the preface to his conference proceedings that slander, religion, and politics would not be discussed, he held public conferences in France on the Copernican system.[83] However, he respected the anonymity of speakers and did not draw conclusions in the conference proceedings, which were strategies to evade repercussions.

NOTES

[1] Gilles Galilei Feyel, *L'annonce et la no centurie uvelle* (Oxford, England: Voltaire Foundation, 2000), 132.

[2] W.H. Evans, *L'historien Mézeray et la conception de l'histoire en France au XVIIe siècle*, 62, quoted in Howard Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France: The Innovations of Théophraste Renaudot* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 150. For a list of Richelieu's press agents, see Henri-Jean Martin, *Print, Power, and People in 17th-Century France*, trans. David Gerard (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, Inc, 1993), 172. See also Feyel, *L'annonce et la nouvelle*, 14-18.

[3] Feyel, *L'annonce et la nouvelle*, 17.

[4] Other newspapers published by Renaudot included: *Nouvelles ordinaires*, *Relation*, and *Extraordinaires*. See Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 117.

[5] Ibid., 127-28, 134, 149.

[6] *Relation*, 122, January 1634.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Renaudot sold his papers primarily by subscription to an estimated 1,200 readers at a time when approximately 5 percent of the population was literate. See Geoffrey Parker, "An Educational Revolution? The Growth of literacy and Schooling in Early Modern Europe," *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis* 93 (1980): 210-20.

[10] Kathleen Wellman, *Making Science Social: The Conferences of Théophraste Renaudot, 1633-1642* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003), 123.

[11] Leo Strauss, *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Blencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952), 25.

[12] Harcourt Brown in Robert A. Hatch, *The Collection Boulliau (BN, FF. 13019-13059)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1982), xiv.

[13] Strauss, *Persecution and the Art of Writing*, 24.

[14] Descartes to Mersenne, n.d. [February 1634], in Paul Tannery, Cornelis de Waard, and Armand Beaulieu, eds., *Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne*, vol. 4 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1932-1985), 27.

[15] See Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, ed., *Les correspondants de Peiresc: Lettres inédites, publiées, et annotées*, 2 vols. (1879-97; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine, 1972); Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, ed., *Lettres de Peiresc*, 7 vols. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1893); Alexandre-Jules-Antoine Fauris de Saint-Vincens, ed., "Suite des letters inédites de Peiresc, communiqués par M. Millen," *Magasin encyclopédique* 5 (1806): 109-55; Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Marin Mesenne*, 16 vols.; Le P. Apollinaire de Valence, ed., *Correspondance de Peiresc avec plusieurs missionaries et religieux de l'ordre des capucins, 1631-1637* (Paris: Picard, 1891); and Bernard Rochot, ed., *Pierre Gassendi: Lettres familières à François Luillier pendant l'hiver, 1632-1633* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1944).

[16] Eusèbe Renaudot, ed., preface, *General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, upon questions of all sorts of philosophy, and other natural knowledge made in the assembly of Beaux Esprits at Paris, by the most ingenious persons of that nation*, trans. G. Havers (London: printed for Thomas Dring and John Starkey, 1664), no page number.

[17] Peiresc to Gassendi, Sept. 6, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 4, 354.

[18] Raymond A. Mentzer, Jr., *Heresy Proceedings in Languedoc, 1500-1560* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984), 104. For the procedure of criminal and heresy trials, see Isambert, Jourdan, Decrusy, eds., *Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises depuis l'an 420 jusqu'à la révolution de 1789*, 20 vols. (1822-33; reprint, Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg, 1964-1966).

[19] David T. Pottinger, *The French Book Trade in the Ancien Regime: 1500-1791* (Cambridge, Mâss.: Harvard University Press, 1958), 122-23.

[20] Jeffrey Sawyer, *Printed Poison: Pamphlet Propaganda, Faction, Politics, and the Public Sphere in Early Seventeenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 139.

[21] Léon Sabatie, *La censure* (Paris: Pedone, 1908), 52-67.

[22] For a discussion of the implications of these observations, see Albert Van Helden's conclusion in Galileo Galilei, *Sidereus nuncius or the Sidereal Messenger*, trans. Albert Van Helden (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 41.

[23] René Pintard, *Le libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du xviie siècle* (1943; reprint, Geneva: Slatkine, 1983), 185.

[24] Lynn Thorndike, "Censorship by the Sorbonne of Science and Superstition in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 16 (1955): 122.

[25] Ibid.

[26] The procedure used by the Inquisition to censor texts and interrogate was recognized in France by the Ordinance of Villers-Cotterets in 1539. See Mentzer, *Heresy Proceedings in Languedoc, 1500-1560*, 104. See also Isambert, Jourdan, Decrusy, *Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises depuis l'an 420 jusqu'à la révolution de 1789*, 629-34, for information on the procedure of criminal and heresy trials.

[27] Cardinal Richelieu founded the *Académie française*, a literary academy, in 1635.

[28] The academies of secrets carried out investigations about the mysteries of nature. For more, see William Eamon, "From the Secrets of Nature to Public Knowledge," in David Lindberg and Robert Westman, eds., *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 340-45.

[29] Peter N. Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 42. See also Robert A. Hatch, "Peiresc as Correspondent: The Republic of Letters & the Geography of Ideas," in B.P. Dolan, ed., *Science Unbound* (Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University Publications, 1998), 23; and Robert Mandrou, *From Humanism to Science, 1480-1700*, trans. Brian Pearce (Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1978), 196.

[30] For the use of correspondence to procure data for work on a method of determining longitude, see Jane T. Tolbert, "Seventeenth-Century Technical and Persuasive Communication: A Case Study of Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc's Work on a Method of Determining Terrestrial Longitude," *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 15: 1 (2001): 29-52.

[31] Renaudot, preface, *General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, upon questions of all sorts of philosophy, and other natural knowledge made in the assembly of Beaux Esprits at Paris, by the most ingenious persons of that nation*, no page number.

[32] Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 65.

[33] Renaudot, who hoped to attract "quality" audiences, estimated his first fifty conferences attracted "thousands of honorable people," which Feyel suggested represented from forty to fifty each time. See Feyel, *L'annonce et la no centurie uvelle*, 104.

[34] Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 65.

[35] Renaudot, "To the Reader," *General Collectionof Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, upon questions of all sorts of philosophy, and other natural knowledge made in the assembly of Beaux Esprits at Paris, by the most ingenious persons of that nation*, no page number.

[36] Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 68.

[37] It is difficult to ascertain with certainty the identity of participants at these conferences. Feyel provided the names of mathematicians and other scientists whom he said attended. See Feyel, *L'annonce et la no centurie uvelle*, 79-80, 109-11.

[38] See Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 80; Wellman, *Making Science Social*, 9-10; and Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Jan. 15, 1634, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 15.

[39] See Peiresc to P. Dupuy, April 18, 1633, and Sept. 12, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 2, 498, 596.; and Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Jan. 15, 1634, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 15.

[40] Gassendi to Boulliau, May 17, 1633, in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 3, 400-02.

[41] Gassendi to Boulliau, Jan. 24, 1634, in Ibid., vol. 4, 11.

[42] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, April 18, 1633, and Sept. 12, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 2, 498, 596.

[43] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, April 18, 1633, in Ibid., 498.

[44] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Jan. 10, 1633, Jan. 24, 1633, and Oct. 10, 1633, in Ibid., 409, 425. 620.

[45] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Jan. 10, 1633, in Ibid., 409

[46] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Jan. 30, 1630, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 24-25.

[47] Gassendi to Luillier, Nov. 9, 1632, and Dec. 4, 1632, in Rochot, *Pierre Gassendi*, 8, 19.

[48] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Nov. 22, 1632, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 2, 375.

[49] Peiresc to Gassendi, June 25, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 4, 318.

[50] See Peiresc to Holstenius, June 2, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 5, 406; and Peiresc to P. Dupuy, May 30, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 2, 534.

[51] Armand Beaulieu, *"Les réactions des savants français au début du xviie siècle devant l'héliocentrisme de Galilée:" Convegno internazionale de studi galileian* (Firenze: Giunti Barbera, 1984), 374.

[52] Peiresc to Gassendi, Aug. 12, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 4, 342.

[53] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Aug. 16, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 2, 582.

[54] Descartes to Mersenne, n.d. [early Feb 1634], in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4, 27.

[55] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Feb. 6, 1634, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 28. See also Peiresc to P. Dupuy. March 14. 1634, in Ibid., 55.

[56] Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 3, 452.

[57] See A. Favaro, "Processo di Galileo," as quoted by Robert S. Westman, "The Reception of Galileo's 'Dialogue:' A Partial World Census of Extant Copies," in P. Galluzzi, ed., *Novità celesti e crisi del sapere* (Florence, Italy : Giunti Barbera, 1984), 330-31; and Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4 , 8, n. 3.

[58] Peiresc to P. Dupuy, Feb. 6, 1634, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 28.

[59] Mersenne, *Harmonie universelle*, t. I, livre I, Prop. 33, 76, as quoted in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4, 411.

[60] Descartes to Mersenne, [May 1] 1634, in Ibid., 98-99.

[61] Mersenne to Rivet, Feb. 8, 1634, in Ibid., 37-38.

[62] Peiresc to Gassendi, June 25, 1633, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 4, 318.

[63] Peiresc to Gassendi, Sept. 6, 1633, in Ibid., 353.

[64] Ibid., 354.

[65] Descartes to Mersenne, n.d. [early February 1634], in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4, 27.

[66] Renaudot, "Conference X: On the Motion or Rest of the Earth," *General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, upon questions of all sorts of philosophy, and other natural knowledge made in the assembly of Beaux Esprits at Paris, by the most ingenious persons of that nation*, 57-61.

[67] Villiers to Mersenne, n.d. [Nov. 15, 1633], in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 3, 550.

[68] Galilei, *Sidereus nuncius or the Sidereal Messenger*, 41.

[69] Galileo Galilei, "Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine, Grand Duchess of Tuscany Concerning the Use of Biblical Quotations In Matters of Science," [1615] in Stillman Drake, ed. and trans., *Discoveries and Opinions of Galileo* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1957), 182.

[70] Gassendi to Peiresc, Feb. 11, 1634, in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4, 41.

[71] Ibid.

[72] See Mersenne to Peiresc, Dec. 4, 1634, and Dec. 19, 1634, in Ibid., 406-07, 418; and Mersenne to Peiresc, May 25, 1635, in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 5, 214.

[73] Marin Mersenne, *Les questions théologiques, physiques, morales, et mathématiques où chacun trouvera du contentement ou de l'exercise* (Paris: Henry Guenon, 1634).

[74] Mersenne to Peiresc, July 28, 1634, in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 4, 267.

[75] Ibid., 267-68.

[76] Gassendi to Peiresc, Feb. 26, 1632, in de Larroque, *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 4, 259.

[77] Peiresc to Holstenius, July 2, 1636, in de Larroque, ed., *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 5, 443-44.

[78] Peiresc to Gilles de Loches, Nov. 4, 1636, in Tannery, de Waard, and Beaulieu, *Correspondance du P. Mersenne*, vol. 6, 144.

[79] Peiresc to J. Dupuy, Dec. 5, 1634, in de Larroque, ed., *Lettres de Peiresc*, vol. 3, 236.

[80] Mandrou, *From Humanism to Science, 1480-1700*, 294.

[81] Harcourt Brown, *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth Century France (1620-1680)* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1934), 37-38.

[82] Feyel, *L'annonce et la nouvelle*, 112.

[83] Solomon, *Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France*, 65.