

PART 1

Scaliger and Casaubon



Confidentiality and Publicity in Early Modern Epistolography: Scaliger and Casaubon*

Dirk van Miert

Introduction

The surviving correspondence of the seventeenth century sometimes includes letters that the writer asked the recipient to destroy by “dedicating them to Vulcanus.” There is, for example, a letter of 1608, from Jan Boreel to the great Hugo Grotius, in which Boreel resorts to using Greek and even Hebrew to conceal a message and asks Grotius, in any case, to burn the letter (in the following translation, the Greek is in italics, the Hebrew is underscored):

I first had misgivings about the letter that I include. But I thought I would be unworthy of your most dignant letter if I failed to send anything in return at all. And I do this indeed in the hope, yes even the trust, that you offer this letter to Vulcanus as soon as you have read it. I am not quite surprised that you find yourself unable to steer a middle way between the *patriots* and the *warmongers* in order to demonstrate your support for both parties. I experience the same thing here [in Zeeland]: hardly any action, hardly any conversation at all is safe from reprehension. I have torn up one letter in which I had informed you about the state of our affairs, and while I trembled, I had *boldy ventured* to write that now was the hour of exile from Zeeland, which I still think it is.¹

* This article was written in the context of the research project Biblical Criticism and Secularisation in the Seventeenth Century (OND1316730), which was financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). I am indebted to Piet Steenbakkers, Jetze Touber, and in particular Henk Nellen for their comments on earlier versions, and to Ann Blair, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and the peer reviewers for corrections and helpful remarks.

1 J. Boreel to Grotius, 13 Dec. 1608, in Hugo Grotius, *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, ed. P.C. Molhuysen et al., 17 vols. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1928–2001), 17:42: “Ista quam inclusam mitto antehac displicuit, sed indignus mihi visus sum dignissimis tuis si nihil omnino rescriberem. Atque hoc quidem facio ea spe, quinimo fiducia, uti meas ubi legeris Vulcano tradas. Quod inter φιλοπατρίδας et φιλοπτολέμους ita te medium gerere non potes uti utrisque tuum studium probes, haud sane miror. Idem nobis hic accidit; vix ulla actio, vix ullum colloquium a reprehensione tutum est. Laceravi epistolam unam qua te certiore feceram quo in statu res nostrae essent, et cum tremere ἀποτολμήσας scripseram esse nunc הַיְהוּדִים הַגָּלוּת גַּלְיָת עַתָּה, quod ipsum adhuc iudico.”

There are other letters extant in Grotius's correspondence that were destined for destruction, but that were in fact never burned.² Most of these letters contain sensitive religious or political inside information. Such intelligence provided a good reason for destroying letters. And recipients were not the only ones to do so: posterity also could make sure letters disappeared. Almost all the letters that Theodorus Beza received from French authors were destroyed in order to prevent them from being found should Geneva be captured by the Duke of Savoy, a scenario that would seriously compromise Geneva's secret allies.³

In the practice of Renaissance epistolography, recipients customarily showed letters to their peers, who sometimes copied them out or excerpted them. It was therefore of paramount importance for letter writers to weigh their words and keep track of what they had sent off. Even if the writers forbade their addressees to discuss the contents of their letters with anybody else and completely trusted in the integrity and confidentiality of their correspondents, they might still use concealing language and ask to have the letters destroyed, lest the written word eventually escape the recipients' studies. Unauthorized circulation could have very serious consequences for the reputation of a writer, in particular if she or he was of some standing. Enemies could take advantage of the information (as we will see below in the case of Casaubon), but so also could authors and publishers who wanted to enrich the paratext of their books with a letter from a famous author (as happened in Scaliger's case). It was therefore necessary for the letter writers to keep as much control as possible over the circulation of their work. How did they do this? To answer this question, I will look at two cases: one from the correspondence of Joseph Scaliger, and the other from the letters of his friend Isaac Casaubon.

2 J. Wtenbogaert to Grotius, 2 Sept. 1603, in *ibid.*, 1:28: "Interea quas a me tenes litteras tibi habe et Vulcano sacrificata." J. de Groot to Grotius, 2 Aug. 1621, in *ibid.*, 17:185: "Tu literas hasce Vulcano trade, ne quandoque reperiantur." D. Baudius to Grotius, 4 Mar. 1605, in *ibid.*, 1:51: "Scriverianam litem etiam curae tuae fiduciaequae commendo. Non est quod te rogem, ne foras eliminentur quae hic temere effutio; satis me tacente intelligis non esse proferenda, nec ulli concedenda nisi Vulcano nostro, vel si mavis Veneris marito." J. Boreel to Grotius, 7 Feb. 1614, in *ibid.*, 1:297: "Vale amicorum decus. 7 Febr. 1614. Lectas Vulcano." Grotius to N. van Reigersberch, 15 Feb. 1624, in *ibid.*, 2:344; on the back: "Mons. Grotius. xv Febr. 1624 A Paris. Vulcano." Grotius to N. van Reigersberch, 15 Feb. 1624, in *ibid.*, 2:342, at the end of a letter in Dutch: "Vulcano haec epistola sacrator."

3 Alain Dufour, "Le dit et le non-dit dans la correspondance de Théodore de Bèze," in *L'épistolaire aux XVII^e siècle*, ed. Frank Lestringant et al. (Paris: Rue d'Ulm, 2001), 135.

Scaliger's Strategies of Concealment

In contrast to Grotius's correspondence, we find only one request for destruction in Scaliger's letters. Instead, Scaliger asked his correspondents not to share the contents with others if the contents were delicate. In a postscript to a letter of 1578 to his friend François Vertunien, Scaliger wrote: "I beg you to keep this letter as little circulated as possible."⁴ Scaliger knew that his letter would be read by more than one person, and he seems not to have objected to this, as long as the distribution was kept to a minimum. This letter was not printed until 1879—maybe not out of respect for Scaliger's wish but because that happened to be the year of the publication of the first edition of his French letters. In 1580, when Scaliger criticized Siméon Dubois's edition of Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, he wrote to Claude Dupuy: "I only ask you to keep this between the two of us, because, really, I should only speak of this man with respect, because of his erudition, his integrity, and his position."⁵ This letter was printed likewise only in 1879. In 1598, Scaliger wrote a note to Janus Dousa, curator of the University of Leiden and an influential member of the High Council of Holland and Zeeland. Scaliger (the son of a staunch Aristotelian) asked Dousa to help stop the spread of Ramist influences at the university. He rounded his letter off by begging Dousa "by the law of friendship to prevent any of your colleagues or someone else's finding out that I had words with you or wrote any letter at all about this case." Dousa may have kept his mouth shut, but in 1627 Daniel Heinsius published this Latin letter without leaving out a word.⁶

But not all of Scaliger's secret letters were published. One confidential letter saw the light only in 2012. In this letter, Scaliger explicitly asked Jacques-Auguste De Thou to speak with nobody about the contents, which concerned the book of Judith. This relatively early letter (27 Apr. 1591) was written when Scaliger was in Preuilly, two years before he accepted the invitation to come to Leiden. Preuilly was a relatively safe place in southern France: the small

4 Scaliger to Vertunien, 29 June 1578, postscript, in *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, ed. Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, 8 vols. (Geneva: Droz, 2012), 1:226, line 87: "Je vous prie que la presente soit le moins divulguée qu'il vous sera possible."

5 Scaliger to Claude Dupuy, 7 July 1580, in *ibid.*, 1:294, lines 13–17: "Seulement je vous prie que ceci demeure entre nous deux. Car au contraire je ne dois parler de lui qu'avec respect, tant pour sa doctrine, que pour sa probité, et aussi pour le reng qu'il tient."

6 Scaliger to Janus Dousa, 5 Mar. 1598, in *ibid.*, 3:105, lines 20–22, and critical apparatus ad loc.: "Oro autem te per ius amicitiae, ne aliquis collegarum tuorum, aut alius, resciscat a me tibi de hac re verba facta, aut ullam epistolam scriptam." See Heinsius's edition of the text in Joseph Scaliger, *Epistolae omnes quae reperiri potuerunt*, ed. Daniel Heinsius (Leiden: B. et A. Elzevir, 1627), 130–31.

town had a Protestant community and Scaliger himself lived in a fortified stronghold on the hill, which dominated the town and the surroundings. Scaliger's own patron at the time, Henri Louis Chasteigner de La Rochepey, was a Catholic who had fought the Huguenots for three decades. The confessional differences between the two never seem to have jeopardized their relationship. But in 1590–92, the political and religious situation in France was particularly uncertain: after the murder of Henri III in 1589, Henri of Navarre, leader of the Protestant cause, had become the sole heir to the crown, and Chasteigner suddenly found himself in the position of possibly serving a former enemy. Like other Catholics, Chasteigner might have foreseen that Navarre would eventually convert to Catholicism, for it was inconceivable for the throne of France to be occupied by a Protestant. On the day that Scaliger wrote his last letter from France, Sunday, 25 July 1593, Henri did indeed convert, by attending mass in the church of Saint-Denis. It is understandable that Scaliger, after three decades of bloody religious turmoil, was careful in the volatile years leading up to Henri's conversion. He made sure not to criticize Catholic authorities in his letter, but still felt the urge to ask De Thou not to circulate it.

In the letter, Scaliger provided several arguments against the historicity of the book of Judith. These problems pertained to chronology, geography, textual transmission, and historical tradition. After explaining all these, Scaliger said he left it to De Thou to draw his own conclusions when they met again, "pourveu qu'il n'y ait que vous et moi." Scaliger warned, in a mixture of French and Latin, against ultramontane Catholics, whom he denoted by using a Greek epitheton, and he begged De Thou, "Ne communiquez ceci à personne, je vous prie," reaffirming this request with a Latin quotation from Horace (*Odes* 3.1.1) to fence off the unlearned.⁷

The use of covert Greek and indirect Latin quotations indicates that Scaliger tried to conceal his critique of a book that was canonical in the Catholic Bible. A couple of months later, he referred back to the letter, indicating its subject (the book of Judith) in Greek, begging De Thou: "Ne communiquez point nos lettres à personne. Prennes en vostre entendement ce qu'il vous plaira: reliquum tardipedi deo dica."⁸ So here we meet our "slowfooted god" (Catullus, *Odes* 36.7) again, the lame Vulcanus. Scaliger's request was evidently ignored in one instance, but of course we know very little of the cases in which it was not.

7 Scaliger to De Thou, 27 Apr. 1591, in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 2:160, lines 63–69.

8 Scaliger to De Thou, 4 June 1591, in *ibid.*, 2:176, lines 8–10.

Scaliger's Discretion

Scaliger employed another strategy to conceal information: he used veiled references that were clear for the recipient, who was aware of the silent context, but that would not be immediately clear to outsiders. Thus in a letter to Casaubon in which Scaliger complained of the professor of theology François du Jon (his colleague at Leiden, better known as Franciscus Junius the Elder), Scaliger refrained from mentioning Junius by name, and limited himself to rubbishing the man's work: "Have you ever seen the Heidelberg-edition of Manilius?" Scaliger's student Daniel Heinsius, who posthumously published this letter in 1627, thought this reference was too thinly disguised. He replaced the words "the Heidelberg-edition of Manilius" with "the edition of ***."⁹ Likewise, when Scaliger wrote to Casaubon again, he spoke, in the context of his own edition of Manilius, about someone who "hardly knows Latin," as was evidenced by "that Heidelberg-edition" of his, as well as by his "notes on the ecclesiastical African," knowing all too well that Casaubon would immediately recognize that it concerned Junius's Manilius edition and his notes on Tertullian, the Church Father who was born in the Roman province of Africa. Again, Heinsius thought that Junius's identity was too lightly concealed and proceeded to replace with asterisks three of Scaliger's references. Instead of "my Manilius," Heinsius printed "my ***" (so as to obscure that it was in the context of Manilius that Scaliger complained about someone); he replaced the word Heidelberg with asterisks again; and he had asterisks printed instead of "the ecclesiastical African."¹⁰ Scaliger came back to the issue in a third letter. This time, he spoke of "someone of great reputation," who continuously criticized Scaliger in his public lectures and who knew hardly any Latin at all. Scaliger was immediately put off when he opened this man's commentary on *To Atticus*. "If you want to see it for yourself, read his Manilius-notes, read his [edition of] Cyprian's teacher." All this time, Scaliger refrained from mentioning Junius, and referred only to Junius's work: the commentary on (Cicero's *Letters*) *To Atticus*, and that on "the teacher of Cyprian," who was of course Tertullian again. Heinsius replaced only the word "Manilius-notes" by asterisks.¹¹

These interventions raise the question of what an editor was allowed to disclose and what not. What was Scaliger's opinion of the possible publication of his own epistolary legacy?

9 Scaliger to Casaubon, 27 Mar. 1598, in *ibid.*, 3:109, line 27.

10 Scaliger to Casaubon, 23 Oct. 1598, in *ibid.*, 212–13, lines 18, 24–25.

11 Scaliger to Casaubon, 16 May 1599, in *ibid.*, 281, line 28.

The Intricacies of Publishing Scaliger's Correspondence Posthumously¹²

Scaliger himself never planned to have his letters printed. "Is it a blessing for us if people, without our asking for it and knowing it, make faulty and in every aspect mutilated editions of our letters, verses, trifles?" he rhetorically asked Casaubon, two years before his death in 1609.¹³ Yet, he did consider it, as is clear from his hostile response to a German pastor, Theobaldus Meuschius, who published two letters from Scaliger as part of the paratext of his *Harmonia Evangelica*,¹⁴ without informing Scaliger:

Il y a un fat de ministre qui a fait imprimer de mes epistres. Je le reprens bien en son *Harmonia Evangelica*. Il n'aura garde de faire imprimer cette epistre-là.¹⁵

Scaliger went on to predict that his friend Janus Gruter would be wary of printing the letters he had received from Scaliger (these letters were full of instructions on how Gruter should print the corpus of Latin inscriptions, and of complaints on Gruter's slow progress):

Gruter n'a garde de faire imprimer celles qui je lui écris, car je l'instruis de plusieurs choses.

Scaliger subsequently ridiculed men who attempt to make a name for themselves by publishing the letters of a greater man:

C'est à faire à un ignorant de faire ainsi imprimer des epistres pour estre honoré.¹⁶

-
- 12 This subheading is borrowed from Henk Nellen, "Confidentiality and Indiscretion: The Intricacies of Publishing Grotius' Correspondence Posthumously," in *Produktion und Kontext. Beiträge der Internationalen Fachtagung der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für germanistische Edition im Constantijn Huygens Instituut, Den Haag, 4. bis 7. März 1998*, ed. H.T.M. van Vliet (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999), 135–44, where a similar case is discussed.
- 13 Scaliger to Casaubon, 8 Mar. 1607, in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 7:80, lines 11–12): "Beant nos denique qui nostro iniussu, nobis insciis, epistolas nostras, versus, nugas, omnia trunca, mendosa edunt?"
- 14 These two letters are Scaliger to Meuschius, 2 June 1602 and 27 Aug. 1603, in *ibid.*, 4:305–07, 5:132–33.
- 15 This letter, in which Scaliger apparently upbraided Meuschius sharply, has not come down to us. See *ibid.*, 6:47, lines 10–11.
- 16 *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pithoeana et Colomesiana. Ou Remarques historiques critiques, morales, et littéraires de Jos. Scaliger, J. Aug. de Thou, Cardinal Du Perron,*

Finally, he professed to dislike the idea of his letters being printed. “If I wanted them printed, I would polish them.” This is not to be read as a plan; on the contrary: Scaliger did not polish his letters because he had no plans of publishing and would have to be forced to do so:

Entre les siens [i.e., Scaliger’s] on escrit tumultuairement sans ordre, quidquid in buccam venit.

Si vellem excudi, polirem. Je seray contraint de faire un petit volume d’Epistres, et desavouery toutes celles qu’on feroit imprimer.¹⁷

We have no drafts or copies of Scaliger’s outgoing letters, and if he made mistakes in his autographs, he corrected them immediately by crossing out a word, and carried on writing. A few grammatical mistakes in his autographs imply that he did not care to read his letters over before sending them off. For Scaliger, letters were primarily carriers of information, and writing them was not in the first place a literary pursuit.

But according to his student Daniel Heinsius, Scaliger was not hostile to the idea that others would publish his letters after his death. Perhaps Scaliger trusted that letters with delicate information would be treated with due caution, given that confidants like Isaac Casaubon had proved trustworthy. But Casaubon wrote to De Thou after Scaliger’s death:

If someone were to publish all the letters of this man, not only those that he wrote with a certain, intended content *with more attention*, but also those that he dashed off, he would in my opinion render no bad service.¹⁸

Casaubon used a Plinian tag to indicate the letters Scaliger had given special attention: Pliny the Younger spoke of publishing those of his letters that “I wrote with more attention” (*curatius scripsissem*).¹⁹ But Casaubon also thought it worthwhile for scholars to take notice of Scaliger’s straightforward, day-to-day letters (perhaps we may say familiar letters). Scaliger would not have agreed.

Fr. Pithou, et P. Colomies, ed. Pierre des Maizeaux, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Còvens et Mortier, 1740), 2:307.

17 Ibid., 308.

18 Casaubon to De Thou, 29 June 1610, in Joseph Scaliger, *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, ed. Isaac Casaubon (Paris: Hadrianus Beys, 1610), sig. 12v: “Si quis omnes huius viri epistulas, non solum quas certo proposito argumento accuratius scripsit, sed etiam quas subito exaravit, publicaret, eum ego existimem non male operam positurum.”

19 Pliny the Younger, *Epistles* 1.1: “Frequenter hortatus es, ut epistulas, si quas paulo curatius scripsissem, colligerem publicaremque.”

Scaliger's correspondence marks a watershed in the history of epistolary self-presentation.²⁰ From Petrarch to Lipsius, humanists had often tried to control their own public profile by means of carefully editing their own letters. Judith Henderson has the impression that

humanists wrote and published letters in the late fifteenth century because the new opportunity for self-promotion to a larger audience proved irresistible. The humanist letter collection became the equivalent of our literary review or scholarly journal as a forum for professional discussion and career building.²¹

Scaliger had witnessed Justus Lipsius churning out carefully selected and continuously reprinted (and retouched) volumes of letters for over a decade.²² But precisely at this time, about half a century before scholarly journals would conquer the world, things changed. Learned men, at least as far as the Low Countries are concerned, increasingly left it to posterity to publish their letters posthumously, often more than once in expanded editions, as in the cases of the letters of Dominicus Baudius (fourteen editions),²³ Isaac Casaubon (three editions),²⁴

20 Dirk van Miert, "Het presenteren van de geleerde ander. Een diachronisch overzicht met enkele methodologische overwegingen," in *De menselijke maat in de wetenschap. De geleerden(auto)biografie als bron voor de wetenschaps- en universiteitsgeschiedenis*, ed. Leen J. Dorsman and Peter Jan Knegtman (Hilversum: Verloren, 2013), 45–46.

21 Judith Rice Henderson, "Humanist Letter Writing: Private Conversation or Public Forum?" in *Self-Presentation and Social Identification: The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times*, ed. Toon Van Houdt et al. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 25.

22 For an overview of the repeated editions of Lipsius's *Centuriae*, see the bibliography in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 1:1xxiv–lxxvii.

23 See *ibid.*, lx–lxii. See also Philip C. Molhuysen, "Dom. Baudii Epistolae," *Tijdschrift voor Boek- en Bibliotheekwezen* 1 (1903): 243, who identifies only ten editions.

24 Paul Dibon, "Les Avatars d'une édition de correspondance: les *Epistolae I. Casauboni* de 1638," *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* 2, no. 2 (1982): 25–63; see, in addition, Heinsius to G.J. Vossius, 22 Oct. 1629, MS III C 18 no. 55, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Amsterdam; Heinsius to Jacobus Rovenius, 1 Feb. 1637, MS Sup.ep. v, fol. 49r, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Hamburg; and James Ussher to Ludovicus de Dieu, 9 June 1632, postscript, MS copy Thysiana Archief 170, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Leiden (I am indebted to Elizabethanne Boran, Edward Worth Library, Dublin, for letting me know the date and addressee of this letter, which she has edited from an autograph, in Elizabethanne Boran, ed., *The correspondence of James Ussher: 1600–1656*; with Latin and Greek translations by David Money, 3 vols. (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2015), 2: 582–87.

The second edition, edited by Johann Georg Graevius (Magdeburg and Helmstedt: Chr. Gerlach, 1656), was expanded with eighty letters, and the third edition (Rotterdam:

Hugo Grotius (ten editions),²⁵ Caspar Barlaeus (one edition),²⁶ Claude Saumaise (one edition),²⁷ and Gerardus Joannes Vossius (four editions).²⁸

What had Scaliger himself said about the posthumous publication of his legacy? He bequeathed his unpublished papers to Leiden University Library, but on the condition that none of these be published, not even abstracts of them.²⁹ The papers contained not only unpublished but also unfinished material. The will says nothing about Scaliger's letters. His testament pertained only to what he owned; what he had sent off was not in his possession anymore. Letters, as soon as they were posted, were out of the control of their senders. Scaliger thought he ought to be consulted if someone wanted to publish his letters (as is clear from the Meuschius case), but he was unable to appeal in his testament to any legal rule. The same applied to any items attached with letters: short essays, treatises, occasional poems, lists of corrections and remarks, charts, tables, drawings of monuments, and so on. The recipients of such *schedia*, *schedae*, or *chartae* usually detached them from the letters and filed them separately.³⁰

A number of such small works had already been printed during Scaliger's life. The first edition of his *Opuscula* appeared in Paris in 1605. He did not initiate the edition and did not oversee it, and he was annoyed that some corrections that he sent to the editor, Charles l'Abbé or Carolus Labbaeus, arrived too late to be inserted. Isaac Casaubon, who lived in Paris and who was close to Labbaeus, promised Scaliger that in the next edition everything would be settled. Here we see a reason why Casaubon in 1610 published an expanded version of the *Opuscula*, this time posthumously, and now with inclusion of letters.³¹

Caspar Fritsch et Michel Böhm, 1709) with three hundred (Saskia Stegeman, *Patronage and Service in the Republic of Letters: The Network of Theodorus Janssonius van Almeloveen [1687–1754]* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1995), 51–52).

25 Jacob ter Meulen and P.J.J. Diermanse, eds., *Bibliographie des écrits imprimés de Hugo Grotius* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950), 604–11.

26 *Epistolarum liber* (Amsterdam: J. Blaeu 1667).

27 *Epistolarum liber primus* (Leiden: Adrianus Wyngaerden, 1656).

28 *Epistolae* (London: S. Smith, 1690; Augsburg: typis Schönigianis, 1691; London: S. Smith & B. Walford, 1693); *Epistolae selectiores*, in Vossius, *Operum tomus quartus* (Amsterdam: P. & J. Blaeu, 1699), sec. 6, 3–398.

29 Henk Jan de Jonge, "The Latin Testament of Joseph Scaliger, 1607," *Lias* 2, no. 2 (1975): 255.

30 See Dirk van Miert, "Concluding Observations on Communicating Observations," in *Communicating Observations in Early Modern Letters (1500–1675): Epistolography and Epistemology in the Age of the Scientific Revolution*, ed. van Miert (London: Warburg Institute; Torino: Nino Aragno Editore, 2013), 231–33.

31 See our discussion in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 6:106–07.

Casaubon wrote in his preface to this edition that he would have preferred Scaliger to have published the material himself, but Scaliger had replied that he had written many works on demand, works of which he had kept no copy.³² Casaubon in his preface was careful to account for his choices and for his sources: he made sure that he printed only genuine works. Although he limited himself to what he could find in Paris,³³ he stated that he had asked Daniel Heinsius in Leiden for more material.³⁴

Why Heinsius? Because Heinsius, as librarian of the university and as Scaliger's favorite student, had been responsible for guarding the legacy of Scaliger in the university's library. Heinsius proved unwilling to send the material, because of Scaliger's prohibition of publishing anything. Casaubon envied the Dutch, who not only "possessed" Scaliger during all those years he spent in Leiden, but even continued to do so after his death. Casaubon wished France had not been robbed of these treasures.

The letters exchanged between Casaubon and Heinsius corroborate Casaubon's account. Casaubon put pressure on Heinsius by writing to people close to Heinsius, and he even mobilized the authority of De Thou.³⁵ But Heinsius remained reluctant to send Casaubon the material he had asked for, such as a numismatic treatise by Scaliger, as he let Casaubon know in a letter from February 1610. Heinsius expressed joy that Scaliger's small works were being (re)printed in Paris. But he regretted that he could not comply with Casaubon's request to send more material from the Leiden library, owing to Scaliger's own prohibition.³⁶

But Heinsius did approve of printing letters: "When he was still alive, Scaliger showed himself not terribly opposed to this idea, the many times I told him this

32 Scaliger, *Opuscula*, sig. év.

33 *Ibid.*, sig. é3r.

34 *Ibid.*, sig. í3r.

35 Casaubon to Heinsius, 19 Apr. 1609, in Casaubon, *Epistolae, insertis ad easdem responsionibus*, ed. Theodorus Janssonius ab Almeloveen (Rotterdam: typis Casparis Fritsch et Michaelis Böhm, 1709), 331; Casaubon to Heinsius, 3 Jan. 1610, in *ibid.*, 340; Casaubon to Janus Rutgersius, 3 Jan. 1610, in *ibid.*, 340–41; Casaubon to Rutgersius, 5 Jan. 1610, in *ibid.*, 341; Casaubon to Heinsius, 12 Jan. 1610, in *ibid.*, 341 ("Scimus isthic vos habere multa lectu dignissima, quae vel ipsi edite, vel nobiscum communicate. Hoc Praeses Thuanus te mecum rogat: at scin' quomodo? ut nihil magis obnixae queamus."); Casaubon to Thomas Erpenius, 13 Feb. 1610, in *ibid.*, 341–42; Casaubon to Heinsius, 1 May 1610, in *ibid.*, 347–48, postscript 348.

36 See, e.g., Heinsius to Casaubon, 21 May 1610, MS Burn. 364, fol. 231r–v, notably 231v, British Library, London.

was going to happen.”³⁷ In fact, Heinsius supervised what became the dominant early modern edition of Scaliger’s letters—the Leiden edition of 1627.

A letter to Pierre Dupuy of 1626 shows that Heinsius struggled to find a balance between the printer’s wish for bulk, his readers’ expectations of selectivity, and his own inclination to select on the basis of style and contents. We also see him evaluating the editorial principles of one of his predecessors, Casaubon, who had been more selective than he. Heinsius excused himself for the relatively large number of letters that carried little weight in his eyes because they were not always up to the best standards of style and content. He said he was unwilling to expose some of Scaliger’s careless letters, and he left out letters that painfully showed Scaliger’s mathematical shortcomings. Nevertheless, to please the printer Heinsius added other letters, some of which were fine; about the quality of others, he remained silent.³⁸

Not everyone particularly appreciated Heinsius’s edition of 1627. When it came out, Gerard Johannes Vossius complained more than once that Heinsius had insufficiently censored some of Scaliger’s scathing criticisms of Vossius’s father-in-law, Franciscus Junius the Elder, who was still all too easily recognizable. In fact, he thought Heinsius would have done better to omit entire letters instead of superficially censoring them.³⁹

Ironically, it was Vossius’s own son Isaac who in 1666 published the infamous *Scaligerana*, which recorded Scaliger’s sayings from within the even more private setting of conversations in the seclusion of the scholar’s own house, as recorded by some of his students. This often-scandalous publication proved such an immediate success (it was reprinted in 1667, 1668, and 1669)

37 Heinsius to Casaubon, 14 Feb. 1610, *ibid.*, fol. 230r–v, at 230r: “De libellis Scaligeri quos apud vos excudi scripsisti vehementer gaudeo. Utinam conferre vobis aliquid possem. Nam quaecunque bibliothecae reliquit, edi vetuit. Inter ea est doctissimum *De re nummaria* scriptum, sed quod, nisi fallor, etiam in vestris manibus versatur. Poemata quae sparsim edita sunt, aut alibi edenda adhuc latent, coniungi a me voluit et publicari: quae Lutetiae excudi cum praefatione mea vellem, modo commode cum reliquis excudi, et divendi possent. ... Existimo multas apud vos illius viri elegantissimas extare literas, quae edi cum delectu publice interesset, neque ipse ὧν ἐν ζῴοις cum id saepe di[ce]rem futurum, vehementer refragari videbatur.” (There is some loss to the right margin, unfortunately.)

38 Heinsius to Pierre Dupuy, 6 June 1626, MS Coll. Dupuy 19, fols. 113r–14v, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris. The passage about mathematics is not cited in our quotation in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 1:xlili–xliv.

39 See G. Vossius to Grotius, 23 Aug. 1627, in Grotius, *Briefwisseling*, 3:160–61; and G. Vossius to Franciscus Junius F.F., 22 Sept. 1628, in Sophie van Romburgh, “For my worthy Freund [sic] Mr Franciscus Junius”: *An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591–1677)* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), no. 59(h), 342.

that it gave an existing genre of table talk (think of Luther's *Tischreden* and James I's *Table Talk*) a new impulse and inaugurated a veritable craze in publishing the *apophthegmata* and *sententiae* of learned men: the genre of *-ana*, which became immensely popular in the second half of the seventeenth century.⁴⁰

The entry "Junius" in the *Scaligerana* paints a particularly nasty portrait of Franciscus Junius as someone who read himself into ignorance, while thinking himself a better Grecian than Casaubon. "Junius despises the whole world. He thinks he is the greatest man of his own time, of past and of future ages. ... He had two Flemish wives and he still never learned Flemish." The entry carries on like this for two pages (it is among the longest in the entire *Scaligerana*), and one can understand why such gossip was avidly consumed in the tightly bound network of the Republic of Letters. Riding the crest of this wave, Isaac Vossius's good friend Paul Colomiès (Colomesius) even proceeded to publish a key with "solutions" to the censored passages in the editions of the correspondences of Scaliger, Casaubon, and Claude Saumaise. Whoever wondered who was hiding behind Heinsius's asterisks was much helped by Colomiès.⁴¹ Colomiès's "solutions" share some characteristics with a genre popular in the eighteenth-century historiography of learning: catalogs of names revealing the identity of anonymous or pseudonymous authors.⁴² But Colomiès's keys were also a set of belated footnotes to, or even a commentary on, the posthumous

40 See Francine Wild, *Naissance du genre des -ana (1575–1712)* (Paris: Champion, 2001). Michael Lilienthal's "Observatio VI de libris in ANA," in Lilienthal, *Selecta historica et literaria* (Königsberg and Leipzig: Literis Reusnerianis, 1715), 141–77, gives an overview and evaluation of no less than forty-five different table talks. On the freedom of discussing heterodox theories at the dinner table, see Martin Mulsow, *Die unanständige Gelehrtenrepublik. Wissen, Libertinage und Kommunikation in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2007), 122–28; Dirk van Miert and Henk Nellen, "Media en tolerantie in de Republiek der Letteren. De discussie over Isaac de La Peyrère (ca 1596–1676) en zijn Prae-Adamitae," *De Zeventiende Eeuw* 30, no. 1 (2014): 3–19.

41 Paulus Colomesius=Paul Colomiès, "Clavis Epistolarum Josephi Justi Scaligeri Aginnensis, Lugduni Batavorum 1627, 8^o," "Clavis Epistolarum Is. Casauboni Genevensis, Hagae-Comitis A. 1638. curante Cl. Gronovio," "Clavis Epistolarum Claudii Salmasii Divionensis, editore Ant. Clementio. A. 1656," and "Clef des Epîtres Françaises à M. Joseph Juste de la Scala. Recueillies par Jacques de Reves, à Harderwyck l'an 1624," in Colomiès, *Opuscula* (Paris: Sebastian Mabre Cramoisy, 1668), 147–91, at 150–51, referring to pp. 165 and 173–75 of Heinsius's edition. See the apparatus criticus in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 3:109, line 27; 212, line 18; 213, lines 24–25.

42 Martin Mulsow, "Practices of Unmasking: Polyhistor, Correspondence, and the Birth of Dictionaries of Pseudonymity in Seventeenth-Century Germany," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 2 (2006): 219–50.

work of *recentiores* such as Scaliger.⁴³ Theodorus Janssonius ab Almeloveen, who like Colomiès was a facilitator, knowledge broker, and supplier of building blocks for the history of recent learning (it is no coincidence that he authored a *Plagiatorum syllabus*),⁴⁴ pillaged Colomiès's keys in his monumental third (and definitive) edition of Casaubon's letters of 1709.

Isaac Casaubon and Early Modern Authors' Rights

Exercising control over one's own letters could be a difficult affair. Authors' rights were acknowledged by most authors themselves, but were generally not legally formalized. Only printed material could temporarily be protected within the jurisdictional territory of a ruler. The interests of authors and printers often clashed. Although a letter became the physical property of the addressee, the sender still felt he had a moral right to control its fate. In 1644, René Descartes became angry with the physician Vopiscus Fortunatus Plempius for adding his correspondence with Descartes to the 1644 edition of the philosopher's *Fundamenta*. The decision to include these letters was made without Descartes's consent, and the two stopped exchanging letters.⁴⁵

The prudent scholar Isaac Casaubon harbored strong opinions about the difference between work for private communication and work for the public sphere. He attacked the publication of one of his letters to Joseph Scaliger by his enemy Kaspar Schoppe.⁴⁶ In this letter, Casaubon deplored the poor

43 For example, where Scaliger speaks of a "maximi nominis vir," Colomiès identifies "Petrus Victorius," or when Scaliger mentions an "Apologia homuncionis nescio cuius," Colomiès clarifies: "*Mathematica pro Lucano Apologia* Francisci Insulani, Parisiensis procuratoris; de qua quaedam diximus in *Gallia Orientali* in Syllabo scriptorum adversus Scaligerum" (Colomesius, "Clavis Epistolarum Josephi Scaligeri," 148).

44 Stegeman, *Patronage and Service*, 51; Herbert Jaumann, "Öffentlichkeit und Verlegenheit. Frühe Spuren eines Konzepts öffentlicher Kritik in der Theorie des 'plagium extrajudiciale' von Jakob Thomasius (1673)," *Scientia poetica. Jahrbuch für Geschichte der Literatur und der Wissenschaften* 4 (2000): 79n.35.

45 Mihnea Dobre, "Early Cartesianism and the *Journal des Sçavans*, 1665–1671," *Studium* 4, no. 4 (2011): 237.

46 Kaspar Schoppe, *Alexipharmacum regium, felli draconum et veneno aspidum sub Philippi Mornaei de Plessis nupera papatus historia abdito oppositum; et serenissimo D. Jacobo Magnae Britanniae regi strenae Januariarum loco muneris missum* (Mainz: ex officina typographica Ioannis Albini, 1612), 16–18.

performance of the Calvinist leader Philippe du Plessis-Mornay at the Conference of Fontainebleau (1600), an orchestrated showdown between Catholic and Huguenot leading intellectuals.⁴⁷ The Catholic controversialist Schoppe capitalized on this critique of one great Calvinist scholar by another, by inserting, between square brackets, biting anti-Calvinist paraphrases of Casaubon's carefully couched phrases. Feeling that Schoppe had rubbed salt into his wounds, Casaubon was infuriated. In a letter to Georg Michael Lingelsheim, written in 1612, he reflected on something that today we would call authors' rights. The passage is worth quoting in full, because Casaubon is very explicit in his condemnation of publishing material without the author's consent (again, the italics represent what was put in Greek):

Although through God's virtue I could rightly ignore the evil speaking of this Thersites,⁴⁸ I cannot and ought not be silent about the notorious injustice he caused me. He has laid hands on a letter that I once wrote to the great Scaliger, in accordance with our mutual bond. With the impudence of a prostitute, the idiot has published part of it without consulting me. The wretch did not realize that he could not bring forth someone else's letter without incurring the accusation of manifest theft, indeed of the most disgraceful kind. For where did he get the letter? Who gave it to him? Or what else than theft is it to hand over something that belongs to someone else against the will of the owner? I had learned from the writings of the most serious men that this sneaky bookish predator once in his youth heinously pillaged the manuscripts of Obertus Gifanius. Now his own evidence betrays him as a shrew-mouse. So this thief is a gallows-rogue and one who is caught *in the act* of a most shameful type of theft. *Litterae ad familiares* are not governed by public law, they are in the purview of private law and are private property.⁴⁹ Thus in the times when among the pagan Greeks and Romans a virtue reigned that in the false Christians of today we can only long for, great leaders refused to inspect the letters intercepted from their enemies. And rightly so. For whoever violates the law of literature, violates the law of nations and disturbs the laws of the entire human society. He therefore is a criminal,

47 Casaubon to Scaliger, 22 Sept. 1600. We neglected to consult this incomplete *editio princeps* for our edition of Casaubon's letter in Scaliger, *Correspondence*, 3:497–501.

48 An ugly figure who is proverbially given to evil speaking and contemptible. See Homer, *Illiad* 2; Juvenal, *Satires* 8.269; Erasmus, *Adagia*, no. 3280.

49 That is, the property of the recipient. Of course the recipient should handle a letter in accordance with the interests of the sender.

*a cursed man in need of expiation. "For he that foment's civil discord is a clanless, hearthless outlaw."*⁵⁰

Casaubon then goes on to blame the ignorance and "diabolic malice" of "this monster," who "contaminated with his own filth" (i.e., added paraphrases of) Casaubon's words, partly because he did not know any Greek (of course Schoppe did know Greek, but he was not sure all his readers did).

When invoking antiquity, Casaubon may have had in mind a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Demetrius* that relates how the Rhodians, who were under siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes (305 BCE), intercepted letters from Demetrius's wife to her husband but left them unopened, just as Athenians had once done after capturing the messengers of Philip of Macedonia: the military letters were opened and read, but the one from Philip's wife, Olympia, was sent back with the seal unbroken.⁵¹ The passage suggests that antiquity drew a line between a private domain as something personal and a public domain as something political. Adolf Deissmann classified epistolography into official letters (epistles) and personal correspondence (letters).⁵² Of course, such dichotomies hardly ever reflect situations in real life, in which letters can carry all sorts of information.

Every letter, no matter how personal or public, how real or fictitious, how well wrought or dashed off, is the product of a selection of information

50 Casaubon to Georg Michael Lingelsheim, 9 Aug. 1612, in Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 483: "Quum igitur Thersitae istius maledicentiam, Dei virtute, possimus iure contemnere; insignitam iniuriam quam fecit nobis, tacere non possumus, nec debemus. Nactus enim epistolam quam ad magnum Scaligerum pro mutua coniunctione nostra aliquando scripsimus, prostituti pudoris nebulo nobis inconsultis partem illius edidit. Non cogitavit Alastor, epistolam alienam proferre se non posse, quin furti manifesti, et quidem turpissimi, reum sese ipse perageret. Nam unde habet? Quis illi dedit? Aut quid furtum est aliud, nisi alienae rei invito domino tractatio? Didiceram ex gravissimorum scriptis felem hanc librariam viri clarissimi Oberti Gifanii scrinia olim in iuventute sua nefarie compilasse. Nunc prodit se indicio suo sorex. Fur igitur est iste furcifer, et quidem in maxime infami furti genere ἐπὶ αὐτοφώρῳ deprehensus. Literae ad familiares scriptae iuris publici non sunt, privati iuris, privatae possessionis sunt. Itaque olim quum inter paganos Graecos et Romanos virtus vigeret, quam in falsis Christianis cogimur hodie desiderare, magni duces captas suorum hostium literas inspicere noluerunt. Recte. Nam qui ius literarum violat, ius gentium violat, humanae totius societatis iura conturbat. Scelestus igitur est, ἐναγῆς et piacularis: Ἀφρήτωρ, ἀθέμιστος, ἀνέστιός, ἔστιν ἐκεῖνος [Homer, *Iliad* 9.63]."

51 For this passage, see Patricia A. Rosenmayer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1–2.

52 Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. Lionel R.M. Strachan (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927).

controlled by the author.⁵³ Early modern writers ascribed different grades of privacy to letters depending on their status. Theoretically, humanist epistolography was ambivalent about the permitted level of personal expression. The reliance on classical rhetoric in the manuals on the art of letter writing until deep into the sixteenth century shows how the letter was expected to reach a public readership. Most authors, especially those who expected to publish their letters during their lifetimes, were reluctant to discuss personal convictions when communicating religious and political news.⁵⁴ But the rise of Protestantism, which encouraged personal investigation of one's own soul, contributed to an increasingly personal character in the letter, which made it more private. Because of the wars of religion, scholars turned to stoic philosophy; the Ciceronian ideal of style, associated with republicanism and public debate, grew less important. Instead, room was created for individual expression.⁵⁵ The letter thus acted as a carrier of personal convictions and motives.

In his expression of outrage Casaubon discusses the private domain and the public sphere by using a vocabulary that connotes the legal system: injustice (*iniuria*), theft (*furtum*), accused (*reus*), other people's belongings (*res aliena*), proprietor (*dominus*), evidence (*indicium*), thief (*fur*), caught red-handed (*ἐπι ἀυτοφώρῳ deprehensus*), public law (*ius publicum*), private law (*privatum ius*), private property (*privata possessio*), inviolability of mail (*ius literarum*), and even the law of nations (*ius gentium*). In fact, the entire idea of *private* and *public* is derived from Roman law. The idea of theft (*furtum*) was also applied later in the seventeenth century to a related form of literary crime: plagiarism.⁵⁶ Casaubon assigns "private law" to *litterae familiares*. This would mean that even if letters were read by people surrounding the recipient, as they usually were in the beginning of the seventeenth century, Casaubon still

53 Rosenmayer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 5, 10–12. She also criticizes a classification by M. Luther Stirewalt, *Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), who nevertheless maintains the distinction between "official letters" (6) and "personal familiar letters" (10).

54 Karl Enenkel, "Der neulateinische Brief als Quelle politisch-religiöser Überzeugungen. Theoretische Reflexionen zur Diskursivität einer ambivalenten Gattung," in *Between Scylla and Charybdis: Learned Letter Writers Navigating the Reefs of Religious and Political Controversy in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Jeanine De Landtsheer and Henk Nellen (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 3–16.

55 *The Classical Tradition*, ed. Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and Salvatore Settis (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2010), s.v. "Letters, and Epistolography," 523.

56 Jaumann, "Öffentlichkeit," 69. On author rights, see also Kathy Eden, *Friends Hold All Things In Common. Tradition, Intellectual Property, and the Adages of Erasmus* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 5–7.

regarded this practice as falling within the boundaries of the confidentiality of mail, even if he himself never specified how to define the circle of those authorized readers.

Casaubon put his case very strongly because in addition to his personal reputation, Calvinism itself was at stake. His strong feelings on this matter may constitute a sign that the expectation of privacy for *epistolae familiares* was increasingly widespread in his milieu. This “private” domain, then, was not the personal privacy of the modern age but was seen as the domain of the *familia*: the household and the peers of the recipient. Did Casaubon expect that his letters would be read by other people than Scaliger alone? It is unlikely that Scaliger, who despised Schoppe even more than Casaubon did, showed Casaubon’s letter to the wrong person. Far more likely, Casaubon’s letter was intercepted and copied out. After all, Casaubon was closely monitored at the time by ecclesiastical authorities in Paris.⁵⁷

Casaubon was not the only one to draw the boundary between *privatus* and *publicus* in terms of authorial control. During the seventeenth century, this distinction was omnipresent. Printing was generally thought to be an act of crossing the boundaries between private and public, as is clear from the often-used idiomatic expression *publici iuris facere* (to place under public law) to denote “publishing.” We may locate the dichotomy of public versus private in a legal framework of publication, even if “private” does not connote the privacy of modern times but refers to a semiprivate sphere shared by the recipient of a letter and the friends of that recipient, as long as these were well disposed to the author of the letter.

Conclusion

Scaliger reckoned with the possibility that uninvited readers read his letters, and he disguised information by making implicit references only. He appealed to his authorial rights against Meuschius because he had not been consulted. From Casaubon’s protests we may conclude that there was a code against breaching the confidentiality of mail. He protested strongly in legal terms. A similar apprehension likely surrounded the prospect of letters being published posthumously, especially as this pattern became dominant after the mid-seventeenth century. But the keys of people like Colomiès show that

57 Dirk van Miert, “The Limits of Transconfessional Contact in the Republic of Letters around 1600: Scaliger, Casaubon, and Their Catholic Correspondents,” in De Landtsheer and Nellen, *Between Scylla and Charybdis*, 390–97.

personal objections of deceased authors were deemed less important than serving the greater good of the community of scholars, who were entitled to have information on the good and the bad in the history of scholarship. This development may point to a growing commercialization in the Republic of Letters, as well as to the rise of the idea that historical facts deserved greater consideration than historical reputations.⁵⁸ Of course, authors continued to insist that their moral rights be respected in their lifetimes, but dead scholars were abandoned to the not-so-very-tender mercies of a growing commercial literary market. This market, which produced the scholarly output known as *historia literaria*, aimed at a mixed readership of students and of people who were not professionals, but who could steep themselves in reading journals, –ana, keys, bio-bibliographies, and an increasing apparatus of footnotes in posthumously published collections of correspondence. The more sensitive the information, the more attractive was the collection.

We are no less curious ourselves. In fact, every time we come across evidence that Vulcanus was not properly served by recipients of letters, we experience a sense of relief and satisfaction. The failed burnt offerings will keep us busy to the moment we retire. And hopefully long afterward.

58 Intriguingly, Paul Botley, who is editing the correspondence of Casaubon's English years (1610–14) comes to the conclusion that the early modern editors of Casaubon's correspondence carefully manipulated Casaubon's image by silently censoring harsh passages, critique of Protestant authorities and references to his domestic life. Hereby, they constructed a somewhat less passionate, more detached and more masculine public image of Casaubon. In this case, at least, it would appear that historical reputation *did* trump historical fact. Paul Botley, "The Censorship of Isaac Casaubon's Letters," paper read at the conference *Epistolary Cultures. Letters and Letter-writing in Early Modern Europe*, University of York, 18 March 2016.