

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/114589>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Definitive version for *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* Feb 2019

How the Sauce Got to be Better than the Fish:

Scholarship and Rivalry in Isaac Casaubon's Studies of Ancient Satire*

Satira haec & genus & nomen est non plebeij poëmaticis,
sed carminis eruditi...¹

[Roman] satire is neither by genre or by name common poetry,
but the poetry of scholars...

'Persius is scarier than fourteen drill sergeants', wrote the French satirist Jacques Du Lorens in 1624.² Throughout the early modern period Persius's six satires and their prologue were notorious for their level of difficulty.³ Julius Caesar Scaliger, for instance, reprimanded the poet for his cantankerous style and for his lack of regard for his readers, although he smugly added, '...we do now understand everything'.⁴ His son Joseph was of a similar disposition:

* I owe thanks to Paul Gehl, former curator of the Special Collections at the Newberry Library, for facilitating access, in September 2013, to the Newberry's extraordinary holdings of Persius editions (the 'André Himpe Persius Collection'). Initial versions of this article were presented at the 'Scholarship, Science, and Religion in the Age of Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) and Henry Savile (1549-1622)' conference, held at Merton College Oxford (1-3 July 2014) and a joint University of Warwick-Johns Hopkins University workshop on 'Antiquity and Its Uses: Reception and Renewal' (Baltimore, 4-5 April 2016). I am grateful to the audiences at both events for their feedback. I particularly thank Dr Paul Botley (University of Warwick), Dr Jeanine De Landtsheer (KU Leuven), Prof. Mordechai Feingold (CalTech), Prof. David Lines (University of Warwick), Dr Máté Vince (Trinity College Dublin) and the anonymous referee for this journal for their close reading of my text and for sharing their knowledge and, in some cases, unpublished research. Any mistakes that remain are of course my own.

¹ Isaac Casaubon, 'In Persium Prolegomena', in *Auli Persii Flacci Satirarum liber. Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, et commentario libro illustravit. Ad Virum Amplissimum D. Achillem Harlaeum Senatus Principem* (Paris: Ambroise and Jérôme Drouart, 1605), no page number.

² 'Perse fait plus de peur que quatorze Sergens'. Du Lorens, *Les Satyres* (Paris: Jacques Villery, 1624; repr. Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1881), 172, also quoted in *A. Persius Flaccus. Saturae*, ed. with a commentary by Helgus (Oleg) Nikitinski, *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare* (Munich and Leipzig: Saur, 2002) (hereafter Nikitinski), 298.

³ See the 'Varia de Persio Iudicia. Saec. XIV-XX' gathered in Nikitinski, 285-352.

⁴ Quoted from Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem* (Lyon, 1561), anastatic edition (Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Fromman, 1964), 323, in Nikitinski, 290-91 (290): 'Persii vero stilus morosus, et ille ineptus, qui quum legi vellet quae scripsisset, intellegi noluit quae legerentur. Quanquam nunc a nobis omnia intelliguntur.'

Persius is a most miserable author who courts obscurity; he does not contain beautiful things, but we can write very beautiful things about him.⁵

So, despite the challenges, or perhaps because of them, editions and commentaries on Persius abounded.⁶ Within this prolific textual and scholarly tradition, the 1605 Persius edition by the French protestant humanist Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) has long been recognized as a milestone.⁷ The edition's companion-piece, the *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*, also published in 1605, has similarly been acknowledged as a seminal study for the humanists' broader understanding of Classical satire, most notably for its clear etymological (and hence generic) distinction between Latin satire or *satira* and the Greek satyr play.⁸

The aim of this article is not to anatomize Casaubon's work in view of the current state of Classical scholarship on satire or comedy, nor to reassess *ab ovo* what contributions he made to the Early Modern understanding of Ancient satire.⁹ But recent developments in research on humanist correspondences, the commentary tradition, and Casaubon's life and work as a whole, allow us to build a much fuller and far more nuanced view than before of either book's trajectory from concept to print and

⁵ *Scaligeriana sive excerpta ex ore Iosephi Scaligeri. Per FF. PP. Editio auctior...* (The Hague: Vlacq, 1669), 252: 'Persius miserrimus Autor obscuritati studet, non pulchra habet, sed in eum pulcherrima possumus scribere.' See also *ibid.*, 182: 'Iuvenal est un admirable Poëte, il y a de belles choses à dire là dessus, c'est un si beau Poëte au prix de Perse, qui s'est plû à escrire obscurement.' Cf. Nikitinski, 295-96.

⁶ See Morris H. Morgan, *A Bibliography of Persius, including the catalogue of a library made by him and by Daniel B. Fearing*, Bibliographical Contributions of the Library of Harvard University 58 (Cambridge, Mass.: The Library of Harvard University, 1909). Persius editions will henceforth be referenced as Morgan followed by their entry number in this catalogue.

⁷ As in n. 1 above. Morgan *218. See, for instance, Dorothy M. Robathan and F. Edward Cranz, with the assistance of Paul Oskar Kristeller and with a contribution by Bernhard Bischoff, 'Persius', in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. Annotated Lists and Guides*, vol. 3, ed. F. Edward Cranz and Paul Oskar Kristeller (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1976), 201-312 (207) (hereafter *CTC*). Cf. Daniel M. Hooley, 'A Vexed Passage in Persius (6.51-52)', *The Classical Journal*, 87.1 (1991), 13-24 (18): 'We should remember, as sometimes Housman did not, just how good a reader of Persius Casaubon was.'

⁸ Isaac Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi, & Romanorum satira libri duo. In quibus etiam poetae recensentur, qui in utraque poesi floruerunt* (Paris: Ambroise and Jérôme Drouart, 1605). For a summary of the distinction between *satira* and *satyra*, see Holt N. Parker and Susanna Braund, 'Imperial Satire and the Scholars', in *A Companion to Juvenal and Persius*, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, ed. by Susanna Braund and Josiah Osgood (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2012), 436-64 (448).

⁹ See, among others, Lennart Pagrot, *Den klassiska verssatirens teori; debatten kring genren från Horatius t. o. m. 1700-talet* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1961), 105-07, and Ingrid De Smet, 'Giants on the Shoulders of Dwarfs? Considerations on the Value of Renaissance and Early Modern Scholarship for Today's Classicists', in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, ed. by Stephen Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 252-64.

distribution, of the motivations and guiding principles behind Casaubon's research, and more generally of the dynamics of scholarly endeavor around the turn of the seventeenth century. I shall argue that Casaubon's work on Ancient satire, whilst stunningly erudite, is at the same time a product of fierce scholarly rivalry and very strongly colored by confessional differences.

1. Towards the Persius Edition of 1605

What led Casaubon to work on Persius? As early as 1584, Josias Mercier had heard from Denys Godefroy that Casaubon was preparing an edition of Juvenal and Persius, a rumor which Casaubon strenuously denied; yet Casaubon must already have studied both satirists in considerable detail, for he offered to share with Mercier whatever variants he had noted on the basis of his consultation of old manuscripts.¹⁰ Isaac Casaubon subsequently lectured on Persius in Geneva in 1591 or 1592¹¹ and again at Montpellier in June 1597,¹² drawing at least in Geneva a multitude of students to his course.¹³ Casaubon's early interest in Roman verse satire is also evident in his 1592 edition, with a Latin translation and commentary, of the *Characters* of Theophrastus, an enterprise for which he received ample praise from Joseph Scaliger.¹⁴ For after the Latin translation follows not only an extract of the 'ostentatoris pecuniosi character'

¹⁰ Casaubon (Geneva) to J. Mercier, 30 April 1584 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae: insertis ad easdem responsionibus, quotquot hactenus reperiri potuerunt, secundum seriem temporis accurate digestae...*, ed. by Theodorus Jansonius ab Almeloveen (Rotterdam: C. Fritsch and M. Böhm, 1709), 1-2. On Mercier, see Jean (c. 1525-1570) et Josias (c. 1560-1626) Mercier: *L'Amour de la philologie à la Renaissance et au début de l'âge classique. Actes du colloque d'Uzès, 2-3 mars 2001*, ed. by François Roudaut (Paris: Champion, 2006) [Oxford, TAY PN723 .J43 2006]

¹¹ See Casaubon's letter to R. Thomson, 4 February 1602, quoted on p. 000 below. Hélène Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon helléniste. Des studia humanitatis à la philologie*, Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance 454 (Geneva: Droz, 2009), 43.

¹² Isaac Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ed. with a preface and notes by John Russell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850), 2 vols, I, 28: 'VIII. Kal. Jul. [24 June 1597] Mane preces: studia, et ad Persium, quem eo die publice interpretari incepti cum Deo, παρασκευή. Da mihi, Pater clementissime, absolvam, inoffenso pede, quod institui, et sic haec studia tractem, ut et conatus nostri et juvenum profectus ad nominis tui gloriam tanquam ad versum et ἀρχιτεκτονικόν finem suum referantur. Γένοιτο, γένοιτο.' Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559-1614*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), 100-01.

¹³ Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 22n. Casaubon to G. Lingelsheim, 24 February 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 233) (as in n. 86 below), to D. Heinsius, 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 235-36),

¹⁴ J. J. Scaliger to Casaubon, 7 May 1594 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, II, 384-86); see also Casaubon's pleased reply of [1 October 1594] (*ibid.*, II, 437-39). *Scaligeriana* (1699), 64. Scaliger's copy of the 1592 edition is in Copenhagen, Royal Library. Cf. Ib Magnussen, 'Casauboniana glimt fra den filologiske verden omkring 1600', *Fund og Forskning*, 7 (1960), 24-34 (28).

(‘type of man who shows off his wealth’) from the Fourth Book of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, but also the notorious chatterbox from Horace’s *Satires* I.9.¹⁵ Moreover, Casaubon saw an affinity between Theophrastus and what we could broadly call satirical writing, as he briefly related the *Characters* to Greek satyrs and Varro.¹⁶ The seedbed for Casaubon’s *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira* thus also seems to go back much further than is usually assumed and than he himself later indicated.

Although Casaubon was also working on other authors in the mid to late 1590s, most notably Athenaeus and to some extent Polybius,¹⁷ Persius was certainly at the forefront of his mind, when he wrote from Geneva to Jacques Auguste de Thou in October 1595:

Just as a long time ago Lucilius feared his poems would be read by Persius, so I fear that I what I write should be read by Scaliger, by the Lefèvre, or by the Pithou brothers.¹⁸

Casaubon was well aware that the Persius whom Cicero refers to in the source text for this learned allusion, was not the satirist but a namesake (as he would later argue). Nevertheless, another telling feature of his work on satire already manifests itself here,

¹⁵ *Theophrasti Characteres ethici, sive descriptiones morum*, ed., trans. and comm. by Isaac Casaubon (Lyon [= Geneva]: François Le Preux, 1592), 83-88.

¹⁶ *Theophrasti Characteres ethici*, ed. by Casaubon, ‘Liber Commentarius’ [with separate title-page], ‘Prolegomena’, 11: ‘Et apud Graecos Satyrus antiquissimus peripateticus, et apud Romanos doctissimus Varro libros non dissimilis, ut videtur, argumenti ediderunt: quos tam non χαρακτηρας, sed περι χαρακτηρων inscripserant. Varronis librum laudatum aliquoties apud Latinos grammaticos reperimus: verum ita, ut de eius argumento pro certo quicquam pronuntiare non possimus. ac fieri potest, ut sit is ipse quem Nonius *De proprietate scriptorum* vocat. quod si est, nihil huc scilicet facit. Satyri vero librum affinem huic Theophrasteo fuisse argumenti similitudine, ferme mihi persuasit aliquando hic ex illo locus, ab Athenaeo prolatus: dignum profecto ubique, non ibi tantum legi. Est autem character hominis asoti.’

¹⁷ Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 30, 32, 33; R. Thomson to Casaubon, 9 August 1595 (Paul Botley, *Richard ‘Dutch’ Thomson, c. 1569-1613. The Life and Letters of a Renaissance Scholar*, Scientific and Learned Cultures and their Institutions 16 [Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016], 199-203). On Athenaeus of Naucratis, see Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon helléniste*, especially 378-400, and Botley, *passim*. On the Polybius edition, see Martin Albert, ‘L’Édition de Polybe d’Isaac Casaubon (1594-1609)’, *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 10 (1890), 3-43, and Parenty, 74-77, 177-205.

¹⁸ Casaubon to J. A. de Thou, 8 October 1595 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 25): ‘Ut olim Lucilius a Persio sua poemata, ita ego quae scribo a Scaligero, a Fabris, a Pithoeis legi reformido.’ Casaubon alludes to Cicero, *De or.* 2, 6, 25. This passage is also quoted in his Persius edition of 1605, ‘Notae ad Persii Vitam’ (1605), no page number, and in Casaubon’s letter to J. Lipsius, 8 March 1605 (*Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, ed. by Pieter Burman, 2 vols [Leiden: Samuel Luchtmans, 1727], I, 381-82 [382]).

viz. that from the outset the judgment of Casaubon's scholarly peers would be a determining factor for the measure of its success.

In 1596, that is, the year before his Montpellier lectures, Casaubon voiced the idea of a Persius edition in a letter to the learned French diplomat Jacques Bongars – this Persius was part of an ambitious publishing programme that would lay the intellectual groundwork for his move to Paris.¹⁹ In the following years, marked by his transfer to the capital, Casaubon does not appear to have actively worked on Persius, although a note in the *Ephemerides* for 1599, about the thirteenth-century tract *De disciplina scholarium* (then falsely attributed to Boethius) and its affinity with the satirists, and Persius in particular, indicates once more that the topic of satire never really left the scholar's mind.²⁰ Around that same time, however, some of Casaubon's friends and acquaintances began to speculate that Casaubon had published a new Persius edition.²¹ Indeed, in his commentary on Athenaeus, published in 1600, Casaubon briefly mentions his commentary on Persius as if it was in existence.²² This 'public' claim to Persius may have been buried in this voluminous commentary like a needle in a haystack; but it did not escape the attention of Casaubon's friend and admirer, Richard Thomson, who assembled a list of the scholar's unpublished works and projects – including the 'Commentar. in Persium' – on the fly-leaf of his presentation copy of Casaubon's Athenaeus, preserved in Exeter Cathedral Library.²³

In the first week of July 1601, however, the Parisian printer Claude Morel published a *variorum* edition of Persius that would play a crucial role in the production

¹⁹ Casaubon to J. Bongars, 2 March 1596 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 30): 'Interea Athenaeum, Persium, et quaedam alia, si vivimus, et Deus aderit, edemus.' The statement is somewhat ambiguous. Robert Estienne's *Dictionarium latinogallicum* (third edn, 1552, accessed via <http://artfl-project.uchicago.edu/content/dictionarium-latinogallicum>) (art. *Edo*) alerts us to the dual meaning of the verb *edere*: it does not necessarily signify 'to publish' (*pervulgare et edere. Cic. publier*) but can also simply mean 'to explain publicly with a commentary' (*edere et exponere. Cic. declarer et exposer*).

²⁰ Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 130. On this text, see Árpád Steiner, 'The Authorship of the *De Disciplina Scholarium*', *Speculum* 12.1 (1937), 81-84.

²¹ Thomson to Casaubon, 1 March 1599 (Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson*, 218-20 [220]): 'Persium tuum prodiisse idem ille amicus vir retulit.'

²² Isaac Casaubon, *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas Libri XV* (Lyon: Antoine de Harsy, 1600), 285: 'Quid appellant Græci ὑγρὸν βίον ..., quid item ὑγρὸν ὀφθαλμὸν, fusè exposuimus ad Persium.' Casaubon also makes a few other references to Persius in the course of his commentary.

²³ John Glucker, 'A Presentation Copy of Casaubon's Athenaeus in Exeter Cathedral Library', *Pegasus*, 6 (1966), 13-19 (13); Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson*, 73-74.

and shaping of Casaubon's work on satire.²⁴ Let us therefore take stock of its principal components. Other than the text of Persius's satires, the 1601 volume included (i) the edition of the so-called Cornutus scholia and accompanying notes by Élie Vinet (1509-1587); (ii) a list of variants on these scholia recorded by Pierre Pithou (1539-1596); and two further commentaries: (iii) one was by Jean de Tourneroche (ca. 1550-1620), a professor of rhetoric at the Collège d'Harcourt,²⁵ (iv) the other by a Dutchman who taught at the Parisian Collège de Reims, named Derrick Marcelysz[oon] Blanckebiel, but better known to his contemporaries and to posterity as Theodorus Marcilius (1548-1617).²⁶ Now, Vinet's commentary and edition of the Cornutus scholia had been published at Poitiers in 1560 and 1563, following his collation of the scholia in his native region of Barbezieux and Angoulême in 1557.²⁷ Morel's 1601 edition, however, added in variants from an old manuscript belonging to the mayor of Langres and antiquarian, Jean Roussat.²⁸ The few ensuing pages are drawn from Pithou's 1585

²⁴ The timing is derived from the dates of the *epistolae dedicatariae* by Marcilius and Tourneroche (see below) and the *terminus ante quem* provided by Jacques Gillot's letter to Scaliger of 7 July 1601 (see below, n. 000).

²⁵ On Tourneroche, see *CTC* (as in n. 7 above), 302-04.

²⁶ *Auli Persij Flacci Satyrae cum antiquissimis commentariis qui Cornuto tribuuntur, collatis cum veteribus membranarum et auctis. Eliae Vineti praefatio et annotationes in easdem. P. Pithoei IC variae lectiones & notae ad veteres glossas. Theodori Marcilii ... Emendationes et commentarius. Ioannis Tornorupaei Notulae. Accesserunt indices rerum & verborum quae in satyris et commentariis* (Paris: Claude Morel, 1601). Morgan *210. On Marcilius, see Christian Mouchel, 'Théodore Marcile et le cicéronianisme à l'Université de Paris sous le règne d'Henri III', *Nouvelle Revue du XVIe Siècle*, 8 (1990), 51-62. On his birthplace Arnhem (rather than Zutphen), and new evidence concerning his vernacular name and family, see Willem Frijhoff, 'Le Paris vécu des Néerlandais: de l'Ancien Régime à la Restauration', in Marie-Christine Kok-Escalé, *Paris: de l'image à la mémoire. Représentations artistiques, littéraires, socio-politiques*, Faux Titre 122 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997), 8-36 (15-17) and id., 'Les Blanckebiel, une famille sans frontières au temps de l'humanisme et des Guerres de religion', *De Nederlandsche leeuw* 129.3 (2012), special issue: *Familiegeschiedenis en heraldiek zonder grenzen*, 136-53. On the Cornutus scholia (or rather the 'Commentum Cornuti' and further 'scholia'), see *Commentum Cornuti in Persium*, ed. by Wendell V. Clausen and James G. Zetzel (Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 2004) and James G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Supplement* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 2005).

²⁷ *Auli Persii Flacci Satyrarum liber, ab Elia Vineto Santone emendatus: cuius annotationes una cum Annaei Cornuti, grammatici vetustissimi, commentario in eundem satyrarum Persii librum, separatim expressimus* (Poitiers: Enguilbert Marnef, 1560), which contains the text of Persius only, and *Lucii Annaei Cornuti Grammatici Antiquissimi Commentum in Auli Persii Flacci Satyras, nunc primum [sic] formis editum. Eliae Vineti Santonis praefatio in id commentarium, et annotationes in easdem Persii Satyras* (Poitiers: Enguilbert Marnef, 1563). Morgan *175: the entry notes that despite the different dates, the continuous signatures on the quires of either part indicates that both were published together. I have consulted Newberry Library, sc2808 no.2. Vinet mistakenly thought he was offering the *editio princeps* of these Scholia.

²⁸ Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship*, 59-60. Zetzel attributes the new collation to Claude Morel and his father, the scholar-printer Frédéric II Morel.

edition of both Juvenal and Persius,²⁹ in which Pithou had similarly published variants of the Cornutus scholia drawn from a ‘vetustissim[um] & opt[imum] exemplar’ (the so-called codex Pithoeanus, currently preserved at Montpellier).³⁰ Classicists now consider Pithou’s as the most significant Persius edition before Casaubon’s.³¹ Indeed, reprinted in Heidelberg in 1590, it would be perused by scholars such as Petrus Scriverius, Nicolas Heinsius, and Pieter Burman the Younger.³² In the meantime, however, the commentaries by Tourneroche and Marcilius were new.³³ Their publication evidently resulted from a concerted effort, since Tourneroche signed his dedicatory epistle the day after Marcilius – the driving force behind the entire venture – signed his.³⁴

²⁹ *A. Persii Satyrarum liber I; D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satyrarum libri V; Sulpiciae Satyra I: cum veteribus commentarijs nunc primum editis ex bibliotheca P. Pithoei, cuius etiam notae quaedam adjectae sunt* (Paris: Mamert Patisson, 1585), here 277-79. Morgan *195. The copy at the University Library Ghent (BIB. CL. 001514), available online at eBoeken Gent and Google Books, bears the ownership mark of Florent Chrestien. The book was a gift from Mamert Patisson (‘Q. Sept[imii] Florentis Christiani. Dono Mamerti Patissonii Typographi Regii’). Leiden University Library holds a copy annotated by Justus Lipsius (Special Collections 757 G7:1).

³⁰ Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, section médecine, ms. H125. It concerns a ninth-century codex, also containing Juvenal, and generally referred to as P (*Pithoeanus*) in modern Persius editions. Pithou refers to the manuscript as L (*Laureshamensis*). For a digital reproduction see http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/view/bumm_h125/. On the manuscript, see Holt N. Parker, ‘Manuscripts of Juvenal and Persius’, in *A Companion to Juvenal and Persius*, ed. by Braund and Osgood, 137-61 (155-56), and Holt N. Parker and Susanna Braund, ‘Imperial Satire and the Scholars’, *ibid.*, 436-64 (449-51: ‘Pithou’s Legacy’).

³¹ See the list of ‘Editiones atque commentarii praecipui’ in Nikitinski, 8-9. Cf. also *Juvenal and Persius*, ed. and trans. by Susanna Morton Braund, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College, 2004), 26, 28. Its text of Juvenal served as the model for Nicolas Rigault’s edition. See Parker and Braund, ‘Imperial Satire and the Scholars’, in *A Companion to Juvenal and Persius*, ed. by Braund and Osgood, 436-64 (448, quoting Housman and Cranz & Kristeller).

³² Morgan *197. See the annotated copies in Leiden University Library, including the copy annotated by P. Pithou himself (Leeszaal Bijzondere Collecties, signatuur 757 G 12 ‘cum notis mss. P. Pithoei’), alongside Leeszaal Bijzondere Collecties, sig. 757 G 8 ‘cum collatt. et notis mss. ex biblioth. Vossiorum’; sig. 757 G 9 ‘cum notis mss. Pt. Scriverii’; sig. 757 G 10 ‘collatus cum mss. ab Nic. Heinsio’; sig. 757 G 11 ‘cum notis mss. Jani Broukhusii’; sig. 757 G 13 ‘cum notis mss. Pt. Francii’; sig. 757 G 14 ‘cum notis mss. Pt. Burmanni Sec.’.

³³ Persius (1601), Tourneroche commentary, ‘secundae curae’, 93: ‘...cum iam pridem fuerit observatum in nostris notulis Persianis, quas Cadomi excudendas curavi anno millesimo quingentesimo octogesimo nono’. The *CTC* mentions Caen, Bibliothèque de la ville, ms. 532. f 110 (113) ‘Annotations in sextas (sic) Auli Persii Satyras’. See Gaston Lavalley, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque municipale de Caen* (Caen: Blanc-Hardel, 1880), no. 313.

³⁴ Marcilius’s dedicatory epistle to Renaud de Beaufort, archbishop of Bourges and archbishop designate of Sens, is dated 23 May 1601. Tourneroche’s *epistola dedicatoria* to Groulart, president of the Parlement of Rouen, is dated 22 June 1601. The *privilege* for the entire volume is dated 26 May 1601. Cf. J. Gillot to J. J. Scaliger, 7 July [1601] (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, ed. by Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, dir. by Anthony Grafton, Henk Jan de Jonge and Jill Kraye, *Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 507/1-8, 8 vols [Geneva: Droz, 2012], IV, 3-7 [7]): ‘Nous avons icy un Martial nouvellement imprimé et un Perse. Je donneray ordre que l’on vous en envoie, encores que je ne sçache pas bonnement s’ils le valent. C’est Morel qui les a imprimez, *Marsilii cura et diligentia*’ [emphasis mine]. In February 1602, Christophe Dupuy would also offer to send this Persius edition to

Casaubon was clearly needed that with this Persius edition Marcilius had pipped him to the post: even if he himself had not yet taken any concrete steps to publish his own edition of the satirist, it is worth remembering that upon his move to Paris in 1598 Casaubon had obtained a blanket *privilège* covering all of his works. Moreover, during his stint at Montpellier, the absence of a suitably skilled printer and, above all, the lack of specialist Greek type had seriously hampered any plans of scholarly publication Casaubon may have entertained.³⁵ Anyone familiar with Casaubon's work will know that even an edition of a Latin author such as Persius is liberally sprinkled with Greek, so much so that readers clamored for Latin translations of these Greek tags, which the third edition of the Persius commentary, edited by Casaubon's son Meric in 1647, would indeed provide.³⁶ At any rate, in 1601, Casaubon could no longer muster the mild amusement with which he had first reacted to the supercilious reception Marcilius had given him when Casaubon first went to pay his respects to the Dutchman in his college den. The irksome visit had soon been followed by reports of Marcilius making derogatory remarks about Scaliger, Lipsius and Casaubon in his lectures.³⁷ From then on, anything Marcilius produced was received with contempt and derision by the triumvirate and their friends. Less than a week after Marcilius's Persius edition came off the press, Casaubon shared his disdain for it with the young protestant scholar and lawyer Didier Hérault (c.1579-1649), using offensive yet highly allusive language:

You, I know, will have much to teach me, but not that foul dog who does not stop yapping at my name from within the depths of its cavern – I mean that creature of darkness, that snake [literally 'son of the earth', *i.e.* Erichthonius], whose new commentary on Persius you have seen. O the scoundrel, how unworthy is he of our indignation! For if he deserved it, he would have obtained a proper retort.³⁸

Scaliger (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, IV, 201-203 [203]). The Bibliothèque nationale de France preserves a copy bound with the Dupuy arms and bearing the handwritten inscription 'Donum Theodori Marcilii, 1601' on the third part (Marcilius's commentary) (Paris, BnF, shelfmark YC-774).

³⁵ See Alexandre Germain, 'Isaac Casaubon à Montpellier', *Mémoires de la Section des lettres / Académie des sciences et lettres de Montpellier* 5 (1871), 207-44 (230-31, 237, 239).

³⁶ *Auli Persi Flacci Satirarum liber. Isaacus Casaubonus recensuit, et commentario libro illustrative. Tertia editio, auctior et emendatior ex ipsius Auctoris codice*, ed. by Meric Casaubon (London: M. Flesher for R. Mynne, 1647). Morgan *274. For a contemporary critique of Casaubon's use of Greek, see p. 000 below.

³⁷ Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 27 July 1599 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, III, 296-300 [298-99]). Cf. J. J. Scaliger to Casaubon, 30 September 1599 (*ibid.*, III, 334-37 [334-35]), and Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 31 December [1600] (*ibid.*, III, 552-56 [555]).

³⁸ Casaubon to D. Hérault, 13 June 1601 (*Isaacus Casauboni Epistolae*, 120): 'Tu nos multa, scio, docebis: non ille canis impurus (*Marcilius*), qui ex intimo spelaeo suo nostrum nomen allatrare non cessat. Illum dico tenebrionem, telluris filium, cujus recentem in Persium commentarium vidisti. O male,

Hérault, as it happens, freshly arrived from Sedan, had just published some notes on Martial's epigrams in an edition that also contained notes by Marcilius and by de Thou's young protégé Nicolas Rigault. Unsurprisingly, this edition too, or at least Marcilius's part in it (a revised commentary on the *Liber spectaculorum*, first published in 1584), was fair game, alongside the Persius edition: 'whenever I seek to distract myself,' so Scaliger wrote to Casaubon in December 1601, 'I take to hand the writings of that person who recently pooped on Martial's *Amphitheatrum* [i.e., the *Liber spectaculorum*] and on Persius. For I never laugh more sweetly than when I see something by that madman'.³⁹

More significant for our present purpose is the fact that Casaubon soon staked his prior claim on Persius in a letter to Richard Thomson, crushing Marcilius's arrogant endeavor with insults borrowed from Timon Phlasius, Plautus and Aulus Gellius, and accusing him of plagiarism:

quod indignus est indignatione nostra! Nam si ita esset meritis, responsum tulisset.' Also quoted in Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 58. The term *tenebrio* is an insult taken from Varro's *Menippeae* (197; 377). The expression *telluris filium* probably refers to the mythological figure of Erichthonius, who was 'born of the earth', after the goddess Athena (Minerva) was almost raped by Hephaestus (Vulcan) and wiped the god's semen off her thigh (see, for instance, Apollod. 3.14.6); according to Servius's commentary on Virgil's *Georgics*, 'the child was born with snake-like feet; he is called Erichthonius, since he was born from "strife" and the "earth"' ('Inde natus est puer draconteis pedibus, qui appellatus est Erichthonius quasi de terra et lite procreatus: nam ἔρις est lis, γῆθὼν terra', Serv. G. 3, 113). The expression *canis impurus* recurs several times in Calvin's writings and became part of the polemical language of the period's confessional debate: it would also be applied to the Counter-Reformation pamphleteer Gaspar Scioppius.

³⁹ J. J. Scaliger to Casaubon, 18 December 1601 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, IV, 148-50 [150]): 'Quum animum remittere volo, assumo in manus scripta illius *Amphitheatrum* Martialis et Persius nuper κατακέχοθεν. Nam nunquam suavius rideo quam quum aliquid eius Lucumonis video.' For the metaphoric meaning of 'Lucumon', see Paulus Festus, 120 ('Lucumones quidam homines ob insaniam dicti, quod loca, ad quae venissent, infesta facerent'). On Scaliger's own aggravation with Marcilius, which centred especially on his commentary on Martial, see Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983-1993), II, 622-24. Cf. J. J. Scaliger to the Dupuy brothers, 10 January 1602; Scaliger to Casaubon, 22 January 1602; Casaubon to Scaliger, 27 March 1602; Scaliger to Chr. Dupuy, 8 June 1602; Casaubon to Scaliger, 9 April 1603 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, IV, 171-72 [172], 177-85 [183-84], 235-40 [236], 290-92 [291-92]; V, 13-16 [15-16]). Casaubon's copy of Marcilius's 1593 edition of the *Epigrammata in Caesaris Amphitheatrum* is in the British Library, class-mark 598.a.15.(3) (Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, with Alastair Hamilton, *'I have always loved the holy tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* [Cambridge, Mass., and London: The Belknap Press, 2011], 338). It carries only occasional underlinings and marginal notes, none of a polemical nature.

I agree with you about the new commentator on Persius. He's a sordid schoolmaster, an empty-headed windbag,⁴⁰ who thinks and boasts that he is the most learned among men. Next to him, the others are supposedly puffballs, dullards,⁴¹ not to say mere animals, and barely rational beings.⁴² As I am in the habit of saying, *he is the most pathetic plagiarist*, lucky only in this respect that he is unworthy of my bile. For had he and all that he has said deserved that, then his insolence against the great Scaliger and the equally great Cujas, not to mention others, would not have gone unpunished. *You are aware, I think, that ten years ago I composed a commentary on that same poet with the utmost care.* What I shall do with it, I have yet to see. But although that fathead has not exactly pre-empted my modest observations, I am getting used to their being treated with more and more disregard and contempt as each day passes.⁴³

Seven months later, Casaubon reiterated the claim in rather similar terms in a letter to Justus Lipsius, but now openly and unreservedly stating his scorn:

It pleased me that you not only dignified this tasteless little book, born under the wrath of the Muses, with a reply, but also that you immediately shared this response with me. On both counts, most eminent Lipsius, I thank you very much indeed. It was absolutely the right thing to do, to strike with your stylistic sword at that pack of whining dogs, led by that yapper. Ever since he received praise from you in some letter, there has not been a day that he stopped crowing about it. I am talking about that bookworm, that most arrogant, petulant, injudicious of human beings that are, have been or ever will be, who recently sullied Persius with his filthy hands. It has been more than nine years since I publicly lectured on that weightiest of poets, with extraordinary diligence too; *and I still have among my drafts the great many notes I collected to shed light on him*; if I ever have the urge to publish them, then I shall hardly be able to restrain myself from giving that frantic little school master his just deserts. But let that day not dawn

⁴⁰ Allusion to Timon Phliasius (ca. 320-230 BCE), as transmitted by Theodoret of Cyrus. Casaubon may have read the expression in *Ποίησις φιλόσοφος. Poesis philosophica, vel saltem, Reliquiae poesis philosophicae, Empedoclis, Parmenidis, Xenophanis, Cleanthis, Timonis, Epicharmi. Adjuncta sunt Orphei illius carmina qui a suis appellatus fuit ὁ θεολόγος [sic]. Item Heracliti et Democriti loci quidam et eorum epistolae* (Geneva: Henri II Estienne, 1573), 61: '[Ex Theodorito.] Ἄνθρωποι κενεῆς οἰήσιος ἔμπλεοι ἄσκοί.'

⁴¹ 'Fungi, bardi': cf. Plautus, *Bacchides*, 5, 1, 1-4.

⁴² λογικά ζῶα: cf. Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 14, 1.

⁴³ Casaubon to R. Thomson, 4 February 1602 (Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson, 270-74 [273]*): 'De novo Persii interprete assentior tibi. Impurus Ludimagister, κενεῆς οἰήσιος ἔμπλεος ἄσκός, doctissimum se mortalium et putat, et praedicat. Caeteri prae ipso fungi, bardi, bestiae denique, et vix λογικά ζῶα. Soleo dicere, nequissimum plagiarium uno beatum, quod stomacho meo sit indignus. Nam si mereretur, et omnia illius essent tanti, non ferret inultum, quod in me, quod in magnum Scaligerum, et item magnum Cuiacium (ut alios taceam) est ausus. Scis, opinor, ante decem annos exactissimae diligentiae Commentarium scriptum nobis in eum Poetam. Eo quid facturi sumus, viderimus. Iste quidem nebulo observatiunculas nostras non praeripuit nobis; quas tamen aspernari et facere non tanti, magis magisque in dies assuescimus.' (my emphasis).

that sees me straying from the path of true virtue and depart from the footsteps of those that I follow from afar, but follow nonetheless...⁴⁴

These testimonies call for various remarks. First, on the surly question of precedence, it is worth noting that Marcilius's commentary allegedly stemmed from lectures he had delivered as a young man, whilst Tourneroche alludes to some *notulae* on Persius which he had ready for printing in his hometown of Caen in 1589, for distribution among his friends – these working notes, in fact, survive in a single manuscript.⁴⁵ The Bibliothèque Mazarine holds a copy of Vinet's 1560 edition, which Marcilius gave to the Flemish humanist Petrus Colvius, who died in 1594, aged just 27, after being kicked by a mule in the streets of Paris. This book has been partly annotated, possibly in two different hands.⁴⁶

The notes and assembled comments which Casaubon refers to as his own undoubtedly include his copious manuscript annotations in his copy of the Juvenal and Persius edition, printed at Basle in 1522, now held in the British Library.⁴⁷ Casaubon

⁴⁴ Casaubon to J. Lipsius, 22 October 1602 (*Isaaci Casauboni epistolae*, 161): 'Et quod Libellum inficetum, Musisque iratis natum, responsione sis dignatus; et quod scripti illius tui feceris nos statim participes, utrumque juxta gratum. Ago igitur, praestantissime Lipsi, utroque nomine magnas maximas gratias. Erat omnino faciendum, ut semel saltem stili tui mucronem in istos vere λυπόδας κόνας stringeres, quorum gregem Μαυιλάκας ille ducit; qui olim Epistolâ quâdam a te laudatus, cotidianos ex illo triumphos de te ducere intermisit nunquam: Illum dico γωνιοβόμβυκα, bipedem ὄντων ἔσσομένων πρό τ' ἔόντων arrogantissimum, peculatissimum, insulsissimum, qui Persium nuper impuris suis manibus conspurcavit. Decimus annus agitur, cum gravissimum illum Poetam publice interpretati sumus haud mediocri diligentîâ; *extantque in liturariis nostris quae ad ejus lucem congesseramus quam plurima*: horum publicandi si impetus aliquando nos capiat, vix est ut contineri possumus, quin furiosum Magistellum pro suis meritis accipiamus. Sed ne illucescat ille dies, qui me exorbitantem a verae virtutis semita, et eorum vestigia deserentem, quos πόρρωθεν quidem, sed tamen sequor, sit visurus...' (my emphasis). Cf. Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 90.

⁴⁵ Caen, Bibliothèque Centre Ville, ms. 532 ('Recueil d'opuscules de Jean de Tourneroche'), fols 110-55 ('Annotationes in sextas [*sic*] Auli Persii satyras').

⁴⁶ Paris, Mazarine, 4^o 10509 B-1 (Rés): this copy of Vinet's 1560 edition (as in n. 27 above) bears Colvius's manuscript ownership mark between the title and the printer's vignette ('P. Colvi'), and Marcilius's ex-dono at the bottom of page, underneath the printer's address: 'donum TH. Marcilij'. Bound with: Barnabé Brisson, *De ritu nuptiarum liber singularis* (Paris: Rovinge, 1564); Ludovicus Carrio, *Emendationum et observationum liber primus* (Paris: Gilles Beys, 1583); and id., *Emendationum et observationum liber secundus* (Paris: Gilles Beys, 1583). See also art. 'Colvius, Petrus', in A. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (1852-1878), III (1858), 635-36 [accessed via dbnl.org].

⁴⁷ Morgan *112. London, British Library, shelfmark 1068.i.15 (listed among the 'Printed Books with Manuscript Annotations' in Grafton and Weinberg, *I have always loved the holy tongue*, 339). A handwritten book list amongst Casaubon's papers suggests he had several Persius editions at his disposal. Oxford, Bodleian, Adv. 22, fol. 47r-48rv: 'Persius cum Comment. Cornuti et Britannici fol. / Juvenal. Persius cu[m] vett. Glossis 8 / Juvenal. Persius. 8. / Juvenal. Persius Pulmanni / Persius cum Comment. Cornuti.'

had received this book as a gift from his close friend and future brother-in-law Pierre Périllau (Petrus Perillaeus), who had studied with him under Giulio Pace at Geneva, and who also provided Casaubon with a Polybius edition and a manuscript of Theocritus.⁴⁸ Both the ex-dono and the annotations are undated, but the latter are consistent with the notes a lecturer might make in preparation of a detailed *explication de texte*.⁴⁹ All in all, these annotated copies and the scholars' competing allusions to their respective lectures or notes suggest that Marcilius and his circle had in fact entertained an equally long-standing interest in Persius as Casaubon.

Casaubon's accusation of plagiarism in his letter to Thomson, on the other hand, is more serious: it may well refer to the otherwise unspecified 'manuscript of Persius' ('Persium MS.') that Casaubon (according to his diary) had lent to Marcilius's publisher Morel in March 1601, just months before Morel published the 1601 *variorum* edition.⁵⁰

A further observation must be made *ex silentio*, insofar as Casaubon does not really vent his disparagement of the other new commentator on the scene, Tourneroche, other than tacitly including him in Marcilius's 'pack of whining dogs'. Tourneroche, who is now entirely forgotten, had the good sense of minimizing his own achievement in comparison with the great scholarly luminaries of his age in the letter-preface that preceded his commentary on Persius:

In my readings of Persius, I chose Turnèbe, Scaliger, Casaubon and Lipsius as my guiding lights: to them I shall pay my respects in perpetuity, just as the travellers of old sacrificed to Hercules of the Rocks. I hope that by taking their lead, wherever I digress, I shall not ramble, but follow a straight path.⁵¹

⁴⁸ The ex-dono reads: 'P. Perillæus [*illegible word*] amantiss[imo] viro fratriq[ue] Is[aac] Casaubono d[ono] d[edit]'.
⁴⁹ Isaac Casaubon, *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI. Ad Cardinalis Baronii prolegomena in Annales* (London: John Bill, 1614), 42. Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson*, 199. Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon helléniste*, 43. On Casaubon and Périllau, see anon., 'Lettre inédite d'Isaac Casaubon à son beau-frère Périllau. 1603', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 2.5-6 (1853), 289-92. Paul Colomiès, *Italia et Hispania orientalis sive Italarum et Hispanorum qui linguam hebraeam vel alias orientales coluerunt vitae*, ed. by Johann Christoph Wolff (Hamburg, 1730), 'Casauboni Epistolae Gallicae, nunquam antehac editae', 137-46, contains 8 letters in French from Casaubon to Périllau. Jacques Pannier quotes extracts from manuscripts letters between Casaubon and Périllau (1601-1609) held in Paris, Bibliothèque du protestantisme français (*L'Église réformée à Paris sous Henri IV* [Paris: Champion, 1911], *passim*, and 174n., Casaubon lamenting the books he left behind at Montpellier). On 5 March 1602 Périllau carried a letter from Casaubon to D. Hérault (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 141).

⁵⁰ Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 342.

⁵¹ Persius (1601), Tourneroche's commentary, 'Lectori bene precatur Ioannes Tornorupæus', no page number: 'In percurrando Persio Turnebum, Scaligerum, Casaubonum, Lipsium legi Deos Viales, quibus,

Tourneroche's allusion to 'Hercules Saxanus' is no doubt a nod to one of Scaliger's learned notes in his commentary on the pseudo-Virgilian *Catalects*.⁵² And unlike Marcilius who does not quote any contemporary humanists by name, Tourneroche's commentary explicitly refers to Turnèbe's notes on Persius (published in 1556, 1564, and 1567) ('lest I appear to plagiarize'),⁵³ as well as to Casaubon's commentary on Suetonius,⁵⁴ and, intriguingly, to Scaliger's interpretation of the Cornutus scholia.⁵⁵ This last comment warrants further consideration.

Somehow, Tourneroche was aware that the Cornutus scholia printed in Pithou's 1585 edition were based on a transcription, which Scaliger, rather than Pithou himself, had originally made from the Montpellier manuscript. Scaliger had indeed entertained the idea of publishing a combined edition, with commentary, of the Probus scholia on Juvenal and the Cornutus scholia on Persius in 1573,⁵⁶ after François Pithou had told him that his brother Pierre owned a manuscript of them. Pithou, however, seems to have been reluctant to lend Scaliger the precious codex he had received from his brother.⁵⁷ But he succumbed ten years later, allowing Scaliger at the end of the summer of 1583 to collate the text of the Probus scholia from his manuscript with the so-called *Probus*

ut olim Herculi Saxano viatores, sacra propter viam perpetuo sum facturus. Spero etiam hisce ducibus, quocumque deferar, non erroneum fore, sed recta iturum.'

⁵² P. Virgilius Maro, *et in eum commentationes, et paralipomena Germani Valentis Guellii, P[atroni] P[arisiensis] eiusdem Virgilii appendix, cum Josephi Scaligeri commentariis et castigationibus* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1575), 'in Catalecta', 87.

⁵³ Persius (1601), Tourneroche's commentary, 11: 'haec, ut pleraque alia, Turnebus, ne plagiarium videar.' Turnèbe's commentary on Persius was first published anonymously in 1555, 1556, 1558 and 1564 by the Parisian printer Thomas Richard (Morgan 167 [1556 only], *170, 177), but a named and augmented version, with added readings drawn from Turnèbe's *Adversaria*, appeared in a combined edition of Persius and Juvenal printed at Lyon in 1567 (Morgan *181). John Lewis, *Adrien Turnèbe, 1512-1565: A Humanist Observed*, *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 320 (Geneva: Droz, 1998), 166.

⁵⁴ Persius (1601), Tourneroche's commentary, 16: 'Ne te pluribus morer, lege Casaubonum commentariis in Suet.'

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 88: 'Ita legendum putat Scaliger ex reliquijs veteris interpretis Cornuti.'

⁵⁶ J. J. Scaliger to P. Pithou, 23 August 1573 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, I, 54-57) (only Probus is mentioned); Scaliger to Pithou, 9 October 1573 (*ibid.*, I, 62-64 [62-63]); and Scaliger to P. Pithou, 6 November 1573 (*ibid.*, I, 66-66).

⁵⁷ Scaliger complains of Pithou's lack of response to his letters on 10 September 1573 and 6 November 1573 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, I, 62-64 [62] and 65-66 [65]). On the provenance of the manuscript, see Persius, ed. by P. Pithou (1585), 273: '... unius omnium sane optimi atque antiquissimi [exemplaris]... Id ad nos tandem pervenit Francisci fratris cariss[imi] dono, ...'. For a different slant, see *Scaligeriana* (1669), 83: 'ledit P[ierre] P[ithou] prit à son frère, et luy retint le vieux commentaire de Juvenal et Perse, pour lequel ils ont eu dispute.' The ownership mark 'P PITHOV' is clearly legible on fol. 80v.

Vallae, the Probus scholia first published in 1486 by Giorgio Valla of Piacenza (c. 1430-1499).⁵⁸ In January 1584, Scaliger duly sent Pithou his ‘excerpts from Cornutus’ (*Excerpta Cornuti*) via their mutual friend François Vertunien.⁵⁹ In his 1585 edition, Pithou acknowledges Scaliger’s help in an address to the reader,⁶⁰ and makes two passing references within the text, to ‘the most learned Scaliger’ (‘doctissimus... Scaliger’) and ‘our friend Scaliger’ (‘Scaligero nostro’).⁶¹ But surely these general references by Pithou were not sufficient for Tourneroche to attribute the provenance of the Cornutus scholia to Scaliger. The manuscript source itself, the *Pithoeanus* (Montpellier 125), had passed back to François Pithou’s library in Troyes.⁶² But Scaliger’s collation of Vinet’s edition of 1563 with the *Pithoeanus* also survives – with a note of receipt and further annotations by Pithou – amongst a selection of Scaliger’s papers, currently held in Paris, at the Bibliothèque nationale de France (ms. Dupuy 394ter, fols 218-84).⁶³ Later, Scaliger would not only firmly stake his claim as the real collator of the Cornutus scholia in 1600 in a letter to another Persius scholar, Eilhard

⁵⁸ J. J. Scaliger to Cl. Dupuy, 3 July 1583 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, I, 359-60); Scaliger to P. Pithou, 4 July 1583 (*ibid.*, I, 363-64); and Scaliger to P. Pithou, 17 September 1583 (*ibid.*, I, 381-82 [382]): ‘J’ai receu tout maintenant le Probus in Iuvenalem. Je pense partir dans peu de jours pour m’en aller en Poitou, et de là je le vous enverrai tout transcript. Si je suis contraint demeurer ici un moi, soies seur que vous l’aures bona fide.’ On the Probus scholia, see Parker and Braund, ‘Imperial Satire and the Scholars’, in *A Companion to Persius and Juvenal*, ed. by Braund and Osgood, 436-64 (438-39, 19.2 ‘Will the Real Probus Please Stand up?’).

⁵⁹ J. J. Scaliger to P. Pithou, 22 February 1584 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, I, 392-93), enquiring after the safe delivery of the package.

⁶⁰ Persius, ed. by P. Pithou (1585), 274: ‘quanquam non ignoro a plerisque non postremæ notæ scriptoribus Probo tribui commentaria non in Iuvenalem modo, sed et in A. Persij Satyras illa, quorum hic quoque bonam partem emendatiorem damus, usi etiam hac in re consilio iudicioque amicorum, atque in primis Ios. Scaligeri viri incomparabilis, de quo quidquid prætera dixerò, minus erit.’ Also quoted in *CTC*, 236 and by Zetzl, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance*, 164.

⁶¹ Persius (1601), Pt. II, ‘Petri Pithœi IC. Variæ lectiones quaedam’, 91-92.

⁶² Pierre Pithou’s manuscripts later passed in part to Jacques Auguste de Thou and in part to his brother François, who in turn bequeathed his house and most of his library to the city of Troyes in 1621, for the foundation of the Collège de l’Oratoire. The *Pithoeanus* bears a manuscript note ‘Ex Libris Collegii Oratorii Trecent[is]’ (Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, ms. H125, fol. 1r). On the dispersion of Pithou’s manuscripts, see Françoise Bibolet, ‘Bibliotheca Pithoeana: les manuscrits de Pithou. Une histoire de fraternité et d’amitié’, in *Du copiste au collectionneur. Mélanges d’histoire des textes et des bibliothèques en l’honneur d’André Vernet*, ed. by Donatella Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda and Jean-François Genest, *Bibliologia* 18 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 497-520 (here especially pp. 500, 502) and ead., ‘Les Pithou et l’amour des livres’, in *Les Pithou, les lettres, et la paix du royaume. Actes du Colloque de Troyes des 13-15 avril 1998*, ed. by Marie-Madeleine Fragonard, Pierre-Eugène Leroy and Anne Ravit, *Colloques, congrès et conférences sur la Renaissance* 38 (Paris: Champion, 2003), 296-304.

⁶³ Paris, BnF, ms. Dupuy 394ter: ‘Recueil de lettres et d’opuscules latins de Joseph Scaliger’, fol. 218-225 ‘Glossae veteres in Persium’, with notes and corrections by P. Pithou (foliated). Pithou noted on fol. 225r that he had received the notes on 9 January 1584, whilst at Périgueux. Zetzl, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance*, 64, 162-79 (‘Appendix I: Pierre Pithou and the *Commentum Cornuti*’) (here 164).

Lubin,⁶⁴ he reiterated the claim in 1605 to Casaubon, adding that he had given his manuscript collation to his friend Claude Dupuy.⁶⁵ This probably happened in the early 1590s when Dupuy annotated a copy of Pithou's Persius and Juvenal in the 1590 Heidelberg edition, using a superior source ('ex emendatio[...]').⁶⁶ So it is not unthinkable that Tourneroche had access to Scaliger's collation around 1600, whilst it was in the library of Dupuy's sons in Paris. Alternatively, could Scaliger's transcription have been part of the Persius manuscript that Casaubon had lent to Morel and had the latter shown it to Tourneroche and – oh horror – to Marcilius? It is also possible that Tourneroche learnt by word of mouth the gossip that would later filter into the *Scaligeriana*, where, some decades later, one of the Vassan brothers likewise claimed that

the old Juvenal and Persius commentary was excerpted by M. de La Scala, and given in this form to my uncle [Pierre] Pithou, sieur de Savoie, and it has been found written in Scaliger's hand among the papers of the late M. Dupuy.⁶⁷

Each of these scenarios remains speculative. Casaubon himself later stated that he had not realized that the collation ascribed to Pithou was essentially Scaliger's, although this is somewhat hard to believe.⁶⁸ We know that Casaubon sometimes worked in the Dupuy brothers' library,⁶⁹ whilst his commentary refers on various occasions to Ancient manuscripts that had belonged to the late Claude Dupuy, as well as to others

⁶⁴ Scaliger to E. Lubin, 27 July 1600 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, III, 459-61 [460-61]): 'Scito eas glossas quae nomine Pithoei editae sunt, me selegisse ex eius codice, quibus adiunxi alias quae extabant in Valensi enarratione nomine Probi. Ex utraque sementi una seges crevit. Sed meus amicus ille non omnia edidit, quaedam enim suo arbitrio recidit, quod non debuit.' Lubin's paraphrase of Persius was first published at Franeker and Amsterdam in 1595 (Morgan *201) and reprinted several times.

⁶⁵ Scaliger to Casaubon, 7-8 April 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 602-09 [606]): 'patri enim eorum dedi...'. Claude Dupuy was himself interested in textual variants in Persius and annotated

⁶⁶ Jérôme Delatour, *Les Livres de Claude Dupuy: une bibliothèque humaniste au temps des guerres de religion*, Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société de l'École des Chartes (Geneva: Droz, 1998), 61, 241 (no. *1065), identified as Paris, BnF, class-mark Rés. p-Yc-766. Morgan *197. Claude's death in 1594 provides a *terminus ante quem*.

⁶⁷ *Scaligeriana* (1669), 252: 'Le vieux Commentaire sur Perse & Juvenal a esté tiré par Monsieur de Lescalle, & ainsi rendu à Monsieur Pithou, mon Oncle de Savoye, & a esté trouvé écrit de la main de Monsieur de la Scala, parmy les papiers de feu Monsieur du Puy.'

⁶⁸ Scaliger to Casaubon, 7-8 April 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 602-609 [606]). Casaubon to Scaliger, 12 May 1605 (*ibid.*, VI, 23-26 [25]): 'Veterum notarum, quas adjeci, eclogarium te fuisse, non scivi. Non dissimulaturus alioquin, si rem habuissem notam.'

⁶⁹ See the entry for 17 January 1602 in Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 395: 'mane egimus in bibliotheca Puteani'.

from Jacques Bongars's collection.⁷⁰ (The latter may have been one of the manuscripts that Casaubon borrowed from Bongars but never returned, and which are now in the British Library.⁷¹) It is evident, at any rate, and (some might say) hardly surprising that the desire for a scoop strongly animated the production of scholarly editions in the French Renaissance.

2. Casaubon's Persius Edition in Production

Casaubon's own plans for a new Persius edition seem to have taken concrete shape by early November 1603, since his patron Jacques Auguste de Thou had encouraged him to produce something from his existing papers. From Paris, the scholar confessed to Scaliger and Daniel Heinsius that he turned to Persius rather reluctantly, but he vented his thoughts about Marcilius with the same verve and in very similar terms as he had in his letters to Thomson and Lipsius.⁷² He seriously started organizing his old notes on Persius on 1 December 1603, having set this particular month aside for the task.⁷³ Less than three days into the work, he announced to the Augsburg humanist David Hoeschel – and through him to Marcus Welser – that he hoped the work would be published in time for the next Frankfurt book fair, in 1604, once more shaking his fist at Marcilius:

⁷⁰ Persius, ed. by Casaubon (1605), Commentary, 10 ('antiquissimis membranis è bibliotheca praestantissimi viri Claudij Puteani'), 13 ('meliores libri et Puteani membranae', 'non aliter perantiquae clarissimi viri Iacobi Bongarsij membranae'), 27 ('liber Puteani').

⁷¹ Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 61. London, BL, Royal ms. 15 A IV; Royal ms. 15 B XII (belonged to François and Pierre Daniel, then Bongars); Royal ms. 15 A XV; Royal ms. 15 B XVII; and especially Royal ms. 15 B XVIII containing a Life of Persius (ascribed to Probus). These manuscripts require further investigation.

⁷² Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, [7 November] 1603 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 185-189 [187]). Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 23 December 1603 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 198): 'Persium a nobis edi scito, non segni opera post tot ineptias Interpretum illustratum. Non erat animus, veteres illas curas retractare, sed ita lubitum amicis. Legi quae Marrucinus [i.e., Marcilius] iste, de quo elegantissime scribis, ad illum effutiit. Moriar, nisi opinionem meam de hominis insania res ipsa longe superarit.'

⁷³ Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 525: 'Kal. Dec. [1 December 1603] Quod bene Deus vertat mensem hunc institui Persio impendere; quem olim expositum a nobis tandem edere constituimus. Tu, benigne Deus, da opusculum hoc ad exitum brevi perducere, et tibi hoc quoque nomine post paucos dies posse εὐχαριστεῖν, quod ut fiat, meam et uxoris valetudinem ut firmes, nosque ut praesidio tuo regas, et omnes nostros supplex te, ὃ σῶτερ, oro. Amen.'

So this is the third day, since I began polishing, with God's will, my Persius edition. A long time ago I gave public lectures on this poet: that I should now no longer spurn my youthful trivia, is the work of that sordid scourge, who two or three years ago, I believe, besmirched that poet. O what a blockhead! What useless erudition! I plan to spend only a few days on this project. I hope the work will be published for the Frankfurt book fair. Please do tell the eminent Welser about this, and do convey to him my apologies for my tardiness.⁷⁴

On 23 December 1603, Casaubon reminded Scaliger that he was 'reheating some old tidbits' and preparing 'a commentary on Persius quite unlike any model provided by previous commentators'.⁷⁵ By the end of the month, notwithstanding the usual distractions of appearances at court, work in the Royal Library, visits from friends and frequent attendance of the Huguenot service at Ablon, he had all his notes in order, and it was apparently just a matter of joining them all together.⁷⁶ Casaubon's subsequent exchanges with Scaliger, Lipsius, and Heinsius, however, show that from then on the work stalled, because of other worries or his waiting to see Lipsius's *Physiologia Stoicorum*, since one of Casaubon's principal tenets was that Persius should be regarded as a versifying philosopher – a φιλόσοφος ἔμμετρος.⁷⁷ Meanwhile, his notes kept proliferating and Casaubon even regretted ever having started the work. On 18 August of 1604, however, Casaubon wrote to Scaliger about his Persius edition and commentary in the perfect tense, indicating that he must have completed it. Yet he added:

⁷⁴ Casaubon to D. Hoeschel, 3 December 1603 (*Isaaci Casauboni epistolae*, 196): 'Itaque tertius hic dies est, cum Persii editionem adornare, σὺν Θεῷ εἰπεῖν, institui. Olim eum Poetam publice exposuimus: nunc ut juveniles nugas nostras ne contemneremus, efficit ille impurus ἀλάστορ [Theodorus Marcius], qui ante annum, opinor, alterum aut tertium eum Poetam conspurcavit. O stolidum caput! O inutilem πολυαναγνωσίαν! Est animus, paucos dies huic curae impendere. Ad nundinas Francofordienses, spero, opus editum iri. Velim haec cum amplissimo et praestantissimo Velsero communices, et meam cessationem apud illum excuses.' Casaubon draws the term πολυαναγνωσία from Athenaeus (654A).

⁷⁵ Casaubon to Scaliger, 23 December 1603 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 202-04 [204]): 'Nos nescio quas veteres nugas recoquimus, et in Persium commentarium paramus non sane ad exemplum ullius interpretum priorum.'

⁷⁶ Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, 529: 'Prid. Kal. Jan. [31 December] Negotiosum admodum hunc diem sumus experti. Susceperamus Kalendis hujus mensis Persium recensendum, quo in negotio cum partem curarum nostrarum toto mense impenderimus, alia multa velut ex transverso inciderunt, quae nos habuerunt occupatos. Hactenus igitur veteras schedas in eum Poetam nostras evolvimus, et composuimus; quod quidem hodie demum est peractum. Neque aliud fere jam restat, nisi ut retexantur quae pridem sunt congesta, nunc etiam disposita, et foras quam primum ξὺν Θεῷ mittantur. At quota ea pars hodiernae operae? [...]'

⁷⁷ Casaubon to J. Lipsius, 27 January 1604 (*Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, ed. by Burman, I, 378-39). Cf. Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon helléniste*, 164-65.

But whilst I consulted the studies of less refined critics, my work – I do not quite know how – burgeoned to the extent that I have not yet decided what I shall do with all that midnight oil.⁷⁸

By mid to late October 1604, both Scaliger and Philippe Duplessis-Mornay heard, at last, that Casaubon's *Persius* was in press.⁷⁹ The finished product would contain (i) a dedicatory epistle to Achille de Harlay, First President of the Parlement of Paris and brother-in-law to Casaubon's protector Jacques Auguste de Thou (dated Paris, 12 February 1605); (ii) 23 pages of primary Latin text; (iii) 18 pages of scholia (*Glossae veteres in Persium*); (iv) a short address to the reader (3 pages) referring to the editions by Pithou, Vinet, and Bongars's manuscripts; (v) a Greek verse translation of Persius's prologue; (vi) more than 500 pages of commentary with a separate title page and page numbering; (vii) an exhaustive list of all the places where Persius may have alluded to Horace (*Persiana Horatii imitatio*); and (viii) two indexes.

Lengthy and complex, the eagerly awaited book elicited praise before it came out. In August 1604 the Silesian nobleman and travelling student Abraham von Bibran (1575-1625) expressed the hope that Casaubon's as yet 'half-dressed Persius' would soon put on its comic boots and fully enter the stage to rapt applause – the metaphor did perhaps not quite conform to Casaubon's still unpublished views on Roman satire!⁸⁰ A German visitor to Paris, Hermann Mylius Birckmann (1584?-1657), who was the son and heir of a Cologne printer and bookseller, saw the *Persius* edition being set for printing in the workshop of the Drouart brothers. It inspired him to send Casaubon a fanciful Latin poem that not only featured the acrostic 'ISAACVS CASAUBONVS', but also played on the fashionable genre of the echo poem:

I nvia vox, quae quando tuis spatiarer antris

⁷⁸ Casaubon to Scaliger, 18 August 1604 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 384-87 [386]): 'Sed dum rudiorum studiis consulimus, ita nescio quomodo opus excrevit ut ea lucubratione quid simus facturi nondum constituerimus.'

⁷⁹ Scaliger to Casaubon, 17 October 1604 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 417-22 [420]): 'Persium sub praelo esse audimus'. Casaubon to Ph. Duplessis-Mornay, 25 October 1604: 'Je fais maintenant imprimer un ample commentaire sur Perse, qui sont des leçons qu'ay fait à Genève, il y a passé dix ou douze ans. Et ainsi voyés, Messieurs, comme je reviens à ma jeunesse, lors que je suis avant en l'aage. Si tost qu'il sera fait, je le vous feray voir, si tant est que daignies le voir en passant, pour la nouveaute des interpretations de ce difficile Poete....' (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 224).

⁸⁰ A. von Bibran to Casaubon, 6 August 1604 (BL, ms. Burney 363, fol. 66): 'De Persio tuo hoc libenter [cogito] eum semi-vestitum: optarem quas si exspecationes commovet, iam sumpsisset cothurnos, et scenam prodisset. Nunc audire mihi videar plausum ab omnib[us] theatris et videre tibi omnes exsurgere.'

Solum me nosti, refugis, meque hisce relinquis
 Arboribus nixum. HIC SUM. Hic eademne puella es,
 A rate quam patrijs tantum poematibus haerens
 Cognovi Germanus. ANUS. Quae prima animantum
 Vidisti virtute Dei, primordia. DIA.
 Spectasti, caneret Romano Persius olim
 Cum populo Satyras. IRAS. Satyrasque revisens
 Aspicias Casaubonum. BONUM. In ordine dignum
 Scriptorum geni, qui te dignissime Persi
 Arte animoque vetat memori MORI. at omnibus hic est
 (Vivere qui reliquos facit, ut nec tempora possint,
 Bellave, vel ignes nomen delere) in amore.
 O RE. Atque, ob doctum nimis assiduamque laborem
 Numquid erit moriens. ORIENS. Velit illa potentis
 Vera Dei soboles iubeat tua nomina, vere
 Sincereque boni, non casu, vivere. VERE.⁸¹

Mysterious voice, who only know me when I wander through your caves, you flee and leave me leaning on these trees. HERE I AM! Are you the same girl here as the one whom I, a German aboard a ship, have only known through poems at home? I AM OLD! Who have seen by God's will, as the first among living creatures, the very first principles [of the world]? I AM DIVINE. You looked on, when Persius long ago recited his Satires to the Roman people. HIS IRE! And when you revisit the Satires, you will see Casaubonus – A BONUS! – a man worthy of the ranks of authors, whose art and mindful heart do not allow you, most worthy Persius... TO DIE! But he is a man who makes others live on so that time, war or fire cannot delete their name: he remains beloved by all – AND SPOKEN OF! – and because of his learned and assiduous effort he will never die. HE WILL RISE! May [Echo], true daughter of the almighty God, ordain that your name, which is that of a truly and sincerely – not a casually – good man, live on. TRULY!

In November or December 1604, Daniel Heinsius similarly sent Casaubon a congratulatory poem.⁸² Even the Protestant theologian Simon Goulart indicated he was waiting for Casaubon's Persius at Saint-Gervais in Geneva.⁸³ Casaubon subsequently

⁸¹ H. M. Birckmannus to Casaubon, n. d. (BL, ms. Burney 363, fol. 82 [no. 54]).

⁸² Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 29 December 1604 (not 1603) (*Isaaci Casauboni epistolae*, 198-99).

⁸³ S. Goulart to Casaubon, 10/20 October 1604, in Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 128-30 (128): '... j'attens encore pour la dernière pièce votre Perse.'

set up a vigorous publicity campaign, sending copies to Jacques Lect,⁸⁴ Justus Lipsius,⁸⁵ Janus Gruterus, Conrad Rittershausen, Georg Lingelsheim,⁸⁶ David Hoeschel and Marcus Welsler,⁸⁷ and Pierre Périllau.⁸⁸ The Huguenot envoy Bongars sent a copy to the Protestant exile Scipione Gentili.⁸⁹ The young Dutch nobleman Foppe van Aitzema saw Duplessis-Mornay's copy at Saumur,⁹⁰ whilst Lingelsheim showed his to Gottfried Jungermann.⁹¹ M. Du Temps, the secretary and courier of the French ambassador to the United Provinces, Paul Choart de Buzenval, took copies to Leiden, for Johannes

⁸⁴ The dedication copy to the Genevan Jacques Lect is now in the Royal Library at Copenhagen: (Closed stack Kl. 83282 8°): 'Clarissimo viro Jacobo Lectio I[uris] C[onsul]to praestantiss[im]o Senatori Genevensi I[ibens] m[erito] d[ono] d[edit] Is[aacus] Casaubonus.' The copy later belonged to Jacob Gronovius. See Magnussen, 'Casauboniana glimt fra den filologiske verden omkring 1600', 30. On Casaubon's correspondence with Lect between 1597 and 1611, see Matteo Campagnolo, 'Isaac Casaubon et Jacques Lect d'après une correspondance inédite', *Bulletin de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, 17.1 (1980), 17-34.

⁸⁵ The book was sent with Casaubon's letter to Lipsius of 8 March 1605 (*Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, ed. by Burman, 1727], I, 381-82) but took a while to arrive (Casaubon to Lipsius, 30 April 1605 [*ibid.*, I, 382-83]). Lipsius wrote to thank Casaubon on 31 May 1605 (BL, ms. Burney 363, fol. 138). See also Lipsius's library catalogue, Leiden, Univ. Bibl., ms. Lips. 59, fol. 10^v, book 20. I am grateful to Dr J. De Landtsheer for this information.

⁸⁶ Casaubon to G. M. Lingelsheim, 24 February 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 233): 'Veteres meas in Persium recitationes, quas in auditorio Genevensi habui, nuper edidi: opus tyronibus elaboratum, non doctis, nedum tibi, qui doctissimus es, quia tum nihil aliud ad manum erat, quod tibi mitterem, et ita moris est, accipe quaeso, πρόφρονι θυμῷ, quod mitto tibi exemplar.' (I have recently edited my old notes of the course I gave on Persius in the lecture theatre at Geneva: it is a work intended for students, rather than scholars, and since I had nothing else to hand to send to you, learned as you are, in accordance with our custom, I hope that you will accept the enclosed copy with a sympathetic mind.) Cp. the dedicatory epistle to A. de Harlay: 'Hoc igitur animo quum ante multos annos Persii Satyras interpretati essemus, ut ipsi nos primum ad amorem virtutis, odium vitiorum capessendum stimularem: deinde ut studiosae juventuti ad similem conatum duces nos praeberemus, de quo priores interpretes parum videbantur cogitasse: ...'. (When many years ago I lectured on Persius' satires, [I did so] with the intention, first, of bringing myself to love virtue and to develop a hatred of vice; secondly, of leading young students by my own example toward making a similar effort, something to which previous commentators seem to have given little thought...).

⁸⁷ Casaubon to D. Hoeschel, 11 March 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 237).

⁸⁸ Casaubon to P. Périllau, 11 March 1605 (Colomiès, *Italia et Hispania Orientalis*, 145-46).

⁸⁹ Casaubon to G. Lingelsheim, 11 March 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 236-37 [237]).

⁹⁰ F. van Aitzema to Casaubon, 22 April 1605 (London, BL, ms. Burney 363, fol. 6). The book is mentioned in one of the two handwritten catalogues of Ph. Duplessis-Mornay's library: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Histoire du Protestantisme française, ms. 753², 10. 'Catalogue des livres fait lan. 1605', last item under 'C': 'Causaubonus in Persium. in 8°.'

⁹¹ G. Jungermann to Casaubon, 2 September 1605 (London, BL, ms. Burney 364, fol. 299).

Meursius and Scaliger.⁹² Last but not least, the author worried about lost mail and the cost of postage in his effort to send his Persius to the itinerant Bibran.⁹³

Casaubon repeatedly insisted that his edition was based on old lecture notes and intended for students, rather than scholars;⁹⁴ he only allowed himself a measure of smug pride in his work in his correspondence (conducted in French) with Périllau, thus implicitly emulating Julius Caesar Scaliger's perception of the obscure poet:

Meanwhile, I send you my Persius, that is, the lessons I gave a long time ago in Geneva on this author who has more commentators, as it were, than lines: and yet, if I am not mistaken, he never let himself be understood so intimately by anyone before me.⁹⁵

The edition met with wide acclaim, not least from Joseph Scaliger whose praise in April 1605 was effuse: 'with your clear explanations you have accomplished that I now not only think that Persius is great in his own right, but that he is even better because of you. ... The seasoning appears to be worth more than the meat',⁹⁶ or as the *Scaligerana* would have it: 'Au Perse de Casaubon la saulce vaut mieux que le poisson' (In Casaubon's Persius, the sauce is better than the fish).⁹⁷ Unlike the much younger Daniel Heinsius, however, who sent Casaubon a florid letter of undiluted praise,⁹⁸ Scaliger

⁹² Casaubon to J. Meursius, 8 May 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 238); Casaubon to Scaliger, 12 May 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 23-26 [24]). Casaubon's presentation copy to Scaliger features in *The Auction Catalogue of Scaliger's Library*, facsimile edn, ed. by Henk Jan de Jonge, *Catalogi redivivi* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 35. See also *Catalogue des livres de feu M. J. Fr. Boissonade... dont la vente aura lieu le jeudi 3 mars 1859 et jours suivants...* (Paris: B. Duprat, 1859), 246 (no. 2704): 'Exemplaire portant une note d'envoi de Casaubon à Jos. Scaliger, avec note autogr. de ce dernier'. The current whereabouts of this copy are unknown. It is worth noting that Ben Jonson later presented a copy of Casaubon's 1605 Persius edition to his friend John Roe (Nikitinski, 297).

⁹³ Casaubon to A. von Bibran, 7 October 1604 (*Epistolae virorum doctorum ineditae*, ed. by Friedrich Schultze [Liegnitz: E. Doench, 1827], 13) and 11 March 1605 (*ibid.*, 14-15).

⁹⁴ Casaubon to G. M. Lingelsheim, 24 February 1605 (as in n. 000 above). Casaubon to A. von Bibran, 11 March 1605 (*Epistolae virorum doctorum ineditae*, ed. by Schultze, 14-15 [14]): 'Olim cum Genevae essem, et frequenti auditorio poetam illum publice exponerem, id serio agebam, ut etiam rudiorum rationem haberem. Hinc illa λεπτολογήματα; quae doctos offendere non debent, quia illis scripta non sunt.' Casaubon to J. Lipsius, 8 March 1605 (*Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, ed. by Burman, I, 381-82 [382]).

⁹⁵ Casaubon to P. Périllau, 11 March 1605 (as in n. 000 above): 'Cependant ie vous envoie mon Perse, c'est à dire, mes leçons qu'ay autrefois fait à Geneve sur cet Auteur, lequel a quasi plus d'Interpretes que de vers: Et neantmoins si ie ne me trompe, il ne s'estoit si familierement communiqué à personne avant moi.' Cp. J. C. Scaliger's *iudicium* of Persius, quoted on p. 000 above.

⁹⁶ Scaliger to Casaubon, 7-8 April 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 602-09 [604]): 'Tu luculenta illa explanation fecisti ut mihi non solum magnus propter se, sed et melior propter te videatur. ... Pluris condimentum esse videtur quam pulpamentum.'

⁹⁷ *Scaligeriana* (1669), 64.

⁹⁸ D. Heinsius to Casaubon, 9 April 1605 (London, BL, ms. Burney 364, fol. 222).

could not resist adding that whilst he appreciated the inclusion of Pithou's *Cornutus* scholia, the collation was actually his. Nor did he refrain from sending Casaubon his own Greek verse translation of Persius's prologue, to emulate Casaubon's rendering (which we have seen was one of the paratexts in the 1605 edition).⁹⁹ Incidentally, Jean Morel had likewise attempted such a translation exercise but it apparently failed to meet with Casaubon's approval.¹⁰⁰ So competitive was Scaliger that two months later he sent Casaubon a revised version of this short piece, which was eventually published amongst his own *Poemata*.¹⁰¹

The praise for Casaubon's Persius was not unanimous, however. In 1607 there appeared a new Persius edition with a commentary by Bernard Automne, a lawyer at the Parlement de Bordeaux, who had previously published an extremely rare edition of the satirist at Agen in 1599.¹⁰² Automne drew on various editions and commentaries including those by Pithou, Turnèbe, and Marcilius. He probably only received Casaubon's work at a very late stage, because there are just some dispersed references to the scholar in Automne's main commentary. However, he took Casaubon to task in an appendix of 'notes ... illustrating some obscure places in Persius, which were insufficiently explored by Casaubon' (*Notae ... quibus obscuriora Persij, non satis explorata a Casaubono illustrantur*). Automne accused Casaubon of suggesting contrived interpretations that are completely alien or contrary to Persius's spirit (*interpretatio... a mente Persii prorsus aliena*); of departing from Turnèbe, despite the fact that among all the Persius commentators Casaubon held him in the highest esteem; of being misled by typographical errors; and above all of being a pedant:

Casaubon, who is by all accounts a learned man, but wants to appear more learned than any other, has published not a commentary but a work of fiction on Persius's *Satires*.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Scaliger to Casaubon, 7-8 April 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 602-09 [607-608]). Morgan *616. *Scaligeriana* (1669), 223.

¹⁰⁰ *Scaligeriana* (1669), 223.

¹⁰¹ Scaliger to Casaubon, 15 June 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 59-65 [65]).

¹⁰² *Auli Persii Flacci Satyrae, et in eas Commentationes, Observationes et Paralipomena Bernardi Autumni Nitiobrigis in suprema Burdigalensium Curia patroni* (Paris: Robert Fôüet, 1607). Morgan *223. The Caen 1599 edition was printed by Antoine Pomaret (Morgan *208): I have not been able to consult the single known copy (Harvard University Library, Houghton Library, call number Lp 15.5.99.3* Lobby I.2.14).

¹⁰³ Persius, ed. by Automne (1607), 1-3, 15, 17. The quotation is on p. 10: 'Casaubonus vir alioqui doctus, ut aliis doctior appareat, non commentarium, sed commentum in Persii Satyras edidit.'

In that same year 1607, Automne's publisher Robert Foüet brought out a further Persius edition and commentary by the *avocat au Parlement de Paris* Étienne de Clavière (Stephanus Claverius), which contained variant readings from a Persius manuscript in Clavière's possession.¹⁰⁴ Clavière and Casaubon were acquaintances, it seems, who appreciated each other's learning.¹⁰⁵ Nevertheless, Clavière took a stance against the scholar, by formulating a general criticism against the 'ostentatious' and unnecessary use of Greek,¹⁰⁶ a particular habit for which Casaubon would also be attacked in other contexts,¹⁰⁷ but which inspired Clavière to compose a teasing, *ad hominem* epigram:

Ad Is. Casaubonum V. C. primarum artium principem.

Iudicium optaram, memini, de vate Canopi,
 Contigit in laudes te tamen ire meas:
 Sic ego qui Persi miror decus, ut tua vidi,
 Reddo vicem, Latiis ultus Achæa sonis.¹⁰⁸

To the illustrious Isaac Casaubon, prince of primary skills.

I had wanted a verdict, so I recall, on the poet [denouncing the debauchery of] Canopus [Juv. 1, 26 'verna Canopi']: it so happened that you sang my praises. So when, as an admirer of Persius's charm, I saw your work, I return the honor, and avenge [your] Greek with Latin sounds.

As one might expect, Casaubon's commentary also rankled with Marcilius. In the 1613 reprint of his commentary, Marcilius compares Casaubon's Persius to a lyre taking its tune from another and their rivalry to that of the ancient painters Apelles and Protogenes, vying to draw the finest line – the subtext is that Apelles made Protogenes

¹⁰⁴ A. Persii Flacci Satyrarum sex liber singularis. ... Post felices huius saeculi curas a St. Claverio in prima Galliarum Curia Advocato redditus, et explanatus. (Paris: Robert Foüet, 1607). Morgan *224; CTC, 309.

¹⁰⁵ Casaubon to Ch. Labbé, 12 October 1602 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 161-62 [162]): 'Etiam illud a te peto, ut virum eruditissimum Stephanum Claverium, a quo nuper literas accepi, meis verbis quam amantissime salutes.' Persius, ed. by Clavière (1607), 220: 'Casaubonus doctiss[imus]'

¹⁰⁶ Persius, ed. by Clavière (1607), 9-10.

¹⁰⁷ See Casaubon's defence on the matter in his *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes* (1614), 41-42.

¹⁰⁸ Persius, ed. by Clavière (1607), 11. Clavière's interest in Juvenal resulted in *D. Iun. Juvenalis periphrases prope aenigmatae* (Paris: Robert Foüet, 1607); the slim volume is hardly a match for the erudite mass of Casaubon's publications.

famous by buying some of his work and selling it as his own.¹⁰⁹ Unsurprisingly, Marcilius makes a point of addressing some of Casaubon's sharp rebukes, which the latter had directed, namelessly but recognisably, at specific passages in Marcilius's commentary.¹¹⁰ It is safe to say that the world did not take much notice of Automne's, Clavière's, or Marcilius's reactions, although we have seen that the matter of the ubiquitous Greek would be addressed posthumously by Meric Casaubon in the revised edition of his father's *Persius* of 1647. However, it would not be until Otto Jahn's fundamental *Persius* edition of 1843 that Marcilius would find some vindication.¹¹¹

3. *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira: a spin-off?*

Meanwhile, Casaubon's theoretical treatise, in two books, on Greek satyr plays and Roman satire very much constituted a counterpoint to his *Persius* edition. In the dedicatory epistle to the rather obscure Jean de Rieu, 'President of the Parlement of Rodez', Casaubon retraces the origins of his *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira* to a conversation held at Montpellier on the nature and designation of Roman satire.¹¹² The draft notes (*Adversaria*) that survive among his manuscripts suggest, however, that Casaubon had at first pursued the Greek satyr play as an independent strand of research.¹¹³ This interest may have arisen partly from his work on Athenaeus, which would have made him familiar with various dramatic fragments,¹¹⁴ although work on other authors such as Theophrastus also fed into it. The

¹⁰⁹ The allusion is to Pliny, *Natural History*, 35, 81-84.

¹¹⁰ Morgan *238. *Auli Persii Flacci Satyrae* (Paris: Jean Orry, 1613), commentary by Marcilius, no page number. Note that this edition no longer contains Tourneroche's commentary.

¹¹¹ Morgan *436. *Auli Persii Flacii Satirarum Liber*, ed. by Otto Jahn (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1843), preface, no page number: 'Quorum si neminem Casaubono comparandum dico, omnes consentientes habeo, neque tamen silentio praeterire possum Th. Marcilium, quem oppressit inimicitiae, quam cum Casaubono et Scaligero exercuit, invidia. Is vero in commentario, quamquam multa inepta et inutili doctrina congescit, haud pauca tamen docte et utiliter monuit, et mihi saepe usui fuit.'

¹¹² Casaubon to J. de Rieu, 24 August 1605 (Casaubon, *De satyrica graecorum poesi*, fol. ã ij^r-fol. ã iiij^v [fol. ã ij^v]): 'Diatribam enim super Romanæ Satiræ natura atque appellatione, cum inter colloquendum de literarum studijs, in eum forte sermonem incidissemus, tibi pollicitus: ne tam benignus creditor sortem sine aliquot fenore, longo adeo praesertim intervallo, reciperes: disputationem aliam adieci, ut non plane eiusdem, ita nec usquequaque dissimilis argumenti...'

¹¹³ Oxford, Bodleian, MS Adv. 23, fols 9-28 ('De Satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum Satyra notae') and Adv. 31, fol. 30 ('Observationes de Satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum Satyra').

¹¹⁴ Dana F. Sutton, *The Greek Satyr Play*, Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie 90 (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1980), 196.

second book, on Roman satire, seems above all to have grown out of surplus material collected for the Persius commentary.¹¹⁵ As a matter of fact, Casaubon's Prolegomena to Persius already summarized his thesis on the distinction between Roman satire and Greek satyr-plays, although the main aim of that particular section had been to pinpoint the differences between the three principal Roman satirists Horace, Juvenal and Persius. (Such a brief essay on the satiric genre was of course a stock element of editions and commentaries on the verse satirists.)

The idea to turn all this additional material into a separate book took shape in December 1604.¹¹⁶ Just like the Persius edition, this publication incurred delays, which only whipped up the climate of expectation, not just among Casaubon's correspondents in Germany (Lingelsheim, Rittershausen, Gentili and Hoeschel) and the Low Countries,¹¹⁷ but also in Venice, where Philippe Canaye de Fresnes was stationed.¹¹⁸ At the eleventh hour, in August 1605, Casaubon requested and obtained Florent Chrestien's Latin translation of Euripides's *Cyclops*, from Chrestien's son, Claude,¹¹⁹ and this text was added as an appendix.¹²⁰ On 31 August and 1 September 1605, just one week after signing the book's *epistola dedicatoria*, Casaubon was able to dispatch

¹¹⁵ Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 9 July 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 242): 'Ego mittam tibi cis paucos dies, volente Numine, opellam librorum duorum, cujus titulum ex Prolegomenis in Persium fortasse notum habes. Hui! dices, tantum verborum de re tam levi? Sic est: posteaquam enim persuasisti mihi, eam, quâ apud Persium usus sum, πολυλογία tyronibus non fore inutilem, verbis non parcere constitui, et horum in scribendo rationem habere semper. Ita factum, ut ex argumento Prolegomenôn (sic enim initio constitueram) duo libelli nascerentur; quorum editio adeo elegans et venusta, ut lenocinio alio non sit opus.'

¹¹⁶ Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 29 December 1604 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, V, 483-87 [487]): 'Addemus libellum *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et satira Romanorum*, quae opella si tibi non displicet, satis iustam μεγαλαυχίας υπόθεσιν nos putabimus esse consecutos.'

¹¹⁷ Casaubon to D. Hoeschel, 17 July 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni epistolae*, 244): 'Ego tibi mittam proximo mercatu libellos duos, *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi, et Romana Satyra*, de quibus jam nunc tuum iudicium opto cognoscere.' Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 140. Casaubon to C. Rittershausen, 11 August 1605 (*ibid.*, 245): 'Is [Thuanus] te amicissime salutatur, et una tecum clarissimum virum Scipionem Gentilem, cui brevi et scribam et opusculum mittam in quo nunc sum nunc totus, de Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Romana Satira. Exspecta etiam tu exemplar unum...'

¹¹⁸ P. Canaye de Fresnes to Casaubon, 23 March 1605 (Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 152-53 [153]): 'Alia quae edidisti nondum huc pervenerunt, nec quae de satyra scripsisse te ad Ruthenum praesidem ex primo et fortuito charissimi tui muneris affectu video.'

¹¹⁹ Cl. Chrestien to Scaliger, 16 August 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 118-21 [120]): 'J'ay baillé à Monsieur Casaubon le *Cyclops* d'Euripide pour adjouster à son livre *De satyra* que vous verrez incontinent.' See also the draft letter fragments from Casaubon to Cl. Chrestien, in his *Adversaria*.

¹²⁰ Note however that not all copies contain the *Cyclops*.

copies to Scaliger,¹²¹ Lingelsheim,¹²² Marquard Freher,¹²³ and Rittershausen.¹²⁴ A few days later he sent, as promised, a copy to Gentili¹²⁵ and informed Scaliger and Heinsius that he had passed six copies of his treatise to Gilles Beys, Plantin's agent in Paris, for the attention of Raphelengius in Leiden, who was supposed to pass them on.¹²⁶ Heinsius's copy, with a handwritten dedication, is now in the Central Library at Rotterdam.¹²⁷ Two of the remaining copies were intended for Meursius and Johannes Drusius.¹²⁸ Dominicus Badius must also have featured among the intended recipients, since he wrote to Johannes Woverius on 6 November that he had received a copy and how he admired Casaubon's erudition and work-ethos.¹²⁹ Lipsius was also sent a copy, and may even have owned two.¹³⁰ Also worth noting is Thomson's copy, which is currently held at Canterbury Cathedral Library,¹³¹ whilst Nicolas Rapin's (whose Odes Casaubon had singled out for praise in his commentary on Persius's first satire¹³²) is at the Bibliothèque municipale de Poitiers,¹³³ and Jacques Auguste de Thou's in the

¹²¹ Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 5 September 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 155-58 [157]).

¹²² Casaubon to G. Lingelsheim, 1 September 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 248) and 30 March 1606 (*ibid.*, 263).

¹²³ Casaubon to M. Freher, 1 September 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 248-49 [248]).

¹²⁴ Casaubon to C. Rittershausen, 1 September 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 249-50 [249]).

¹²⁵ Casaubon to C. Rittershausen, 11 August 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 245); Casaubon to S. Gentili, 3 September 1601 [in fact 1605] (*ibid.*, 125-26).

¹²⁶ Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 5 September 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 155-58 [157]); see also *The Auction Catalogue of Scaliger's Library*, ed. by De Jonge, 36. Casaubon to J. J. Scaliger, 31 August 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 247); Casaubon to Scaliger, 27 September 1605 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, VI, 174-77 [174-75]); Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, I, Notae, 140. Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 5 September 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 250), and Casaubon to Heinsius, 5 November 1605 (*ibid.*, 254-55 [254]).

¹²⁷ Rotterdam, Centrale Bibliotheek, shelfmark: Erasmuszaal 1394 E 26:1.

¹²⁸ Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 5 September 1605 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 250).

¹²⁹ D. Badius to J. Woverius, 6 November 1605, in Johannes Woverius, *Epistolarum Centuriae II. Eiusdem Syntagma De Bibliorum Interpretatione: cum Epistolis Clarorum Virorum ad Woverum*, [ed. by Geverhartus Elmenhorstius] (Hamburg: Michael Heringius, 1609 [for 1619]), 432-42 (441): 'Misit ad me recens opus de Satyrica poësi Graecorum etc. cum benignissimis literis, in quibus modum non tenuit circa laudes nostras. Vir ille plurima scit, pauca ignorat. Quam multa cottidie eruit, quae frustra alibi requiras!'

¹³⁰ Casaubon to J. Lipsius, 4 September 1605 (*Sylloge epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum*, ed. Burman, I, 385); J. Lipsius to Casaubon, 27 October 1605 (*ibid.*, I, 386). See the entry in the library catalogue of Justus Lipsius's books: Leiden, UB, ms. Lips. 59, fol. 17^v, book 29: 'Isaacus Casaubonus, De satyrica poesi Graecorum, 8, Par[isi]jis, 1605'. Jeanine De Landtsheer, written communication to the author, 26 November 2013.

¹³¹ Classmark: H/E-2-25.

¹³² Persius, ed. by Casaubon (1605), 134.

¹³³ Class-mark D.2096. Jean Brunel, 'La Bibliothèque de Nicolas Rapin', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 36.2 (1974), 291-319 (309 [no. 55] and 310 [illustration of Rapin's copious manuscript annotations]).

British Library.¹³⁴ Moreover, when Casaubon moved to England, both the Persius edition and the *De Satyrica Graecorum poesi* featured amongst the books he offered to James I.¹³⁵

Once more Casaubon insisted to his correspondents that the work envisaged a readership of students rather than savants. He was also well aware that his study of ancient satire was nigh exhaustive on the topic.¹³⁶ His outlook could, in fact, not be further removed from Marcilius's, who had succinctly stated that 'satire (*satyra*) draws its origins from satyrs, and it is a labor of Ixion for grammarians to seek other roots for this word'.¹³⁷ Indeed, in the 1613 reprint of his Persius commentary, Marcilius also scoffed at Casaubon's new directive, picking up – interestingly – on Automne's scathing term 'commentum':

What kind of fantasy is this, that one should correctly write *satira* or *satura* but not *satyra*? What is that about? Because, they claim, from *satyr* one apparently derives not *satyra* but *satyrica*, by analogy. Illogically, I say! But there is no need for me to waste my ink on such a wide-open field.¹³⁸

4. Some Remarks about Casaubon's Scholarship

There is no doubt that Casaubon's *De satyrica Graecorum poesi* represents a landmark in the history of early modern scholarship relating to satire. And whilst critics now readily credit Casaubon – perhaps more emphatically than they should – with the divorce between Greek satyrs and Roman *satura*, attention is more often paid to Casaubon's discussion of Roman satire than to his treatment of satyrs and the satyr-

¹³⁴ Class-mark G.17208. Karen Limper-Herz, 'Bindings from the Library of Jacques Auguste de Thou in the Bibliotheca Grenvilliana', in *Les Labyrinthes de l'esprit. Collections et bibliothèques à la Renaissance. Renaissance libraries and collections*, ed. by Rosanna Gorris Camos and Alexandre Vanautgaerden (Geneva: Bibliothèque de Genève and Droz, 2015), 255-302 (294).

¹³⁵ Casaubon notes in his diary for 13 January 1611 that he offered King James I a selection of his books, even though copies were hard to find in London and expensive; yet he had them beautifully bound. Among the books featured his 'Persii comm. de Satyra etc.' (*Ephemerides*, II, 812-13 [813]).

¹³⁶ Casaubon to S. Gentili (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 125-26 [126]), and Casaubon to D. Heinsius, 5 September 1605 (*ibid.*, 250).

¹³⁷ Persius 1601, Marcilius commentary, 4: 'A Satyris itaque origo Satyræ, & Ixionius Grammaticis labor est, alias huius nominis originationes quærere.'

¹³⁸ Persius, 1613, Marcilius commentary, no page number: 'Quale commentum illud quoque Satiras aut Saturas non autem Satyras recte scribere? Quid ita? Quia, inquiunt, à Satyris non Satyra sed Satyrica diceretur analogè. Immo enim alogè. Sed meo quidem stilo iam operæ non est tali campo decurrere aperto.' Also quoted by *CTC*, 301.

play. His discussion of Euripides's *Cyclops*, for instance, includes points and corrections that had escaped the attention of Henri Estienne and Dirk Canter,¹³⁹ in response to which Scaliger would later send Casaubon his own notes on the play. Above all, Casaubon's division between satire and satyr play is less strict than it is often portrayed: 'I do not deny that there was some kind of poetry in Rome that could fittingly be described as 'satyrical', he writes with reference to the *Fabula Atellana*.¹⁴⁰ He points also to Fontanus, a Roman poet of the Augustan age, who according to Ovid sang the loves of the nymphs and satyrs, and in the end concludes that 'satire', for the Romans, is a polysemic term.¹⁴¹ Even in terms of Roman verse satire itself, he asserts that there is no real difference between it and the Horatian verse epistle.¹⁴² Similarly, Sulpicia's poem may be more erudite than biting, but is still rightly called a satire.¹⁴³ Casaubon, in other words, offers a nuanced view that is not only significant in the history of scholarship on Ancient satire, but is also consonant with the often loose interpretation of *satura/satyra* in the satirical texts produced in the Early modern period.

Recently, Anthony Grafton, Joanna Weinberg and Alastair Hamilton have drawn attention to the way in which Casaubon infused his truly broad reading of Greek and Latin texts with insights drawn from his study of Hebrew and Arabic sources, signs of which are present in the *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*, not least in Casaubon's definition of poetry and his discussion of priapism.¹⁴⁴ One further aspect, however, of Casaubon's learned and comprehensive discussion of the Hellenic coterie of satyrs that has been largely ignored by modern students of the history of satire, is his adduction not just of textual sources (in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, or Arabic), but also of physical evidence and personal observation. This is admittedly a broader character trait of Casaubon's: indeed, his nineteenth-century biographer Mark Pattison described Casaubon as a 'close and keen observer', who was 'particularly attracted by the

¹³⁹ Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*, 223.

¹⁴⁰ Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*, 305: 'non negare nos genus aliquod poeseos apud Romanos fuisse cui Satyricae appellatio non male potuerit convenire'.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 311.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 299-300

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 6-7, 90. See Grafton and Weinberg, 'I have always loved the holy tongue', 109-10; Hamilton, 'The Long Apprenticeship: Casaubon and Arabic', in Grafton and Weinberg, 299-300 ('Avicenna on Priapism').

marvellous in nature’ and ‘always pleased when he can illustrate his author with some fact which he has observed himself’.¹⁴⁵

One striking example, worth a little elaboration here, is Casaubon’s discussion of a *homo cornutus* in the *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*.¹⁴⁶ It concerned a man named François Roville, who had made his living as a collier (*charbonnier*), deep in the woods of the Maine region, thus successfully hiding a horn-like deformity on his head for more than twenty years. The Duke of Lavardin, however, had discovered him by chance during a hunting party and had brought the man to Paris in 1598, where he was dressed in fox’s fur and displayed as a curiosity for two months. Roville’s disfigurement not only gave rise to illustrated broadsheets (fig. 000);¹⁴⁷ it was also reported by Jacques Bongars in a letter to Joachim Camerarius,¹⁴⁸ by Jacques Auguste de Thou in his *History of his Own Time*,¹⁴⁹ in medical literature,¹⁵⁰ and by Ulisse Aldrovandi in his *Monstrorum historia*.¹⁵¹ Casaubon’s description of his personal encounter with the man, however, reminds us of Montaigne’s interview with the American Indians at Rouen in ‘Des Cannibales’: Casaubon’s attitude is remarkably humane, whilst as a

¹⁴⁵ Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 443-45.

¹⁴⁶ Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*, 47; Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 445 (without any particulars).

¹⁴⁷ Anon., *Pourtraict au vif de l’homme cornu, decouvert au pays du Mayne* (Lyon: Michel Brunand, 1599), ‘Prins sur la copie de Paris’. Paul de La Houve, *Pourtraict au vif de l’hom[m]e cornu. Decouvert au pays du Mayne* (Paris: s.n., c. 1599) (Heidelberg University Library, Klebeband nr. 18 der Fürstlich Waldeckschen Hofbibliothek Arolsen, fol. 9; a copy is included in Paris, BnF, MS Cinq cents de Colbert 32 (‘Copies de pièces sur la Ligue et le règne de Henri IV; correspondance du président Jacques-Auguste de Thou [1594-1602]’), fol. 495). See also Paris, BnF, Département Estampes et photographie, RÉSERVE FOL-QB-201 (12) (with German text, referring to de Thou’s *History*).

¹⁴⁸ J. Bongars to J. Camerarius, 25 October 1598 (*Lettres latines de Monsieur de Bongars resident et ambassadeur sous le Roy Henry IV en diverses negociations importantes. Traduits en François et dédiées à Monseigneur le Dauphin* [Paris: Pierre Le Petit, 1668], 2 vols, II, 705-06): ‘Carissime Domine, amice colende, Monstra tibi et spectra narro. Cornutus homo Lutetiae ostentatur, nomen ei Franciscus Troville, oriundus ex pago Mareschalli Laverdini, opificio, carbonarius, eoque vitam ducens in silvis. Cœpit ei ætatis anno septimo erumpere è summa fronte cornu fabæ in modum; nec excessit usque ad annum ætatis 20. auctum ex eo ad pollices septem, reflexum incurvum, cætera etiam cornu arietinum referens: et quotidie crescere cum dolore ipse affirmat. Latuit hactenus, nunquam nisi operto capite procedens. Forte eo feras persequens deductus cum aliis Laverdinus, inopinanti supervenit; hodie spectaculo est omnibus.’

¹⁴⁹ Jacques Auguste de Thou, *Historiarum sui temporis tomus primus[-septimus]*, ed. by Samuel Buckley (London, 1733), V, 825.

¹⁵⁰ Fabricius Hildanus (Wilhelm Fabri von Hilden), *Opera observationum et curationum medico-chirurgicarum, quæ exstant omnia* (Frankfurt: J. L. Dufour, 1682), 102-105 (= Centuria II, Observatio 25: ‘De Gravissimis quibusdam ... capitis vulneribus ... Item, de Cornuto quodam homine, historia admiranda’) (104), referring to the account of Emanuel Urstisius, a Basle physician, and de Thou’s.

¹⁵¹ Ulisse Aldrovandi, *Monstrorum historia cum Paralipomenis historiae omnium animalium*, ed. by Marco Antonio Bernia (Bologna: Nicolò Tebaldini, 1642), 126, with a woodcut illustration (127).

rational scholar, he ventures that the Ancient Greeks must have partly based their concept of a satyr's horns on the basis of abnormalities like Renville's.

A further manifestation of Casaubon's limitless curiosity is his attention to Ancient artwork. Thus Casaubon compares, again in the *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*, the otocele or swelling that Ancient artists often depicted near the satyrs' ears, to the thyrocele or enlargement of the thyroid gland (in French *goitre*) that was endemic in the Savoie and other Alpine regions.¹⁵² More importantly, in January 1603, some eleven months before Casaubon started on his Persius edition, the Provençal collector and Keeper of Henri IV's Antiquities Rascas de Bagarris had sent Joseph Scaliger samples and rubbings of Ancient medals and gems, in order to obtain Scaliger's comments. One of the imprints portrayed (as Scaliger described it) represented a Silenus, with an infant Bacchus, surrounded by a small throng of satyrs, and some female figures, including one with cymbals. Scaliger commented in detail on this composition, relating it to Euripides's *Cyclops*, and more generally to theatrical tableaux of Antiquity created by 'instrument players, buffoons, and comic and tragic actors' (*thymelici, histriones, comoedi, tragoedi*).¹⁵³ The timing of this learned exchange was perfect in terms of Casaubon's keen interest in all things satirical in that particular period: unsurprisingly the scholar refers to the self-same gem, which Rascas de Bagarris had shown him, in his *De satyrica Graecorum poesi* to insist on the differences in age and shape between satyrs on the one hand and *Sileni* on the other. How amazing that such a small surface can hold such a variety of figures and actions! Above all, the jasper stone which Casaubon describes as dark-green, almost black in color, fully supports his argument that there did exist a theatrical scene in Antiquity that was not so much built around comedians or tragedians but satyrs – the discussion of the gem and the issues arising from it go on for almost eight pages.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² *De Satyrica Graecorum poesi*, 87-88.

¹⁵³ Scaliger to P.-A. de Rascas, sieur de Bagarris, 12 January 1603 (*The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, IV, 542-56 [545-47]). Scaliger's interest in numismatics is also attested by his visit, in the company of Bonaventura Vulcanius, to Utrecht, where he admired the coin collection of Abraham Gorlaeus. Chris L. Heesakkers, 'Bonaventura Vulcanius, Janus Dousa and the *Pleias Dousica*', in *Bonaventura Vulcanius: Works and networks. Bruges 1538-Leiden 1614*, ed. by Hélène Cazès, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 194 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 263-86 (280).

¹⁵⁴ Casaubon, *De satyrica graecorum poesi*, 67-8: 'quod non solum scriptorum testimoniis probare possumus: verum gemmae sculpturae τῆς παλαιᾶς [sic] χειρὸς, quam ostendit nobis vir harum rerum callentissimus, et indagator felicissimus, Petrus Rascasius Bagarrius, Aquisextiensis advocatus, et gazae regiae cimeliorum antiquitatis praefectus. Eius gemmae exemplum, quia facit apprime ad institutum sermonem, infra subiecimus. [Image] En vetustatis monumentum egregium, et admiratione omnium,

Crucially, Casaubon's text also included an engraving of the object – the same engraving that, as the editors of Scaliger's correspondence have pointed out, also appears with the first printed edition of Scaliger's learned letter and – rather less appropriately, given Casaubon's theoretical position on *satura* – already on the title page of some rare copies of the 1605 Persius edition (fig. 000), as well as on the second and third editions of his Persius, published posthumously in 1615 and 1647.¹⁵⁵ A copy of it also featured on the title-page of the eighteenth-century edition of Casaubon's *De Satyrica graecorum poesi*, published at Halle in 1774.¹⁵⁶

The copperplate print, small though it was, had quite an impact of its own. Lingelsheim, for instance, singled out the illustration for special praise, alongside Casaubon's discussion of the nature of poetry:

But that gem, which is included in your discussions as in a setting of the purest gold, you have made more precious than the hand that carved it. Nay, it glitters more brilliantly than the stars themselves.¹⁵⁷

It also served as a primary point of reference for a brief antiquarian discussion between Claude Saumaise and Pierre Dupuy. For on 13 July 1628 Saumaise wrote to his friend in Paris that one particular type of Dionysian *thyrsos*, wound with paper and ivy, could be seen 'in a carved jet stone, which is at the front of Casaubon's Persius, and in his book *On satire*, and which is explained by Scaliger in one of his Letters; it depicts the Mysteries or Orgies of Bacchus, with a bacchant holding a thyrsus, of the type I just

quos res antiquae capiunt, dignissimum. Nam praeter solertiam subtilissimi artificis, cuius hoc elaboratissimum opus est: plane stupenda in tantula spatio rerum, personarum, actionum varietas. ... ipsa gemma iaspis est, viriditatis nigricantis, non plane pellucida, punctis rubris stellata: grammaticam sive polygrammon veterum esse censeam, addubito. Argumentum prorsus huic nostrae diatribae convenientissimum. Chorum enim Bacchi continent, scenaeque descriptionem: et quidem Satyricae potius quam tragicae aut comicae: hoc enim arbor adiecta promittit: ... Videtur haec gemma eo consilio sculpta, ut thymelicarum tabularum picturas imitaretur.'

¹⁵⁵ Morgan *219. The gem features on the title pages of the copy of the 1605 edition held in the British Library (1001.f.14), formerly belonging to Francis Hargrave (1740/41-1821) and Richard Moland, and of that in the 'André Himpe Collection' at the Newberry Library (SC 2823). Morgan lists two further copies, in the Vatican Library, and his own (now Harvard University Library, Houghton Library Lp 15.6.05.3*). On the 1615 and 1647 editions, see p. 000 above.

¹⁵⁶ Isaac Casaubon, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira libri duo* ..., ed. by Johann Jakob Rambach the Younger (Halle: 'Apud I. I. Grebaueri viduam et filium', 1774).

¹⁵⁷ G. Lingelsheim to Casaubon, 17 September 1605 (London, BL, ms. Burney 365, fol. 108rv [108r]): 'sed gemma illa, quam tu exalta explicatione tua, tamquam auro purissimo inclusam, longe pretiosiore, quam artificis manus reddidisti, nã illa micat splendidius, quam astra ipsa.'

mentioned'.¹⁵⁸ Dupuy forwarded Saumaise's letter, or a copy of it, to Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637), who in turn expressed his disagreement with Saumaise's interpretation of the rod held by one of the figures in Casaubon's engraving ('cette petite verge que tient en main l'une des figures sur la graveure de Casaubon') as a genuine *thyrsus*.¹⁵⁹ Later still, the engraving also seems to have inspired other *objets d'art*, such as a gold and enamel seventeenth-century snuff box with classicizing miniatures preserved in the Louvre,¹⁶⁰ or a drawing by the eighteenth-century sculptor and engraver Edmé Bouchardon (1698-1762), at the Musée des Beaux-Arts at Angers,¹⁶¹ although these may of course also draw on a broader tradition of such Bacchic scenes.

Nonetheless, Rascas also described the gem in his own writings on numismatics and glyptics and used the same engraving in his (incomplete) treatise *La nécessité de l'usage des médailles dans les monnoyes*, published in 1611.¹⁶² It is not often realised that the actual intaglio itself survives, albeit with some damage. It entered the royal collection of Louis XIV in 1670 and is now held in the Cabinet des médailles et antiques of the Bibliothèque nationale de France (inv.58.2338). Its current frame dates from the

¹⁵⁸ Cl. Saumaise to P. Dupuy, 13 July 1628 (Claude Saumaise, *Epistolarum Liber Primus. Accedunt de laudibus et vita ejusdem prolegomena*, ed. by Antonius Clementius [Leiden: Adrianus Wyngaerden, 1656], 29-30): 'Quant aux Thyrses Bacchiques, il faut necessairement qu'il y en ait eu de deux sortes, et les Auteurs anciens en marquent la difference. Les uns estoient tout entortillés de papier et de feuilles de lierre; Anacreon les appelle κατακίσσους θύρσους, *id est, hederâ inductos thyrsos*. Il s'en voit de cette façon dans l'Agathe gravée, qui est au devant du Perse de Casaubon, et dans son livre *De Satyra*, et qui est expliquée par Scaliger en l'une de ses Epistres. Elle a pour argument les mysteres ou Orgies de Bacchus, et une bacchante y tient un thyrses, fait en la façon que je dis. C'est un baton simple qui a du lierre à l'entour. En quelques uns le bout du javelot estoit envelopé de feuilles de vigne ou de lierre, et en ce sens Macrobe interprete *thyrsus*, *hastam vel jaculum, cujus mucro hederâ lambente obiectus est*. Les Grecs les appellent λογχοτοῦς θύρσους, ou θυρσολόγχοι.'

¹⁵⁹ Peiresc to Dupuy, 28 July 1628 (*Lettres de Peiresc aux frères Dupuy*, ed. by Philippe Tamizey de Laroque, 6 vols, Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France [Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1888-1898], I, 678-85 [684]).

¹⁶⁰ Paris, Louvre, Département des Objets d'art, OA 7997 ('Pierre-François Draï, Maître à Paris en 1763, *Tabatière, 1772-1773*, Paris, Or, agate rouge, émail Miniatures à sujets antiques dont Le Triomphe de Silène. Legs Georges Heine, 1929').

¹⁶¹ Angers, Musée des Beaux-Arts, MTC 58; *Inventaire legs Turpin de Crissé*, p. 21, no. 29 ('Edme Bouchardon (dessinateur, sculpteur), *Triomphe de Silène; Marche de Silène* (ancien titre), 3e quart 18e siècle').

¹⁶² *Curiositez pour la confirmation et l'ornement de l'histoire... Cabinet de M. de Rascas, sr de Bagaris, conseiller du Parlement de Provence...*, printed pamphlet in BnF, ms. français 953, fol. 58-75, here p. 31 (= fol. 73'): 'Les Sylènes et Satyres y sont representez fort naïvement, notamment en un convoy de Bacchus cheu en yvesse, qu'ils portent, accompagné de Bacchantes, où se voyent d'autres particularitez sur ce sujet [...]'. Pierre Antoine Rascas, sieur de Bagarris, *Lettres inédites écrites d'Aix et de Paris à Peiresc (1598-1610)*, ed. with an introduction, notes and an appendix by Philippe Tamizey de Laroque, *Les Correspondants de Peiresc XII* (Aix-en-Provence: Illy and J. Brun, 1887), 47n.

seventeenth century. The scene we know from the engraving was in fact its mirror image, as if showing an imprint in sealing wax. Disconcertingly, however, since the mid-nineteenth century the precious stone is no longer considered of Ancient origin itself, but an imitation, possibly of Bacchic scenes that can be found on Roman sarcophagi. Specialists now ascribe the work to the virtuosic Italian engraver Valerio Belli of Vicenza, on the basis of a comparison with other signed pieces.¹⁶³

Since the artistic evidence which Casaubon adduces in his scholarly work on satire proves to be false, does that invalidate his reasoning in his *De satyrica Graecorum poesi*? There is little doubt that Rascas, Scaliger or Casaubon acted in anything but good faith in their discussion of the glyptic artefact; in all likelihood, it was Rascas who was duped at the point of acquisition. The scene represented on the gem may not be authentic, but it is concordant with the wealth of textual evidence quoted by Casaubon; moreover, as an imitative piece of art, it still represents an Ancient Roman motif, albeit in a filtered or deflected manner. One could say therefore that Casaubon's inclusion of it weakens the edifice of his argument but does not cause its collapse.

Conclusion

What may we take from all this? Despite the allure of the genesis of Casaubon's twin works on ancient satire, it was of course neither the first or the last time that humanistic rivalry and one-upmanship galvanized great scholarship. What is very clear, however, is that in both works Casaubon strongly linked his brand of scholarship with his co-religionaries, in Geneva and France, the Low Countries and German-speaking regions. This is quite remarkable, insofar as we might carelessly have assumed that a (pagan) Classical author like Persius or a topic such as the theory of satire would constitute 'neutral' territory in the Republic of Letters. Nevertheless, there feature but few exceptions among Casaubon's contacts on this matter: Lipsius in Leuven, and of course de Thou and his circle in Paris. Even Casaubon's restraint vis-à-vis Jean de

¹⁶³ *Vrai ou Faux? Copier, imiter, falsifier* (Paris: BnF, 1988), 76. The catalogue sees the gem itself as the source of inspiration for the snuff box mentioned above. Salomon Reinach, *Pierres gravées des collections Marlborough et d'Orléans, des recueils d'Eckhel, Gori, Levesque de Gravelle, Mariette, Millin, Stosch* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1895), 95.

Tourneroche may have had a confessional side to it, for Tourneroche had dedicated his Persius commentary to his fellow Norman, Claude Groulart, First President of the Parlement of Rouen, who was a Protestant and a good friend of Scaliger's. According to Pierre-Daniel Huet, the Jesuit polemicist François Garasse would wrangle with Tourneroche, calling him *Tournebroche* ('spit-turner'), labelling him a Huguenot, and taking him to task precisely for his commentaries on Ancient satire.¹⁶⁴ Marcilius, on the other hand, was an overt Catholic and had dedicated his work to Renaud de Beaune, archbishop of Bourges and *grand aumônier de France*, well known for his sympathy with the Ligue. Bernard Automne's allegiance similarly lay on the Catholic side, and he accordingly dedicated his work to Chancellor Nicolas Brulart de Sillery, who supported Marie de Medicis in her efforts to kindle a Catholic renouveau.

This confessional divide also appears to have marked the afterlife and reception of Casaubon's work for a very long time, if we think of the second and third editions of Casaubon's Persius in England, or the 1699 and 1774 reprints of the *De satyrica graecorum poesi et romanorum satira* in Germany. If, in the interval, the work was translated into Italian (1728), a language we associate with Catholicism, this was no doubt due to the relative independence and rather exceptional interconfessional contacts of the translator, Anton Maria Salvini (1653-1729), in an otherwise very censorious intellectual context.¹⁶⁵ Certainly, an idea floated by Venetian printers in 1612 to have Casaubon's Persius edition reprinted in Venice alongside his Athenaeus and Polybius never materialized.¹⁶⁶ Did illness and death intervene or did such editions become increasingly impolitic in post-Interdict Venice? Casaubon's erudition and the contributions he made to scholarship on Persius, Greek drama and Roman satire remain indisputable, and we can only regret that the Juvenal commentary that Casaubon

¹⁶⁴ Pierre-Daniel Huet, *Les Origines de la ville de Caen*, 2nd edn (Rouen: Maurry, 1706), 363.

¹⁶⁵ *Di Isacco Casaubono della satirica poesia de' Greci e della satira dei Romani libri due ... e Il Ciclope di Euripide*, trans. Anton Maria Salvini (Florence: Giuseppe Manni, 1728). On Salvini, see Maria Pia Paoli, 'Anton Maria Salvini (1653-1729). Ritratto di un letterato fiorentino nella Firenze di fine Seicento', in *Naples, Rome, Florence. Une histoire comparée des milieux intellectuels italiens (XVII-XVIIIe siècle)*, ed. by Jean Boutier, Brigitte Marin and Antonella Romano, Collection de l'École française de Rome 355 (Rome: École française de Rome, 2005), pp. 501-44.

¹⁶⁶ 'Veneti Bibliopolae' to Isaac Casaubon, 13 August 1612 (BL, ms. Burney 363, fol. 91^r), now published in *The Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon in England*, ed. by Paul Botley and Máté Vince, *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 588, 4 vols (Geneva: Droz, 2018), III, 34-36 (35). Domenico Molino to Casaubon, 17 August 1612, *ibid.*, III, 45-48 (48). Note that the Venetian booksellers also demanded that all Greek tags in the commentaries be Latinized.

promised Caspar von Barth in 1606 never appeared either.¹⁶⁷ But when we consider the genesis and the vicissitudes of Casaubon's work on satire, we may like to think that even the great Casaubon had feet of clay, and we may find that Barthius's mischievous appreciation of Casaubon's Persius in his choliambic *Amphitheatrum sapientiae* equally applies to the *De satyrica graecorum poesi*, viz. that notwithstanding Casaubon's erudite commentary, Ancient satire remained a tough subject nonetheless:

Tenebricosa Persii fugit Larva
 Casaubono exigente: sed locum servat
 Ab eruditione multa adorandum.
 Ut ipse nec Casaubonus tenet regnum
 In eruditionis omnibus punctis.¹⁶⁸

Persius's dark specter is on the run, with Casaubon forcing it out; yet it still occupies a place that has to be admired for its great learning, since not even Casaubon himself will wear the crown on every learned point.

Ingrid A. R. De Smet
 University of Warwick

¹⁶⁷ Casaubon to C. von Bart, 29 August 1606 (*Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae*, 274-75 [2075]): 'De locis Juvenalis gratius fuit, tuas conjecturas intelligere: eum Poetam gravissimum, si superi annuerint, accurate recensebimus.' Cf. *Claudii Claudiani Poetae praegloriosissimi quae exstant*, ed. by Caspar von Barth (Hanau: Willier, 1612), 'Animadversiones', separate pagination, 27.

¹⁶⁸ Taraeus Hebuis (= Caspar Barthius), *Amphitheatrum sapientiae, quae ex libris hauriri potest: cuius decem libri puris choliambis scripti nunc primum prodeunt* (Hanau: Biermann, 1613), lib. IV, VI 'Forum ad poetam', 74-76 (75). Cf. lib. X, XXXVII (160: 'Ut a liquore potus Hippocrenæo / Dat erudita Persius, sed obscura'). Both quoted in Nikitinski, 302. For Athenaeus, see lib. X, CCXXI (176); for Zeno, lib. X, CCCIII (184); for the *Historia Augusta*, lib. X, CCCXIX (185).