Between Antiquarianism and Satire: Tertullian's *De Pallio* in the Age of Confessions, *c*. 1590-1630

Marcello Cattaneo

Magdalen College, University of Oxford

Abstract:

This article analyses the scholarly efforts of two generations of late humanists on a text that became particularly popular in learned circles around the turn of the seventeenth century: Tertullian's mock oration on the philosophical cloak, known as *De Pallio*. It focusses on a methodological shift in scholarship from conjectural emendation to antiquarian explication, and it highlights the polemical and literary dynamics at the basis of the text's reinterpretation as a satire. These insights are in turn linked to the changing circumstances of learned polemics in the Republic of Letters, and to the central place of confessional strife as an organizing principle for scholarship itself. I conclude the article by gesturing towards the seventeenth-century fortune of the 'pallium' as a polemical trope.

Keywords: Tertullian, *De Pallio*, Claude Saumaise, Isaac Casaubon, satire, confession.

1 Introduction

By the consent of generations of students, Tertullian is a very hard author. But one work above all has left behind a trail of perplexed readers and commentators: it is the speech that the African church father pronounced to his fellow citizens of Carthage to justify his choice to dismiss typically Roman clothes such as the toga in favour of the Greek philosophical cloak, the humble pallium. Eduard Norden, the doyen of Latinists at the turn of the twentieth century, thought that *De Pallio* was the hardest text in the Latin language.[1] Indeed, *De Pallio* is a paradoxical piece: it is an apologetic speech that barely mentions Christianity, assembling instead a collection of recondite allusions to some spectacular cross-dressing episodes in classical mythology, and comparing them to contemporary and bygone Greek, Roman, and Punic fashions and textiles. It argues for the licitness of clothes-swapping from the example of elaborately described natural phenomena such as the seasons, celestial events, and earthquakes. At the end, the pallium itself is given speech, in a startling prosopopoeia in praise of secession from public life. The whole is cast in an intricate, and often mystifying, Latin style, whose tone ranges from platitudinous to sarcastic and from deadly serious to playfully ironic. To make matters even worse, a very faulty manuscript tradition often obscures the text's bewildering rhetoric.

This article will make no attempt to dispel these obscurities. Instead, it will chronicle a short period, around the turn of the seventeenth century, when two generations of late humanists were captivated by the enigmas of *De Pallio*, and worked on it with an intensity of philological and interpretative effort that is unparalleled at any other time. This

[1] Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1923), 2: 615.

fascination has been completely overlooked by modern scholarship, notwithstanding some very thorough work on Tertullian in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,[2] and the veritable birth of patristic reception as a central field of study in early modern intellectual history.[3] Why did this specific age become alive to this precise text and to its literary possibilities? And how did scholars *remake* Tertullian's mock-oration into a text that suited their intellectual world?

Indeed, the mock-oration sat at the intersection of several interlocking trends of thought and practice that were operative in the Republic of Letters, at a time of great

---

[2] Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden, 2003), 152-172; *eadem*, 'Le Tertullien de Lambert de Daneau dans le Contexte Religieux du Seizième Siècle Tardif', in Mariarosa Cortesi, ed., *I Padri Sotto il Torchio: Le Edizioni dell'Antichità Cristiana nei Secoli XV-XVI* (Florence, 2002), 33-52; *ead.*, 'Quelques Remarques sur les Annotations Doctrinales de Bèze dans son Exemplaire de Tertullien', and Pierre Petitmengin, 'De Théodore de Bèze à Jacques Godefroy', both in Irena Backus, ed., *Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605): Actes du colloque de Genève (septembre 2005)* (Geneva, 2007), 339-352 and 309-337 respectively. See also the contributions of Petitmengin, 'L'Édition de Tertullien, de Nicolas Rigault à Migne', in Luc Deitz, ed., *Tempus Edax Rerum: le bicentenaire de la Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg (1798-1998)* (Luxembourg, 2001), 27-40, 'Jacques de Pamèle Passeur de Manuscrits Perdus de Tertullien', in Yann Sordet, ed., *Passeurs de Textess. 2, Imprimeurs, éditeurs et lecteurs humanistes dans les collections de la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève* (Turnhout, 2009), 124-137; 'Pierre Pithou, Théodore de Bèze et la Chronologie des Traités de Tertullien', in Maria Cristina Pitassi and Daniela Solfaroli Camillocci, eds., *Crossing Traditions: Essays on the Reformation and Intellectual History in Honour of Irena Backus* (Leiden, 2018), 200-215.

[3] See especially Irena Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997), and the work of Jean-Louis Quantin, *Le Catholicisme Classique et les Pères de l'Église: Un Retour aux Sources (1669-1713)* (Paris, 1999), and *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009).

intellectual ferment but also of deep divisions along confessional lines.[4] *De Pallio* is a Christian work that wears its heathen lore ostentatiously, and yet is capable of sharp mobilizations of such abstruse learning for novel and enigmatic purposes. It is, then, unsurprising that Tertullian's polemical 'antiquarianism' captivated the interest of an age that was itself discovering the intellectual potentialities of antiquarian studies.[5] Hardly classifiable within the categories of pagan literature as the Renaissance received them, *De Pallio* stimulated scholars to rethink the boundaries of literary genre. If at the start of our period the text was simply a declamation written *more scholastico*, by the end it had become a *satyra* (which is different from *satira*). Given the textual obscurities of the received text, the work also raised questions of critical method. Faced with such an elusive speech, humanists debated, upheld, and disparaged the values of various approaches, be it emendation by conjecture or by manuscript variants (*emendatio ingenii* and *emendatio ope codicum* respectively, to use early modern terms),[6] or, indeed, literary-historical contextualization.[7] Finally, Tertullian's mock-oration also bridged or defied disciplinary

[4] For studies of the impact of confession on scholarship, see (for a more bibliographical account) Ian Maclean, *Scholarship, Commerce, Religion: The Learned Book in the Age of Confessions, 1560-1630* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012), and (for one more focussed on the intellectual stakes of confession) Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017). I owe a great debt to this last contribution.

[5] On Tertullian's 'antiquarianism', see Timothy D. Barnes, 'Tertullian the Antiquarian', in *Studia Patristica*, 14 (1976), 3-20.

[6] See Sebastiano Timpanaro, *La Genesi del Metodo di Lachmann* (Padua, 1981), 3-16; and, much more in detail, Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983-1993), 1: 9-133.

[7] A parallel case of an obscure and satirical case posing similar methodological problems is Petronius's *Saryricon* – on which, see Anthony Grafton, 'Petronius and Neo-Latin Satire: The

divisions: as the work of an ante-Nicene church father steeped in pagan literature and philosophy, did it belong to the domain of theology or to the province of what was known as 'grammar'? Or was such division a spurious construction upheld by the practitioners of either discipline for their gain? These questions were legitimate considerations as much as occasions for controversy in a very quarrelsome age. In other words, it would be hard to find another work in which so many of the issues that late humanists found compelling converge.

A brief bibliographical survey will evoke the trace of this forgotten humanist fascination: *De Pallio*, which amounts to scarcely 3,500 words, was first published as a heavily annotated, self-standing piece in 1595 (by François du Jon, as a forerunner to his 1597 edition of Tertullian's complete works),[8] and again in 1600 (by the theologian Edmond Richer), in 1614 (by Théodore Marcile, professor of Latin at the Collège Royal),[9] and finally in 1622, by Claude Saumaise, whose philologically ground-breaking edition plus commentary ran to almost 500 octavo pages, discounting the index.[10] Even before 1595, the Flemish Catholic bishop Jacques de Pamèle had produced an edition of

---

Reception of the *Cena Trimalchionis*', in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 53 (1990), 237-249.

[8] *Tertulliani de Pallio Liber, cum Notis Francisci Iunii* (Leiden, 1595). I have consulted the commentary in the 1597 edition, *Tertulliani Carthaginiensis Presbyteri Opera* (Franeker, 1597), 1-19 (second pagination) [henceforth du Jon, *DP*].

[9] *Liber de Pallio, Notis Latinis & Interpretatione Gallica Illustratus, Auctore Edmundo Richerio* (Paris, 1600); *Tertulliani Liber de Pallio cum Interpretatione, Notisque Criticis & Historicis Theodori Marcilii* (Paris, 1614) [henceforth Marcile, *DP*].

[10] *Tertulliani Liber de Pallio, Claudius Salmasius Recensuit, Explicauit, Notis Illustrauit* (Paris, 1622) [henceforth Saumaise, *DP*]. Saumaise's edition was also reprinted posthumously, with no alterations, in 1656: *Liber de Pallio, Claudius Salmasius Ante Mortem Recensuit* (Leiden, 1656).

Tertullian's *Opera Omnia* in 1583-1584, adorned with aggressively 'post-Tridentine' notes, in which *De Pallio* headed the entire folio.[11] Pamèle's edition dominated the Catholic market for decades, and its extensive apparatus easily absorbed new Tertullianic scholarship, most of which, unsurprisingly, focussed on our mock-oration: a 1598 reissue was augmented with a commentary on *De Pallio* by the French jurist Jean Mercier,[12] and other later copies of the 'Pameliana' often incorporated the commentaries mentioned above.[13] With Saumaise's edition, *De Pallio* also became the centre of controversy: because of his commentary, the Calvinist editor was drawn into an exceptionally bitter and long-lasting polemic with the Jesuit Denis Petau.[14] In 1626, just as the Saumaise-Petau quarrel was enjoying a lull, another Jesuit, the Spanish Juan Luis de la Cerda (who had also been preparing an edition of Tertullian) published yet another commentary on *De Pallio*, in which he often disparaged Saumaise's judgement while at the same time

[11] *Tertulliani Opera quæ hactenus Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia*, ed. Jacobus Pamelius (Antwerp and Paris, 1584) [henceforth Pamèle, *Opera*].

[12] 'In Librum de Pallio Ioannis Mercerii Commentaria', in *Tertulliani Opera*, ed. Pamelius (Paris, 1598). The author of the commentary should not be confused (as most online catalogues do) with his homonym, the more famous Hebraist Jean Mercier (†1570), whose grand-daughter, Anne Mercier, married Claude Saumaise.

[13] The 1608 reprint of Pamèle's edition, for example, incorporated at the end of the folio both Mercier's and Richer's commentaries: *Opera quæ hactenus Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia* (Paris, 1608), 1079-1097 and 1098-1101. I have consulted these commentaries in this 1608 edition [henceforth Mercier, *DP* and Richer, *DP* respectively].

[14] The sole modern notice of this quarrel is Thomas Conley, 'Vituperation in Early Seventeenth-Century Historical Studies', *Rhetorica*, 22/2 (2004), 169-182, 175-177, which only catalogues the insults the disputant exchanged.

affecting impartiality.[15] Soon enough, *De Pallio* was also being translated: three different French translations were printed in 1637, 1640, and 1665,[16] and an anonymous, undated one remains in manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.[17] It is then unsurprising that Robert Burton, in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, ironically included 'writ[ing] a comment on […] Tertullian *de Pallio*' among the remedies for the ills of the spleen.[18]

And yet there might have been more than just irony in Burton's comment: scholarship on the mock-oration indeed turned 'splenetic' over the course of this period. This article will trace this development in three movements, roughly in chronological order. At first I will consider one of the most important figures of the generation in which late humanism arguably reached its apex, Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614).[19] Casaubon's notes on *De Pallio* provide the first example of what it meant to study the text from an

---

[15] Juan Luis de la Cerda, *Adversaria Sacra. Accessit, eodem autore, Psalterij Salomonis ex Græco MS. Codice Peruetusto Latina Versio, & ad Tertulliani Librum de Pallio Commentarius Auctior* (Lyon, 1626), 3-70 (third pagination). His edition of Tertullian appeared between 1624 and 1630 in Paris.

[16] *Traicté du Manteau*, trans. Isaac de la Grange (Vendôme, 1637); *Tertullien du Manteau*, trans. Charles de Titreville (Paris, 1640); *Livre de Tertullien du Manteau, Traduction Nouvelle*, trans. Nicolas Manessier (Paris, 1665).

[17] Bibliothèque Nationale de France [henceforth BnF], MS Français 4822. It is clearly a fair copy for presentation, with a dedication to 'Monsieur T. A. s.', who is addressed as 'mon cher frere', fol. 1[r].

[18] Robert Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Rhonda Blair *et al.*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1989), 2: 94. Significantly, the comment was added to the 1651 posthumous edition of the *Anatomy* (see 'Textual Notes', p. 328). Burton died in January 1640.

[19] On Casaubon in general Mark Pattison's biography, *Isaac Casaubon*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1892), remains valuable.

antiquarian point of view, thus raising the crucial question of what 'antiquarianism' was for him, and of what purposes it might serve. I will then discuss the Catholic commentators (especially Théodore Marcile, 1548-1617) who were responsible for bringing new work on ancient satire to bear upon *De Pallio*, thereby refashioning the text into a work where ridicule could be married to apologetics and polemics. In the third section, the pioneering edition of Claude Saumaise (1588-1653, who had been Casaubon's pupil) and his quarrel with Denis Petau (1583-1652) demonstrate how these scholarly trends could meet, and function together as a cover for confessional controversy: antiquarianism could turn satirical just as philology could stand in for theology. At the end of the article, I will delineate the survival of the pallium as a polemical trope in the seventeenth century, and point to the implications that an enquiry of this kind can have for the modern disciplines of literary studies.

This is not to say that before this period scholars and writers worked in an atmosphere that was free of confessional pressure. Already in 1539, when Beatus Rhenanus revised for the third edition his own 1521 *editio princeps* of Tertullian (itself a polemical work that would be put on the Index),[20] the humanist seized the occasion offered by *De Pallio* to apply its teaching to contemporary polemics: in his introduction to the mock-oration, Rhenanus remarked that 'nowadays Christians have raised themselves up from the pallium not only to the toga, but also to the sceptre and the diadem, even if a more frugal and holier life would be fitting for them, as in the case of the purer part of the Lord's

[20] See Backus, *Historical Method*, 156-157.

flock'.[21] The veiled reference both to papal luxury and monastic hypocrisy did not go unnoticed, and the Catholic Jacques de Pamèle took issue with it both publicly in his 1584 edition of Tertullian's *Opera Omnia*,[22] and privately in his working copy, where the passage is crossed out twice and branded by vertical slash and a mark in the margin.[23] And yet, as we shall see, what was a simple off-hand insinuation in Rhenanus's hands would come to be extensively supported by antiquarian and critical methods whose ends were fundamentally eristic. In other words, in the case of *De Pallio*, antiquarianism, criticism, and literary history were not fields of scholarship that resisted, or sat uneasily with, confessionalization (as some modern historiography has it),[24] but they were instrumental and even subservient to it. A nexus existed tying antiquarianism to satire and consequently to polemics, and it is only by taking it seriously that we can recover a fuller picture of the uses and misuses of scholarship in late humanism. Conversely, by showing that satire was

[21] 'At hodie commutatis in diuersum rebus apud nos non solum à pallijs ad togas uerum etiam ad diadema & sceptrum emerserunt, quos tamen vita frugalior sanctiorque in primis deceret, veluti puriorem Dominici gregis partem', in *Opera Tertulliani Carthaginensis*, ed. Beatus Rhenanus (Basel, 1539), 677 – itself a reference to *De Pallio* V.1.

[22] Pamèle, *Opera*, 10, n. 1: '[E]xpungendi (præter eos quos Censores Regij repurgarunt) veniunt duo loci in ipsius [Rhenanus's] ad hunc librum argumento. præterquam enim quod in calce tacitè suggillat Romani Pontificis sceptrum & diadema; etiam in ipso offendit limine de Monachorum agens veterum vestitu, Erasmum opinor imitatus'.

[23] Pamèle's working copy was a 1566 octavo edition in two volumes, now in Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, classmark 8 CC 1097 INV 1046-1047, 2: 216, digitized at https://archive.org/details/8CC1098INV1047/page/n285 [last accessed 29th March 2019].

[24] On antiquarianism and irenicism, see Peter N. Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, 2000), esp. chapter 4 (101-129); *id.*, 'The 'Antiquarianization' of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 62/3 (2001), 463-482.

much more than just a literary genre, such a picture can in turn contribute to a richer understanding of what early modern 'literature' might have been, and of the polemical context that went to shape our own modern conception of this discipline.

2 Casaubon: The 'Antiquarianization' of *De Pallio*

In a well-known letter dated June 1635 and addressed to Nicholas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, Claude Saumaise took the occasion to pay his respects to the greatest antiquary of the day: 'one must admit that you have excelled all other men in this field of study of antiquity, as you have joined the practice to the theory'.[25] Most scholars, Saumaise complained, are only competent in the latter, and the neglect of the former often leads them into misunderstandings. In a move of studied modesty, he admitted: 'the case is the same with ancient clothes, *togae*, *pallia*, *chlamydes*, *saga*. How many times have I racked my brain, and laboured in vain to explain and clarify what I found of these things in ancient

[25] 'Il faut avouer que vous dominés sur tous les autres hommes du monde en cette estude de l'antiquité, d'autant que vous avés joint la pratique à la théorie' – a manuscript copy of the letter is in BnF, MS Dupuy 583, fol. 92[r]; there is a printed version in *Les Correspondants de Peiresc V: Claude de Saumaise*, ed. Tamizey de Larroque (Dijon, 1882), 30; it is quoted almost as an exemplary description of humanism by Miller (*Peiresc's Europe*, 10), by Ingo Herklotz ('Momigliano's 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian': A Critical Review', in Peter N. Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto, 2007), 127-153, 138-139), and by Roger Zuber ('De Scaliger à Saumaise: Leyde et les Grands 'Critiques' Français', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 126 (1980), 461-488, 480).

authors'.[26] The allusion to his 1622 edition of Tertullian's *De Pallio* would not have been lost on his correspondent: in the earliest extant letter from Peiresc to Saumaise (May 1620), the antiquary had expressed his anticipation for the work the humanist was undertaking on the difficult African church father.[27] In 1634, Saumaise had even asked for drawings of the mantle to be made among 'your antiquities of Marseille, where Greek was once spoken' (the city was founded as a Greek colony), 'for I cannot see its shape but through a cloud'.[28] Such request, Saumaise wrote, was for his new book 'on clothes and colours' (*de re vestiaria et coloribus*) in antiquity, which he had just compiled from 'all that I formerly gathered'.[29] Peiresc happily complied, sending several drawings, imparting to Saumaise his iconographic knowledge of the pallium, and commending his correspondent's design of a collection of discoveries *de re vestiaria et coloribus*.[30]

---

[26] 'Ainsi de tout le reste, et principalement des habits antiques *Togæ*, *Pallia*, *Chlamydes*, *Saga*. Combien me suis-je de fois rompu la teste, et travaillé en vain à expliquer et éclaircir ce que j'en rencontrais chés les autheurs', ibid.

[27] 'Je me resjouis grandement de l'esperance que vous me donnez de venir bien tost en ceste Cour, […] ne voyant l'heure que vous veuilliez donner voz rares observations sur le Tertullian *de pallio*, veu que c'est une matiere si difficille et qui a tant de besoing de vostre main', in *Lettres à Saumaise et à son entourage (1620-1637)*, ed. Agnès Bresson (Florence, 1992), 4.

[28] 'Si je pouvois avoir quelque figure du manteau grec, j'aurai ce qui me manque […] Je ne fais point de doubte, que parmi les antiquitez de vostre Marseille, où l'on a parlé grec autresfois, il ne se trouve quelque vestige de cet habillement à la grecque, et de ce *pallium* […] Car je n'en veois la figure qu'à travers un nuage', dated 2nd September 1634, in MS Dupuy 583, fol. 103r, and printed in *Salmasii Epistolarum Liber Primus*, ed. Antoine Clément (Leiden, 1656), 110.

[29] '[J]'ai par occasion reveu tout ce que j'avois recueilli autresfois, *De re vestiaria et de coloribus*, dont j'ai fait un juste volume, qui sera bien tost prest d'estre mis soubs la presse', ibid.

[30] Peiresc's reply is dated 2nd October 1634: '[J]e suis infiniment ayse que vous veuilliez donner vox traictéz *de Re vestiaria et de coloribus*, ne doubtant nullement que vous n'y ayiéz descouvert de tres belles singularitéz bien incongneues aujourd'huy […] Je vous en envoye le dessein [of the

Of this projected antiquarian work by Saumaise, we hear no more. No manuscript of this type has ever been found. Saumaise, however, was clearly eager to stress the development of his scholarship along antiquarian lines, from his interest in Tertullian's caricatures of vestments towards a catalogue of ancient clothes, for which he planned to expand the insights of his edition of *De Pallio*. And yet, such development, notwithstanding Saumaise's complaint about scholars privileging 'theory' over 'practice', was not unprecedented, and the Leiden professor was following the path opened by some of his predecessors. Indeed, a manuscript of this type and with this exact title does survive, not in Paris or Leiden, not dating from the 1630s, nor in Saumaise's hand, but in the Bodleian library in Oxford, dated February 1594, and compiled by one of the most celebrated humanists of the previous generation, Isaac Casaubon.[31] On the very title-page of this very untidy collection of miscellaneous notes on ancient dress (which Casaubon as well used to describe as of imminent publication),[32] among a list of Greek and Hebrew

pallium] d'une figure que j'ay veüe à Venise chez le s^{r} Frideric Contarini […]', in *Lettres à Saumaise*, 144-145. The drawing survives in the BnF, MS Français 9530, fols. 58^{v} (a close-up of the head), 61^{r} (a sketch with the inscription), and 62^{r} (the full front of the statue, captioned 'Statua Marmorea Venetijs apud Fridericu[m] Contarenu[m] 1600').

[31] MS Casaubon 8, fol. 1^{r}-43^{r}: 'De Re Vestiaria Com[m]entarius, vel potius Excerpta ad Commentarium. Is. Casaubonus. mense Feb. CIↃIↃXCIV', which is composed of mainly Greek notes arranged alphabetically; fol. 43^{v} *et seqq.*: 'Περὶ χρωμάτων: De coloribus', fol. 44^{r}. The compilation is very untidy. See also, for a slightly less messy compilation (but no fair copy), MS Casaubon 29, fol. 168^{v}-172^{v}: 'Collectanea de re vestiaria'.

[32] See Pattison, *Casaubon*, 431.

terms for clothes, Casaubon's first reference to the Latin use of the word *habitus* is, indeed, to *De Pallio*.[33]

This parallel between Saumaise and Casaubon is unsurprising, given the extent to which Saumaise moulded his scholarly persona in the matrix of his predecessor, and of his predecessor's friend and contemporary, Joseph Scaliger.[34] Casaubon had even been Saumaise's mentor between 1604 and 1607 in Paris, and, if we are to credit Saumaise's first biographer, Antoine Clément, he had a crucial role in the teenager's conversion to Protestantism by guiding his studies of early church history.[35] It is then not unlikely that Saumaise saw his tutor's catalogue of clothes and dyes. They might even have discussed Tertullian's mock-oration, for we have some exceptional traces of Casaubon's own fascination for *De Pallio*, in the form of the humanist's manuscript notes in his copy of

---

[33] MS Casaubon 8, fol. 1[r]: 'ἐσθης, ἀμφίεσμα, ἔνδυμα, ἱμάτιον, ἐνδυμενία. Polybius 164. ἀμπεχόνη, Etiam habitus. quod Galli retinueru[n]t. Sic Tertull. in De pallio cap. 1. Gr. σχῆμα, vt Theocr. [et] Plaut. servilis schema. Heb. לבש, בגד שַׂלְמָה siue potius שִׂמְלָה [*sic*], כְּסוּי et כְּסוּת περικάλυμμα, ἱματισμος'. As one of the anonymous peer-reviewers for this article pointed out to me, Casaubon is partly engaged in a linguistic observation: the word *habitus* derives from the verb *habeo*, just as the Greek σχῆμα and ἀμπεχόνη come from ἔχω (and as the French *habit*). On Casaubon's extensive familiarity with Hebrew texts, see Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambrdige, Mass., 2011).

[34] See Dirk van Miert, 'The French Connection: From Isaac Casaubon to Isaac Vossius, via Scaliger and Salmasius', in Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert, eds., *Isaac Vossius (1618-1689): Between Science and Scholarship* (Leiden, 2012), 15-42; and *id.*, 'Scaliger, Saumaise, Casaubon and the Discovery of the *Palatine Anthology* (1606)', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 74 (2011), 241-261; Zuber, 'De Scaliger à Saumaise'. See also the laudatory comments of Antoine Clément, in his 'Vita Salmasii', in *Salmasii Epistolarum Liber Primus* (Leiden, 1656), x-xi.

[35] 'Vita Salmasii', xix-xx.

Tertullian, a 1584 'Pameliana' also kept in Oxford.[36] The folio has copious annotations in at least two layers: one, more sparse, in a lighter ink, covers the whole of Tertullian's works, while a later, more crammed layer in a darker ink is concentrated on specific sections, and *De Pallio* is by far the text thickest with marginalia.[37] Not only do these annotations reveal what it meant for Casaubon to join the 'practice' to the 'theory', but, because they capture Casaubon reading Tertullian at two different times, they also shed light on his intellectual development, and on the role that a text like *De Pallio* could play in this shift.

Casaubon's long-standing interest in Tertullian and especially in *De Pallio* was certainly well known in learned circles, and it would be remembered for a long time: as late as 1715, when the Maurists were preparing a new edition of Tertullian (which would never appear), they made enquiries after Casaubon's marginalia.[38] Casaubon had indeed publicized this interest: from his correspondence we know that, between 1592 and 1595, he planned to give a series of lectures on the text while teaching at the Reformed Academy of Geneva, but that this project was rejected by the Company of Pastors, who probably wanted him to concentrate instead on a Protestant edition of Tertullian's complete works to

[36] Now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, H.10.9 (1).

[37] On Casaubon as an annotator, see Grafton and Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved'*; Christian Jacob, 'Périples de Lecteurs, Notes sur Athénée', *Revue de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France* 2 (1999), 19-25.

[38] We know this from the Oxford-based scholar Thomas Hearne. See his *Remarks and Collections*, 11 vols. (Oxford, 1885-1921), 5: 68-69. I am grateful to William Poole for bringing this to my attention. On the Maurists' failed edition of Tertullian, see Daniel-Odon Hurel, 'The Benedictines of the Congregation of St Maur and the Church Fathers', in Backus, ed., *Reception of the Church Fathers*, 2: 1009-1038, 1030.

counter the explicit Catholicism of Pamèle's.[39] After hearing that François du Jon was already intent on this task, Casaubon abandoned the project, even if, as he wrote to correspondents, he was sceptical of du Jon's ability to tackle Tertullian and to restrain his fondness for conjectural emendation.[40] Such apprehensions were confirmed: as soon as du Jon's edition of *De Pallio* appeared in 1595, Casaubon was quick to voice his disappointment.[41] This chronology helps us dating the marginalia themselves, for, unlike the second layer, the first never mentions du Jon: Casaubon's first reading of Tertullian must have predated 1595. This does not just match the date of the catalogue *de re vestiaria* (February 1594),[42] but it also links Casaubon's initial interest in Tertullian to his work on

[39] Hardy, *Criticism and Confession*, 52-53, has unravelled the chronology of Casaubon's early interest in Tertullian.

[40] See Casaubon's letter to Jacques Bongars, in *Isaaci Casauboni Epistolae* (Rotterdam, 1709) [henceforth *ICE*], 15: 'possem ita illum [Tertullian] suscipere explicandum, ut simul historiam Ecclesiasticam multùm juvarem: sed eam provinciam audio jam à Francisco Junio esse susceptam: qui si acerrimo illi quo pollet ingenio, minùs indulserit, non alium ille Afer vindicem poscere debet'. I follow Hardy's redating of this letter to 15th December 1595.

[41] See Casaubon to Friedrich Lindenbrog, 27th August 1595, in *ICE*, 21: 'Tertulliani loci è lib. de Pallio non visi nobis magnam habere obscuritatem: & vidisti, puto, quæ paullò pòst scripsit in illa verba doctissimus vir [in the margin: Franc. Junius], quanquam ego non planè illi assentior, in quibusdam verò nullo modo'. Casaubon was much more scathing about du Jon to Bongars in May 1596, in *ICE*, 589.

[42] However, this is clearly only the date when the catalogue was started, as it also criticizes du Jon's 1595 commentary. See e.g., *s.v.* 'Infibula': 'Iuni[us] ad Tert. de Pall. distinguit i[n]ter fibula[m] et infibula[m] […] Sed disti[n]ctio Iunii noua e[st]: Na[m] infibula[m] quis dixit Latine?', MS Casaubon 8, fol. 58r (du Jon is also reprehended for another emendation on fol. 71v, in a section 'De calceis'). On Casaubon's use of his notes, see esp. Grafton and Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved'*; also Hélène Parenty, 'Philologie et Pratiques de Lecture chez Casaubon', in Denis Thouard, Friedrich Vollhardt, and Fosca Mariani Zini, eds., *Philologie als Wissensmodell = La Philologie comme Modèle de Savoir* (Berlin, 2010), 139-163.

late classical authors such as Apuleius (with whom Tertullian is often compared on account of their flamboyant rhetoric) and Athenaeus.[43]

The second layer, by contrast, is the product both of different circumstances and of new critical methods. Indeed, after 1595, Casaubon left Geneva for Montpellier and eventually for Paris, and entered what his first biographer called the 'theological vortex' of polemics: in 1598 he read for the first time Cardinal Cesare Baronio's ecclesiastical history, the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, and gradually started to gather materials for a refutation.[44] This is the genesis of Casaubon's *Exercitationes*, which would only appear in England in the year of his death, 1614. Casaubon's correspondence again sheds light on how this new phase could influence his reading of *De Pallio*: in a letter dated May 1596, Casaubon explicitly mentioned *De Pallio* in relation to a new project of patristic scholarship,[45] and, throughout that year, he kept promising some observations specifically on the mock-oration.[46] In early 1597, Casaubon received a letter from Scaliger on *De*

[43] On Casaubon as a student of classical texts, see Hélène Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon Helléniste: Des Studia Humanitatis à la Philologie* (Geneva, 2009).

[44] See Pattison, *Casaubon*, 296, but see especially Hardy, *Criticism and Confession*, 49-151 – a compelling account of this period of Casaubon's intellectual life.

[45] Casaubon to Bongars, in *ICE*, 589: 'Tum, si vivemus, & Deus aderit, majus opus movebimus; & nostro exemplo præibimus hominibus partium nostrarum, ut mutatâ studiorum suorum ratione, ad res veteris Ecclesiæ & sanctissimos Patres illustrandos navam operam conferre malint, quàm andabaticas istas pugnas, toti orbi Christiano tam perniciosas. […] Institueram diebus hisce librum unum Observationum nostrarum in Sacros & Ecclesiasticos, ac Patres edere: posteà continui me; &, opinor, sat citò, si sat benè. Sed mihi bilem moverat tuus ille, aut noster potius N. [margin: Junius] in *De Pallio*. Quàm multa enim malè capit? quàm multa præterit? Memini Epistolâ quâdam scribere ad te pridem, virum illum opus inchoatum optimè confecturum, si modò ingenio, quo valet plurimum, uti non ἀβασανίστως quàm abuti mallet. Non fui vanus augurii; planè enim ita accidit'.

[46] See letters dated 5th May, *ICE*, 34; 14th May, 36; 18th June, 39; 31st July, 41; 27th August, 47.

Pallio, which points us to a *terminus post quem* for the second layer, and also highlights the shift in methods that accompanied Casaubon's rereading of Tertullian. Scaliger claimed to have once studied the mock-oration intensively,[47] and offered a snippet of his philological observations: 'know that the older editions were right in reading *ut Sibylla non mendax* etc. for it is a reference in Latin to what the Sibyl said in Greek: Καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος ἔσῃ, καὶ Δῆλος ἄδηλος, καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη [and Samos will be sand, and Delos dissolved, and Rome a rush]'.[48] This enigmatic quotation refers to a crux in the text in which Tertullian, in the course of a list of geological mutations (aimed at justifying the principle of change, whether of the earth or of dress), alludes to a verse from the collection known as the 'Sibylline Oracles'.[49] Beatus Rhenanus, whose editions of Tertullian had predated the *editio princeps* of the Oracles (1545), had trusted his manuscripts in reading this *locus* as '& Sibylla non mendax' ('and the Sibyl was no liar').[50] Pamèle, on the other hand, had committed a flagrant oversight in proposing the conjectural emendation of the text to '&

[47] 'Liber *De pallio* adhuc postulat industriam tuam. Annotaram neque pauca neque levia, sed liber mala manu aliqua mihi sublatus est', *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*, ed. Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, 8 vols. (Geneva, 2012), 3: 21. Scaliger seems to be referring to a theft of an annotated copy of Tertullian he owned. Casaubon seems to have considered this letter important, as it is listed as 'Epistola Scaligeri ubi aliquid i[n] lib. de Pallio' among the titles of other sets of notes in MS Casaubon 11, fol. 131b[v].

[48] 'Scis tamen antea recte legi in vetustioribus editionibus, 'Ut Sibylla non mendax', etc. Retulit enim Latine, quae illa Graece dixerat, Καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος ἔσῃ, καὶ Δῆλος ἄδηλος, καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη. Si potero alicunde animadversiones meas nancisci, impertiar', *ibid.*

[49] See the *editio princeps* of some of the Greek text by the German humanist Sixt Birck: *Σιβυλλιακῶν χρησμῶν λόγοι ὀκτώ* (Basle, 1545), 117.

[50] This is consistent in the 1521, 1528, and 1539 Rhenanus editions. The text of the 1545 and 1550 editions also follows Rhenanus.

(si ille [Plato] non mendax)'.[51] Du Jon's readiness to accept the reading of the Catholic editor must have seemed even more egregious. This same correction, in fact, appears in Scaliger's own marginalia in his copy of du Jon's Tertullian (now in Leiden University Library),[52] and Casaubon recorded his debt to Scaliger in the second layer, annotating: 'This is an elegant passage that has been very badly interpreted; Tertullian alludes to the verse of the ancient oracle that says that δῆλος will be ἄδηλος, and Samos ἄμμος. See in the Sibylline Oracles, page 292: Καὶ Σάμον ἄμμος ἅπασαν etc. Scaliger himself told me'.[53] This comment proves not only that the second layer must post-date Scaliger's reply, but also that Casaubon was checking Scaliger's hint against the new edition of the Sibylline Oracles by Johannes Opsopoeus, which only appeared in 1599.[54] It is therefore reasonable to assume that Casaubon inscribed the additional marginalia in his 'Pameliana' in the early 1600s.

Moreover, his acceptance of Scaliger's suggestion registers a novel direction in the methodology of textual criticism. If du Jon and the previous editors had worked by

[51] In his notes, Pamèle explains that the emendation is not his but by Adrien Turnèbe. The change to 'ille' (i.e., Plato) is warranted, according to Pamèle, by Plato's reference to the submerged island of Atlantis in *Timaeus* 24e-25, to which Tertullian refers in the words following – see Pamèle, *Opera*, 13.

[52] Classmark: 754 A 11, p. 2. There is also a manuscript copy of Scaliger's notes (which are mainly simple corrections) in Gerhard Vossius's hand (dated 1611) in the BnF, MS Moreau 847, fol. 134-136.

[53] 'Elega[n]s locus pessime acceptus interpr. Tertullianus alludit ad versum oraculi a[n]tiqui, δῆλος erit ἄδηλος, et Samos ἄμμος. Vide i[n] Oraculis Sibyllinis, pag. 292; Καὶ Σάμον ἄμμος ἅπασαν etc. Hoc ipse Scal. ad nos', 6, outer margin.

[54] *Σιβυλλιακοὶ χρησμοί, Hoc est, Sibyllina Oracula* (Paris, 1599). This is the only edition that matches Casaubon's reference to 'page 292'.

conjectural emendation, Scaliger and Casaubon thought instead that the 'love of novelty' (φιλοκαινία)[55] characterizing these conjectures was only the product of an ill-disguised lack of knowledge.[56] Du Jon and Pamèle had thereby betrayed their ignorance of ancient literature and customs necessary to accept and explain a received reading, instead of emending away what did not seem to make sense. Conjectural emendation normalized texts whose apparent obscurity was instead the key to understand antiquity. This shift had far-reaching implications, which permeate the second layer of Casaubon's notes, and mark a significant intellectual change from his earlier marginalia. Indeed, after 1595 Casaubon had started to investigate ancient scholarly practices for a projected book *De Critica* which, however, would never see the light.[57] Thus, moving away from the affected 'novelty' of conjectural emendation coincided with an increased interest in the ancient practices of criticism, and indeed of antiquarianism. Moreover, this shift was at least partly dictated by the polemical goal of refuting Baronio's antiquarian ecclesiastical history. Casaubon's reading of Tertullian alongside Opsopoeus's Sibylline Oracles should already alert us to

[55] See Casaubon's letter to Drusius, 16th December 1600: 'Mihi unquam φιλοκαινία hæc tanta certorum hominum probari potuit. Ab illo fonte illæ monstrorum plenæ in Tertullianum notæ prodierunt', *ICE*, 113.

[56] See Scaliger's scathing judgement of du Jon in *Scaligerana Secunda*: 'Franciscus JUNIUS & Theodorus Marsilius [Marcile also published a commentary on *De Pallio* in 1614, after Scaliger's death] diversa via eundem finem sunt consecuti, ignorantiam. Hic omnia legendo, ille nihil', in Pierre de Maizeaux, ed., *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1740), 2: 410.

[57] See Benedetto Bravo, '*Critice* in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism', in C. R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin, eds., *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute* (Oxford, 2006), 135-195, esp. 162-171; and esp. Hardy, *Criticism and Confession*, 29-46.

this transition, as it is well known that Casaubon replicated Opsopoeus's arguments for the spuriousness of the Oracles in his refutation of Baronio's reliance on the *Corpus Hermeticum* as a genuine Egyptian source in his *Annales*.[58] Thus, Tertullian's own apologetic and polemical uses of antiquarianism which *De Pallio* exemplified could now be unlocked, and imitated.

The pervasiveness of this novel historical dimension is readily apparent in the second layer. The marginalia open with two notes on the history of the romanization of Carthage,[59] and Casaubon constantly brings in various historical contexts aimed at explaining a reading of the received text, obscure though it is, rather than correcting it conjecturally. For example, where Tertullian says that the pallium which the Carthaginians now criticize was once worn not only in Carthage, but also 'sicubi alibi in Africa Tyros' ('wherever else Tyre [settled] in Africa'), previous editors had been at a loss to explain how Tertullian could talk of the Asian city of Tyre as if it was in Africa, and had thus

[58] Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), 145-177, esp. 174-177.

[59] 'De Carthagine. A.V.C. 604. Inchoatu[m] e[st] bellu[m] Punicu[m] III. quod intra quinu[m] annu[m] quàm erat cœptu[m] fuisse o[m]nino [con]su[m]matu[m] ait L. Deleta e[st] ig. a.v.c. 609.

A.V.C. 630. L. Cæcilio Metello, et T. Quinto Flamino Coss. Carthago in Africa iussu senatus reparata e[st], quæ nu[n]c manet: annis duobus et XX. postqua[m] à Scipione fuerat eversa. Deducti eo su[n]t cives Ro[man]i. hæc Eutrop[ius.] Velleius Pat. lib. pr. Carthago in Africa pr[im]a extra Italia[m] colonia condita est. Solinus verè sic, cap. 30, Carth. post an[n]is DCCXXXVII exciditur quam fuerat extructa: dei[n]de à C. Graccho colonis Italicis data et Junonia ab eo dicta: aliqua[n]tisper ignobilis, humili et languido statu: demu[m] in claritate[m] secu[n]dæ Carthag. interjectis centu[m] et duobus a[n]nis, M. Antonio, et P. Dolabella Coss. enituit, alter[um] post urbe[m] Roma[m], terrar[um] decus', 4, lower margin.

assumed some textual corruption.[60] Casaubon, instead, relied on his antiquarian knowledge to offer a convincing historical explanation: 'consider Hadrumetum – which [African] city was a colony of Tyre, as Solinus testifies, and the name 'Hadrumetum' itself – حضرموت'.[61] The fact that Casaubon writes out the name of the city in Arabic implies that he thought it of Semitic, eastern origin, and captures his ability to bring heterogeneous knowledge to bear on classical texts. Indeed, an antipathy for conjectural emendation recurs throughout: at one point Casaubon even changes his mind midway through an annotation, turning his initial suspicions into acceptance of the text as it stands.[62] Later, on a doubtful passage mentioning the mythological origins of wool-spinning, he even takes pride in 'applying

[60] Pamèle thought that 'Tyros' was a marginal gloss added by a 'sciolus' (an ignorant commentator) that had been later copied as part of the text (this suggestion, Pamèle admitted, had been communicated to him by the Italian humanist Latino Latini) – Pamèle, *Opera*, 11, n. 8.

[61] 'Puta Hadrymen. qua[m] vrbe[m] [esse] Tyriorum colonia[m] et Solinus testatur: et ipsu[m] nomen Hadramyte[m] حضرموت', 5, inner margin. The inclusion of the Arabic name confirms a late dating of the second layer of marginalia, for Casaubon only started to learn Arabic seriously in Paris in late 1600, and his interest in Arabic topography is evinced from his printed works of the early 1600s. See Alastair Hamilton, 'Casaubon the Arabist: 'Video Longum Esse Iter'', in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 72 (2009), 143-168. Casaubon briefly discusses Hadrumetum and the testimony of Solinus in his notes on the writers of the *Historia Augusta* – see *In Ælium Spartianum, Iulium Capitolinum, Ælium Lampridium, Vulcatium Gallicanum, Trebellium Pollionem, & Flauium Vopiscum Emendationes ac Notae* (Paris, 1603), 244 (and 266 for a similar use of Arabic topography).

[62] When Tertullian accuses the Carthaginians of criticizing the pallium that was once 'generaliter vestrum', Casaubon writes: 'Suspecte mihi vox generaliter. Sed fallor: na[m] capio ia[m] mente[m] Tert. Opponit eni[m] vestes [com]mune[m] olim omnibus in univers[um] Carthag. togæ, tunicæ, et cæteris de q. modò dixit[.] […] At pallium quod à generaliter vestr[um] etia[m] deridetis i[m]memores: h.e. non recordantes fuisse quonda[m] vestrum pallium. etsi ia[m] Græcanica[m] censetis. Hæc vera sententia', 4, lower margin.

medicine' to 'very obscure' *locus* without proposing any emendation apart from a change in punctuation.[63] Commenting on the same sentence, he also criticizes du Jon for proposing to emend the rare verb 'deglubasse' ('to skin') to the unheard-of 'diglabrasse', when there are instances of usage of the former to translate the Greek ἀποξύρεσθαι ('to get shaved').[64]

Two cases in particular encapsulate Casaubon's departure from the methods of his contemporaries: if in the first layer he had used such methods, in the second he rejects them, and crosses out his earlier notes. One case occurs in the final prosopopoeia of the pallium, which extols its own efficacy in upbraiding vices 'de qualibet margine vel ara' ('from any edge or altar'). The difficulty of interpreting the exact location of the pallium's

---

[63] 'Oscuriss[imo] loco medicina[m] fecimus sine ulla muta[ti]o[n]e nisi distinctionis. Na[m] ita locus concipie[n]dus. Ea t[empestate] q[ua] ad i[llum] H[ammon] v[asit] ouiu[m] dies, deniq[ue] cu[m] illis, M[ercurium] etc.', 7, inner margin – referring to a place in the text that reads: '[…] Ægyptii narrant, & Alexander digerit & Afer legit, ea tempestate Osiridis qua ad illum ex Libya Hammon vasit ouium dies. Denique cum ipsis Mercurium autumant […]' – Pamèle's punctuation (as his note on page 15 implies) turns the text into two separate episodes linked by a succession in time: it was after the time of the visit of Hammon ('rich in sheep') to Osiris in Egypt that Mercury (separately, and 'finally', *denique*) invented the art of weaving wool. Casaubon's correction emphasises that the text's 'cum ipsis' (which Casaubon transcribes as 'cum illis') refers instead to Mercury's presence at Hammon's visit to Osiris. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that Casaubon perceived a 'peculiarity' in Tertullian's usage of the adverb *denique* ('and then', 'finally') as if it did not necessarily imply a later time in the African author. Thus, in the alphabetical glossary at the beginning of Pamèle's edition, Casaubon inserted 'Deniq. peculiare[m] usu[m] habet apud Tertull. vt i[n] obscuriss[imo] loco, p. 7 [referring to our passage on Mercury]', 167 (first pagination), inner margin.

[64] 'Jun. diglabrasse. nihil muto. Nam et deglubere Dio in Tiberio vertit ἀποξύρεσθαι. Vt ad Suet. dix[i]. Et utitur verbo aspero Tert. de industria', 7, outer margin. Casaubon refers to a note in his 'animadversiones' on the life of Tiberius at the end of his edition of Suetonius, *Suetonii de XII Cæsaribus Libri VIII* ([Geneva], 1595), 215. For du Jon's proposal, see du Jon, *DP*, 10-11.

harangue had been variously remedied before Casaubon: Pamèle understood 'margine' metaphorically as referring to the margin of a book (he quotes a precedent in Juvenal, thus 'textualizing' the pallium's attack), while also reporting that Adrien Turnèbe had suggested to emend the text from 'margine' to 'imagine', thus identifying the pedestal of a pagan statue from which the pallium might address the gentiles (thus 'Christianizing' the text).[65] In his earlier annotations, Casaubon proposed two of conjectural emendations to remedy the obscurity of the *locus*, either 'imagine vel ara' ('statue or altar') or 'margine vel ora' ('edge or brink'), apparently on the assumption that this must be a hendiadys.[66] When he reread the text in later years, however, he crossed out his previous note, and wrote another comment accepting the reading 'margine vel ara' because of the 'custom of the primitive Christians' and especially of 'becloaked (palliati) philosophers' of inciting humble crowds to virtue and piety in frequented places.[67] Such a willingness to accept the text as it stands came also with a heightened sensitivity to the rhetorical features of Tertullian's style: in several instances Casaubon comments on Tertullian's favourite figure of the oxymoron

[65] *Opera Omnia* (1584), 19, n. 100.

[66] 'mal[o] imagine vel ara. aut potius margine vel ora. quæ lectio melius [con]venit ei qui e[st] i[n] secessu', 9 [misprinted as 6], outer margin.

[67] 'margine vel ara) Probo ha[n]c lect[ionem] sed aliter interpretor. Respicet more[m] Christianor[um] veter[um], qui stantes in crepidinibus ponti[um], (is locus pauper[um] et viliu[m]), ad populu[m] soliti verba facere, i[n]citare ad virtute[m], et pietatis studiu[m]' – thus Casaubon seems to explain the reading 'margine', before proceeding: 'Ara si leg. refera[m] ad locu[m] frequentatu[m] na[m] qui populu[m] cogere volu[n]t, loca celebria frequenta[n]t. Videntur ig. Christiani ad aras [con]venisse quæ i[n] vicis et plateis era[n]t, atq[ue] i[n]de orationes ad populu[m] circumstante[m] habuisse. Sed veri[us] e[st] [loqui?] Tertull. de palliatis ph[ilosoph]is, quorum pleriq[ue] ho[min]es era[n]t [illegible] et declamatores, quibus hoc pulcherrime [con]veniat', ibid., lower margin.

(rather than the hendiadys),[68] and even when he does propose a conjecture, it is in the light of this awareness of Tertullian's penchant for the paradoxical.[69]

The second case of self-correction occurs in a passage on the introduction of the Greek pallium into Rome by 'Cato' in his judicial capacity. Casaubon had written in the first layer that this *locus* shows that it was the custom of the Roman praetors to put off the toga when called to judge.[70] He was, in other words, simply gleaning information out of the text (indeed several marginalia in the first layer amount to little more than rubrics). In the second layer, however, he realizes that Tertullian is confusing Cato the Censor with

[68] E.g., on Tertullian's 'iniuriæ beneficium' Casaubon writes: 'ὀξυμ[ωρον]: ut ἀφοβία μεγίστη τὸ φοβεῖσθαι τῶν νόμων Sy[nesius]. Sen[eca:] no[n] egere felicitate felic[itas vestra est]. Id. Deo [par]ere libertas e[st]' (5, inner margin), referring to Synesius, *Epistolae* 2; Seneca, *De Providentia* VI.4; Seneca, *De Vita Beata* XV.7. When Tertullian talks of the change undergone by the stag who, 'serpente pastus, in venenum languescit in iuuentutem', Casaubon writes: 'ὀξύμωρον: Iunius corru[m]p[it]' (6, outer margin) – referring to du Jon's conjecture of 'longiscit' instead of 'languescit' (du Jon, *DP*, 10). When Tertullian accuses the Carthaginians of indulging in the Greek habits of the gymnasium and mentions an 'arida saginatio' as the regimen of athletes, Casaubon writes: 'e[st] ὀξύμωρον' (7, outer margin). Similarly, on Alexander who wore a transparent silky garment that 'textu pellucido tegendo nudauit' his body, he writes 'Sic texit, ut nud[us] appareret', 8, outer margin.

[69] E.g., in chapter five Tertullian sarcastically recounts that, when Omphale wore the skin of the Nemean lion at the time of Hercules's enslavement to her, she had the mouth of the lion stuffed with hair to prevent scratches from the fangs, so that 'tota oris contumelia mugiret' – at which point Casaubon proposes to change the verb to 'rugiret' to emphasise what he describes as an 'elega[n]tiss[ima] δείνωσις' (8, outer margin).

[70] 'Locu[m] hu[n]c ad que[m] tace[n]t interprr. exponet ex more Rom. Prætores iudicaturi vestem mutaba[n]t et toga[m] poneba[n]t. De Catone testatur Utice[n]si Plut. in Vita. Et de hoc more ad. ep. ad Att. dix.', 7, outer margin.

Cato of Utica,[71] and that therefore the *locus* cannot be adduced to prove the consistency of any such practice. This last instance represents a further step in dealing with the obscurity of the received text. If the other marginalia described above aimed at securing the text from conjectures by historical contextualization or linguistic and rhetorical analysis, in this case Casaubon could even elucidate a dark passage by showing that the obscurity rested on Tertullian himself, who was writing at a time of antiquity that was itself in an oblique relation to the Roman past. In a similar move, Casaubon noticed the oddness of the word 'Romanitas' in the text (and of its cognate 'Graecitas'), which is first attested in Tertullian although it would gain common acceptance in late and medieval Latin: the African author was reshaping the classical heritage for new, 'post-Roman' purposes.[72] In other words, Casaubon had come to see the text not just as a witness of ancient customs, but as a work that mobilized and confused the memory of other pasts for its apologetic purposes: *De Pallio* was not just best interpreted in the light of antiquarian methods, but was itself a work of 'philosophical' antiquarianism. Strikingly, the afterthought about Tertullian's 'Cato' was prompted by another polemical context in which Casaubon intended to engage (beyond Pamèle or du Jon), for Baronio had used this *locus* as evidence to show that the

[71] 'Vide Plut. p. 1431.β. Sed Tertull. duos Catones confu[n]dit', ibid. Casaubon refers to his father-in-law Henri Estienne's edition of the complete works of Plutarch, *Πλουτάρχου Χαιρωνέως τὰ σωζόμενα συγγράμματα. Plutarchi Chæronensis quæ Extant Opera*, 13 vols. ([Geneva], 1572), 6: 1431.

[72] On Tertullian's comic description of the chameleon ('humble lion' in Greek), Casaubon proposes corrections to Pamèle's conjecturally emended text (as Pamèle says in *Opera*, 15, n. *ad loc.*) of '& Græciam nominis', and says: 'egregia[m] an poti[us] Græcanici n[omen]. Aut ita poti[us] et Græcitate[m.] no[ta] amat id gen[us] no[min]a Tertull. Sic Romanitas', 7, upper margin.

pallium was in common use in Rome before the time of Augustus.[73] Indeed, in the *Exercitationes* the Roman cardinal would be taxed for failing to appreciate the temporal distance separating Augustus and the late Republic from Tertullian.[74] Antiquarianism, polemics, and philosophy seemed to converge in the mock-oration, which thus supplied a paradigm for writing apologetics through the manipulation of history.

This convergence is especially captured by two comparisons that Casaubon proposes at the start of the mock-oration, which show Casaubon assessing the eristic rhetoric of *De Pallio*, and the 'philosophical' methods by which Tertullian could marshal his own learning on pagan antiquities to serve the purposes of Christian apologetics. Firstly, *De Pallio* could be usefully compared to 'Dio Chrysostom's oration περὶ σχήματος [on apparel], from which it appears that the clothing of philosophers was similarly ridiculed'.[75] After the first-century Greek orator and philosopher Dio Chrysostom, Casaubon instances a parallel from the fifth-century bishop Salvian about 'the vicissitude of things and times: in the beginning African Christians who left the toga and took up the pallium were ridiculed by the pagans; but when Christians were later admitted to honours, the pallium was left to the monks, who were not better received by the toga-wearing Christians of Carthage, as Salvian testifies'.[76] From Tertullian's reliance on the principle of

[73] Cesare Baronio, *Annales Ecclesiastici, Tomus Primus* (Rome, 1593), 78.

[74] Casaubon, *De Rebus Sacris et Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes* (London, 1614), 219-220, where Tertullian's mistake on the two Catones is explained, and the testimony of Plutarch quoted in full.

[75] 'Ση[μείωσ]αι Vtiliter hu[n]c libru[m] [con]tuleris cu[m] Dionis Chrys. ora[ti]o[n]e Περὶ σχήματος. ex qua [con]stat similiter rideri solit[um] habitu[m] ph[ilosoph]or[um] cui[us] rei c[aus]a inquirit[ur]', 5, upper margin.

[76] 'Ση[μείωσ]αι a. Vicissitudine rer[um] et tempor[um]: initio Christiani ho[min]es apud Afros toga posita, assu[n]to pallio, rideba[n]tur à paganis. Postea vero qua[m] Christianis fuit ad honores

vicissitudo as a central strategy for his defence of the pallium, Casaubon gestures towards a 'vicissitude of ridicule' spanning classical and Christian literary history: he was aware that both philosophy and religion had been objects *and* users of rhetorically-coded ridicule as a polemical weapon. We will later see how Saumaise would make use of this idea of historical vicissitude to polemize and mock both monks and clerics in his edition.

The parallel with Dio is especially useful. In 1604, in fact, Casaubon published a 'Diatriba' at the end of Fédéric Morel's new edition of Dio,[77] where he upheld the orator's rightful title of philosopher against those who sought to relegate him among mere sophists. According to Casaubon, the ancient critics who transmitted Dio's texts rearranged his writings so as to obscure the fact that he wrote both philosophy ('φιλοσοφικά') and miscellaneous literary scholarship ('φιλολογικά siue mixta'), as well as merely oratorial productions ('σοφιστικά').[78] Many of Dio's orations are steeped in philosophy, which is often mixed with literary subjects, narrations, and other 'poetical' devices; but the ancients

---

aditus, palliu[m] penes monachos remansit: quos togati Chr. primi Carthagine, no[n] clementi[us] soliti excip[er]e. Testis Salvian[us], pag. 291', ibid. Casaubon was evidently using the in-16° reprint of Johann Alexander Brassicanus's text: *Diui Saluiani Massyliensis Episcopi De Vero Iudicio et Prouidentia Dei* (Paris, 1575), 291.

[77] 'Casauboni Diatriba Αὐτοσχέδιος' in *Δίωνος τοῦ Χρυσόστομου Λογοι Π'. Dionis Chrysostomi Orationes LXXX*, ed. Claude Morel (Paris, 1604), second pagination. Casaubon's work on Dio is very briefly noted in Parenty, *Isaac Casaubon Helléniste*, 70-71.

[78] 'Veteres critici cum magnorum scriptorum monumenta recenserent, & colligere omnia sunt soliti, quæ auctoris eiusdem esse[n]t: & in certas veluti classeis eadem tribuere. Qua in re nec sensisse idem semper omnes videas: nec iudicio interdum satis certo vsos in eligendos quæ vel iungi deberent, vel separari. […] Porro legitima omnium Dionis scriptorum, quæ quidem extent, aut quorum aliqua notitia ad nos peruenit, tributio fuerit, in σοφιστικά, siue oratoria, φιλοσοφικά, & φιλολογικά, siue mixta', in ibid., 5.

made the mistake of classing him among the sophists because he did not treat philosophy in the standard way ('vulgari more'), and did not belong to a philosophical sect.[79] In Casaubon's view, Dio was a writer that did philosophy by adapting historical and literary learning to his own times: therefore, Casaubon emphasised, 'elucidation must be gained from history'.[80] Casaubon's elucidation of Tertullian does not function differently: historical learning was not just a method applicable to the study of ancient texts, but it was a form of philosophy that had itself thrived in rhetorical, polemical, and apologetic settings in antiquity. *De Pallio*, like Dio's orations, should be explained by the very methods through which they had been constructed by their authors – by *historia*.[81]

Thus, what drew Casaubon to Dio and to Tertullian's mock-oration is their reliance on *historia* as an organizing principle for 'philosophical' discourse. Antiquarianism was

---

[79] 'Scimus tame[n], veteres plerosque de hoc eximio scriptore ita iudicasse: vt eum non philosophorum albo, sed sophistarum, (eloquentiæ professores & alios eruditos viros ea ætas sic vocauit) adscriberent. Id adeo videtur accidisse Dioni, non solùm quia σοφιστικά nonnulla, vt iam diximus, scripta ediderat: verùm etiam, ac multo quidem magis, quod argumenta philosophica non vulgari philosophoru[m] more tractauerit: sed noua quadam & singulari industria seueritatem solubrium præceptorum, narrationibus modò veris, modò fictis, & aliis nescio quibus inue[n]tiunculis condiuerit. quinetiam ex poëtarum fabulis quæsita illi sæpe occasio grauissimarum & verè philosophicarum dissertationum. At veterum sapientiæ magistrorum fatalis ille error omnium (si paucos excipias) fuit, vt de nomine sectæ, non de studio sapientiæ, philosophos ce[n]serent', ibid., 6.

[80] 'Hæc [the various names for 'emperor' used by Dio in his orations *De Regno*] eo duximus nota[n]da, vt scirent lectores, multis locis huius tractatus [*De Regno*], & reliquoru[m] sequentiu[m], lucem ex historia petendu[m] esse. Sic enim philosophum agit Dio, de boni maliq[ue] principis notis disserens, vt rebus præsentibus, temporibusq[ue] suis omnia acco[m]modet', 'Diatriba', 7.

[81] On *historia* and its relation to antiquarianism, see the essays collected in Gianna Pomata and Nancy G. Siraisi, eds., *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 2005).

not just a philological method of study that could emancipate scholars from conjecture, but also a philosophical and apologetic tool that had been handed down from antiquity and that could be rediscovered in ancient texts. It was, in other words, an intellectual 'practice' capable of subverting the established structures of other disciplines. Nicholas Hardy has recently shown how much Casaubon's late scholarship (especially after his relocation to Paris in 1600) was a sophisticated way of practicing controversial theology through historical learning.[82] The marginalia on *De Pallio* suggest that Casaubon elaborated this novel way by studying ancient precedents, which he thought were sustained by comparable principles. Indeed, it is unsurprising that one of the most conspicuous uses of his catalogue *de re vestiaria* occurred in a 'disputatio' in the *Exercitationes* about Christ's cloak at the Crucifixion.[83] And yet, adversarial though this 'practice' may be, it was not (yet) overtly antagonistic. In a marginalia on the title-page of his 'Pameliana', Casaubon could concede that the Catholic Pamèle was a *vir eruditissimus* even if in his Tertullian had corrupted many *loci*,[84] and refer to a similar judgement by Scaliger.[85] Indeed, around Casaubon, other scholars had started to focus on *De Pallio*'s implicit antiquarian eristics, and to transform the text itself, by conjectural emendations, into a s*atyra* that could be expediently redeployed in confessional strife.

[82] Hardy, *Criticism and Confession*, 49-151.

[83] Casaubon, *Exercitationes*, 628-638.

[84] 'Ση[μείωσ]αι. Rhenani editio in multis melior et o[m]nino [con]sulenda. na[m] Pameli[us] etsi vir eruditiss. tamen multa non intellecta corrupit. Vt et Scaliger admonet ad Manilium, p. 70', title-page.

[85] Scaliger, 'Castigationes et Notae', in *M. Manilii Astronomicon*, ed. Joseph Scaliger (Leiden, 1600), 70 (second pagination): 'Pamelius vir eruditus, & optime de Tertulliano meritus'.

3 Some Catholic Commentators: From 'Oratio' to 'Satyra'

Around the turn of the seventeenth century, the ambiguous flippancy of *De Pallio* started to be taken seriously. Casaubon may have deplored the misreadings of Cardinal Baronio, but, in the case of Tertullian's most perplexing little work, they had more common ground than Casaubon was willing to admit: while Pamèle had conjectured that Tertullian wrote the mock-oration as soon as he emerged from the baptismal font (sometime between 195 and 197 CE), having abandoned the legal and rhetorical profession that he had exercised until then,[86] Baronio thought instead that the work must be dated more than a decade after that event.[87] Casaubon felt similarly inclined towards a later date,[88] and, indeed, after Baronio's re-dating, all subsequent commentators embraced this opinion.[89] More is at stake

[86] '[P]erspicuum est, statim à baptismo conscriptum ab eo Librum de Pallio', in 'Vita Tertulliani', in Pamèle, *Opera*, 24. Pamèle proceeds to date Tertullian's conversion on the basis of internal evidence in *De Pallio*, especially the reference to 'præsentis Imperij triplex virtus', which he links to the third year of Severus as emperor, when he ruled with Caracalla and Clodius Albinus. He also approves Trithemius's opinion that 'apud Carthaginem aliquot annis, Rhetoricam gloriosè docuisse; postea & Oratorem fuisse seu caussarum Aduocatum' (27-28) – which Pamèle proves, indeed, by referring to the pallium's prosopopoeia on retreat from the public life of the forum, assuming that Tertullian 'sub Pallij persona de se scripsit' (28). Before Pamèle, Rhenanus and the Magdeburg Centuriators (as Pamèle says, 24) dated *De Pallio* even earlier, under the 'triplex virtus' of Severus, Albinus and Pescennius Niger (i.e., in 193 CE).

[87] After 208 CE, under the 'triplex virtus' of Severus and his two sons, Carcalla and Geta. See *Annales Ecclesiastici, Tomus Secundus* (Rome, 1594), 261-262.

[88] He expresses this opinion in the *Emendationes ac Notae* (1603) on the *Historia Augusta*, 262-263, also identifying Severus and his sons in Tertullian's 'triplex virtus': *De Pallio* was written 'multo post' the end of the civil wars.

[89] Du Jon, *DP*, p. 9; Mercier, *DP*, 1085; Richer, *DP*, 1100; Marcile, *DP*, 2-3 (second pagination).

here than mere chronology: thus *De Pallio* became a work of the maturity of Tertullian as a Christian thinker and writer, rather than as a text that sat on the awkward threshold of his previous life as a pagan and as an orator, and that was therefore still implicitly anchored in the practices of late Latin literature. Soon enough, the crucial point was not any more the mock-oration's anchorage in pagan rhetoric, but rather the choice of it for novel purposes. This shift signalled a rethinking of *De Pallio*'s genre: in 1600 Scaliger could still say that *De Pallio* was a playful book written 'more scholastico' (in the manner of the oratorial exercises of antiquity),[90] and win acceptance for this opinion,[91] but, by 1614, the mock-oration had definitively become a *satyra*.

Inklings of this shift are to be found already in Jean Mercier's commentary, which appeared as an appendix to a 1598 reissue of Pamèle's edition. Mercier lacked the acumen of Casaubon in respecting an obscure text, and he indeed indulges in often unnecessary conjectures. But it is precisely this tendency to emend that reveals Mercier's underlying interpretation of the text. For example, after the final prosopopoeia of the pallium explaining why the choice of retirement is preferable to active life, Tertullian had written (fictitiously addressing the pallium) – 'Sermone […] me suasisti medicamine sapientissimo' ('with speech, the wisest medicine, you have convinced me'). Both Casaubon and Scaliger had immediately seen that this was an allusion to a Greek proverb,

[90] In his 'Castigationes et Notæ', 70 (second pagination): 'Ludit hoc argume[n]to [the world's changeableness] in scholastico libro de Pallio Tertullianus'.

[91] Richer in his commentary also describes *De Pallio* as a 'scholastica declamatio', characterizing it as 'brevissim[a] quidem & obscurissim[a], sed rerum præstantissimarum uarietate, & historiarum copia refertissim[a]', in Richer, *DP*, 1098.

and had annotated accordingly.[92] Mercier, instead, proposed to read 'sanauisti' ('you healed') instead of 'suasisti', because, as he rightly points out, the last part of Tertullian's mock-oration is structured around the metaphor of the pallium as a physician applying medicine to vicious customs.[93] Mercier had certainly come to such a sharp identification of this fundamental trope thanks to all the parallels that in his opinion linked *De Pallio* to the Latin satirists, to Martial, and to the comic dramatists more generally, who were often associated with the commonplace conception of satire as a 'physic' or 'purgative' against vices.[94] For Mercier, Tertullian's description of the corruption of contemporary mores through 'Greek' luxury was thoroughly indebted to the Latin poets. To explain Tertullian's sarcastic account of depilation he had in fact referred to Martial, Juvenal, and Plautus.[95] Horace, Persius, Apuleius often recur as well, and once even the *Carmina Priapea* are

[92] Casaubon: 'λόγῳ με πείθεις φαρμάκῳ σοφωτάτῳ. Eurip.', 10, outer margin. The closest parallel, however, is not Euripides, but a fragment of Menander collected in the *Sententiae Monostichi* of Chrysolaras: 'Λόγῳ μ'ἔπεισας φαρμάκῳ σοφωτάτῳ' – this is indeed the form under which it is quoted in Scaliger's marginalia in his copy of du Jon's Tertullian (6, outer margin). See also Erasmus's *Adagia*, n. 2100.

[93] Mercier, *DP*, 1096: 'Euincit emendationem illam metaphora in qua tantùm sibi constituit Author'; Mercier also explains in this way Tertullian's reference to 'cauterem', 'scalpellum', and 'catharticum' (the first and third being *hapax legomena* derived from Greek) as medicines and chirurgical instruments, 1095-1096.

[94] According to the definition of Daniel Heinsius, which the humanist constructed to describe all types of satirical writings, the first characteristic of satire is that it is 'ad purgandos hominum animos inventa' – see the dissertation 'De satyra Horatiana libri duo' added to Heinsius's edition of Horace, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1629), 54.

[95] Mercier, *DP*, 1088.

brought in to allude to the 'obscene meaning' of Tertullian's mocking usage of the verb *caedere*.[96]

Such an influx of Roman laughter into the explanation of a patristic text had little precedent – and was highly beneficial: as we have seen, Casaubon also thought that Tertullian's text needed elucidation through similar ancient contexts about the uses of ridicule. This move also helped to understand *De Pallio* as a text that was steeped in pagan literature, while also being capable of deploying it for the needs of Christian apologetics. Mercier shows himself more at ease on this point than the theologian Edmond Richer would be: when Richer published his short commentary on *De Pallio* in 1600, he seized the occasion of Tertullian's ambiguous *sententia* 'elingui philosophia vita contenta est' to add a veneer of easy piety to the mock-oration: he explained (quoting 1 Corinthians 2:4) that the father was here showing that 'the place of the doctrine of the Gospel is not *with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power*', and finished the comment by subjoining another passage of this tenor by 'Tertullian's disciple' (Cyprian).[97] And yet Mercier had emphasised how reliant *De Pallio* was on the enticing tropes of ancient rhetoric, and especially on the conventions of satire and comedy: Christian eloquence could truly wear the habit of classical literature, and turn it, so to speak, inside out.

---

[96] *Ibid.*, 1089.

[97] Richer, *DP*, p. 1101: 'Ostendit doctrinam Euangelicam *non in persuasionibus humanæ sapie*[n]*tiæ verbis, sed in ostensione Spiritus & virtutis Dei posita*[m] *esse*'; Richer gives the quotation of Tertullian's text with the nominative 'elinguis', while Pamèle reads 'elingui' in the ablative. The (arguably calculated) ambiguity of the *locus* stems from the fact that both 'vita' and 'philosophia' can be the subject of the sentence.

Mercier, indeed, had shown himself receptive to the ridicule wielded by the church father. For example, in a very circumvoluted (and corrupt) passage, Tertullian attacks Empedocles for having philosophized clad in silk and shoed in bronze, and for having thought himself a god. But Tertullian does this indirectly, by referring to the cynic Diogenes: had Diogenes lived in Empedocles's time, he would have brought him down 'in adyta ['sacred recesses'] Cloacinarum' to show him how 'divine' he really was. Mercier explained the passage by referring to a piece of information from Lactantius on the goddess of the Roman sewers, Cloacina: 'Christians often taunted the gentiles for the ridiculousness of this goddess' – indeed, a temple had even been consecrated to her 'after a statue of a goddess without name was found in the great sewer, as Lactantius says'.[98] This interpretation is valuable, for it is precisely the notice about the unknown statue that clinches Tertullian's mocking allusion: just as a bust found in a gutter could be thought a goddess by the gentiles, so could Empedocles pass himself off as divine in the eyes of his fellow-citizens. We are here just a short step away from the realization that Tertullian is not just performing the typical work of Christian apologetics *ad gentes*, but is in fact also taking up the figure and the role of the Greek Diogenes as the ultimate ridiculer of superstition.

In 1614, Théodore Marcile published his edition and commentary of *De Pallio*, and for the first time the mock-oration was explicitly identified as a 'satyra'.[99] In this

[98] Mercier, *DP*, 1091: 'Hanc Deam ridiculi causa sæpe Gentilibus obijciunt Christiani, fertur ei consecrata ædes à Tito Tacio inuento in magna cloaca simulachro Deæ, cuius nomen ignorabatur. Author Lactantius libro de falsa religione primo, capite duodecimo'.

[99] Indeed, together with his edition, Marcile also published a version of the text explained with 'glossae' in italics, which stressed the genre shift in its title, *Tertulliani Satyra de Pallio* (Paris,

commentary, we can trace a full-blown 'satirification' of Tertullian (often called 'satyricus noster'),[100] and, concomitantly, a 'polemicization' of scholarship. These phenomena are not unconnected. Although Marcile was clearly indebted to the earlier commentators for his insights, the only scholar he mentions is Scaliger, and only for the purposes of taking issue with his identification of *De Pallio* as a 'liber scholasticus' rather than as a 'satyra apologetica sive apologia satyrica' with its concomitant *licentia* and *lascivia*.[101] And yet even to Scaliger Marcile was beholden for the *locus* on the Sibyl (Scaliger had published his observation in 1600),[102] which instead Marcile affirms to have been universally corrupted by a 'critical scabies, or a fog of ignorance, or some other more sinister malady'.[103] Indeed, Marcile revelled in his 'rediscovery' of the pallium's satiric qualities as much as he shows himself ready to mock the efforts of his predecessors.

The *locus* on the Roman cloaca is a case in point (it is the most extensively annotated passage in the whole commentary). For Marcile, Diogenes would bring Empedocles 'in adyta Cloacinarum' because Cloacina was the goddess not just of the sewers, but also of the vainglorious. Her name, Marcile explained, comes from the verb *cluere*, which has a double meaning of 'to be famous' and 'to purge';[104] in this capacity,

---

1614). Evidently, Marcile's interpretative efforts on *De Pallio* stemmed from the same desire as Casaubon's, i.e., to use the text in a pedagogical setting.

[100] E.g., Marcile, *DP*, 42, 79.

[101] *Ibid.*, 10.

[102] In his 'Castigationes et Notæ', 70 (second pagination).

[103] Marcile, *DP*, 42: 'Critica scabies, aut inscitiæ nebula, aut etiam scævior aliquis morbus'; 43: '[s]ed illis suis sacris Sibyllam exesse voluerunt'.

[104] *Ibid.*, 91-93; 'nomen eius à cluendo. Id autem est vel purgare […] vel vigere ac celebrari', 92-93. Modern lexicography distinguishes between *cluēre* (to be famous) and *cluĕre* (to purge).

she is almost a tutelary goddess of the sluicing work of satire. So far, Marcile is developing the insight he had certainly found in du Jon's commentary (which also relied on this pseudo-etymology),[105] but, typically, he only says that previous interpreters 'have hallucinated' on this passage.[106] Indeed, in the following note (still on the same *locus*), Marcile cannot refrain from alluding to du Jon's interpretation only to revile it: an unnamed previous commentator has shown 'a most elegant pertness' ('[u]rbanissima vernilitate') in his interpretation – 'as for the honour due to him, others before me have already spoken' (obliquely referring to the hostile reception of du Jon's efforts).[107] The Pamèle and Rhenanus texts were indeed exceedingly awkward at this point: once in the cloaca, Empedocles could 'sorores prius suas, dehinc homines deas salutaret'. For du Jon, the 'sisters' Empedocles could greet there were the 'filthy excrements' nourishing the cloaca, before proceeding to 'people' sitting on toilets, and finally to the 'goddesses' of the place.[108] Given the corruption of the sentence, this is not an unreasonable interpretation. Marcile, however, seized the occasion to indulge his derisive vein: 'what Zeuxis, what Apelles could paint so skilfully these sacred recesses?'.[109]

---

[105] Du Jon, *DP*, 14: 'Verbum clueo Latinis duo significat Græca origine: τὸ κλύειν audire, putari, celebrari; & τὸ κλύζειν, purgare, expurgare'.

[106] Marcile, *DP*, 91: 'Allucinantur illi'.

[107] *Ibid.*, 93: 'Honorem illi, ante me iam præfati sunt'.

[108] Du Jon, *DP*, 14-15: 'Auctor à Diogene Empedocle[m] in adyta ista detrusum iri pronunciat, tamquam olidum stercus & excrementum hominum, indignum qui in numero hominum (à quo se abdicauerat) poneretur: nempe vt quisquem cælitem delirarat, priùs sorores suas (merdas scilicet, cloacarum & foricarum alumnas) dehinc homines ipsos in foricis sedentes, & præsidentes deas præstititesque Cloacinas salutaret'.

[109] Marcile, *DP*, 93: 'Quis Zeuxis, quis Apelles tam scitè adyta illa pinxerit?'.

The interpretation that Marcile offered instead is as idiosyncratic as it is revealing: the text needed to be emended to 'sorores prius suas [i.e., the goddesses of the cloaca], dehinc *omnes Deos* salutaret' (correction in italics). For him, this *locus* was in fact a miniature mock-deification in the manner of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*: the vainglorious Empedocles, who threw himself into Mount Etna to trick people into thinking that he had been assumed into the sky among the gods, is here pictured in his proper 'celestial sphere' (λῆξις), where he could still greet divine beings, though of a much lower order.[110] Marcile's conjecture veers away even from the practices of Christian apologetics towards a vision of the text that is thoroughly illuminated by the light of classical satire. It would take Saumaise to reintroduce the apologetic element by emending 'deas' to 'deus', thus making the word agree with 'Empedocles'. The philosopher, as a god, was greeting his divine fellows, who lived, indeed, in the sewers; in a fragment of Empedocles's *Purifications* (apt title), the philosopher in fact greets his fellow-citizens referring to himself as a god.[111] Unsurprisingly, Casaubon had anticipated both Saumaise's correction and Marcile's interpretation in a brilliant annotation, which shows him thinking along both satiric and apologetic lines.[112]

---

[110] *Ibid*., 94:'Dignus Empedocles cum gloriis suis, qui delatus à Diogene *in adyta Cloacinarum* siue cloacas potius, quam Ætnæ crateres, sic in cælum ac Deorum numerum veniret, ac *salutaret prius sorores suas* Cloacinas Deas, in quarum adyta & regionem cæli, siue λῆξιν receptus, deinde *alios omnes Deos*'.

[111] Saumaise, *DP*, 293-294.

[112] Casaubon stresses Empedocles's failed apotheosis while also correcting the text to 'deus': 'Sorores vocat Empedoclis Cloacinas: Emp[edoclis] nunqua[m] ἀποθεωθέντος [*sic*]: quia no[n] magis illæ Deæ qua[m] hic De[us]. Legendu[m] aute[m] Deus salutaret. Quod no[n] obseruant

Marcile's commentary, churlish though it is, also contains some interesting insights. Predictably, for a scholar of Latin literature that set so much store by eloquence,[113] they mainly concern the more 'literary' aspects of *De Pallio*: for example, Marcile was fully prepared to accept the reading 'testitrahum' ('testicle-dragging') as the epithet for the ram used by the mimographer Laberius as quoted by Tertullian in chapter one, because the mime was a genre with its own form of decorum, which included obscenity.[114] In fact, Marcile was aware (like Mercier before him) that the conventions of the mime, just as those of satire, were not just to be found in Tertullian's quotations or allusions, but had seeped into the literary structure of the mock-oration itself. Thus, Marcile could interpret the prosopopoeia of the pallium (the climax of the *satyra*) as a theatrical dialogue between a pallium and a toga, in which it is the former's business to deflate the vainglory of the latter.[115] Indeed, this parallel with the theatre we can also trace in the notes on Persius that Marcile had contributed to a 1601 edition of the Roman satirist:

---

interpretes alludit Tertull. ad carme[n] Empedocli […], quod refert Diog[enes Laërtius] vbi est hic [ver]sus, Χαίρετ᾽ἐγὼ δ᾽ὔμμιν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὔκετι θνητός.', 8, lower margin.

[113] 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.

[114] Marcile, *DP*, 29: '[Previous commentators] [n]on adtendêre obscœnitatem mimicam siue mimo decoram esse'. See also 94-95 for Marcile's explanation of Tertullian's 'Menandrico fluxu' as a reference to Menander and to the garments of ancient theatre.

[115] At the end of the prosopopoeia: 'nunc Tertullianus ipse prodit, & hanc Satyricam quasi scænam claudit', in *ibid.*, 133. See also 107 and 118 for Marcile's awareness of the dialogic quality of the last part of the mock-oration.

according to Marcile, Persius's learned style was characterized by 'alternations of personae as if it was a proscenium'.[116]

And yet, even for this insight, Marcile could find help from contemporary scholarship, for the early seventeenth century had seen a proliferation of studies of ancient satire.[117] Casaubon himself had contributed significantly to this field by publishing in 1605 a commentary, indeed, on Persius, and a 'monograph' entitled *De Satyrica Graecorum Poësi et Romanorum Satira*. This last contribution is credited as the first study to distinguish between the Greek genre of the 'satyr drama' and the Roman one of the *satira* or *satura* through the identification of the false etymology of 'satire' that connected it to the satyr, that ambiguous creature embodying both a propensity to vituperation and vice and, according to other accounts, a hidden wisdom.[118] And yet Casaubon's conclusions found little echo throughout the seventeenth century. Marcile, for one, was pointedly disregarding Casaubon's findings in his commentary on *De Pallio*, flaunting as he does the

---

[116] 'Personarum item mutationes vt in proscænio', in 'Emendationes & Commentarius', in *Persii Satyrae* (Paris, 1601), sig. ã4^{r} (second pagination).

[117] They are discussed by Ingrid de Smet, *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters 1581-1655* (Geneva, 1996); see also, Nicholas Hardy, 'Literary History as Critical Practice: Dryden's 'Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire'' in Nicholas McDowell and Henry Power, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of English Prose, 1640-1714* (Oxford, forthcoming) – I am grateful to the author for sending me a pre-print version.

[118] See J. W. Joliffe, 'SATYRE: SATURA: ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ: A Study in Confusion', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 18/1 (1956), 84-95. On the ambivalence of the satyr, see Anthony Parr, 'Time and the Satyr', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68/3 (2005), 429-465. On Casaubon's work on satire, see most recently Ingrid de Smet, 'How the Sauce Got to be Better than the Fish: Scholarship and Rivalry in Isaac Casaubon's Studies of Ancient Satire', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters*, 4 (2019), 275-315, which also contains details about the scholarly rivalry between Casaubon and Marcile.

spelling ‘satyra’. The ‘satyrical’ paradigm, in fact, offered a greater latitude of usage, ranging from the most serious philosophy to the obscenity and vituperation of the lampoon. It could thus easily incorporate a text like *De Pallio*, or scholars could make the mock-oration fit into it by emending, and thus rewriting, the text in accordance to the *lascivia* that *satyra* as a genre required. Conjectural emendation was less a technical instrument in the humanist tool-kit than a literary method capable of unlocking new fields of interpretative and creative potentialities.

Marcile’s commentary also indicates further reasons for an attachment to baggier definitions of *satyra*: the comprehensiveness of this plural genre provided ancient precedents for the practice of vituperation in controversy. It is no coincidence that Marcile’s re-reading of *De Pallio* as a *satyra* overlapped with such vitriol against his fellow critics. There was, in other words, a dialectic between scholarship and satire. Casaubon, in his commentary on Persius, had indeed emphasised the centrality of ‘philosophy’ rather than of abuse and obscenity in the genre, and, in his *De Satyrica*, he had lamented the contemporary tendency to lambast scholarly opponents through *satyrae*.[119] Conversely, Marcile’s commentary exemplifies how a focus on polemical works such as *De Pallio* could inject ‘satyrical’ elements into the practice of scholarship itself, at a time when war could be fought both physically and intellectually through learning. Indeed, it is even less of a coincidence that the two scholars that received the

[119] On Persius, see Peter E. Medine, ‘Isaac Casaubon’s ‘Prolegomena’ to the ‘Satires’ of Persius: An Introduction, Text, and Translation’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 6/2 (1976), 271-298. Casaubon laments the ‘error fanaticus’ of satirical calumnies in *De Satyrica Græcorum Poësi* (Paris, 1605), sig. a3^{v}, as pointed out by Hardy, ‘Literary History’.

largest share of Marcile's scorn (du Jon and Scaliger) were Calvinists. This pattern of scholars turning vituperators along confessional lines had already had several precedents by the time Marcile took up the role,[120] and it would shape entirely the last phase of this flourish of late humanist interest in Tertullian's mock-oration. In other words, although *De Pallio* is far from containing any statements of theology (if anything, since Pamèle's 'post-Tridentine' notes the mock-oration had been cleansed of its more theological interpretative frames),[121] scholarship on it quickly became heavily confessionalized. And yet, as the controversy surrounding Saumaise's edition of *De Pallio* reveals, this process of confessionalization actually aided the philological and interpretative efforts on the text.

4 Saumaise: Scholarship, Satire, Polemics

With Saumaise's edition we are, philologically speaking, on novel grounds. The length of the digressive commentary is amply repaid by the acumen with which Saumaise reinterprets, corrects, and makes sense of the received text, which is reprinted in full (according to Marcile's edition) almost as the opaque foil to Saumaise's 'Nova Editio ex veteribus libris emendata' following it.[122] The overt antipathy for conjecture that Saumaise inherited from Casaubon was aided in this case by access to a new witness of *De Pallio*:

[120] Different cases are analysed in de Smet, *Menippean Satire*.

[121] This is not to imply that *De Pallio* was not used as a witness for specific practices in theological works. One instance of such use has been found by Dmitri Levitin, 'John Spencer's *De Legibus Hebraeorum* (1683-85) and 'Enlightened' Sacred History: A New Interpretation', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 76 (2013), 49-92, 70.

[122] Saumaise, *DP*, 1-34 (vetus) and 35-64 ('nova editio') respectively (first pagination).

the 'Codex Divionensis', which is now lost. The Divionensis had already been collated in the 1570s for John Calvin's successor Theodore Beza in Geneva and for his friend, the philologist Pierre Pithou in Paris, when they were collaborating for a Protestant complete edition of Tertullian, before Pithou's conversion to Catholicism in the aftermath of the massacre of St Bartholomew (1572).[123] In fact, this long projected Genevan edition of Tertullian was the one for which, in all likelihood, the Reformed Academy wanted to enlist a reluctant Casaubon in the early 1590s.[124] Thus, the manuscript that should have furthered a doctrinally inflected and probably controversial edition of Tertullian was now being used for the first time in print as a witness to the least theological of all of the works of the African father. However, the irony of this history is not as readily apparent as the previous sentence suggests: as we shall see, Saumaise too had his controversial (and confessional) aims in mind.

The fifty years separating Beza and Pithou from Saumaise already appear in their respective working copies of Tertullian's *Opera*. For Beza, *De Pallio* was clearly a minor work of Tertullian: while the manuscript marginalia in his copy often contain theological notes and reflections in many places,[125] in the case of *De Pallio* they only record a great number of variant readings, almost exclusively coming from the Divionensis (marked as

[123] See Petitmengin, 'De Bèze à Godefroy', 314-316, and esp. 330-337; and now *id.*, 'Pierre Pithou, Théodore de Bèze et la chronologie des traités de Tertullien'.

[124] Hardy, *Criticism and Confession*, 53.

[125] Backus, 'Annotations Doctrinales de Bèze'.

'D').[126] The variants in Beza's copy are also found in Pithou's, on top of a sparser earlier layer of annotations,[127] which show that Pithou had read *De Pallio* attentively (he proposed, for example, the hitherto unvoiced opinion that the mock-oration was one of Tertullian's late works).[128] Conversely, Saumaise's method is less meticulous than Beza's and more purposeful than Pithou's, or even Casaubon's. In his working copy (the 1597 du Jon edition, reproducing Pamèle's text), Saumaise, like Beza and unlike Pithou, restricts himself to collations; but, unlike both of his predecessors, he makes no mere compilation.[129] In fact, he rarely distinguishes the variants he is taking down from his own conjectures, and a comparison with those marked with 'D' in Beza's copy shows that Saumaise was already operating a selection: the readings that seemed to him erroneous or obviously scribal do not make it into his copy.[130] In other words, Saumaise set about collating variants with an interpretation of the text that must have already been at least partially formed in his mind. The copy also records some of the developments of this interpretation: for example, in the case of the *testitrahum*, 'testicle-dragging' ram,

---

[126] Beza's copy of Tertullian (a 1545 *Mesnartiana* edition) is preserved in the Bibliothèque de Genève, Bf. 81 fol.; *De Pallio* is fols. 208^{r}-212^{r}, digitized at https://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-42673 [last accessed 29th March 2019].

[127] Pithou's copy (a 1550 Gelenius edition) is now in Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte Geneviève, CC fol. 233 inv. 224; *De Pallio* is 588-595, digitized at https://archive.org/details/FOLCC233INV224FA/ [last accessed 29th March 2019].

[128] On the 'triplex virtus', Pithou annotates: 'Seuerus pater Antoninus et Geta filii Cæss [Caesares] et AAA [Augusti]', 590, outer margin.

[129] Saumaise's working copy is in the BnF, Rés. C 300; *De Pallio* is 1-6.

[130] E.g., Beza records 'numeris.D.' as a variant for 'humeris' (fol. 209^{v}), 'omnia condito.D' and 'coacto.D' as variants for 'omni aconito hostilitatis, & cacto' (fol. 210^{r}), which do not appear in Saumaise's copy.

Saumaise copies the variant 'testitrabum' from the Divionensis,[131] but, at the top of the page, he writes a fragment of the satirist Lucilius that decides the question in favour of the reading 'testitrahum'.[132] This interpretation, in fact, stemmed from the 'satyrical' quality of *De Pallio*, and that therefore accommodated, as Marcile and Mercier had shown, a recourse to obscenity.

Another instance is even more revealing of the way in which Saumaise was rewriting the text according to these conceptions. After taking on Empedocles for the luxury of his philosophical attire, Tertullian despises those who 'Menandrico fluxu' drag about precious clothes on the ground: 'let him hear the same as the comic poet: *what a cloak is this fool wasting!*'. While Rhenanus read from his manuscripts 'Menandrico fluxu' ('with the softness of a Menander', referring to the comic poet Menander but without explanation), Pamèle had corrected the text to 'Mæandrico fluxu' ('with the fluidity of a Meander', comparing a dress's artfully composed folds to the winding course of the river Meander).[133] As part of his rhetoric of returning *ad fontes* against the corruption of conjectures, Saumaise upheld the reading 'Menandrico', explaining in his published commentary that Tertullian was satirically ('satyrice') redeploying a verse by Menander against its author: we know from a fable of Phaedrus that Menander, in order to please the tyrant Demetrius of Phalernum, once went to pay his respects to him dressed in flowing

[131] We know the variant comes from the Divionensis thanks to the collation in Beza's copy, fol. 209^{v}, outer margin; Saumaise's copy, 2, outer margin.

[132] 'Testitrahum […] legitur Lucillius lib. XVI[:] Ibat forte aries inquit, iam quod genus ~~inquit~~ quantis [/] Testibus, uix uno filo hosce hærere putares [/] Pellicula extrema exaptum pendere onus ingens', 2, upper margin. It is also quoted in the published commentary (*DP*, 76).

[133] Pamèle, *Opera*, 18, n. 85.

robes, thus turning himself into the cloak-wasting fool that he had criticized in his comedies.[134] Saumaise's interpretation gives ample reasons for preferring the reading 'Menandrico fluxu', which, Saumaise says, he reads from 'my ancient codex and the early editions' (i.e., Rhenanus's).[135]

And yet, once we look at Saumaise's working copy, the picture becomes less straightforward. There Saumaise does correct 'Mæandrico fluxu', but he does so by writing in the margin 'Menandri confluxu', and, below, 'leg. Menandrico fluxu'[136] – an interestingly ambiguous phrasing, for it could stand for 'lego' ('I read' – where?) or 'legendum' ('it should be read'). In any case, the variant certainly did not come from the Divionensis, as Saumaise instead asserted in print: Beza's copy, in fact, gives it as 'Menandri est fluxu' (as does Pithou's), clearly marking it as coming from 'D'.[137] Either Saumaise simply relied on his working copy when writing the commentary, thus falling into a false assertion by his earlier lack of precision, or his claim was purposefully disingenuous. Even in the former case, he certainly did not endeavour to check this again against the manuscript, nor did he, in the face of his own previous ambiguous note, refrain from saying that his manuscript read thus in the commentary.

---

[134] Saumaise, *DP*, 302-303. Casaubon had also identified the exclamation in Tertullian's text as a translation of Menander's verse: 'Qualem dem[ens]) Græcus [ver]sus ita [con]cipiend[us] no[n] vt Jun[ius]. οἷαν ἀνόητος ~~οὗτος~~ ὅδε χλαμύδ' ἀπόλλυσιν', 8, lower margin (the correction suggests that Casaubon is quoting from memory).

[135] *Ibid.*: '[V]etus noster, & antiquæ editiones *Menandrico fluxu*, legunt'.

[136] 4, lower margin.

[137] Beza: fol. 211^{r}, outer margin; Pithou: 593, outer margin.

What this suggests is that, for all of his talking up of the Divionensis as a codex 'satis vetustum & optimæ notæ',[138] Saumaise did not rely on it as if it was 'a sacred anchor to which we must always return'.[139] Rather, this rhetoric served his turn in fashioning the critical stance of a faithful interpreter, intent on recovering the words of Tertullian against a novel generation of corrupters, who by dint of conjecture did the same harm that their forefathers, the medieval scribes, had previously inflicted on the text by careless copying. However, Saumaise's own carelessness in the marginalia of his working copy reveals that he was also coming to the mock-oration with a preconceived notion of its genre and of its purpose, to which the manuscript evidence was subservient. This notion descended directly from Marcile's interpretation of *De Pallio* as a *satyra*, even if Marcile himself is sarcastically taken by Saumaise as the unnamed archetype of the ignorant corrupter ('Parisian schoolmaster' or 'corrector', and 'royal glosser' are among the epithets Saumaise attributes to him).[140] Indeed, on the question of *De Pallio*'s genre, Saumaise makes the same moves as Marcile: he is completely silent about previous critics that had worked in this direction (Marcile included), criticizing instead Scaliger's mistake, though without acrimony, and paying his respects to the 'shade' of such a *vir maximus*.[141] In this,

[138] Saumaise, *DP*, dedication, sig. *7^{v}.

[139] *Ibid.*, 148:'[V]etus scriptura libri nostri ad quam semper, ut ad sacram anchoram decurrimus'.

[140] 'Magister Parisiensis', 60-61 (where Saumaise seizes the occasion to instruct Marcile's students, 'ne quid errent tirones tanti magistri auctoritate inducti'); 'corrector Parisiensis', 254; 'Glossator Regius', 251.

[141] *Ibid.*, 7-8: '[in calling *De Pallio* 'declamationem scholastico stilo'] immaniter errat vir maximus [Scaliger] qui Animaduersionibus in Eusebium scribit primitias operum Tertulliani hunc libellum de Pallio fuisse. […] Nec leuior est error quem errat idem dum asserit Tertullianum qui togatus erat, opus habuisse pallio priorem habitum mutare, vt eo profiteretur Christianum […] Ignoscant mihi tanti viri manes'.

we see Saumaise negotiating between the advantage gained by illustrating his Protestant intellectual pedigree and a desire to present himself as the first true reader of the mock-oration,[142] thus implicitly polemizing with the Catholic critics that had provided him with a vision of the text as a *satyra* displaying the eristic value of ridicule.

Even when Saumaise does not distort the manuscript evidence, he often overrules or builds upon it to give it a 'satyrical' turn. Other passages show Saumaise endeavouring to bring out the expedient obscenity and derisive sarcasm that he saw lying behind the received text. Thus, in Tertullian's account of Roman practices of depilation, Saumaise proposes to change the manuscript reading of 'a talo' ('from the ankle') to 'a culo' ('from the posterior') because of parallel passages in Clemens Alexandrinus alluding to the shamefulness of the positions necessary for such a procedure.[143] Similarly, in Tertullian's mocking comparison between the toga and the pallium, Saumaise claims that he reads in his manuscript that the pallium, unlike the toga, did not need to be relegated 'cruo in posterum' ('to a *cruum* till the next day') so as to keep all folds in place when not worn. Saumaise explained this bizarre locus as a corruption from *crucin posterum*, itself a remnant of the original *cruci in posterum* ('to a cross till the next day'): Tertullian was speaking 'satyrice' of the forceps necessary to keep the elaborate toga in shape.[144] And yet the satirical quality of the reading 'cruci' in the context of a mock-oration to the pagans cannot stem from the Christian cross, but rather from the pagan one as a form of death

[142] *Ibid.*, sig. *4^{v}-*5^{r}: '[…] *neminem ad hoc tempus extitisse, qui possit iurare hunc libellum a capite ad calcem usque totum a se non minus bene intellectum quam lectum*'.

[143] *Ibid.*, 228-229. Referring to Clemens's *Paedagogus*, III.3, [misprinted as 'in Pædagogo lib. II cap. III'].

[144] *Ibid.*, 374-376.

penalty, for the whole tenor of Tertullian's passage relies on the ridiculously absurd pains that wearing a toga entails.

This last emendation points us to a larger pattern that operates in the edition, and that helps to explain the significance of *satyra* as an apologetic genre in the eyes of Saumaise. In his view, the apologetic work of *De Pallio* happens, paradoxically, by minimizing references to Christianity: the satire is entirely steeped in the principles of pagan literature, and it is by exploding them from the inside that Tertullian shows himself a great Christian apologist. This is especially clear in Saumaise's account of the social and rhetorical conventions associated with the wearing of the pallium, on which he dwells in his comments on the prosopopoeia of the garment, i.e., what Tertullian had called a *sermo palliatus*, a 'becloaked speech'. Pamèle, who had unproblematically used the passage as evidence for Tertullian's own renunciation of his earlier legal profession in favour of Christianity, had failed to see that he was basing his claims on the shaky ground of a speech constructed 'declamatorio more', in which the speaker is neither a becloaked Tertullian, nor indeed the 'Christian' pallium, but the cloak of the Cynics, i.e., of Diogenes and his followers.[145] Saumaise constantly reminds his reader that this loquacious pallium should not be in any way identified with Christianity or with the mores of the early Christians; instead, it embodies the conventions of the Cynical sect, famous for wearing

[145] Saumaise, *DP*, 389: 'Ex hoc loco bonus Pammelius colligebat Jurisconsultum aut causarum patronum fuisse Tertullianum priusquam Christo nomen daret. demus fuisse, id certe ex his verbis colligi nullo modo potest. quæ heic dicuntur, προσωποποιϊκῶς à pallio philosophico vel Cynico dici fingit auctor […] Non de se igitur, nec de Christianorum pallio hæc dicit Tertullianus, sed de Cynico'; also 395: '[N]ihil toto hoc sermone tractari aut tangi quod ad Christianum pallium spectet […] ista rhetoricatur pallium Cynicum non Christianum'.

the philosophical τρίβων (i.e., the pallium) without a tunic underneath, and for speaking out with brutal honesty against the vices of their fellow-citizens.[146]

Saumaise seems at pains to make a subtle distinction: it is precisely because the speech of this mantle has nothing that would have made it recognisably Christian to the ears of the pagans of Carthage that Tertullian can deploy it to plead, covertly, on Christianity's behalf. The pallium, in other words, does not speak *de Christianismo* but *pro Christianismo*, and does so surreptitiously until the very close of the satire, when Christianity is suddenly (and obscurely) mentioned as a *melior philosophia*. Indeed, as Saumaise had stressed in his prefatory essay, the pallium had never been a dress generally worn by Christians (and thus not identifiable with the new religion), but only by a smaller sect of ascetic Christians, which coincided with the presbyters of Tertullian's time.[147] It is by these movements of camouflage and obscure revelations that Tertullian's oration, being 'apologetic and satyrical together', works.[148]

---

[146] *Ibid.*, 393: 'Meminisse oportet attentum lectorem, pallium Cratetis hoc est cynicum ista loqui, non Christianum': the reference to Zeno and Epicurus makes sense in this frame, for the 'cynical pallium' is complaining that pagans call the cynics' rival sects (Stoics and Epicureans) 'wise', but withhold such praise from the cynics because of their all too honest rebukes against their hearers' vicious habits. Similarly, according to Saumaise, the passage on haranguing the crowds in the prosopopoeia cannot be linked to an early Christian custom, but only to the practice of the philosophers of the cynical sect (396).

[147] *Ibid.*, 395: '[P]resbyteri porro Christiani pallium eo modo amiciebant quo Cynici. ideo Tertullianus pallium Cynicum heic loqui facit, qui habitus erat Christianorum ascetarum. sic dum pro se loquitur pallium Cynicum, pro pallio quoque Christiano perorat'.

[148] *Ibid.*, 3-4: 'Tertulliani de Pallio opusculum, Apologiam pro pallio esse, satyrico subinde sale conspersam, ac stilo nasi conditam […] certum est'; it was when the Carthaginians insulted

In the rhetorical context of the dedication of the edition to his father, Saumaise had already amply indulged in this discourse of concealment, emphasising how the 'obscure' Tertullian seems to have written his mock-oration 'only for this one purpose: not to be understood except by someone who would greatly labour'.[149] Just as the Cynics once concealed ('contexisse') their bodies in the lowly mantle, so did Tertullian everywhere hide his intention in the blind windings of his pallium.[150] But, Saumaise goes on,

> Tertullian marked this same dress with such intricate signs of rare and recondite learning […] that it seems as if he wanted to weave the gaudy mantle ('pompaticum amictum detexere') of a triumphant consul or of a pontiff adorned for display ('pontificis ad ostensionem ornati'), rather than the lowly little pallium of a dirty barefoot philosopher.[151]

Tertullian for abandoning the toga that Tertullian 'hoc apologetico simul & satyrico scripto illis occurrisse'.

[149] *Ibid.*, sig. *4^{v}: '*Opus est, ut scis, auctoris difficilis & obscuri, longe difficillimum & obscurissimum. Nam qui in reliquis scriptis naturæ suæ vel gentis genio quodam ubique obscuritatem affectavit, in hoc opusculo videtur consulto consilio operam dedisse, & hoc unum laborasse, ut a neminem intelligeretur nisi qui plurimum laboraret*'.

[150] *Ibid.*, sig. *5^{r}: '*Profecto non magis pallii sui circumjectu omnia corporis involvisse & contexisse Cynicos olim certum est, quam Tertullianus cæcis hujus Pallii ambagibus mentem suam ubique infuscavit & operuit*'.

[151] *Ibid.*, sig. *5^{r-v}: '*Tam crebris tamen idem raræ ac reconditæ doctrinæ notis, quasi quibusdam purpuræ clavis, aut auri patagiis hunc eumdem habitum insignivit, ut non vile nudipedi ac sordentis philosophi palliolum, sed aut consulis triumphantis, aut pontificis ad ostensionem ornati pompaticum amictum detexere voluisse videatur*'.

However, because such show would be unfit for the natural modesty of Christianity, Tertullian hid away in obscurity all these shining gems and purple crumbs from overeager hands and eyes.[152]

It is difficult to pierce through such dazzling sentences and their elaborate word-plays (e.g., the compounds of *texere* coming primarily from *texo*, 'to weave', but also being attested as infinitives of *tego*, 'to conceal'). Should we consider Saumaise's reference to the pontiff in the same category as Rhenanus's brief comment on papal diadems and sceptres, and interpret it as a side swipe at Catholic luxury? Surely, as we shall see, if there is a 'key' that Saumaise thought could 'unlock' the hidden learning of the mock-oration, it is his interpretation that Tertullian's usage of the pallium as a rhetorical and visual trope only refers to the mantle worn by the Cynics, while Christianity remains a concealed frame of reference.

It is clear that Saumaise had laboured much to understand *De Pallio*. The wealth of antiquarian information that sustains the commentary suggests that Saumaise's claim to Peiresc about having compiled a Casaubonian catalogue *de re vestiaria* was not unfounded. For example, Saumaise uses this antiquarian knowledge to explain one of the most conspicuous contradictions of the mock-oration: Tertullian's reference to a pallium 'cervicibus circumstrictus' ('bound around the neck') in chapter one, and to a pallium that 'nihil circumstringit' (that 'binds around nothing') in the prosopopoeia in chapter five. The

[152] *Ibid.*, sig. *5^{v}: '*Ceterum quod medestam vestem, & Christiano gerendam minime decuisset, gemmas illas, & purpureas micas quibus pallium inluminavit, non foris censuit exponendas ita ut in frontem incurrerent, sed omnes intus occulatavit, ut tractantium manus, spectantiumque oculos fugerent*'.

former, for Saumaise, is the common pallium, known to the Carthaginians from their long-standing commerce with the Greeks, while the latter is the philosophical, and especially Cynical, mantle. According to him, all previous commentators, their erudition notwithstanding, were tricked into error by *locus*, probably because they lacked familiarity with that 'practice' which, as he would later write to Peiresc, he thought necessary for a critic.[153] For Saumaise, Tertullian himself was using such contradictions and obscurity purposefully: the pretext ('ὑποθέσει') of the vague resemblance of the common and the philosophical pallium could be deployed for rhetorical purposes, to emphasise the Carthaginians' hypocrisy in blaming him when they themselves had once worn a type of this mantle.[154] It is only by reading Tertullian's work critically, and comparing the notices he gives with an antiquarian grid of reference that critics can learn to discriminate between *historia* and *rhetorica*.[155] This method of critical reading to sift a text's notices was precisely what Casaubon had pioneered when he changed his mind about Tertullian's reference to Cato, interpreting it as a confusion on Tertullian's part rather than as a reliable historical piece of information.

And yet, behind Tertullian's 'rhetorical' use of *historia*, his most important purpose (in Saumaise's eyes) lies concealed: the ascetic Christians who took up the pallium were

[153] *Ibid.*, 60-62, esp. 61-62: 'Hæc distinctio palli communis & philosophici non observata, pluries errandi doctissimis interpretibus ansam præbuit in hoc opere'.

[154] *Ibid.*, 55-56: 'Tertullianus ὑποθέσει serviens non distinxit inter utrumque pallium, sed quasi generaliter pallium Græcanicum à Carthginensibus improbaretur, probare nititur illos olim palliatos Græco more fuisse, & male facere quod pallii usum in quoquam carperent, qui proprius quondam habitus ipsorum fuerit'.

[155] *Ibid.*, 56: 'Omnino quæcunq[ue] de pallio & tunicis Carthaginiensiu[m] heic à Tertulliano prodita sunt, oratorie magis, quam historice ab eodem excogitata fuisse opinor'.

borrowing the cloak of the Greek philosophers, not the common one – which is why they were taxed (according to a later notice) with the insult 'γραικοὶ ἐπιθέται' ('Greek impostors'), because of the proverbial imposture of philosophers faking their wisdom for gain.[156] What Saumaise's interpretation implies is that *De Pallio* is not a text that endeavours to clear Christians of this slander straightforwardly, but that Tertullian embraced this association for hidden apologetic purposes. Tertullian could thus rely on these connotations of the pallium to bring the Cynical cloak on the stage of his mock-oration, and make it speak covertly on behalf of Christianity, by using the entirely pagan conventions of Cynical moral philosophy. 'Philosophy' could be welded to apologetics, and especially, as the example of Casaubon suggested, to antiquarianism. Saumaise's constant striving to make the Christian pallium converge with the philosophical one is highly revealing, and, as we shall see, implicitly controversial. On the surface, however, Saumaise was completing the removal of the more conspicuously theological references from *De Pallio*, and attempting to restore to his *palliolum* its original philosophic lowliness, with all the satirical vigour that would come as a natural consequence. Diogenes could expediently perform the work of St Paul.

Although this move had been initiated by Mercier and Marcile, in Saumaise's hands it was perceived by his contemporaries as tendentious and polemical – but not for the reasons that a modern scholar might assume: the bitter controversy that ensued between Saumaise and the Jesuit Denis Petau was not prompted by any apparent resentment on the

[156] *Ibid.*, 55: 'Hinc Christianorum ἀσκηταὶ, qui illum habitum propter humilitatem & vilitatem frequenter vsurpabant, vulgo a gentilibus γραικοὶ ἐπιθέται per conuitium vocabantur, quasi qui sub vili palliolo imposturam hominibus facere pararent, ut plerique ex Græcia philosophorum'.

Jesuit's part at the ostensible 'secularization' that Saumaise's *De Pallio* might seem to enact.[157] Petau, writing immediately after the publication of the edition under the pseudonym 'Antonius Kerkoëtius Aremoricus', stressed that he had been spurred into attack because Saumaise's venturing into patristic territory had revealed ('manifestum est', thus turning Saumaise's rhetoric of revelation against him) his Calvinist heresy in addition to his pride and ignorance.[158] Was this gratuitous slander, or was Saumaise's 'secularization' of *De Pallio* a covertly Calvinist move? It is true that personal and institutional factors played an important role in the exceptionally intense and vitriolic quarrel that engulfed the two scholars. Saumaise had sarcastically referred in passing to Petau's new edition of Epiphanius, correcting an inaccurate translation from Greek that the Jesuit had made.[159] Conversely, Petau's correspondence with some fellow members of the Society of Jesus suggests that he could rely on the quick machine of Jesuit polemics to

[157] The edition, however, did attract scholars of anti-clerical tendencies, such as John Selden – see Jean-Louis Quantin, 'John Selden et l'étude de l'Antiquité Chrétienne: Érudition, Critique et Anticléricalisme', *Annuaire de l'Institut Michel Villey*, 3 (2011), 339-389, 354.

[158] '*At postquam te in Theologiam ipsam, Patresque transdidisti, & à Tertulliano initium grassandi fecisti; tum sane* οὐκέτ᾽ ἀνεκτόν, οὐδ᾽ ἕδρας ἀκμήν *esse persuasi mihi. Na*[m] *cum & religione, vt fama est, Calvinista sis, & scripta tua, postrema maximè, ex temeritate, arrogantia, & inscitia conflata sint, manifestum est, quid & ab hæretico, corruptelæ; & ab homine temerario, falsitatis; & ineptiarum ab imperito in Patrum scripta comportandum sit; nisi consilijs tuis obuiam eatur*', in Antonius Kerkoëtius Aremoricus [= Denis Petau], *Animadversorum Liber ad Claudii Salmasii Notas in Tertullianum de Pallio* (Rhedonis [= Paris], 1622), sig. A2^{v}.

[159] Saumaise, *DP*, 446 : '[A]t bonus interpres qui novam illius auctoris [Epiphanii] versionem nuper edidit, imperite στολάς sive ἀμπεχόνας cum dalmaticis sive colobiis, hoc est pallia cum tunicis confudit […] & tamen ille est cui si de se credas ipsi, nemo præter eum credatur doctus'.

provide materials for attack.[160] Vituperation itself had come to serve as a mark of confessional allegiance, as Marcile's case showed. And yet Petau might have been right in seeing an underlying Calvinist tendency in Saumaise's edition. Indeed, reading Petau's attacks is an experience of discovery as much as it is a reminder of the fact that scholarship in this period happened adversarially, and that this adversarial stance was inherent in and even beneficial to scholarship. 'Satyre' could be a heuristic tool of great sophistication: the insults and the calumnies that it relied on are not a regrettable veneer disfiguring the face of learning, but an intrinsic part of it.

Petau/Kerkoëtius immediately draws our attention to a series of inconsistencies that Saumaise tenaciously upheld. These inconsistencies concern exactly Saumaise's argument about the Christian pallium being a type of the Cynical cloak, and about the social connotations that the choice of this mantle implied. First of all, Petau is highly critical of Saumaise's chronology: Saumaise's insistence that the taking up of the pallium must mark a moment of transition in Tertullian's life is attacked because it was on this basis that Saumaise argued that all presbyters and bishops in the early church started wearing the cloak upon their ordination.[161] For Petau, the choice of an ascetic life did not have to

[160] E.g., in the BnF, MS NAL 1554 (fols. 59^{r}-70^{v}) contains a list of Saumaise's errors on historical topics sent to Petau by a fellow Jesuit, Johannes Fayon. It is not unreasonable to believe that Petau could have had similar help for his protracted controversy on *De Pallio*.

[161] [Petau], *Animadversorum*, 4-5: 'Tu in ingressu ipso Presbyterij mutasse vis; & confectam tibi rem ratiocinatione ista vanissima putas: Erras mi homo. Dicat aliquis: Quid interest ineunte an suscepto iam sacerdotio mutauerit? Ad rem non multum, pertinet: Ad ineptiam Grammatici, & temerariam obseruationem, plurimum. Nam ex eo quod in ingressu ipso sacerdotij togam posuerit, ariolatur; Sacerdotes omnes, & Clericos Philosophorum habitum induisse'.

coincide with ordination.[162] Secondly, Petau remarks on Saumaise's contradiction in saying that Christians wore the philosophical pallium (and not the common one) while also claiming that this practice stemmed from their desire to imitate the humility of the Apostles: did the Apostles then wear the Greek Cynical pallium to go about their evangelizing mission, or, as Saumaise himself had said, were they rather dressed in the Jewish manner?[163] In Saumaise's attempt to reveal the hidden doctrine of the pallium,

---

[162] Petau dwells on Saumaise's 'paralogismum' (*ibid.*, 3) or circular reasoning in proving from *De Pallio* that all presbyters wore the pallium, and then proceeding to prove from this shakily established fact that Tertullian must have written *De Pallio* exactly when he became a Presbyter: 'Quid si enim parte in aliqua temporis huius, quod ante sacerdotium in Christianismo habuit, mutasse dicam? Quid si in aliquanto post susceptum sacerdotium? Hoc enim per te paulo postea monstrabitur' (4) – Petau refers to the contradition that he brings out of Saumaise's argument in the following pages: on 6-7 Petau quotes Saumaise's admission that some ascetic laymen also wore the pallium, while before he had emphasised that the pallium was the special mark of the clerics in Tertullian's time: 'Vanissime mortalium, vbi es cum ista scribis? πᾶ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι; Adeo nos lectores tuos contemnis, vt tam absurda, tam inepta, tam ridicula texas, ac retexas? Didiceramus clericos omnes, ac solos, palliatos inter Christianos fuisse. Tu id pro tua authoritate persuadere volueras. Num contrarium occinis: & ne quid ad stuporem desit, etiam varijs authorum testimonijs approbas', 7.

[163] *Ibid.*, 9-10: 'Vis enim Christianos sacerdotes ideo pallium cepisse, quòd Apostolos imitarentur. Si de pallio vniuersè loqueris; nihil loqueris. Nam & Græci omnes, & Iudæi tam Christiani, quàm cuiusuis sectæ, palliati. Sed intererat [between the common and the philosophical pallium] materiæ ac formæ. Frustra igitures, cùm ideo Philosophico pallio præditos doces. Credisne aliter Apostolos, ac Iudæos cæteros vestitos esse? Tu ne Christum quidem ipsum aliter dixeris. Si ergo Iudaicis pallijs vsi sunt Apostoli; Christianos Clericos Apostolorum imitatione Philosophorum induisse Pallia, non efficis, nisi & illud suades, Iudæorum Pallia fuisse, cuiusmodi erant Philosophorum. Hæc enim syllogismi, si vllus est, vis & ratio postulat'. But, as Petau goes on to show, Saumaise not only does not discuss this missing premise, but he even expresses doubts on it, saying 'An pallia vero quibus amicti erant Apostoli ac Discipuli Christi, usquequaque cum philosophico pallio materia & forma convenirent, haud facile dictu est, non admodum tamen dissimilia fuisse dici

Petau saw another form of concealment and imposture: a Calvinist disingenuously parading as an innocent grammarian.

These two examples cut to the heart of the antiquarian dissertation on ancient dress that Saumaise had placed as an introduction to his notes. When read against Petau's animadversions, the dissertation's effort to distinguish between the common and the philosophical pallium appears now as the bedrock on which many of Saumaise's claims are based, and which is itself concealed by much additional erudition aimed at obscuring the centrality of this unsteady foundation. Was Saumaise's antiquarianism structured on a confessional pattern? Indeed, we can now see how such an argument about the choice of the philosophical mantle as a sign of ascetism enabled Saumaise to polemize on two fronts at the same time. The first is against the clerics who abandoned the humility of the early church for more luxurious vestments. Such a degeneration was deplored by Saumaise by insinuating that with it 'more grievous changes' than those of dress (changes of doctrine?) may give grounds to complaint (and to reform?).[164] The second front is against the monks, who were the only ones to keep the pallium, but whose asceticism was so extreme that they rejoiced in dirt and squalor and truly led a 'swinish life', as many ancient accounts

potest', in *DP*, 16-17. On the score of this, Petau insinuates Saumaise's blasphemous treatment of Christ: '[n]isi sic insanis, ut & Christum Philosophico Pallio velis indutum. Parum aberit, quin & Cynicam illi peram, & baculum tribuas: aut in Apollonij, aliorumque ordinem redigas', *Animadversorum*, 10-11.

[164] Saumaise, *DP*, 21: 'Verum ut mores subinde mutant ac tempora, nihilque rerum humanarum in eodem statu permanet, etiam hæc res in Ecclesia Dei mutatione passa est. atque utinam quidem hactenus, ne de gravioribus queri possemus. Nam hæc levissimi momenti res est, habitus mutatio, si sola spectetur: sed fere semper, aut morum ruinam trahit, aut jam inclinatos sequitur mores, præcipue cum luxo magistro, delicatior & inflatior vestis viliorem & modestam excludit'.

(gleefully quoted by Saumaise) testified.[165] While Casaubon had simply pointed to a 'vicissitude' of ridicule inherent in the alteration of ancient customs, Saumaise was actively redeploying it for the purposes of contemporary controversy. In the dissertation, Saumaise also indulged in polemical insinuations by gesturing forwards from Tertullian's time: back then bishops and presbyters truly merited the name of 'Christian philosophers' because of the humble and pious life that they marked with the philosophical pallium; later, only the monks kept the lowly life that the clergy had abandoned; but now (here Saumaise quotes an Orphic line in Greek) '*many bear the thyrsus, but few are Bacchi*'.[166]

Thus, Saumaise's erudite antiquarian dissertation is essentially built on the same polemical principles as Rhenanus's off-hand insult both to papal luxury and to monkish hypocrisy a century earlier (both being favourite targets of Protestant abuse). Indeed, the fundamental trajectory of Saumaise's dissertation is even more revealing than his insinuations. It is a trajectory of decline: having established that the pallium was not

[165] *Ibid.*, 11-12: 'Hujusmodi [i.e., in the way of the Cynics, who were often accused of imposture] quoque sordes affectarunt olim monachi. nam quam semel tunicam induissent, nunquam exuebant, priusquam penitus tota usu detrita & scissa esset, ac de altera habenda cogitandum foret. [Saumaise then quotes Jerome's *Vita Hilarionis*] quantum sordium putamus contraxisse talem tunicam? [he then quotes Rutilius Namatianus's *De Reditu Suo* on the squalor of the monastic island of Capraria] Et hæc causa est quamobrem Eunapium putem Christiani nominis infensissimum hostem in libro de vitis philosophorum, de monachis sui temporis dixisse, ὑώδη βίον ['swinish life'] eos vivere, quod illud animal immunditiem & sordes in amoribus ac deliciis habeat, lutoque & olenticetis præcipue gaudeat'.

[166] *Ibid.*, 8: 'Nam qui disciplinæ Christianæ diligentissimos & exactissimos cultores præstare volebant in omnibus, hi Christiani philosophi erant, & dicebantur. Tales Tertulliani ætate Episcopi presbyterique & omnes clerici, ac postea monachi; nunc vero πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δέ τε βάκχοι'.

generally worn by Christians but only by priests and ascetics, Saumaise moves on to trace the luxurious corruption of the early church against the background of late antique mores, when the toga became obsolete and the 'birrus' rose to prominence among laity and clergy alike. Already in the early fifth century, the clergymen, having abandoned philosophy with the pallium, started to wear the birrus with precious elements to distinguish various clerical ranks.[167] To such clerical indulgence in the fashions of the *saeculum*, the monks responded by tightening the asceticism of their communities.[168] Around the same time, or even before, clerics started using a type of silken tunic with golden stripes, the 'dalmatica', under their birrus: it was thus that the garment of the voluptuous ('delicati') became the prerogative of the 'most chaste' priests of the church.[169] Both in the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Church the birrus with a tunic underneath became extremely common, even if primitive usage would instead require the pallium.[170] Clearly, for Saumaise, since the time of Constantine, the church had entered a phase of corruption. Indeed, when bishop

[167] *Ibid.*, 26: 'Pretiosioribus [birris] utebantur vulgo Episcopi, minus pretiosis presbyteri, postquam pallia reliquerunt, & philosophari desierunt' – the discussion develops from a notice given by Palladius (early fifth century).

[168] *Ibid.*, 27-28: 'Et birros ideo monachi sibi interdixerunt quod ambitiosior esset vestis, quam ut humilitatem professis conveniret. [a testimony quoted from Cassian, Palladius's contemporary] Et hæc ratio est: qui de sæculo recesserant, omnia sæculi, ut habitum quoque, summo opere vitabant. Birrus autem, presbyterorum cum hominibus sæculi tunc communis fuit habitus, ut paulo supra ostendimus'.

[169] *Ibid.*, 29: 'Et sane vestitus quem soli olim delicati usurparunt, postea castissimorum Ecclesiæ sacerdotum proprius factus est'. Commodus and Helagabalus are later mentioned as examples of those who used to show themselves 'dalmaticati'.

[170] *Ibid.*, 31: 'Communissimus cum in Græca, tum in Romana Ecclesia sacerdotalis habitus olim fuit, birrus sive lacerna, & tunica. Antiquissimis etiam & primis Ecclesiæ temporibus, pallium & tunica, philosophorum plane habitus, sed & Apostolorum'.

Eusthatius tried to reinstate the former humility of the church by rejecting its ostentatious secularization of dress, he was condemned by the synod of Gangra (340 CE).[171] Saumaise shows himself particularly eager to prove that the word 'περιβόλαιον' used in the official condemnation refers precisely to a pallium just like Tertullian's,[172] and thus betrays that for him the mantle of the mock-oration had come to identify much more than a simple garment. (Strikingly, the same point about the equivalence of Tertullian's pallium to the synod's περιβόλαιον appears in one of Casaubon's manuscript *Adversaria*).[173] For Saumaise, the pallium identified an entire attitude to Christianity, which eschewed ornament and luxury and embraced 'philosophy'; but, most of all, the pallium for Saumaise was a polemical trope. Indeed, although not necessarily 'Calvinist', Saumaise's dissertation was certainly structured as a learned attack on Roman Catholicism. Petau, by spotting Saumaise's efforts to conflate the philosophical pallium with the Christian and

[171] *Ibid.*, 31-32: 'Extitit porro Constantini Magni temporibus Eustathius quidam, Sebastenorum ut nonnulli volunt Episcopus, qui Episcopos presbyterosque ad antiquam ἄσκησιν & pallium reducere vellet, vestemque communem, & civilem habitum in sacerdotibus condemnaret, quos ad philosophicum pallium revocabat, cum & ipse palliatus philosophorum more incederet. [Saumaise quotes from the proceedings of the synod of Gangre, which described the pallium as:] Hæc peregrina vestis, hæc sacerdotibus indecora, philosophi nempe habitus. & vide quantum hæc Constantini tempora mutata ab illis quibus Tertullianus vixit'.

[172] *Ibid.*, 32: 'In eo canone περιβόλαιον est pallium, τὸ φιλοσόφου σχῆμα. ita enim Græci proprie vocant, ἀπὸ τοῦ περιβάλλεσθαι, quod uno circumiectu, ut ait Tertullianus, totum hominem ambiat'.

[173] MS Casaubon 60 (Bodleian Library), fol. 70[r]: 'Vestes τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήρου. Qui si[m]plici[us] se vestiebant vt ascetæ fereba[n]t περιβόλαιον, sive palliu[m]. vide Tertull. et in XII. canone Ga[n]gre[n]sis co[n]c[ilii]. Cæteri ferebant birros βήρους [...] Ση[μείωσ]αι palliu[m] a Christianis no[n] fuisse gestatu[m] te[m]pore Ga[n]grensis [con]c[ilii] certe nulla[m] fuisse necessitate[m]'.

apostolic one, had clearly hit on the crucial nexus that had enabled Saumaise's antiquarian polemics.

Saumaise's reply to Petau's animadversions was published in 1623; it contained as much abuse as Petau's attack, and it was disguised under the pseudonym 'Franciscus Francus'. Yet, on the question of the identification of the pallium, Petau had forced Saumaise to reconsider the premise of his argument. Did the Apostles really wear the philosophical cloak? Saumaise/Francus does little more than restate his assertions, but he is also forced to shed all ambiguity on this point: now he must claim that 'even the Jews used that Greek pallium, Christ included', and that 'the pallium of the philosophers, and of all the Greeks, and of the Jews was the same one'.[174] Saumaise's pallium was thus losing much of its exceptionality. To preserve at least some of its special significance as both an apostolic and a philosophical garment, Saumaise must now introduce a novel distinction: 'let us concede this to Kerkoëtius for Petau's sake, that all Greeks in the whole of the East wore the pallium, even the Jews: but what does this matter for the West?' Tertullian, who lived in the Latin-speaking West, referred to a pallium that had special connotations in his

[174] 'Græcanico porro illo pallio etiam Iudæi amiciebantur. inter Iudæos ergo etiam Apostoli, etia[m] Dominus ipse. […] pallium vero philosophorum, & Græcorum omnium Iudæorumque idem fuit. exceptis enim Cynicis reliqui philosophi commune pallium Græcanico gestabant. […] Pallium Cynicum a philosophico & communi pallio, nec forma nec materia differebat, vt pluribus ostendit Salmasius, sed solo amiciendi modo', in Franciscus Francus [=Claude Saumaise], *Confutatio Animadversorum A. Cercoetii ad C. Salmasii Notas in Tertullianum de Pallio* (Middelburg, 1623), 6-7.

region.[175] Moreover, by Tertullian's time, even in the East the Greeks had started to wear typically Roman clothes: at least then the pallium must have had a symbolic significance.[176] Saumaise was striving to keep the axis of his case intact.

But even more interesting is the rhetoric used by Saumaise/Francus in the prefatory attack on Petau/Kerkoëtius, as it shows the humanist on the offensive rather than in retreat. Here, by dint of biting sarcasm and clever retortions, Saumaise turns the disciplinary boundary between 'grammar' and 'theology' to polemical advantage. If 'Kerkoëtius' had accused the grammarian Saumaise of trespassing into patristic territory, 'Francus' re-joins that the theologian Petau is unworthy of the liberal arts, disingenuously asking: 'what does this apology for the pallium have which is not purely grammatical and historical?'[177] Indeed, it was Petau that was unjustifiably attempting to extend the ambit of theology: if any writing by a theologian like Tertullian, even the least theological ones, qualify as 'theology', then it would follow, by Petau's own reasoning, that Kerkoëtius's own abusive speech, 'all that most dirty flow of an impure mouth with which you have shat your papers

[175] *Ibid.*, 6: '[I]n fauore[m] Petauij demus hoc Cercoetio, Græcos omnes in Oriente toto pallium gessisse, etiam Iudæos: in Occidente quid erit? Atque ibi nunc sumus, ibi Tertullianus vixit, & scripsit. de habitu Christianorum Occidentalium loquitur'.

[176] *Ibid.*, 7: 'Tam in Occidente, quam in Orientis partibus per illa tempora, cum ex lege Antonini Romanæ iure ciuitatis, vniuersi sub Imperio Romano populi donati essent, Romanam etiam vestem omnes gerebant' – but to support this claim, Saumaise quotes the tenth-century Suidas and the early fifth-century Palladius, while the Edict of Caracalla (212 CE) is more or less contemporary with Tertullian's mock-oration.

[177] *Ibid.*, sig. a8[r]: '[Q]*uid habet hæc Apologia Pallij, quod non pure Grammaticum sit & Historicum?*'.

('qua chartas tuas concacasti'), must be genuine flowers of Theology'.[178] The theologians are those who lust after the grammarian's wives, the *artes humaniores*, while the grammarians do not in the least covet the bristly province of scholastic theology.[179] Enflamed by the rhetoric of 'Francus', Saumaise even concludes by claiming that when it comes to the true ancient theology, that of the Apostles and the Fathers, who spoke and wrote in Latin and Greek, that theology is the property of all Christians, and to be enjoyed especially by students of the ancient languages.[180] This move is, once again, at least a century old: Rhenanus, true to his friendship with Erasmus (a sworn enemy of scholasticism), had similarly used his edition of Tertullian to make the typical humanist case against scholastic theology.[181]

---

[178] *Ibid.*, sig. e1^{r}: '*Calumniæ, strophæ, conuitia, maledicta, circulatricis linguæ probra, cetera virulentiæ propudia, tota illa denique fœdissima proluuies oris impuri qua chartas tuas concacasti, Theologiæ meri flores essent*'. There is surely an allusion to Catullus's polemics against Volusius's 'cacata charta', in *Carmina* 36.1.

[179] *Ibid.*, sig. e2^{r}: '*Profecto si verum fatendum est, vos nimias interdum delicias facitis, & nimirum secure nos ludificatis, o Theologi. Nostras quippe passim corrumpitis ac permotilies uxores, artes istas dico quas colimus humaniores*'; sig. e3^{r}: '[S]*i de illa intelligis spinosa, & hispida Theologia, quam Scholastici profitentur, quæ & inde nomen accepit, nihil nobis cum ea rei sit, vos eam sine riualibus & æmulis amate, totamque si vultis habete vobis*'.

[180] *Ibid.*, sig. e3^{r-v}: '*Sin de illa etiam loqueris, vera, germana & antiqua Theologia,* […] *quam Apostoli prædicarunt, quam patres ab iis acceptam nobis tradiderunt, quo iure Theologis eam solis vindicare postulas, vt Christianis omnibus eripias?* […] *O Cercoeti si linguam tantum Aremoricam tuamque calleres, tam temere de legendis Græcis Latinisque patribus cogitares, quam frustra de intelligendis laborares. Qui linguam quam patres illi loquuti sunt, qua populum sunt alloquuti, qua denique scripserunt, melius etiam sciunt quam tu tuam maternam nosti, cur eos ab illorum scriptorum lectione prohibebis, quorum intellectum longe quam tu melius habere possunt?*'.

[181] John F. D'Amico, 'Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 71 (1980), 37-63.

Such vehemence bespeaks the fact that, as Petau perceived, Saumaise's edition was doing through antiquarian erudition exactly what Rhenanus and Reform-inclined humanists had done through eloquence a century earlier. Indeed, antiquarianism could also be very eloquent as a method of organizing and ordering knowledge. As Casaubon's fascination for writers like Tertullian and Dio Chrysostom suggests, antiquarianism and rhetoric could converge: while rhetoric worked on the *ordo verborum*, antiquarian learning functioned by establishing an *ordo rerum*.[182] What distinguished Saumaise from Marcile was precisely this 'Casaubonian' understanding of the transformative potential of grammatical and historical learning as a way to construct novel foundations of higher disciplines, be it philosophy or indeed theology. It is significant that, out of all the inchoate Casaubonian projects that Saumaise could have chosen to prove himself worthy of his ex-tutor, he picked Tertullian's mock-oration. *De Pallio* enabled Saumaise to outdo Casaubon by combining antiquarianism with the rhetorical and intellectual efficacy that was thought to inhere in the genre of 'satyre'. And yet this efficacy was double-edged. Saumaise's fashioning of the philosophical pallium into a polemical and indeed confessional trope could be turned against him: Petau wielded the same 'satyrical' weapons when he accused Saumaise of an insolence that was 'worthy of chastisement by a becloaked speech' ('palliato sermone castiganda'),[183] forcing him to reveal the underpinnings of his arguments. Tertullian's pallium had thus come to encapsulate the intellectual potentialities

[182] In Saumaise's case, Dirk van Miert has recently shown how his antiquarian philology could take the form both of a learned dissertation (the 1644 *Epistola ad Colvium*) and of a rhetorically patterned satire (the 1645 *Σπουδογέλοιος*) – in *The Emancipation of Biblical Philology in the Dutch Republic, 1590-1670* (Oxford, 2018), 185-191.

[183] [Petau], *Animadversorum Liber*, 94.

of antiquarianism as much as the heuristic role of polemics, in an age when scholarship was often at the service of the needs of confession.

5 Coda

Saumaise's philological insights exhausted the potential of scholarship for a long time. Another critical edition of the mock-oration would not appear until 1853.[184] And yet the pallium had a significant seventeenth-century afterlife as a polemical and confessional trope, which suggests that the boundaries of scholarship and other disciplines were not as solid as we might assume. Indeed, soon after its publication, Saumaise's dissertation on ancient dress was plagiarized: substantial sections of it were seamlessly woven into a neo-Latin prose satire by the Lutheran theologian Johann Georg Dorsche, fittingly entitled *Pallium Exulans*.[185] The recalcitrant antiquarianism that Saumaise had injected into his edition seems to have been no impediment to a smooth recasting of the dissertation into a more obviously 'literary' mould: scholarship had a rhetoric of its own that could easily migrate into other forms, and satire was one the best conduits for such transposition.

The intellectual potential of our rhetorical pallium also proved enduring. In the 1670s, the philosopher and theologian Nicholas Malebranche singled out *De Pallio* as an

[184] In Franz Oehler's edition of Tertullian's complete works – *Tertulliani Quae Supersunt Omnia*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1853), 1: 912-952.

[185] Johann Georg Dorsche, *Pallium Exulans in Possessionem Restitutum Satyra* ([Strasbourg], 1629): 141-182 of the 'Mantissa Philologica' correspond exactly to 8-35 of Saumaise, *DP*; 135-141 of 'Mantissa' combine 56-59 and 445-446 of *DP*; 128-135 of 'Mantissa' are 364-368 of *DP*; 'Mantissa', 127-128 correspond to *DP*, 209; 'Mantissa', 125-127 to *DP*, 321-322.

example of the work of a distempered imagination that dissociates language and the search for truth.[186] For Malebranche, the words of texts such as the mock-oration are but charms of conjurers intent on evoking phantasms which superficially persuade us of their truth, but which, once we approach to examine them, 'dissolve into smoke with all their trimmings and *éclat*'.[187] This evocation (and attempted exorcism) of the pallium suggests that the phantom's hold onto philosophy was still tenacious. Malebranche might disparage Tertullian's unreasoning 'érudition',[188] but the role of learning in philosophy remained

[186] Nicholas Malebranche, *Recherche de la Vérité*, ed. Geneviève Rodis-Lewis, 3 vols. (Paris, 1962-1964), 1: 343-344: 'Mais, quand le génie de la nation, la fantaisie de la mode qui regnoit en ce temps-là [i.e., Tertullian's time], & enfin la nature de la satire ou de la raillerie seroient capables de justifier en quelque maniére ce beau dessein de se rendre obscur et incompréhensible; tout cela ne pourroit excuser les méchantes raisons & l'égarement d'un Auteur, qui dans plusieurs autres de ses ouvrages aussi-bien que dans celui-ci [*De Pallio*], dit tout ce qui lui vient dans l'esprit; pourvû que ce soit quelque pensée extraordinaire, & qu'il ait quelque expression hardie par laquelle il espére faire parade de la force, ou pour mieux dire, du déréglement de son imagination'. These comments are briefly analysed by Julie Walsh, 'Confusing Faith and Reason?', in Plínio J. Smith and Sébastien Charles, eds., *Academic Scepticism in the Development of Early Modern Philosophy* (Switzerland, 2017), 181-212, 198-199.

[187] *Ibid.*, 341: 'Par exemple, le tour des parolles de Tertullien, de Sénèque, de Montaigne, & de quelques autres, a tant de charmes et tant d'éclat, qu'il ébloüit l'esprit de la plûpart des gens, quoi que ce ne soit qu'une faible peinture, & comme l'ombre de l'imagination de ces Auteurs. Leurs paroles toutes mortes qu'elles sont, ont plus de vigueur que la raison de certaines gens. Elles entrent, elles pénetrent, elles dominent dans l'ame d'une maniére si impérieuse, quelles se font obéïr sans se faire entendre, & qu'on se rend à leurs ordres sans les sçavoir. On veut croire mais on ne sçait que croire: car lorsqu'on veut sçavoir précisément ce qu'on croit, ou ce qu'on veut croire; & qu'on s'approche, pour ainsi dire, de ces fantômes pour les reconnoître, ils s'en vont souvent en fumée avec tout leur appareil et tout leur éclat'.

[188] *Ibid.*, 342: 'Tertullien étoit à la verité un homme d'une profonde érudition, mais il avoit plus de mémoire que de jugement, plus de pénétration & plus d'étenduë d'imagination, que de pénétration & d'étenduë d'esprit'. On the downgrading of memory and 'érudition' in the Enlightenment, see

pervasive, just as philosophy itself was still enmeshed in confessional strife.[189] Similarly, at the end of the century Pierre Bayle would deplore, in his *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, the vehemence with which Saumaise and Petau had waged their war.[190] And yet, as we have seen, their vehemence was not only dictated by the satirical material on which they were battling, but it was also expedient in their search for truth.

With Malebranche and Bayle we rightly have the impression of being in a different age – one in which, at least nominally, satire and rhetoric appeared at odds with knowledge, and perhaps better understood as 'literature'. And yet we should be wary about identifying here the birth of an irenic 'Enlightenment', for the polemical pallium proved to be very longaevous. A manuscript marginalia in an early life of Jonathan Swift tells us that, as late as the 1690s, the young Swift was reading and excerpting Tertullian before writing his *Tale of a Tub* (1704)[191] – a major satire in the English literary canon. There, hidden in plain sight and so far unrecognized, Tertullian's pallium reappears as the central trope structuring Swift's attack on confessions beyond the pale of the Anglican Church: the humble cloak of primitive Christianity, as in Saumaise's dissertation, is shown undergoing

---

Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Reason and Reasonableness in French Ecclesiastical Scholarship', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 74/3 (2011), 401-436.

[189] See Dmitri Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640-1700* (Cambridge, 2015).

[190] 'La Guerre qu'ils se firent fut très-longue & très-violente […] C'est dommage qu'ils n'aient pas écrit avec moins d'emportement', in *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, 5th ed., 4 vols. (Amsterdam, Leiden, La Haye, Utrecht, 1740), 3: 690.

[191] The manuscript note is by John Lyon (Swift's guardian during his final years of senility), in his copy of John Hawkesworth's *Life of the Revd. Jonathan Swift* (Dublin, 1755), 20 – now in the Forster Collection in the National Art Library, V&A Museum (London), NAL 48. D. 39.

the corruptions of secular fashions before a Reformation at least partially restores its original shape. While Swift's own restyling of the pallium lies beyond the scope of this article, the very presence of the cloak in his satire intimates that not just early modern scholarship was shaped by the dynamics of confessional polemics, but also modern 'literature'.[192] It is only through this recognition that we can reach a more nuanced understanding of the interaction of learning and rhetoric, and overcome the post-factum disciplinary boundaries that we use to define them, and that were themselves fashioned in a polemical context.

Acknowledgements:

I am very grateful to William Poole and Nicholas Hardy, as well as to the two anonymous reviewers, for corrections and suggestions on preliminary versions of this article. I would also like to thank the organizers and the audience of the Cambridge Seminar for Early Modern Scholarship and Religion, where I presented some of this research in March 2019. This research was generously funded by the Clarendon Fund and Merton College, Oxford.

[192] For a preliminary discussion of 'literature' and 'confessionalization', see Ute Lotz-Heumann and Matthias Pohlig, 'Confessionalization and Literature in the Empire, 1555-1700', in *Central European History* 40 (2007), 35-61; for a compelling treatment ot the topic, see now Alexander Wright, 'William Cave and the Fortunes of *Historia Literaria* in England' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2018).