THE *ARS CRITICA* IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

N. J. S. HARDY

Abstract

‘The *ars critica* in early modern England’
N. J. S. Hardy
University College
DPhil in English
Submitted in the Long Vacation, 2012

This thesis surveys and interprets the discipline of humanist philology in England in the seventeenth century, with a focus on the period before the Restoration. Its main sources are editions of and commentaries on ancient texts by British humanists (who in some cases were Irish or Scottish, but published in England); historical and philological treatises; correspondence; and manuscript drafts and notes. It extends recent studies on late Renaissance humanist textual criticism and exegesis into the relatively untrodden territory of the British Isles, but it also revises some of the guiding presuppositions of those studies.

Firstly, it shifts scholarly focus from the practices of humanist critics to their overarching sense of method. This produces an emphasis on the substantial intellectual differences that divided humanists from each other: over the use of manuscripts and conjectural emendation, for instance. It also complicates the relationship between humanists and theologians, by showing that many, but not all, humanists were more invested in theological modes of reading than has previously been thought; and that theologians produced major works of philological scholarship.

Secondly, it interrogates and heavily qualifies the notion that humanist criticism was a historical discipline. It does so by showing that the goals of humanists remained literary-critical as well as historical, well into the seventeenth century, and that they understood their discipline as operating within a broadly Aristotelian philosophical system that did not always lend itself to an understanding of historical particularity or context. Furthermore, their model of sacred history relied on an enduring and robust typological framework that did not disappear with the onset of humanism.

Finally, it demonstrates closer affinities between British and continental philology than have been recognized in the past, by showing that humanism across Europe was turning to biblical criticism and patristic scholarship, not only in England. The intellectual and ideological pressure this turn induced, however, along with the rise of new disciplines that owed little to philological research, caused criticism to recede from its central place in English culture during the middle of the century.

Acknowledgements

I have incurred many debts in the process of researching and writing this thesis. First of all, to the staff of several libraries: principally the Bodleian, but also the British Library; the Cambridge University Library; Trinity College and St. John's College, Cambridge; Queen's, University, Wadham, and Worcester Colleges, Oxford; the Leiden University Library; the Amsterdam University Library; the Royal Library of The Hague; and the Vatican Library. During my travels in the Netherlands, Kasper van Ommen of the Scaliger Institute, Astrid Balsem and Theo Dunkelgrün were exceptionally hospitable, not to mention helpful on a scholarly level. Theo has been a constant and generous guide to European, and particularly Dutch, humanism since the first year of my doctoral studies. I received very generous funding for my Scaliger Fellowship at Leiden from the Scaliger Institute there, without which I could not have completed my work on Patrick Young, and similarly generous funding from the Bodleian Library's Centre for the Study of the Book, to visit the Vatican. I would also like to thank the University of Oxford for providing me with the Passmore Edwards Studentship that funded me throughout my DPhil programme.

For academic assistance of many different kinds, I am very grateful to Daniel Blank, Warren Boutcher, James Carley, Tania Demetriou, Mordechai Feingold, Dmitri Levitin, Jan Machielsen, Timothy Macholz, Noel Malcolm, Dirk van Miert, Adam Mowl, Kathryn Murphy, Henk Nellen, David Norbrook, William Poole, Richard Serjeantson, Grant Tapsell, Rowan Tomlinson, Gerald Toomer and Joanna Weinberg. Thomas Roebuck was a regular source of guidance who helped me shape my work in the first year of my research. Jeffrey Miller's constant encouragement and profound knowledge of early modern theology, among other fields, have improved this thesis immensely. Karen Collis's expertise in the learned cultures of the early Enlightenment, as well as biblical Hebrew, has been indispensable. I am lucky to count her as a friend and colleague.

I have received kind and constructive criticism from two scholars whose work on the history of English scholarship and literary culture has seldom left my side. Scott Mandelbrote read and offered very helpful comments on drafts of several chapters, and Kristine Haugen responded to an eighty-thousand word draft with a rare combination of conceptual clarity and eye-watering attention to detail.

There are two academics without whom this thesis would be inconceivable. The first is Tony Grafton. It has been written in constant dialogue with his studies of late humanist scholarship, in particular of Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon. Since his Visiting Fellowship at Merton College in Trinity Term, 2010, he has personally encouraged and supported my work, with an extraordinary level of generosity towards someone to whom he had no professional or institutional obligations. Finally, I must thank my supervisor, Rhodri Lewis. His calls for clarity and rigour have taught me how to write academic prose and express myself using argumentation rather than suggestion. No less importantly, his intellectual open-mindedness has done more than anything else to expand my horizons for the study of English literature.

Contents

Introduction

I. European criticism after Scaliger

1. Criticism in theory and practice
    i. Criticism, grammar, and the classical tradition
    ii. Aristotelianism and the encyclopaedia
    iii. Criticism and the Judeo-Christian heritage
    iv. Sceptics and philosophers
    v. The political, social, and institutional context

II. New horizons

1. Antiquarian philology and the Scaliger paradigm
    i. William Camden
    ii. John Selden

2. Changing models of patristic scholarship and ecclesiastical history
    i. Thomas James
    ii. Henry Savile and the Eton Chrysostom
    iii. Casaubon's *Exercitationes*
    iv. Richard Montagu

3. John Bois and early biblical criticism
    i. Bois and the King James Bible
    ii. Bois's reception and the confessionalization of Christian antiquity

4. Philology in Selden's *Historie of Tithes*
    i. Selden's concept of philology
    ii. Ecclesiastical history and disputation
    iii. Criticism, antiquity, and modernity
    iv. Typology

5. Patrick Young and Christian antiquity
    i. Greek studies and the early Church
    ii. Young's collaboration with John Bois
    iii. Criticism and ecclesiology

6. New Testament criticism and the limits of secularization
    i. John Price, English classicist
    ii. The turn to the New Testament

III. Radicalization, institutionalization, and collapse

1. The Septuagint
    i. Jean Morin, Louis Cappel, and the Ussher circle

ii. Patrick Young, the Septuagint, and the limits of humanist philology

2. Early Christian ecclesiology and the controversy over Ignatius

3. The marginalization of humanist philology

Conclusion

Till of late years England was as free from Criticks, as it is from Wolves.

– Thomas Rymer, preface to René Rapin, *Reflections on Aristotle* (1674).

Introduction

This is a study of a discipline whose contribution to intellectual life in seventeenth-century England has been almost forgotten. It was known at the time as 'philology' or 'criticism,' and occasionally as 'humane letters,' or simply 'literature.' Each of these terms had slightly different nuances and suggested slightly different methods, preoccupations, and objects of study; but common features unite them, and make it possible to write the history of philology and its cognates as a unified whole. These include the fact that works of philology were written in Latin for an erudite, pan-European, multi-confessional audience. Such works were identified as somehow distinct from theology, philosophy, narrative history and civil, ecclesiastical, or common law; but they were often considered as subsidiaries to these genres, providing the collected and refined information about ancient texts on which they could build normative arguments and conclusions. Sometimes they were editions of and commentaries on specific works or authors, but sometimes they were synthetic treatises dealing with a particular question concerning a custom or doctrine from the ancient world.

The narrowest definitions of the *ars critica* limited it to the editing and correction of ancient texts, usually from manuscript. But this was just the surface: to practise this kind of criticism required an ever more sophisticated and encyclopaedic understanding of ancient history and literature. Great critics such as Scaliger, Grotius, and John Selden were the academic heroes of their era, comfortably as famous as Descartes, Galileo, Bacon, or Hobbes.

Although philology within the British Isles has largely been neglected by scholars,

philology as a whole has not. It has featured within several different historiographical traditions, from the histories of national literatures, to those of classical reception, science, or political thought. In recent decades, it has even acquired a sub-discipline of its own: namely, the history of scholarship. In order to set out the positions and methods of this study in relation to previous scholarship, I will begin by analysing each of these traditions in turn, starting with literary history.

Under the umbrella term 'literary history,' I denote histories of literary criticism written by scholars in modern languages and English literature departments, but also histories of what has come, in recent decades, to be called 'classical reception,' often written by scholars trained as classicists.[1] Students of classical reception, however, have tended to concentrate more on original literary compositions as instances of 'reception' of the classics, and less on the way in which the classics were 'received' by professional or semi-professional scholars.[2] A great deal of work has been done on Milton, for instance, but it has dealt largely with issues of poetics and intertextuality in poems such as *Paradise Lost*, rather than with his use of contemporary philological techniques in his Latin prose.[3] This points

---

[1] For the former, see Joel Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1908); René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, 8 vols. (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955-1992); idem, *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963); Bernard Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance* (University of Chicago Press, 1961); Baxter Hathaway, *The Age of Criticism: The Late Renaissance in Italy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962); Glyn Norton, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume Three: the Renaissance* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), and H. B. Nisbet and Claude Rawson, eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume Four: The Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1997). The latter devotes more attention to 'criticism' as it was defined during the late Renaissance than the former: see in particular Douglas Lane Patey, 'The Institution of Criticism in the Eighteenth Century,' pp. 3-4. The same is true of another study of the eighteenth century: see Jack Lynch, *The Age of Elizabeth in the Age of Johnson* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 6-15.

[2] See, for instance, Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, eds., *Shakespeare and the Classics* (Cambridge University Press, 2004); Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Colin Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); Victoria Moul, *Jonson, Horace, and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge University Press, 2010); and, more generally, David Hopkins, *Conversing with Antiquity: English Poets and the Classics, from Shakespeare to Pope* (Oxford University Press, 2010).

[3] Charles Martindale, *John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic* (London: Croom Helm, 1986); Stella Revard, *Milton and the Tangles of Neaera's Hair: the Making of the 1645* Poems (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997); Estelle Haan, *From* Academia *to* Amicitia*: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998).

to another bias within the field, in favour of interactions between classical and vernacular texts rather than between classical and neo-Latin ones.[4]

This bias may well be a product of the way in which classical reception has related to the discipline of English literature. Rather than forming new canons, studies of classical reception in the Renaissance have largely preserved existing canons of vernacular texts: hence, within English literature, more (and better) studies have been written of Shakespeare and Milton's vernacular works than of other authors. Scholars of vernacular literature are becoming more aware of the importance of neo-Latin composition during the period, however, and this study should help to further that process.[5]

A second tradition within literary history of relevance to this study is the history of literary criticism. In the British context, only a limited range of works has been identified as falling into the category of literary criticism.[6] This category often includes vernacular treatises on poetry such as Sir Philip Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*; prefaces to vernacular texts such as Sir John Harington's to his translation of Ariosto, or Ben Jonson's to some of his plays; or historical surveys of English literary authors, such as the one offered by Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia*. This list illustrates the paucity of what might plausibly pass for literary criticism during the English Renaissance. This absence of literary-critical

---

[4] The groundwork for studies in the latter category has been laid by the magisterial survey of J. W. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin Writings of the Age* (Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990). On neo-Latin literature as a whole, see J. Ijsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*, 2 vols. (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1990-1998).

[5] See, in addition to Moul (2010) and Haan (1998), Jane Stevenson, *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford University Press, 2005); and Philip Ford and Roger Green, eds., *George Buchanan: Poet and Dramatist* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2009).

[6] For anthologies and studies focusing on Britain, see Brian Vickers, ed., *English Renaissance Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999); Gavin Alexander, ed., *Sidney's* The Defence of Poesy *and selected Renaissance Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004); and William Russell, 'The Invention of the Critic in England, 1570-1640' (unpublished PhD dissertation: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009).

texts has been filled using texts from another, very closely connected discipline: rhetoric, a fundamental part of Renaissance education. Scholars have looked to the rhetorical tradition as a substitute for literary criticism, with its canons of eloquence, advocacy of classical imitation, and broad applicability to a range of literary forms beyond the political or judicial oration.[7] Rhetorical analyses of texts, along with prescriptive textbooks of rhetoric, have understandably been treated as works of literary criticism in all but name, and histories of rhetoric have made immense contributions to our understanding of how modern conceptions of 'literature' were shaped over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[8] They have also allowed literary historians to extend their work into other fields, such as political and religious writing, on the grounds that rhetorical principles underpinned techniques of composition in every area of intellectual endeavour during the period.[9]

The discipline of philology is equally crucial to the history of literary criticism, but is comparatively overlooked. In fact, the very term 'critic,' while it came to denote a figure with special expertise in judging literary texts such as poems, plays, and works of prose fiction, originated in late humanist philology. Philologists were regarded not only as expert historians, but also as expert judges of the stylistic and aesthetic qualities of texts. There was not yet a sense of any divergence or discrepancy between 'historical' and

---

[7] See Marijke Spies, *Rhetoric, Rhetoricians, and Poets: Studies in Renaissance Poetry and Poetics* (Amsterdam University Press, 1999); Arthur Kinney, *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986); Wayne Rebhorn, *The Emperor of Men's Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); and Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[8] See Edward A. Malone, ed., *British Rhetoricians and Logicians, 1500-1660*, 2 vols. (Detroit: Gale Group, 2001-2003); Heinrich Plett, *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004); and, most recently, Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380-1620* (Oxford University Press, 2011).

[9] David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, rhetoric and politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).

'literary' criticism; in fact, such qualifying terms were not used during the period.[10] There are interesting connections between the early seventeenth-century critics who are the objects of this study, and the later seventeenth-century critics, such as John Dryden, who adapted this term and some of the methods it presupposed for their own ends. Even when they rejected the models of criticism followed by earlier scholars, this rejection was a highly conscious and often aggressive one. Criticism in its philological guise, moreover, was treated as separate from the discipline of rhetoric, although critical and rhetorical judgements sometimes overlapped. This study, then, forms part of the history of literary criticism, insofar as it provides a history of the other, non-rhetorical side of its genealogy.

Literary studies have shared their preoccupation with rhetoric with another tradition: the history of political thought.[11] The work of influential historians of political thought, such as Quentin Skinner and J. G. A. Pocock, has always been attentive to the rhetorical conventions used by early-modern political theorists, who participated vigorously in the literary cultures of Renaissance humanism.[12] They have been similarly concerned with the ways in which political thinkers deployed their classical and medieval erudition.[13] Pocock, in particular, has shown that early-modern political thought, especially in Britain, was rooted in historical research.[14] Political arguments were shaped and decided more often by

---

[10] As noted by Patey (1997), p. 7.

[11] This is noted by Mark Goldie, 'The context of the *Foundations*,' in *Rethinking* The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, ed. Annabel Brett and James Tully (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 6.

[12] See Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), although the importance of philology as well as rhetoric is acknowledged in the section on Hobbes's humanist works from pp. 238-44; and J. G. A. Pocock, *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on political thought and history* (London: Methuen, 1972).

[13] See Jacob Soll, *Publishing the Prince: History, reading, and the birth of political criticism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), p. 2: 'Central to the understanding of the rise of political criticism between the Renaissance and Enlightenment is the story of humanist erudite practices and their consequences.'

[14] J. G. A. Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: a study of English historical thought in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge University Press, 1957; reissued with a retrospect in 1987). See also, more recently, Dmitri Levitin, 'Matthew Tindal's *Rights of the Christian Church* (1706) and the Church-State Relationship,' *Historical Journal* 54.3 (2011), pp. 717-40.

appeals to historical precedents than to abstract reason. As a result, historians of political thought have ended up paying a great deal of attention to how historical research was conducted during this period, and they have inevitably written about many of the figures who feature in this study. Above all, their focus has been on the historical study of English law and politics. They have had more to say about antiquarian research and the work of ecclesiastical historians than about the philological study of the classical past and Judeo-Christian antiquity.

This study offers two corrections to this tradition. The first is to point out the importance of biblical criticism and the study of the Church Fathers within early-modern English political thought, broadly construed. Much of John Selden's work, for instance, is shown to have been more controversial and politically significant in these fields than it was in the field of English legal history, in spite of what historians of political thought have written about Selden.

The second correction will prove more important and more contentious. It is that the discipline of philology became so specialized that it was beginning to assert its independence from political theory altogether. This is not to say that philologists lacked political motivations, that their work failed to have political ramifications, or that its subject matter was not political: rather, it is to say that their claims began to be assessed purely on the basis of their underlying philological methods, rather than on the basis of the visions of politics which they implied. The work of Selden, for example, was attacked by various opponents. These attacks may have been politically motivated; but the methods they used to attack Selden were, like Selden's own, largely philological.[15]

[15] See II.4, below.

In other words, this study exploits the fact that the marriage between political thought and historiography was rather less comfortable than the marriage between political thought and rhetoric. Historians have had little trouble incorporating rhetoric into their accounts of political thought as a genre, because rhetoric is motivated discourse. As its classical and Renaissance theorists noted, it demanded to be used to serve political ends. This is less true of historical writing. My thesis uses the history of criticism as an invitation to historians of political thought to consider very carefully the rigorous disciplinary distinctions which were made within British humanism, and articulated with more and more force as the seventeenth century wore on: to define 'political thought' according to what served as political thought at the time it was uttered, written, or published. They may find, if they do so, that the number of seventeenth-century writers whom they can legitimately class as 'political thinkers,' rather than as historians or critics, will decrease considerably.[16] They will probably be able to salvage Thomas Hobbes, but they are less likely to be able to reclaim John Selden.

Theology offers a different case from political thought. The domination of English and continental intellectual life by the queen of the sciences extended to philological research.[17] In that sense, this study responds to recent work by historians of religion on the

---

[16] See William Bulman, 'Constantine's Enlightenment: Culture and Religious Politics in the Early British Empire, c. 1648-1710' (PhD dissertation: Princeton University, 2009), p. 160: 'To discuss the ideological contours of the period solely in terms of the anachronistic notion of "political thought," or the disciplines of philosophy and theology, is insufficient and often misleading.' Similarly, Pocock (1987), p. 258, has conceded that historians of political thought have a tendency to 'unify' the 'extreme plurality of its subject matter.'

[17] See, above all, François Laplanche, *L'Ecriture, le sacré et l'histoire: érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVIIe Siècle* (Amsterdam: APA-Holand University Press, 1986). The subservience of much political thought to theology is acknowledged by Pocock, but by few other historians of political thought. See 'A discourse of sovereignty: observations on the work in progress,' in Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 381: 'The great discovery which we constantly make and remake as historians is that English political debate is recurrently subordinate to English political theology; and few of us know one-tenth of the theology available to competently trained divines and laymen among our predecessors.'

intellectual methods of academic theologians during this period.[18] They have been conscious of the importance of neo-Latin texts, which allowed theologians to communicate and debate with their continental counterparts, but also to make more controversial utterances than they were able to in the vernacular; and of the importance of the philological and historical study of the sacred and ecclesiastical past, alongside the continuing prominence of other, more systematic approaches to theology.[19]

One scholar's work stands out within this field and has influenced nearly every section of this study: that of Jean-Louis Quantin, whose account of how the Fathers were read in seventeenth-century England and used in theological debates will prove seminal once other historians have had time to absorb its findings.[20] Quantin has been able to show how patristic texts acquired an increasing prominence in relation to the Bible within the Church of England, and how this new emphasis on the Fathers was shaped by the methods of humanist philology and the scholarly protocols of the neo-Latinate European republic of letters, as well as by theological method and insular religio-political factors.

If there is one slightly under-historicized aspect of Quantin's work, however, it is perhaps the notion that 'patristic scholarship' was a separate entity from humanist criticism as a whole, which had its own specialized practitioners from a very early stage. This study aims to revise this notion by offering a historical account of the slow and incremental

---

[18] Especially Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[19] The work of Sarah Mortimer exemplifies these trends: see *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). See also Milton (1995), pp. 6-7; Gerard Reedy, *The Bible and Reason: Anglicans and Scripture in late seventeenth-century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); and John Spurr, '"A special kindness for dead bishops": the Church, history, and testimony in seventeenth-century Protestantism,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), pp. 313-34.

[20] *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford University Press, 2009).

development of patristic scholarship over the course of the seventeenth century up to the Restoration. It shows that at first, most of the scholars who worked on patristic texts were equally interested in secular literary studies, and that only one or two figures from this early period deserve to be placed within the category of 'patristic scholar.' Furthermore, that category implied not only a set of scholarly methods and preoccupations, but also a doctrinal position regarding the value of the Fathers in theological controversy which few of the philologists who studied them actually possessed. Once again we come up against the stumbling-block of early modern disciplinary specialization: by presenting 'patristic scholarship' as a sub-domain of theology, we risk understating the extent to which scholars ignored or even actively rebelled against theological modes of reading. On the whole, however, I can only claim to nuance and deepen, rather than overturn, Quantin's account of patristic scholarship, and I eagerly await his next publication in this area.[21]

In the twentieth century, some of the earliest contributions to the history of Renaissance philology were made within a now-outmoded genre: that of the sweeping history of classical scholarship.[22] These were written by practising classical scholars who had taken an interest in earlier figures within their own discipline, often starting with the very earliest

---

[21] On 'the growth of patristic scholarship in seventeenth-century England': promised in Quantin (2009), p. 20. See, for now, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588-1613),' in Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle, eds., *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008); 'Les jésuites et l'érudition anglicane,' *XVII^e Siècle* 237 (2007), pp. 691-711; 'L'Orthodoxie, la censure et la gloire: la difficile édition princeps de l'epître de Barnabé, de Rome à Amsterdam (1549-1646),' in M. Cortesi, ed., *'Editiones principes' delle opere dei Padri greci e latini* (Florence: Galluzzo, 2006); 'Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity,' in C. R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin, eds., *History of Scholarship* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

[22] See Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *History of Classical Scholarship*, trans. Alan Harris (London: Duckworth, 1982); J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, 3 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1903-1908); Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); idem, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); and L. D. Reynolds and Nigel Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: a guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature* (Oxford University Press, 1991). On a smaller scale, see E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); and Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, trans. Glenn Most (University of Chicago Press, 2005).

instances of philological research within antiquity itself, such as the scholar-poets of Hellenistic Alexandria. They largely ignored the middle ages, before offering a routine account of the revival of classical learning during the Italian Renaissance and its continuation in sixteenth-century France. Britain was overlooked, because it was difficult to identify British classicists whose interests paralleled those of modern classicists. The British Isles produced very few editions of canonical Greek and Latin authors such as Homer, the Attic tragedians, Virgil, and Horace.[23] Before Richard Bentley, the British were said to have been more interested in sacred texts than in classical ones: in Pattison's memorable phrase, any promising scholars were inevitably sucked into the 'theological vortex.'[24]

This study, however, demonstrates that the seventeenth-century notion of the classical was very different from the one entertained by these historians of classical scholarship. Classical learning was, in fact, a valued part of scholarly research in seventeenth-century Britain, but it was nearly always brought to bear on texts which we might not, today, consider 'classical': the Bible, above all, but also the works of the Fathers of the Church, as well as post-biblical Jewish literature and the literatures of other oriental cultures. The absence of editions of Virgil does not mean that he was not studied at the most advanced level: rather, canonical classical authors were put to purposes alien from those of modern classical studies.

Finally, we can move on to the most important tradition which bears on the history of

---

[23] See e.g. Wilamowitz (1982), p. 77.

[24] Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon* (London, 1875), p. 333.

philology: namely, the history of scholarship.[25] Like the grand histories of classical scholarship surveyed above, it was initially practised by classicists. The great Arnaldo Momigliano, for instance, continues to exert his influence over this field, not only through his own publications, but also those of his students.[26] These, however, have tended to specialize in the history of scholarship in its own right, rather than dividing their work between it and classics *per se*. Within this tradition, the most influential figure has been Anthony Grafton. This study, in fact, originated in a reading of Grafton's work on Joseph Scaliger, which remains the most revealing and important study of a classical scholar ever written.[27] In the first place, Scaliger was a critical figure in the development of philology within Britain, and stands at the beginning of the period covered by this study. In a broader sense, however, this thesis takes as its point of departure Grafton's work in the round. Grafton began his career by pointing out that professional classicists might not be very well equipped to write histories of classical scholarship: they were too inclined to judge the work of earlier scholars, and even define earlier conceptions of the classical, according to modern standards.[28] Their methods were not historical enough: they showed no sensitivity to the way in which early modern scholars defined 'scholarship' as a field. These fundamental perceptions have had profound and inspiring consequences: perhaps most notably, that the early modern conception of the classical tradition was far more

---

[25] For an excellent survey of the discipline, see the introduction to Ligota and Quantin, eds. (2006). See also Constanze Güthenke, 'Shop Talk. Reception studies and recent work in the history of scholarship,' *Classical Receptions* 1 (2009), pp. 104-115.

[26] Above all the seminal essay, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13.3/4 (1950), pp. 285-315. For responses to this and other aspects of Momigliano's work, see the special issue, 'The Presence of the Historian: Essays in memory of Arnaldo Momigliano,' *History and Theory* 30.4 (1991); Michael Crawford and C. R. Ligota, eds., *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London: Warburg Institute, 1995); and Peter Miller, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (University of Toronto Press, 2007), particularly Ingo Herklotz, 'Arnaldo Momigliano's "Ancient History and the Antiquarian": a Critical Review.'

[27] Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983-93).

[28] See his review of Kenney (1974): 'From Politian to Pasquali,' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977), pp. 171-6.

ecumenical than our own, incorporating Jewish and oriental antiquity with Greco-Roman culture.[29] The foundation of classics as a modern discipline in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was predicated on an occidentalist and secularizing restriction of the classical canon which classicists have only recently begun to overturn.[30] It also relied on a more reductive approach to periodization than that of seventeenth-century scholars. As this study reveals, the modern tendency to distinguish hierarchically between classical, Hellenistic, and late antique Greek literature was not shared by seventeenth-century critics.

This is where multiple aspects of Momigliano's legacy converge. As well as opening a path for the establishment of the history of scholarship as an independent discipline, he also helped to pave the way for historians of the Hellenistic period and of late antiquity to reevaluate and even collapse the qualitative distinctions traditionally made between these eras.[31] In doing so, moreover, he showed that the classical heritage of the modern western world had been irreversibly shaped by its encounter with Judaism and Christianity.[32] In fact, this study owes more to Momigliano's work in this field than it does to his work on the history of historiography. It shows that classical scholarship in the seventeenth century was orientated precisely around this convergence of Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christian culture.

As far as Momigliano's work on the history of scholarship is concerned, one of his interests in particular has endured: that is, a concern for the development of historical

---

[29] Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a forgotten chapter in Renaissance scholarship* (Harvard University Press, 2010).

[30] Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity: from Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971).

[31] See, for example, 'The Fault of the Greeks,' *Daedalus* 104.2 (1975), pp. 9-19.

[32] 'The Greeks and Us,' *New York Review of Books*, October 16, 1975; and *Alien Wisdom: the limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge University Press, 1975).

method. Momigliano and others have argued that the disciplines of classical philology and antiquarian study of the past, encompassing material culture as well as texts, thrived during the Renaissance and were eventually incorporated into the genre of narrative, political history in the work of Edward Gibbon.[33] A corollary of this is the argument that philological and antiquarian research gave the Renaissance its sense that the past was a foreign country, whose customs and ways of thinking were different from modern ones.[34] This led to the Enlightenment and its notion of modernity as a comprehensive break from the norms of antiquity or the middle ages: the classical past was eventually stripped of its normative value and regarded as something alien from the present.[35] As a result, a great deal of care has been taken to locate moments of 'historicism' within Renaissance scholarship: moments when scholars realized, and argued publicly, that it was anachronistic to judge the past according to present-day standards, and vice versa. These moments were produced by interactions between philology and various disciplines,

---

[33] This is the central thesis of Momigliano (1950), taken up by the various responses to that essay cited above. See, in addition, J. G. A. Pocock's extraordinary study of Gibbon, *Barbarism and Religion*, 5 vols. to date (Cambridge University Press, 1999-), vol. II of which is dedicated in memory of Momigliano.

[34] See Pocock (1957); George Huppert, 'The Renaissance Background of Historicism,' *History and Theory* 5.1 (1966), pp. 48-60; Donald Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970); Anthony Grafton, 'Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.4 (1985), pp. 615-49; and, from the point of view of a literary scholar, Victoria Kahn, 'Humanism and the Resistance to Theory,' in Patricia Parker and David Quint, eds., *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986). Luc Deitz gives a critique of Grafton's valorization of 'historical' moments in humanist philology in his review of *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Texts and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997): 'To Corinth and Back,' *Arion* 9.3 (2002), pp. 124-5, 131-2. For a slightly different account which incorporates the humanism-centric narrative of historicism within a longer timespan, see Samuel Moyn, 'Amos Funkenstein on the Theological Origins of Historicism,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64.4 (2003), 639-48. For older precedents, see Erwin Panofsky, 'Renaissance and Renascences,' *The Kenyon Review* 6.2 (1944), especially pp. 225-6; and E. M. Sanford, 'The Study of Ancient History in the Middle Ages,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 5 (1944), pp. 21-43.

[35] Joseph Levine has written at length about this shift: see *The Autonomy of History: Truth and Method from Erasmus to Gibbon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), especially vii-x, p. 22 n. 63. See also Anthony Grafton, 'The Identities of History in Early Modern Europe: Prelude to a Study of the *Artes Historicae*,' in Gianna Pomata and Nancy G. Siraisi, eds., *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005), esp. pp. 47-50; the much less cautious treatment by Richard Popkin of 'Cartesianism and Biblical Criticism' in Thomas W. Lennon, John M. Nicholas and John W. Davis, eds., *Problems of Cartesianism* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1982); and Bulman (2009), esp. p. 222. An excellent survey of the scholarship in this area will be offered by Dmitri Levitin, 'From Sacred History to the History of Religion: Paganism, Judaism and Christianity in European historiography from Reformation to "Enlightenment,"' forthcoming in 2012. I would like to thank Dr. Levitin for allowing me to read this review article in advance.

whether theology (leading to a number of claims connecting historical research with secularization), political science, law, or literature.[36]

This search for historicism, however, offers the most powerful example of the limitations of the history of scholarship as it is practised today. It has had few critics, with Zachary Schiffman a particularly noteworthy exception; and he has addressed his work to wider audiences than merely historians of Renaissance philology, without delving very deeply into the intricacies of that field.[37] First of all, historians have more commonly studied individual scholars than groups of them, institutions of scholarship, or the status of the discipline as a whole.[38] Although some biographical studies involve detailed reconstruction of institutions and networks, not enough work has been done on the way in which discoveries and methodological innovations made by individuals were recognized as innovative by their peers, and became absorbed into scholarly practice on a wider basis. Often, in fact, what modern historians have identified as moments of 'historicism' were never acknowledged as such at the time by early modern authors or their readers. At other times, critics undeniably did discuss the status of their work as 'history' and the relationship between 'history' and the truth-claims of disciplines such as theology. However, this frequently happened in debates between humanists where the very meaning

---

[36] On secularization, see Laplanche (1986), p. 327; and, most recently, Mark Somos, *Secularization and the Leiden Circle* (Leiden: Brill, 2011). Peter Miller argues that early modern antiquarianism was inherently secularizing, whether its practitioners recognized it or not: 'The "Antiquarianization" of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62.3 (2001), pp. 464-5.

[37] See, above all, 'Renaissance Historicism Reconsidered,' *History and Theory* 24.2 (1985), pp. 170-82; but also *On the Threshold of Modernity: Relativism in the French Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), and, most recently, *The Birth of the Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011; with foreword by Anthony Grafton), especially pp. 209-10.

[38] For exceptions, see Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities,' in Nicholas Tyacke, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford, Volume Four: Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); Anthony Grafton, *Athenae Batavae: the Research Imperative at Leiden, 1575-1650* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2003); Kristine Haugen's review of William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (University of Chicago Press, 2006): 'Academic Charisma and the Old Regime,' *History of Universities* 22.1 (2007), pp. 199-228; and Nancy Siraisi, *History, Medicine, and the Traditions of Renaissance Learning* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007), esp. p. 262.

of the term ‘history’ was at stake; and ‘historicism’ did not always and inevitably triumph over conceptions of history that modern historians would refuse to acknowledge as their own.

This study attempts to distinguish more carefully between different forms of historicism, in accordance with the longer-term impact they had on the discipline of philology. It concentrates heavily on the reception of individual works of philology, drawing on correspondence, marginal annotations, and other manuscript evidence, as well as citations of philological works in printed texts. By studying groups of scholars, and their sense of themselves as sharing in (or, just as often, disagreeing over) a common enterprise, it attempts to avoid the casual praise or blame of individuals for reaching, or failing to reach, a modern standard of ‘historicism’ in their research. In short, it deals with the institutionalization of criticism, which took more than one form in Britain in the period studied.[39]

One result of its focus on institutionalization is that this study may appear more insular than others in the same field. Historians of scholarship have often taken a pan-European approach, exploring the way in which philological problems were solved by particular scholars regardless of their national or confessional affiliations. At its worst, this approach can lead to a reification of the concept of the ‘republic of letters’ as a fundamentally supranational, cosmopolitan network: relationships between scholars are said not only to

[39] Historians of British scholarship and education could learn from Dutch scholars in this respect. See in particular *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Theodoor Herman Lunsingh Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes (Leiden: Brill, 1975); and H. J. de Jonge, ‘The Study of the New Testament in the Dutch Universities, 1575-1700,’ *History of Universities* 1 (1981), pp. 113-30.

have crossed political and religious boundaries, but to have transcended them.[40] At times this idea underwrites a teleology of Enlightenment, especially once analogies are drawn between the republic of letters and the Habermasian 'public sphere.'[41] By concentrating on the British Isles and the Church of England, this study aims to restore a sense of how local and non-intellectual factors shaped philological enterprises. Its approach is also justified by the standards of the period itself. It shows that scholars often did have a very keen awareness of what divided them as well as united them, and not all of them subscribed to an ethos of disinterested cooperation, or even addressed their works to an international audience.

Since it offers an account of the history of a discipline in a particular country, rather than an individual scholar or the republic of letters as a whole, this study is highly sensitive to the changing relationships between philology and other academic disciplines. This helps it to avoid another potential shortcoming in the history of scholarship: the assumption that distinctions between philology and theology, political theory, rhetoric, philosophy, and literature were unproblematic. The history of scholarship is usually written from the point of view of the scholars themselves, rather than practitioners in other fields who were concerned that philology was competing with, encroaching on, and even conquering their

---

[40] For a balanced view which nonetheless maintains this point, see Anthony Grafton, 'A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: the Republic of Letters,' *Republics of Letters* 1.1 (2009), pp. 12-13. The sheer range of meanings of 'republic of letters,' not all of them implying political organization or transconfessionalism, is surveyed by Françoise Waquet, 'Qu'est-ce que la République des Lettres? Essai de sémantique historique,' *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 147 (1989), pp. 473-502. See also Marc Fumaroli, 'The Republic of Letters,' *Diogenes* 36 (1988), pp. 129-52; and the introduction to Herbert Jaumann, ed., *Die europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2001).

[41] See Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. T. Burger and F. Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989). This problem is discussed by Noel Malcolm, 'Private and Public Knowledge: Kircher, Esotericism, and the Republic of Letters,' in Paula Findlen, ed., *Athanasius Kircher: the Last Man who Knew Everything* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 300-301; cf. Malcolm, 'Hobbes and the European Republic of Letters,' in *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).

own areas of expertise.[42] To establish itself, however, philology constantly had to engage with other disciplines, especially theology. This is a history of those engagements. It highlights the different ways in which the identity of philology was contested during the period. These contests, moreover, were internal as well as external. Philologists clashed with each other over the direction their movement ought to take, as well as with theologians or philosophers.

A further weakness of the history of scholarship addressed by this study is also a product of the aforementioned preoccupation with 'historicism': this is the tendency to conflate the late Renaissance and the early Enlightenment as far as the development of historical method is concerned. In 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian,' Momigliano restricted his claims about the historicizing force of antiquarian research to the later seventeenth century. His followers have been arguably too ready to assume that he would have extended these claims to the earlier seventeenth and even sixteenth centuries if he had known more about those periods.[43] From this point of view, early seventeenth-century scholars are made to look like Spinoza *avant la lettre*, advancing radical arguments about the historicity of sacred texts in a way that damaged the very foundations of revealed religion. In other words, the history of late Renaissance scholarship has been distorted by certain teleologies of Enlightenment. This process may have gained more momentum in the light of recent

---

[42] Exceptions include Robert Goulding's work on Henry Savile, who in his correspondence with Joseph Scaliger positioned himself as a professional mathematician commenting on the works of a philologist, discussed in II.2, below; and work on Roman lawyers' responses to French philologists and legal historians. In the Anglo-Italian context, see Benedict Kingsbury and Benjamin Straumann, eds., *The Roman Foundations of the Law of Nations: Alberico Gentili and the justice of empire* (Oxford University Press, 2010), especially p. 15 of the editors' introduction, and the chapter by Christopher Warren, 'Gentili, the Poets, and the Laws of War.'

[43] For example Peter Miller 'Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences,' in Miller, ed. (2007), pp. 29-30.

work on Spinoza and early Enlightenment historical criticism in general.[44]

This study is a reaction to such accounts of the proto-Enlightened character of late Renaissance historical research, rolling back many of their claims by showing that philology as it operated at the time was not necessarily perceived as having radical implications, even in its most historicist moments. It does so not in order to reject the assertion of a link between early modern and modern historical criticism altogether, but rather in order to place such assertions on a firmer footing, showing exactly what was required and what was not required for philological research to be placed on an Enlightened trajectory. What is more, this thesis uncovers a strong tradition of conservatism within and around early modern philological research in the British Isles, a tradition which nonetheless has affinities of its own with some strains of Enlightened thought.[45]

Finally, just as scholars of literature have tended to ignore the philological and historical dimensions of literary criticism, historians of historiography have sometimes neglected the confluence of literary criticism and historical research during the period.[46] In the

---

[44] Such as the work of Jonathan Israel, from *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (Oxford University Press, 2001) onwards. See also Jonathan Sheehan, 'When was Disenchantment? History and the Secular Age,' in Michael Warner, Jonathan VanAntwerpen, and Craig Calhoun, eds., *Varieties of Secularism in a Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 232-3. For studies that connect Spinoza to contemporary humanist scholarship while avoiding value judgements regarding the Enlightened status of the latter, see Stanislaus, Graf von Dunin-Borkowski, *Spinoza*, 4 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1910-36), especially vol. IV; and Susan James, *Spinoza on Philosophy, Religion, and Politics: The Theological-Political Treatise* (Oxford University Press, 2012).

[45] As argued by Bulman (2009), in the case of Lancelot Addison; and Pocock (1999-), vol. I.

[46] With some exceptions: a particularly strong case for such a confluence at the turn of the eighteenth century is made by Kristine Haugen, *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011). For other examples that do not deal with seventeenth-century England, see Anthony Grafton, 'Rhetoric, Philology and Egyptomania in the 1570s: J. J. Scaliger's invective against M. Guilandinus's Papyrus,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 42 (1979), pp. 167-94; Pierre Lardet, 'Entre grammaire et philosophie, la philologie, science ou art? Sur l'*emendatio* à la Renaissance et au-delà,' in Denis Thouard, Friedrich Vollhardt, and Fosca Mariani Zini, eds., *Philologie als Wissensmodell* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010); and Herbert Jaumann, *Critica: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Literarurkritik zwischen Quintilian und Thomasius* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

following chapters, I demonstrate that criticism cannot be circumscribed as an exclusively 'historical' discipline. Its methods rested on modes of linguistic and stylistic analysis which, for its practitioners, placed the texts they studied within the category of 'literature': they were more than simply historical documents. Eventually, however, tensions began to emerge between literary and historical ways of reading texts. This thesis explores some of those tensions and asks how they contributed to the formation of literary criticism and historical scholarship as increasingly separated endeavours. Furthermore, new conceptions of literature had no less of a bearing on the arrival of the Enlightenment than did new conceptions of history.[47]

Having surveyed existing approaches to early modern philology, I can now outline in brief the contents of this thesis. It is divided into three sections. The first, relatively short, section deals with the continental background: with the discipline of criticism as it was being defined by continental scholars circa 1600, with a focus on those figures who were most influential in England: Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon. It outlines general themes that recur in the work of British philologists, as well as providing a point of reference for a comparison of English philologists with their continental precursors and contemporaries. It discusses the foundations of criticism in the art of grammar, which combined linguistic and stylistic evaluation with the harvesting of historical knowledge from ancient texts; and the relationship between criticism and higher disciplines, such as philosophy and theology.

The second and longest section, entitled 'New horizons,' deals largely with British criticism in its early phase, up to the 1630s (though for reasons of coherence and clarity,

---

[47] See Haugen (2011); and Joseph Levine, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

some mention is made of works published in the 1640s and 1650s). It is roughly rather than strictly chronological, dividing scholars and their works up into several different traditions. First comes the tradition of what I call 'antiquarian philology,' represented by aspects of William Camden's work, and some of the output of his protégé, the lawyer and humanist John Selden. It shows that antiquarians drew heavily on continental philological research, especially the work of Joseph Scaliger. They belonged to a secular literary culture based around the Inns of Court, the Society of Antiquaries and, in some cases, the universities.

The next chapter deals with a slightly different area of philological endeavour, namely the category of ecclesiastical history. Unsurprisingly, it was fostered within the Church of England, and practised mainly, but not exclusively, by clerics. Here, the example set by Isaac Casaubon was paramount. He arrived in England in 1610 and composed a lengthy, erudite refutation of the principal counter-Reformation ecclesiastical historian, Cardinal Cesare Baronio. However, figures like Thomas James and Henry Savile were importing continental critical methods into English patristic studies before Casaubon's arrival, albeit with varying levels of recognition and success. The chapter finishes by assessing the reception of Casaubon's work in England, with a special emphasis on Richard Montagu. Montagu became notorious for his Arminianism and his support of William Laud, and his work provides an early instance of the way in which patristic philology was appropriate to serve the ends of intra- and inter-confessional polemic.

The third, much shorter chapter concerns another aspect of the influence and reception of Casaubon and other continental scholars: the use of Casaubon's work made by John Bois in his translation of the King James Bible, notes on which survive, along with books

annotated by him in the course of his labours. As well as presenting newly discovered archival evidence pertaining to the King James Bible, it shows that the story of the translation has less to do with domestic religious politics or the growing self-confidence of vernacular prose, and more to do with the incorporation of continental philology into the mainstream of English biblical scholarship.

The fourth chapter deals with Selden's *Historie of Tithes* (1618), which combined these three traditions into one: it was a work of biblical criticism, ecclesiastical history, and legal antiquarianism. In keeping with my methods throughout, the chapter gives an unprecedented amount of attention to the hostile responses to Selden's work, especially that of Richard Montagu. It shows that although Selden and Montagu felt at this point that they belonged to the same culture of humanist philology, fault lines were already beginning to emerge within that culture: especially between scholars who treated philological and theological modes of reading as mutually exclusive, like Selden, and those who regarded them as part of a common enterprise, like Montagu. This distinction is then linked to other points of difference between lay and clerical approaches to erudition.

The next two chapters deal principally with two scholars who came within Selden's orbit in the 1620s and 1630s. The first is Patrick Young, Royal Librarian to James and then Charles I, who collaborated with Selden on an edition of Greek inscriptions before producing the *editio princeps* of the earliest surviving Father of the Church, Clement of Rome. Both works were part of a common enterprise, that of excavating the history and literature of the ancient Mediterranean during the period when it was culturally Hellenic: from the composition of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, in around 300 BC, to the early decades of Christianity and beyond. Young's background in

Scottish humanism and the secular study of Hellenistic antiquity gave his patristic scholarship a very different colouring from Richard Montagu's. His work on Clement, which would become a key proof text in the debates over episcopacy in the 1640s, illustrates that patristic scholarship during this earlier phase of British philology was relatively untouched by religio-political exigencies.

The final chapter of this section deals with John Price, who offers another example of a scholar who approached Christian texts in a relatively secularized and classicizing way. He worked on Apuleius, Hesychius, and Aulus Gellius before publishing commentaries on the Bible in the 1640s. This chapter discusses Price in relation to two scholarly networks: first, that of British classical scholars in which he moved earlier on in his career, and secondly, that of the European republic of letters. Price, a Roman Catholic, spent more time abroad and established more European contacts than most other British philologists. His confessional affiliation did not, however, radically affect the course of his scholarship or the friendships he established (which included numerous Protestants), and in this respect he belongs to the second section of this thesis rather than the third. The chapter also offers an original account of New Testament criticism in Europe during the middle of the century, showing that New Testament critics in general were more theologically conservative and less inclined towards historical criticism of the biblical text than has previously been suggested. If they took a secular approach to the Bible, it was because they wrested its interpretation away from theologians on an institutional level, and applied literary-critical criteria to the text at the expense of dogmatic concerns. Moreover, the commentary form lessened the radical force of the criticism they applied to the text. This both deepens our understanding of Price's work, and provides the foundations for an account of two fields of criticism that did engender more controversy: the editing of the Old Testament, and of the

Church Fathers.

The third section, 'Radicalization, Institutionalization, and Collapse,' deals with the new challenges which philology faced in the charged religious and political climate of the 1640s. These were matched, however, by internal challenges caused by methodological problems within the discipline itself. It begins with a chapter on biblical criticism, and the study of the Septuagint in particular. The Septuagint had become crucial to biblical criticism because Catholics (and eventually some Protestants) had used it to undermine the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and hence the authority of the Protestant canon of Scripture. These debates combined literary and historical criticism and dominated Protestants' approach to the Septuagint. They are used to explain why Patrick Young, who had started to produce a new edition of the Septuagint in the 1630s, never finished that edition. The literary-critical methods which humanists were borrowing from classical and New Testament criticism were simply inadequate for any serious editorial project, but they were so pervasive that they continued to determine Young's approach as an editor. Moreover, the need to support the standard Protestant account of the primacy of the Hebrew text meant that Young was unable to treat the Septuagint independently from the Hebrew version and construct a historical account of its transmission in the way Catholic scholars had done. Text-critical method collapsed under these methodological and ideological contradictions.

The next chapter deals with a rather different area of religious controversy: namely debates over ecclesiology, which recent historians have shown were crucial to political thought and theological debate during the 1640s. It begins by examining the way in which the Fathers, especially Clement and Ignatius, were used to argue for various stances on episcopacy, and

to answer the question of whether it had foundations in divine law, or whether Christ and the apostles had actually endorsed presbytery. Previous scholars have regarded James Ussher's intervention in this controversy, with his publication of a new text of Ignatius, as a scholarly masterstroke which more or less ended the debate in favour of bishops. However, the way in which the battle was continued by anti-episcopal authors, some of whom were philologists in their own right, shows that philology was never accorded enough authority to resolve the pressing theological and ecclesiological questions of the era. Divines ultimately needed to rely on higher criteria of legitimation for their positions. This is the common thread that binds this chapter and the previous one: the standards of both historical and literary criticism foundered when they came up against ecclesiastical tradition and authority.

The third chapter, rather than concentrating on a specific text or debate, is concerned with the phenomenon I have chosen to describe as the institutionalization of philology, which was more or less successful in different contexts. It examines the broadly Anglican response to some of the most radical and dangerous strains of humanist philology, but also to challenges which had come from outside the discipline altogether. The first of these is represented by Thomas Hobbes, whose historicising approach to the Bible was exhibited in the second half of *Leviathan*. It argues that Hobbes's work was seen as controversial not so much because it advanced controversial interpretations as because it did so without its author's having attempted to accrue any of the authority usually accorded to humanist biblical critics; and because its findings were published in English and addressed to a different audience from most works of biblical philology. Hobbes has never been placed in relation to the development of humanist criticism in England, and this section, which covers the reaction to his work by philologically inclined readers such as Thomas Barlow,

sheds important light on the extent to which philology had become a specialized discipline which took care to exclude the uninitiated.

Hobbes's work had broader implications for philology than simply the radicalization of biblical criticism, however. His approach to political science was construed by many readers as an attack on humanistic, historically orientated traditions of political thought, and his critique of the universities was taken as an attempt to undermine the central role which philology had come to assume within clerical education. This, along with other movements of educational and philosophical reform, is what motivated the anti-Hobbesian writings of Thomas Barlow and Meric Casaubon. Casaubon was struggling to uphold the institutional centrality of the discipline which had made his father one of Britain's most famous intellectuals.

The study concludes with a figure who represents the simultaneous survival and decentring of humanist philology. Thomas Stanley took many of the literary-critical tools of biblical scholarship and applied them to secular Greek literature in his landmark edition of Aeschylus (1663). He was also a poet and an author of a vernacular history of philosophy, however, and thus exemplifies the absorption of philology into a broader culture of 'polite' literary activity. Most importantly, he wrote a treatise on tithes that links him directly to the world of Selden and his clerical opponents. This treatise demonstrates the enduring compatibility of advanced philological research with the religio-political conservatism which Stanley's work was supporting, especially when criticism was made to serve exegesis rather than to produce editions of the Bible or the Fathers.

All that remains is to describe what this study is not. It is not a study in the history of

theology or political thought, although it hopes to contribute a great deal to those disciplines, and has itself benefited from their perspectives on the philological output of the period. In terms of content, it has relatively little to say about a discipline which some historians have asserted as fundamental to Renaissance scholarship, namely chronology.[48] As the first section shows, chronology was, strictly speaking, a separate discipline which did not fall into the category of philology as defined by humanists themselves. It incorporated mathematical and scientific methods, was less accessible and more distant from the mainstream of humanism than most philological works, and deserves a separate study of its own, in spite of its numerous points of overlap with philology.[49]

I have only slightly more to say about how oriental texts, especially Arabic ones, were studied during the period. I cannot lay any claim to the kind of formidable expertise which has been brought to bear on this topic in recent decades.[50] Fortunately, however, the recondite and marginal nature of Arabic studies in England during this period somewhat excuses this deficiency.[51] Exactly the same could be said of the study of the Germanic

---

[48] See especially Grafton (1983-1993), vol. II; as well as C. A. Patrides, 'Renaissance Estimates of the Year of Creation,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 26.4 (1963), pp. 315-22; and Paul Botley, 'Renaissance Scholarship and the Athenian Calendar,' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 46.4 (2006), pp. 395-431.

[49] For instance in debates over forgeries: see III.2, below.

[50] Above all in the work of Alastair Hamilton: see *The Copts and the West, 1439-1822: the European Discovery of the Egyptian Church* (Oxford University Press, 2006); 'Isaac Casaubon the Arabist: "Video longum esse iter,"' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009), pp. 143-68; and, with Arnoud Vrolijk, 'Hadrianus Guilielmi Flessingensis: the Brief Career of the Arabist Adriaen Willemsz,' *Oriens* 39 (2011), pp. 1-15. See also G. J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Rijk Smitskamp, Philologia orientalis*: a Description of Books Illustrating the Study and Printing of Oriental Languages in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Dietrich Klein, 'Inventing Islam in Support of Christian Truth: Theodor Hackspan's Arabic Studies in Altdorf, 1642-6,' *History of Universities* 25.1 (2010), pp. 26-55; and Jan Loop, 'Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620-1667) and the "Historia Orientalis,"' *Church History and Religious Culture* 88.2 (2008), pp. 169-203. Literary-critical appreciation of texts in this field was a relatively late and largely continental development: see idem, 'Divine Poetry? Early Modern European Orientalists on the Beauty of the Koran,' *Church History and Religious Culture* 89.4 (2009), pp. 455-488. However, for some partial exceptions, see James Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its history* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 220-26.

[51] Scholars often complained about the difficulty of learning oriental languages in England: see, for instance, Meric Casaubon to André Rivet, 19 August 1625, in Leiden University Library, MS BPL 285, fol. 146.

languages, which was becoming more popular during this period.[52] Within philology, however, it always remained subordinate to criticism of classical texts. Concentrating on the languages and literatures which were universally learnt by British philologists – Latin, Greek, and Hebrew – seemed like the best way to start writing the history of the discipline. I look forward to seeing how readers of this study continue to write it.

[52] See Sophie van Romburgh, ed., *For my worthy freind [sic] Mr. Franciscus Junius: an edition of the correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); and D. C. Douglas, *English Scholars* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939).

PART ONE: EUROPEAN CRITICISM AFTER SCALIGER

I.1: Criticism in theory and practice

This part functions as background to the story of criticism in Britain itself. It is about European criticism in the late sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. It does not pretend to offer an exhaustive survey of the field, but rather concentrates on aspects of criticism that influence or correspond with features of criticism in Britain. The rest of the thesis considers British criticism in its own right. However, one of its findings, demonstrated in almost every chapter, is that scholars have exaggerated the divergences between the methods, resources, and preoccupations of British and continental scholars.

For now, more attention will be given to the theory of criticism than its practice. From Angelo Poliziano to Joseph Scaliger and beyond, critics committed reflections on the duties and history of their office to paper: in private notes preserved only in manuscript, in letters that were often later printed, in the prefaces to editions of authors and other works of criticism, and in independent, formal treatises *de arte critica*.[53] Looking beyond these longer, more formal discussions of the art, there was no shortage of self-reflexive discussion of what it meant to be a critic in the early modern period embedded in works of criticism themselves. The challenge lies not in finding such material, but in understanding what it can tell us about the history of scholarship as it was practised. What is the relationship between the theory and the practice of criticism?

---

[53] See the invaluable summary of much of this material, to which my discussion is indebted, in Benedetto Bravo, '*Critice* in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the rise of the notion of historical criticism,' in Ligota and Quantin, eds. (2006). I have used Bravo's translations of all material cited by him, with occasional minor modifications; other translations are my own. On Poliziano, see Aldo Scaglione, 'The Humanist as Scholar and Politian's Conception of the *Grammaticus*,' *Studies in the Renaissance* 8 (1961), pp. 49-70. On Scaliger, see below. An important and comprehensive account of the notion of 'criticism' in the early modern period (though it overlooks the British Isles), with a far greater scope than my study, but a comparable interest in the relations between textual and literary criticism, is Jaumann (1995). Another study, concentrating on France, is that of Jean Jehasse, *La Renaissance de la critique: l'essor de l'humanisme érudit de 1560 à 1614* (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 1976). For a substantial survey of European text-critical theory and practice concentrating on the sixteenth century, see Klara Vanek, *Ars corrigendi in der frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007).

There are several reasons why an appraisal of theoretical writings about scholarship is needed. One is the gap between what Renaissance critics perceived themselves to be doing and what modern historians perceive them to have done. Thus Anthony Grafton observes that as late in his career as 1586, years after the decisive move to chronology which (in Grafton's eyes) brought about the reshaping of Scaliger as a scholar and forced his adoption of new methods and a heightened critical sensitivity, his subject still 'lacked a clear tradition to cling to and defend. Worse still, he lacked a clear sense of what kind of philologist he was, or what his past had actually meant.'[54] Similarly, for Benedetto Bravo, Scaliger had a 'confused idea' of 'the scope, the aim, and the method of his own work.'[55] These interpretations of Scaliger have much in common with a general tendency in the history of early modern scholarship: to claim that scholars either lacked, or refused to articulate, an overarching concept of what they were doing: their works consisted of raw erudition, motivated by curiosity.[56]

A careful look at critics' own descriptions of their activities helps to account for the discrepancy between contemporary and modern construals of Renaissance criticism. Examination of practice alone risks neglecting the significance attributed to philological works in their own time, which may not have had anything to do with the methodological

---

[54] Grafton (1983-1993), vol. II, p. 372.

[55] Bravo (2006), p. 150.

[56] Kristine Haugen, 'Apocalypse (A User's Manual): Joseph Mede, the Interpretation of Prophecy, and the Dream Book of Achmet,' *The Seventeenth Century* 25.2 (2010), p. 233, speaks of 'that allergy to articulating one's assumptions that pervaded the seventeenth-century scholarly world.' Peter Miller makes a comparable comment in a discussion of Selden's *De diis Syris* (1617). See 'Taking Paganism Seriously: Anthropology and Antiquarianism in Early Seventeenth-Century Histories of Religion,' *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001), p. 195: 'Like early modern antiquarian scholarship more generally there is hardly any attempt to answer the "why?" question, to explain the author's interest in the material, to persuade the potential reader of its worth, or even to step back from the mass of fact in order to draw conclusions.' Similarly, Hélène Parenty suggests that the theory of philology in the late Renaissance tended to lag behind, rather than directly reflecting, contemporary philologists' actual practices: *Isaac Casaubon, Helléniste: des* studia humanitatis *à la philologie* (Genève: Droz, 2009), p. 30.

innovations or particular historical discoveries made in them. Theories of criticism are not a master key to understanding every scholarly endeavour in the Renaissance, but they can serve as a useful starting point for working out what underlying conceptions of the world, of learning, and of texts motivated these endeavours, and for understanding why the conclusions of Renaissance critics, often based on the same evidence as is available today, can be confusingly and frustratingly different from the conclusions of modern ones; indeed, why at times they do not appear to fall within the province of 'scholarship' at all.

In what follows, I attempt to survey and analyse a range of uses of the terms *criticus* and *critica* by authors in the Renaissance.[57] If we look more closely at a key term with which writers now commonly referred to as scholars, textual or historical critics, or philologists characterized their activities, we find 'criticism' in the period to be a phenomenon that resists circumscription within a more modern hierarchy of disciplines, but which nevertheless was perceived as a unified phenomenon by its practitioners. They agreed, furthermore, on its basic outlines to a remarkable extent, and major controversies within the writing on this subject between one philologist and another are rare. This broad agreement, with occasional differences in emphasis, justifies my approach below: rather than dealing with theories of criticism one text or author at a time, I shall isolate, explain, and analyse features common to all or most of these theories. I have also adopted a more diffuse understanding of the term 'theory': by it, I mean any self-reflexive comment about what a critic is doing. These comments can range from one-off sentences in a textual commentary to full encyclopaedia entries *de critica*.

[57] On the ancient sources for these, and associated, terms, see Bravo (2006), pp. 138-40, and Pfeiffer (1968).

A particular concern will be the extent to which writers demonstrate a 'historical' appreciation of ancient texts. The notion that the roots of historicism as an intellectual outlook lie in humanist philology is a dominant one in the historiography of early modern scholarship.[58] This can be seen in the ease with which scholars allow the contemporary term 'criticism' to slide into the more modern one of 'historical criticism,' which was much less prevalent in the earlier seventeenth century.[59] By 'historicism' historians of early modern scholarship generally understand, in a limited sense, an awareness of difference between the things and/or events of the past and those of the present; and, in a more expansive sense, an understanding of things and events in the past as having meaning in relation to the culture surrounding them in a way that excludes other interpretations, whether providentialist, normative, essentializing in any other way, or simply anachronistic. However, theoretical discussions of criticism hardly contain any traces of historicism in the latter sense, however many times they have been detected in the practice of one critic or another. More importantly, these discussions are best thought of not as attempts at a historical understanding of the ancient world and its texts that simply fall short; rather, they advocate different methods and a different perspective altogether. These methods are those of literary criticism and Aristotelian philosophy. This can be illustrated by drawing attention to the relation between criticism and grammar first of all, and then between criticism and other disciplines.

i. Criticism, grammar, and the classical tradition

---

[58] As noted in my Introduction, above.

[59] As evinced by the title of Bravo (2006), and François Laplanche, *La Bible en France entre Mythe et Critique (XVI^e^-XIX^e^ siècle)* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), pp. 10-11: 'c'est seulement par Juste-Joseph Scaliger qu'il [the term 'critique'] a été introduit dans la langue française.... Il sera employé encore au XIX^e^ siècle...pour désigner la critique biblique, *appelée aujourd'hui l'exégèse "historico-critique* [my emphasis].'"

Almost all writers agreed that criticism was a part of the field of learning known as 'grammar'; *criticus* and *grammaticus* seem to have been interchangeable terms for some, and different functions within the same hierarchy for others. It is worth briefly recounting the state and functions of grammar in the Renaissance before moving on to the particular part it played in these reflections on the art of criticism.

Grammar, already part of the medieval curriculum and with its own place in medieval philosophy, was at the heart of the humanists' attempts at reform. Part of this reform involved the dismantling of the elaborate logical edifice which medieval philosophers and theologians had allegedly built up on top of the Latin language, and careful examination of and conformity with the way in which Latin had been used by the ancient Romans – not just any ancient Romans, but the best, most elegant authors.[60] This was the spirit in which Valla wrote his famous, partially text-critical investigation of classical Latin, the *Elegantiae* (c. 1440), and which Erasmus, who published a paraphrase of this work, followed in his approach to the New Testament and other texts.[61] The new conception of what grammar was for – imitation of the ancients directed towards practical concerns, rather than speculative investigation into abstract, theoretical matters – was accompanied by a new conception of how it was to be taught and acquired: by experience, that is,

---

[60] On the separation of grammar from logic, see Toivo Viljamaa, *The Renaissance Reform of Latin Grammar* (Helsinki: Turun Yliopisto, 1976), p. 14. An excellent summary of Renaissance grammar is provided in Kristian Jensen, *Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Grammar: Julius Caesar Scaliger's Theory of Language* (Munich: Fink, 1990). See also G. A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500-1700: The Latin Tradition* (Cambridge University Press, 1976). Unfortunately, Padley's preoccupation with the evolution of linguistics as a discipline culminating in Saussure, Chomsky et al. makes his work less useful for illuminating the contemporary functions of Renaissance grammar.

[61] On Erasmus and humanist grammar, see Brian Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 111-27; and, more recently, 'Erasmus and the End of Grammar: Humanism, Scholasticism, and Literary Language,' *New Medieval Literatures* 11 (2009), pp. 249-70. On Valla, see his *Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1962), with an introduction by Eugenio Garin; Lodi Nauta, *In Defense of Common Sense: Lorenzo Valla's Humanist Critique of Scholastic Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009); and Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, pp. 9-44.

repeated encountering of concrete examples of usage, rather than by the learning of general precepts.[62]

Grammar was a very flexible category, encompassing not only the fundamentals of language but also information – about history, geography, mythological background, and so on – contained in that language's literary corpus: *res* as well as *verba*.[63] The fact that grammar was 'not merely a linguistic but also a literary discipline' is crucial.[64] The 'literary' scope of grammar affected the linguistic theorizing that formed part of it: humanists dealt not so much with language in the abstract, but with one specific language, Latin, and they dealt with it as manifested in a body of texts, not as a metaphysically abstracted system.[65] 'Grammar' was essentially Latin grammar; it was a point for debate whether English, for example, had a 'grammar' of its own. When grammars of vernacular languages did come to be written, they unsurprisingly based themselves on grammars of Latin, in spite of the distortions and elisions this entailed.[66]

Two buzzwords of Renaissance grammar deserve to be singled out, because they recur in treatments of criticism as a form of grammar, and also in criticism as practised. The first is *elegantia*, the second, *emendatio*. The need for *elegantia* was a refrain of textual criticism and literary pedagogy – often the two overlapped – from at least Valla onwards. It was

---

[62] 'Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance,' in W. K. Percival, *Studies in Renaissance Grammar* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 310-11.

[63] Ann Moss, 'Language can change minds,' in Lodi Nauta, ed., *Language and Cultural Change: Aspects of the Study and Use of Language in the Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), pp. 194-6. See also Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-century Europe* (London: Duckworth, 1986), p. 14.

[64] See 'Grammar and Rhetoric in the Renaissance,' in Percival (2004), p. 305.

[65] See 'The Grammatical Tradition and the Rise of the Vernaculars,' ibid., pp. 247-8.

[66] Cummings (2002), p. 206ff. See also Tim William Machan, 'When English became Latin,' in Brian Cummings and James Simpson, eds., *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History* (Oxford University Press, 2010).

commonly on the basis of *elegantia* that texts were corrected. Consider, for example, the very first correction in Scaliger's notes on Varro's *De re rustica*:

> 'I will indicate from which authors you may find [writings on husbandry].' There is no doubt that there is a mistake in this reading, which does not live up to the elegance and brilliance of Marcus Varro. For it is a barbarism to talk of 'finding from someone,' and no first-class author ever spoke in this way.[67]

The resort to *elegantia* precedes the resort to manuscripts, both in order of importance and chronology. Indeed, even a manuscript itself can be assessed in terms of its *elegantia*, as a letter from Johannes Wowerius to Scaliger about a manuscript of Apuleius demonstrates.[68] Wowerius tries to 'prove' to his addressee the manuscript's 'elegantiam' by quoting one emendation offered by it.[69] Scaliger never quite abandoned his concern for *elegantia*, and it recurs in surprising places – for instance, his praise of the 'elegance' of certain terms for the computus in Hebrew and other languages.[70]

Emendatio, on the other hand, denotes 'correction' in a very broad sense.[71] Thus Thomas Linacre and Thomas Smith were able to write books *De emendata structura Latini sermonis* (London, 1524) and *De recta et emendata linguae Anglicae scriptione* (Paris, 1568), respectively.[72] In grammar, the term was associated with a universalized notion of linguistic correctness: when Scaliger reports that Horace is 'a most correct author, as

---

[67] Scaliger, ed., *M. Terentii Varronis opera quae supersunt* (Geneva, 1573), sig. o1[a]: 'Indicabo à quibus scriptoribus reperias.] Non dubium est quin mendum insit in hac lectione, quae M. Varronis elegantia & nitore indigna est. Barbarismus enim est, Reperire ab aliquo. neque vllus vnquam primae classis auctor ita locutus est.'

[68] On Wowerius, see below.

[69] Wowerius to Scaliger, January 1602, in Johannes Wowerius, *Epistolarum centuriae II* (Hamburg, 1619), pp. 232-3.

[70] Joseph Scaliger, *Opus nouum de emendatione temporum* (Paris, 1583), p. 298. On the computus in general, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, section 2.16, 'From Chronology to Computus.'

[71] As some historians of scholarship acknowledge: see Sebastiano Timpanaro, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*, ed. and trans. Glenn W. Most (University of Chicago Press, 2005), p. 46, n. 3.

[72] See Kristian Jensen, '*De emendata structura Latini sermonis*: The Latin Grammar of Thomas Linacre,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 49 (1986), pp. 106-125.

Augustus used to say' ('emendatissimus auctor, ut dicebat Augustus'), he does not, of course, interpret Augustus as having meant that the poet had been corrected very much by subsequent critics.[73] Nor, indeed, does the phrase *emendatio temporum* refer to the correction of various chronological schemes to their original states at particular moments in the histories of the societies that produced them. Rather, it refers to the correction of chronology as a whole, in order to produce an accurate and enduring knowledge of historical events and their dating and, above all, a superior calendrical format for present-day use. Grafton argues that this was the least important aspect of Scaliger's chronological output, and that the engagement with various problems of historical fact was of much greater interest to him.[74] Yet Scaliger himself repeatedly asserted that the last book of the *De Emendatione Temporum* was the most important, even the reason for the whole thing.[75] This need not encourage a complete re-orientation of our view of the whole significance of Scaliger's work, *contra* Grafton, but it does show that Scaliger had not yet replaced the sense of 'emendation' as 'correction according to universal standards,' orientated towards validity and utility in the present – a sense which he would have found in humanist grammar – with a definitively historical notion of the term, as something like 'correct reconstruction of what had actually happened (or been written) in the past.'

All this needs to be borne in mind when we come to Scaliger's most extensive statements about criticism. These are contained in two letters: one written to François Vertunien on 25 December between 1574 and 1576, and the other to Petrus Scriverius, probably around

---

[73] Pierre des Maizeaux, ed., *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pithoeana, et Colomesiana*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1740; henceforth *Prima* or *Secunda Scaligerana* as appropriate), vol. II, p. 101.

[74] Anthony Grafton, 'From *De Die Natali* to *De Emendatione Temporum*: The Origins and Setting of Scaliger's Chronology,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985), pp. 129, 134.

[75] Scaliger (1583), sigs. ã3^{a}, ã6^{b}; pp. 380-81.

1595.[76] I shall refer mostly to the second letter, which was published separately from and earlier than most of the rest of his correspondence, and possibly (as Bravo conjectures) even circulated widely in manuscript before then.[77] If true, it is likely to have had the most impact in forming philologists' understandings of criticism, as well as representing the opinions of Scaliger in his maturity.

Both letters express the concept of criticism as the 'principal' part of grammar, the point in which grammar culminates. Scaliger put it more succinctly elsewhere: 'κριτική is the principal and the nobler part of grammar, indeed it is grammar absolute.'[78] He writes that there are three types of *grammaticus*: first of all, there are those who are called τεχνικοί, 'technical grammarians' and teach language itself, the first stage in grammatical learning. This is precisely what he says to Vertunien; but in the later letter he adds that this part is not *really* grammar – rather, it is 'litteratura.' Those who teach the elements of language were called γραμματιστάς (roughly, 'grammatists,' or perhaps 'grammatasters') by the Greeks, rather than γραμματικούς, and the Romans called them '*litteratores*' rather than '*litteratos*.'

The second type of grammarian is the *historicus*: 'historical grammarians deal with names of rivers, mountains, regions; they explicate recondite stories or mythical narratives or poetic discourses about the gods; they diligently investigate the genealogies of gods, of

---

[76] See Joseph Scaliger, *Epistolae* (Leiden, 1627), pp. 116-20 and 824-6 respectively. On Vertunien, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, pp. 180-84. The second letter was published before 1627 in two different versions. It was included in *M. Val. Martialis nova editio*, ed. Petrus Scriverius (Leiden, 1619), p. 139ff. There was also a separate edition: Scaliger, *De arte critica diatriba*, ed. J. Morsius (Leiden, 1619). For more on these two letters, see Bravo (2006), pp. 146-57. See also Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, p. 181, on the first letter; vol. II, pp. 622-6 on the second; vol. II, pp. 687-8 on both; and idem, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 73-4.

[77] Bravo (2006), p. 157.

[78] *Prima Scaligerana*, p. 62: 'κριτική Grammaticae pars principalis et nobilior est, imo Grammatica absolutissima.'

heroes, and of men of the oldest times.'[79] That is, they dealt with the kind of factual erudition in which antiquaries were also interested: things, as well as words. Finally, there is the third part, κριτική itself: 'criticism is more noble than both.'[80] The same division had been used in the letter to Vertunien, but there Scaliger also writes that κριτική was known alternatively as 'proper – private, as it were' ('ἰδιαιτέραν, quasi peculiarem'). It was so called not from the functions the critic performed but because it was the province of only a small number, and that small number concerned themselves not with just any authors but with the 'most noble ones': it was an aristocratic office. Critics were like grammarians, but superior, if not in an easily definable way.

The aforementioned correspondent of Scaliger, Johannes Wowerius, discussed the *ars critica* as part of a larger book about learning.[81] He was accused of having plagiarized Isaac Casaubon – unfairly, although the two had known each other and Casaubon had likely influenced and perhaps even helped Wowerius.[82] Like Scaliger, he also used Sextus Empiricus, among other sources, highlighting the mutual dependence of criticism and the 'technical' and 'historical' parts of grammar.[83] He glosses the word 'private' (ἰδιαιτέραν) in a more orthodox fashion than Scaliger, but still insists on its primacy within the grammatical hierarchy: it was 'the chief part of Grammar and the one proper to

---

[79] 'Historici in fluminum, montium, regionum nominibus occupati sunt: abstrusas historias, aut μυθολογούμενα, aut ποιητικῶς θεολογούμενα explicant: genealogias Deorum, Heroum ac priscorum diligenter rimantur.'

[80] Scaliger's three-part division is borrowed, with considerable modification, from Sextus Empiricus. In modern editions, Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus Mathematicos* I.91-5; cf. I. 252-3. On the reception of Sextus Empiricus in the period in general, see Luciano Floridi, *Sextus Empiricus: The Transmission and Recovery of Pyrrhonism* (Oxford University Press, 2002). See also Richard Popkin, *The History of Scepticism: From Savonarola to Bayle* (Oxford University Press, 2003).

[81] This is the *De polymathia tractatio* (Hamburg, 1603). On Wowerius, see Luc Deitz, 'Ioannes Wower of Hamburg, Philologist and Polymath. A Preliminary Sketch of His Life and Works,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995), pp. 132-51.

[82] For the controversy over authorship, see Deitz (1995), p. 143; Bravo (2006), pp. 175-6; and the preface to the 1665 edition of the *De polymathia tractatio* by Jakob Thomasius, sigs. $a2^{a}$-$b1^{b}$.

[83] Wowerius (1603), pp. 53, 122-3.

it' ('Praecipua & propria Grammaticae pars'). Johann Heinrich Alsted, who wrote, or rather compiled, a section *de critica* for his monumental encyclopedia of 1630, repeats many of these motifs.[84] Daniel Heinsius, too, split grammar into three in his *Aristarchus Sacer* of 1627, an important essay on ancient criticism which served as the preface to his edition of Nonnus of Panopolis's paraphrase of the Gospel of John.[85]

There were other ways of arriving at a similar conclusion. Kaspar Schoppe (Gaspar Scioppius) was a friend of Scaliger's who converted to Catholicism and then published attacks on his mentor, questioning the genealogy to which Scaliger and his father had pretended.[86] In 1597, however, when he published his treatise *De arte critica*, he was firmly in Scaliger's camp, as his praise of Scaliger's facility and success in emendation and criticism in general indicates.[87] Schoppe, among others, used Dio Chrysostom's fifty-third oration (on Homer) to show that in antiquity the terms 'criticism' and 'grammar' were treated as though interchangeable, but that in any case Aristotle was their true founder.[88] Henri Estienne, whose treatise on criticism Pfeiffer described as the first modern history of ancient scholarship, suggested that the title of 'critic' was bestowed on those *grammatici*

---

[84] Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Encyclopaedia* (Herborn, 1630), vol. VII, cols. 2216-17. For more on this book, see Howard Hotson, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German ramifications, 1543-1630* (Oxford University Press, 2007), esp. p. 261.

[85] See Heinsius (1627), sig. **7. Heinsius was a devoted pupil of Scaliger at Leiden and regarded as one of his principal successors. He was himself a Professor at the Dutch university and published numerous editions of secular and religious texts, as well as important works of literary criticism. See Paul Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden University Press, 1968).

[86] See Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, p. 747; Herbert Jaumann, ed., *Kaspar Schoppe (1576-1649): Philologe im Dienste der Gegenreformation* (Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1998); and Kaspar Schoppe, *Autobiographische Texte und Briefe*, ed. Klaus Jaitner, Ursula Jaitner-Hahner, and Johann Ramminger (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2004-). See also the withering entry on Schoppe in *Scaligerana*, vol. II, p. 565.

[87] Schoppe, *De arte critica* (Nuremburg, 1597), sigs. B1[a], C3.

[88] Schoppe (1597), sig. B5. See also Wowerius (1603), p. 155, and Heinsius (1627), sig. *2[a]. The source is Dio Chrysostom's 53rd oration, 'On Homer.' G. J. Vossius underlined Heinsius's quotation of this passage in his copy of the *Aristarchus sacer* (Leiden University Library, 601 G 1). It is also underlined in John Selden's copy of the Paris 1623 edition of Dio Chrysostom, in pencil and with brackets in the margin (all features characteristic of Selden as an annotator): Bodleian Library, C 1.15 Art.Seld., p. 553.

'who were held to be "sharper" – that is, I think, endowed with more detailed and less familiar learning.'[89]

What is shared by all these treatments of the same question is an insistence that criticism is heavily dependent on grammar, accompanied by a need to stress that it is not the same thing as grammar – that it is special, elevated, at a certain remove from what grammarians do. Hence Scaliger and others' constant scornful asides concerning mere 'schoolmasters,' *paedagogi*.[90] At the same time, critics were not always above admitting that they were acting as mere grammarians. In the letter to Vertunien, Scaliger presents an example of a critic's use of *grammatica* in action. Having discussed the term *criticus* in its ancient context, he moves on to Vertunien's other query, which is about the Latin word *macte* ('honoured'). This query, he says, must be dealt with 'technically,' not 'historically' or 'critically.' It is worth covering this example in some detail, as the methods exhibited by Scaliger, including his refusal fully to historicize the word he was investigating, did not go out of fashion at any point in the course of the period covered by this study, and remained absolutely fundamental for all philologists. The placement of his discussion of *macte* within the 'technical' category of grammar has caused some confusion for Bravo, who concludes that Scaliger can only have been joking:

> His remarks on *macte* constitute a brilliant and admirable piece of philologico-historical research. This is history of words and of religious notions and rites, something that no ancient *grammaticus* could have done or thought of, and for which no convenient name existed in ancient terminology. I think Scaliger was not quite serious when he wrote

---

[89] Henri Estienne, *De criticis vet. Gr. et Latinis dissertatio* (Paris, 1587), pp. 17-18: 'qui ἀκριβέστεροι haberentur, (id est, vt opinor, exactiore & reconditiore doctrina praediti.' See Pfeiffer (1968), viii. On Estienne, see also Jehasse (1976), passim. This treatise remained popular with English philologists: see Gerard Langbaine's excerpts from it in Bodleian Library, MS Langbaine 17, fol. 61ff.

[90] See e.g. Scioppius (1597), sig. K4ª, praising Scaliger for his frequent invectives against 'Paedagogici iudicij homines.'

> that he was going to treat the matter τεχνικῶς: in this passage he used the ancient classification quite artificially, as an intellectual pastime.[91]

Once more we must confront the issue of when a piece of research becomes 'historical.' First of all, it must be remembered that Scaliger's own definition of 'historical' in this very letter does not deal in any explicit manner with temporal distinctions, or transitions from one state of affairs to another. The second part of grammar is 'historical' in the same way that Pliny's *Natural History* or the numerous Renaissance natural histories based on it are 'historical,' although it deals with different material. *Historia* can simply denote an account of a phenomenon or group of phenomena; a diachronic dimension is not required.[92]

More importantly, Scaliger's treatment was 'technical' because he was answering the question of why *macte* almost always appeared in the vocative rather than the nominative case, even when this was clearly inappropriate according to the grammar of the sentence. He deals in a simple way with the 'significatio' of the word, and largely with a *verbum* rather than a *res*: 'the earlier Romans say *mactum* in place of *auctum* [increased, enriched; an increase]' ('*Mactum* veteres Romani vocant *auctum*'). Although he cites authors from different periods and even in Greek as well as Latin, such as Theocritus and Ausonius, he is not interested in any divergences between them that may or may not be connected with historical processes. Rather, he accumulates a number of testimonies which all illustrate linguistic usage in general, what 'tends' to happen in Latin: 'authors of both languages tend to speak in this way' ('utriusque linguae auctores ita loqui solent').

---

[91] Bravo (2006), p. 151.

[92] For an excellent set of engagements with the nuances of the term *historia* in the period, see Pomata and Siraisi, eds. (2005). See also Nicholas Wickenden, *G. J. Vossius and the Humanist Concept of History* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993).

Scaliger's material may be 'historical' in the broadest sense, but his overall aim is not; nor is his conclusion. He is not concerned simply with whether the vocative *macte* was used in place of the nominative *mactus* at one time or another, but with whether its usage is generally acceptable. Scaliger's explanation, however, invariably slid from purely technical considerations into matters of historical fact and usage (but never historical narrative). In this sense, Bravo is right, but he has underestimated the unity of linguistic style and historical referentiality in the mind of the Renaissance critic.

For now, the fact that diverse authors could be aggregated in order to demonstrate the continuity and validity of one feature of classical linguistic usage shows that the historicity of texts was not always a dominant preoccupation of late Renaissance critics. They remained interested in the conformity of a text with general laws of linguistic usage and, secondly, in its correspondence with the world of details heaped up by 'historical' grammarians from the poets and other ancient authors.

These interests help to explain why the use of manuscripts to correct texts is so remarkably underplayed by Renaissance theorists of criticism. The judicious use of manuscripts to correct the *textus receptus* is often felt to have distinguished Poliziano and then Scaliger as particularly cautious, progressive, historically minded critics (albeit with occasional lapses).[93] To judge by these letters, however, it was not nearly so important for Scaliger himself. Consider, for instance, the description of criticism in the second letter, where the mention of manuscripts, or any other historical documents or objects on which critics base their judgements, is conspicuously absent. The same is true of his letter to Vertunien, not to mention other contemporary authors. I am not the first to note a certain ambivalence

[93] This is a central theme of Grafton (1983-93), vol. I.

towards the use of manuscripts on Scaliger's part, as far as his critical practice is concerned.[94] But not enough attention has been drawn to the absence of prolonged discussion of manuscripts from Scaliger's establishment in these writings of a blueprint for his profession. As far as his legacy was concerned, some scholars, such as Schoppe, did incorporate a careful reading of his practices as a textual critic into their own theoretical works, but such nuanced treatments of his work seem to have escaped the notice of his English readers.[95]

In place of a theory of criticism founded on historical documentation, then, we find a criticism founded, if anything, on the trans-historical laws of linguistic usage – the laws, that is, of pure Latinity or *Hellenismus* – and on more local laws based on the proprietary styles and norms of individual authors, genres, or eras. This is why grammar is so important as to be fundamental to criticism itself: it furnishes the critic with literary standards against which to judge a specific text. If anything, it insulates critics against a properly historical attitude towards texts. Even when the use of manuscripts does come into play, questions of literary decorum remain integral. It is no wonder that none of these writers perceives any divergence between the profession they are discussing and the 'criticism' of Julius Caesar Scaliger in his *Poetices Libri Septem* (Lyon, 1561), although today the former is categorized as 'textual criticism' or 'scholarship' and the latter as 'literary criticism.' In fact, the elder Scaliger is embraced as an exemplar of 'criticism' as a whole by both Schoppe and Alsted; and Heinsius, as well as mentioning Julius Caesar and his son in the same breath as exemplary critics, even transfers the former's judgement

---

[94] See, for example, H. J. de Jonge, 'The Study of the New Testament,' in Scheurleer and Meyjes, eds. (1975), p. 83. See also the numerous examples in Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 442-9, 563, 566.

[95] See Grafton, 'Kaspar Schoppe and the Art of Textual Criticism,' in Jaumann, ed. (1998); and Vanek (2007), pp. 63-97.

about the style of Lucan on to Nonnus.[96] This same ecumenical vision of criticism applied to the ancient sources: Longinus, whose *On the Sublime* has since become a canonical work of 'ancient literary criticism,' figures for Wowerius as a textual critic as well, and as a critic in the broad sense for Estienne.[97]

To be sure, critics attempted to restore corrupt texts to their pristine, original state, as Aristarchus is said to have done. Yet this is only one aspect from which the work of an Aristarchus may be seen, as Estienne deftly illustrates by tracing how the name 'Aristarchus' acquired a proverbial status in Latin writers like Cicero and Horace: both bestow it upon friends who help writers to improve their prose or poetry.[98] Talking of the need for a friend to give opinions about and help correct one's poetry, Horace famously wrote, 'fiet Aristarchus'; and Cicero described his friend Atticus as his Aristarchus, in that he helped him revise his speeches.[99] The significance of Aristarchus for Cicero and Horace, then, and for Estienne, is not that he stripped the text of Homer of its historical accretions, removing the verses added by later interpolators, but that he improved the text of Homer as a work of literature. Scaliger took the same view.[100] He invokes Aristarchus as a corrector of texts on a synchronic basis, judging works that have just been written; but even when Aristarchus is presented as a corrector of ancient texts, this aspect of his office is not presented as requiring historical fidelity. Aristarchus had the same significance for

---

[96] Schoppe (1597), sig. C1[a]; Alsted (1630), vol. VII, cols. 2216-17; and Heinsius (1627), sigs. **4[b], ******8.

[97] Wowerius (1603), pp. 155-6; cf. 136. Estienne (1587), p. 18. See also Gerard Langbaine's edition of Longinus (Oxford, 1636), sig. B2[b], which describes Longinus as a critic (though the title page describes him as a *rhetor*).

[98] Estienne (1587), pp. 19-22.

[99] Horace, *Ars Poetica*, l. 450; Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, I.14.3. Horace's phrase is quoted in Wowerius (1603), p. 140.

[100] As well as invoking Aristarchus in the letter to Scriverius, Scaliger called Claude Dupuy 'my Aristarchus' when he gave him a copy of his work on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. See Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, p. 162.

Heinsius: evaluating texts from the past simply involves an extension of the friendship-orientated critical practices of an intimate literary coterie into the public realm.[101] Gerardus Johannes Vossius gave his *Aristarchus, sive De arte grammatica libri septem* (Amsterdam, 1635) its title because it was 'about the art of speaking well.'[102] The paradigm presented by Aristarchus, then, supports the work of grammatical education rather than historical restoration. It is only later on, in fact, that we see treatises on criticism making more rigid distinctions between grammar and criticism. Jean Le Clerc distinguished sharply between two senses of 'grammar': if it meant 'knowledge of languages,' then it was an integral part of criticism, but if it signified merely the 'art of speaking properly,' then criticism had to constitute 'another discipline' altogether.[103] The Aristarchan paradigm had disintegrated over the course of the century. Scholars had already complained that some critics had been led astray by an excessive concern for cultivating a good Latin prose style, at the expense of solid historical and linguistic erudition, but none had articulated this complaint in such a generalized, programmatic way.[104]

It has been pointed out already that as well as a collection of judgements about ancient poetry, the elder Scaliger's *Poetics* was a prescriptive manual of poetic composition. Grammar textbooks such as Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantiae* and Vossius' *Aristarchus* were also intended as aids for writing (and even speaking) elegant Latin prose, as Le Clerc's second definition of grammar indicates. Even in the case of the 'higher' criticism itself, we find that the boundary between study of the texts of the past as objects and creative imitation of

---

[101] Heinsius (1627), sig. ******5[a].

[102] 'De arte bene loquendi.' Vossius (1635), sig.))))1[b]. On Vossius, see Wickenden (1993).

[103] Jean Le Clerc, *Ars critica* (Amsterdam, 1697), p. 3.

[104] See, for instance, Meric Casaubon, *Generall Learning: a Seventeenth-Century Treatise on the Formation of the General Scholar*, ed. Richard Serjeantson (Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 175-6.

them is repeatedly transgressed. Henri Estienne's *Dissertatio* is an excellent illustration of this, but by no means the only one. Renaissance criticism, even when dealing with the correction of texts, offered itself as a platform for the improvement of creative literary composition and imitation, with grammar as the foundation.

For Estienne, good criticism is like good poetry in that both are the products of an innate facility: someone who is 'critical' is akin to a 'poetical' person, who 'has a certain inclination and nimbleness of spirit with regard to poetry by nature, or some germ, as it were, of poetry.'[105] He adds the further qualification that those capable of judging (κρίνειν) a particular genre ought to be capable of being 'practitioners' of it themselves ('artifices ipsi').[106] Estienne has moved, within a few pages, from a mere analogy between criticism and poetry to saying that they are essentially contiguous. For Heinsius, similarly, Virgil served as the archetypal critic-poet, who exercised these faculties above all in imitating (and improving on) Homer.[107] Apollonius and Callimachus, too, were good poets first of all because they were good critics; and these figures, particularly Callimachus, served as paradigms of criticism for nearly all the authors I am discussing. Neither the analogy nor the new assertion of identity between critical and poetic competence, however, tells the reader how to acquire or discern either.

In the light of the affiliations between poet and critic made by these authors, Scaliger's assertion in the letter to Scriverius that the 'ἐκλογαὶ καλλιγραφίας [samples of fine writing], which are passages in an author elegantly rewritten' ('ἐκλογαὶ καλλιγραφίας,

---

[105] Estienne (1587), pp. 2-3: 'quandam à natura inclinationem & dexteritatem ingenij ad poesin, siue aliqua poetices velut semina habet.'

[106] Ibid., p. 15.

[107] Heinsius (1627), sigs. *******4^{b}-5^{a}.

quae sunt ab illis in quodam auctore venuste novata') were part of the office of the critic seems less bizarre. Estienne's suggested revisions of the opening lines of the *Aeneid* can be seen as putting this precept into practice.[108] Indeed, the very notion that a critic may put forward such modifications is justified with reference to Virgil's own description of the process of composition, as when Estienne is weighing up possible revisions to the epic's fourth line: 'Putting forward a different version of the poem actually corresponds with what Virgil says in this passage, that he himself had previously "modulated his song with a slender pipe."'[109] One function of the critical faculty, then, was rhetorical or poetic *copia*.[110]

Like original composition, translation – particularly into Latin – also crossed the border between literature and scholarship. Heinsius demanded 'the highest critical judgement in a translator' ('Summam...crisin in interprete').[111] The prefatory material appended to the Leiden edition of Joseph Scaliger's collected poems quotes Isaac Casaubon's claim that Scaliger's translation of Martial into Greek would serve as a 'commentary': 'in many passages over which the critics do battle with each other, your translation will serve as a commentary – even for those who are moderately educated.'[112] This follows praise of the

---

[108] Estienne (1587), pp. 52-58.

[109] Estienne (1587), pp. 52-8: 'Nec verô, mutationem carminis profiteri, ab hoc alienum loco est, quum prius illud carmen gracili modulatus auena se modulatum esse [Virgilius] dicat.' See also the twelve different renderings offered by Estienne of a line from Ovid's *Heroides*, pp. 280-81. Stephen Heyworth notes that this technique was followed by Nicolaus Heinsius: see *Brill's New Pauly* (Leiden: Brill, 2002-), s.v. 'Emendation of texts.'

[110] On copia in general see Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

[111] Heinsius (1627), sig. ******3[a]. For earlier examples of the interface between philological scholarship and translation, see Paul Botley, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti, and Desiderius Erasmus* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 115-63. On translation as a form of scholarship, see ibid., p. 1, and Ingrid De Smet, 'Giants on the Shoulders of Dwarfs? Considerations on the Value of Renaissance and Early Modern Scholarship for Today's Classicists,' in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, ed. S. J. Harrison (Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 261.

[112] Joseph Scaliger, *Poemata omnia* (Leiden, 1615), [21]: 'multis in locis, de quibus inter [*sic*] critici digladiantur, pro commentario tua versio & mediocriter eruditis sit futura.'

translation's 'elegantia' and 'sermonis integritas,' terms that illustrate the roots of translation-based criticism in the mainstream of humanist grammar. It is well known that translation into Latin could motivate, and sometimes resolve, scholarly controversies. But these controversies were more than 'scholarly'; they were about more than the correct sense of a text as intended by its author or determined by the conventions of the age in which it was written. They were about maintaining the purity and elegance of what was to them a living language.[113]

The connections between historical scholarship and other literary endeavours must always be remembered during any discussion of the 'elitist,' 'aristocratic' mentality of scholars like Casaubon and Scaliger. Grammar kept advanced philological scholarship close to the mainstream of humanist literary culture.[114] It was not until the later seventeenth century that literary authors began stridently to complain that philology had become so specialized, pedantic, and antiquarian that it had lost its power to reinvigorate contemporary *belles lettres*.[115] Earlier in the period, the world of literary humanism was still felt to be a coherent whole.

ii. Aristotelianism and the encyclopaedia

I have already noted, in passing, that critics identified Aristotle as the founder of their discipline. We might wonder why scholars who were dedicated to an ostensibly narrow

---

[113] See de Jonge, 'The Study of the New Testament,' and J. H. Waszink, 'Classical Philology,' in Scheurleer and Meyjes, eds. (1975), pp. 73-4 and 164 respectively.

[114] This point has already been made, albeit in a slightly different key, by Jakob Bernays, as quoted in R. C. Jebb, *Richard Bentley* (London: Macmillan, 1902), pp. 207-8: 'People had thought that aesthetic pleasure could be purchased only at the cost of criticism...now they saw the critical workshop itself lit up with the glow of artistic inspiration.'

[115] Feingold, 'The Humanities' (1997) provides excellent examples, pp. 235-8 and 251-3. See also III.3, below.

discipline such as criticism adopted a universal, polymathic philosopher as its founder and paradigmatic figure. In the first place, they appreciated that much of Aristotle's philosophical work had been built on historical foundations. His political theory had involved a survey of the facts about states and constitutions which had actually existed, just as his natural philosophy rested on natural history, and his *Poetics* involved an account of facts about past poetry as well as critical judgements about contemporary poets.[116]

This is not to say that, in their view, he wrote narrative histories or exemplary histories of political events and virtuous acts; nor even that he developed a finely honed sense of chronological or geographical discrepancies between different 'historical' facts, whether political, natural, or literary – for instance between different stages in the temporal evolution of the Greek *polis*. One way of describing Aristotelian *historia* from the perspective of the Renaissance is to say that it sought to offer not atomized records of particular facts, situated carefully at particular points in time and space, but an account of what happens, in Aristotle's famous phrase, 'for the most part.'[117] Testimonies are not treated on a wholly individual basis: they are witnesses to a general pattern, which may not be universal, but is more than a collection of one-off coincidences. This approach in fact militated against 'historicism' as historians of scholarship have understood it, and especially against the production of a historical narrative linking specific events. Although the influence of the Aristotelian model for interpreting events and processes has been discussed by scholars in the context of natural philosophy, it also seems applicable to the way in which critic-grammarians heaped up linguistic testimonies without much concern

---

[116] As Heinsius (1627) points out, sigs. *1^{b}-2^{b}. See also Alsted (1630), vol. VII, cols. 2216-17, and Schoppe (1597), sig. B5.

[117] ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ: see Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1026b-1027a; *Rhetoric*, 1357a35 and 1402b8-11; and the discussion of the latter passage with reference to Aristotle's use of historical evidence by Carlo Ginzburg, *History, Rhetoric, and Proof* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), pp. 44-5.

for their individual particularity, as pieces of evidence for a general law of correct usage – precisely as Scaliger does with the word *macte*.

However, we must note at once that we still lack a complete picture of how the terms *historia* and 'history' were used and understood by philologists over the course of this period. Although they almost invariably claimed that their approach was fundamentally Aristotelian, it is clear that certain pressures brought about a departure from Aristotelian paradigms. This can be seen very clearly in the interaction between philology and natural law in the controversy over tithing.[118] Some scholars, such as Richard Montagu, argued that when enough isolated facts about ancient tithe payments were accumulated, they bore witness to a general, natural law that bound human behaviour. John Selden, by contrast, argued that the very same facts had to be understood in all of their particularity, as isolated occurrences with their own unique significance and set of causes or motivations: the inference of a general law from them could not be justified. However, such tensions never erupted into a full-blown reconfiguration of critical methodology on a more theoretical level. Nor did Selden's approach entail a full assault on the Aristotelian edifice: all it required was tactical obliviousness to Aristotle's own inclination to move from particulars to general laws or causes, assimilating him with Pliny the Elder and other natural philosophers whose approaches were less systematizing.[119] The compatibility of Aristotelianism and philology in the minds of early modern humanists is another reminder

---

[118] For more detail, see II.4, below; and the discussion of Thomas Stanley in my conclusion.

[119] See the preface to Selden's *Historie of Tithes* (1618), discussed in II.4, below; and Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, XI.2.8: 'nobis propositum est naturas rerum manifestas indicare, non causas indagare dubias.' I would like to thank Rowan Tomlinson for this reference.

of the enduring importance and the flexible reception of Aristotle's work long into the early modern period.[120]

The Aristotelian basis for the 'historical' aspects of philology also provided some of the justification for its claims to deal with the whole world of learning. For Alexander More, it was the very universality of his erudition that earned Scaliger the right to be compared with Aristotle, even if he did not share the philosophical ambitions of the Stagirite.[121] This was a complex comparison, however, which also involved Descartes. In More's reckoning, Scaliger was to mid-seventeenth-century philologists as Aristotle was to Descartes. Even if the new generation had surpassed its most important predecessor in some fields, it had not done so across the board. Built in to More's comparison is a recognition that the claims Scaliger made to expertise in mathematics or astronomy would no longer seem valid, or even plausible, in the mouth of a Salmasius or a Heinsius.[122] By the same token, Descartes may have surpassed Aristotle in geometry and other fields, but he could not match his encyclopaedic learning in politics or literature (to take two examples). Accordingly, the rest of this thesis traces elements of the process of specialization in the aftermath of Scaliger's career that led More to make his comment.

If we grant that the encyclopaedic ideals of Scaliger became less pronounced in successive generations of critics, we might be tempted to infer a corresponding growth in the sense of the irreducible pastness of the past, as philologists realized that the materials they were studying did not provide the key to the problems encountered by all modern intellectual

---

[120] See Christia Mercer, 'The Vitality and Importance of Early Modern Aristotelianism,' in Tom Sorell, ed., *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: the tension between the new and traditional philosophies from Machiavelli to Leibniz* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993); and Charles Schmitt, *Aristotle and the Renaissance* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983).

[121] See his preface to the second edition of the *Thesaurus Temporum* (1658), sig. ††4[b].

[122] For examples of such claims, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 457, 477, 482-3.

disciplines. History, accessed through the tools of philology, might be transformed into an independent discipline rather than the handmaiden of higher ones.[123] Particulars may have come to be valued and studied in their own right, rather than as steps on the ladder of scientific knowledge.

iii. Criticism and the Judeo-Christian heritage

It may be the case that the drive towards such a historical, particularizing approach was strongest in criticism of the Bible and ecclesiastical texts. This hypothesis is substantiated over the course of this thesis, which argues that concerns over the impact of philology on historical method were most prominent in the fields of biblical criticism and patristic scholarship. Here, scholars' preoccupation with preserving divinely inspired texts against corruption, and with the revelation given to men in a particular historical moment, sometimes overrode the need for ongoing revision and improvement of the literary qualities of Scripture or of the Fathers. The corpus of classical Greek and Latin literature, on the other hand, remained alive, rather than being frozen in history: its grammar, from stylistic elegances and rhetorical standards to the facts and examples it referred to, was still in active use by the educated public in general as well as by a small body of hardcore philologists.

Grammar, then, played a different role when it illuminated Scripture from when it treated profane, typically Greek and Roman authors. The formative statements on biblical criticism by humanists from Erasmus to Scaliger and beyond contended that grammar had

[123] As suggested in the introduction to Donald Kelley, ed., *History and the Disciplines: the Reclassification of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe* (Rochester, N. Y.: University of Rochester Press, 1997).

a rightful place as a handmaiden of theology.[124] Just as models of criticism had been discovered in classical Greek and Roman antiquity, from Aristotle to Varro (via the Alexandrian librarians and scholars) and beyond, so too early modern scholars found two types of precedent for criticism of religious texts in the ancient world: primarily the Church Fathers, who represented a continuation of the Greek and Latin literary tradition as well as the earliest stirrings of a literate Christianity after the authors of the New Testament, but also the learned Jews who had preserved and written commentaries on the text of the Hebrew Bible. This was how Scaliger described the latter group, in his letter to Scriverius, again making the connection between criticism and the establishment and teaching of grammatical rules:

> Among the Jews, there are the Masoretes, who correspond to 'critics' among the Greeks. They drew up an order for the uncertain and scattered prescriptions of the art of grammar, and adorned the text of the Holy Bible with punctuation and vowel points, which are the soul of Hebrew. In short, they call 'criticism' *masoreth*.[125]

These separate 'critical' traditions were assessed syncretically. Casaubon, for instance, planned to write a treatise 'De Critica,' but never published a work matching this description.[126] He did, however, collect extensive manuscript notes on education and erudition in the ancient world, and discussed the topic of criticism across his published output.[127] Consider the conflation of Galen, Tertullian and the 'Hebraeorum doctores' in the preface to Isaac Casaubon's notes on Athenaeus, a pagan author:

---

[124] See Cummings (2002), passim.

[125] 'Apud Hebraeos *Masoritae* sunt, qui apud Graecos Critici. ii incertas ac vagantes artis Grammaticae regulas in ordinem coëgerunt: Bibliorum sacrorum scripta apicibus ac punctis vocalibus, quę Hebraismi anima est, exornarunt. Denique ἡ κριτικὴ apud eos *Masoreth* vocatur.' See also Scaliger's reference to the 'Critici Iudaeorum' in *De emendatione temporum* (Geneva, 1629), p. 573.

[126] See the quotation below. On Casaubon in general, see Parenty (2009), with a useful bibliography; and now, with more attention to the relationship between Casaubon's Greco-Roman and Hebrew studies, Grafton and Weinberg (2010). See also Pattison (1875).

[127] See e.g. Bodleian Library, MSS Casaubon 29 and Casaubon 60. The former is discussed by Parenty (2009), p. 409f.

> Therefore those who think that it makes no difference whether they use an emended book or an unemended one, are quite ridiculous. These people are...enemies and despisers of the divine criticism (I mean the true one, not one that is promiscuous, and, as Tertullian says, all over the place). The fatuousness and malignity of these people was frequently attacked by the great Galen. And I have proved, in my *De critica*, which I have written with a most exact diligence, that it is from this source that very many errors have come into widespread existence. The teachers of the Jews have a word to designate the need for this study: they say no less truly than elegantly that criticism is the fence of divine Law, and does this not apply all the more to human writings?[128]

The image of criticism as a 'fence' of the divine Law was taken up by Scaliger, Heinsius, and Alsted, as well as James Ussher, one of the most ecclesiastically oriented of British philologists.[129] The Masoretes, Fathers of the Church like Tertullian, and learned non-Christians like Galen all figure as manifestations of one and the same, divinely sourced art of criticism. But when Casaubon talks about 'divine criticism' and the 'need for this study' he is referring to criticism not only of sacred texts, but also of profane ones. This is, after all, his preface to Athenaeus; and the notes for the treatise *De Critica* which he advertises here show that he was thinking as much about profane criticism as sacred when gathering the material for it. Historians of scholarship who look back to Hellenistic Alexandria for the birth of scholarship and more or less bypass the Fathers, except perhaps for Jerome, have misrepresented the genealogy of their discipline. The early Christians or the Masoretes may not have made many methodological advances on Alexandrian criticism, but leaving them out of an account of the history of scholarship also means leaving out the religious sentiments that animated their engagement with texts and clearly

---

[128] Casaubon, *Animaduersionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri XV* (Lyon, 1600), sig. ¶6: 'Ut planè ridiculi sint, qui emendatóne an inemendato libro utantur, sua nihil putant interesse. Isti sunt...divinae Critices (legitimam intelligo, non istam volgivagam, et ut loquitur Tertullianus, passivam) hostes et contemtores: quorum fatuitatem et κακοήθειαν tot locis magnus Galenus acriter est insectatus. Nos autem in eo libro quem accuratissima diligentia de Critica fecimus, plurimos in vitam errores ab hoc fonte manasse, vero vicimus. Sed studij huius necessitatem Hebraeorum doctores verbo indicant, qui Legis divinae, (quanto igitur meliore iure humanorum scriptorum?) sepem esse Criticam non minus verè quàm eleganter pronunciant.' Casaubon's claim that he had already written this treatise seems to have been an exaggeration, and is unsupported by the current state of his papers.

[129] Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 733-4; Heinsius (1627), sig. ***2[a]; Alsted (1630), vol. VII, col. 2214. These references probably all stem from Paulus Fagius's edition and translation of Pirke Avoth: *Sententiae uere elegantes...veterum sapientum Hebraeorum* (Isny, 1541), p. 56. For Ussher, see his letter to Louis Cappel in Richard Parr, *The Life of James Usher* [*sic*] (London, 1686), p. 575; and, in general, III.1 and III.2, below.

resonated with the philologists of the Renaissance. The rhetoric of Renaissance critics against the ineptitude of the scribes and learned men of the Middle Ages clearly draws on various movements to reform the Church.

There is one final aspect of the interaction between theology and philology which deserves treatment in this opening chapter, because it serves as a backbone for many of my later discussions of the topic. It also, however, provides an absolutely crucial counterweight to the notion that philological study of the Bible led humanists to historicize the Bible. This is the role of typology in Protestant biblical scholarship. My account of early modern typology builds on the indispensable study of Jeffrey Miller.[130] Simply put, typology is the identification of correspondences between things or events in the Old Testament, and things or events in the New. These correspondences are not merely analogies; rather, divine providence ensured that parts of the Old Testament would find their fulfilment in the New. Such correspondences were used by theologians to argue that certain aspects of the Old Testament had been abrogated and were no longer legitimate within Christianity; or, conversely, that they ought to be extended from the Old Testament to Christianity.

The specific arguments made by theologians, however, are not my principal concern. What matters is that types and the antitypes that fulfilled them were fundamentally historical. Moreover, as I shall show, even the most advanced and sophisticated biblical critics with a humanist training regarded types this way, with some extremely important

---

[130] Jeffrey Alan Miller, 'Theological Typology, Milton, and the Aftermath of Writing' (DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2011). A remarkably small amount of attention has been paid to interactions between typology and humanist biblical scholarship, but see Debora K. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 23-4, 50, 83, 224. To put these issues in broader perspective, see Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974); and Erich Auerbach, 'Figura,' in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature: six essays* (New York: Meridian Books, 1959).

exceptions.[131] The historical facts and their typological significance were inseparable, so that it is actually misleading to speak of 'typological *significance*' as though it were something added to the historical facts. Thus, as powerful as the Aristotelian concept of *historia* may have been, with all its potential to foster an appreciation of texts and things as rooted in particular historical contexts, it was not absolutely dominant. In one respect, the attention to historical facts enjoined by typology may have led to the same kind of particularizing conclusion, where scholars finally realized that what they had regarded as types were irreducibly historical in a more modern sense. Fundamentally, though, the model of *historia* adopted by many biblical scholars – even some of those who were committed and self-professed humanists and critics – was theological rather than secular. When an aggressively secular model is applied to the Bible, then, it deserves our attention.

Typology, then, offers a limit case against any easy association between humanism and any anti-theological, proto-modern idea of historicism. Placing the 'history' and the 'things' referred to by Scripture in a separate, sacrosanct realm of typological correspondences allowed critics more freedom when they investigated its text. Philology was said to be incapable of touching the fundamental truths of Christianity. How this worked can be demonstrated with the example of the Protestant Hebraist Johannes Drusius (the younger). Drusius famously said that 'there is no such thing as heresy in history, and even less in grammar.'[132] We must attend to the context of this statement and the examples Drusius used immediately after it to support his point. He recalled the anger he had aroused after he had pointed out in an early work that David had been allowed, 'by custom,' to have

---

[131] Chiefly Selden and Scaliger: see II.4.

[132] Drusius, *De Hasidaeis* (Franeker, 1603), p. 22: 'Tenuis mea scientia versatur tota circa Grammaticam & Historiam. Dogmata fidei aliis me doctioribus tractanda relinquo. In Historia nulla haeresis, multo minus in Grammatica.' Quoted by Shuger (1994), p. 7. Cf. the similar passages cited by de Jonge (1975), pp. 66-7, and Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, p. 498. For more on Drusius's scholarship, see van Rooden (1989), pp. 75-9.

more than one wife.[133] Whether he was allowed to by any formal 'law,' on the other hand, Drusius claimed not to know. Drusius's distinction between 'law' and 'custom' allowed him to bypass typology and speak directly and exclusively about Jewish history, saying nothing about what Christians should or should not do. Only the Jewish law could function as a type of the New Testament; an informal practice of the Jews could not. Thus, he left the typological framework untouched.

When it came to more intricate linguistic issues, however, the controversial implications of his work were harder to deny. He was forced to defend himself publicly against Sibrandus Lubbertus, the high Calvinist and eventual Counter-Remonstrant, who had taken issue with some of his comments on the word 'created' in Scripture.[134] Drusius seemed to have said that 'created' and 'begotten' in the Old Testament were interchangeable, at least as far as the Septuagint was concerned, and tried to demonstrate as much using a canonical passage (Proverbs 8:22) and, more dangerously, an apocryphal one (Sirach 1:4). These passages spoke of 'wisdom,' but were commonly regarded as referring to Christ. Drusius's reading of them directly contravened the Athanasian creed, which described the Son as 'non factus, nec creatus, sed genitus.' He had collapsed one of the fine philosophical distinctions on which the doctrine of the Trinity rested, and opened the door to Arianism and even Socinianism.

Having approached Drusius with a firm understanding of typology, then, it is possible to see how grammatical study of the words of the Old Testament could upset key articles of

---

[133] Drusius (1603), pp. 23-4.

[134] See Drusius's *Ad fratres Belgas epistola, in qua calumnia diluitur recens sparsa de logo creato* (Franeker, 1615), later published in a collection of *Praestantium ac eruditorum virorum epistolae ecclesiasticae et theologicae varii argumenti* (Amsterdam, 1704; third edition), pp. 415-6, from which I quote here. Cf. the letter discussing these matters of 5 June, 1616, from Sixtinus Amama to Petrus Cunaeus, and the comments by its editor, Pieter Burmann, in Cunaeus, *Epistolae* (Leiden, 1725), pp. 133-4.

the Christian faith. Grammar was thus 'historical' insofar as it recovered meanings and usages of words that allowed it to demolish some of the later accretions of Christian theology. It did not, however, desacralize the history of the Old Testament. Grammarians were dealing in a diluted form of historicism, and a questioning of the divine import of the facts of sacred history had to come from outside their discipline.

Whereas the demands of confessional polemic and the grammatical foundations of theology pushed critics towards a more historically faithful attitude to ancient texts – with typology as an important exception – the literary elements of criticism may have pulled them the other way. However, we still do not know how this relationship played out during the seventeenth century, and what was motivating critics at one time or another, or in different places, partly because too much attention has been paid to the development of scholarly practices and not enough to ideas about what scholarship was for. The rest of this study will put this hypothesis to the test with Britain as its focus, but I hope to show that many of my conclusions about the effects of post-Reformation debates on the development of historical method and the increasing separation of literary from historical criticism may hold for other countries as well.

iv. Sceptics and philosophers

I aim to show readers of this study that the more scholars practised criticism in its Judeo-Christian and theological modes, the more they were forced to grapple with the philosophical foundations of their work. As noted above, Aristotle was a paradigmatic critic, and the neo-Aristotelian concept of *historia* placed historical knowledge not on its own, independent from normative or abstract reasoning, but within a larger philosophical

framework. Some humanists even went so far as to represent criticism as one of the philosophical schools. Salmasius wrote that the sceptics had been so called because they doubt everything; the dogmatics, because they are eager to affirm something; and the critics, because they exercise their judgement.[135] As early as the middle of the seventeenth century, then, criticism was responding to the challenges posed by a revival of scepticism within epistemology.[136] These philosophical contexts, from disputes over the status of Aristotelianism to the challenges issued by new philosophies, will prove important over the course of this study, especially when I consider the state of criticism around the time of the Restoration; and they were never more important than when they came into contact with religious issues.

When Salmasius said that critics used 'judgement' whereas sceptics did not, however, he dodged the question of what 'judgement' was. A conjectural emendation could not be 'proven' in the same sense as an emendation from manuscript. Judgement in such instances was necessarily a matter of speculation, and such speculation was felt to be highly dangerous in some cases, especially where the text of Scripture was concerned. One of the hallmarks of Scaliger's approach to scholarship, to which both theologians and humanists objected, was the audacity with which he passed judgement on ancient history and literature.[137] For a figure as late as Gibbon, equally, it was the 'sagacity' of critics, the

---

[135] Claudius Salmasius, *Defensio Regia, pro Carolo I* (Leiden, 1649), p. 19: 'disciplinae philosophorum ex praecipuo aliquo doctrinae suae dogmate nomen adsciverunt, Sceptici quia dubitant, Dogmatici quia adfirmant, Critici quia judicant.'

[136] Much more has been written about the supposed rise of scepticism and its impact on philology in the later seventeenth century. For a small sample, see Paul Hazard, *La Crise de la conscience européenne (1680-1715)* (Paris: Boivin & Cie, 1935); Patrick Lambe, 'Critics and Skeptics in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters,' *Harvard Theological Review* 81.3 (1988); and Grafton (2005).

[137] Beza to Johannes Crato, 30 October, 1583, in Beza's *Correspondence,* edited by Hippolyte Aubert and Fernand Aubert, 36 vols. to date (Geneva: Droz, 1960-), vol. XXIV, p. 285 (remarking on the first edition of the *De emendatione temporum*): 'Mihi tam displicet in multis confidentia, quam in plurimis placet.' For more on Beza's response to this work, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, especially p. 366.

way they hunted down the truth by means of intuition, that gave them their boldness.[138] Judgement was equally contentious when it came to the question of the authority of an ancient author, rather than a manuscript. The outrageousness of Scaliger's self-confidence was most pronounced when he attacked the Church Fathers for their errors in matters of history and literature.[139] Such boldness could, at times, grow into a full-blown scepticism about what critics could say about the past with any certainty. More often, in the period covered by this study, it was a cause for concern about individuals rather than the art as a whole.

It would be easy to make much of the presence of Sextus Empiricus in the discussions of criticism I have already mentioned. In fact, what scepticism there was within criticism was just as often a product of its own methodological protocols (such as conjectural emendation), which were drawn from other sources than Sextus Empiricus alone, and of its association with Aristotelianism.[140] It also arose out of a dialogue with philosophical systems that appeared to downgrade the value of philological and historical research. In his earliest work, Descartes was dismissive about the value of authors' testimonies for finding out about the past. When an author states an opinion, or relates events, he does not

---

[138] 'The bold and sagacious spirit of criticism,' in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. David Womersley, 3 vols. (London: Allen Lane, 1996), vol. I., p. 742. *Sagax* in Latin, and 'sagacious' in English, both connoted the sense of smell, and were widely used by early modern philological and philosophical or scientific writers to denote the following of hunches. See, for instance, Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, p. 307; Kenney (1974), p. 37; for the philosophical dimension, Rhodri Lewis, 'A Kind of Sagacity: Francis Bacon, the *Ars Memoriae* and the pursuit of natural knowledge', *Intellectual History Review*, 19.2 (2009), pp. 155-75; and, for its use by a figure whose work falls into both camps, Lynn Sumida Joy, *Gassendi the Atomist: Advocate of history in an age of science* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 76-7.

[139] See, for instance, Joseph Scaliger, *Thesaurus Temporum* (Leiden, 1606), 'Animadversiones,' p. 255; Scaliger (1629), pp. 536-9; and de Jonge (1975), p. 86.

[140] Although it does not always engage directly with humanist philology, much work has been done to recover a broader basis for early modern scepticism than the dissemination of Sextus Empiricus, and to trace elements of it to developments in high and late medieval philosophy: see Rudolf Schüssler, *Moral im Zweifel* (2 vols.; Paderborn: Mentis Verlag, 2006), vol. II; Ian Maclean, 'The "Sceptical Crisis" reconsidered: Galen, rational medicine and the *libertas philosophandi*,' *Early Science and Medicine* 11.3 (2006), pp. 247-74; and Lesley Smith's forthcoming chapter on 'Uncertainty in the study of the Bible,' in Nicolette Zeeman, Kantik Ghosh, and Dallas G. Denery II, eds., *Uncertain Knowledge: Interdisciplinary conversations about doubt and scepticism in the Middle Ages* (in preparation). I would like to thank the editors for allowing me to read the introduction to this volume, and Lesley Smith for allowing me to read her contribution.

provide his reader with 'mathematical,' 'philosophical,' and 'scientific' certainty about the truth, however many other authors say the same thing. 'History' was not a source of absolutely reliable knowledge.[141]

Much early modern discourse about criticism was responding to some version of this view, whether or not it took its cue from Descartes specifically. An appeal was made to a neo-Aristotelian distinction between 'moral' and 'mathematical' certainty in order to rescue certain categories of scholarship.[142] Examples of such an appeal include the use of conjectural emendation to arrive at the original, now partly lost Hebrew text of the Old Testament from its ancient translations; and the study of the Church Fathers in order to extract from their works a *consensus Patrum* that represented legitimate ecclesiastical tradition.[143] Yet it was also used to pit one kind of scholarship against another. James Ussher dismissed Scaliger's interventions in biblical chronology by identifying him as no more than a literary critic whose standards of 'proof' were dubious, especially as far as conjectural emendations were concerned. Scaliger's were playful, and amusing enough when nothing other than the text of the *Appendix Virgiliana* was at stake. Yet they rarely approached even 'verisimilitude,' one of the lower standards in the Aristotelian epistemological hierarchy, let alone the kind of certainty required of a scholar of sacred

---

[141] *Regulae ad directionem ingenii*, ed. Giovanni Crapulli (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), Rule III, p. 7. See also J. R. Milton, '"Delicate learning," erudition and the enterprise of philosophy,' in Jill Kraye and M. W. F. Stone, eds., *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2000).

[142] It was, in fact, Jean Gerson who coined the phrase *certitudo moralis*: see Rudolf Schüssler, 'Jean Gerson, moral certainty and the Renaissance of ancient Scepticism,' *Renaissance Studies* 23.4 (2009), pp. 445-62, with a concise summary of the Aristotelian background, p. 453. For more on early modern applications of these distinctions, see R. W. Serjeantson, 'Testimony and Proof in Early-Modern England,' *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 30.2 (1999), pp. 195-236; and Lorraine Daston, 'Probability and Evidence,' in Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers, eds., *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 1998). For a discussion of these issues in relation to Descartes and erudition, see Krzystof Pomian, 'Le Cartésianisme, les érudits et l'histoire,' *Archiwum historii filozofii i myśli społecznej* 12 (1966), pp. 185-88.

[143] See, respectively, III.1 and III.2, below.

history or the text of the Bible.[144] For the purposes of the present chapter, it does not matter whether there was any justice in Ussher's sarcasm: the point is that, like Henry Savile, he was trying to defend the boundaries of his profession against the perceived arrogance of a philologist.

Connected to the philosophical framework of philology was the issue of its modernity. When critics averted to Aristotle, the ancient Greek and Roman grammarians, or the Fathers as models for their enterprise, they were implying a certain continuity between ancient and modern approaches to texts. When and to what extent they started to perceive a fundamental gap between their research and that of these predecessors is a question of some interest, and should exercise scholars of seventeenth-century intellectual history as a whole, rather than students of the so-called 'quarrel of the ancients and moderns' or 'battle of the books,' which are perhaps better regarded as late, vernacular epiphenomena of tensions that had been exercising European philologists for decades, if not centuries.[145] Hugo Grotius, for example, identified criticism as, among all the fields of learning, the one art where the modern age had so distinguished itself as to eclipse antiquity altogether. His notion that philology was at the cutting edge of intellectual life, rather than mounting a conservative rearguard action against the encroachment of empirical science and

---

[144] See Ussher's letter to William Eyre, 21 December, 1607, in Parr (1686), p. 2: 'Sed ludet ibi profectò operam [Scaliger, in treating the Masorah], si quid ego augurari possum. Ludat *Scaligeri* Critica in *Virgiliano Culice*; ludat, (inquam) nam lusisse ostendunt crebrae illae trajectiones, quas ille nulli opinor hominum unquam probaverit. Et ludente autore, ludat etiam Interpres. Lusit *Virgilius* Culice, (*Lusimus Octavi*) lusit etiam in emendando Culice *Scaliger*. Et hujusmodi nugis ludat ille quantum volet: Non in eo positae sunt fortunae Graeciae. Sed in seriis & maximi momenti rebus pium & modestum pectus desideraverim. Tuum erit (doctiss. *Eyri*) & tui similium, quibus ad arcana literaturae Hebraicae datus est aditus, succrescenti huic malo ire obviam, & curare ne quid inde detrimenti Resp. Christiana capiat...Lasciviunt critici, quorum petulantia comprimenda; nisi non sit verisimile, non ego credulus illis.' Ussher's harsh dismissal of Scaliger's work on the *Appendix Virgiliana* might disappoint the moderation, but provoke the assent, of Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, p. 125, who calls it 'another exercise in the Parisian mode.'

[145] For an expression of some of these continuities, see C. D. A. Leighton, 'Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell,' *History of European Ideas* 31 (2005), pp. 1-16.

philosophical rationalism, did not survive long beyond his own period.[146] This makes its recovery more, not less, important.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, the claims of scepticism did not seem especially pressing. On the whole, the question of criticism's relationship with philosophy, literature and history was relatively uncontested. Critics such as Isaac Casaubon refused to distinguish between 'literary' and 'historical' forms of criticism. Neither Renaissance scholars nor their readers always demanded historical accuracy, let alone a historical narrative, at the expense of everything else.[147] This is partly because criticism had not yet been detached from wider projects of humanistic literary, cultural and religious reform.

v. The political, social, and institutional context

Criticism was not affiliated with any particular political position, but critics did discuss the contexts and ramifications of their work in political terms, once again starting with analogies from ancient history.[148] More often, however, critics asserted a certain independence and detachment from public life and the demands of patronage. Scaliger read the obituary for Lipsius's attempt to blend philology with political philosophy: 'Lipsius is not a political author, nor can he achieve anything in that genre: pedants can

---

[146] See his early work, the *Parallelon Rerumpublicarum liber tertius* (Haarlem: A. Loosjes, 1802), p. 52: 'Merito itaque nunquam majus Literaturae hujus studium, nunquam major gloria fuit. Quicunque enim sunt hodie magnae existimationis viri, hanc amplexi sunt laudum suarum materiam aut viam. Caeteris eruditionis partibus multum est, si prisca aetas aequari potest: hac una vetustatem longissime superari, laus magna saeculi est. Graecos omnes in emendandis Authoribus nugatos videmus, nec quicquam fere serii attigisse; Romanos, qui Grammaticam sero admodum accepere, Critices vix umbram consecutos, & inde tam inveteratos in Codicibus errores.' I owe this reference to Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Reason and Reasonableness in French Ecclesiastical Scholarship,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 74.3 (2011), p. 427.

[147] As Kenney (1974) observes, p. 23.

[148] In general, see Anthony Grafton, 'Humanism and political theory,' in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie, eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).

achieve nothing in that field. Neither I nor any other learned man can write political tracts.'[149] Sir Henry Wotton complained that the dedicatory epistle to Henri IV in Casaubon's edition of Polybius (1609) was sycophantic and politically overambitious, redolent 'of a courtier, not a critic' ('non critici...sed aulici').[150] When John Selden was in prison in 1629, Peter Paul Rubens wrote to Pierre Dupuy expressing his disappointment that the great philologist and author of *De Diis Syris* had become mired in 'the turbulence of politics.'[151] The model of political organization they were committed to was one of elitist friendship circles: hence the popularity of philological enterprise and discussions in the Italian academies and similar intellectual networks.[152] The European republic of letters has repeatedly been described as a vastly expanded instance of such a network, which nonetheless shared the same ethos of polite, unhierarchical, and politically neutral exchange amongst a learned elite – an ethos made manifest in Rubens' lament for Selden. This is why the Aristarchan critic who corrected his friends' philological faux pas had such appeal. The importance of the office of critic in either a public or semi-private context was that he contributed to the literary culture of his own time, not that he restored the literature of an earlier age. There is no reason why such a perspective on criticism should have contributed to a more historically sensitive approach to textual corruption, correction, and elucidation.

This 'republic of letters,' however, is far from the only prism through which philological enterprise in the period can be viewed. There were pockets of intensely confessionalized

---

[149] *Secunda Scaligerana*, pp. 430-31: 'Lipsius non est...Politicus, nec potest quicquam in Politia: nihil possunt pedantes in illis rebus; nec ego nec alius doctus possemus scribere in Politicis.'

[150] Pattison (1875), p. 427.

[151] See Peter Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 100-101; quoting Rubens to Dupuy, 8 August 1629, in Rubens, *Correspondance*, ed. C. Ruelens (Antwerp, 1887-1909), vol. V, p. 148.

[152] See Anthony Grafton, 'Conflict and Harmony in the Collegium Gellianum,' in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, ed. Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel Vardi (Oxford University Press, 2004).

and politicized scholars who were nonetheless at the heart of European criticism: not least the Barberini circle in Rome. One of its members, the Greek ecclesiastical historian Leo Allatius, praised Cardinal Francesco Barberini and Pope Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini) for their investment in humanistic learning and counter-Reformation patristic scholarship in the same breath.[153] Yet these were not the only philologists who saw their work as addressed to Christendom rather than, or as well as, a republic of letters: the same could be said of Ussher, a profound student of sacred philology whose letter to William Eyre invokes the unity of a 'Christian commonwealth' of biblical critics.

Ecclesiastical patronage was clearly vital in the British context, as the involvement of bishops like Ussher, Lancelot Andrewes, John Williams, and William Laud amply demonstrates. However, it took more than mere patronage, whether ecclesiastical, political, or disinterested, to produce an ideology of scholarship. Jean-Louis Quantin has traced how seventeenth-century patristic scholarship and theology eventually converged on a distinctively 'Anglican' confessional identity, but it is not even clear whether the same might be done for biblical criticism, where radical and ideologically problematic divergences can be found between the approaches of scholars as like-minded and closely connected as John Selden, Patrick Young, and Ussher. Equally, there is a distinction to be made between formal academic theology and historical scholarship, however directly it addressed religious questions. The supremacy of the former on an institutional and confessional level gave it much more potential to cause controversy, as Quantin has noted: the historical approach Ussher took to contemporary debates about predestination allowed

---

[153] Leo Allatius, *Apes Urbanae* (Rome, 1633), p. 11: Humaniores ipsae literae, & artis Criticae censoria virgula, futilibus Barbarorum ineptijs repurgatę, doctè omninò, & luculenter pertractantur...Quid plura! Pronus iam habetur Historiae Ecclesiasticae cursus; quo vnanimem Patrum & continuam, licet diuersis temporibus, ac regionibus, nec vno linguae idiomate scripserint, in nostrae Fidei dogmatibus, ac ritibus exponendis, sententiam callemus, velut praesidium contra Nouatorum technas, & haereses omninò validissimum.' See also Peter Rietbergen, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policies* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), and Ingo Herklotz, *Die Academia Basiliana: griechische Philologie, Kirchengeschichte und Unionsbemühungen im Rom der Barberini* (Rome: Herder, 2008).

him to promulgate opinions that would have been suppressed if stated in a more systematic way.[154]

Isaac Casaubon, of course, can be considered one of the first major practitioners of late humanist philology in Britain, and he embodies the Janus-faced nature of European scholarship during the period, with his regard both for the common cause of true religion and for polite humanistic exchange between the confessions.[155] Before Casaubon's arrival in 1610, however, there were developing traditions of philological inquiry which took other continental figures, especially Scaliger, as their models. They were rooted in antiquarianism, native as well as European, and centred not on the Church but on the history of English law and politics and their present-day institutions. These must be addressed first, before examining the impact of Casaubon and his distinctive approach to Christian antiquity.

---

[154] Quantin (2009), pp. 189-90.

[155] See Dirk van Miert, 'The Limits of Transconfessional Contact in the Republic of Letters around 1600: Scaliger, Casaubon, and their Catholic correspondents,' in Jeannine de Landtsheer and Henk Nellen, eds., *Between Scylla and Charybdis: Learned letter writers navigating the reefs of religious and political controversy in early modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

PART TWO: NEW HORIZONS

II.1: Antiquarian philology and the Scaliger paradigm

This chapter discusses John Selden's early work, up to and including his *De Diis Syris* (1617). The account it offers differs from those of historians of political thought or of British antiquarianism.[156] It considers the extent to which Selden can be described not as an antiquary, legal historian, or political thinker, but as a critic and a humanist.[157] I am interested not in placing his early work exclusively within the former category or the latter, but rather in exploring the distinctions which Selden and his contemporaries tended to make between different forms of learning. Selden ended up contributing more than any other British scholar to the development of philology as a discipline, even if his own interests went far beyond its scope. This contribution began with his earliest publications. Selden deserves to be claimed for the history of British philology, moreover, because he was that discipline's most original, provocative, and renowned practitioner before Bentley; and also because most of the major intellectual disputes he became involved in hinged on its status.[158]

i. William Camden

Selden was inspired not only by Joseph Scaliger, but also by Selden's English mentor, William Camden. The best place to start, then, is with Camden's own involvement in

---

[156] For examples of these, see Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 205-9; idem, 'Grotius and Selden,' in Burns and Goldie, eds., (1991), p. 523; Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 95-118; and the more sophisticated treatment of Selden in relation to Drayton by Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 169-99.

[157] I differ from G. J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship* (Oxford University Press, 2009) in regarding Selden's emulation of Scaliger as central from his earliest works onwards, rather than only in *De Diis Syris*: see p. 256.

[158] See especially II.4, below.

humanist philology, especially in his *Britannia*.[159] This may seem counter-intuitive, since Camden was not generally described as a critic or philologist by his peers. His work related to various disciplines: geography, history, antiquarianism, and law. Camden himself drew careful distinctions between these fields, making sure to describe his *Britannia* as antiquarian geography or chorography rather than history, for instance, and trying to avoid 'any unconscious slips into a narrative of men and deeds' or a rigorous chronological arrangement of his material.[160] His readers echoed this distinction. As Grotius put it, beyond the account of the reign of Elizabeth in his *Annales*, Camden had never written a history, except for occasional bits of historical material which had intruded into his chorographical account of Britain.[161] Selden himself praised Camden as a chorographer and 'most Learned Nourice of Antiquitie,' rather than as a critic or a narrative historian.[162] Similarly, James Howell later called him 'the *English Strabo*,' again emphasizing the geographical connection.[163]

Equally, many of Camden's critics attacked him for his supposed pretensions to narrative, political historiography. The rival herald Ralph Brooke declared that 'for a meere scholler to be an historian, that must take up all by hearesay, and uncertaine rumors, not being

---

[159] The literature on Camden is vast; but see Wyman H. Herendeen, *William Camden: a life in context* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007); Patrick Collinson, 'One of Us? William Camden and the Making of History,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 8 (1998), pp. 139-63; and Christiane Kunst, *Römische Tradition und englische Politik: Studien zur Geschichte der Britannienrezeption zwischen William Camden und John Speed* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1994).

[160] See D. R. Woolf, 'Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987), p. 24; referring to Camden, *Britannia* (1607), pp. 206, 239, 256, 260-61, and pp. 340, 363, 369, 371 of Philemon Holland's 1610 translation.

[161] Grotius to B. Aubéry du Maurier, 26 July, 1629, in Hugo Grotius, *Briefwisseling*, eds. Bernard Lambert Meulenbroek, Philip Christian Molhuysen and Paula P. Witkam, 17 vols. ('s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1928-2001), vol. IV, p. 81: 'Camdeni extra Elisabetham nihil est historicum, nisi quod in accuratissimam, quam dedit Britanniae descriptionem, obiter incurrit.' Grotius is making a comparison with Bacon, whose history of Henry VII had recently been published.

[162] In his *Illustrations* to Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (London, 1613), sig. A3^{b}.

[163] *A German Diet* (London, 1653), p. 37; echoing Scaliger, *Epistolae* (1627), p. 813. In the same catalogue of English scholars he says that Selden 'knows as much as both the *Scaligers*.'

acquainted with the secretes and occurrences of state matters, I take it (as many other affirme with me) verie unfit, and dangerous.'[164] When Fulke Greville attempted to establish a lectureship in history in 1615, John Coke must have been glancing at Camden when he said that 'nothing can bee more unthriftie nor vaine' than putting a 'critical antiquarie instead of an historian' in the chair.[165] Geographer-antiquaries like Camden lacked the intimate relationships with rulers and politicians which distinguished classical historians like Polybius or Tacitus in the eyes of Renaissance readers. Nor did they have requisite experience of ecclesiastical and political history: as Coke put it, they could not 'joyne church and comonwealth together which to separate is to betray.'

The sense of 'history' articulated in these comments is something other than that outlined by Scaliger when he spoke of 'historical' grammar. The former has often been identified as the 'Ciceronian,' diachronic, and politically orientated vision of history as the *res gestae* of illustrious men, the latter as the 'Aristotelian' (or Herodotean) form.[166] Indeed, Camden might not have objected to having the *Britannia* described as Aristotelian *historia*; and his synchronic historical inquiries into words and things, whether human monuments and institutions or geographical features, took him into the province first of grammar and secondly of humanist criticism. This face of antiquarian inquiry is what Coke was gesturing at with his warning about the 'critical antiquarie.' Camden's work constantly drew on the textual criticism and philological enquiries of Scaliger and the like, and many of his readers appreciated this convergence of antiquarianism and cutting-edge philology.

---

[164] *A discoverie of certaine errours* (London, 1596), 'To maister Camden'; quoted in Woolf (1987), p. 25.

[165] Coke to Greville, 15 September, 1615; quoted in Woolf (1987), p. 27. See N. Farmer Jr., 'Fulke Greville and Sir John Coke: An Exchange of Letters on a History Lectureship and Certain Verses on Sir Philip Sidney,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 33 (1969-70), pp. 217-36; and the discussion by Feingold, 'The Humanities,' p. 354.

[166] For instance by Momigliano (1950). See also idem, 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography,' *History* 43 (1958), pp. 1-13. On the Aristotelian roots of humanist philology, see I.1, above.

Selden himself annotated his copy of Isaac Casaubon's edition of Athenaeus with a reference to the *Britannia*.[167] The passage of Athenaeus in question featured a reference to the British Isles taken from an older author, Moschion, making it one of the earliest references to Britain in Greek literature. Camden's discussion of it had considered the possible emendation of the word Βρεττανίας to Βρετίανης, which would make it refer instead to a mountain range in Italy.[168] Polybius had already been emended in exactly the same way to show that Hannibal had not travelled to Britain, and Camden 'feared' that the 'critics' might remove yet another reference to Britain from a classical text. Indeed, he paused to wonder, 'what is beyond the audacity of our current generation of critics?'[169]

As Selden understood it, then, Camden's work on geography was rooted in philological recovery (or, in some cases, demolition) of the classical past. Even when it connected the histories of ancient nations to modern ones such as Britain, it was a pan-European rather than a domestic enterprise.[170] Exactly the same could be said of the confluence of criticism and antiquarianism in Scaliger's debate with Camden over the origins of the Scots.[171] Selden, however, was not the only reader alive to this dimension of Camden's work. Edmund Bolton called him 'the most approued, and learned Philologer, and

---

[167] The 1608 Heidelberg edition: Bodleian Library, B 1.21 Med.Seld., p. 208.

[168] Camden (1607), p. 24: 'Dum enim Athenaeus nauem illam Hieronis, cuius magnitudo & artificium cunctis miraculo fuit, è Moschione vetustissimo authore descripsit, praecipuum eius nauis malum difficulter in Britanniae montibus à subulco inuentum, & à Philea Tauromenite mechanico in Siciliam deductum prodit. Sed vereor ne Critici etiam Βρετίανης hîc pro Βρεττανίας legendum censeant & ad montes Brutiorum in Italia itidem referant.' Selden's annotated copy is Bodleian Library, C 1.4 Art.Seld.

[169] 'Quid non audeant temporis nostri Critici,' ibid. For Casaubon's praise of Camden's work, however, see his letter to Camden of 5 November, 1596, in his *Epistolae* (Rotterdam, 1709) pp. 56-7.

[170] Points made with greater force and applied to other British antiquaries by Thomas Roebuck, 'Antiquarianism and Regionalism, 1580-1640' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2010): see Ch. I, 'Early-Modern Antiquarianism in Context.'

[171] Covered in Grafton (1993), pp. 79-81. Scaliger copied inscriptions and made notes on the *Britannia*: see Leiden University Library, MS Scal. 61, fols. 140, 177^{b}-178^{b}. For his favourable opinion of that book, see his *Epistolae* (1627), p. 500, quoted in Toomer (2009), p. 22; and the *Secunda Scaligerana*, p. 252, s.v. 'CAMDEN.' He also owned other English antiquarian works, such as John Twine's *De rebus albionicis* (London, 1590): see p. 31 of H. J. de Jonge, ed., *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J. J. Scaliger* (Utrecht: H&S, 1977).

Antiquarie of our nation.'[172] Casaubon had been encouraged to contact Camden in connection with his work on Polybius by Richard Thomson, who thought him one of the leading experts on Greek in England (along with Henry Savile).[173]

At the same time, Camden's concern for what the critics might do to Athenaeus suggest that he recognized some kind of boundary between the *Britannia* and works of philology in the strict sense, just as he observed the distinction between geography and narrative history. However, the fact that he did also venture into the latter genre (like Savile with his translation and adaptation of Tacitus) reminds us that he belonged to a different intellectual environment from British philologists of the following two generations. For Savile, Camden, and their European counterparts like Jacques-Auguste de Thou, it was possible to be regarded as a man of erudition and as a narrative historian, even if the two personae were notionally separate. And yet, in the culture of philological erudition which characterized the decades after their deaths, this was no longer such a realistic goal: humanist scholars tended to follow the model of either Scaliger or de Thou, but rarely both.

ii. John Selden

---

[172] In his 'Hypercritica, or A Rule of Ivdgement, For writing, or reading our Histories': Bodleian Library, MS Wood F. 9, p. 42. Also published as *Hypercritica or a Rule of Judgement for Writing or Reading our History's* (Oxford, 1722). For more on Bolton, see *ODNB*, s. v. 'Bolton, Edmund Mary'; Ethel M. Portal, 'The Academ Roial of King James I,' *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1915-16), pp. 189-208; D. R. Woolf, 'Edmund Bolton, Francis Bacon and the Making of *Hypercritica*, 1618-1621,' *Bodleian Library Record* 11 (1983), pp. 162-8; Patricia J. Osmond, 'Edmund Bolton's Vindication of Tiberius Caesar: A "Lost" Manuscript Comes to Light,' *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11.3 (2005), pp. 329-343; and, in the context of Camden and the antiquarian tradition, Kunst (1994), pp. 138-41.

[173] See *ODNB*, s.v. 'Savile, Henry.'

Selden, for instance, never laid much of a claim to being a narrative historian.[174] Rather, his early work can only be understood in the context of European philology and especially the legacy of Scaliger. Toomer observes, for instance, that *De diis Syris* was conceived in emulation of Scaliger's work on oriental religion and languages, and that the connection to Scaliger was immediately observed by Selden's readers.[175] For this reason, among others, *De diis Syris* gave Selden unprecedented recognition and acclaim on the European stage.[176] It appealed to Selden's contemporary readers largely because of its multifarious erudition rather than for any philosophical or theological overtones.[177] Selden called it a 'commentary' or a collection of *adversaria* – as opposed to a coherent treatise, or, indeed, a history.[178] J. C. Gevartius exemplifies the usual response issued to the work: he praised Selden's 'most accurate and learned commentary,' particularly his emendation of the nonsense-phrase 'palam est vidique liquores' in Statius to the much more intelligible

---

[174] Although Woolf (1987), p. 32, makes the bold claim that Selden ignored 'the distinction between history and antiquities' and started to 'redefine "history" in something like its modern sense.' For more on this interpretation, see II.4, below.

[175] See Toomer (2009), pp. 212-13. Camden himself described Selden as 'our Scaliger': see Camden to Peiresc, 5 December 1617, in British Library, MS Add. 36294, fol. 83[b]. This report was repeated by Peiresc to the Italian scholar Girolamo Aleandro, on 18 January 1618: see Jean-François Lhote and Danielle Joyal, eds., *Correspondence de Peiresc & Aleandro* (Clermont-Ferrand: Adosa, 1995), vol. I, pp. 157-8.

[176] See Toomer (2009), p. 250; G. J. Vossius to Selden, 7 July 1627, in Vossius, *Epistolae* (London, 1690), p. 109; and the letter of Rubens to Dupuy quoted in I.1, above. The work's effect on Selden's international reputation was recognized by the author of British Library, MS Add. 4247, fol. 8[b]. Elsewhere, Colomesius wrote that it was, 'De tous les Ouvrages de Selden...le plus agréable, & le plus utile': see his *Bibliothéque choisie* (La Rochelle, 1682), p. 197 (reviewing the second edition, published in Leiden in 1629). He also notes that G. J. Vossius borrowed heavily from it for his own *De theologia gentili* (Amsterdam, 1641), and noted Selden's own debts, not always properly acknowledged, to Scaliger. On the popularity of the book in England, see David Pearson, 'Patterns of book ownership in late seventeenth-century England,' *The Library* 11.2 (2010), p. 151.

[177] In spite of all that has been written by modern scholars about its overarching account of idolatry, which tended to present profane pagan rituals as corruptions of sacred Jewish ones: see Martin Mulsow, 'John Seldens *De diis Syris*: Idolatriekritik und vergleichende Religionsgeschichte im 17. Jahrhundert,' and Miller, 'Taking Paganism Seriously,' both in *Archiv Für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001), pp. 1-24 and 183-209, respectively; Mulsow, 'Antiquarianism and Idolatry: the *Historia* of Religions in the Seventeenth Century,' in Pomata and Siraisi, eds. (2005); and Jonathan Sheehan, 'Sacred and Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism and the Polemics of Distinction in the Seventeenth Century,' *Past & Present* 192.1 (2006), pp. 35-66.

[178] Selden (1617), sig. a2[a]. This classification was appreciated by Jérôme Bignon, who wrote to Girolamo Aleandro, 7 November 1617: 'Seldenus Anglus mihi nunc primum ex occasione notus de Dijs Syris eruditum edidit Commentarium': Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 2154, fol. 89.

'Palaestinique liquores.'[179] Ingenious correction had triumphed over explication, as it so often had for Scaliger. Another passage which proved similarly alluring to philologists was Selden's comment on the mysterious speeches in what looked like Punic in Plautus's *Poenulus* (or *Little Carthaginian*).[180] Attempts to explain Plautus's 'Punic,' including Selden's, generally relied on Scaliger's hypothesis that Hebrew provided the key to that language.[181] In both of these instances, obscure Oriental erudition was used to cast light on a line of a well-known classical text.

Almost everything that characterized *De Diis Syris* as a work of philology, however, can be found adumbrated in Selden's earlier publications. It is clear that they, too, attempted to position Selden as a student of European philology as well as of British antiquities. Take, for instance, his *Iani Anglorum facies altera* (1610), in which his emulation of Scaliger is already apparent.[182] He goes out of his way to condemn Annius of Viterbo as a forger in order to align himself with the scholarly *persona* of the learned critic, who combined a strong sense of historical inaccuracy and anachronism with a literary critic's sensitivity to stylistic impropriety and interpolation: 'Among the more Learned, there is hardly any Critick, who does not set down *Annius* in the list of Forgers.'[183] Later on, Selden appeals to the 'prince of critics', Justus Lipsius, to argue for interpolations in a passage of Julius

---

[179] See Gevartius to Patrick Young, 20 March 1618, in Johannes Kemke, ed., *Patricius Junius* (Leipzig: M. Spirgatis, 1898), p. 30. Gevartius says that the book was sent to him by Peiresc. For more on this emendation in particular, see Toomer (2009), p. 214.

[180] Selden (1617), p. XVII. See Toomer (2009), p. 251, who notes that Selden eventually compiled a list, intended for his third edition of *De Diis Syris*, of scholars who had dealt with the problem in his wake: Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 106, fol. 4[a].

[181] Scaliger (1598), appendix 'in fragmenta notae,' XXVII.

[182] As noted in Woolf (1987), p. 34.

[183] 'E doctioribus vix quispiam est Censor qui Annium in albo falsariorum non notat.' I quote from the English translation: see *Tracts written by John Selden*, ed. and trans. Redman Westcot (London, 1683), p. 8. Redman Westcot is a pseudonym for Adam Littleton: see Toomer (2009), p. 88. On Annius and his critics, see Grafton (1990).

Caesar concerning the druids.[184] When Selden rubbished the tradition that Brutus had travelled from Troy and settled in Britain, moreover, he did so with a disdainful aside at the English 'antiquaries' of his own day: 'To clear these points aright, Antiquaries, who are at see-saw about them, will perhaps eternally be at loss, like the *Hebrews* in their mysterious debates, for want of some *Elias* to come and resolve their doubts.'[185]

This squares with comments he makes in another early work: his *Illustrations* to Michael Drayton's chorographic and historical poem, *Poly-Olbion*, first published in 1612, where he praises Camden as a chorographer but implies that philology and criticism are more exotic, continental imports: 'From vaine loading my Margine, with *Books, Chapters, Folio's*, or *Names* of our *Historians*, I abstain: Course of Time as readily directs to them. But, where the place might not so easily occurre (chiefly in matter of *Philologie*) there onelie...I haue added assisting references.'[186]

He goes on to defend the antiquarian virtuosity of his remarkable preface to *Janus Anglorum*, which uses numerous obscure terms from Ennius and other archaic Latin authors, on a philological basis. At the same time, he acknowledges the convergence of classical philology and antiquarian interests in the latest generation of critics:

> I haue read in *Cicero, Agellius, Lucians Lexiphanes*, and others, much against that forme; But withall, this later age (wherein so industrious search is among admired Ruins of olde Monuments) hath, in our greatest Latine Critiques *Hans Douz* [Janus Douza]*, P. Merula, Lipsius* and such more, so receiued that *Saturnian* Language, that, to Students in *Philology*, it is now grown familiar.[187]

---

[184] Selden (1610), pp. 20-21: 'Iustus Lipsius Criticorum Coryphaeus.'

[185] 'Ad haec rectè enucleanda egebunt fortè aeternùm reciprocantes Antiquarij aliquo, vt in abstrusis Hebraei, Eliâ': ibid., p. 14 (1683 trans., p. 10).

[186] Selden, *Illustrations* (1613), sig. A3[b].

[187] ibid., sig. A4[a]. For a comparable instance of Selden excusing his quotation of 'barbaric' (sometimes English and/or medieval) sources, see *Janus Anglorum*, sig. A5.

Since the late sixteenth century, Selden proposed, it had not been enough for a mainstream philologist to study the canonical Latin literature of the first century BCE and later. Ciceronian classicism had been disrupted by new movements within literary studies. These movements passed beyond the philological elite and into mainstream university education: the Cambridge classicist James Duport (1606-1679) advised his students, when writing letters, to follow Lipsius and 'now & then to intermingle some odd, old word, so it be sparingly, & when you write to your equalls.'[188] While antiquaries like Camden had learnt from the philologists, philologists like Lipsius had started to look more antiquarian in their preoccupations; and literary culture in general was learning to appreciate the results of this convergence.

It may be objected that the *Janus Anglorum* and other early publications established Selden above all as a lawyer and a legal historian. In this account, the most important influence would be the tradition of legal history practised by numerous French lawyers in the sixteenth century, not the all-encompassing model of critical philology represented by Scaliger. This perspective is not without its merits, and it is a long-established one. The author of an anonymous life of Selden, now in the British Library, placed him in precisely this context, comparing him with Guillaume Budé, Barnabé Brisson, Jacques Cujas, Salmasius, and others, but not Scaliger. However, his point is that all of these men transcended their narrow legal training and turned themselves into 'heroes of the republic of letters,' with Grotius being perhaps the most shining example.[189] That Selden was reaching beyond a mere legal history is shown by his desire to study the period before the

---

[188] Trinity College, Cambridge, MS O.10a.33, p. 10. The *ODNB* entry for Duport unfortunately gives this manuscript's shelfmark as MS O.104.33, which does not exist.

[189] British Library MS Add. 4247, fol. 8[a]: 'Les Héros de la République des Lettres ont été dans l'autre siecle & dans celui-ci pour la plûpart Jurisconsultes.' For more on this manuscript, and its possible authorship by Paulus Colomesius, see Toomer (2009), p. 568.

common law was fully established, especially in the *Janus Anglorum*. This is why this work stopped around the reign of Henry II: as Toomer notes, 'the Magna Carta to which Selden's contemporaries appealed was the revised version signed in the ninth year of Henry III, in which form it appeared as the first item in the statute books of his time.'[190] In this respect he resembles Henry Spelman, who tended to avoid dealing with periods from the rise of the 'modern Common Law' onwards.[191] It was common for philologists to boast at having penetrated beyond the horizons of narrow practitioners of specific disciplines, into their more ancient prehistories; but this made their work less useful to the civil or political historian. Edmund Bolton dismissed 'Grammatical Criticks' as incapable of furnishing 'any thing in historie noble'; the periods they covered, or 'those tymes which our Criticks mark with their Ἄδηλον, and their Μυθικόν, their *Ignotum*, and *Fabulosum*' were not 'much to bee stood upon' by anyone seeking to write a 'uniuersal Historie for England.'[192]

When it took philology beyond the smooth surfaces of a uniform legal code, this search for origins had a particularizing force. Early modern historians of Roman law often sought to identify the various sources and original contexts for the legal codes and treatises that had been brought together under Justinian into their modern, more systematized form, as Kelley and others have amply documented.[193] Such an approach may have had its opponents in an English context, perhaps most notably Francis Bacon, but it is represented

---

[190] Toomer (2009), p. 89. George Garnett's review of this book in the *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 February, 2010, points out that Magna Carta was not, properly speaking, 'signed.'

[191] See Pocock (1957), p. 104.

[192] See MS Wood F. 9, pp. 21, 3-4, and 1, respectively. Bolton may have been thinking specifically of Scaliger. See Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 597-8 on Scaliger's use of this distinction in Censorinus, *De die natali* XXI.1; and, for another possible precedent, Wowerius (1603), p. 93.

[193] Kelley (1970).

well by Selden.[194] The crucial feature of Selden's approach, however, and one that distinguishes him from many fellow scholars of the common law, is its breadth, which extended not only into ancient and modern legal systems of other nations, but also beyond law and into the history of beliefs, customs, and other forms of culture. So he was no less concerned with what he called 'critical origins' ('originationibus criticis') in *De Diis Syris* than he was in his works of legal scholarship. This and other works are pervaded by a critical particularism that reaches far beyond the normal scope of legal history; and his hostile anticipations of those who might complain about its excessive curiosity are addressed to theologians, as well as historians like Bolton.[195]

Scholars have already perceived this particularism at work in the *De Diis Syris*, in an interesting contrast with other studies of pagan religion, such as those of Gerardus Johannes Vossius and Herbert of Cherbury. These tended to move beyond concrete facts and passages in the search for a more abstract *consensus gentium* that demonstrated the universality and legitimacy of certain religious beliefs and practices, even when this universality was obscured and corrupted in its pagan forms. Selden, on the other hand, seems to have refused to inscribe his work with any overarching theory of idolatry.[196] Such an interpretation is consonant with my account of Selden's unusually destructive, particularizing interventions in other debates centring on natural law and ancient paganism.[197]

---

[194] See Stephen Gaukroger, *Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Early Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 64; and Julian Martin, *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[195] Selden (1617), sig. A6^{b}.

[196] See G. J. Vossius (1641) and Edward Herbert, *De religione gentilium* (Amsterdam, 1663). Mulsow (2005), p. 196 and 201-203, and idem (2009), pp. 665-6, are the best expressions of this distinction between Selden and his peers.

[197] See II.4 and my conclusion, below.

Selden's work before *De Diis Syris* saw him negotiating the borders between the new continental philology and antiquarian study of the British past. As the work of Camden shows, these borders were already permeable. *De Diis Syris* maintained his commitment to philology while more or less abandoning the British aspect. He would, of course, return to British history many times over the course of his career, but with varying degrees of sustained interest and commitment. The philological nature of his work, on the other hand, remained a constant. Selden was seeking to reconcile the barbarism of English antiquarian philology with the elegant classicism that concerned European critics, warning the latter group that some of the terminology he was studying might offend their tastes.[198] As Sir John Coke put it in a letter praising Selden's *Mare Clausum* (1635), its author deserved

> the highest praise, for combining your reverence for all humane literature and its beauty with the rough and semi-barbarous (as superficial people view it) study of our laws and jurisprudence. You have not been happy with the little schools of the vulgar: with great labour and judgement, you have brought a whole series of things from antiquity out from their obscure Greek and Oriental sources, even the mysteries of learning itself, into the light. Nor, in doing so, do you exhibit (as many do) fruitless bits of criticism, or pursue vain quibbling over words.[199]

Here, as elsewhere, Selden was lauded for his unification of humanist literary style, philological erudition, and expertise in legal history. He owed his greatest debts to the philological antiquarianism of Camden and the antiquarian philology of Scaliger. From early on in his career, Selden had belonged to a rather different intellectual context from other scholars of his era, as the next chapter on patristic scholarship demonstrates by way

---

[198] Selden (1610), sig. A5: 'Nequaquàm scriptorum me duntaxàt menti accomodaui, aut rationi historicae, verùm & ipsis, quas loquuti sunt, syllabis, atque eas disparibus exaratas typis inserui...saepiculè barbaras, politurâ miserè indigas, Aristarchiis [*sic*] nimiò inuisas.' The translation in the 1683 translation, sig. a3[a], renders 'Aristarchiis' as 'Criticks.' For the use of this term to denote a sect of critics who followed Aristarchus, see Wowerius (1603), p. 156. Cf. Selden's discussion of law French in the *Historie of Tithes* (1618), p. 485.

[199] Coke to Selden, 11 August 1635, in Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 110, fol. 64: 'Tibi vero nobilissime, doctissimeque Seldene debetur summa laus quod scabroso et semibarbaro (ut sciolis videtur) legum nostrarum et iurisprudentiae studio, omnis humanioris litteraturae cultum et ornatum adieceris. Accedit etiam quod non contentus vulgaribus scholarum paedagogiis summo opere ac iudicio ex reconditis totius Graeciae ac Orientis fontibus, omnem antiquitatis seriem, et ipsa doctrinarum arcana...in apertum extuleris. Neque in his (ut plerique) inutiles criticismos, aut verborum aucupia frustra sectaris.'

of contrast. The institutional contexts were different, too: Selden moved within the informal literary circles of London – especially the Inns of Court – and the universities, rather than the world of ecclesiastical patronage.[200] His literary contacts clearly appreciated the philological and antiquarian dimensions of his early work, and understood the place it occupied on the European stage. Ben Jonson, for instance, probably used *De Diis Syris* to inform his reading of Casaubon's Athenaeus.[201] Nonetheless, Selden used many of the same scholarly resources and interacted with many of the same figures as ecclesiastical scholars. It was not, however, until his *Historie of Tithes* (1618) that lay and clerical erudition clashed with each other, rather than simply overlapping.

---

[200] As noted by Tuck (1993), p. 5. See the section on 'The Inner Temple and Literary London' in Toomer (2009), pp. 9-27.

[201] See the description of Jonson's copy of the 1621 Lyon edition of Casaubon's text of Athenaeus (now in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D. C.), in David McPherson, 'Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia: an annotated catalogue,' *Studies in Philology* 71.5 (1974), pp. 33-4. McPherson's attribution of the notes to Jonson is provisional. See also the entry for the copies of the *Janus Anglorum* and *De Diis Syris* given by Jonson to Selden, pp. 89-90. Jonson recommended *De Diis Syris* to William Drummond: see his *Conversations with Drummond* in *Ben Jonson*, edited by C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1925-52), vol. I, p. 136. For more on Jonson and Selden, see the chapter on 'Selden, Jonson, and the Rabbis on Cross-Dressing and Bisexual Gods,' in Jason Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

II.2: Changing models of patristic scholarship and ecclesiastical history

At the same time as Selden was using them to inform the history of English law, various clerics were applying the methods of humanist criticism to Christian antiquity. Throughout this study, I will have recourse to the phrase 'patristic scholarship'; it will be used mainly as a convenient shorthand for a whole range of philological approaches to primitive Christianity which looked beyond the Bible for legitimation of contemporary confessional identities. We cannot have much confidence that it was a separate discipline from philology as a whole, or that its practitioners recognised it as such; and this is particularly true of the earliest decades of the seventeenth century, before academic specialization and doctrinal controversy had begun to establish the study of Christian antiquity as a distinctive field, no longer coterminous with biblical scholarship or with philological scholarship *tout court*. Grafton and Weinberg's conclusion underpins my outlook:

> When these men called themselves 'grammarians' or 'critics,' they did not mean that they were classical scholars in a sense now easily recognized. They did not claim to be 'Christian Hebraists,' or indeed 'patristic scholars.' Yet their project was at once classical, Hebraic, and patristic, in complex combinations.[202]

We may also ask how far the Fathers could constitute a field of philological study at a time when so many philologists considered philological method itself, and the problems it dealt with, to be fundamentally patristic.[203] Was there enough distance between modern scholarship and that of the Fathers to conceive of them as objects of study, rather than tutors or colleagues in shared enterprises of biblical exegesis and ecclesiastical history?

---

[202] Grafton and Weinberg (2010), p. 290.

[203] See I.1, above.

This chapter engages with these problems on several levels. It begins with two examples that only belong on the periphery of any study of the form of philology we have described in the opening chapter, and its fortunes in Britain. For this very reason, however, they prepare us for the distinctive features of British patristic scholarship in its later development. The model of highly and openly confessionalized documentary research embraced by Thomas James was not followed by many subsequent scholars – even those with strong confessional interests guiding their own work, such as Richard Montagu.[204] The publication of the complete works of Chrysostom by Henry Savile offers a similar case. Savile was a polymath whose expertise across multiple disciplines placed him in a different context from most of the specialist critics considered over the course of this history; and it is debatable whether the methods and preoccupations exhibited in his edition of Chrysostom allow us to identify Savile and his collaborators as 'patristic scholars' in the same sense as other subjects of this study.

Isaac Casaubon, on the other hand, was undisputably a paradigmatic figure. The blend of theology, ecclesiastical history and humanist philology exhibited in his *Exercitationes* against Cardinal Baronius made him, perhaps even ahead of Scaliger, the main reference point for British philologists for most of the seventeenth century. They did, however, go further than Casaubon towards developing a fully-fledged theology of tradition. They also sharpened the genre of anti-Baronian ecclesiastical history into a tool of aggressive, explicit confessional polemic. These aspects of the British response to Casaubon are described in the final section, with special attention to Richard Montagu's desire to close the gap which Casaubon had opened up between the Fathers and modern critics, and to

[204] A partial, and telling, exception is James Ussher: see the discussion of his edition of Ignatius's letters (Oxford, 1644), III.2, below.

restore theology, in place of criticism, to its proper role in the vanguard of patristic scholarship.

i. Thomas James

Thomas James's efforts to turn the recently founded Bodleian Library, along with the resources of other English manuscript collections, into 'the gunboat of reformed Protestantism' have been discussed in some detail.[205] He wanted to assemble teams of scholars to collate English manuscripts of the Fathers, especially the Latin ones.[206] His notion that these manuscripts would lack the corruptions which Roman Catholic scribes had introduced into European ones was hardly original; it had been articulated in the sixteenth century.[207] At the same time, he was working on new editions of sixteenth-century English Protestant theologians such as John Jewel. Equally, James's conspectus of English manuscripts went beyond early Latin Fathers such as Cyprian; it included medieval authors like Wyclif, owing to his desire to prove the age-old continuity of Protestant tradition in England.[208]

What is most important for our purposes, however, is that James situated the very modes of scholarship he was adopting within an English and medieval context. He 'viewed his work

---

[205] The phrase is William Poole's: see 'Oxford Printing in Divinity, c. 1580-1780,' in Ian Gadd, ed., *The Oxford History of the Oxford University Press* (Oxford University Press: forthcoming). I am grateful to Dr. Poole for sharing his work with me ahead of publication. The most in-depth account of James is given by Paul Nelles, 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library,' *History of Universities* 22.1 (2007), pp. 21-70, to which I am heavily indebted. See also Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Les Jésuites et l'érudition anglicane,' in *XVII^e Siècle* 237 (2007), pp. 691-2.

[206] On this project in particular, see N. R. Ker, 'Thomas James's Collation of Gregory, Cyprian and Ambrose,' *Bodleian Library Record* 4 (1952-3), pp. 16-30. See also idem, 'Salisbury Cathedral Manuscripts and Patrick Young's Catalogue,' in *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, edited by Andrew G. Watson (London: Hambledon, 1985), pp. 178-9.

[207] Nelles (2007), pp. 24-5. This mirrored claims made about German manuscripts by the Magdeburg Centuriators: ibid., p. 27.

[208] ibid., p. 26.

in the tradition of Boston of Bury (Henry Kirkestede, the itinerant fourteenth-century author of a medieval union catalogue of British manuscripts).' He identified himself with John Leland and John Bale, and had much in common with Elizabethan manuscript collectors such as Archbishop Matthew Parker.[209] James, then, was not very interested in aligning his work with that of leading critics on the continent, even staunch Protestants like Scaliger and Casaubon who had become embroiled in inter-confessional disputes. This is not to downplay or even disparage insular traditions of scholarship, but to distinguish them from European ones as deliberately and carefully as scholars did at the time.

James's attention was probably focused on the Latin Fathers by the wave of polemical, anti-Roman publications which Britain experienced in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot, and the ensuing responses by Jesuits like Bellarmine, Suarez, Jakob Gretser, and Martin Becanus.[210] It is clear, however, that the collations were a failure on a conceptual as well as practical level: not only by modern standards, but by those of James's contemporaries. Samuel Ward and James Ussher were almost alone in lamenting the abandonment of the project.[211] Peter Goldman, the close friend and colleague of Patrick Young, concluded that James was destined to be a bibliographer rather than a critic: 'he is a lover of antiquity, albeit a very stupid one...most worthwhile as a compiler of summaries and indices.'[212] It is hardly a coincidence that he addressed this judgement to Isaac Casaubon. According to a

---

[209] ibid., pp. 28-9.

[210] ibid., pp. 36-7.

[211] ibid., pp. 46. James had already praised Ward's own endeavours in ecclesiastical history in his *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councels, and Fathers* (London, 1611), p. 102. For Ussher, see Parr (1686), p. 93, and the seminal chapter on 'James Ussher' in Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth-century essays* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1987), pp. 137-9.

[212] Goldman to Casaubon, 7 November 1613, in British Library, MS Burney 364, fol. 150[a]; quoted by Grafton and Weinberg (2010), p. 263. For more on Goldman, see Kemke, ed. (1898), passim; and II.5, below.

later Dutch scholar, James wasn't even fit for bibliography: his manuscript catalogues had been composed 'sine judicio.'[213]

Moreover, Nelles's description of James's *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture* as a 'manifesto of state-of-the-art textual criticism' is uncharacteristically hyperbolic.[214] It risks conflating two quite different types of writing about criticism: on the one hand, a miscellany of text-critical prescriptions and examples, composed along explicitly anti-Roman lines and written in the vernacular for an audience of divinity students, and on the other, manuals and anthologies of textual criticism aimed at a European and Latinate audience of humanistically inclined readers. This is not to say that the latter category of texts eschewed religious conflict. In fact, many of their authors and readers were theologians; but they found very different, usually subtler ways of conducting inter-confessional debates.

James dedicated the *Treatise* to George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, saying that he 'thought it not vnmeete to addresse this small Treatise vnto your *Lordship*, written in English for the benefite of my poore seduced country-men: who are perswaded by the Priests and Iesuites, that...their bookes are freest from corruption, and minds from falshood.'[215] The subject matter of the book was not the art of textual criticism in an abstract sense, using examples which happened to tell against Roman Catholicism: it was nothing other than the errors and corruptions of the Roman Church, a 'vaste wildernes of

---

[213] See Theodore Ryckius to J. F. Gronovius, 23 September 1668, in Leiden University Library, MS Per. Q 8, fol. 2[a]. He pointed out to Nicolaus Heinsius that James had often confused parts of books with entire books and given them a separate entry in the catalogue: ibid., fols. 163[a]-4[b]. Ryckius's notes on Oxford manuscript collections copied from and added to a list originally compiled by Lucas Holstenius, which mentioned details missed by James: see, for example, ibid., fol. 6[b]. The autograph is in British Library, MS Burney 362, fols. 6[a]-11[b]. This must have been shown to Ryckius by Meric Casaubon: see III.3, below.

[214] Nelles (2007), p. 43.

[215] James (1611), sig. ¶3[b].

Sin.'[216] Most of its sections were arranged along polemical lines rather than according to the structure and method of the art: for instance, 'The varietie & contrarietie of the Popish Bibles.' He took particular joy in pointing out where Catholics disagreed amongst themselves: Bellarmine and Baronius often regarded as spurious patristic texts which their co-religionists had embraced as authentic. For James, text-critical judgements were not private decisions made by individual scholars which may or may not have corresponded with the official position of the Church to which they happened to belong: they necessarily reflected on the Church as a corporate body, so that any deviation or inconsistency was a matter of embarrassment for that Church.

It is not clear, then, how far James appreciated or cared for the increasing prominence of continental neo-Latin scholarly literature encompassed by the name of 'criticism.' The *Treatise* offered very little discussion of non-Christian texts, which would have given the impression that James was handling the rules of a universally applicable art rather than a tool of religious controversy. Nor did he end up moving with the times and embracing a broader conception of criticism in later years. Unlike other examples of the genre, the catalogue of books aimed at advanced undergraduates which James compiled towards the end of his career neither contained a separate section for 'criticism' or 'antiquities,' nor subsumed such works in other categories.[217] The 'grammar' section dealt with elementary linguistic textbooks rather than grammatical treatises or commentaries such as Casaubon's on Athenaeus. The chronology section mentioned various medieval and more recent chronicles, but none of Scaliger's works. Thomas Hearne's complaint that James had neglected 'curious Classical Books' in favour of anti-Catholic theology is

---

[216] ibid., sig. *2[a].

[217] The copy I have consulted is University College, Oxford, MS 155; and G. W. Wheeler, *The Earliest Catalogues of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford University Press, 1928), pp. 102-13. On the incorporation of philological works into the university curriculum, see III.3, below.

understandable.[218] The most telling indication that James had slipped out of the mainstream of British criticism by the 1620s is that he himself had decided to venture into anti-Roman historiography rather than any strictly philological enterprises. He wrote to Robert Cotton asking for help with his research on Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent*, whose narrative of Roman corruption and hypocrisy he was attempting to flesh out and improve for a Protestant audience.[219]

ii. Henry Savile and the Eton Chrysostom

If James's growth as a critic was stunted by his Protestant nationalism, Henry Savile's was hindered by the sheer breadth of his intellectual endeavours. Among other things, he was a mathematician, narrative historian, and patristic scholar; his academic interests were more diverse than the majority of figures surveyed in this study under the umbrella terms of 'philology' and 'criticism.' Much has been made, however, of his contention with and emulation of Scaliger, based partly on a very late anecdote reported by John Aubrey: Thomas Hobbes accused Savile of wanting to be considered 'as great a scholar as Joseph Scaliger.'[220] This is not an easy statement to parse. It could refer specifically to Savile's philological enterprises, or more generally to Savile's pretensions to polymathy. Casaubon's account of Savile is more helpful: he was 'a most noble and indeed learned man; but so ill-disposed towards the spirit of that divine man that he was not afraid, even in my presence, to state more than once that that...man had been "chief among the

[218] Wheeler (1928), p. 111.

[219] See James to Cotton, 30 June, 1625, in British Library, MS Cotton Julius C. III, fol. 220.

[220] See John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), vol. II p. 214.

Grammarians, but not much of a Philosopher, and more madman than Mathematician.'"[221] Savile had been able to show that Scaliger's powers as a critic and historian of ancient mathematics did not necessarily qualify him as a professional or even competent mathematician by modern standards.[222] This demonstration formed one step on the road to the professionalization not only of mathematics, but also of criticism, turning it from the encyclopaedic key to all knowledges into a limited art with more specific goals, techniques, and subject matter.[223]

It is far from clear, then, that the perceived relationship between Savile and Scaliger had much to do with Savile's monumental eight-volume edition of Chrysostom.[224] Nor should we expect it to: it was collaborative at every stage, and involved a pan-European and pan-confessional effort to gather manuscripts which Scaliger alone would not have been able to orchestrate, even if he had wanted to.[225] Quantin has brilliantly demonstrated the precarious nature of Savile's collaboration with Jesuits such as Fronton du Duc, which would have been much less successful had Savile intended to publish a Latin translation alongside a Greek text. In fact, Fronton's view of the importance of Latin translation was that he wanted to enforce a stricter division between humanistic and patristic enterprises within the republic of letters: 'it is to the great detriment of the Catholic religion...that the

---

[221] Casaubon to Jacques Auguste de Thou, 19 April 1612, in Casaubon (1709), p. 461 (cf. p. 512, also to de Thou). Savile had also called Scaliger a 'grammaticus melior quam logicus': see Bodleian Library, MS Savile 37, p. 149; quoted by Grafton (1983-93), vol. II pp. 383-4. For instances of Scaliger's ventures into mathematics and scorn for contemporary mathematicians, see ibid., pp. 457, 477, 482-3; and pp. 484-8 for Kepler's critique of Scaliger, the terms of which bear a very close resemblance to Savile's.

[222] I draw this conclusion from Grafton (1993), pp. 378-84 and 488; and the excellent entry by Robert Goulding in *ODNB*, s.v. 'Savile, Henry.' On Savile as a mathematician, see idem, *Defending Hypatia: Ramus, Savile and the Renaissance Rediscovery of Mathematical History* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2010).

[223] As we have seen in I.1, above.

[224] Henry Savile, ed., *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Opera Graecè* (Eton, 1613). The manuscript prepared for the printers is now Bodleian Library, MSS Auct. E. 3. 1-16, and Auct. E. 4. 1-6.

[225] My account makes frequent use of the definitive study by Quantin (2008). See also Quantin (2007), pp. 694-6.

translations of the Fathers we have are written by professors of the liberal arts rather than men of the Church.'[226] Savile, himself a layman, avoided such a translation, but his preface presented Chrysostom in precisely the kind of humanistic framework the French Jesuit had decried: it praised the author's eloquence and gravity as an orator, noting that he had been educated by the pagan sophist Libanius before his conversion to Christianity. As Quantin has pointed out, it addressed itself to the entire 'orbe Christiano.'[227] The closest it came to any mark of controversy was its aside that Chrysostom had always been held in particularly high regard by the Eastern and British Churches.

The edition was also a response to those who claimed that British printers were uninterested in philological publications from valuable, unpublished manuscripts.[228] In this connection, Quantin writes that Britain did not see anything similar in the field of patristics until Patrick Young's edition of Clement in 1633. But as we shall see, Young's was a rather different kind of publication, whose content and influences diverge so sharply from the Eton Chrysostom as to lead us to question whether both can safely be said to belong to the same tradition of English 'patristic scholarship.'[229] This can be seen most clearly when we examine the notes on Chrysostom gathered in Savile's eighth volume. We can concentrate on the notes provided by John Bois: firstly, because they are more or less representative of the notes as a whole, and secondly because it provides a background for

---

[226] 'Quo mihi gravius Catholicae religioni uidentur importare detrimentum, qui dum laudem interpretum obtritum eunt, laborem quidem illorum ingentem asserunt, sed gloriam minorem, uix hominibus Theologis expetendam: quo factum est, ut dum hanc illi Spartam aliis ornandam relinquunt, ab humaniorum potius artium professoribus, quam ab ecclesiasticis conuersa Doctorum scripta teneamus.' Fronton du Duc, ed. and trans., *S. Joannis Chrysostomi...tractatuum decas* (Bordeaux, 1604), sigs. *2^{b}-3^{a}; quoted by Quantin (2008), p. 288.

[227] ibid., p. 339.

[228] See *Secunda Scaligerana*, p. 237: 'Angli nunquam excuderunt bonos libros veteres: tantum vulgares.' Quoted by Quantin (2008), p. 312. It ended up being well-received, if not widely purchased, in the Netherlands: see S. Van Der Woude, 'Sir Henry Savile's Chrysostomus Edition in the Netherlands,' in idem, ed., *Studia Bibliographica in honorem Herman de la Fontaine Verwey* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1966).

[229] ibid., p. 339.

later discussions of Bois's biblical and patristic scholarship.[230] Indeed, Bois provides a direct link between the editions of Chrysostom and Clement, and helps us to see how radically the horizons of patristic editors and commentators would expand over the intervening two decades.

The first point to make is that there is very little of what might be called 'historical context.' Chrysostom himself and the particularities of his historical moment, or the state of the Christianity in his era, are rarely addressed by Bois's commentary. Nor is an attempt made to outline Chrysostom's overall theological system, apart from occasional remarks about the affinities between Greek patristic theology and Platonic philosophy.[231] The history of the various pseudo-Christian heresies or the interactions between late antique paganism and Christianity are not concerns in the way they would be for Richard Montagu. Bois's notes are largely literary and linguistic, anchored in three bodies of literature: the Bible (especially the Septuagint, including the Apocrypha), the rest of the Greek Fathers, and a variety of pagan authors.[232] His use of such works deals in grammatical and intertextual parallels, however, rather than genuine historical relationships. Eustathius's commentaries on Homer are cited alongside Casaubon's on Theophrastus and Estienne's on Diogenes Laertius.[233] As far as textual criticism was concerned, Bois refrained from identifying himself as a true 'critic': he was far too busy with his pastoral duties at Boxworth fully to occupy that office.[234] Even so, he admitted, some of his conjectures

---

[230] Not to mention that Savile himself is said to have preferred Bois's notes over those of Andrew Downes: see Anthony Walker's life of Bois in Ward Allen, *Translating for King James* (London: Allen Lane, 1970), p. 141.

[231] Savile, ed. (1613), vol. VIII, col. 38.

[232] Bois noted, without passing judgement, how well-versed Chrysostom was in apocryphal books like the Wisdom of Solomon: ibid., col. 32.

[233] See ibid., cols. 63, 424, and 62, respectively. Quantin (2008), pp. 305-6, observes that favourable comparison of the Fathers' Greek with that of pagan authors was common.

[234] Savile, ed. (1613), vol. VIII, cols. 31-2.

might not altogether displease the nose of even the most sensitive critic.[235] On the whole, though, Bois regarded textual criticism – especially by conjecture – as a more than Herculean labour, on the grounds that there was often no way of telling for sure whether a conjecture was correct.[236] He restricted himself largely to what he took to be the safest method, of correcting Chrysostom so that his text corresponded with the most reliable text of all, that of the Bible – specifically, the Greek New Testament and the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Old Testament which Chrysostom was taken to have had before him.[237]

The Eton Chryostom has meant different things to different modern scholars. For Pfeiffer, Savile was, in England, the first in 'a line of scholars in the strict sense,' who 'inspired the next generation, of whom we may mention John Selden, John Hales, and Thomas Gataker,' and subsequently John Pearson and Thomas Stanley, among others.[238] For Feingold and Nelles, he can be placed alongside Thomas James in his dedication to ecclesiastical rather than secular erudition.[239] James himself made such an association, although Savile, tellingly, did not.[240] To some readers, however, editing Chrysostom represented a humanistic turn in Savile's career, towards the aesthetic delights of Greek literature and away from the less glamorous, antiquarian British history in which he had

---

[235] ibid., cols. 29-30: 'quas ne emunctissimae quidem naris critici sint prorsus aspernaturi.'

[236] ibid., cols. 411-12. Bois's mentor Andrew Downes had said the same thing to Isaac Casaubon: see his letter addressed to Casaubon in Geneva (Casaubon was there until 1596), MS Burney 363, fol. 252[b].

[237] For example, ibid., col. 81: 'Chrysostomo cum Graecis Biblijs meliùs conueniret, si καὶ inter ἐπιδείκνυσθε & ποιεῖτε, interponeretur.'

[238] See Pfeiffer (1976), p. 144.

[239] See Mordechai Feingold, 'Reversal of Fortunes: The Displacement of Cultural Hegemony from the Netherlands to England in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries,' in idem and Dale Hoak, eds., *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford University Press, 1996), pp. 243-5; and Nelles (2007), p. 42.

[240] See James (1611), part V, p. 24.

been engaged.[241] As Edmund Bolton, making the case for a collaborative 'uniuersal Historie for England,' put it, it was 'an affliction for those myndes which haue beene conversant in the marveils, and delights of *Hebrew, Greek,* and *Roman* antiquities, to turn ouer so many mustie rolls, so many dry, bloudlesse *Chronicles*, and soe many dull, and heauy-paged *Histories*.'[242] This suggests that the relevant opposition was not between ecclesiastical and secular erudition, but the literature of antiquity – sacred, ecclesiastical, or neither – and the dry records of the middle ages. Bois's notes bear this out, and a comparison with James shows that if both his and Savile's projects were 'ecclesiastical,' they nonetheless had different aims and audiences; and that the latter was much more responsive to contemporary trends in continental philology.

iii. Casaubon's *Exercitationes*

Isaac Casaubon would never, as we have noted, have called himself a 'patristic scholar.' Yet his *Exercitationes* against Cardinal Baronius have to hold a central place in any narrative of English and continental patristic scholarship in the seventeenth century.[243] Problems of extraordinary complexity surround the place of the *Exercitationes* within contemporary religious politics, and the longer-term narrative of Casaubon's career in

---

[241] See his edition of *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam praecipui* (London, 1596).

[242] Bodleian Library, MS Wood F. 9, p. 18.

[243] For volume I of the *Annales* (the only volume answered by Casaubon in print), I cite the Antwerp, 1596 edition. On the Protestant obsession with refuting Baronius, see Meric Casaubon (1999), pp. 35-7 of Serjeantson's introduction. On the *Exercitationes* in general, see Grafton and Weinberg (2010), passim; François Laplanche, 'A propos d'Isaac Casaubon: la controverse confessionelle et la naissance d'histoire,' *History of European Ideas* 9.4 (1988), pp. 405-22; Pattison (1875); and, for a brief discussion of its publication, Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 104-6.

theology and ecclesiastical history.[244] We still await a comprehensive study of this text written from the perspective of international Protestantism rather than the republic of letters.[245] For now, I shall concentrate on the relationship between historical, philological, and theological methods in the *Exercitationes*, and its subsequent English reception. Casaubon's own positions are of less interest than the significance of his last work for the genre of ecclesiastical history and the discipline of philology. Casaubon's emphasis on philology, in his rhetoric and his practice, had an enduring impact on the historiography of the Church. Previous works of ecclesiastical history had hardly been uncritical, but Casaubon's strident advocacy of criticism made his readers wonder whether he had purified and invigorated the genre of ecclesiastical history, or shaken its foundations.

Casaubon's union of the ecclesiastical historian and philologist came at the expense of the theologian. Baronius had allowed theology to infiltrate ecclesiastical history: for instance, the task of demonstrating that 'the visible monarchy of the Church has always been there, in the Church, for all to see' was properly the theologian's rather than the historian's.[246] The underlying problem was that Baronius had been 'disputatious': he had played the role not only of a theologian, but particularly of a scholastic one for whom the content of Scripture and Church history always had to be arranged around a particular controverted question, such as 'Is the Church visible?' The passages he chose were common proof-texts

---

[244] See W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge University Press, 1997); Luciano Canfora, *Convertire Casaubon* (Milan: Adelphi, 2002); Matteo Campagnolo, 'Entre Théodore de Bèze et Erasme de Rotterdam: Isaac Casaubon,' in Irena Backus, ed., *Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605): Actes du colloque de Genève (septembre 2005)* (Geneva: Droz, 2007); Olivier Reverdin, 'Isaac Casaubon et Genève de 1596 à 1614,' in *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul-E. Martin par ses amis, ses collègues et ses élèves* (Geneva: Comité des Mélanges P.-E. Martin, 1961); and Harm-Jan van Dam, 'Breasting the Waves: Grotius's Letters on Church and State,' in de Landtsheer and Nellen, eds. (2010); and Grafton and Weinberg (2010), pp. 171-9.

[245] For now, see Quantin (2009), pp. 142-54; and, most recently, Christian Thorsten Callisen, 'Georg Calixtus, Isaac Casaubon, and the Consensus of Antiquity,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 73.1 (2012), pp. 1-23.

[246] Casaubon (1614), sig. *******2[b].

used for or against such questions, and he quoted them not according to where they naturally belonged in the narrative of ecclesiastical history, but when he wanted to argue a particular case.[247] The organization of his treatise reflected what was controversial today, not what primitive Christians themselves did or thought.[248] The worst thing was the dishonesty of Baronius's theological stances compared with those of an actual theologian. Where Bellarmine debated such questions openly ('with his head uncovered, as it were'), Baronius had published disputation artfully disguised as mere narration, making his work all the more dangerous.[249]

Like Grotius and many other Christian humanists before them, Casaubon was beginning to historicize the discipline of theology itself. His arguments against Baronius's methods rested partly on the nature of early Christians' religious beliefs. In the first three centuries of the Church, men had been more concerned with faith in practice than in theory.[250] Slightly later Fathers such as Gregory of Nyssa had rarely written in a spirit of disputation, either.[251] Casaubon was not condemning the application of all forms of theology to texts conceived in a thoroughly untheological age as misguided anachronism; he was simply singling out the polemical, needlessly subtle form of theology which had eventually

---

[247] ibid., sig. *******2[a]: 'Historiam professus, non solùm Theologum, sed etiam persaepe disputatorem è schola agit. Locos communes à narratione historica digrediens saepissime contexit.'

[248] ibid., sig. A2[a]: 'Cuius enim nisi Theologi est, de Scripturis & earum obscuritate, de Traditionibus, de Sacramentis, de Imaginibus, de Angelorum cultu, de Reliquijs, de Ritibus in synaxibus & celebratione Sacramentorum, & caeteris religionis capitibus hodie controuersis longas disputationes instituere, loca Patrum cumulare, & cum diuersa sentientibus serram reciprocare? Hoc igitur...quum faciat Baronius, Theologi personam in eo agnosco, Historiographi desidero.'

[249] ibid., sig. *****3[b]: 'Bellarminus, Becanus, Suarius, & id genus disputatores, nudo, quod aiunt, capite veram antiquitatem religionis & jura Principum inuadentes atque oppugnantes, minus videntur metuendi.... A Baronio verò scriptionem Annalium promittente, quis sibi metuat? aut quis vidit historiographum argumentosum?'

[250] ibid., sig. *******1[a]: 'Christiani homines in praxi verae pietatis, magis quàm ipsius scientiae theoria, fuerunt occupati.'

[251] See Casaubon's preface to the letter of Gregory of Nyssa which he had recently edited and published: *B. Gregorii Nysseni ad Eustathiam, Ambrosiam & Basilissam epistola* (Paris, 1606), sig. e4[a]: 'nihil admodum continet, quod polemicorum scriptores suis libellis inserciant.'

insinuated itself into the Church. Ecclesiastical history was also part of his historical account of the Christian sciences. Like theology, it had not flourished until after Constantine's conversion and the adoption of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman empire. Casaubon would no more have dismissed theology on the basis that it was a fourth-century invention than he would ecclesiastical history, whose own methods and resources he was using in the work at hand.

Casaubon's understanding of philology was similarly historical. He lamented Baronius's departure from the Fathers' own conception of the scope of philology. Consider his discussion of whether one woman or different women washed Jesus's feet, anointed him, and wiped his feet with their hair, in various passages of Scripture.[252]

> I think it bizarre that in a better age each learned man was free to make up his own mind and express his opinion publicly (but modestly) regarding philological questions like this, on the grounds that they concern only the outer shell of the divine word rather than its very heart and marrow; whereas today, the same freedom, even when accompanied by the appropriate modesty, has no place.... In these philological questions there is no risk of heresy, no absolute obligation to cleave to one opinion or another.[253]

Baronius had overextended the authority of the Church into an area the early Fathers would never have allowed it to reach. He mistook the Fathers' private opinions concerning philological matters for statements of official doctrine. Casaubon's view of criticism as a discipline independent from the Church as an institution was (he thought) rooted in the Fathers. Unlike some of his English readers, however, he did not necessarily feel that they had practised philology any better than modern critics.

---

[252] These are Matthew 26:7, Mark 14:3, Luke 7:37, and John 11:2 and 12:3. Baronius thought it was the same woman, namely Mary Magdalene.

[253] Casaubon (1614), pp. 330-331: 'mihi videri mirum, quando melioribus olim seculis in huiusmodi quaestionibus philologicis, non ad cor & medullam verbi diuini, sed ad corticem dumtaxat spectantibus, liberum fuit vnicuique eruditorum, & sentire quod rectissimum putaret, & sententiam suam modeste proferre in medium: cur hodie eidem libertati, pari modestiae iunctę, non sit locus.... In istis philologicis quaestionibus, nulla versatur haeresis; nulla absoluta necessitas, vel sic, vel aliter sentiendi.'

Casaubon, then, does not seem to have objected to the preeminence of theology as a modern discipline, in spite of his historical anxiety regarding its more disputatious strains. If theology needed to be restrained within its former, early Christian limits, the same was true of ecclesiastical history and philology. Nor, more importantly, can we claim that Casaubon's methods excluded modes of reading which were not only theological, but even fundamentally anti-historical and anti-philological – by the standards of the later seventeenth century, as well as our own. First of all, students of theology were part of the book's intended, and actual, audience.[254] Casaubon frequently addresses 'novices' ('tirones') in order to show them 'how necessary criticism is for theologians.'[255] He intended to 'provide young men with a clear path to reading Baronius's work profitably.'[256] The second edition of the *Exercitationes*, printed in Frankfurt in 1615, came in the more manageable quarto format and put into Latin passages of Greek which Casaubon himself had not originally translated. Theology and history needed to be recognised as separate and mutually exclusive genres, but they were not in competition with one another. The historical worldview did not trump the theological one; good history would end up informing and strengthening the theological studies to which it was subordinated.[257]

Secondly, Casaubon did not lack respect for theologians as intellectuals, despite identifying himself as a philologist whose research interests extended far beyond religious subjects.

---

[254] The *Exercitationes* ended up becoming a staple of undergraduate reading lists: see, for instance, Worcester College, Oxford, MS 4.19, p. 49. This manuscript is discussed in more detail in III.3, below.

[255] ibid., pp. 169.

[256] ibid., sig. ******2[a]: 'qui ad legendum cum fructu opus Baronianum juuentuti...viam muniret' (cf. sig. A4).

[257] ibid., sig. *******1[a].

The difference between Casaubon and another, more libertine type of critic is exemplified by his correspondence with the Leiden jurist and humanist Petrus Cunaeus (1586-1638). Casaubon had written to Cunaeus in 1610 to declare how impressed he was with the budding critic's commentary on Nonnus's *Dionysiaca.*[258] This emboldened Cunaeus enough to convince him to send Casaubon his humanistic satire, the *Sardi Venales* of 1612, written in the tradition of freewheeling philological invective which included Lipsius's *Somnium: Lusus in nostri aevi criticos* (1581) and went back to Erasmus's *Encomium Moriae* (1511).[259] The book was accompanied by a letter in which Cunaeus drew particular attention to his mockery of theologians, 'who form the largest body of morons. For every time I've witnessed their contentions and the discord between them, I've felt that they would be difficult not to satirize.'[260] Casaubon's reply, however, indicated politely that Cunaeus's anti-theological diatribe had crossed the line.[261] He had failed to stress that there were good theologians as well as bad ones, and risked conflating the errors of individual theologians with the characteristics of the discipline itself.[262] Cunaeus's misjudgement of Casaubon's disposition towards theologians is understandable: it rested on an assumption to which many more recent historians have subscribed, that the academic

---

[258] Casaubon to Cunaeus, 1 May, 1610, in Casaubon's *Epistolae* (1709), p. 349.

[259] See Ingrid de Smet, *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581-1655* (Geneva: Droz, 1996); and the modern edition of Lipsius and Cunaeus: Chris Heesakkers and Constantinus Matheeussen, eds., *Two Neo-Latin Menippean Satires* (Leiden: Brill, 1980).

[260] Leiden University Library, MS Cun. 1, fol. 42 (a draft): 'Notavi...qui maxima pars ineptientium sunt, theologos. Eorum enim contentiones, et dissidia quoties viderem, toties illud in animo mihi erat, "Difficile est satyram non scribere."' Neither this letter nor Casaubon's response is published in the printed collections of Casaubon's letters from 1638-1709, although Cunaeus was asked to contribute any correspondence he possessed to the edition of 1638 (see J. F. Gronovius, the editor of that edition, to Cunaeus in Leiden University Library, MS Cun. 2). It is, however, printed in the posthumous edition by Pieter Burmann of Cunaeus's own *Epistolae* (1725), pp. 121-22. It is likely that he withheld these letters from Gronovius on the grounds that they were embarrassing to him. His letter to Gronovius, 21 July, 1638, ibid., p. 394, says that of the three letters between him and Casaubon, one is no longer in his possession; the 'second' he is happy to give to Gronovius; but the 'third' ('tertia'; clearly denoting the third in chronological order, because Cunaeus mentions it second in his list here) is 'momenti nullius' and therefore not worth sending.

[261] Casaubon to Cunaeus, 21 March 1613, in Leiden MS Cun. 2.

[262] ibid.: 'Non sunt omnes, quales tu descripsisti. Habet adhuc Ecclesia Dei fideles aliquot pastores.... Ante omnia cauendum, ne dum Theologos malos insectamúr, ipsi Theologiae, atque adeo ipsi Deo, eius disciplinae auctori iniuriam faciamus.'

cultures of humanism and theology were inevitably in tension with one another. But the spirit of ironic, critical free speech to which philologists had appealed since Erasmus clearly held little attraction for Casaubon, especially when he was engaged in his *magnum opus* of ecclesiastical history.

Finally, although Casaubon had carefully banished theological disputation from narrative ecclesiastical history, this does not mean that he had embraced a secular historical method or a secular interpretation of Christian antiquity. This is perhaps most manifest in his use of typology.[263]

In general, typology 'was particularly acceptable to the reformers because it could be rigorously, even scrupulously applied – unlike the arbitrary allegorizing of the Fathers.' Furthermore, 'the historicity of types gave an evidential value to Protestant hermeneutics that allegory did not have.'[264] The connections Casaubon drew between the Old and New Testaments rested on what he perceived to be historical facts, but in connecting those facts, he relied on an assumption of divine intervention that transcended historical method. A history of historicism in the seventeenth century cannot omit typology, precisely because the typological modes of reading embraced by Casaubon ended up being ignored or rejected by later scholars.[265] Nor can a history of literary criticism: typology came to be treated with such caution because it intersected the boundary between historical fact and rhetorical device. Philologists were unsure whether to describe typological relationships as

---

[263] Although he does not discuss typology in the *Exercitationes*, Miller (2011), p. 75, observes that, in his copy of the 1559 Genevan edition of Calvin's *Institutio* (Bodleian Library, Auct. S 10.26), Casaubon 'almost invariably underlined' the author's typological claims. For a further example of Casaubon's extensive reading of Calvin, see the 'Epitome Institutionum Calvini,' dated 27 July, 1585, in Bodleian Library, MS Casaubon 35.

[264] Donald Dickson, 'The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century,' *Renaissance and Reformation* 23.3 (1987), p. 259. This point is also made by Frei (1974), pp. 1-4.

[265] In particular, Selden: see II.4, below.

genuine historical correspondences, or mere literary parallels designed to persuade readers of deeper truths.[266]

The first explicit mention of typology in the *Exercitationes* comes in the midst of Casaubon's famous demolition of the Sibylline oracles.[267] This immediately suggests that Casaubon regarded typology as a safe alternative to identifying prophecies of Christ in pagan texts, texts whose claimed provenance could not withstand philological scrutiny. Casaubon's primary motivations for dismissing the Sibylline oracles as forgeries devised by early Christian apologists was not criticism for its own sake, but a desire to defend typology as a more historically plausible form of prophecy:

> What moves me above all is that it seems contrary to the word of God to suppose that such profound mysteries were declared more openly to the Gentiles than they were to that people whom the Most High God had a special love for and treated as his own, instructing them in his own voice and the voices of his faithful servants.... We know how tiny the sparks of truth were that shone on the Jewish people in ancient times. For the whole Law was leading the Jews to Christ, through shadowy types of future events, in the manner of a teacher, as Paul says to the Galatians [3:24].[268]

This echoes Calvin's suspicion that God would not have revealed the truths of the New Testament more clearly to the pagans than the Jews. This suspicion took its cue from passages like Isaiah 52:15: 'So shall hee sprinckle many nations, the kings shall shut their mouthes at him: for *that which had not beene told them*, shall they see, and *that which they*

---

[266] This ambiguity is covered in more detail in II.6, below.

[267] See Anthony Grafton, 'Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 46 (1983), pp. 78-93, reprinted in Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991); 'Higher Criticism Ancient and Modern: the lamentable deaths of Hermes and the Sibyls,' in A. C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton, and Jill Kraye, eds., *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays* (London: Warburg Institute, 1988); and now 'Hermes Trismegistus and His Jewish Cousin,' in Grafton and Weinberg (2010), p. 30f.

[268] Casaubon (1614), p. 72. 'Ante omnia mouet illud me; quod verbo Dei contrarium videtur, existimare, tam profunda mysteria Gentibus fuisse clarius proposita, quàm illi populo quem Deus Opt. Max. vt peculiariter suum dilexit, & suamet ipsius & fidelium suorum seruorum voce erudijt.... scimus quam exiles scintillae veritatis priscis temporibus populo Iudaico illuxerint. Tota enim lex per obscuros rerum futurarum typos ad Christum Iudaeos deducebat, paedagogi instar, vt Paulus ait ad Galatas, III. 24.'

had not heard, shall they consider.'[269] The principal difference is that Calvin used this passage to debunk the 'chimera' of the Roman Catholic doctrine of 'implicit faith,' according to which individuals did not need to acquire certain knowledge for themselves in matters of faith (instead, they could defer to the knowledge of a higher body, namely the Church).[270] Either the gentile kings had certain knowledge of Christ, or they didn't; there was no middle ground, except perhaps for the Jews. Casaubon eschewed overt polemic, and the desire to connect exegesis to systematic theology, but he preserved much of the architecture of Calvinist thought.

Typology became even more important when Casaubon came to Jesus's celebration of the Passover and the chronology of the last days of his life, a passage which has commanded the attention of Grafton and Weinberg for its 'grimly technical' attempts to contextualize and understand the Gospels using a vast array of biblical and post-biblical Jewish sources.[271] There is little to add to Grafton and Weinberg's meticulous reconstruction of Casaubon's research for this section of the *Exercitationes*. Layered on top of Casaubon's various uses of rabbinical literature and other pieces of historical evidence, however, is a very straightforward and clear-cut distinction between the Law given to God by Moses, and the laws and traditions subsequently invented by the Jews, a distinction which allows Casaubon to identify the typological parallels in the Gospel narrative of Christ's death.

The crucial problem with the Gospels' accounts of the time of Christ's celebration of the Passover was the discrepancy between John and the other three Evangelists. In the

---

[269] Calvin, *Commentarii in Isaiam Prophetam* (Geneva, 1583), p. 434, on Isaiah 52:15.

[270] See Peter Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 100 for more on this doctrine.

[271] See Grafton and Weinberg (2010), pp. 167-9, 214-230.

Synoptic Gospels, the Last Supper was described as the Passover meal. In John, it was said to have happened before the Passover: the two meals were not one and the same. Casaubon concluded, following Scaliger, that John used 'Passover' to refer to 'the festival of the Jews,' whereas Matthew, Mark, and Luke referred to 'the legitimate time taken from the Law, which Christ observed.'[272] The Jews' customs had changed, and they did not always observe the Passover in the manner prescribed by the Mosaic Law, often postponing it on various grounds. If, on the other hand, one concluded that John, too, was referring to the Passover as prescribed by the Law, it had to follow that Christ (in John's account) had contradicted rather than 'fulfilled' the Law by celebrating it a day in advance.[273] To believe such a thing was as 'impious' as it was 'absurd.' After all, the Passover was a type of the Last Supper, and Christ celebrated it in the manner prescribed by the Old Testament because he was 'the true lamb, who takes away the sins of the world' – as reason, Scaliger, and Casaubon's numerous other quotations from the Fathers, rabbis, and modern authors such as Edward Liveley all demonstrated.[274] This is not a case of Casaubon intruding theological arguments for which he did not particularly care in order to strengthen his case in a printed, polemical publication. His manuscript papers bear witness to his personal, scholarly interest in typology no less than to his multifarious reading and obsession with linguistic and antiquarian detail.[275]

---

[272] ibid., p. 471: 'quare solutio facilis est & certa, quam antè proposuimus è Scaligero: Iohannem locutum esse de festo Iudaeorum: caeteros de tempore legitimo ex Lege, quod Christus seruauit.'

[273] ibid.: 'si Pascha egit Christus ante festum Paschatis, hoc est, antequam eius ritus tempus legitimum aduenisset...non igitur seruauit Legem: neque πληροτής sed παραβάτης τοῦ Νόμου fuit: quod etiam cogitare impium est, nedum absurdum.'

[274] ibid., p. 473: 'Christum autem, verum illum agnum, qui tollit peccata mundi, tempore vespertinae oblationis fuisse cruci affixum, ratio suadet, & multi viri doctissimi existimant.' Casaubon was extrapolating from biblical passages like John 19:36, and its citation of Exodus 12:46; cf. 1 Corinthians 5:7. On Casaubon's use of Liveley in this context, see Grafton and Weinberg (2010), p. 224f; and Casaubon (1614), pp. 467-8, 485-6.

[275] See especially the *Casauboniana*, edited by J. C. Wolf (Hamburg, 1710; henceforth cited as *Casauboniana*), p. 110 (noting Epiphanius's identification of a typological correspondence between the paschal lamb and Christ); and MS Casaubon 53, fol. 107[a] (regarding the typological status of Melchizedek in Genesis 14).

That typology underpinned Casaubon's reading of the New Testament should remind us that as well as anticipating twentieth-century historians of late antiquity, Casaubon's research into the relationship between Judaism and early Christianity inherited a great deal from enduring traditions of scriptural exegesis. As we have observed, however, there is no indication that Casaubon saw typology as an inherently theological rather than historical or philological way of reading the Bible. If he had, he would have dismissed it along with the other methods which he regarded as the trappings of theological disputation.

At the same time, Casaubon clearly did not regard typology as a purely philological way of approaching a text. In neither of the cases we have examined did he allow typological arguments to stand on their own; they were always supported by critical and historical ones. Typology occupied an ambiguous position within his scholarly method. This ambiguity, while unproblematic for Casaubon himself, would lead some scholars to exclude it from philological exegesis of Scripture altogether. We shall deal with these developments in subsequent chapters. For now, we can focus on a different strand of the reception of Casaubon, which was concerned with his application of criticism to Christian antiquity.

Numerous readers felt that Casaubon had gone further than he needed to in assuming the office of the critic. He cited from a needlessly broad range of texts, delving far more deeply into rabbinical sources and the Greek Fathers than Baronius ever had. As Paolo Sarpi put it, Baronius could easily have been refuted 'with the sole help of the evidence

which Baronius himself has put forward.'[276] Sarpi played the role of the disputatious, polemical ecclesiastical historian or theologian in this exchange – he was encouraging precisely the mode of writing which Casaubon rejected at the start of his *Exercitationes*.

However, there is a further, less well-known letter from Sarpi, in which his portrait of the *Annales* changes slightly.[277] Sarpi tells Casaubon that he was in Rome in 1585, when Baronius was working on the first volume of the *Annales*. 'I think you have noticed the discrepancy between the style of the first volume and the others,' he continues, 'but whether you know why it's that way, I have no idea.' He explains that Baronius's work was polished and corrected by Latino Latini, an old and by then very well-known classicist and patristic scholar from Viterbo, who was also in Rome at the time.[278] Latini often told Sarpi that he was helping Baronius in order to keep himself busy, not because he thought that Baronius's project was a worthwhile one. Quite the opposite, in fact: he regarded the Pope as something of a tyrant and the whole venture of justifying his supremacy in a universal ecclesiastical history as ridiculous. Unlike Sarpi, however, Latini did not air his views publicly, but chose a more devious approach: he thought it was best to argue for the orthodox positions of the Church, but to use such 'inept or frivolous proofs' for those

---

[276] See Sarpi to Casaubon, 8 June 1612, in Sarpi, *Opere*, ed. M. D. Busnelli (Bari: G. Laterza & figli, 1931), vol. II, pp. 219-20. For more on the Casaubon-Sarpi correspondence with regard to ecclesiastical history, see Miller (2000), pp. 121-2.

[277] Sarpi to Casaubon, 17 August, 1612, in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 74, pp. 245-8. This letter is a copy in the hand of Thomas Smith (1638-1710). I have not yet been able to locate the original, and have found no references to it in the editions and discussions of Sarpi's correspondence and works which I have surveyed, including Busnelli, ed. (1931) and Gaetano Cozzi, 'Paolo Sarpi tra il Cattolico Philippe Canaye de Fresnes e il Calvinista Isaac Casaubon,' *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato Veneziano* 1 (1959), pp. 27-154, the appendix to which includes other letters between Sarpi and Casaubon. It was probably missed by Sarpi scholars because the Bodleian card catalogue of manuscript correspondence identifies the author as 'Paul Tarpius,' owing to the fact that the pages of the manuscript have been cut and the top of the letter 'S' is now missing. The letter comes at the end of the sequence of known correspondence between the two men.

[278] Baronius does, in fact, mention Latini's help on another project: see the second edition of his *Martyrologium Romanum* (Antwerp, 1589), pp. 165, 264 and 315. See Latini's posthumous *Epistolae, coniecturae, & observationes sacrae*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1659-Viterbo, 1667), vol. II, vii-viii. Latini did, moreover, have detailed knowledge of Baronius's progress on the *Annales*: see Anna Maria Raugei, ed., *Gian Vincenzo Pinelli et Claude Dupuy: une correspondence entre deux humanistes*, 2 vols. (Pisa: Leo S. Olschki, 2001), p. 358, n. 7.

positions that any sensible man could spot their insincerity. Baronius, however, was not a sensible man, and so Latini was able to convince him to insert at least two such patently absurd arguments into the first volume of the *Annales*, without ever arousing Baronius's suspicion.[279] One was a proof of the absolute power of the Pope, founded on a hint in Acts 5:15 that sick people were cured when the shadow of Peter fell on them. The other was a justification of the worship of saints' relics based on the account in Acts 19:12 of a handkerchief that had touched Paul curing illnesses on its own.[280]

Whether or not Sarpi's remarkable story is true, it suggests that he regarded the scale of the antiquarian erudition brought to bear on ecclesiastical history by both Baronius and Casaubon as somewhat inappropriate: it was absurd to justify centuries of political dominion using such obscure details in a single text, even when that text was the New Testament. The enterprise of philology was frivolous and ludic, whereas that of ecclesiastical history ought to be serious and weighty. Sarpi's last letter to Casaubon was an elaborate hint that Casaubon's granular approach did not belong in this arena.

Other readers were equally indifferent to Casaubon's critical digressions, and his gestures towards impartiality. Lancelot Andrewes echoed Sarpi's concerns a few months later:

> Although I do not agree with Padre Paulo that those *Annales* are of no great importance, yet we all know that you are equal to the task, that you have enough strength and

---

[279] I have paraphrased pp. 247-8 of the letter. I am preparing the whole document for separate publication.

[280] These can indeed be found in Baronius (1596), p. 233 (34 AD) and pp. 426-7 (55 AD), respectively. Neither passage fell within the chronological scope of Casaubon's *Exercitationes*, but at least two needles in the haystack of Casaubon's manuscripts – compared by Grotius to the 'leaves of the Sibyl,' in his letter to Joachim Camerarius, July 27, 1628, Grotius (1928-2001), vol. III, p. 352 – seem to indicate that Casaubon was preparing to engage with them, and had Sarpi's account of them in mind. In MS Casaubon 26, fol. 43^{a}, Latini is mentioned by name in a discussion by Casaubon of the time it took Baronius to produce the *Annales*. Secondly, MS Casaubon 3 contains copies of some of Casaubon's notes on Baronius: on p. 9 Casaubon connects Baronius's discussion of the worship of saints' relics to his discussion of Peter's shadow in Acts; and on p. 2 of the notes 'De potestate praesertim temporali Pontificis Romani' in the same manuscript (with new pagination) he makes the same connection again. There appears to be no reason why Casaubon would have made this connection without Sarpi's help.

> enough words for this duel. But, please, don't spend so much time on those chronological details. Get on to the more important points, the ecclesiastical matters that are worthy of you, quickly. It's to them that the expectations of the literary world summon you.[281]

More than a decade after Casaubon's death, William Laud alluded to these characteristics of his work when he advised G. J. Vossius on the work of anti-Baronian ecclesiastical history he was planning: he was pleased that Vossius had decided 'not to chase after minutiae...which tire out travellers and those who are in a hurry. The main thing is to indicate, with short examples, the ways in which the Roman Church has fallen away from the primitive Church, and finish your demonstration with watertight arguments.'[282]

Casaubon's two main imperatives – philological comprehensiveness and accuracy on the one hand, and refutation of Baronius on the other – were clearly felt to have clashed. Moreover, his meticulous critical method had caused him to waste too much time responding to Baronius's account of the life of Christ, and to forsake entirely the later history of the Church. A battle was taking place to transform the genre of ecclesiastical history, and to many it was unclear whether Casaubon had won – even though Casaubon himself had been confident about the outcome.[283]

---

[281] Andrewes to Casaubon, August 23, in *Ephemerides*, ed. John Russell (Oxford, 1850), vol. II, p. 1203 (quoting from British Library, MS Burney 363, fol. 26[a]; year not specified): 'Etsi autem cum Patre Paulo non sentio esse opus illud Annalium non magni momenti; at id tamen omnes scimus, parem te oneri, satis jam tibi superque virium esse atque verborum ad hoc duellum. Tantum (amabo) in minutiis illis Chronologicis ne nimium diu haereas: ad illa majora cito te confer, Ecclesiastica te digna, ad quae te vocat expectatio literatorum omnium.' I have quoted the translation in Grafton and Weinberg (2010), p. 168, with one correction: Andrewes clearly disagrees with Sarpi, otherwise his first 'non' would be redundant and the concessive phrasing of the clause 'at id tamen...duellum' would make no sense. Andrewes kept warning Casaubon about wasting time on 'Chronologorum nodos istos vix explicabiles': 8 September, 1612, in MS Burney 363, fol. 28[a].

[282] Laud to Vossius, 14 July, 1628, quoted by Colomesius (1682), p. 110: 'De Baronio quod moliri instituis imprimis laudo; praecipuè verò quòd fixum habeas minutias non consectari. Certè in Opere tam diffuso nimis longum iter esset per minutias, & quae taedio afficerent & peritos viatores & festinantes. Caput rei est, illa in quibus longius a primitiva Ecclesia, Romana recessit, brevibus ostendere, & argumentis insolubilibus demonstrare.' This letter is also available in Laud's *Works*, 7 vols. (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847-60), vol. VI, pp. 253-4. The refutation of Baronius was one area where Vossius could appeal to more than one faction within the Church of England: see his letters to John Williams and Samuel Ward, both written from Leiden, 7 July, 1627, in G. J. Vossius (1690), pp. 107-9.

[283] Casaubon to Salmasius, 10 November, 1612, in the Magdeburg, 1656 edition of the former's *Epistolae*, p. 898: 'Miraberis utilitatem nostrarum literarum in tam gravi scriptione.'

This battle also went on beyond the British Isles, as cases like Sarpi's demonstrate. English clerics were hardly alone in wondering whether the polymathic critic was best equipped to defeat the Counter-Reformation historian. Even Jacques-Auguste de Thou warned him to avoid getting entangled in 'chronological disputations' except when Baronius' errors hinged on them.[284] De Thou's perspective was that of the narrative historian and Gallican *politique*, which placed him on more or less the same side as Sarpi.[285] The crucial task was to address questions of temporal power and ecclesiastical jurisdiction without dwelling on rebarbative theological questions or philological niceties.

More generally, it is hard to argue that Casaubon's move to England forced a lapse from his usual, politically and theologically neutral preoccupations as a man of letters. Consider, for instance, his famous complaint to Heinsius that the English cared less for literature than they did for theology.[286] To interpret this as a lament that secular texts received no respect or attention from English scholars is misguided. In the light of the distinction Casaubon made between theology on the one hand and ecclesiastical history and philology on the other, it becomes clear that Casaubon was usually referring to the English penchant for polemical theology over literary studies of any subject matter, whether Christian or not. Casaubon clearly had no objection to the work of Henry Savile on Chrysostom, which sought to redress this imbalance. Indeed, this was precisely how

---

[284] Casaubon to de Thou (repeating de Thou's advice), 1 January 1613, in *Epistolae* (1709), p. 512: 'Admonitio tua de vitandis Chronologicis disputationibus per mihi placet. Ego illum scopulum vitavi, nisi quòd immanes errores Baronii planissimè refutavi.'

[285] See his letter to Casaubon, 1 October, 1612, in de Thou's *Choix de Lettres Françoises Inédites* (Paris: Société des Bibliophiles, 1877), p. 80. De Thou reports a conversation with the French chancellor Nicolas Brûlart in which he assured Brûlart that the *Exercitationes* would touch only on 'ce qui regardoit l'antiquité & le poinct de la légitime jurisdiction, sans entrer à la discussion des dogmes & quaestions [*sic*] de la doctrine.' If Casaubon kept within these limits, de Thou added, Brûlart and his colleagues would be happy for him to return to France. I owe this reference to Patterson (1997), p. 137, who gives the impression that he is quoting a letter from de Thou to Brûlart himself.

[286] Discussed by Feingold, 'The Humanities' (1997), pp. 262-3. See also Sellin (1968), pp. 80-81.

Thomas Smith perceived this moment in the history of English scholarship. Ecclesiastical scholars who followed in Casaubon's wake, such as Patrick Young, went against the grain of English intellectual life: in general, clerics were devoting themselves to 'polemical theology.'[287] In spite of exceptions like Savile, Montagu, and John Bois, they left 'humane letters' alone. Since Montagu and Bois wrote almost exclusively about Judeo-Christian texts, and Savile was working on Chrysostom when Young became Royal Librarian, Smith was not necessarily drawing a distinction between religious and secular literary studies. Rather, he was separating two different approaches to Christian antiquity.

As some later writers interpreted it, in fact, Casaubon had gone to England precisely because the English – or, at least, their king and leading clerics – respected literary scholarship and rewarded it accordingly.[288] Andrew Downes, for instance, eagerly waited for Casaubon to finish his work on the *Exercitationes* so that he could write to him with questions about Plato, Aristotle, and Hesychius.[289] Patrick Young looked forward to seeing more of Casaubon's work on Polybius and Strabo.[290] If we were forced to divide up Casaubon's legacy into different parts, we could still maintain that his strictly philological works were as influential in England as the *Exercitationes*, as later chapters of this study amply demonstrate.[291] For the time being, however, we shall focus on Richard Montagu,

---

[287] See his *Vita Patricii Junii*, in *Vitae quorundam Eruditissimorum et Illustrium Virorum* (London, 1707), p. 15: 'plerisque in studiis Polemicae Theologiae excolendis sese occupantibus.' Young himself did utter a similar complaint, but this was early in his career, when he was struggling to publish and before he came to work on Clement of Rome or the Arundel marbles. See his letter to James Montague, 7 November, 1614, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 28-9.

[288] See, for instance, François du May to Lucas Holstenius, 16 September 1631, in Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 2181, fol. 35. Du May notes the departure of Salmasius from France to Leiden, and compares it with Scaliger and Casaubon's earlier abandonment of France. The latter was attracted to England by the 'liberal spirit and generosity which nourishes him and honours his skill' ('liberalitate et munificentiâ quae eum honore artis alit').

[289] See Downes to Casaubon (undated, but addressed to Casaubon in London) in British Library, MS Burney 363, fol. 260.

[290] Young to Casaubon, 1 August 1609, in Johannes Kemke, ed., *Patricius Junius* (Leipzig: M. Spirgatis, 1898), pp. 3-4.

[291] See, for example, II.3, below.

whose ventures into ecclesiastical history reacted in a complex, mainly oppositional fashion to the new impetus which Casaubon had given the genre.

iv. Richard Montagu

The uses Montagu made of the Fathers and the primitive Church differed considerably from the Eton Chrysostom, although Montagu himself had been involved in that project.[292] This is apparent from his earliest publication, his edition with commentary of two speeches made by Gregory of Nazianzen against Julian the Apostate, the Christian Emperor of Rome who had converted to paganism in the fourth century.[293] His dedication to Richard Bancroft made a more strident argument than Savile had for the importance of the Fathers in general for Christian doctrine and the need to deploy them 'in controversies over dogma. For they are the heads of the Christian religion, who provide us with our doctrine as it was revealed: they derived it from the Apostles, and have passed it down to our era, supported by continuous practice.'[294]

Compared with the notes made for the Eton Chrysostom, Montagu's commentary is much more concerned with the contemporary historical context for Gregory's writings, and with patristic tradition as an object of inquiry in itself, rather than a means to the end of understanding the Bible. Moreover, Montagu is much more willing to engage in open polemic. Consider his gloss on Gregory's use of the word Ἀρχομένους ('those who are

---

[292] See *ODNB*, s.v. 'Montagu, Richard.'

[293] Richard Montagu, ed., *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni in Iulianum Invectivae Duae* (Eton, 1610). British Library, 1124.f.31 is Isaac Casaubon's copy. The text is annotated, but Montagu's preface and commentary are not, suggesting that Casaubon read the book before he was aware of Montagu's attempt at a response to Baronius.

[294] ibid., sig. ¶2[a]: 'nos libenter in controversis dogmatibus, eos facilè admittimus diribitores [*sic*]. Nam sunt Religionis Christianae Proceres, Doctrinae revelatae, Promi-condi, quam ab Apostolis derivatam, perpetuâ praxi confirmatam ad nostra usque tempora transmiserunt.'

led'): he understands the term as equivalent to Λαϊκοὶς ('laypeople'), and adds that 'our own Innovators hate both words, and burden us with tragical declamations; but the ancient fathers, famous for their holiness, do use them. Our Nazianzen everywhere calls the priesthood "the higher order, rank, level," and so on – that of the "leaders."'[295] The priesthood was a separate order amongst the early Fathers, and this gave Montagu enough with which to taunt his puritan enemies, regardless of what the Old or New Testament had to say about the matter. He did not stop including such pointedly topical asides in his later work, explicitly relating the history of the primitive Church to contemporary inter- and intra-confessional disputes.[296] This is all the more striking when we consider that Grotius, at more or less the same time, was using Gregory for the opposite purpose: to encourage reconciliation, not polemic, between and within the confessions.[297]

So Montagu differed from Casaubon, Savile, and Grotius in his willingness to conduct open, explicit polemic using the ammunition provided by ecclesiastical history, rather than letting his historical conclusions speak more or less for themselves. This difference is not so much a question of scholarly method as it is of the rhetoric of scholarship. Yet we must nonetheless regard it as central to the development of ecclesiastical history as a discipline. At least within neo-Latin works of scholarship, Casaubon's studied refusal to hurl direct insults (imitated by Patrick Young, among others) began to make Montagu's more

---

[295] ibid., sig. *b*3[a], referring to p. 49, l. 10: 'utramque vocem Novatores nostri exosam habent, & tragicis exclamationibus aggravant, at patres antiqui sanctitate insignes, usurpant. Nazianz. noster sacerdotium ubique vocat τὴν κρείσσονα, τὴν τῶν ἀρχόντων τάξιν, βαθμὸν, βῆμα &c. populum saepius ἀρχομένους.'

[296] See, for instance, the comparison of the Pharisees with puritans in his *Apparatus ad Origines Ecclesiasticas* (Oxford, 1635), pp. 244-5 (cf. p. 247).

[297] See Silke-Petra Bergjan, 'The Patristic Context in Early Grotius,' *Grotiana* 26.1 (2007), pp. 127-46 (especially p. 135).

inflammatory, disputatious tone look obsolete, whether it was applied to religious factions or individual scholars.[298]

There were, however, genuine methodological differences between Casaubon and Montagu, in addition to the gap in politeness. It is worth pausing to assess these, since they will illuminate features of Montagu's confrontation with Selden over the *Historie of Tithes*.[299] While Casaubon was composing the *Exercitationes*, Montagu was also preparing a response to Baronius. Casaubon thought that Montagu had obtained a draft of his own work (perhaps via Savile) and simply planned to plagiarize from it.[300] At the same time, he admitted to de Thou and Heinsius that Montagu's work differed substantially in its 'scope' and in Montagu's relative lack of 'diligence.'[301]

What did Casaubon mean by 'scope'? *Scopus* is a technical term frequently found in humanist rhetoric, denoting the intention of the author behind a piece of writing; it can be applied to units of speech as small as a single word as well as to whole passages or treatises.[302] The letter to de Thou shows that Casaubon was capable of conceiving of his work as having multiple 'little scopes,' *scopuli*, such as a digression into a chronological problem which had little to do with his overall goal of refuting Baronius – although he

---

[298] As the Catholic scholar John Price noted, his *Apparatus* was 'plein de tres bonne érudition sacrée et prophane, mais il parle *(quod nollem factum)* trop rudement de M. Scaliger.' See Price to Jean Bourdelot, 28 October 1635, in P. Tamizey de Larroque, 'Deux lettres inédites de Jean Price à Bourdelot,' *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, April 1883, p. 146. On Price, see II.6, below.

[299] See II.4, below.

[300] See Casaubon (1850), vol. II, p. 957. See also Pattison (1875), pp. 419-23; and Grafton and Weinberg (2010), pp. 180-81.

[301] Casaubon to de Thou, 1 January 1613, and Casaubon to Daniel Heinsius, 2 January 1613, in *Epistolae* (1709), pp. 511-13.

[302] For an example, see Lawrence D. Green, ed. and trans., *John Rainolds's Lectures on Aristotle's* Rhetoric (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986), p. 94. It was already a major component in Protestant biblical exegesis: see Kathy Eden, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the ancient legacy and its humanist reception* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), especially Chapters 5-6.

claimed to have avoided such lapses in focus. *Diligentia*, on the other hand, was a potential enemy of focused, rhetorically astute composition. Many of Casaubon's readers thought that he had been too diligent in his pursuit of knowledge about primitive Christianity, at the expense of winning the rhetorical war.

Rhetoric, then, remained central to how some scholars (even 'enlightened' ones such as de Thou) conceived of historical and grammatical research. It is not clear whether Montagu attached much value to purely philological investigation motivated by curiosity rather than a sense of rhetorical purpose. Certainly, he was uncomfortable with it in its published form. As a young man, he wrote an unsolicited letter to Scaliger recording his amazement at Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistae*, and especially 'by what method they [that is, the learned banqueters of Athenaeus's title] pick a path through and string together so many things in so many authors. Some of them are matters of detail, but they are certainly of considerable interest.' This multifarious approach, Montagu adds, is very similar to that of Scaliger and other 'famous men of letters today.'[303] He asks Scaliger for advice on how to follow this model, but evidently decided later on that it was not for him. The closest Montagu came to writing a rhetorically unmotivated treatise or commentary (along the lines of Patrick Young's Clement or Selden's *Marmora Arundelliana*) with no single identifiable *scopus* was, ironically, his response to Selden's *Historie of Tithes*.[304] In that work, he felt obliged

---

[303] Montagu to Scaliger, 1 August (year not specified), Leiden University Library, MS BPG 77: 'qua via et methodo tot ex authoribus tam multa, aliquando minutiora certè non insignioris notae consarcinant...et vos hodiè primi nominis literatos similia factitare.' I take the letter to have been written at around the same time as Montagu's letter to Bonaventure Vulcanius, 7 March 1599, in Leiden University Library, MS Vul. 105: 1: both letters request a copy of a catalogue of the Vatican Library, and were written from King's College, Cambridge, and are clearly written by a young admirer of the addressees. Furthermore, it seems likely that Montagu wrote it before Casaubon published his *Animadversiones in Athenaeum*, and probably after he published the text of that author in 1597. I have taken Montagu's date in the Vulcanius letter of 'the seventh day from the beginning of the month Elaphebolion' (ἑβδόμῃ ἀρχομένου μηνός ἐλαφηβολιῶνος) to indicate the seventh day of the ninth month, i.e. September, rather than the seventh of either of the two months of the modern calendar in which Elaphebolion would fall (March and April).

[304] See II.4 and II.5, below.

to show that as a cleric he could match Selden in terms of encyclopaedic learning, but the overall aim of refuting his account of tithing remained clear.

I offer this observation not to pass judgement on Montagu as a scholar, or to exclude his work from the category of philology as it was conceived at the time, but rather to show that humanism absorbed the lessons of rhetoric in a variety of ways, ranging from the elegant historiography of de Thou's *Historia* to the undigested polymathy of Casaubon's Athenaeus. Montagu simply tried to fall somewhere between these two poles. His and others' opposition to Casaubon's methods in the *Exercitationes* arose partly from a feeling that criticism needed to be anchored by rhetoric, especially when the history and status of Christianity itself were at stake. For Montagu, Casaubon had overindulged in 'critical and philological niceties,' chasing them 'ad nauseam' as if he were writing about Athenaeus or Strabo again.[305] The erudition had weighed him down to the point where he only managed to issue a response to the first volume of the *Annales*. The later volumes, however, were actually more important for the controversial ecclesiastical historian: they covered the periods of history in which the Roman Church had erred from the Church instituted by Christ and his apostles, and thus best illustrated the flaws in present-day Roman Catholicism.

We can broadly concur, then, with Pattison's conclusion that, whereas Casaubon was a 'master of ancient learning,' Montagu was little more than a 'clever university-bred scholar, who holds a brief, and can accumulate passages of ancient authors in support of "a view,"' even if we discard the slightly anachronistic value judgement carried with it.[306]

---

[305] Montagu (1635), sig. d1[a].

[306] Pattison (1875), p. 421.

However, to suggest that he was simply impatient with Casaubon's digressions is to tell only part of the story. He also believed that Casaubon had failed to respect the boundaries of his own discipline. Philologists had rightly identified certain tasks as peculiarly theirs: reading widely in humane letters and recording ancient practices, customs, and other facts about the past. They had then expanded their jurisdiction to include 'the whole world of knowledge,' deciding that this included 'the learning of the schools, the hiding-places of more remote theology,' and 'the great mysteries of Jesus Christ's teaching.'

Montagu went on to describe his own methods. He had considered it necessary, in narrating the *res gestae* of the Church, to play the role of theologian as well as ecclesiastical historian, and even of the 'disputant in the schools.'[307] He rejected the opinion of Casaubon that the primitive Church took a practical view of piety and faith rather than a theological, speculative one: 'the Church consists of discipline and doctrine, both at the same time; that is, practice and theory.' The presence of theoretical elements in early Christian doctrine was what legitimated his theological approach against Casaubon's. It was not that the theologian dealt with different texts or subject matter from the ecclesiastical historian or the critic. Both discussed the rise and progress of heresy and orthodoxy, and the rules established by Church councils. Instead, the theologian's writings necessarily, because of their theoretical import, took a different form. As Casaubon himself had said, this form was inherently adversarial. The struggle between heretics and orthodox believers or the decisions of a council had to be narrated and explained in much the same way as 'Loci communes,' the standard proof-passages over which participants in 'disputationes' argued. This is why anyone responding to Baronius had to write more than a mere chronicle of events. The very nature of the subject matter demanded the techniques

[307] Montagu (1635), sig. d2[a].

of scholastic argumentation. Hence Montagu refused to designate his work as a *Historia* or even as *Annales*, preferring the term *Origines*: he was following contemporary theological debates back to their earliest instances in the Church, in the faith that the sources would have the perfect answers to the questions he was asking.

We have reached a surprising conclusion. From our point of view, Montagu appears even less sympathetic towards Casaubon's methods than Andrewes or Laud were. As soon as philology moved from the study of secular Greco-Roman literature into the field of Judeo-Christian antiquity, he regarded it as a mere piece in the game of inter- and intra-confessional religious debate. Even in his scholarly contacts, he was far less ecumenical than most Englishmen. After his abortive attempts to win the favour of Scaliger and Vulcanius as a very young man, he either insulted or simply avoided mainstream European Protestant scholars such as Casaubon or Daniel Heinsius.[308] His friends and correspondents within the republic of letters were largely Arminian or Roman Catholic, and included an unusual number of Jesuits.[309] Within England, he was particularly close to his fellow Laudian bishop, Augustine Lindsell.[310]

These were not the only aspects of his scholarly practice conditioned by his Catholicizing theological outlook. His whole view of Christian antiquity was founded on a Catholic

---

[308] See Milton (1995), pp. 354-5. For Heinsius's wariness about the religious politics of Montagu and the Laudian faction, see Sellin (1968), pp. 91-2.

[309] See in particular Quantin (2007), pp. 696-702. Montagu's collaboration with Roman Catholics came in spite of the fact that some Leiden scholars were eager to publish his work on Eusebius in Holland: see Lucas Holstenius to Johannes Meursius, 13 May, 1624, in Holstenius, *Epistolae ad Diversos*, ed. Jean-François Boissonade (Paris, 1817), p. 28; and Meursius to Holstenius, 1 June, 1624, in Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 2185, fol. 37[b].

[310] On Montagu and Lindsell, see Milton (1995), pp. 311-12; Montagu, ed. (1610), sig. ¶4[b]; idem, *Diatribae Vpon the First Part of the Late History of Tithes* (London, 1621), p. 144; and Montagu to John Cosin, 7 February, 1624, in George Ornsby, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin*, 2 vols. (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1869-72), p. 92. On Lindsell's Arminianism, see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 36, 118-19, 127.

approach to ecclesiastical tradition. As Milton has pointed out, all English divines 'would pride themselves on having studied antiquity, but Montagu's insistence that he had studied it *instead* of following "the ordinarie and accustomed by-paths" of Reformed writers such as Polanus infused a new combative exclusivity into understandings of the two.'[311] Modern theologians were inferior by virtue of their modernity; ecclesiastical tradition and whatever could be identified as the continual practice of the Church were always to be consulted and accepted whenever there was any doubt in an argument.[312] Modern scholars, moreover, had paid too little respect to ancient historical scholarship, particularly when it had been undertaken by the Fathers.[313]

Montagu, then, subscribed to a theology of tradition underwritten by a scholarship of tradition. Rather than representing an Anglican consensus or even a consensus amongst patristic scholars as a group, his view of the functions of philology was idiosyncratic for its time. Only by comparing him with Casaubon and, moving forward, with other scholars of Christian antiquity such as Patrick Young, John Selden, and even James Ussher, can we appreciate the substantial differences which divided English philology as far as method, form, and the overall goals of philological research were concerned. Especially intriguing is the divergence between his approach to the Fathers and Young's, which has not been noted. Young inherited much more from Selden's approach to the entire corpus of Greek literature and history than he did from Montagu's theologically motivated study of the Greek Fathers. Before examining this discrepancy, however, I shall leave patristic

---

[311] Milton (1995), p. 447.

[312] Montagu (1635), sig. d2[b]: 'noviter autem subintroducta, sunt ipsâ suâ Novitate suspectiora. De sententiâ vetustatis communiori, post suffragium Scripturarum *autodespotikon*, non private alicujus spiritu, semper infirmo, saepe improbo, sed Traditione Ecclesiasticâ interrogatâ, & acceptâ: praxi perpetuâ accedente: in omni re dubiâ & litigiosa, meam ipse sententiam, & non aliter, si haberi poterint, exponam.'

[313] For his critique of Scaliger, see ibid., sig. d1[a]; and for complaints about Casaubon's treatment of the Fathers, see pp. 136-8, and Grafton and Weinberg (2010), pp. 180-181. He repeated these complaints in his attacks on Selden and Scaliger: see II.4, below.

scholarship to one side, and treat a slightly different field in which Casaubon's influence was felt: namely, the study of the Bible and its ancient and modern translations.

II.3: John Bois and early biblical criticism

i. Bois and the King James Bible

The King James Bible is often held up as a monument to the peculiar power and elegance of the English language and its literature. The surviving documents that illuminate the work of the translators are rarely mentioned, let alone studied in depth, and the translation has never been discussed in the context of the contemporary European republic of letters and European movements within sacred and secular philology.[314] It is time for that deficiency to be remedied, in light of one of this study's recurring themes: that, during the earlier seventeenth century, any fledgling canon or movement which might be called 'English literature' was being outflanked and overwhelmed by the literary and scholarly cultures of continental late humanist philology.

The best way of testing this hypothesis is by resorting to the Greek aspects of the composition of the Authorized Version. In fact, the ambiguities of Hellenism and the study of Greek receive special attention throughout this study. The original language of both the New Testament and the privileged earliest translation of the Old Testament occupied a large territory within sacred philology, but also outside it. This was thanks to its place in the grammar school and undergraduate curriculum, second only to Latin, to the sheer range of genres covered by ancient Greek texts, and to the strong secular or pagan element in the surviving body of Greek literature. For all these reasons, Greek generated more

[314] By far the best overview of the documentary evidence for the genesis of the King James Bible is David Norton, *A Textual History of the King James Bible* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), although Norton's focus on the text-critical basis of the Authorized Version through the ages limited the amount of archival research he was able to do into individual translators.

mainstream philological questions and controversies than Hebrew did, at least as far as England is concerned.

Few scholars in the earlier part of the seventeenth century illustrate these themes better than John Bois, one of the new Bible's translators. Bois had been a fellow and eventually lecturer in Greek at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he studied under Andrew Downes, before becoming rector of Boxworth, near Cambridge, and eventually being drafted into the so-called 'second' Cambridge company of translators, assigned to work on the Apocrypha.[315] He and Downes also, however, joined delegates from Oxford and Westminster for the subsequent revision of the whole translation, which took place in London. Until now, only one source for this revision process had been thought to survive: Bois's fairly extensive notes on the revision of the New Testament epistles and Revelation.[316] This chapter adds two further major sources, one unknown, the other simply neglected: the former is Bois's copiously annotated working copy of the 1587 Rome Septuagint, which he used to translate the Apocrypha and during the final revision stage.[317]

---

[315] See *ODNB*, s.v. 'Bois, John.' For more biographical information, see the life of Bois written by his grandson-in-law Anthony Walker: published in Allen (1970), p. 127ff. Allen's version is taken from Francis Peck, ed., *Desiderata Curiosa* (London, 1732-35), vol. II, sig. I2^{b}ff. There are manuscript copies in British Library, MS Harley 7053, p. 92f. (the copy used by Peck); and Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 278, fol. 2^{a}f. The latter was apparently not consulted by Peck or Allen; the Tanner MSS did not arrive at the Bodleian until after Peck's edition. It confirms Peck's suggestion that the dedicatee of Walker's life, not named in Harley 7053, was Ralph Brownrigg, Bishop of Exeter and close friend of Bois (see Bois's note on the recto of the first leaf of MS Tanner 437, which precedes the official foliation in the manuscript; Bois's will, also in MS Harley 7053, p. 128; and the letter from Bois to Brownrigg, 28 September 1643, in MS Tanner 62, fol. 322).

[316] Published with translation and introduction by Allen (1970). The copy used by Allen was Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS Fulman 312. Another copy, in British Library, MS Harley 750, was later discovered by David Norton: see 'John Bois's Notes on the Revision of the King James Bible New Testament: A New Manuscript,' *The Library* 18.4 (1996), pp. 328-46.

[317] Bodleian Library, D 1.14 Th.Seld. Selden most likely acquired this book through the London printer and bookseller Cornelius Bee, who became his publisher around 1650. An anonymous account of Bois's books in MS Tanner 278, fol. 3^{a}, records that Bee bought Bois's library, although perhaps not his manuscripts.

The latter is Bois's correspondence with Isaac Casaubon, containing minutely detailed discussions of problems of translation in the Apocrypha.[318]

The best approach to this topic, however, is provided by a separate document, containing a statement by Bois that deserves attention for its unusual clarity and candour. Bois was in the habit of composing a short 'review' at the end of those books which he had found especially useful or interesting.[319] MS Burney 368 in the British Library contains a copy of such a review – of Isaac Casaubon's famous *Animadversiones* on Athenaeus.[320] Bois wrote that the quality of Casaubon's expositions and emendations of Athenaeus could not be matched by any other European critic – not even Scaliger. Scaliger was blessed with an extraordinary wit ('ingenio') and range of learning ('doctrina'), and he had taught Casaubon a great deal, without necessarily learning much in return. The reason why Scaliger could never have done what Casaubon did with Athenaeus, however, was that once he had reached maturity ('postquam ad ἀκμήν aetatis et iudicii peruenit') he had been concerned with far greater and more difficult matters than mere 'grammar.' When Scaliger did deal with grammatical issues, it was generally part of a detour on his journey towards some more important goal.

---

[318] In British Library, MS Burney 363, fols. 101[a]-105[b]. A third potential, but less important, new source consists of some of the excerpts from modern authors copied by James Wedderburn or a scribe into MS Harley 750. In many places these directly reflect notes made by Bois in the margins of his Septuagint: compare, for instance, the note on tithes taken from Scaliger in MS Harley 750, fol. 30[b], with the note in D 1.14 Th.Seld., p. 369. It may not, however, be possible to prove that Bois was reading any of these texts before the first edition of the Bible was published; and for Scaliger's 'Diatriba de decimis in Lege Dei' he definitely cited the 1612 rather than 1610 edition of Scaliger's *Opuscula varia ante hac non edita*, published in Frankfurt.

[319] See, for instance, his extremely extensively annotated copy of Guillaume Budé's *Commentarii Linguae Graecae* (Paris, 1529), which he left to St. John's College, Cambridge (the shelfmark is G.7.7; cf. Bois's will, in MS Harley 7053, pp. 124 and 127): p. 967.

[320] See fol. 92[a]. The hand is not Bois's. The date on which Bois wrote the review is recorded as 15 December, 1623.

Bois distinguished sharply, then, between two different models for the critic. On the one hand, the universal, encyclopaedic philosopher-critic who had chronology, mathematics, and every form of philosophy at his fingertips; on the other, the critic as grammarian and man of letters, exemplified by Casaubon. In fulfilling this office, Casaubon displayed 'maturity, the highest wit, discriminating judgement, a passion for his work, an unusual knowledge of languages (above all Greek), patience and an incredible tolerance for hard work, a desire to learn from anywhere he could'; most strikingly, he also availed himself of a 'a perspicuous and easy style' and was 'forthright and free in his speech' ('παρρησία atque loquendi libertas'). Bois added that he had been able to perceive these virtues at first hand, having often encountered him in London.

Bois does, of course, cite Scaliger in his notes on the translation, but only in grammatical contexts; and he refers to Casaubon much more frequently.[321] To say that Bois articulated a distinction between two types of critic is not to allege that any such distinction had begun to operate, formally, in the discipline of criticism as it was practised in the early seventeenth century. It is nonetheless significant that Bois understood that progress in one type of criticism could hinder progress in another, and that he himself might only be capable of embracing one sub-category of criticism and not the rest. Equally, he had an unusually developed sense of the integrity of European criticism as a disciplinary community, and the extent to which individual critics necessarily drew on each other. One of the many qualities that made Casaubon special was how well he used the work of modern authors; not just Scaliger, but also Canter, Turnèbe, Estienne, and others. He was never jealous of his peers, and never stooped to open abuse when he disagreed with them. The implicit critique of Scaliger in these lines was that he, unlike Casaubon, had given the

[321] See e.g. D 1. 14 Th.Seld., p. 455; Allen (1970), pp. 44-5.

impression of utterly transcending other scholarship, never depending on his contemporaries for any of his findings, and even violently attacking their work when he felt like it. His refusal to make even the slightest concession to scholarly specialization was another cause of his remoteness from his fellow critics.

Bois's general comments on specialization and disciplinarity reflect his practice as a translator of the Bible, not to mention his other works.[322] When he wrote to Casaubon, for example, he appealed specifically to Casaubon's expertise in the Greek language, and in grammatical and historical learning. Casaubon's knowledge of or engagement with Hebrew literature was apparently of no interest to Bois, in spite of the fact that he was asking about Jewish texts (albeit ones written in Greek and Latin). His queries concern narrow points of Greek grammar, and even punctuation, as well as broader questions about ancient customs and history which drew on Casaubon's edition of Athenaeus, among other similar texts. Casaubon's response acknowledged the specific focus on Greek, and displayed the friendly collegiality which Bois was recalling in his copy of Athenaeus: 'It is the right of you, and those of your reverend colleagues who have pushed all the way to the summit of erudition in Greek, to make these decisions and tell the others to follow them.'[323]

When Bois was translating the Septuagint, moreover, he confined himself very strictly to these areas of enquiry. He did not offer any chronological observations on the

---

[322] His posthumously published *Veteris Interpretis cum Beza aliisque Recentioribus Collatio* (London, 1655) is discussed later in this chapter. For his work on Savile's Chrysostom, see II.2, above; and for Patrick Young's use of his work in his editions of Clement and the Septuagint, see II.5 and III.1, below.

[323] 'Tuum est, et reuerendorum tuorum collegarum, τῶν ἐὶς ἄκρον τῆς ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἑληλακότων, de his statuere, et aliis quod sequantur praescribere': Casaubon to Bois, not dated, in MS Burney 363, fol. 105[a]. I have understood 'aliis' to refer to the other translators who were not specialists in Greek, although it may admit other interpretations. The attributive relationship between 'reuerendorum...collegarum' and 'τῶν...ἑληλακότων,' however, supports mine.

discrepancies between the Greek and Hebrew texts, one of the most contested problems in Septuagint scholarship in the seventeenth century. Nor did he cite post-biblical Hebrew or Aramaic texts, leaving the rabbinical commentaries to those translators who were genuine Hebraists. This is not to say that he had no interest in oriental languages, simply that he had a strong sense of his own competencies and his remit as a translator specializing in Greek.[324] Most strikingly of all, he observed precisely the distinction that Scaliger, Drusius (of whom he was an assiduous reader) and others had made between grammar, or *historia*, and theology.[325] He cited a remarkably small number of modern theologians (all of them Protestant), and when he did so it was usually in order to make a narrowly text-critical or linguistic point.[326] This is not to say that Bois never felt these points to have possible theological implications; but if he did, he refrained from saying so explicitly, allowing grammatical arguments to stand on their own terms. This was doubtless easier for him to do in the case of the Apocrypha, which were to be translated and read only for moral and historical, not theological instruction. His notes on the New Testament, however, differ little in this respect.

The theologians Bois does cite represent moderate Protestantism – with Lutherans particularly prominent – and in one case a clear institutional affiliation (Whitaker had been Bois's Master at St. John's).[327] Calvin is absent, but absence does not denote rejection; and

---

[324] In fact, later in his life he took up Arabic as a pastime, and fell 'in loue' with the language: see Gilbert Wigmore's letter to the Cambridge orientalist and Saxonist Abraham Wheelocke, 27 August 1629, and Bois to Wheelocke, on the same day, in Cambridge University Library, MS Dd. III. 12, fols. 144 and 146, respectively. See also the notes on the Koran and learning Arabic in MS Harley 750, fols. 29^{b}-30^{a}.

[325] See I.1, above.

[326] See the citations in D 1. 14 Th.Seld., pp. 243 (Luther); 519 and 625 (Melanchthon); 522 (Hooker); 532, 537 and 775 (Peter Martyr and Whitaker); 541 (Chemnitz); and 545 (Keckermann). These constitute the sum total of Bois's mentions of modern theologians by name, compared with hundreds of direct references to modern philologists.

[327] See Bois's fond recollection of Whitaker in his diary (the entry is dated December 9, 1630): Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 3856, fol. 156^{a}.

later in his career, Bois praised Samuel Ward's famous anti-Arminian sermon *Gratia discriminans* and denounced the anti-Calvinists (although he simultaneously claimed not to have paid much attention to the ongoing controversies over predestination).[328] As far as ecclesiology is concerned, he seems to have supported episcopacy without ever expressing his views on church government in detail.[329]

Two aspects of Bois's exegetical practice throw more light on the interaction between his religious outlook and philological endeavours: his use of the ancient translations of the Bible, and his use of the Fathers. Colomesius noted that Bois was rare among Protestants in evincing a great deal of respect for the Septuagint.[330] Similarly, he also wrote a long commentary on the Gospels which defended at almost every turn the Vulgate Latin translation against the various modern translations, especially that of the arch-Calvinist Beza: as Colomesius put it, 'in these notes the Helen of the Papists is defended everywhere.'[331] He then drew a telling parallel, noting that the same enterprise had been undertaken by another scholar, in this case one who had wavered between Catholicism and Protestantism: Alberico Gentili, the Italian professor of civil law who had emigrated and taken up a chair at Oxford in 1581.[332]

ii. Bois's reception and the confessionalization of Christian antiquity

---

[328] See Bois to Ward, 24 June 1626, in Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 72, fol. 139.

[329] For instance in his notes on Clement: see II.5, below.

[330] Colomesius (1682), p. 107: 'Il y a peu de Protestans qui estiment la Version des Septante. Les premiers que j'aie découvert qui en ayent parlé avec éloge, sont Dounaeus [Andrew Downes], Professeur en Grec à Cambrige, [Nicholas] Fullérus Doyen de Salisbury, & Boisius Chanoine d'Ely, tous trois Anglois, & vivans en méme tems.' Colomesius cited only Bois's *Collatio* (1655), pp. 61 and 307.

[331] See his short biographical note on Bois in Casaubon (1709), p. 380. I am not sure precisely what Colomesius meant by 'Pontificiorum Helena': the most likely answer is that he was comparing the Vulgate with 'Helen' in the transferred sense of an inauspicious meteor, spelling doom for sailors: the opposite of her 'brothers,' the stars Castor and Pollux, which sailors regarded as benign. See Pliny the Elder, *Hist. Nat.* II.37.

[332] On Gentili, see *ODNB*, and Kingsbury and Straumann, eds. (2010).

Secondly, Bois cited the Church Fathers much more often than modern theologians. He had praised Casaubon for having so many 'Greek theologians,' such as Basil, Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nazianzen, at his fingertips.[333] Bois's respect for Christian antiquity – whether it came in the form of the Vulgate (which he continually referred to by the name of 'Vetus Interpres'), the Greek Fathers, or the Greek version of the Old Testament which they had treated as canonical – could easily be regarded as an endorsement of one form of Protestantism, moderate and Anglican, against others. This is precisely how the anonymous preface to his *Collatio* treated it: to reject the version which had endured for so long and been not only used but treated as sacred by all Churches was the mark not of true reformers, but of 'Innovators' who had rejected orthodoxy out of hand.[334] This invective was yoked to a defence of patristic learning, which had also been abandoned in the present era of Fifth Monarchists and other enthusiasts.

The same preface, however, offered an argument which Bois himself would not necessarily have accepted: that most of the modern objections to the older Latin version rested on its stylistic lapses, and paid little heed to the question of doctrinal accuracy. Modern critics 'take its infelicity, which is for the most part literary, and transfer it, with their most awful translations, to the matter of life itself – and this is the greatest error of all.'[335] The printed edition quoted Augustine on its title page: 'The pious translator chose to neglect Latinity rather than accuracy' – but Bois's manuscript had not.[336] The author of the preface, then,

---

[333] MS Burney 368, fol. 92[a].

[334] Bois (1655), sigs. A2[a]-3[a].

[335] ibid., sig. A4[a] : 'σφάλμα ejus, ut maximè literarium, in vitam ipsam, errore omnium maximo, versione pessimâ transferentes.'

[336] 'Maluit pius Interpres minùs Latinè aliquid dicere, quàm minùs propriè.' The Drusius epigraph, by contrast, was Bois's: see MS Tanner 437, fol. [1[a]] (several leaves before the actual foliation begins).

added a second target to the enthusiasts: libertine critics who had taken grammatical erudition and a penchant for attacking the ineptitude of early Christians too far. As we have seen in the case of Montagu's critique of Selden, these two groups were rarely far apart in any polemical debate within philology, but the intervening decades had made the association stronger.

The clearest candidate for authorship of the preface is William Sancroft. Sancroft had acquired the manuscript of the *Collatio* after Bois's death from the Cambridge printer and bookseller, Roger Daniel, and given it 'freely to be printed.'[337] If he had lived through the 1640s and 1650s, Bois would probably have come to share some of the views of Sancroft, who had spent those years investigating the past and fearing for the future of the Church of England. Doubtless Bois can be said to have played a small part in the politicization and specialization of scholarship on Christian antiquity. He had some involvement in the work of High Church divines and scholars such as Richard Montagu and Augustine Lindsell.[338] He was encouraged in his commentary on the Vulgate by Lancelot Andrewes, but Andrewes himself, whatever his religious agenda, rarely claimed that there was a particular affinity between the power of philological research and the truth of conservative, anti-

---

[337] ibid. This attribution has already been made, but without the evidence provided by this manuscript. See George D'Oyly, *The Life of William Sancroft* (London, 1821), vol. I, pp. 75-8, where the author records that the copy in the possession of the clergyman Henry John Todd contains a note by 'an old hand' assigning authorship to Sancroft; and *ODNB*, s.v. 'Sancroft, William.' Sancroft gathered other material relating to Bois, including a copy of his will, now in Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson D 817, fol. 212[a]; and probably his letter to Ralph Brownrigg in MS Tanner 62, fol. 322. For more information on Tanner MSS connected with Sancroft, see M. J. Sommerlad, 'The Historical and Antiquarian Interests of Thomas Tanner, 1674-1735, Bishop of St. Asaph' (DPhil thesis: University of Oxford, 1962), appendices M, N and O. I would like to thank Grant Tapsell for this reference.

[338] Bodleian Library, MS Laud Gr. 64b contains (fol. 65[a]) a homily by Chrysostom, in Greek, annotated by Bois. This manuscript was also annotated and translated by Richard Montagu: see fol. 77[a]. The nature of Bois's collaboration with Lindsell is more clear: he wrote 'notes to the quantitie off verie neare a dozen sheetes off paper' for the Bishop concerning John of Damascus. See Bois's letter to Samuel Ward, 17 July 1638, in Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 67, fol. 26[a].

puritan positions on ceremonies, doctrine, or church government.[339] The fact is that Bois and Andrewes were operating in an environment of relative freedom for philologists, before their work had become subject in a widespread and routine way to the pressures of intra-confessional conflict.

Bois's grammatically orientated, unpolemical work on the Vulgate is a relevant context for his work on the King James Bible, because it reminds us of the fundamental role of Latin in the enterprise of biblical translation: even for Protestants, and into vernacular languages. In the margins of his Septuagint, he frequently cites the Vulgate as well as the modern translations of Franciscus Junius and of Petrus Cholinus, who had translated the apocrypha for the 1543 Zurich Bible. Citations of Latin bibles comfortably outnumber English ones, and Bois shows far more concern about the difficulty of translating Greek into Latin than about the value of individual English words or phrases. This corresponds with what we already know from his notes on the New Testament. When Bois does mention previous English translations, he refers generally to 'Anglici interpretes' or an equivalent; he never cites a specific English Bible by name.[340] He exhibits a much more refined sense of the variations and histories of the different continental Latin translations than of the English ones. His discussions of English renderings tend not to be directed towards the English version(s) *per se* so much as what they tell him about the original texts underlying them.[341]

---

[339] There has been little detailed study of Andrewes' scholarly interests, but on the ways in which Andrewes's life and work were co-opted after his death by Arminian and High Church interests, see Quantin (2009), pp. 158-9; Peter McCullough, 'Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642,' *The Historical Journal* 41.2 (1998), pp. 401-24; and Nicholas Tyacke, 'Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,' in Peter Lake and Michael Questier, eds., *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000). Tyacke (pp. 7-10) points out that puritans also laid claim to aspects of Andrewes's legacy.

[340] See, for example, D 1.14 Th.Seld., pp. 344, 370, 723.

[341] See, for instance, his discussion of 1 Esdras 3:5, in MS Burney 363, fol. 103[a] (cf. D 1.14 Th.Seld., p. 343). Bois uses the available English translations to work out which version of the Greek text the translators had placed their trust in.

Bois's concern for Latin over English underlines the extent to which the King James Bible was first and foremost a scholarly enterprise conducted in the language and methods of the European republic of letters. From the perspective of the only surviving documents of the translation the translators do not seem to have been interested in the place of the Bible within the history of English literature, or in the qualities of the English language itself. To them, the King James version was a moment in the history of Latin rather than English Bible translation. What underpinned its creation was not so much religious politics or vernacular literary culture as the new discipline of grammar-centric, historically erudite philology which figures like Isaac Casaubon were fostering in the British Isles. The next chapter examines what happened when a layman brought this form of biblical criticism to bear on sensitive matters of ecclesiastical history, published his work in English, and conspicuously rejected all of the trappings of theological exegesis on which Montagu and even, at times, Casaubon had insisted.

II.4: Philology in Selden's *Historie of Tithes*

The controversy over Selden's *Historie of Tithes* focused as much on the status of history as a discipline as it did on the issue of tithes *per se*.[342] Selden himself claimed that the *Historie* was not a refutation of tithing: it was simply an attempt to consider tithing from the point of view of human, not divine, laws and opinions.[343] It might even support an argument in favour of tithing, albeit one based purely on civil rather than divine law.[344] What it did advocate without any ambiguity, however, was the necessity of philology for any historical investigation of tithing. We have seen that the precedent of Aristotle as a universal scholar, along with the Aristotelian notion of *historia* to which many philologists appealed, often conspired to make philology and history interchangeable.[345] One consequence of this is that Selden's idea of 'history' and the opprobrium it generated cannot be understood without accounting for his use of philological techniques.

Recent decades have seen more commentary on the *Historie of Tithes* than any of Selden's other works. It has attracted attention from historians of historiography for its advances in historical method, and the fact that it 'set off the biggest historical controversy in England

---

[342] For a discussion of the work's contents, composition, and publication, see Toomer (2009), pp. 257-310, and idem, 'Selden's "Historie of Tithes": Genesis, Publication, Aftermath,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65.3/4 (2002), pp. 345-378. See also Mark Bland, '"Invisible Dangers": Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England,' in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 90 (1996), pp. 170-177.

[343] John Selden, *The Historie of Tithes* (London, 1618), preface, i. Henceforth all page references will be given in parentheses at the end of each citation, in order to avoid a proliferation of footnotes.

[344] As Gerard Langbaine wrote to Selden, August 22, 1653, in Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 109, fol. 463. Langbaine's point was repeated by the author himself in John Selden, *Table Talk*, ed. Samuel Reynolds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), p. 179.

[345] See II.1, above.

since Polydore Vergil had called Geoffrey of Monmouth a liar.'[346] Alternatively, scholars have discussed it from the point of view of the history of political thought, inspired especially by Pocock's enduring discussion of the ancient constitution and the 'common-law mind.'[347] From both of these perspectives, the most influential part of the *Historie* was that which dealt with the practice of tithing from apostolic Christianity up to the present. The standard interpretation states that it used 'non-narrative legal-antiquarian research' to construct 'a narrative account of tithing practices through the ages.'[348] Selden 'demonstrated the historical anachronism' of Sir Henry Spelman's argument for tithes in his short epistolary treatise *De non temerandis ecclesiis* (1613), which rested increasingly on divine and natural law.[349] He deployed a sophisticated understanding of common law and arguments from historical precedent to undermine the notion that there was a divine precept enjoining the payment of tithes in England in his own time. Instead, tithing since the apostles had evolved gradually, as a result of interaction between written laws and unwritten customs, and generally because of the decisions not of any ecclesiastical body but of the civil magistrate in any given country. This is taken as an early manifestation of

---

[346] D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, ideology, and the 'light of truth' from the accession of James I to the Civil War* (University of Toronto Press, 1990), p. 230; see also idem, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five transitions in thinking about the past, 1500-1700,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), pp. 33-70; F. Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (London: Routledge, 1962), pp. 275-296; and Parry (2007), pp. 118-124.

[347] Pocock (1957). Although Selden hardly featured in Pocock's original study, he was covered briefly in parts of the 1987 reissue. Otherwise, see Paul Christianson, *Discourse on History, Law, and Governance in the Public Career of John Selden, 1610-1635* (University of Toronto Press, 1996); and Laura Brace, *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth-Century England: Tithes and the Individual* (Manchester University Press, 1998). Despite approaching it from the point of view of the reception of Camden, Kunst (1994), pp. 171-7 still stresses the political thought rather than the philological methods of Selden's early work. Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 209f., treats the *Historie* as an example of political thought but cleaves less than Christianson to the ancient constitution paradigm, as does, more recently, Jeffrey R. Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 98.

[348] Woolf (1990), pp. 42-3.

[349] Paul Christianson, 'Young John Selden and the Ancient Constitution, Ca. 1610-18,' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128.4 (1984), p. 300. Christianson (1996), pp. 64-8 offers the best account of the progress (and relative originality) of the *iure divino* argument for tithes up to and including Spelman.

the alleged Erastianism that characterized Selden's understanding of ecclesiastical and legal history.[350]

However, the fact that the *Historie* provided a narrative of tithing practices was not nearly as important as has been suggested. By this stage in discourse about tithing, the *iure divino* argument had become so predominant as to overshadow the argument from civil or ecclesiastical law. Since this argument was based on Scripture and on natural law theory drawn from pagan sources, it circumvented the narrative of tithing practices which Selden had established from the apostolic age onwards.

Historians of historiography and political thought have perhaps been misled by the influence of Momigliano and Pocock to search for a combination of philology or antiquarianism and a diachronic, evolutionary sense of history in works of early modern scholarship.[351] Yet the first analogy Selden drew in his preface was with natural history in the mould of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Pliny, not with narrative histories like those of Livy or Tacitus. Nor had Rivallius and Brodaeus, his next two examples of authors who had composed 'histories' of law, really offered 'narratives' of Roman law so much as philological commentaries aimed at gathering, arranging, and interpreting the known facts about Roman law.[352] Furthermore, it is important to distinguish between two separate strands in the content of the *Historie* itself: the practice of paying tithes, and the history of opinions about tithe payments. The latter strand was particularly open to being read less as a continuous, self-contained history and more as a collection of interpretations of

---

[350] See Tuck (1993), p. 210, and the more judicious discussion in Toomer (2009), pp. 569-70.

[351] On Momigliano, see the Introduction, above.

[352] See Johannes Brodaeus, *Miscellaneorum libri sex* (Basel, 1555); and Aymarus Rivallius, *Ciuilis historiae iuris, siue in XII. Tab. Leges commentariorum libri quinque* (Mainz, 1533).

Scripture. This is the way Selden himself presented it in his audacious letter to Buckingham: 'I know, my Lord, what other Men in their published Conclusions have affirmed, or denied touching it [i.e. the 'divine Right of Tithes']; & that I declar'd at large in my History.'[353] Even the part of this letter that handled practice, in fact, steered clear of presenting a story about how tithe payments developed over time. It remains unclear whether Selden himself appreciated that the distinctive achievement of his *Historie* was its construction of an evolutionary narrative about tithing.

The opening three chapters, on the other hand, cover first of all tithing in the Old Testament before the Law; then tithing after the law, then tithing amongst the gentiles. In general, they have been overlooked in favour of the sections of the *Historie* in which discussions of English law predominate. Nor, peculiarly, has there been much interest in what Selden thought about 'philology,' which he identified in his preface as the master-discipline to which all others, including common law as well as theology, owed their foundations. If it is noticed at all, this claim is glossed with Selden's comments about the French school or movement in legal history which has come to be known as the *mos Gallicus*.[354] Insofar as Selden laid claim to a philological approach to legal history, then, it is thought to have filtered through lawyers like Jacques Cujas and François Hotman, many of whom he cited in the preface. Finally, the responses to Selden's *Historie* which were released after its publication have largely been overlooked. If they are discussed, it is for their failure to understand Selden's methods and their historicizing force; but the manner and terms of this alleged failure are rarely given any consideration.[355]

---

[353] Selden to the Marquis of Buckingham, May 5, 1620, in Selden, *Opera omnia*, ed. David Wilkins, 3 vols. (London, 1726), vol. III.2, cols. 1393-6.

[354] See, for instance, Woolf (1990), pp. 218, 233-4; and Christianson (1996), pp. 69-70.

[355] Toomer (2009), p. 309, describes them as 'of more political than intellectual interest.' See also Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, 1875), pp. 326-7.

We shall soon see, however, that all three of these elements are absolutely fundamental for understanding the *Historie* and the controversy it generated. Most surprising of all the omissions in the historiography is that of Selden's opponents.[356] When we read Selden through the eyes of James Sempill, Richard Tillesley, and especially Richard Montagu (whose response was the longest by far), we find that the nature of philology was indeed a focal point, and that 'philology' as both Selden and his challengers conceived of it was much more than French legal historicism: it took in almost the full range of techniques and sources already surveyed in this thesis. We also find that the first three chapters received much more attention than the rest. Montagu's reply only dealt with those three, in painstaking detail, over the course of almost six hundred pages. Sempill attacked the first two alone. Later, Stephen Nettles also concentrated on 'the Jewish part.'[357]

Only Tillesley bothered to engage with the rest of the *Historie*. He stated, however, that his work was a kind of adjunct to Sempill's, on the basis that Sempill's treatment of Scripture remained to be confirmed by subsequent tradition (1). Only the '*peeuish*,' Tillesley added, needed such a confirmation, not being able to see the self-sufficient truth of Scripture for themselves. Although Tillesley was dealing with the part of the *Historie* which has been of greatest interest to modern historians, he does not, unlike them, seem to have perceived the radical implications of its approach for the composition of history or the practice of law. He treated the later chapters partly as a commentary on the vision of Jewish and Christian tithing set out in the first two. As Tillesley imagined it, Selden was citing post-Biblical authorities because he thought that they did not believe the Bible to

---

[356] Sir James Sempill, *Sacrilege Sacredly Handled* (London, 1619); Richard Tillesley, *Animaduersions Vpon M. Seldens History of Tithes* (London, 1619); Montagu (1621). All subsequent references to these works are given in parentheses in the main text.

[357] Stephen Nettles, *An answer to the Jewish part of Mr. Selden's History of Tithes* (Oxford, 1625).

contain a *iure divino* justification of tithing, and therefore that they lent support to his own interpretation of Scripture. This is why Tillesley felt able to provide, as a counterweight, a catalogue of ecclesiastical authors who had argued that tithes were due *iure divino* (3-29). This catalogue was not really a history, even if it was arranged chronologically. Each of the authors was lifted from his historical moment, with none of the care which Selden had taken to note records of contemporary tithing practices as well as precepts. Rather, it was a list of such precepts that added up to 'the vnanimous consent of continuate antiquitie' (2), an appeal to a *consensus Patrum* which typified many theological debates.[358]

The *iure divino* argument, of course, had to rely primarily on Scripture, even if it was accompanied by arguments from natural law or ecclesiastical history, and so we should not be surprised that neither Tillesley nor any of Selden's other opponents constructed a counter-*Historie* of their own. To do so would have been to concede Selden's point that legal precedent and civil power were the true arbiters of whether and how tithes should be paid. Tillesley's retrospective focus on Scripture indicates that the most dangerous feature of the *Historie* was Selden's insistent application of philology to the Bible. Selden's historicism, to the extent that it was perceived as such at the time, was philological. Philology and history, once the handmaidens of theological modes of reading, had become their opponents.[359]

Whereas the later sections were remarkable largely for their use of a wide range of rarely or never-quoted primary sources, the first three chapters dealt with largely familiar passages from Scripture, Fathers, and pagan authors, but introduced glosses, suggested

---

[358] Quantin (2009), pp. 50-68.

[359] On the motif of philology as the handmaiden of theology, see I.1, above.

emendations and made inferences which were considered idiosyncratic, and drew heavily on continental scholars such as Scaliger – no mere legal historian – to an extent which was novel for a vernacular English work.[360] The first chapter dealt with tithes before the Law was handed down to Moses; the second, with tithes under the Law, both as they were actually paid and as they were 'thought due' (sig. d3[a]); the third, with tithing under the gentiles. The subject of the second chapter underpinned typological arguments in favour of tithing *iure divino*: the tithing practices prescribed by God for the Jews had been preserved, not abrogated, for the Christian Church from the apostles onwards. The subject of the third chapter, pagan tithing, underpinned natural law arguments: if the gentiles, who had no access to God's revelation, nonetheless paid tithes, it demonstrated that tithing was prescribed not just by divine or human positive law, but by the law of nature also. The subject of the first chapter underpinned both kinds of argument: on the one hand, if tithes were paid by the Old Testament Patriarchs before the Law had explicitly required any tithing, then natural law must have led them to do so. On the other, Melchizedek, regarded as the first recipient of tithes in the Old Testament, was commonly interpreted as a type of Christ.

i. Selden's concept of philology

Selden did not attack typology or natural law head on. He simply left them out of his account of tithing from Abraham to the apostles. That his book constituted an attack on them (regardless of his own intentions) only becomes absolutely clear in the reactions of

[360] Scaliger's brief, posthumously published 'Diatriba de decimis in Lege Dei' was important for the second chapter in particular: in Scaliger (1612), pp. 53-66. Selden's copy is listed in MS Selden supra 111, fol. 47[a]. Selden had already cited it elsewhere: see Woolf (1987), p. 36. He emphasized the link between the *Historie* and Scaliger's work when he described it to Peiresc as his '*diatribae* seu historiolae de decimis' (my emphasis): Selden to Peiresc, 29 March 1618, in Selden (1726), vol. II.2, col. 1699. But Selden had already made himself intimately familiar with the rest of Scaliger's oeuvre: see Toomer (2009), pp. 212-13.

his adversaries. At the same time as he avoided any recourse to natural law or typology, he made a strident positive argument, starting in his preface, for the value of philology. The preface was already a response to the earliest critiques of the *Historie*, written after the work was more or less finished and had already been in circulation, as is clear enough from its first sentence. Writing the history of tithes should not, he went on to say, be 'proper to any one alone of those that are commonly made Professions' – that is, theology or common law:

> The truth is, both it and not a few other enquiries of subiects too much vnknowne, fall only vnder a farre more generall Study; that is, of true *Philologie* the only fit Wife that could be found for the most learned of the Gods. Shee being well attended in her ἐγκύκλια διακονήματα or daily seruices of Inquiry, by her two Hand-maids *Curious Diligence* and *Watchfull Industrie*, discouers to vs often from her raised Towre of Iudgment, many hidden Truths, that, on the deuell of any one restraind Profession, can neuer be discerned. and euery Profession takes from her to it selfe (as was long since obserud) some necessary part not elswhere to be sought for. not much otherwise then as the Subaltern sciences do from their Superiors, or as they all do from that *Vniuersalitie* or *First Philosophie*, which is but the more reall part of true *Philologie*, and establishes principles to euery Facultie that could not of it selfe alone know how to get them. (Preface, xviii-xix)

The affinity of the vision of philology articulated in Selden's preface with the continental discourses about philology that we have already surveyed is clear.[361] Nobody had been more vehement than Scaliger in asserting the necessity of philology, or the *ars critica*, in every field of learning. Selden's claim that philological methods should underwrite legal studies was hardly a new one in the European context.[362] Nor, however, was the marriage of philology and theology. Montagu's response conceded that philology had been co-opted to great effect by French lawyers: Cujas and others, such as Brisson, 'that great Philologer and Lawyer of France' (437), were 'great *Humanitians*...and renoumed ouer Christendome

---

[361] To note one concrete correspondence, in the margins of this passage, Selden cited Quintilian and Martianus Capella. The testimonies of these two authors concerning philology had already been connected by Wowerius (1603), pp. 119-20. Selden's copy is 4º W 3 Art.Seld., listed in MS Selden supra 111, fol. 67ª. On the *De Polymathia*, see I.1, above.

[362] As Kelley (1970) shows.

for their learning' (124). But theologians could also make use of it because it was (as Selden himself acknowledged) 'indifferent vnto all.... So you haue no more interest in her, being an industrious Lawyer...then I haue, *One* of the *Ignorant* and *Lazie*, and *Postillating Clergie*' (120). Plenty of continental divines had made employed philological methods, such as Beza, Hospinian, Martin Chemnitz, and 'diuers of late at *Leyden*' (127).[363]

Montagu concluded his lengthy preface with a statement of intent: 'seldome doe I vse, but where I must needs, any helpe but of humane Literature: or call for any assistance, but from your *Philologie*' (135; cf. 235). It was a constant refrain of Montagu's polemic that Selden had over-confidently arrogated the powers of philology and criticism to himself alone: 'you are much vpon the by, to bring in your Philologicall obseruations' (9); 'you...delight your selfe a little, in your so much beloued, and admired *Philologie* and Criticke faculty' (198); 'the Author...would be held, for a great *Philologer*, none like him of the Nation' (229).

In his own preface, Montagu started by telling the story of Selden's career and reputation up to the publication of the *Historie*:

> His name was already vp, and not vndeseruedly, for a great Scholer: a various Linguest, a curious Critick, an excellent Antiquary: such an Humanitian, and Philologer as might wel be *tantùm non* Corriuall with *Mercury* for his wife; whom long since *Martianus Capella* contracted him vnto. For he neuer shooke hands with *lazy ignorance*, or *Patient idlenesse*, the common customers of the Clergy...*Aquila in nubibus*, in some mens opinions. (1-2)

[363] To defend tithes was to defend clerical learning itself: see Quantin (2009), p. 111; Peter McCullough, ed., *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons and Lectures* (Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 85. In a section on tithes in one of his commonplace books, the clergyman James Wedderburn quoted, alongside Selden and Montagu, a rabbinical saying which echoed precisely these concerns: 'Massoreth sepes est legis, diuitiarum sepes decimae.' British Library MS Harley 749, fol. 151[a] – from Paulus Fagius, ed., *[Pirke Avot:] Sententiae ueterum sapientum Hebræorum* (Isny, 1541), p. 56.

The legacy of Joseph Scaliger was key: Lipsius had famously applied the phrase αἰετὸς ἐν νεφελαις ('eagle in the clouds') to Scaliger, and it was often repeated before ending up on the scholar's funeral monument at Leiden.[364] Selden's constant appeals to Scaliger prevent us from putting common law or French legal history at the heart of Selden's historical method, in place of the broader category of continental philology *tout court*.[365] Even his invocations of 'practice' and 'custom' – ostensibly reflections of the common-law mindset – were associated, in his suppressed rejoinder to Sempill, with Scaliger's work on tithes: he and Scaliger had 'both related what was in *practice*' and refrained from discussing the *ius divinum* of tithes.[366]

Selden had acquired his reputation as a polymath and philologist in the Scaliger mould principally from *De diis Syris*, and Montagu put almost as much energy into exposing Selden's mistakes in that work as he did into refuting the *Historie*.[367] Christianson remarks that with its 'analytic narrative of great imagination and expertise, *The Historie of Tithes* marked Selden's entry into full maturity as a scholar.'[368] However, by the standards of the European scholarly world of his own era Selden's 'maturity' had been achieved with *De diis Syris*.[369] This was also prompted by direct professional rivalry: Montagu's earliest learned work had delved, as Selden would, into the history of ancient idolatry and the

---

[364] See e.g. Aristophanes, *Birds*, l. 987. For Scaliger's monument, see Stefanie A. Knöll, *Creating Academic Communities: Funeral Monuments to Professors at Oxford, Leiden and Tübingen, 1580-1700* (Haren: Equilibris, 2003), pp. 413-14.

[365] Though Scaliger himself had been influenced by the French jurists: see Grafton (1983-1993), vol. I, pp. 120-160.

[366] Selden (1726), vol. III.2, col. 1349; cf. col. 1361: 'We write of what *was* in use *settled*, he [i.e. Sempill] what (*he thinks*) *should have been*.'

[367] Selden took some of these accusations seriously enough to refute them in the second edition of that work: see John Selden, *De diis Syris syntagmata II* (Leiden, 1629), sigs. *5^{b}-6^{a}, e.g.

[368] Christianson (1996), p. 63.

[369] On the reception of *De Diis Syris*, see II.1, above.

relationship between paganism and Christianity.[370] Nonetheless, the fact that Montagu targeted *De diis Syris*, rather than Selden's earlier work on English history and politics, indicates that philology, and not legal history, was the true epicentre of the controversy.[371] Certain aspects of the later reception of the controversy between Selden and Montagu seem to bear this out.[372]

Montagu owed his perception of the importance of philology to the fact that he participated in the same culture of humanistic scholarship and publication. This made his quarrel more sensitive. He did not dislike Selden personally, either before or after he published the *Diatribae*; he simply objected to Selden's having applied his lay erudition to ecclesiastical matters in such a public way.[373] Nor was Tillesley entirely unfamiliar with this culture. He noted Selden's interest 'both in the *Grammar sense* of wordes and phrases, wherein as a *Criticke* he is iudged curious; and in the *relation of ancient authorities*, wherein as an *Antiquary*, hee hath beene diligent' (preface, sig. b1^{b}), but Sempill was less sensitive to this dimension of Selden's rhetoric. Of all the rebuttals, Montagu's reveals most clearly the fault lines within humanist philology, as well as between it and other disciplines, which Selden's treatise had opened up. It is time to turn from theoretical statements about the

---

[370] Montagu, ed. (1610). See II.2, above.

[371] That this was a personally held view of Montagu's, rather than simply an argumentative tactic, is suggested by his letter to Henry Spelman, in British Library, MS Add. 34599, fol. 138^{a}, in which Montagu recites, in brief, his complaint that Selden had presented himself as having a monopoly over 'humanity' and 'Philologie.' The year is not given but the letter was clearly written just after Montagu had finished his *Diatribae.* I owe this reference to Thomas Roebuck.

[372] Especially a previously unnoticed manuscript treatise in Cambridge University Library, which provides an exclusively philological interpretation of Hebrews 7: Cambridge UL, MS Gg. III. 16, fol. vi^{a}, entitled 'Ἀκροθίνια, sive Exercitatio philologica de primitiis ac decimis praedae ad versum IV capitis VII Epistolae ad Hebraeos.' I attribute this work to Thomas Stanley, and discuss it below, in my Conclusion. See also the account of the controversy by Peter Heylyn in *Aerius Redivivus, Or, the History of the Presbyterians* (Oxford, 1670), p. 391.

[373] See his letters to John Cosin, 29 May 1626, in Ornsby, ed. (1869), pp. 92-3, and to Robert Cotton (undated), in British Library, MS Cotton Julius C. III, fol. 276 (I quote the copy in the Bodleian Library, MS Smith 71, p. 107): Montagu claims that he loves Selden 'for his excellent good parts, saving the Churches quarrel, into which I would he had never entred.'

value of philology for common law and divinity to the way in which these disciplines interacted in practice.

ii. Ecclesiastical history and disputation

We begin with the first chapter, and the very first reference to tithing dealt with by Selden: that of Genesis 14:20, in which Abraham gives to Melchizedek, 'the priest of the most high God,' 'tithes of all.' What the cryptic phrase 'tithes of all' referred to was difficult to determine: the options ranged between a tenth of all the spoils from the battle Abraham had just fought, to a tenth of all 'increase' or revenue from the harvest. Unsurprisingly, clerics favoured the latter interpretation, since it offered a precedent for parishioners to pay tithes deducted from all of their earnings. Selden favoured the former, quoting several later glosses on the passage. One of the most telling for him was that of Josephus, 'a Iew,' who had 'confidently writen the Tithe there giuen to be δεκάτην τῆς λείας, *the Tithe of what was gotten by the Warre*. He knew a receiued opinion in his Nation, to be so, or else had not been so forward to deliuer it' (2). Montagu engaged closely with the question of Josephus's testimony, and the extent of his 'forwardness.' Josephus, he pointed out, doesn't assert directly that Genesis 14:20 refers only to the spoils of war:

> *Iosephus* hath this and no more. δεκάτην τῆς λείας Αβράμου διδόντος προσδέχε τὰς αὐτῶ̃ [*sic*] τὴν δόσιν.[374] *Abraham* giuing him *Tithe* of the *spoyles*, hee receiueth that his gift. Heere is neither All, nor Onely, nor confidence, nor contestation; but a simple, naked, bare historicall recitall of things done. (156-7)

Montagu's complaint was that Selden had made an unreasonable, overreaching inference from Josephus, treating Josephus's statement as though it were an emphatic assertion forming part of an explicit position in a debate about tithes. In fact, it was much less than

[374] Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* I. 181. The modern text of Benedikt Niese, 7 vols (Berlin: Weidmann, 1885-95) vol. I, reads Ἀβράμου δὲ διδόντος καὶ τὴν δεκάτην τῆς λείας αὐτῷ προσδέχεται τὴν δόσιν.

that. Montagu's standards for admissible evidence were high: he was essentially asking that Selden find an ancient source which expressly put forward exactly the same interpretation as Selden himself. This amassing of proof-texts bypassed the 'dangerous' process of having to proceed by inference and personal judgement from facts to doctrine, as Montagu noted elsewhere.[375] Anything else required a speculative leap on Selden's part, from 'affirmation' to 'contestation': 'It is a new poynt of learning you insist vpon, Euery affirmation of any thing, is a contestation against all other things...A dangerous piece of doctrine in these high-spirited times' (157).

Montagu had missed one of the subtleties of Selden's argument. The reason why Josephus had only needed to 'recite' his interpretation of Genesis 14:20 was that it had, by that time, become 'a receuied opinion in his Nation.' The simplicity of Josephus's statement allowed the modern historian not so much to rely on the testimony of Josephus alone as to infer that an exegetical consensus prevailed among the Jews as a whole. Selden's insight lay in his double use of Josephus: on one level, he took Josephus's proposition about tithes at face value, as an affirmation of the true meaning of Genesis 14:20. On another level, however, he was arguing from silence, gleaning from Josephus something which his source was not necessarily trying to give its readers.

Montagu repeated the same basic point elsewhere: a few pages later, discussing Hebrews 7:4, he insisted that Selden had gone too far in claiming that the author of Hebrews (whom Montagu believed to be Paul) had subscribed to the same interpretation of Genesis 14:20 as Josephus when he said that Abraham 'gave the tenth of the spoils' to Melchizedek. To convince Montagu, the passage had to say something more definitive: '*He gaue Tithe...of*

[375] Milton (1995), pp. 333-4. Milton also details Montagu's plans to compose a longer treatise regarding tithes, along with other aspects of the clerical response to Selden.

All the spoyles, of Onely spoyles.' In the conclusion of this section, Montagu brought the full weight of patristic tradition and translation to bear: 'can you name me one man amongst the Fathers or last Interpreters, that saith *Only spoyles*?...If not, you are a Noueller, Master *Selden*, and tread in Pathes that are *Nullius ante, Trita solo*, and therefore best looke vnto your Feete that you goe surely' (180).

Other remarks show that the whole force of Montagu's rebuttal came from the methods and habits of neo-scholastic disputation: 'It is a fault in Schooles, whatsoeuer it is in Mootes, to haue more in the Conclusion then the premises affoord.' Montagu was relying on the integrity of the traditional academic hierarchy, whereas Selden, a 'Noueller,' was using a nebulous notion of philology to infiltrate other disciplines. Responding to Selden's comparison of his work with the natural histories of Aristotle, Pliny, and Theophrastus, Montagu observed that Aristotle 'was too good a *Methodist*, and *Logician*, to confound the limits and boundaries of Arts'; unlike Selden, who has 'straggled so farre from the Lawes of *History*, as wee finde him wandring euery where' (78-9).[376] The handling of Josephus was an example of this, as the allusion to Lucretius in both quotations reveals: Selden had wandered outside the bounds of historical narration and into those of dogmatic assertion.[377]

We have come to a point where we may feel that Montagu had failed to appreciate the complexities of Selden's use of his sources, or that 'historical scholarship had no need of syllogisms to make very persuasive points.'[378] Montagu, in this view, espoused a commitment to philology but was still clinging to a highly conservative, sterile culture of

---

[376] For instances of Aristotle being described as the paradigmatic philologist, see I.1, above.

[377] Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, I. 926-7. Montagu's use of Lucretius obviously took hold in Selden's mind: he repeated the quotation himself, on the title page of *De iure naturali & gentium, iuxta disciplinam Ebraeorum* (London, 1640).

[378] Quantin (2009), p. 314.

academic argumentation, relying on the rules of Aristotelian dialectic: as he warned Selden, 'you left *Logick* too soone at Vniuersity, to haunt *Philologie* at Innes of Court' (49). In this respect, his approach had its affinities with Sempill's, who presented his arguments in the form of syllogisms (e.g. Sempill, *Sacrilege,* 25). This is part of the picture, but it misses quite how radical Selden's approach was for its time, even in relation to other examples of humanist historical writing. At this point it is worth returning to Casaubon's *Exercitationes*, a model of cutting-edge ecclesiastical history.[379] Just like Montagu, Casaubon required of his opponent, Baronius, that the sources he cited be not simply impartial, but rather partial on Baronius's side.

In his treatment of the use of Latin in the early Church, Casaubon started by making the kind of subtle inference and appeal to received, unwritten custom rather than formal precept that characterized Selden's work.[380] Baronius, as Casaubon presented it, had argued that the use of Latin in official documents and at Church Councils showed that Latin had been established, in a prescriptive fashion, as the primary language of the Church. In fact, said Casaubon, the use of Latin was a matter of contingency and custom. Greek speakers used Latin merely in order to gain curial advancement: Chrysostom told the story of a young man who had flourished at an episcopal court because he had received a solid education in Latin. As we have seen in Selden's use of Josephus, Casaubon was extracting a fact from Chrysostom which was not the principal object of Chrysostom's discourse: Chrysostom was not *stating,* 'Greek-speakers use Latin not because it is the officially prescribed language of the Church, but because it is useful from a professional point of view to do so.' He was simply recording evidence which, with a little inference on

---

[379] On Casaubon as ecclesiastical historian, see Grafton and Weinberg (2010), passim; Laplanche (1988); and II.2, above, on Casaubon and Montagu.

[380] Casaubon (1614), pp. 225-6.

the part of the reader, contributed to that conclusion. The use of Latin, furthermore, was purely a matter of custom: 'it must be known that no law, no canon, existed which ordered it to be done in this way; it became a received idea solely by custom.'[381] Such an appeal to unwritten custom, far from being peculiar to common law, was ubiquitous in humanist historiography.

At this point, however, Casaubon retreated from inferential arguments and resorted to one that would have satisfied Montagu. He adduced sources showing that, whereas the use of Latin in Papal documents was simply a matter of custom, 'it was not a mere custom for the delegates of the Pope to translate [his letters] from Latin into Greek, but a matter of law and necessity.'[382] He still, like Montagu, felt a need to cite a passage in a source which stated, almost verbatim, his own position. He was much less strident than Selden about the fundamental importance to the historian of unwritten custom in itself, independent from any other form of evidence. The gradations of historicism we can observe between these three authors belie the complacent notion that humanist scholarship was homogenous in its use of historical methods, and remained so throughout the seventeenth century; or that humanism, at least in its most sophisticated, philologically astute manifestations, had managed to sever itself from scholasticism.[383]

---

[381] 'sciendum, nullam legem extitisse, nullum canonem, qui iuberet ita fieri: sola consuetudine id receptum est.'

[382] 'vt Latina verterentur à Papae Legatis in Graecum, non mos; sed ius & necessitas fuit.'

[383] See, for example, the assertion that 'the problems and techniques of the new historiography...changed hardly at all for two or three centuries' in Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 155. Similarly, David Berkowitz asserts that 'with Selden's *History* [*sic*] *of Tithes*, humanist historiography reaped where Lorenzo Valla had sown': *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England* (Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988), p. 35.

Montagu's rigorous distinction between 'recitall' and 'affirmation' was, then, a commonplace of humanist ecclesiastical history and patristic scholarship, as he confirms when he formalizes the ideas implicit in his earlier critique of Selden's use of Josephus:

> ...things are spoken in the writings of the Fathers foure seuerall wayes. Εριστικῶς, in heate of contention & opposition. πανηγυρικῶς, by way of Amplification.... Thirdly, Διηγητικῶς, by way of History and relation, wherein things are repeated as they were, without passing censure on them, so, or so. And lastly, Δογματικῶς, by way of peremptory and Theologicall conclusion. Finde me any such position or conclusion deliuered dogmatically in any of the Fathers, and then, in some sort, you may bee excused. (267-8)[384]

Whether or not Montagu was right about the facts, there is a sense in which his methodological objection to Selden was understandable. From the patristic scholar's point of view, Selden had taken historical statements in his sources as statements of dogma, and in turn, he himself had offered a history which pretended, Montagu thought, to have the force of dogma. Montagu had arrived at, without quite being able to articulate, an understanding of history as a genre which would prove crucial in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Unlike dialectical disputation and theological polemic, it was not an intrinsically contentious mode of writing. For him, this was a disadvantage, especially if someone like Selden tried to use history to lead his readers to highly contentious conclusions. But it would become a great advantage in an era which conceived itself as more 'polite' and 'civil' than the preceding age of religious enthusiasm, doctrinal strife, and civil and inter-confessional bloodshed.[385] For now, though, some of Selden's claims seemed incongruous and inadequate in the demanding arena of academic theology.

iii. Criticism, antiquity, and modernity

---

[384] This typology itself, and the practices of reading it entailed, were derived from the Fathers. See the excellent summary in Quantin (2009), pp. 64-68.

[385] The work of J. G. A. Pocock on Gibbon and Enlightenment historiography frequently demonstrates this point, but see, in particular, *Barbarism and Religion, Volume One: the Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 63-4.

The debate as we have assessed it so far was about the relative truth-claims of philology and scholastic theology, and the question of whether the two could or should be separated from each other. There were, however, moments when the debate was purely internal, involving competing accounts of what philologists ought to be able to do, before they even ventured into the territory of theological controversy. Such moments reveal equally clearly how much one philologist's approach could differ from another's. This is most apparent when Selden's opponents turn to what Montagu called his 'Criticke faculty' (198). At times, Selden seemed to indulge in emendation for emendation's sake: 'you are too forward and desirous to be Criticizing...in the poynt of correcting, it is νόσημα ἐπιδήμιον [an epidemic], of you *Philologers:* but Scholers must not beleeue you, without better warrant then your word' (166).

The most significant intervention by Selden's 'Criticke faculty' came in the third chapter of the *Historie*, when Selden discussed a crux that propped up natural law arguments for tithing:

> that assertion vsed by many out of *Festus: Decima quaeque veteres Dijs suis offerebant* [the ancients used to offer all of their tithes to their gods]. no such matter. some did, and only somtimes, and of some things, and most vsually to some gods only. *Festus* himselfe was too learned to haue left such a moniment of ignorance. No doubt is, but that which *Festus* had there in some larger note obserued, according to a truth agreeing with what is before opend, was too boldly contracted into that piece of vntruth, by his Epitomator *Paulus Diaconus*...and *Paulus* is well taxed for it by the diuine *Scaliger*....[386] But when *Scaliger* there added; *Vni enim tantum Herculi hoc fiebat* [for this happened only for one god, Hercules]; he mends it not enough. for if it had been *Decima quaeque Herculi veteres offerebant* [the ancients used to offer all of their tithes to Hercules], it had been false, if vnderstood as of Tithes vsed to be giuen by all or of all

[386] Selden makes a similar remark about the 'bold but ignorant Criticisme' of 'some ignorant Monk' in a Latin version of a law of Athelstan, p. 214.

> things. they consisted painly [*sic*] in vows and speciall thanksgiuing, which were wholly arbitrarie. (28-9)[387]

Selden's philological particularism could not stomach the use of pagan sources to support natural law arguments for tithing; hence his insistence that Festus's original reference to ancient tithing practices was much more restricted (to Hercules alone, and occasionally rather than customarily) than Paul the Deacon's generalizing redaction would have it. For Selden, the task of philology was to provide greater precision, bringing glosses and parallels to bear in order to make the singularity of each example apparent; and perhaps, by extension, to give pagan history a certain autonomy, making it more than an idolatrous reflection of sacred history.[388]

His opponents, by contrast, treated individual and occasional acts of consecration in a variety of different contexts as witnesses to a deeper, binding, and generally observed law which governed tithing as a whole, from the Old Testament Patriarchs to the late Roman Republic. As Tillesley put it, '*the consecration of a* Tenth part *to God was* naturall, *and...herein* the Gentiles not hauing the law, and doing by nature the things contained in the law, shew the worke of the law written in their hearts' (sig. c2^{b}-3^{a}). Tillesley also perceived the threat to natural law arguments posed by Selden's particularizing drift. Faced by two passages in Harpocration and Didymus that, similarly to Festus, seemed to point to a general practice of consecrating the tenth (δεκατεύειν, τὰς δεκάτας καθιεροῦν) of any spoils of war to the gods, Selden had argued that the words for tithing used there were actually substitutes for a much more specific verb, ἀρκτεύειν, found in Suidas and Hesychius, which denoted not tithing in general, but a certain festival in which offerings

---

[387] Selden drew heavily on Scaliger's notes on Festus: see Festus, *De Verborum Significatione* (Geneva, 1575), p. 47 for the passage, and ibid., 'Castigationes,' p. 52 for Scaliger's note, which charges Paul, a Christian epitomizing a pagan text, with 'barbarism.'

[388] This is a safer estimate of the aims of Selden in *De diis Syris* (and here) than the bold suggestion that he was relativising Judaism and Christianity themselves: Miller (2001), p. 198.

were made to Artemis (*Historie,* 32). Here, said Tillesley, Selden 'hath plainely shewed his desire to weaken the naturall both right and practise of Tything' (37), but his 'Criticall falshood' could be turned to face the other direction: as Tillesley understood it, based on his own reading of the ancient grammarians, it was more conventional to put the specific term in place of the general one. Ἀρκτεύειν was more commonly used as a substitute for δεκατεύειν. The amount of effort Tillesley dedicated to refuting Selden's interpretation shows the power of philology to subvert natural law approaches to pagan texts.

The most contentious aspect of Selden's treatment of Festus, however, was his desire to correct the text. Emendation had been a cornerstone of Scaliger's reputation, and Montagu understood its importance to Selden as well.[389] Selden proposed correcting Festus in order to align his statement about gentile tithing in the ancient world with the numerous examples of it that Selden had just cited. But the habit of correcting in this way could end up looking like an exercise of overweening authority and contempt for the learning of past ages. Montagu satirized Scaliger's 'coniectures and opinions, [which] with himselfe, and with many that magnifie him beyond degree of modestie, are κύριαι δόξαι [opinions with the force of authority], as the Lawes and Statutes of the Medes and Persians' (411). It was 'lawfull for any Free-man in Learning, to haue neglected his correction' (411-12) if he considered it unfounded. Scaliger's contempt for the ignorance of ancient or medieval authors did not stop at Paul the Deacon: 'better men then He, as *Varro, Eusebius; Hierome*...haue beene fayne, at *Scaligers* hands, *Iniurias ferre, & gratias agere* [to be wounded, and thank him for it]' (413).

[389] On Scaliger and emendation, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, passim.

Imputing textual corruption to an epitomizer like Paul the Deacon might serve as a backdoor to any number of wilful emendations by a modern critic. Tillesley highlighted the inconsistency and reversibility of emendation, noting that whereas Selden lamented Epiphanius's ignorance of Jewish tithing practices (Selden, *Historie*, 19), Casaubon had simply managed to 'explicate' it (Tillesley, *Animaduersions,* 31-32).[390] Sometimes, in other words, Selden attributed the ignorance to the Father himself, but it was not always clear who deserved the blame: the author, the copyist, or even the reader. As Casaubon's treatment of Epiphanius demonstrated, the author might only need explication, not correction or censure: the true ignoramus was the modern interpreter who rushed to condemn rather than understand. Selden himself often struggled to decide between explication and condemnation. His analysis of Harpocration and Didymus made careful allowance for two possibilities: either those authors could be explicated so that they were shown to have meant what he wanted them to mean, or they had indeed intended to say 'that al men paid their Tithes in *Greece*, and that of euery kind of their spoiles or abundance.' If the latter, 'they deceiue much and are deceuid.'

Underlying these specific disagreements was a more profound difference between the two sides. Montagu found several passages in Dionysius of Halicarnassus in which legendary and historical figures offer up spoils and tenths 'τοῖς θεοῖς (so *Paulus dijs*)' (457). These could have served as a precedent for Festus, or Paul, to write *diis* rather than *Herculi*, and to posit a general custom of paying tithes, rather than occasional, unrelated, and arbitrary consecrations. Dionysius, said Montagu, was 'a man as intelligent in Pagan rites as any: as skilfull in the Romane Histories, Religion, Pontificals, and Ceremonies, as any: as painfull, iudicious, and worthy Historian, as euer dealt with the affaires of that state. And lastly, the

[390] Casaubon (1614), pp. 63-4.

acutest Criticke of his time, and best Philologer, one of them, then liuing' (457-8).[391] Philology had flourished in antiquity as well as during this modern revival of learning, and its practitioners were closer to the objects they studied, and often less likely to make mistakes. Hesychius and other ancient 'Grammarians' were 'the chiefe Masters of the [Greek] tongue, the best now extant, some as good as euer were any, *Aristarchus* himselfe not excepted' (519). Selden, conversely,

> thought himselfe to be the onely man with the great shadow, vnto whom wee poore ignorants in Philology, ought to rise vp, and rely vpon...that dareth oppose his yea, vnto all their nay's: They Philologers, and the best of Philologers, & his Masters in Philologie...They know, and had meanes to know that, which you cannot possibly know: and whatsoeuer you know in Grecian Antiquities, you haue it from them, or such as They. (520-21)

The fact that Selden and Scaliger did not quite agree in their proposed emendations, moreover, was a genuine problem, since it threatened to relativize the whole endeavour of textual criticism: as Tillesley put it, 'the Criticks not agreeing, were it not best to trust *Paulus Diaconus* his honestie in relating learned *Festus* Sense, who saw what they coniectured at?' (32-3).

That this was more than a simple rhetorical *tu quoque* argument – if the ancients made mistakes, why not Selden? – is clear enough from the explosive effects which the elements of this debate produced in the so-called 'Battle of the Books,' eighty years later.[392] The epistemology of *emendatio* was an important factor: how could the critic ever know for sure that he had not simply misunderstood the text he was correcting? Although this has been diagnosed as a peculiarly late-seventeenth-century problem, it had clear

---

[391] Montagu only echoed the judgement of Casaubon, whose preface to Polybius described Dionysius as a 'very erudite critic' ('admodum erudito Critico'): Casaubon, ed. (1609), sig. a5^{b}.

[392] Levine (1991).

antecedents.[393] The fragmentation of humanist philology was already underway in this, the earliest major debate about philology as a discipline in the vernacular, non-scholarly sphere. We have seen that Scaliger was more interested in reconstructing ancient genealogies of scholarship than in presenting or constructing a modern intellectual genealogy for his work; he was more inclined to associate himself with Aristarchus or Eratosthenes than Poliziano or Panvinio. Yet he could be strikingly disdainful towards the learning even of those ancients whom he generally praised, from Herodotus to Eusebius (among other Fathers).[394] Selden, on the other hand, nodded eagerly in his preface towards the modern cultures of antiquarianism and philology which had informed his own work, from Roger Bacon, a light in the darkness of late medieval clerical ineptitude, to Erasmus or the advocates of the *mos Gallicus*. But he was surprisingly silent about the ancient precursors to his own endeavours. This gave Montagu enough ammunition to target both Scaliger and Selden as 'nouellers' and position himself as a champion of antiquity. Selden and Scaliger were autocrats and innovators in learning who imagined an absolute and permanent rupture between themselves and the figures they studied; Montagu preferred a model of primitive perfection followed by incremental decay, with reformation nonetheless always possible. In this respect at least, he made himself appear more historically minded than Selden. In a limited sense, he was historicizing historical learning itself.

This bears on grander narratives about the demise of humanism and the advent of the Enlightenment. The quarrel of the ancients and moderns later in the seventeenth century was influenced by developments in logic and epistemology (especially the advent of

---

[393] The best discussion of this and related problems in textual criticism in relation to this later period is Haugen (2011).

[394] Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, p. 372, notes Scaliger's lack of 'a clear sense of what kind of [modern] philologist he was, or what his past had actually meant.' See also I.1, above.

Cartesianism) and experimental natural philosophy.[395] Philology, in some accounts, was trapped in the middle, neither a science, in which moderns were more often acknowledged as superior, nor one of the arts, in which the ascendancy went to the ancients. Indeed, the career of a figure such as Richard Bentley, whose scholarship laid claim both to an impeccable taste for ancient artistic virtues and to a confident, rationalistic critical method, can be seen as a reflection of this ambiguity.[396] But the controversy over tithes shows that such tensions had already been generated *within* humanist philology on its own, and that the field was much more porous, self-critical, and methodologically unstable than has been imagined, especially by historians of the supposedly more turbid later seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century scene. At times, Montagu was appealing to the norms of scholastic disputation, but there was no indication that he felt these norms were incompatible with philology as he understood it; and in this respect, he was not without companions among the philologists, including Casaubon. Nor did the appeal to natural law presuppose a fundamental break with philological methods as Montagu or Tillesley understood them: philological reading practices were still required to demonstrate the relative uniformity of gentile tithe payments. To us, Selden's attempt to show that this uniformity was a mirage looks like a first step towards historical criticism and a death blow to a certain species of natural law theory. To them, it only looked like a perverse and singular twisting of true philology to suit the author's own ends.

iv. Typology

---

[395] R. F. Jones, *Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Rise of the Scientific Movement in Seventeenth-Century England* (St. Louis, Mo.: Washington University, 1961); and Israel (2001), especially pp. 23-29.

[396] As Haugen (2011) has revealed.

There is one remaining form of *iure divino* argument for tithes that we have not considered: the argument from typology. The way in which Sempill and Montagu defended typology supports the conclusions we have just drawn: they treated it as compatible with philological modes of reading. It was more important for their purposes than natural law, as it relied solely on Scripture, and brought together the Old and New Testaments, demonstrating the necessity of tithing in a Christian commonwealth as well as under natural law or the Mosaic Law.

We have noticed the contribution of sacred and ecclesiastical history to typology in Casaubon's *Exercitationes*, in the case of the chronology of the Last Supper.[397] The historicizing effect of new developments in philology and ecclesiastical history did not necessarily constitute an assault on theological typology, and this holds true in the case of Casaubon, among others.[398] It does not, however, apply to Selden, who excluded typological readings altogether from historiography or philology as he understood them.

The most important typological relationship was, of course, between Christ and Melchizedek, 'the priest of the most high God,' as Spelman had noted, following the correspondence between the two pointed out in Hebrews 7.[399] Selden's use of Hebrews, however, was far more limited, conspicuously avoiding any claim of typological correspondence. He mentioned it in Chapter I, as a mere gloss on Genesis 14:20, forming part of his contention that 'tithe' referred to the spoils of war: 'And, to free it from doubt, the holy Autor of the Epistle to the Ebrews...explains it by δεκάτην ἐκ τῶν πάντων ἀκροθινίων, *the Tithe of all the spoiles*' (2). Like Josephus, the rabbis, and the Fathers, this

---

[397] See II.2, above.

[398] For the role of typology in New Testament criticism, see II.6, below.

[399] Spelman (1613), p. 73.

passage offered not a mystical resonance between one text and another, but a helpful explication of the original meaning of the Old Testament passage where it was unclear.

Selden's refusal to discuss Hebrews 7 with reference to typology was one of the most striking features of the entire *Historie*. Thomas Barlow noted that Selden 'cutteth the sinews of y^e^ Apostles argument.'[400] Sempill made his objections clear, offering his own understanding of how the 'historical' dimension of scriptural exegesis ought to relate to exegesis as a whole. It was its foundation, but not its consummation. Exegetes must begin with '*History*, that is, a simple narration of what is done,' but finish with '*Anagogie*, that is, a forcible Conclusion, transferring all things represented by the *Type*, in, and vpon the prefigured *Veritie*' (35). For Sempill, the typological approach was the polar opposite of Selden's critical particularism:

> All Types, and of all, chiefely this, must haue euer the largest extent of sense that Nature or Analogie can afford them. They be fundamentall things, and so, must beare all that can be truely built vpon them. This Meeting then betweene *Melchisedec* and *Abraham*, being a mutuall Type of all things that might concerne Priesthood κατά τάξιν, it must be extended, to whatsoeuer might be afterwards intended, both for *Blessing* and *Tything* proper to all Priesthood κατά τάξιν, Law, and Gospell: all Times, all Persons, all Things, for all Ends, as at length before. (37)

Sempill's defence of typology here was similar to Montagu's of natural law. Both founded their arguments on examples of tithing from before the Mosaic Law, so that they could not be dismissed as mere ceremonies not to be observed by Christians. Most importantly, both resisted Selden's inclination to limit a word or phrase's range of reference, to prevent general and normative conclusions being drawn from it. In Selden's hands, philology posed a direct threat to the universalizing modes of exegesis found in typology and natural law.

---

[400] Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 54, fol. 53^a^. I owe this reference to Jeffrey Miller.

Montagu, too, highlighted the typological correspondence between Melchizedek and Christ (173). Such claims were easy enough to make when they concerned the most explicitly typological chapter in the New Testament. Yet Montagu was less confident in asserting a typological reading of sacred history when it was provided not by Scripture itself, but by a human interpreter thereof, such as one of the Fathers. His solution was to limit, but preserve, the power of typology by associating it with grammar itself: like grammatical ones, typological deductions made by non-inspired readers were 'probable, and no more...coniecturall, not of certainty' (263-4). Even if typology was more reliable than grammar, it was still another imperfect human art. Montagu accepted that when Scripture was not absolutely clear in itself, it needed philological interpretation by an inevitably human reader, but he then responded that, like philology (and unlike allegory), typology rests on historical facts and the literal sense. So why shouldn't Scripture permit typological interpretation as well?

Montagu's challenge reverberated throughout Selden's career. Sometimes the contextualizing, historicizing force of philology collapsed more abstract interpretations of texts. Otherwise, however, Selden's opponents simply added another layer of interpretation on top of the philological one he had provided. This was a characteristic of his exchanges with divines such as Henry Hammond in the 1640s, regarding ecclesiology.[401] While to modern readers Selden's *Historie* is a monument to the power of historical method, to his immediate audience the edifice seemed half-finished. The philological foundations were there (albeit imperfect in themselves, in their view) but they needed theological demonstrations to be built on top. As Tillesley put it, it contained

[401] Selden himself acknowledged the resemblance between the controversies over excommunication and tithes: *De Synedriis* (London, 1650-55), bk. I, p. 528.

'more *strange reading*, then *stronge reasoning*; more *quotations*, then *proofes*; more *will* (God be thanked) then *power*; good to *vse*, but dangerous to *beleeue*' (236).

This chapter has described the controversy over Selden's *Historie of Tithes* as a crucial and illuminating moment in the history of humanist philology in Britain, and challenged the prevailing accounts of the work and its reception. We have seen that the status of the *Historie* as a 'narrative' was not as important to Selden or his readers as has been suggested. Their understanding of 'history' equated it with contemporary definitions of philology. We have also found that Selden's opponents, especially Montagu, were no less committed than he was to methods that they considered 'philological' or 'historical.' The differences lay in three areas: first, their insistence that Selden play by the rules of academic theological disputation rather than those of a more neutral, less contentious Aristotelian historiography; second, the relative respect they accorded to ancient over modern philologists and the epistemological positions which this respect entailed; and third, their refusal to allow philological reading practices to atomize and destroy other ones, such as typology or natural law. Most importantly, all three of these issues were undecided within humanism itself: Scaliger and Casaubon were deployed on both sides of the debate.

Finally, this was hardly a straightforward battle between philologists and theologians. Selden's recourse to a 'historical' rather than typological account of biblical tithing directly followed the arch-Calvinist David Pareus's commentary on Hebrews. Partly in order to refute Robert Bellarmine's *iure divino* argument for tithing, Pareus had identified those sections of Hebrews 7 that related the story of Abraham's payment to Melchizedek as purely historical, having no part in the 'mystical circumstances of the history' ('mysticis

historiae circumstantiis').[402] Melchizedek was indeed a type of Christ in some respects, but not as far as his having received tithe was concerned. Abraham paid tithe to Melchizedek not out of any formal obligation ('nulla lege') but of his own free volition, as a token of his reverence and inferiority to him.[403]

The architecture of Pareus's argument is remarkably similar to Selden's. As much as the *Historie* represents an infusion of a secular, Aristotelian model of historical erudition into sacred history, then, it was also exploiting an equivocation at the heart of Protestant theology. Divines did seem, when it suited them, to distinguish between a purely historical sense and a typological one, even if they did not programmatically reject typological significances to the extent Selden did. Typology itself involved a particularizing and historicizing drift, which Selden followed to its radical conclusion. What historians of scholarship and political thought have construed as a battle between humanism and scriptural fundamentalism might be better understood as a skirmish within post-Calvinist biblical exegesis.

Finally, we are in a position to see that describing the *Historie* as an example of 'Erastian political thought' makes no sense of the controversy. First of all, the relative unimportance of the later parts of the *Historie* reduced the attention on their Erastian conclusions. Secondly, we need to appreciate that 'political thought' as it was understood at the time

---

[402] For Bellarmine's discussion of tithes, see his *Disputationes*, 4 vols. (I cite the Cologne, 1628 edition), vol. II, p. 323f. (section 1.25, *De decimis*).

[403] David Pareus, *In divinam ad Hebraeos S. Pauli epistolam commentarius* (Frankfurt, 1609), pp. 297-321. See especially pp. 297-8, in which the author places Abraham's payment of tithes under the category of 'historica'; pp. 306-7, where he quotes the same passage of Josephus, 'rectè explicans historiam,' as Selden; p. 319, where he denies that Abraham was bound by any law to pay tithe; and pp. 320-21, where he refutes Robert Bellarmine's argument that tithes were due to the clergy by divine rather than human law. Pareus was a religious polemicist who had attacked Scaliger's work on chronology: see Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 611-12. His reputation may have provided one reason for Selden, a committed follower of Scaliger, not to cite him directly. Pareus later became a highly controversial figure in England, although not for reasons connected with tithing: see Lucy Hutchinson, *The Translation of Lucretius*, edited by David Norbrook and Reid Barbour, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 2012), vol. I, xlvi.

was not a universal and governing feature of all forms of discourse so much as a very specific (and fledgling) genre or discipline. Even if Selden saw his philological findings as yielding political ones, he was read, and taken seriously, as a philologist above all. This is not to say that Selden was being entirely apolitical and objective: his vision of philology implied an agenda of intellectual and educational reform which could have political consequences. Yet it was Hobbes, not Selden, whose work forced his readers to ask whether it represented philology or political thought in the first place.[404] For the time being, Selden's readers were simply left wondering where philology ended and theology began.

[404] See III.3, below.

II.5: Patrick Young and Christian antiquity

To describe Patrick Young as 'librarian' to James I and Charles I is to understate the variety of his career and the peculiar trajectory it followed. The seventeenth-century librarian was much more than a collector and organizer of books: Casaubon and Daniel Heinsius had both been librarians (the former to the King of France), and the post was as much a way of giving its holder the time and money to pursue humanistic research, free from the demands of teaching students or carrying out ecclesiastical duties. For Young, becoming librarian meant escaping from the latter: he had previously been chaplain at All Souls College, Oxford.[405]

His position brought him in contact with the world of controversial theology and ecclesiastical history, but also with the worlds of secular historiography and antiquarian bibliophilia. He became a 'citizen' of the republic of letters, collaborating with international scholars of various confessions. There is little sense of a single impulse underlying his early enterprises. He showed an interest in pagan as well as Christian literature; Latin as well as Greek; medieval as well as ancient; European as well as British. He even ventured into the study of material culture.[406] Nor is there much evidence that these activities were official ones, imposed by the King or other figures at court.[407] Rather than seeing Young as an instrument of state power, we need to recognize that he shifted

---

[405] See *ODNB*.

[406] For Young's interests in numismatics, see Young to Johannes de Laet, 12 November 1640, in Kemke, ed. (1898), p. 99; and Bodleian Library, MSS Smith 22 and 26. On Young's use of inscriptions, see below.

[407] With some exceptions, such as his cataloguing of cathedral libraries: see Patrick Young, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis: Made in 1622-1623*, ed. Ivor Atkins and N. R. Ker (Cambridge University Press, 1944); and Richard Ovenden, 'The Libraries of the Antiquaries (*c*. 1580-1640) and the Idea of a National Collection,' in Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber, eds., *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, Volume 1* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).

between different ecclesiastical and political circles at different times in his career and that he never consistently followed the agenda of a single patron.

His career was provided with some impetus, however, in 1626, when England acquired an important manuscript of the Bible, now known as Codex Alexandrinus. This comprises a copy of the entire Bible, including apocrypha, in Greek, along with two epistles attributed to Clement, Bishop of Rome, and written to the Church of Corinth.[408] These were thought to have been written in the first century AD, and to constitute the earliest document of Christianity after those of the apostles themselves. The second epistle had already been published, but its attribution to Clement was widely doubted (it is, indeed, spurious). The first epistle, however, had never been printed; further, Young's manuscript was at the time the only known witness to it.

The majority of the rest of his scholarly life was dedicated to this manuscript in one way or another, starting with his edition of the epistles of Clement.[409] This is not, however, enough to allow us to define Young as a 'patristic scholar,' or a scholar of the Bible, as the earlier phase of his career should make clear. Nobody described him in these terms in his own time, because 'patristic scholar' was not a meaningful category to Young and his peers, and 'biblical scholar' is too nebulous: it encompasses theologians and sacred historians of many different persuasions who approached Scripture in ways too diverse to

---

[408] See Samuel Richardson, ed., *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe* (London, 1740); Scott Mandelbrote, 'English scholarship and the Greek text of the Old Testament, 1620-1720: the impact of Codex Alexandrinus,' in Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene, eds., *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 77-83; Matthew Spinka, 'Acquisition of the Codex Alexandrinus by England,' *The Journal of Religion* 16.1 (1936), pp. 10-29; and Scot McKendrick, 'The Codex Alexandrinus: or the dangers of being a named manuscript,' in Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O'Sullivan, *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: British Library, 2003). For a reproduction of the manuscript, see E. M. Thompson, ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus* (London: British Museum, 1879). On the later use of Codex Alexandrinus, see Nicholas Keene, 'John Ernest Grabe, Biblical Learning and Religious Controversy in Early Eighteenth-Century England,' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58.4 (2007), pp. 656-74.

[409] Patrick Young, ed. and trans., *Clementis Ad Corinthios Epistola Prior* (Oxford, 1633).

list. 'Librarian,' or *bibliothecarius*, is a relevant term, but it more or less excludes Young's printed output.

The most helpful way of understanding what unites Young's research and his varied publications is to think of him as a 'critic,' as he frequently described himself.[410] In the end, though, the story of his career as a critic is that of the fragmentation of criticism itself and the sub-disciplinary specialization it entailed, particularly as far as textual criticism and editing are concerned. The final chapter of this story is his failure to finish editing the Septuagint, or even to establish a template for what a successful edition of that text might look like. The approaches he had used in his edition of Clement and the rest of his work turned out to be incapable of rising to the demands of editing a text of such momentous theological importance, which was already mired in inter- and intra-confessional controversies, and whose history and manuscript recension were extraordinarily complex. Ultimately, failures like Young's demonstrated the necessity of establishing textual criticism as a separate field of philological endeavour, increasingly distant from biblical exegesis or patristic scholarship. We will consider Young's work on the Septuagint in a later chapter.[411] To understand the editorial difficulties Young faced, however, we must first turn to his earlier career, especially his work on Clement.

i. Greek studies and the early Church

Even at this stage, Young was more a specialist 'critic' than he might have been in an earlier period. A comparison with earlier Scottish humanists is instructive. George

---

[410] Besides the references given below and in Young's printed works, see his letters to Casaubon, 1 August 1609, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 1-2, and to Andrew Downes, 14 March 1610, in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 37, fol. 24[a].

[411] III.1, below.

Buchanan wrote a history of Scotland, but also composed witty neo-Latin epigrams, humanist tragedies, and an influential work of political theory, as well as serving as a schoolmaster at the Collège de Guyenne. Young's own uncle, Henry Scrimgeour, was a scholar who travelled across Europe copying manuscripts, primarily of Greek authors, but these were amateur interests: he was also a diplomat, as well as studying, publishing on, and later teaching civil law.[412] Young's interests were more narrowly philological, and even within the vast field of philology, he chose to concentrate on Greek texts. A critic was never constrained to a single language, and Young did show an interest in, and even, in one case, edited, Latin texts. He also had some regard for the importance of Hebrew – at least as far as establishing the text of Scripture was concerned. In spite of this, his specialization in Greek remains conspicuous. Most of his career was spent acquiring a vast knowledge of the whole gamut of Greek literature, from Homer to the Byzantines, and putting it to work in his editions of Clement, the book of Job, and his incomplete notes on the Septuagint, posthumously published in the London Polyglot.[413] In this respect he followed Casaubon, who, in spite of his assiduous and occasionally profound study of Hebrew (and, to a lesser, extent, Arabic), was recognized above all as a Hellenist.[414] This specialization was also acknowledged as such by his contemporaries. As Abraham Wheelocke put it, Young was 'a second Casaubon amongst us' ('alter inter nos Casaubonus').[415] Sir Simonds D'Ewes singled out his 'outstanding skill in the Greek

---

[412] For Buchanan and Scrimgeour, see *ODNB*. Both men were connected to Patrick Young's father, Peter: see, for instance, the letter from Scrimgeour to Buchanan mentioning him, in MS Smith 26, p. 11 (cf. p. 65). Young evidently took pride in his humanistic, cosmopolitan ancestry: see the short biography of Scrimgeour in Young's letter of 4 June, 1622, to Philip Cluverius, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 46-7. For similar examples of Young transcribing or lending Scrimgeour's manuscripts, see ibid., pp. 51, 79; and for an example of such a manuscript, see Trinity College, Cambridge, MS O.5.23.

[413] Patrick Young, ed., *Catena Graecorum Patrum in beatum Iob, collectore Niceta Heracleae Metropolita...accessit ad calcem textus Iobi στιχηρως* (London, 1637).; *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, ed. Brian Walton (London, 1657), vol. VI. The autograph manuscript of Young's notes (not all of them published) is British Library, MS Harley 1328.

[414] See Grafton and Weinberg (2010) on Casaubon as a Hebraist; and Parenty (2009) on Casaubon as a Hellenist.

[415] See Smith, *Vita Patricii Junii* (1707), p. 47.

language' ('eximiam...Graecae linguae peritiam') and John Price described him as a man born 'to the benefit of all literature, at least as far as Greek is concerned' ('ad literaturae omnis, duntaxat Graecae, beneficium').[416]

Long before King Charles received Codex Alexandrinus, however, Young's studies had concentrated on Greek texts – not just the pagan classics, but those of early Christianity, the later Greek Fathers, and the Orthodox Church. At this stage, it is worth pondering what circumstances in the British Isles and the broader republic of letters may have motivated a man of letters to make such a choice. Greek was always studied initially through the first body of texts, but the second, third and sometimes the fourth, tended to be the final destinations, as we have seen in the case of Casaubon himself.[417]

As with Casaubon, a notion of the 'classical' did not play much of a part in Young's mental world. Casaubon's work on pagan authors took him deep into the period we now know as late antiquity, as did his work on the Fathers of the Church. Grafton and Weinberg have recently demonstrated the extent to which all the different threads of his research were tangled together: Casaubon brought his knowledge of 'classical' Greek literature, of biblical and, in some cases, rabbinical Hebrew, to bear on the Greek spoken and written by the authors of the New Testament and other early Christians.[418] An education in Greek may always have started with the poets, historians and philosophers we now recognize as part of the modern-day 'classics' curriculum. Joseph Scaliger claimed to have learnt the rudiments of Greek by reading all of Homer in twenty-one days flat. But for the very best

---

[416] D'Ewes to Young, 1 February 1647, Kemke, ed. (1898), p. 107; John Price, ed., *L. Apuleii Apologia* (Paris, 1635), pp. 146-8 of Price's commentary.

[417] See II.2, above.

[418] Grafton and Weinberg (2010).

students, it almost always finished with Christian, and therefore late antique, Greek texts; and entering the field of Christian antiquity was the natural aim of a classical scholar anywhere in Europe, not an aberration.

The work of Henry Savile and Casaubon exemplifies the importance of the Greek Fathers, in particular the anti-Nicene ones such as Chrysostom, for the case against Catholic patristics and Biblical exegesis. His superiority in Greek helped Casaubon outflank Baronius, who relied heavily on Jerome and Augustine, in the battle over this earlier period of Christian apologetics and theology. Young's edition of Clement was part of a new trend in patristic scholarship, or at least a coincidental series of publications that had considerable collective impact. As Quantin has noted, the period between 1633 and 1647 saw the appearance of the '*editiones principes* of the epistle of Clement of Rome, of the Greek text of Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians*, of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, of the old uninterpolated Latin version of Ignatius' *Epistles* and subsequently of their Greek original, [and] of the *Martyrdoms* of Polycarp and Ignatius.'[419] These authors were eventually referred to as the 'Apostolic Fathers.'[420] They were held to represent the most authentic, uncorrupted form of Christianity, having lived early enough to have known the apostles themselves, hypothetically at least. In Britain, they played a part in the debate over the institution of episcopacy, including the question of whether it was legitimate *iure divino*, legitimate for some other reason, or illegitimate; though this debate was not an insular or merely clerical one, as the interventions of Grotius and especially Salmasius demonstrate.[421]

---

[419] See Quantin (2006), p. 322. For Ignatius and Polycarp, including a history of their publication, see Joseph Barber Lightfoot, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II: S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp* (London: Macmillan, 1885).

[420] See H. J. de Jonge, 'On the origins of the term "Apostolic Fathers",' *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978), pp. 503-5.

[421] See below, III.2.

To this, another context for the reception of Greek texts in the seventeenth century must be added: the importance of the literature, doctrines, and customs of the Eastern Churches in the inter-confessional battles of the seventeenth century. In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe there had been a surge of interest, dating back to the Counter-Reformation, in the possibility of a reunion of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches.[422] Theologians and humanists attended carefully to any continuities in the doctrine, practices, and Church government of Eastern and Western Christianity. Similarly vigorous attempts were made, although later on and on a less concerted and comprehensive scale, to bring the Greek Church closer to various Protestant denominations, including the Church of England – by its Calvinist wing as well as its less anti-Catholic, Arminian members, such as William Laud.[423] Indeed, the fact that Cyril Lucaris (the Patriarch of Constantinople who donated Codex Alexandrinus to the King) was courted by both Laud and Sir Thomas Roe, with the latter calling him, 'tho' he durst not publickly own it, a direct Calvinist,' shows that English interest in this possibility was by no means exclusively Laudian.[424]

Although they involved direct interaction with living representatives of the present-day Orthodox Church, most denominations conducted these investigations with constant appeals to history, reaching back into Christian antiquity in order to designate some traditions in later Christianity as authentically Christian, and others as illegitimate modern innovations. Greek was not, of course, the only language of the Eastern Churches – hence the increasing prestige of oriental languages such as Arabic, whose texts could serve

---

[422] See Karen Hartnup, *'On the Beliefs of the Greeks': Leo Allatios and Popular Orthodoxy* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); and Rietbergen (2006).

[423] See Milton (1995), especially pp. 309-10, 379-81; Quantin (2009), p. 150; and Toomer (1996), p. 142.

[424] See Richardson, ed. (1740), p. 35.

equally well as witnesses to an early, apostolic Christianity uncorrupted by Roman Catholicism.[425]

This phenomenon was relatively new in England. Casaubon had not been particularly exercised by the question of the relationship between reformed and Greek Orthodox Christianity; nor was it stressed by either Thomas James or Henry Savile. One of its most forthright representatives was a younger man, Richard Montagu, whose important philological works were accompanied, unlike Young's, by more conventionally polemical writings of momentous significance in the religious controversies of the 1620s and beyond.[426] Young, too, had long been interested in the history of the Greek as opposed to the Roman Church. As early as 1614, his friend and countryman Peter Goldman sent him, from Paris, a short fragment of Sylvester Syropoulos's history of the 1438-9 Council of Florence (a failed attempt to reunite the two Churches).[427]

The boundaries between different categories of Greek literature were easily blurred, especially in the case of the Septuagint. It figured as a document not just of Hellenistic Judaism, but also of an Eastern Christianity that had not embraced the Hebrew version or any Latin translation of the Old Testament. The presence of Clement's epistles made Codex Alexandrinus all the more important in this respect. Editing Clement allowed Young to foreground this dimension of the Greek Bible, rather than making an intervention in the debate over the relative authority of the Greek and Hebrew Old Testaments. Young's contribution to that debate came later, starting with his publication of Job, accompanying a

---

[425] See Toomer (1996), pp. 14-15; and Mordechai Feingold, 'Oriental Studies,' in Tyacke, ed. (1997), pp. 449-503.

[426] On Montagu, see II.2 and II.4, above.

[427] See Goldman to Young, 26 October, 1614, in Kemke, ed. (1898), p. 27. The fragment is Leiden University Library, MS VMI 31, and is in Goldman's hand.

catena of Greek patristic commentaries on that book. Notably, it was only after this second publication that Europe's most important and controversial Old Testament critic, Jean Morin, wrote to Young directly about Codex Alexandrinus.[428] He had, it is true, received partial transcriptions of it from Young via an intermediary.[429] Nonetheless, starting with Clement rather than part of the Old Testament text aligned Young with a different philological paradigm from that of Morin. It allowed him to bypass issues of textual transmission and the recovery of the Old Testament in its pure, original form, and make tentative stabs at reconstructing what it was like to be a Greek-speaking Christian in the first century AD – a reconstruction in which Morin seems to have taken little interest.

ii. Young's collaboration with John Bois

When he came to edit Clement, Young did not work alone. He was given access to a lengthy manuscript commentary on both epistles of Clement, written by John Bois for John Williams (then Bishop of Lincoln, and later Archbishop of York).[430] As we have seen, Bois was a scholar of an earlier generation who had been involved in the two greatest erudite projects of the 1600s and 1610s, the King James Bible and the Eton Chrysostom.[431] Williams was a patron, correspondent, and one-time colleague of Young, when he was Lord Keeper and tried to acquire manuscripts from cathedral libraries for the collection of Westminster Abbey.[432] Bois clearly worked from a copy of Codex Alexandrinus, written

---

[428] On Morin, see III.1.i, below.

[429] See Morin's letter to Thomas Comber, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, in Richard Simon, ed., *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis* (London, 1682), pp. 236-8. The letter is undated, but Comber's reply, pp. 238-42, is dated 9 October, 1634.

[430] This is Bodleian Library MS Barlow 10, fols. 118[a]-126[b].

[431] See above, II.2.ii and II.3.

[432] Young (1944), pp. 2-5; and Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645* (London: Macmillan, 1940), p. 180.

by someone other than Young himself.[433] His notes found their way to Young, via Williams, before he completed his own edition of Clement.[434] Young ended up printing many of Bois's observations and suggested emendations of the text, and he wrote occasional responses in the margins of Bois's notes, some of them very similar to his own notes as they were eventually printed. Comparing Young's and Bois's methods as patristic textual scholars and exegetes will afford us a clearer appreciation of what was distinctive about Young as a critic.

First of all, Bois was preoccupied with the relationship between Clement and other patristic writings. He was eager to show where Chrysostom, Clement of Alexandria, and others had alluded or referred directly to the earlier author. He did so partly in order to demonstrate historical continuity in the literature and doctrines of the Church from apostolic times onwards, but also simply in order to prove the antiquity of Clement's first epistle. Indeed, some readers of Young's edition suspected that it had been interpolated or even forged. Young followed Bois's lead, but tended to increase the number of citations comparing Clement with gentile authors. Discussing the supposed lifespan of the Phoenix, for instance, Bois cites Epiphanius; Young repeats this citation and adds a passage from Tacitus.[435] This was not just another attempt to shore up the argument that the letter was genuine. Rather, Young was expanding the horizons of patristic exegesis, placing his text outside as well as inside Judeo-Christian literary traditions. This must have come naturally to someone who had recently finished working on a textual edition and commentary as demanding and diverse as Selden's *Marmora Arundelliana*. In the introduction to that

---

[433] As Young's own note about the copy's 'exscriptor' on fol. 123[a] of MS Barlow 10 makes clear.

[434] See Young to Bois, 23 June 1633, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 68-9; and the correspondence between Bois and Williams in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 73, pp. 3-13.

[435] See MS Barlow 10, fol. 121[b], and Young (1633), sigs. Q2[b]-3[a].

work, Selden had put the Septuagint alongside the pagan Greek inscriptions and literature of the period following the death of Alexander:

> Of the same age as these two marble inscriptions (to speak of Greek authors, and ones who were famous in some area of learning; not just at these specific points in time but during the whole era) were Theophrastus, Menander, Pyrrho, Cratinus, Theocritus, Aratus, Apollonius of Rhodes, Lycophron, Nicander, Epicurus, Zeno, Berosus, Cleanthes, Callimachus, to whom you may join those 'Hellenists' who are known as the Seventy Elders - not to mention other men of less important nations.[436]

Young took this panoramic view of a third-century BC Mediterranean world in which the Greek language, not a particular religious or ethnic affiliation, was the source of cultural unity, and applied it to the first century AD.

The most conspicuous instance of his appropriation of Selden's vision also makes use of an inscription. It occurs in Young's note on the words παροικοῦσα and παροικούσῃ, in the letter's superscription: 'The Church of God sojourning ["peregrinatur" in Young's Latin] at Rome, to the Church of God staying ["diversatur"] in Corinth.'[437] In place of the second παροικούσῃ, Young suggests an alternative, which he then renders as 'diversatur' in Latin:

> The church of God sojourning at Rome, to the church of God sojourning at Corinth...perhaps 'staying', in order to avoid repeating the same word, since 'sojourning' and 'staying' mean the same thing, as can be seen right at the beginning of the book of Ruth, and elsewhere in the Septuagint. Both words mean 'live as a foreigner', and are very often used in its place, and are applied in the same statement, to increase its vividness and force, as in the Psalms, 'I am a guest and foreigner living with

---

[436] 'Coaeui autem fuere (de Graecis loquor scriptoribus atque viris aliquo eruditionis genere celebribus; & non tam de momentis temporum quam de integro seculo) hisce Marmoreis Inscriptionibus binis Theophrastus, Menander, Pyrrho, Cratinus, Theocritus, Aratus, Apollonius Rhodius, Lycophron, Nicander, Epicurus, Zeno, Berosus, Cleanthes, Callimachus, quibus & Hellenistas illos, qui LXX seniores dicuntur, adijcias, vt alios minorum gentium praeteream.' - John Selden, ed., *Marmora Arundelliana* (London, 1628), sig. ¶2[b]. On this work and Young's involvement, see Toomer (2009), p. 363.

[437] Young, ed. (1633), sigs. M4[a]-N1[a].

you, just like all my fathers.' And Peter, 'dearly beloved, I address you as foreigners and strangers,' and so on.[438]

After comparing his author with other Biblical texts, Young adduces a more outlandish linguistic parallel, this time from an inscription 'recently brought from the island of Delos, on an altar consecrated to Apollo by the Athenians, Romans, and other foreigners who were not natives of the island, which can be seen amongst the Royal marbles in the gardens at St. James's.' The inscription uses the verbs κατοικοῦντες and παρεπιδημοῦντες, both to describe the status of the foreigners living on Delos.[439]

As well as a less restricted notion of which sources count as relevant for illustrating patristic texts, this particular note encapsulates other features that make Young's commentary a work of criticism rather than of patristic scholarship. Young's citation of this inscription, for instance, demonstrated the richness of England's scholarly resources: the Royal inscriptions could be put alongside the Royal Library, all the ancient Greek and Roman coins, bronze and marble statues, and all amounted to a 'most excellently arranged treasury and storehouse of antiquity.' Beyond the institutions which Young himself supervised, he draws attention to his use of unpublished manuscripts from the Bodleian, and frequently praises the Earl of Arundel, as we have seen, as a patron of the arts, as well as English scholars, such as Bois, who have helped him.[440] Throughout, there is a commitment to using whatever space was available in his commentary to broadcast the investment of English patrons in the *studia humanitatis*, and the extent of England's

---

[438] 'Ἡ ἐκλησία [*sic*] του Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ του Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον...fortè κατοικούσῃ, ad vitandam *ταυτολεξίαν*, cùm idem sit *κατοικεῖν* quod *παροικεῖν*, vt videre est statim in initio libri Ruth, et alibi apud 70 Seniores. Vtraque autem vox *παρεπιδημεῖν* significat, et saepius pro eodem vsurpatur, ac in eadem enunciatione ad maiorem evidentiam, et ἐνεγειαν [*sic*] adhibetur, vt apud Psalmistam, Πάροικος ἐγώ εἰμι παρά σοι καὶ παρεπίδημος, καθὼς πάντες ὁι πατέρες μου. et Pet. I. 2. 22. ἀγαπητοὶ, παρακαλῶ ὡς παρόικους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, &c.'

[439] The word took on a more personal resonance for Young. See his signature (dated 6 July 1637) in the *album amicorum* of J. F. Gronovius, in The Hague, Royal Library, MS 130 E 32, fol. 161[a]: Παροικία καὶ παρεπιδημία ἐστιν ὅ βίος ἀνθρώπινος ('a man's life is [full of] sojourning and staying in strange places').

[440] For example, sigs. N1[b] and N2[b]-3[a]. For more on Bois's involvement, see below.

holdings of important literary documents. I say 'literary' because Young's use of this inscription for a linguistic parallel does not address the material features of the inscription or any aspect of its geographical context beyond what can be deduced from the text itself. Young's readers were not witnessing the antiquarianization of humanist philology. Rather, philology was consuming alternative forms of material evidence as fodder for its linguistic preoccupations.[441]

A second feature that makes Young's commentary more than an excavation of Christian doctrine and institutions by way of the Fathers is its frequent invocation of literary-critical criteria. In the passage quoted above, Young uses a technical rhetorical term, praising the 'force' of Clement's vocabulary. He regularly deploys the *topos* of the effective 'simplicity' of the 'apostolic style.'

This interest in questions of rhetoric and literary expression extends into Young's willingness to propose emendations of the text. The fact that there were no other manuscripts of Clement gave him a certain freedom: while his suggestion of κατοικούσῃ in place of the second παροικούσῃ had no basis in any physical document, there was no manuscript evidence available to rule it out. He may have refrained from printing the conjecture in his Greek text, but he translated it in the Latin parallel text. This example offers another reminder that emendation on the basis of stylistic propriety alone was hardly Bentley's innovation, even in a British context.[442]

What this note amounts to, in other words, is evidence that Young's edition of Clement was much more than an ecclesiastical project. It was an exhibition of humanistic learning and

---

[441] A point made on a more general level by Roebuck (2010), p. 77.

[442] This is not meant to take away from the originality of Bentley's methods and achievement, as discussed by Haugen (2011).

critical acumen. It would be easy to find fault with Young's execution. The direct relevance of the inscription to the text at hand is questionable. Nobody seems to have taken his conjectural emendations very seriously. But the *desire* to emend, and to call the reader's attention to emendations, is more important than their value or results when it comes to understanding what it meant for Young to identify himself as a 'critic.'

The older commentator's use of Hebrew also sheds light on the uniqueness of Young's work. Bois seems better-versed than Young in the relationship between the Hebrew of the Old Testament and what Heinsius and others described as 'Hellenistic' Greek (a term he himself made use of).[443] Unlike Young, he expatiates on questions of Jewish history.[444] He adopts an eclectic view of the texts of Scripture available to Clement and the authors of the New Testament: Clement 'does not always follow the Septuagint, but sometimes he prefers either his own [Greek version], or that of other men who were experts in Hebrew.'[445] What is notable about this is not so much the specific judgement reached as the fact that whereas Bois expressed a judgement about the version of the Old Testament behind Clement's citations, Young did not.

It would be tempting to conclude that Bois was simply more familiar with Hebrew and with the Old Testament than Young. Yet even where Bois's notes make lengthy treatments of Jewish terminology and institutions available to Young, he preserves the skeleton in his own note, but reduces the amount of examples and information given by Bois.[446] Young's relentless concentration on Greek for its own sake, not as a reflection of the Hebrew Old

---

[443] MS Barlow 10, fol. 121[a].

[444] See the notes on the term δωδεκάσκηπτρον and μωμοσκοπηθέν, ibid., fols. 122[a]-123[a].

[445] ibid., fol. 122[a].

[446] For example, Young's own note on δωδεκάσκηπτρον, in Young, ed. (1633), sig. Q3[a].

Testament, rooted Clement more firmly in two contexts: the contemporary, Hellenized Mediterranean, and the longer traditions of Greek patristic writings that stretched forward into late antiquity and beyond. For instance, Bois draws on a narrower canon of ecclesiastical texts, confined largely to the Septuagint and recognized Fathers; but Young adds linguistic precedents from Philo of Alexandria, another first-century witness to Hellenistic Judaism.[447]

When we come to Young's work on the Septuagint, we will find him much more willing than he is here to engage with the question of the relationship between the Hebrew text and its Greek translations. The fact that he did not do so at this point is, in a way, startling. From the later uses to which Codex Alexandrinus was put, by Young and others, we might assume that the recovery of a lost original dominated the scholarly agenda from the beginning, as the principal aim of any textual critic who made use of the manuscript. What could be more urgent than establishing the exact text of the Bible?

The Septuagint was still central to Young's edition, but in a different way. He called attention to the pervasive influence of the Septuagint on Clement, as well as to the conformity of this influence with usage elsewhere in the New Testament. But he didn't treat Clement's citations or allusions as windows onto the history of the Septuagint's dissemination, transmission, and corruption. In fact, where Clement's citations of the Old Testament differed from those given in Codex Alexandrinus itself, Young took the reading from Codex Alexandrinus and tacitly used that one, rather than Clement's, for his Latin translation. To take just one example, on p. 7, when Clement is quoting Exodus 2:14, Young translates the word κριτήν ('judge') as 'principem' ('prince' or 'leader') because he

[447] See, for instance, Young's note on fol. 124[a] of MS Barlow 10.

is following the reading of the Septuagint preserved in the manuscript: ἄρχοντα. Young was not ready, then, to acknowledge that by Clement's time the text of the Septuagint was already unstable (there are numerous points where Clement differs from the manuscript in this way), or that the text of the Septuagint as preserved in Codex Alexandrinus was not a pure record of first-century Christianity. Young's edition of Clement presents a quite different kind of textual scholarship, and a different kind of criticism: one preoccupied with seeking out historico-linguistic analogies, sketching out a reconstruction of contemporary Mediterranean Hellenism, and foregrounding the erudition and judgement of the editor.

iii. Criticism and ecclesiology

Turning from one kind of criticism to another hardly deprived Young's edition of any theological import. In fact, turning the reader's attention from the status of the text of Scripture to the status of Christians in the first century AD brought up arguably more pressing concerns, especially about church government. One aspect of Clement is particularly relevant here: his treatment of episcopacy, and especially the distinction between bishops and presbyters. Considering how Young handles it will illustrate how he was positioning the figure of the critic in relation to the theologian. Before doing so, however, it is worth adding two other figures to our account of the reception of Clement, figures whose opinions carried far more weight on the European stage than those of Bois or even Young: Hugo Grotius and Claudius Salmasius.

The Church of England would, in the late 1630s and 1640s, experience fervent internal struggles over the divine right of episcopacy, in which the testimonies of the Fathers were

a key battleground. Yet this was more than a domestic concern, as the response of Grotius to the emergence of Clement's first epistle makes clear. Shortly after receiving a copy of Young's edition, he wrote a long letter to the French lawyer Jérôme Bignon, supplying his thoughts on the epistle:

> He never calls to mind that elevated authority of bishops which the custom of the Church began to introduce after the death of Mark, at Alexandria, and elsewhere by that example. Rather, he shows, as plainly as Paul the Apostle, that Churches had been governed by the shared counsel of presbyters - all of whom Paul talks about in the same way as bishops themselves. Insofar as he names a high priest, priest, levites and laypersons, those names pertain not to the Church, but to the Temple in Jerusalem, whence he infers that all things should be done in a fixed order. If this was true for the Jews, it is even truer for Christians.[448]

The epistle, then, preserved the authentic, apostolic institution of episcopacy, with bishops not yet distinguished in power and privilege from presbyterian governors of the Church. The ascendancy of bishops over presbyters did not begin at Rome, moreover, but at Alexandria. Finally, Grotius denies any direct correspondence between the Jewish hierarchy of the Old Testament, with its high priest and its carefully separated, elevated clerical caste, and the Christian system of church government gestured at by Clement.

The crucial passage of Clement for this dispute was on page 57 of Young's edition:

> And our apostles knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be discord over the name of 'episcopacy': for this reason, therefore, with complete foreknowledge, they established mandates in advance, and laid out the successions of ministers and offices after them, so that if they died, other men of proven quality would succeed them and take over their duties...we will be in a state of dire sin if we spurn those who perform the functions of episcopacy blamelessly and with sanctity. Blessed are the presbyters

---

[448] 'Nusquam meminit exsortis illius episcoporum auctoritatis quae Ecclesiae consuetudine post Marci mortem Alexandriae atque eo exemplo alibi introduci coepit, sed plane ut Paulus Apostolus Ecclesias ostendit communi presbyterorum, qui iidem omnes & Episcopi ipsi Pauloque dicuntur, consilio fuisse gubernatas. Nam quòd ἀρχιερέα, ἱερέα, λευίτας & λαικούς nominat, omnia ista nomina non ad Ecclesiam, sed ad templum Hierosolymiticum pertinent, unde infert omnia certo ordine agenda, si Judaeis, tanto magis Christianis.' Grotius to Bignon, 17 July 1634; in Grotius (1928-2001), vol. V, pp. 260-62. This letter was also published in the Leiden 1648 edition of Grotius's *Epistolae ad Gallos*, pp. 418-23, and served as ammunition for vernacular theologians. In addition to the examples provided by Quantin (2009), pp. 268 and 286, see Richard Baxter, *A treatise of episcopacy* (London, 1681), part II, p. 21. The doctrinal charge attached to Grotius's judgement by this later stage is demonstrated by the removal of the word ἱερέα ('priest') from Grotius's denial of direct correspondence between the Jewish and Christian hierarchy – presumably by the Huguenot editor of the letter, Claudius Sarravius.

> who walked ahead of us, who had a fruitful and final release [from life]: for they are not afraid that anyone will move them from their place of rest.[449]

This was what Grotius meant when he said that Clement, like Paul, talks about 'bishops' and 'presbyters' interchangeably; 'presbyters' seems to denote the same 'bishops' already mentioned, whom the seditious Corinthians had cast out of office.

Perhaps the most emphatic deployment of Clement in the battle against episcopacy was that of Salmasius, in his pseudonymous treatise, *Walonis Messalini de Episcopis et Presbyteris contra D. Petavium Loiolitam dissertatio prima*, published in Leiden in 1641. He shared Grotius's interpretation of the crucial passage. He adds that in the time of the apostles, multiple bishops were appointed to one city; there was no direct line of succession from a single apostle to a single bishop, and so forth. The term ἐπίσκοπος was simply one word in a whole nebula of descriptions of different duties carried out by early Christians at the behest of, or in cooperation with, the apostles. Any notion that the name of 'bishop' was a special one, tenable only by designated individuals whose authority was elevated above that of their fellow labourers, had been introduced into the Church later on by way of a misguided attempt to equate the Christian hierarchy with that of the Jews, with their High Priests and Levites. This sense of primitive equality explains why Clement himself is referred to by Paul (Philippians 4:3) as his σύνεργον, his 'fellow labourer' - not as a 'bishop' of Rome or anywhere else.

A comparison with Grotius and Salmasius demonstrates that Young was comparatively reluctant to use the epistle against episcopacy. His draft notes on the text are particularly

---

[449] Καὶ ὀι ἀπόστολοι ήμων ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ήμων Ιησου Χριστου, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπί τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς: διὰ ταὐτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τους προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομιὴν [marg.: ἀπονομιὴν] δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, Διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες, τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτων...ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ήμῖν ἔσται, ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προςενέγκοντας τά δῶρα της ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. Μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντεω πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν: οὐ γὰρ εὐλαβοῦνται μή τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπό τοῦ ἱδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου.

instructive. He was capable of countenancing a presbyterian interpretation of the text, but not of publishing it. Next to the word 'bishops,' Young writes, 'those whom he addresses as bishops here are identified as priests below; look, and consider the passages.'[450]

The overall impression is of a calculated refusal to commit to a stance on the central ecclesiological question posed by this passage, or even of a frantic burrowing into word-usage in order to escape it. When he arrives at the critical proof-passage in his printed commentary, Young offers a note on the phrase 'laid out the successions of ministers and offices after them,' represented by the Greek words ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν, or, as Young conjectures, ἀπονομὴν, and rendered in his Latin as 'descriptas...ministeriorum officiorumque vices reliquerunt.' Here, neither the text nor the translation singles out bishops, although it could be taken to refer to bishops on the basis of what precedes it ('there would be discord over the name of "episcopacy"'). He glosses the phrase with passages from Tertullian that refer to bishops and their succession, and the way in which the apostles designated specific men to succeed them – Polycarp was appointed in advance by John at Smyrna, and Clement by Peter at Rome, and 'those who were installed as a Bishop by the Apostles have traces of Apostolic parenthood.'[451] He finishes, however, dismissively: 'but that is enough about something doubtful.'[452] Tertullian's statements on episcopacy and Apostolic succession are quoted without approval or disapproval. More importantly, the act that prompted the letter to be written – the Corinthians' expulsion of their own clergy – passes, when recalled by Clement a few lines later, without comment.

---

[450] Leiden University Library, MS VMI 7, fol. 99[b]: 'Quos hîc episcopos vocat infra presbyteri nominantur vide et considera loca.'

[451] 'Quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos, Apostolici seminis traduces habeant,' sig. Q4.

[452] 'Verùm de re dubia satis.'

Young's own notes on this passage, then, and on the text's presentation of episcopacy as a whole, were far from polemical, or even conclusive. This was a source of concern for Restoration scholars.[453] James Eckersall wrote to Thomas Smith in 1693, supplying some biographical information and other observations on Young, including that Anthony Wood accused him of siding with the Presbyterians in the 1640s; and that, as Eckersall has 'been told' by someone else, in his edition of Clement, 'if it does not appear he was for Presbytery, neither does it that he was concern'd for Episcopacy.'[454] Smith seems to have agreed: although he blasted Wood's account of Young elsewhere, when he dealt with the edition of Clement he avoided the issue of episcopacy altogether.[455] Similarly, Colomesius followed both Henry Hammond and John Fell in disagreeing with Young's treatment of the episcopacy passage.[456]

Eckersall's conclusion was broadly correct, but it is worth considering his motivations for asking it in the first place. The immediate stimulus was Wood's charge against Young and the need to defend a worthy scholar whose work had served the Church. The underlying impulse, however, came from a post-Restoration mentality that sought to place earlier writers in a clearly defined faction, on one side of the intra-confessional struggles that had threatened to tear apart the Church of England from the 1640s onwards. Eckersall and Smith were looking at Young retrospectively, and his voluminous patristic scholarship and

---

[453] This assumption is manifest in Smith's biography: see Smith (1707), pp. 29-30, 36-7.

[454] As noted in Quantin (2009), p. 268. See Eckersall to Smith, 10 October 1693, in Bodleian Library MS Smith 49, pp. 193-5. Eckersall is referring to Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1691-2), vol. I, col. 794.

[455] For Smith's attack on Wood (whom he does not name), see Smith (1707), *Vita Patricii Junii*, pp. 36-7; for his treatment of Clement, see pp. 24-6.

[456] See his edition of Clement (London, 1687), pp. 104-5, where, unlike Young, he makes clear that episcopacy was a distinct office in the Church of Corinth and that the men who had been cast out of their office were bishops.

apparent dedication to Christian antiquity, among other things, made him look very much like a card-carrying supporter of William Laud and his faction.

After the debates over episcopacy from Smectymnuus onwards, and especially the part played in them by Ussher and Isaac Vossius's philological work on Ignatius, it was hard to imagine an editor of such an important patristic proof-text *not* taking sides on the issue; and it was similarly hard to imagine such an assiduous student of Christian antiquity as Young being anything other than an advocate for *iure divino* episcopacy, in the same vein as Richard Montagu or Henry Hammond. Yet it is less clear that anyone reading Young's edition of Clement in 1633 would have shared these assumptions. As Anthony Milton has pointed out, the polarization between *iure divino* and *iure ecclesiastico* arguments for episcopacy was itself a Laudian construct, which did not take hold until the later 1630s.[457] Even Grotius only offered his judgement on Clement in a private letter, as one in a long list of reasons why the epistle had to be genuine. As Quantin has reminded us, and the Calvinism of Casaubon demonstrates, a concentration on the Fathers had not yet become a mark of a distinctively 'Anglican,' as opposed to Reformed, theology. Nor had historical and linguistic erudition become inextricably associated with a particular group within or outside the Church of England. In their different ways, Samuel Ward, Thomas Gataker, and John Owen were as committed to the forms of philological scholarship represented by Young's work as Richard Montagu, Henry Hammond, or Brian Walton. More importantly, however, a narrow focus on Young's engagement with a specifically *Christian* antiquity occludes the breadth of the vision of ancient history adumbrated in his edition of Clement.

[457] Milton (1995), p. 461.

Bois, on the other hand, is candid where theological questions are concerned. He deals with the controversial passage mentioning bishops and presbyters head on, even half-suggesting a baseless correction of the phrase 'there would be discord over the name of episcopacy' to 'there would be discord over the *right* [ἀξιώματος] of episcopacy...but I'm not changing anything.'[458] Under the cover of an emendation, Bois is proposing to extend the significance of the passage for church government into the present. According to this reading, Clement is not talking about a quibble over semantics, or an isolated, local dispute over ecclesiastical offices; he is addressing in a prescriptive, legalistic fashion the whole question of the divine or apostolic mandate for episcopacy.

Are we to understand Young's equivocation over episcopacy as a political, theological, or a scholarly decision? It would be straightforward to argue that Young's understanding of criticism incorporated a privileged independence from theology. There is no evidence, however, that it did. When Young talks explicitly about criticism, it is with regard to its internal features and techniques. He never articulates a view of the relationship between criticism and other spheres of intellectual endeavour. The closest he comes to doing so is when he draws on a commonplace of philology, invoking the right to suspend his judgement, or ἐπέχειν: 'but that is enough about something doubtful.'[459] If there had been any uproar over his presentation of Clement, he might well have done more to mark out a territory for himself, just as Selden did with his preface to the *Historie of Tithes*.[460] For the time being, however, Young was not forced to define precisely where his activities as a scholar stood in relation to the established disciplines. At this point, his background in Scottish humanism deserves further notice. The Scottish universities, including St.

---

[458] MS Barlow 10, fol. 123[b].

[459] For examples of this commonplace, see above.

[460] See II.4, above.

Andrews, were less predisposed than the English ones to Aristotelianism or to its scholastic baggage.[461] This, along with his exposure to Casaubon and then Selden, may explain why Young displayed none of Montagu's concern for doctrine, disputation, and precise theological definitions, despite working in the same field as him.

We cannot look to earlier editions of Clement to understand Young's. His notes have little in common with most previous or subsequent editions of other early Fathers, such as those of Ignatius. To understand the models he was following as a critic, we need to look to Selden, of course, but also to a form of erudite commentary with a venerable European ancestry: the *liber variarum lectionum*.[462] In their first publication, it was common for budding humanists to range across multiple classical texts, selectively choosing opportune passages to emend or explain, and, less selectively, simply dumping all the erudition they had accumulated in the course of their studies. It has been suggested that this tradition began to die out when philologists, encouraged by mentors like Joseph Scaliger, chose in increasing numbers to edit specific texts rather than to comment on multiple authors. To be sure, a textual edition could help to focus a scholar's attention on the particularities of one author, from his style, to his historical context, to his manuscript tradition. I have tried to argue that Young attended carefully to these first two categories in the case of Clement. In practice, however, the textual edition continued to serve as an outlet for a diverse range of erudition of the kind that foregrounded the ingenuity and knowledge of the commentator

---

[461] The work of David Allan is instructive on this point: see, in particular, *Virtue, Learning, and the Scottish Enlightenment: Ideas of Scholarship in Early Modern History* (Edinburgh University Press, 1993), pp. 34, 104; and *Philosophy and Politics in Later Stuart Scotland: Neo-Stoicism, Culture, and Ideology in an Age of Crisis, 1540-1690* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000).

[462] See Grafton (2004), p. 337. For an example of the longevity of this form, see Edward Gibbon, *Essai sur l'étude de la littérature*, ed. Robert Mankin (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2010), p. 19. for an example of its appeal across cultures, see Azariah de' Rossi, *The Light of the Eyes*, ed. and trans. Joanna Weinberg (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001). For a defence of the genre written in the later seventeenth century, see Antonius Borremansius, *Variarum lectionum liber* (Amsterdam, 1676), sig. *7.

himself – hence the frequent appearance of a separate index listing other authors for which the editor had supplied emendations.

This is the other face of Young's commentary. It is most conspicuous when he tries to connect Clement up with the ancient history of Britain itself. He interprets the phrase ὠκεανὸς ἀνθρώποις ἀπέραντος ('the ocean without bounds for men') as a reference to the sea surrounding England and Ireland, conjecturing ἀπέρατος – 'not navigable' – in place of ἀπέραντος – 'boundless.'[463] As usual, his Latin translation, 'inpermeabilis,' quietly renders the conjecture and not the original term. He also understood the phrase καὶ οἱ μετ᾽αὐτον κόσμοι ('and the worlds that come after it,' i.e. after the ocean) as a reference to Britain, noting, as the Fathers had, that the superfluous pluralization of a term like κόσμος was a common Hebraism in the Septuagint, and the single κόσμος intended by Clement could have been Britain, which was so difficult to reach that it may as well have been a second world.[464]

Young's conclusion to this note reveals something of his overall practice in editing and annotating Clement: 'But we leave these matters to the students of the geographers to weigh with more accuracy; nor do we affirm anything to be fixed and beyond doubt in such an obscure business. It will be enough for us if learned men think that the things which we have given them seem not entirely without credit, nor utterly absurd.'[465] The intention to bring whatever material might shed any light on the text, from however acute an angle, however outlandish it may seem, recalls the virtuosity of Selden's earlier work,

---

[463] Young, ed. (1633), p. 28. The note is at sig. P3.

[464] ibid., sigs. P3^{b}-4^{a}.

[465] 'Verùm haec acuratius perpendenda των γεογράφων παισὶ relinquimus, neque quicquam in re adeo obscurâ, pro certo et indubitato affirmamus; nobisque satis erit, si viris doctis, quae in manum protulimus, non prorsus ἀπίθανα, nec penitus absurda videbuntur.'

but also of the *variae lectiones* tradition as a whole.[466] This playful disavowal of authority after a series of ambitious conjectures squares with what Young says later about the value of his edition as 'criticism.' Commenting on a section where the manuscript is so badly damaged that he has had simply to mark the lacuna and move on, hoping for some 'new Aesclepius' either from Egypt or Greece, i.e. another manuscript of Clement, to fill in the blank, he then adds: 'Those things which, in the rest of the body, did not seem completely beyond my powers of healing, I have tried, according to the meanness of my ability, to mend and put in order; how well, is up to the judgement of learned men, and initiates of the art of criticism.' [467]

Many of Young's conjectures were based on careful scrutiny of the manuscript, but several relied on arguments about style, rhetoric, or grammar. As we have seen, grammar had a linguistic and a historical dimension, with the latter typified by the hypothesis, attached to a conjectural emendation, that Clement was referring to Britain. These could be read as attempts to draw attention to one's erudition and philological nous in one's first major publication, as could the centrifugal quality of the commentary: the more of antiquity on which one is able to shed light, even when irrelevant to the text at hand, the more likely it is that one of the 'initiates of the art of criticism' across the sea will sit up and take note.[468] The attention-seeking exuberance of Young's commentary is largely absent from the sober grammatical corrections and lists of patristic and Old Testament allusions offered by Bois.

---

[466] On which, see G. J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp.74-5, and Selden, *Analecton Anglobritannicon* (Frankfurt, 1615), p. 3.

[467] 'Quae in reliquo corpore medicam manum prorsus refugere non videbantur, pro facultatis nostrae modulo sarcire & καταρτίζειν conati sumus; quàm benè penes doctos, et artis Criticae mystas, iudicium esto,' Young, ed. (1633), sig. R2[a].

[468] For Scaliger's criticism of collections of *variae lectiones* on precisely this basis, see the autobiographical passage in Scaliger (1615), pp. 16-17. This was not without hypocrisy. He had himself published a book in this genre, albeit under the pseudonym Yvo Villiomarus: *In locos controversos Roberti Titi animadversorum liber* (Heidelberg, 1597).

Equally rare is any sense that Bois is self-consciously extending himself beyond the genre of theological commentary, as Young does when he refers to 'Photius the Patriarch, father of the Critics,' or to 'initiates of the art of criticism.' This is in spite of the fact that Bois does deal with problems that could be seen as the province of the 'critic,' such as what ought to fill in the large lacuna towards the end of the manuscript.[469] Even if Bois was a critic, he didn't feel it necessary to draw public attention to the fact.

Moreover, it never seems to have occurred to Bois to have any of his work printed, at least with his name on it. The King James Bible was a collaborative and largely anonymous project; little credit accrued for individual translators. The same is true of the Eton Chrysostom (except, perhaps, for Savile himself). For Bois, the mechanisms for passing on his erudition were traditional, oral, and interpersonal ones, with the university and its structures of tuition still central. He is said to have been 'chief Greek lecturer in the college [St. John's, Cambridge] ten years together; all which time he read most diligently every day. And not only so, but, for divers years, he did voluntarily read a Greek lecture, at four a clock in the morning, in his own chamber; which was frequented by many fellows.'[470] Otherwise, he exchanged manuscript notes with close friends and associates, as in the case of Clement, and corresponded with some scholars, but his network of correspondents is insular compared with Young's. It is debatable whether he had any notion of a reading public, or a republic of letters, interested in the sort of close grammatical and historical work on Scripture in which he specialized – at least not beyond

---

[469] MS Barlow 10, fol. 125[b].

[470] Allen (1970), p. 136. One of those who attended was Thomas Gataker. See the sermon delivered at Gataker's funeral: Simeon Ashe, *Gray Hayres Crowned with Grace* (London, 1655), p. 43.

Britain. Outside of the university, the context for his philological work was predominantly clerical and insular.[471]

Young, on the other hand, was deeply concerned with the mechanics of publication, as his correspondence testifies. He was as eager to hear about the progress of continental editions of texts and treatises for which he had furnished manuscripts as he was to get his own work printed - perhaps more so if we reflect on the relative paucity of his output. His edition of Clement features several complaints about the impatience and parsimony of the printer, but for which he would have more space to digress on interesting topics, such as the meanings of the word σκάμμα (p. 9), for which he heaps up a remarkable number of patristic examples in a note stretching over three pages, before concluding: 'But I am afraid that many will think I go on too long, while I pause a while longer to explain this word and heap up various witnesses...nor does the printer, who is putting his foot down and complaining that he can't get on with his work, suffer us to progress step by step, and pursue individual topics too accurately.'[472] Fair or not, this complaint illustrates Young's commitment to using Clement as a window into an entire world of literate erudition, but just as importantly it shows that he felt his work was shaped by the exigencies of the publishing industry. Indeed, it will be worth considering at the end of this study whether the picture of the critic that emerges would have been conceivable without such a thing as 'print culture,' and the pan-European dissemination of its products.

---

[471] On clerics' reluctance to publish non-theological works, see Mordechai Feingold, 'Science as a Calling? The early modern dilemma,' *Science in Context* 15.1 (2002), pp. 79-119, especially p. 107, noting 'the determination of many practitioners to keep their studies private...and the almost inevitable dispersal of their papers following their deaths.'

[472] Young, ed. (1633), sigs. $O2^{b}$-3^{b} (cf. sig. $M4^{a}$).

Many were impressed by the erudition of Young's commentary, particularly in England, but there was no sea change in his reputation on a European scale.[473] Readers offered precisely the sort of moderate praise they would extend to a novice philologist who had distinguished himself in his first published work, rather than hailing the edition as a decisive or radical contribution to ecclesiastical history. Otherwise, their real interest lay in the hints Young's edition had given as to the nature and value of Codex Alexandrinus.[474]

In several senses, Young's Clement was a victim of timing. Published too early drastically to affect the direction in which controversies over episcopacy would go from the late 1630s onwards, it offered too little in other respects to hold the attention of figures such as Jean Morin, Heinsius, Grotius, or Salmasius. Young's edition came at a time when Morin's work on the Septuagint was attempting to diminish the respect in which the Hebrew Old Testament was held, but Young supplied no answers to the questions Morin was asking. Although he showed occasional concern for the nature of what was in some quarters known as 'Hellenistic,' that is, 'Judeo-Hellenic,' Greek, his edition was published before the polemical interchange between Heinsius and Salmasius had brought that dialect to the forefront of European scholarship and given any discussion of it a keen theological edge.[475] For now, Young was a critic without a cause.

A longer study would be able to consider William Burton, and his reintroduction of Clement into the episcopacy debate (on the side of presbyterianism) with his English

---

[473] See the effusive praise of Bois himself, in his letter to Young dated 7 May 1633, and the positive response of Heinsius, who already respected Young, on 16 May of the same year, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 67-8; and the praise of Peiresc, in his letter to Selden of 31 March, 1636, in British Library, MS Harley 7011, fol. 118[a].

[474] See, for instance, the note referring to Young's preface in Amsterdam University Library, MS RK III H 17, p. 1. This manuscript contains the *variae lectiones* recorded from Codex Alexandrinus and sent by Young to Grotius, via Franciscus Junius. See also the letters between Junius and Grotius in van Romburgh, ed. (2004), p. 619f.

[475] See below, II.6.

translation; but this was overshadowed by the work of Ussher and Vossius on Ignatius.[476] The greater importance attached to Ignatius than to Clement in the 1640s may seem paradoxical. Clement, although he offered less conclusive evidence to either side, had never been edited before 1633, and so his appearance might be expected to have generated more interest; but it was precisely the long fought-over nature of Ignatius's epistles, subject of decades of controversies within Protestantism as well as between Catholics and Protestants, which made the radical revisions of the Latin and then the Greek text so explosive. Young's own subsequent publications, on the other hand, would see him turn away from the first century AD and attempt to exercise a similarly exuberant and self-consciously erudite form of criticism on the Septuagint itself – a criticism that failed to cope with the entirely unfamiliar task it had in hand.

More generally, the lukewarm response to Young's commentary of both theologians and philologists shows that criticism had not yet reached the point, in Britain at least, where it was felt to pose a direct threat to the claims of theology. In Young's work on Clement it comes across as a neutral, or even neutralizing, form of discourse, addressed to the academic theological establishment, but not fomenting conflict between it and any other group of intellectuals. This was surely helped by the playful, literary tone of his commentary, which showed little of Montagu's concern for the historical grounds of modern doctrine and discipline. The feeling that criticism might occasion moments of more direct, more radical contention, had surfaced earlier (most notably in the reactions to Selden's *Historie of Tithes*) but it was not until later decades that various developments turned it into the dominant tone in British discussions of philological learning. By that

[476] See William Burton, ed. and trans., *Clement, the blessed Paul's fellow-labourer in the Gospel, his First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London, 1647).

time, the problems of biblical textual criticism were driving Young further and further from the mainstream of humanist philology.

II.6: New Testament criticism and the limits of secularization

i. John Price, English classicist

In the words of Anthony Wood, John Price was a 'great Critick who had a rambling head.'[477] As well as gesturing at the miscellaneous quality of Price's erudition, Wood was pointing out that Price moved around Europe far more than most contemporary English scholars did, a fact which may have had something to do with his Roman Catholicism.[478] He represents a rare case of a philologist whose work may, at first, have been esteemed more on the continent than it was in Britain, and his liminal status within British philology makes him worthy of special attention.[479] At first glance, Price represents better than most of his British contemporaries the figure of the classicist as traditionally conceived by Wilamowitz, Pfeiffer, Kenney, and others.[480] However, a close comparison of the British and European contexts in which Price's work was written and received reinforces two points made at the beginning of this study: firstly, that the interpenetration of classical and biblical literary study was a hallmark of the seventeenth century, and secondly, that this was a European phenomenon in which British scholars eagerly participated, rather than an effect of British parochialism or disdain for classical studies.

---

[477] Wood (1691-2), vol. II, col. 431. Wood also called Price 'the greatest Critick of his time,' col. 430.

[478] On Price generally, see *ODNB*; Toomer (2009), pp. 361, 393-4, 728, 822; and Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian cultural relations since the Renaissance* (London: Frank Cass, 1998), pp. 144-7.

[479] Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (Paris, 1820), vol. XII, p. 316, says that Price produced 'plusieurs ouvrages très doctes'; and his friend Claude Sarrau called him 'doctissimo,' 'studiosissimo' and 'eruditissimo': see Sarravius, *Epistolae* (Utrecht, 1709), pp. 150 and 162. See also Colomesius (1682), p. 136: 'estoit Anglois de nation, d'une litérature vaste, & d'un grand jugement.'

[480] This is probably why he has been overlooked by historians attempting to demonstrate the overwhelmingly ecclesiastical bent of English erudition during the period: e.g. Feingold (1996).

Furthermore, although Price's confessional allegiance was sincerely Roman, it did not prevent him from spending much of his career collaborating with Protestant scholars: not only for his work on Apuleius and other non-Christian texts, but even for his biblical commentaries.[481] He spent time in France, Germany and Italy, and kept erudite company, forming friendships with Claude Sarrau, Hugo Grotius, Salmasius, Nicolaus Heinsius, and members of the Barberini circle. These friendships might tempt us to attribute Price's classical interests to his continental and trans-confessional connections, using him to prove the traditional point about English ecclesiastical parochialism. However, by examining a number of English classicists of the period, we can see that such a view would be misguided: Price's work on pagan literature and history emerged from decisively English contexts.

We find him mentioned, for instance, in an English translation of Juvenal by the Oxford lecturer and poet-playwright Barten Holyday. In his preface, Holyday thanks John Selden and Thomas Farnaby for helping him to acquire manuscripts from the Royal Library and from the personal library of William Camden; Ben Jonson for another 'ancient Manuscript partly written in the *Saxon* Character'; Meric Casaubon for 'an elegant Manuscript from the Study of his exact Father; along with Thomas Allen and, finally, Price, 'who imparted to me divers forreign Criticks, whose Labours, though publish'd, are but rarely brought into these parts, but collected by his diligent choice, in his Travels into *France, Italy* and

---

[481] See Price, ed. (1635); idem, ed., *L. Apuleii Metamorphoseos libri XI* (Gouda, 1650), including an index of authors mentioned by Hesychius; *Matthaeus...illustratus* (Paris, 1646); *Annotationes in Epistolam Jacobi* (Paris, 1646); *Acta Apostolorum...illustrata* (Paris, 1647); *Commentarii in varios libros Novi Testamenti* (London, 1660; this book served as the fifth volume of the nine-volume *Critici Sacri* edited by John Pearson et al.); Price's contributions to the *Hesychii Lexicon* published in Leiden in 1668. Price's commentary on James is especially rare. I have not been able to consult a copy, and the only copies I have located are in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (A- 7130 (2) and A- 7249), and the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence (MAGL. 5.10.249). I owe this last reference to Prof. Gerald Toomer. Price's fragmentary notes on Pliny, equally, may only survive in one copy: British Library 1082.l.9, which lacks a title page. J. A. Fabricius thought that they had never been published: see his *Bibliotheca Latina* (Venice, 1728), p. 612.

Greece.'[482] He went on to quote from Price's commentary on the *Apologia* of Apuleius in his own extensive philological notes to the translation.[483]

This list of names reminds us that there was a flourishing culture of humanistic critical learning which did not necessarily specialize in sacred or ecclesiastical texts. Two of its key sponsors were Camden and Selden, and Holyday's edition also printed a letter from Selden to Farnaby discussing available manuscripts of Juvenal.[484] That Ben Jonson featured alongside Price, Selden, and Meric Casaubon in the preface to a vernacular translation demonstrates the persistence of the connections between original literary composition and advanced philological research during this period.

It also brings Price closer to Thomas Farnaby. Farnaby is generally presented as the archetype of the deficiencies of English classical scholarship during the earlier seventeenth century.[485] He is portrayed as a mere schoolmaster producing elementary textbooks of the poets prescribed by the grammar school curriculum, hardly even aspiring to citizenship of the European republic of letters, or even to any critical faculty of his own. It is true that Farnaby was modest about his own abilities, writing to Holyday that 'the unfortunate mispending of my younger and better years in Sea affairs, as one hoping and labouring never to be beholding to Scholarship, may not pretend any claim to learning.' Yet if Farnaby wrote entry-level linguistic and rhetorical textbooks as well as classical editions,

---

[482] Barten Holyday, ed. and trans., *Decimus Junius Juvenalis and Aulus Persius Flaccus Translated* (Oxford, 1673), sig. a2^{b}. This book was published posthumously (Holyday died in 1661).

[483] ibid., pp. 195 and 247.

[484] ibid., sig. b2^{a}. The date for Selden's letter, 13 March 1672, can clearly be corrected to 13 March 1618, the same day Farnaby forwarded it to Holyday (Farnaby's own letter is also printed on this page). On Selden and Farnaby, see Toomer (2009), pp. 18-19.

[485] See *ODNB*; Feingold (1997), p. 262, where he is grouped with John Bond and Gerard Langbaine in this connection; Richard Serjeantson, 'Thomas Farnaby,' in Malone, ed. (2001-2003), vol. I, pp. 108-16; and Haugen (2011), pp. 48-9. Colin Burrow echoes Haugen's account in his review of her monograph: 'Pissing on Idiots,' *London Review of Books*, 6 October, 2011.

so did the great Dutch humanist G. J. Vossius, with whom he corresponded.[486] If he was a schoolmaster, so was William Camden. Vossius clearly regarded Farnaby as more than a simple pedagogue, however, offering in 1632 to arrange for his new edition of Martial to be printed in Leiden and giving him guidance about how to improve on the work of Scaliger's former protégé, Petrus Scriverius.[487]

Vossius also sent Farnaby a copy of one of his most recondite works, the *De theologia gentili* of 1641.[488] In fact, Farnaby's editions had always proclaimed his interest in philology, if not his own critical judgement. His Seneca (or, as Farnaby thought, Senecas) of 1613 engaged with Lipsius, Scaliger, and Daniel Heinsius, and one of the epigrams (by Jonson) proclaimed Farnaby's reading of 'authors and volumes of criticism' ('autores criticaque volumina') after which he was able to 'pour forth these notes/Sharp and sagacious, a faithful but concise interpeter' ('has fundit notas/Sagax acutus, fidus interpres, breuis').[489] He began, moreover, to make use of the cutting edge of European historical erudition, quoting Selden's *De Diis Syris* in his commentary on Lucan.[490] One of the epigrams prefixed to the edition wondered whether Farnaby was more knowledgeable about poetry or about ancient history.[491] He cited Strabo, Pomponius Mela, and the modern ethnographer Philipp Cluverius when he came to the well-known passage about

---

[486] See C. S. M. Rademaker, 'Gerardus Joannes Vossius and his English correspondents,' *Lias* 19 (1992), pp. 173-213; Vossius, *Epistolae* (London, 1690), pp. 193-4, 353, 386. Even Farnaby's textbooks proclaimed the influence of scholars like Selden and Augustine Lindsell, who helped provide quotations and examples from the more obscure classical authors: see the preface to Farnaby, *Index Rhetoricus* (London, 1629).

[487] Vossius (1690), pp. 193-4.

[488] See van Romburgh, ed. (2004), pp. 726-7. The book was dedicated to the English clergy.

[489] Farnaby, ed., *L. & M. Annaei Senecae...tragoediae* (London, 1613), sig. ¶4ª. Farnaby dissented from Heinsius's opinion that one author wrote all of the tragedies, instead attributing some of them to Lucius Annaeus Seneca the Stoic philosopher, and others to Marcus, the tragedian. See Moul (2010), p. 57.

[490] Farnaby, ed., *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (London, 1618), pp. 232-3. Bodleian Library, 8º L 13 Art.Seld. is the copy presented to Selden by Farnaby. For other examples of books by Farnaby in Selden's library, see Bodleian Library MS Selden supra 111, fols. 51, 62ª.

[491] ibid., sig. A6ª: 'FARNABI, potior scientiórve/Aut priscae historiae Poëticésve...'

the druids in Book I.[492] In short, he engaged with the mainstream of European antiquarianism and philology, as well as providing a more straightforwardly literary-critical commentary on the poem. Nor did he see the former enterprise as transcending the latter: he could comfortably describe Joseph Scaliger as the 'inheritor of his father's critical faculty' ('heres paternae Critices') when he was discussing Julius Caesar's unfavourable opinion of Lucan as a poet.[493] As we have seen in other instances, there was little appreciation of a gap between the literary and historical legacies of the younger Scaliger's work.[494]

The case of Vossius shows that other scholars took these aspects of Farnaby's commentaries seriously. Equally instructive here is Selden's use of Farnaby in his discussion of a famous crux in Martial, *Epigrams* XI.95.[495] The speaker is addressing a 'circumcised,' i.e. Jewish, poet, accusing him of sodomizing his son, for whom he has been hired as a tutor. The Jew swears that he is innocent, but by Jupiter's temple on the Capitol, suggesting that his oath is insincere; the speaker would prefer that he swore 'per Anchialum.'[496] Selden was simply one of a long line of humanists to have attempted to explain what was meant by the unintelligible *hapax* 'Anchialum'; usually it was understood as a mangled form of an oath sworn by the Jews, a trace of Hebrew or Aramaic

---

[492] ibid., pp. 18-19. See Toomer (2009), pp. 84-5; and A. L. Owen, *The Famous Druids* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

[493] ibid., sig. A4[a].

[494] See I.1, above.

[495] Selden, *De successionibus in bona defuncti* (London, 1631), v-xi. Farnaby's next edition of Martial (1633) acknowledged this reference and disagreed with Selden's solution to the problem.

[496] For a survey of modern and less modern conjectures, see S. Leanza, 'Iura, verpe, per Anchialum,' *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 3 (1973), pp. 18-25.

in first-century Latin.[497] What all of their treatments had in common was a fascination both with the historical presence of a large community of Jews in first-century Rome, and with the linguistic mingling of Latin and Hebrew. If the classical tradition was homogenous and predictable enough at the level of grammar-school education, strange things happened to it when it was appropriated by late humanist critics.

We need to bear in mind the flexibility of the classical commentary for Farnaby, as well as his ability to participate (with or without any particular distinction) in European scholarly debates, when we assess John Price. From this perspective, Price's interests are not so distant from those of his English peers, even if his continental experiences broadened his horizons somewhat. This becomes even clearer when we observe his relationship with Selden and Patrick Young during the 1630s. Price printed material from the Arundel marbles and other inscriptions, thanking Selden, Young, and William Petty for the light they had shed on Apuleius's *Apologia*.[498] His first publication, then, coincided with the acquisitions of manuscripts and other historical material by the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke which had made England a centre for the study of Greek antiquities.[499] Price went out of his way to display this fact, publishing not only the parts of inscriptions which

---

[497] Alongside Farnaby, Selden mentioned Scaliger and G. J. Vossius; and in his own copy of the 1636 edition (Bodleian Library, A 2.9 Art.Seld.) he added a marginal reference to Grotius's later discussion of the poem: see Grotius, *Annotationes in Libros Evangeliorum* (Amsterdam, 1641), p. 105 (on Matthew 5:34). Casaubon had attempted an explanation which disagreed with Scaliger's, but only, as far as I am aware, in his manuscript notes: see Bodleian Library, MS Casaubon 29, p. 148. Salmasius also took on the passage: *De Hellenistica commentarius* (Leiden, 1643), p. 204f.

[498] Price, ed. (1635), sig. a2[a]; notes, pp. 67, 146-8. He also received help from Jean Bourdelot when he was in Paris: ibid., notes, sig. P4[a], p. 49. See also P. Tamizey de Larroque, 'Deux lettres inédites de Jean Price à Bourdelot,' *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, April 1883, pp. 145-158. Price later copied manuscripts and inscriptions for Selden when he was abroad: see Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 121, fols. 9-42, 55-61; and Selden, *De Synedriis*, bk. II, p. 708.

[499] On the acquisition of the Barocci collection, see I. G. Philip, *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 37-41; and W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1984), p. 68f. These manuscripts almost went to the Royal Library: see Parr (1686), pp. 400-401. On the Arundel marbles, see Toomer (2009), pp. 360-62. For the responses to these events of two of Europe's major scholars and intelligencers, see Lucas Holstenius to Peiresc, 24 November 1628, and 25 February 1629, in Holstenius (1817), pp. 115-16; and Peiresc to Holstenius, 27 April 1629, in Peiresc, *Lettres*, ed. Philippe Tamizey de Larroque (Paris, 1888-98), vol. V, p. 318. Holstenius lamented that these treasures of Greek antiquity had fallen into the hands of the 'haereticos.'

provided a grammatical parallel for Apuleius, but in one case the whole of a 'very ancient marble from Crete' which occupied almost eight pages including Price's translation.[500] The edition was dedicated to Henry Howard, the Earl of Arundel's son and heir.

Other than publicizing the extent of the Howard family's patronage of the arts and the depth of English erudition, it is hard to say whether Price had any particular purpose in editing Apuleius. His commentaries on that author read like the rest of his work: an exhibition of copious grammatical, literary, and occasionally historical parallels without any guiding theme or themes. He more or less abandons the neo-Platonic interests of other Renaissance readers of Apuleius and emphasizes the author's encyclopaedic curiosity and learning, imitating and expanding it in his own notes. The other classical authors to whom he was particularly attracted – Aulus Gellius and Hesychius – provided him with very similar opportunities, and at times he was proud simply of the size of his commentary compared with earlier efforts.[501] Price's description of his own editorial process reinforces this impression: from his realization that Scipione Gentili's edition was imperfect,

> My little folder of observations grew. I don't pretend that they should be commended for their shrewdness, or for using lots of manuscripts (which are rare, as with all of Apuleius's works – in fact, more so with this one); but rather for the elegance of the various fragments of antiquarian material which I have taken from the famous treasury of the most excellent Earl of Arundel: a man who has conferred such benefits on Rome and ancient Greece as no amount of time will wipe out, or oblivion take hold of.[502]

---

[500] Price, ed. (1635), notes, pp. 59-66.

[501] He later described his notes on the *Apology* as 'vulgatis triplo auctius,' adding that what he had assembled concerning Aulus Gellius had grown 'ultra mensuram Commentarii': Price, ed. (1650), p. 706. Martin Mulsow has pointed out the appeal of both Apuleius and Aulus Gellius as 'two model authors for early modern polyhistors': see 'Christian Humanism in the Age of Critical Philology: Ralph Häfner's *Gods in Exile*,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70.4 (2009), p. 660.

[502] ibid., sig. P3[b]: 'Fasciculus iste Obseruationum creuit, quem commendatum non imus ab acumine, non à Manuscriptorum copiâ, (quae vt omnium Apuleij operûm, ita huius vel maximè Libri infrequentia sunt) sed ab elegantiâ quorundam fragmentorum antiquariae rei, depromptorum ex celebribus Thesauris excellentissimi Arundeliae Comitis, viri cuius erga Latium veterémque Graeciam talia beneficia extant, quae nulla delebit aetas, nulla vnquam obliuio capesset.'

This does not mean that Price was studying the inscriptions as inscriptions: they simply provided more evidence to be used for the usual grammatical commentary on a literary text (as in the case of Young's edition of Clement).[503] The availability of different forms of material evidence did not automatically alter the methods and goals of scholarship. The same can be said of Price's treatment of manuscripts: he did not even attempt to articulate a coherent view of the history of characteristics of the manuscripts he used.[504] They simply augmented the copious amount of conjectures and other observations on the text which he had already assembled from printed books.[505] Nor, as he implied, was he very concerned about the paucity of manuscripts at his disposal.

There is one final source of guidance for Price's approach to Apuleius, which also serves to contextualize the vision of classical and sacred literature set out in his biblical commentaries. After the dedicatory epistle he quoted Casaubon's opinion on the author, expressed in a letter to Scaliger:

> Why, unless we subscribe to the opinion of people who think that the whole range of Latinity is encompassed by six or seven authors, should we think this book unworthy of being read and studied? My own judgement is that hardly anything else written after the reign of the Antonines survives today which is more classical, more polished, and, finally, more Latinate.[506]

---

[503] See II.5, above.

[504] One manuscript came from the donation of William Laud to the Bodleian Library, and had previously been owned by Price himself (now MS Laud. Lat. 55). Patrick Young had managed to arrange for Price to borrow it back from the Bodleian, and also gave him access to Casaubon's annotated copy of the author: see the preface to the reader in Price, ed. (1650). See also L. C. Purser, 'Laud's Manuscript of Apuleius,' *Hermathena* 15 (1909), pp. 425-37. The exchange was reciprocal: Price lent Young a manuscript of the Greek military author Polyaenus. See Leiden University Library, MS VMI 8, fol. 9[a].

[505] He collated a copy of Colvius's 1588 edition of Apuleius with MS Laud Lat. 55: this is now Bodleian Library, Auct. S 4.27.

[506] Price, ed. (1635), sig. a4[a]: 'Nisi illorum opinioni accedimus, qui totius Latinitatis fines, sex septem Auctorum scriptis contineri putant, quid est cur hic liber lectione ac studio nostro indignus esse videatur? nam equidem sic censeo, post tempora Antoninorum, vix quidquam aliud extare hodiè magis πεπινωμένον, magis comptum, magis denique Latinum.'

Casaubon and Price had an ecumenical view of the canon of Latin literature, refusing to recognize a hierarchical distinction between classical purity and later antique depravity. When Price described Apuleius as a 'mirus Graecissator,' or as a 'Graecismis scatens scriptor,' he was praising his author.[507] These terms, moreover, came in the course of his commentaries on the New Testament. Both the individual commentaries published in the 1640s and the 1660 collection proclaimed on their title pages that the text had been annotated with reference to 'the Holy Fathers and the pagan Greek and Latin authors.' They brought Price's multifarious classical erudition into the field of biblical criticism.

ii. The turn to the New Testament

Why did Price move from working on classical authors to writing biblical commentaries? One of the main impulses is likey to have been the work of Hugo Grotius, who had started publishing his own annotations on the Bible in the early 1640s. They had immediately become very popular across Europe. Like Price, Grotius's training was in law and the more diffuse discipline of humanist philology, rather than in theology *per se*. He still felt that he had a lot to offer as a sacred philologist, however, and his commentaries were packed with classical learning, constantly drawing literary and historical analogies between Christian, pagan, and Jewish texts and practices. Price himself declared Grotius 'the best expositor [of the Bible].'[508] They had clearly become close friends, possibly as early as the

[507] Price, ed. (1660), cols. 323, 389.

[508] Price, ed. (1650), notes, p. 219.

1630s; and he related that Grotius and his friend Jérôme Bignon's approval of his work on the New Testament was spurring him on to produce more.[509]

Seeing a Catholic lay claim to the Grotian approach to biblical criticism may have confirmed the suspicions of the many Protestants who had already censured Grotius on theological grounds. There is little evidence, however, that it did. Such an association was not enough to confessionalize the field of biblical criticism on its own. It is true that Grotius's expositions were very controversial in some quarters, and he himself acknowledged that taking an ostentatiously philological approach to Scripture might displease theologians, especially in France.[510] Yet Price's work was embraced (and influenced) not only by Grotius but also by mainstream Protestants such as Sarrau, and even the Scottish-Genevan theologian Alexander More.[511] More was a close associate of

---

[509] Grotius died before he could read the only known letter by Price to him (I owe this point to Henk Nellen): that of 31 July, 1645, in Grotius, *Briefwisseling*, vol. XVI, pp. 698-9, which testifies to the close relationship they had formed. See also Price, ed. (1650), notes, p. 706: 'meminens ea parte tentata nobis nec olim magno *Grotio* improbata, nec nunc omnimodis displicere *Hieronymo Bignonio*.' Toomer (2009), p. 394, suggests that Price passed on information about the publication of Selden's *Mare Clausum* (1635) to Grotius, based on Grotius's letter of 23 November 1635, in *Briefwisseling*, vol. VI, p. 353. For a brief eulogy of Grotius by Price, see Price, ed. (1660), col. 105.

[510] See Grotius to G. J. Vossius, 1 August 1625, in *Briefwisseling*, vol. II, p. 468: 'Notae meae in tres Evangelistas confectae sunt.... Sed non est e re mea ut id opus prodeat, quamdiu in Galliis vivo. Nam quibus unicum studium est Theologia, nolunt eam a nobis attentari.' On the early reception of Grotius's commentaries within English theology, see Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 122-3, 145, 153-4, 209, 215-16; and Nicholas Tyacke, 'Arminianism and the Restoration Church,' in the author's *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700* (Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 330.

[511] See Sarrau to Ussher, 28 October 1647, in the former's *Epistolae* (Orange, 1654), p. 223: 'Virum amicissimum & eruditissimum Io. Pricaeum...saluta: & vrge suas chartulas componat, & sacra curare & illustrare non desinat.' See also the references to Sarravius in Price, ed., *Matthaeus* (1646), pp. 142-3, 242-15. Sarrau himself had prepared a commentary on the New Testament: see Salmasius to Sarrau, 4 May 1646, in Sarravius (1654), p. 203. Alexander More praised Price as 'optimo & eruditionis exactissimae Pricaeo' in his *Ad quaedam loca Novi Foederis notae* (London, 1661), p. 141, after Price lent him a manuscript of the Greek rhetorician Himerius. Price sent his work to other renowned Protestant scholars like Salmasius and Isaac Vossius: see Sarrau to Salmasius, 10 February 1646, in Sarravius, *Epistolae* (Utrecht, 1697), p. 162 (cf. p. 173). I have not located the letter to Salmasius from Price that Sarravius mentions, but he describes it as a token of 'sui erga te cultus & observantiae non vulgaris.'

Sarrau and Salmasius who had attacked Grotius for the anti-Calvinism of his annotations on the Bible.[512]

The relationship between Price and Grotius's biblical criticism, then, provides us with a new perspective on the interaction between theology and philology during the 1640s and beyond. The controversial impact of Grotius's commentaries largely depended on the extent to which they were understood as a historical reading of Scripture. In this respect, Sarah Mortimer has largely been right to point to Grotius's explicit disavowals of typological correspondences, along with other moments of historicism in his work.[513] Her argument follows that of Peter van Rooden, according to whom Grotius's 'ideal of a reunification of the competing confessions...reinforced the historicising tendency which typified humanist *annotationes* commentary...he hoped to make the abuse of texts for contemporary dogmatic polemics which kept the churches divided, impossible.'[514]

We may, however, ask to precisely what extent Grotius stripped the Old Testament of its prophetic or typological resonances. Was he as insistent as Selden that any method worthy of the term 'history' (a term Selden used more readily and programmatically than Grotius) necessarily excluded consideration of types, whichever books of the Old Testament were concerned? A glance at his commentaries on the gospels suggests that he was not. In fact,

---

[512] On More (and Salmasius), see David Masson, *The Life of John Milton* (London: Macmillan, 1859-94), vol. IV, pp. 459-63. For More's attack on Grotius, see his *Calvinus: Oratio in qua vir amplissimus H. Grotius refellitur* (Geneva, 1648; dedicated to Ussher), p. 7. For the feud which developed between Salmasius and Grotius towards the end of the latter's life, see Henk Nellen, 'A Flaming Row in the Republic of Letters: Claude Saumaise on Hugo Grotius's crusade for Church unity,' in de Landtsheer and Nellen, eds. (2010), pp. 491-512.

[513] Mortimer (2010), pp. 122, 153. See also Shuger (1994), pp. 83, 224.

[514] Peter van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), p. 143; and pp. 146-7 on anti-typological moments in Grotius's commentaries. See also Ernestine van der Wall, 'Between Grotius and Cocceius: the "Theologia Prophetica" of Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722),' in Henk Nellen and Edwin Rabbie, eds., *Hugo Grotius, Theologian: Essays in honour of G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), p. 199.

he was not appreciably more radical in his approach than two other major Protestant commentators, Daniel Heinsius and Louis Cappel.[515] It is worth comparing how the three treated a particular passage: Matthew 2:15, in which the words of God at Hosea 11:1, are said to have been fulfilled (πληρωθῇ). The verse of Hosea reads: 'when Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.' In considering this further, Calvin's commentary on Hosea provides a useful frame of reference.[516] Calvin distinguished between two types of correspondence. The one drawn by Matthew here, between the Jews' and Jesus's return from Egypt, was a matter of typology and divine providence. The temporal and physical liberation of the Jews was a type of the liberation provided by Christ to the Church and to the faithful. It was not a mere rhetorical comparison ('comparationem' or 'similitudinem') made by Matthew to prove a point, unlike his later comparison of the massacre of the innocents with Rachel's weeping for her children (Matthew 2:17-18 and Jeremiah 31:15). At times the gospels could be literary texts, drawing on the resources of intertextuality and allusion in a familiar way; at other times, however, they were sacred.

Calvin was clearly anxious about this distinction, otherwise he would not have gone out of his way to address it in a passage that had nothing to do with Matthew's use of Jeremiah. He was ultimately responding to the pagan Emperor Julian the Apostate's objection that Matthew had twisted the words of Hosea to refer to Christ.[517] A genuine typological correspondence could often be mistaken (maliciously or otherwise) for a literary one, and this risk of confusion also exercised Heinsius and Cappel. The former's *Exercitationes*, in

---

[515] See Heinsius's *Sacrarum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum libri XX* (Leiden, 1639; reprinted at Cambridge in 1640); and Cappel, *Critica Sacra* (Paris, 1650). For the latter, I have referred to the second edition printed in three volumes at Halle an der Saale (1775-86). For more information, see III.1, below.

[516] Calvin, *Praelectiones in duodecim Prophetas (quos vocant) minores* (Geneva, 1581), p. 125.

[517] As recorded in Jerome's commentary on Hosea: see *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. -P Migne, vol. XXV, cols. 0915a-c.

fact, agreed with Calvin, while acknowledging the persuasive force of the alternative reading.[518] Heinsius's analysis of this verse was couched in the terms of humanist literary critique: 'the Evangelist uses the passage of the Prophet with elegance and urbanity, saying that it can be correctly applied in this place.' He glossed the term πληρωθῇ not as 'fulfilled' in the sense of a prophecy, but as 'used' or 'applied' in the sense of a rhetorical trope, adding that the Fathers often use the word in that way; and even went so far as to use the term παρῳδία (probably in its broadest sense of an 'obscure hint,' rather than simply a 'parody' or 'burlesque').[519] In this respect Matthew's use of Hosea was just the same as his use of Jeremiah a few verses later, where what was at stake was not 'the promise of God, but the application of a passage' - a kind of allusion common to all literature.[520] Heinsius appeared set to collapse the very distinction Calvin so carefully upheld. In the end, however, he insisted on a direct typological correspondence between the return of 'Israel,' that is, the Jews, from Egypt, and the return of Jesus: even if Matthew had chosen the terms with which he expressed this correspondence ineptly, its typological status would still be beyond question.[521] Heinsius's emphasis on the opposition between *res*, 'things' or 'events,' and 'speech,' is crucial. No matter the rhetorical decisions made by Matthew as a human author, the typological correspondence between events under the Old and New Testaments was unassailable.

---

[518] See pp. 13-14 of the 1640 edition.

[519] Cf. the use of παρῳδοῖς at Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis* 1147.

[520] 'Non ergò de promissione Dei, sed de applicatione loci agitur. Quam qui mirè elegantem esse non intelligit, nihil in scriptis veterum profecit.'

[521] 'Hìc verò Israel Filius, filius Christus; eadem Aegyptus; res eadem, vocare ex Aegypto. Quae singula si non convenirent, tamen rectè diceretur, quod Evangelista dixit. Jam verò cui mediocriter horum perito novum videri posset, quod de typo dicitur, ad veritatem referri? cùm ipsius typi hic sit usus, ut veritate impleatur. Ut Oseas, cum de typo loquitur, qui est Israel, ad veritatem, hoc est, verum filium, respexerit. Quod Matthaeus sic aut docet, aut interpretatur.'

Cappel's treatment of the same correspondence was more or less the same.[522] He, too, dealt with the human role of Matthew in putting his own rhetorical spin on Hosea, although his treatment hinged on Matthew's decision to cite Hosea according to the Hebrew version of the Old Testament, rather than the Greek version he usually favoured, in order to bring out the correspondence with Christ more clearly (the Hebrew translates as 'son' in its singular form, whereas the Septuagint reads τὰ τέκνα, 'children'). His next comment emphasized, perhaps even more than Heinsius had, the slightly forced nature of Matthew's allusion: the Septuagint version seemed to reflect better than the Hebrew the 'initial and proper intention' ('prima et propria...mens') of Hosea himself, although he was also referring in a secondary sense ('secundario') to Christ. All the same, the Israelites remained a 'type and figure' ('typus atque figura') of Christ, whatever the text read. Cappel's language made clear that he, like Calvin, Heinsius and almost all his Protestant brethren, regarded types as a matter of 'things' rather than words ('typus et res typo significata').

Both Heinsius and Cappel, then, seem aware of a tension between the claims of rhetorical and typological analysis, a tension Calvin had sought strenuously to deny. Their comments gesture at a gap between the text of Scripture and the literary conventions it follows, and the historical events it describes. A fissure is beginning to appear in the previously unified 'single sense' of Scripture, so that it fragments into a 'grammatical' sense implied by its very words on the one hand, and a 'historical' sense on the other. Ultimately, however, this 'historical' sense still includes typology. These authors have not reached the same apex of disenchantment as Selden, where the historical sense of Scripture actively excludes it. If there is any anti-typological, secularizing drift at work here, moreover, it is not towards

[522] Cappel (1775-86), II.1.

'historical contextualization' of the Old Testament so much as the transformation of the Bible into a work of literature, and its authors into human rhetoricians.

What does Grotius have to say about Matthew's use of Hosea? Although he does comment specifically on this passage, its most significant appearance comes slightly earlier in his commentary on Matthew, in a long, general discussion of prophecy and typology, prompted by Matthew 1:22-23: 'Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet [Isaiah 7:14], saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel.'[523] For Grotius, such correspondences are adduced by the evangelists in order to demonstrate the providential role (οἰκονομία or 'dispensatio') of God in history. Nor were Isaiah's words merely prophetic: they were typical, because they described an actual event that prefigured another one, just as some of the ordinances of the Mosaic Law prefigured those of Christianity.[524] Throughout this section Grotius is as emphatic as Calvin, Heinsius, or Cappel that types are things: 'if things themselves refer to Christ, according to God's plan, clearly signs of things [i.e. words] set down by divine inspiration must also be traced back to the same divine plan.'[525] The second part of this formula, moreover, advocates a reading practice that actively looks for typological correspondences, starting with, but not reducible to, the very words of Scripture. In this respect, the heterodox, irenical, supposedly proto-Enlightened humanist Grotius concurs absolutely with the recalcitrant Presbyterian James Sempill.

---

[523] See Grotius, *Opera omnia theologica* (London, 1679), vol. II.1, pp. 11-14.

[524] ibid., p. 11, ll. 12-15: 'Non...instituta tantùm Legis, umbra [*sic*] Christi fuerunt...sed & res gestae praesertim nobiliores.' The typical 'virgin' was identified by Grotius (p. 13) as the wife of Isaiah who gave him a son (though not, of course, through a virgin birth).

[525] ibid., p. 11, ll. 49-51: 'Quod si res ipsae Divino consilio Christum spectant, sanè & signa rerum Divinitus instituta eódem referenda sunt.'

Grotius proceeded to discuss other examples of typological correspondences that had direct scriptural warrant (types alleged by the Fathers alone were another matter). These included Matthew's citation of Hosea, as well as the one Casaubon had endorsed between the paschal lamb and Christ.[526] When considering the former, he asserted the unity of historical fact and Scriptural text: 'the story of Christ itself alerts us to the fact that the Prophet's mind had been guided by God in such a way that what he said about the people of Israel would square just as well, or even better, with Christ.'[527] Grotius seems no more alive than Heinsius or Cappel to the risk of a discrepancy, produced by human volition, between the events narrated by Scripture and the very words of Scripture themselves. He does distinguish between a 'simple' and 'obvious' sense of passages like Isaiah 7:14 and another, 'mysterious' or 'hidden' one, referring to Christ; but the typological framework remains, and he does not circumscribe 'history' within one of these senses alone. He admits that Scripture is on some level a human construct: but it is not a human construct at all when God wishes to highlight a typological correspondence. Then, he inspires his prophet not only with his general intentions, but also the very words with which to express them.[528]

In the light of all this, it might be helpful to refute the quite different account of Grotius's exegesis offered by Sébastien Drouin, according to which Grotius relied on an 'érudition philologique et historique,' and wrote within 'la forme humaniste par excellence, celle des

---

[526] See 1 Corinthians 5:7, and II.2, above.

[527] Grotius (1679), vol. II.1, p. 12: 'Ipsa...historia Christi nos admonet ità directam à Deo mentem Prophetae loquentis, ut quod de populo Israëlitico ab ipso dicebatur, non minus recte aut etiam rectius in Christum conveniret.'

[528] ibid., p. 14: 'Passim dicitur Deus id dixisse quod dixerunt Prophetae, primùm quia ipsam verborum sententiam Deus menti illorum inseruit; *deinde quia & verba ita est moderatus ne à sententia aberrarent* [my emphasis]. Nam ut etiam verba à Deo illis dictata sint, sicuti interdum evenisse non est negandum, ita non videtur perpetuum. Atque hinc factum est ut pro temporum atque loquentium varietate etiam sermo Prophetarum differret.'

notes, celle des "annotations."' Grotius used his erudition to deny, or at least throw into doubt, 'le caractère divin des types.'[529] There are two key pieces of evidence for this argument. The first is that he appeared to historicize typological modes of reading by showing that the ancient Jews used them as well as Christians. In context, however, it is abundantly clear that Grotius is talking about the arbitrary, rhetorically motivated equation of one passage of Scripture or another, not, crucially, the equation of one thing or event with another. Typology consists in the latter, not the former. Thus, Grotius's observation that Jews and Christians have sought to demonstrate affinities between the words of one passage and another is no more harmful to typology than Cappel's observation that Matthew chose the Hebrew text of Hosea over the Septuagint. Nor does it make sense to describe this as a moment of 'historicism' in which Grotius pins the Bible down to its peculiar cultural context. His comment seems more akin to Heinsius's, that all kinds of authors, sacred and secular, like to construct allegories out of disparate things (Grotius also cites Plato in this connection); and the appeal to Jewish exegesis is an apologetic move, as his phrasing makes clear.[530]

Drouin's second piece of evidence is that Grotius tended to explain Old Testament prophecies in terms of their immediate earthly applications, rather than Christological ones that lay further afield. Again, this requires him to assume that Grotius read Isaiah 7:14 as a merely verbal prophecy of an event, not as a description of a typological correspondence, whereby the 'virgin' wife of Isaiah prefigured Mary; and yet this prefiguring, in which the

---

[529] Sébastien Drouin, *Théologie ou libertinage? L'exégèse allégorique à l'âge des Lumières* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2010), pp. 101-4. Drouin's discussion of Grotius is cited approvingly by Levitin (2012), pp. 9 and 15. Aspects of this account have long been scholarly nostrums: see Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle,' in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1987), p. 222.

[530] ibid., p. 12: 'Quae ratio Scripturas interpretandi, praesertim incolumi manente sensu altero simpliciori minusque elaborato, nullo jure à Iudaeis improbari potest.'

type is a pale imitation of the antitype that fulfils it, is precisely what Grotius alleges.[531] Yet again, the supposedly 'historicizing' move, of uncovering an immediate contemporary significance for the prophet's words, does not trump – indeed, it reinforces – a typological correspondence.

Drouin also notes, more felicitously, that Grotius sought to diminish the utility of types within theological argument, and that this element of his commentaries was controversial in some quarters. Grotius did, it is true, claim that the authors of the New Testament emphasized typological connections simply to illustrate and confirm something true Christians already believed – in this case, the divinity of Christ, which was adequately proven by the Resurrection and by the miracles he had performed.[532] This does not, however, mean that types were useless in other kinds of argument, as I have demonstrated above. First of all, they did constitute proof of divine providence (οἰκονομία, as Grotius put it). Secondly, Grotius's allowance that parts of the Mosaic Law were types opened the door to formulating specific prescriptions for Christians on the grounds that those types had been abrogated: for instance (rather uncontroversially), the Passover could no longer be celebrated, as it had been abrogated by Christ. Finally, the affinity of the words of certain passages of the prophets with the types which they indicated demonstrated that Scripture was divinely inspired, sometimes even down to the very choice of words as well as its general meaning.

---

[531] ibid., p. 13: 'Illud autem *Virgo concipiet* quanto excellentiorem habet sensum, si referatur ad eam quae ita concepit ut virgo post conceptum maneret, quod soli Mariae evenit?'

[532] ibid., p. 11: 'Sed notandum est non pugnare Apostolos adversùs Iudaeos his quasi testimoniis ut probent Iesum esse promissum Messiam: pauca enim sunt oracula quae in hunc finem usurpant, contenti caeterùm Christi miraculis & resurrectione.'

As I have shown at several points in this study, the pervasiveness of typology throws the traditional association between late Renaissance critical philology and historicism into disarray. It also problematizes the boundaries between theological and humanistic forms of scholarship, and forces us to confront the unevenness of Joseph Scaliger's legacy in seventeenth-century humanism. Furthermore, many others learned lessons from Grotius that had little to do with history, or with the heterodox theological conclusions which Grotius's historicism underwrote. Thomas Gataker was a Calvinist divine at the centre of theological debates in the Westminster Assembly who nonetheless happily described the annotations as 'stuffed full with all manner of erudition.'[533] Indeed, the objections to Grotius's work cited by van Rooden do not seem entirely to justify the notion that 'historicism' was what made it truly contentious. It may, instead, have been a matter of competition between the discipline of theology and the looser field of philology, and the perceived risk that humanists were hindering the resolution of important theological questions by piling up learned but ultimately fruitless observations, in a quest to be seen as the rightful heir to the great classicists of the sixteenth century. This is one of the features of Grotius's exegesis that displeased Richard Simon at the end of the seventeenth century.[534]

Similarly, what Price took from Grotius was a grammatical and classicizing view of Scripture which we can ultimately describe as literary-critical (even if he did not). Typology is notably absent from his commentaries: unsurprisingly, given his Catholicism. Unlike most Protestants, Catholics did not put undue stress on the absolute unity of the grammatical, historical, and typological significances of Scripture. In this respect, the

---

[533] Gataker, *Cinnus, sive Adversaria Miscellanea* (London, 1651), p. 377.

[534] See Jacques le Brun, *La Jouissance et le Trouble: Recherches sur la littérature chrétienne de l'âge classique* (Geneva: Droz, 2004), p. 195.

relative modernity of their approach may deserve more recognition than it has received. Those scholars, such as Laplanche, who have insisted on the modernizing, historicizing force of Protestant literalism, have failed to recognize that the Catholic preference for separating the grammatical from the allegorical, tropological, and anagogical senses allowed that first sense to be investigated with considerable freedom. This is exactly how Price operates in his commentaries: as a grammarian and philologist in a purer sense, unconstrained by concerns with dogma or revelation. The French, and especially Parisian, Catholic context may prove significant in accounting for the genesis of Price's approach. Scholars like the Hebraist Siméon de Muis, who wrote single-mindedly grammatical commentaries on the Psalms, deserve more attention than this thesis or earlier studies have been able to give them.[535]

Price's desire to situate the Bible, as Grotius often had, in relation to an enduring and ahistorical canon of Greco-Roman literature caused him to ignore any destructively historical aspects of Grotius's method. For instance, where Grotius often referred to the notion of a 'Hellenistic' Greek that was in use during the first century and had imported meanings from Hebrew under the cover of Greek terms, Price tended to disagree with him and sought to find a purer, more classical precedent for the Greek of the New Testament.[536] These precedents could just as easily come from authors who postdated or predated the New Testament by several centuries.[537] An historical argument about the nature of Second Temple Judaism, early Christianity, and their common language metamorphosed into a literary one about the classicism and stylistic qualities of Scripture.

---

[535] For now, see Laplanche (1986), pp. 191 and 301, and III.1, below.

[536] See, for instance, Price, ed. (1660), cols. 26 (on Matthew 5:13), 446 (Luke 21:6), 489 (Luke 24:38). On the debate over Hellenistic Greek, see III.1, below.

[537] Including, in one of the most extreme cases, Petrarch (in Italian): col. 400 (on Luke 16:26).

Price reminds us that Grotius's commentaries only had a historicizing force under certain conditions; nor is it even clear that Grotius himself intended them, as a whole, to be thoroughly and uncompromisingly historical. Both Price and Grotius perceived a strong affinity with Heinsius, who took a much more literary approach than many scholars to the Greek of the Septuagint and New Testament.[538] For all Grotius's popularity, it was Heinsius whose eagerly awaited *Exercitationes* were reprinted in Cambridge only a year after their initial publication, at the behest of English readers.[539] Grotius himself may have seen his work as an emulation of Heinsius's.[540] Price, moreover, engaged with Heinsius's glosses almost as frequently as he did those of Grotius.[541]

If we are to understand the functions and cultural significance of New Testament exegesis during this period, we must first appreciate the place of Heinsius at its heart, and the closeness of his approach to that of Grotius. Simon Episcopius was quite rare in separating the two: he complained that Heinsius's *Exercitationes* offered almost nothing 'useful or

---

[538] As noted by J. C. Lebram, 'Ein Streit um die Hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta,' in Scheurleer and Meyjes, eds. (1975), pp. 37-8.

[539] See de Jonge (1975), pp. 93-6; and the fragment of a letter effusively praising the work from Selden to Heinsius, 27 May, 1640, printed in the anonymous (but almost certainly Heinsian) *Pro Daniele Heinsio adversus Ioannis Croii calumnias apologia necessaria* (Leiden, 1646), pp. 247-8. This letter is supposed 'now unfortunately lost' by Paul Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden University Press, 1968), p. 106, and is not mentioned in Toomer (2009), or idem, 'John Selden, the Levant and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship,' in Alastair Hamilton, ed., *The Republic of Letters and the Levant* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 59-60. It was not available to D. J. H. ter Horst, who writes, in *Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655)* (Utrecht: Hoeijenbos en co, 1934), p. 130, n. 50: 'Ik heb het zeer zeldzame boekje niet gezien' (I owe this reference to G. J. Toomer). No manuscript of Selden's letter appears to have survived. J. F. Gronovius reported Selden's eager expectation of Heinsius's work to Nicolaus Heinsius on 15 August, 1639: see Paul Dibon and Françoise Waquet, eds., *Johannes Fredericus Gronovius: pèlerin de la République des lettres* (Geneva: Droz, 1984), p. 72: 'Seldenum nunquam vidi, quin id primum rogitaret.' For Thomas Gataker's use of Heinsius (1640), see Gataker (1651), p. 113; and for John Bois's, see Bodleian Library, D 1.14 Th.Seld., p. 575. Conversely, Grotius was better received in Paris. See Marin Mersenne to André Rivet, 1 November, 1641, in Mersenne's *Correspondance*, ed. Paul Tannery, Cornélis de Waard, and Armand Beaulieu, 17 vols. (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1945-88), vol. X, p. 772: 'L'on trouve ici que M^{r}. Grotius fait mieux sur les Evangiles que M^{r}. Heinsius; *quid tibi videtur*?'

[540] Gronovius claimed to Joachim Hübner on 12 October 1639 that as soon as Grotius saw Heinsius's *Exercitationes* he decided that he would publish his own annotations 'in his footsteps' ('e vestigio'). See Dibon and Waquet, eds. (1984), p. 87.

[541] See e.g. Price, ed. (1660), cols. 115, 446.

edifying for Christendom...they seemed so frivolous, watered-down and devoid of anything useful or necessary for faith or morals.' In this respect, they differed from Grotius's commentaries, a 'treasure-house replete with all manner of erudition, and, at the same time, piety,' as much as the earth from the heavens.[542] Whether the target was Grotius, Heinsius, or Louis Cappel, the Remonstrant Episcopius agreed with the Calvinist, Buxtorf, in at least one respect: philological curiosity and the desire for literary fame were at odds with true piety.[543] Their objections centred as much on this as they did on any perceived 'historicism' in any humanist's work. The genre of the biblical commentary, especially on the New Testament, was no longer anchored in the discipline of academic theology (despite its consistent appeals to typology): it was turning into a thoroughly humanistic cultural product written for a broad literary audience and designed to place its authors alongside Scaliger in the pantheon of great classicists-turned-biblical scholars.

We can draw a more general conclusion from Price's work on the Bible: to label scholars like Price, Selden, and Patrick Young as 'ecclesiastical' in their preoccupations – on the grounds that they happened to work largely on Christian texts – is to conflate them with scholars whose goals and methods genuinely were religious, on a much more fundamental level. The latter category might include figures like Thomas James, or, in a very different way and only from certain points of view (that of Christian apologetics, for example, or the quest for the reunion of Christendom), Hugo Grotius. It is also to conflate quite different forms of humanistic scholarship. A biblical commentary is not the same thing as an edition

---

[542] Episcopius to Grotius, 25 November, 1641, in Grotius, *Briefwisseling* (1928-2001), vol. XII, p. 642. Discussed by van Rooden (1989), p. 142.

[543] See the letter by Johannes Buxtorf jr. to Rivet discussing the work of Louis Cappel, 1 September 1644, in Leiden University Library, MS BPL 285: 'Tuae autem, Vir Venerande, subscribo sententiae, Liberiorem Criticen in sacris esse suspectam et periculosam. Nihil istiusmodi homines mihi videntur quaerere, quam acuminis alicujus singularis gloriam, nihil facere, quam contentiones favere.' I quote the text offered by van Rooden (1989), p. 148, which I have corrected in several places against the original. I would like to thank Theodor Dunkelgrün for checking the manuscript on my behalf. For more on Cappel and the affinities of his work with New Testament criticism, see III.1, below.

(something that Young, as we shall see, failed to appreciate). The commentary form did not put nearly the same pressure on questions of textual transmission or ecclesiastical authority: it allowed critics to add philological ornamentation to theological frameworks, and pushed them in the direction of literary and rhetorical, as much as historical, issues. Consideration of rhetorical motivation, of course, does not exclude a certain historicizing of a text as a product of a temporally situated author; but such historicism differs significantly from the so-called 'antiquarianization of biblical scholarship' to which recent scholars have often adverted. It does not rely on new manuscripts, inscriptions, or other material factors; nor does it rely on careful accumulation and weighing of historical facts and testimonies. It is relatively speculative, but its practitioners were no less part of the critical mainstream for indulging in it.

Cleaving to these distinctions also allows us to discard the notion that the British were divided from the rest of the world in their scholarly concerns. The overall orientation of classical learning, grammar, and rhetoric towards explication of sacred and ecclesiastical texts was no less a feature of Heinsius, Salmasius, and Grotius's work than it was of Price's, Selden's or Young's. It did not automatically entail a confessionalization of learning, a directing of erudition towards polemical ends. Nor did it automatically entail the desacralization of the Bible, although it may have ended up doing so in the hands of figures like Spinoza. What posed more of a threat for the time being, however, was the increasingly fraught relationship between ecclesiastical authority and textual criticism in a purer sense, orientated towards editing rather than exegesis. The next two chapters address that relationship, by examining the study of the Septuagint and the early Church Fathers from the 1640s onwards.

PART THREE: RADICALIZATION, INSTITUTIONALIZATION, AND COLLAPSE

III.1: The Septuagint

i. Jean Morin, Louis Cappel, and the Ussher Circle

Every student of the Greek Fathers and Christian antiquity was confronted, eventually, with the question of the historical status and canonical value of the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Was it superior or subordinate to the Hebrew text as the latter was now received in Christendom? Where did it stand in relation to the Vulgate? The range of possible responses to these questions at this moment in the history of European biblical criticism is best illustrated by the case of Jean Morin. Morin was born a Huguenot, and studied at Leiden before converting to Catholicism, entering the circle of Cardinal du Perron and eventually becoming a member of the Congregation of the Oratory of Jesus and Mary Immaculate. Peter Miller and Scott Mandelbrote have covered Morin's work on the text of the Old Testament, an edition of which he published in 1628 (with a text of the New Testament appended).[544] In his prologue to the 1628 edition, and in his later works, Morin argued forcefully for the primacy of the Greek version of the Old Testament against Protestant champions of the Hebrew original, adding that the Septuagint largely agreed with the Vulgate version favoured by his own Church. He argued that the earliest surviving physical manuscripts in Hebrew were much newer than those of the Septuagint, and that they reflected centuries of dubious efforts at 'preservation' and textual criticism on the part of the Masoretes. Morin's preface provided a complex and largely critical history of these efforts.

---

[544] Jean Morin, ed., *Vetus Testamentum* (Paris, 1628). See Peter Miller, 'Making the Paris Polyglot Bible: humanism and Orientalism in the early seventeenth century,' in Herbert Jaumann, ed., *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik Im Zeitalter Des Konfessionalismus* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), pp. 59-85; and Mandelbrote (2006), pp. 74-85. There is a biography by Richard Simon in Simon, ed. (1682); and a briefer but more balanced account by Paul Auvray, 'Jean Morin (1591-1659),' *Revue Biblique* 66 (1959), pp. 397-414. See also Pierre Gibert, 'The Catholic counterpart to the Protestant orthodoxy,' in Magne Sæbø, ed., *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: the history of its interpretation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), vol. II, pp. 767-73.

The Samaritan Pentateuch also underpinned Morin's argument, because it agreed more with the Greek than with the Hebrew texts, and helped to decide the vexed question of the chronological discrepancy between the two in favour of the Septuagint.[545] Morin had followed (without acknowledgement) Scaliger and other earlier scholars in arguing for the great antiquity of the Samaritan script, which more closely resembled Hebrew as it was originally written than the corrupt, 'modern' form of Hebrew preserved in the extant manuscripts.[546] Morin added that he had been relatively sympathetic towards the Hebrew version; some of the Fathers more commonly accused the Jews of having corrupted the texts in their custody for anti-Christian ends.[547]

Morin's strident valorisation of the Septuagint opposed an earlier consensus in the European republic of letters. Scaliger and Casaubon had both been distinctly more sceptical about its worth.[548] So had Roman Catholics; as Miller points out, it was a struggle for Cardinal Carafa even to print the 1587 edition at Rome, and some of his contemporaries questioned its value. Latino Latini, who ended up supervising that edition, had already expressed his and Cardinal Sirleto's doubts that the manuscript on which it was based reflected the original Septuagint, or indeed that any editorial work could

---

[545] Morin, ed. (1628), sigs. *5^{b}-6^{a}, **2^{a}.

[546] On Scaliger's work in this field, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 629, 733-7.

[547] Morin, ed. (1628), sig. **2^{a}.

[548] In the margins of his copy of M. Guilandinus, *Papyrus* (Venice, 1572; now Cambridge University Library Adv.c.19.1), Scaliger wrote 'Profecto nullus afflatus divinus fuit illis, qui tam inepte sacra Biblia traduxerunt.' See Grafton (1983-93), vol. II, pp. 416-17. For Casaubon's criticism of Catholics who preferred the Septuagint over the Hebrew Old Testament, see Bodleian Library, MS Casaubon 30, fol. 79^{a}; see also the appendix to Grafton and Weinberg (2010), on 'Casaubon and the Masoretic text.'

reconstruct it.[549] The religio-political explanation for Morin's arguments is straightforward enough. He was confuting Protestant 'literalists,' as Miller puts it, who had mobilised in favour of the Hebrew Old Testament. Many of those literalists, some of them British, returned fire.[550]

Morin also incurred the suspicion of Catholics, as Miller has shown. One of his fiercest critics was the Professor of Hebrew at the Sorbonne, one Siméon de Muis, whose own work was heavily invested in the Hebrew text and its utility for scholars of the Vulgate, as well as those rabbinical authors like David Kimchi and Abraham ibn Ezra who had dealt thoroughly in grammatical exegesis of the Bible.[551] On the other hand, his work implicitly questioned the accuracy of the modern Vulgate, as his Protestant opponents eagerly pointed out.[552] Text-critical details and manuscript evidence aside, the history he constructed of the ecclesiastical reception of the Septuagint seemed to relativize the position of the Vulgate. The Latin translators before Jerome had used the Greek text with absolute approval, and even Jerome himself had preferred it to the Hebrew when translating parts of the Old Testament – not to mention seeming to regard both versions as 'canonical and prophetic [i.e. inspired].'[553]

---

[549] As early as 4 February, 1561, Latini had reported to Andreas Masius from Rome that 'Sirletus...Vaticano Codici [from which the 1587 LXX was eventually printed] minimum tribuit...ille tamen ab haereticis non vno loco corruptum, non modò clamitat; sed facilè etiam grauissimis auctoribus nisus probat.' See Latini (1659-67), pp. 84-5. See also his letter to Masius of 7 May, 1569, p. 134: 'Septuaginta interpretum auctoritatem sacrosanctam suspicio vbique et veneror; doleoque integra eorum scripta non esse.' Masius himself was even more critical: see the preface to his polyglot edition of Joshua (Antwerp, 1574).

[550] See the polemical response by associates of Ussher: Francis Taylor and Arnold Boate, *Examen Praefationis Morini*, (Leiden, 1636); and Laplanche (1986), p. 300.

[551] See de Muis's *Assertio veritatis Hebraicae adversus Exercitationes ecclesiasticas Morini* (Paris, 1631). A second edition followed in 1634. See also Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes, Ezra and the Bible: the history of a subversive idea,' in Malcolm (2002), pp. 418-19.

[552] See Cappel (1775-86), IV.18; and Brian Walton, *Dissertatio de linguis Orientalibus* (Deventer, 1658), p. 131.

[553] Morin, ed. (1628), sigs. *4[b] and **2[a].

It would be wrong, however, to over-emphasize Catholic hostility to Morin. To paint him as an earnest Gallican even in his biblical criticism would be to miss his closeness to the Barberini circle in Rome: not only Cardinal Francesco Barberini (brother of Maffeo, who eventually became Pope Urban VIII), but also his librarian, Lucas Holstenius, who together did so much to orchestrate counter-Reformation scholarship in this period.[554] It might also encourage us to understate the significance of two works that genuinely did worry Holstenius and Barberini, among others: the *Critica Sacra* of Louis Cappel, and Patrick Young's projected edition of the Septuagint.

Cappel taught Hebrew and, eventually, theology at the Protestant academy of Saumur, having studied at Oxford and Leiden in his twenties.[555] His early publications demonstrate his interest in biblical humanism, including an edition of a work by John Cameron of which his own editorial interventions practically made him a co-author.[556] His most important work before the *Critica Sacra*, however, was initially anonymous, although Cappel soon admitted his authorship: the *Arcanum punctationis revelatum*, published in Leiden in 1624 with the help of the orientalist Thomas Erpenius. It intervened in a long-standing debate over the age of the marks used to indicate vowels, and therefore specify the meaning with greater precision, in Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible.[557] Some thought they were as old as Moses himself; others, only as old as the scribe, Ezra; others, that they

---

[554] In general, see Rietbergen (2006), and Herklotz (2008). For some of the correspondence between Morin, Holstenius and Barberini, see Simon, ed. (1682).

[555] Laplanche (1986) offers a good account of his life and works.

[556] John Cameron, *Myrothecium Evangelicum* (Geneva, 1632), published with a *Spicilegium* by Cappel himself – a sample of a longer set of annotations on the Bible. For Cappel's role in editing Cameron's work, see the preface to the *Myrothecium*, and the discussion in Laplanche (1986), p. 195; and Axel Hilmar Swinne, *John Cameron, Philosoph und Theologe (1579-1625)* (Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg, 1972), pp. 63-4.

[557] I have relied on the excellent account of Richard Muller, 'The debate over the vowel points and the crisis in orthodox hermeneutics,' in *After Calvin: studies in the development of a theological tradition* (Oxford University Press, 2003).

were not even used in their present-day form in the time of Jerome. Catholics tended to adhere to a later date in order to discredit the Hebrew text of the Old Testament favoured by Protestants. Cappel's work was unusual for making a similar argument from within Protestantism: the modern apparatus of vowel points was a product of human editorial decisions rather than divine inspiration, and this left it open to criticism. Such an argument provided Catholic critics like Morin with considerable ammunition for their general attack on late antique and medieval Jewish scribal and editorial practices.

This helps to explain why Protestants tended to respond to both Morin and Cappel in much the same way. Cappel himself thought he was refuting the Catholic attack on the Hebrew text by showing that the interpretation or 'reading' of the text expressed by the modern system of pointing was ancient and possibly divine in its origins, even if the marks used for the points were not.[558] Nevertheless, most of his Protestant opponents read the *Arcanum* the way they read Morin's work, as a flat dismissal of the divinely sanctioned status of the modern Hebrew text. Their task was to use rabbinical and patristic sources to construct an alternative history of the Jewish transmission of the Hebrew Bible, protecting the Hebrew text against corrections drawn from its Latin, Greek, and Samaritan counterparts; and, in many cases, to use the same sources to discredit these rival versions, showing that their own histories were murkier and less respectable than their supporters claimed.

These historical arguments were concerned with questions of testimony and authority: what had been said about the various versions of the text; who had said it; how reliable they were as a witness; and how much weight the present-day Church should attach to their statements. This can be seen quite clearly in one of the responses to Morin offered by

[558] ibid., pp. 150-51.

Arnold Boate and Francis Tayler, both of whom were close to Ussher.[559] The main body of the treatise began by quoting Augustine: 'More trust should be placed in the tongue out of which translators have translated.'[560] More authoritative even than Augustine, however, were the authors of the New Testament, whom Morin had claimed as followers of the Septuagint. Since they were unable to perform the impossible task of showing that they had scrupulously followed the Hebrew text in every citation of the Old Testament, Boate and Tayler instead elected to show that they had not sanctioned either version as the official one: they had cared more for the general sense of the Old Testament passage they were using, not its precise words.

Boate and Tayler's work was not taken very seriously.[561] Much more formidable was the opposition of James Ussher, who refused to accept two of Morin's main contentions: first of all, that a divinely inspired, complete Greek translation of the entire Old Testament had ever been made in the manner described by the *Letter of Aristeas* and other sources; and secondly, that Codex Vaticanus closely reflected the superior recension of this version of the Old Testament made by Origen.[562] At the same time, he wanted to uphold the value of the Hebrew text. Unfortunately for the Hebraists' cause, however, Ussher himself did not

---

[559] Boate and Tayler, *Examen praefationis Morini in Biblia Graeca* (Leiden, 1636). For more information on Boate, see his *ODNB* entry; and on Tayler, see Toomer (2009), pp. 588-9.

[560] *De Civitate Dei* XV.13: 'Ei linguae potius credatur, unde est in aliam per interpretes facta translatio.'

[561] See, for instance, Marin Mersenne to André Rivet, 25 November, 1637, in Mersenne (1945-88), vol. VI, p. 333.

[562] Ussher's general view on the second point is expressed most succinctly in his letter to Patrick Young of 27 August, 1639, in Kemke, ed. (1898), p. 148. Otherwise, see his *De Graecâ Septuaginta interpretum versione syntagma* (London, 1655); Parr's *Life*, in Parr (1686), p. 95. Unfortunately, Ussher's Old Testament criticism has been largely overlooked (except where it bears on chronology). Alan Ford's *ODNB* entry and monograph, *James Ussher: theology, history, and politics in early-modern Ireland and England* (Oxford University Press, 2007) have nothing to say about it; and the former actually hinders the curious reader from investigating the topic by identifying Louis Cappel with nothing other than the misnomer 'Capellanus' and omitting to mention any of the relevant primary works.

really enter the fray until he responded to Cappel in 1652.[563] His earlier labours had been devoted to Ignatius and the defence of the historical basis of episcopacy.[564]

By the time Ussher did address these developments in Old Testament criticism, Cappel had published his *Critica Sacra*.[565] In one sense, this work simply built on his earlier research into the vowel points. It attempted to show that ancient translations were sometimes more reliable witnesses to the earliest Hebrew text than modern Hebrew manuscripts. This argument was actually accepted by his Protestant opponents, with some qualification: they were not prepared to concede that the Septuagint could offer such help to textual critics, even if the Aramaic paraphrases and other versions could. In another sense, though, the *Critica Sacra* was much more radical than anything Cappel had previously published. It put forward an argument for the strategic disregard of the manuscript transmission and history of Scripture in favour of a freer mode of critical conjecture.

Throughout, Cappel distinguished between the study and collation of manuscripts, and genuine criticism. The collection of readings from manuscripts was not part of criticism: if anything, it was the opposite of it.[566] He attacked editors who placed excessive faith in

---

[563] See his *De textus Hebraici Veteris Testamenti variantibus lectionibus ad Ludovicum Cappellum epistola* (London, 1652).

[564] See CHIII.2, below.

[565] Paris, 1650. In the following, I have quoted from the edition printed in three volumes at Halle an der Saale (1775-86), which gathers together most of the relevant publications from the *Critica Sacra* onwards. For the *Critica Sacra* itself, I have cited the book and chapter, rather than page, numbers so that either edition can be consulted. The other publications gathered in vol. III of this edition are Cappel's *Defensio Criticae* (which was originally printed alongside the *Critica Sacra*), pp. 263-448, hereafter cited as the *Defensio Criticae*; his *Epistola apologetica* to Ussher, refuting Boate (Saumur, 1651), pp. 450-634, hereafter cited from this edition, as 'Cappel's letter to Ussher'; and Ussher (1652), pp. 653-658, for which I have cited Parr (1686). Jean Morin's letter to Cardinal Francesco Barberini of 1 December, 1653, is also printed here, and discussed below, but I have preferred to cite it from Simon, ed. (1682). Another relevant attack on Cappel is not printed here: Boate's *De textus Hebraici Veteris Testamenti certitudine et authentia, contra Ludovici Capelli Criticam, epistola* (Paris, 1650).

[566] See e.g. III.15 (Cappel's discussion of the textual criticism of the Masoretes, which did not, in his view, take its conjectures from manuscripts alone): 'nihil opus fuit codicum collatione, sed Critico tantum iudicio.' Cf. Cappel's letter to Ussher, p. 69. One of Cappel's eighteenth-century editors, Georg Vogel, noted his lack of interest in manuscripts: see his preface, vol. I, vi-vii.

particular, well-known manuscripts, such as Codex Vaticanus.[567] He himself was never an enthusiastic hunter after manuscripts or the readings in them. He seems to have considered them as sources for alternative readings, rather than individual texts with unique characteristics and histories: as he observed to William Eyre, even the worst manuscript might furnish at least one usable reading.[568]

He also showed little concern for what he described as 'external' arguments based on historical evidence about particular versions, such as statements by the Fathers or the ancient Jews.[569] He did not, for instance, care when the Septuagint was written, by whom, or in how many separate stages: it was enough if he and his interlocutors could agree that all or most of it was written a few centuries before Christ; and that it was held in quite high regard at least by those Jews who could read Greek, and was even read in their synagogues.[570] The same was true of the Vulgate. Buxtorf wondered why he attributed so much 'authority' ('auctoritas') to it when the identity of its author was completely obscure: what mattered was simply that it was twelve or more centuries old, and nothing else.[571] The other judgements to be made about it concerned its internal characteristics only.

When he did advance a tentative history of the transmission of the Old Testament, its naïve providentialism was even more striking than its lack of sources: after the end of the Babylonian captivity, and starting with the Septuagint, the Jews began to show more and more concern for the state of their sacred text than they had before. This increased the

---

[567] IV.1, IV.18.

[568] See his undated reply to Eyre's letter of 19 November, 1635, printed in the *Defensio Criticae*, pp. 412-13.

[569] See IV.16.

[570] IV.1; cf. Cappel's letter to Ussher, p. 47.

[571] *Defensio Criticae*, pp. 297-8.

nearer they came to the arrival of Christ. In the Christian era, the light of revelation shone on editors of the text: Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, the Aramaic paraphrasts, Origen and Jerome all had a clearer understanding of the Hebrew Bible than its first Greek translators.[572] On the external, historical level, then, Cappel's account seemed flimsy and jejune compared with the meticulous and sometimes destructive engagement with the various witnesses offered by James Ussher.[573]

This was not so much because he was incapable of such a project as because he wanted to bypass it, along with the associated questions of ecclesiastical authority and tradition. He wanted to open up the entire enterprise of biblical criticism, starting from a simple axiom, which he referred to as a 'canon': 'whichever reading gives rise to the more fitting and truer sense should be judged as the best one...whichever is more appropriate, apt, suitable, and fitting.'[574] The criteria used to make these judgements were supposedly more reliable and led to more solid conclusions than external testimonies. They were those of the humanist literary critic who sought to restore the original perspicuity and splendour of a text: Cappel looked for that reading which 'coheres better with what precedes and follows it, is closer and more aligned with the intentions and overall purpose of the writer, and

---

[572] See Cappel's preface to the reader: 'A tempore enim LXX. Interpretum Iudaei maiore multo cum studio Legis et totius Scripturae cognitioni et examini incubuerunt, quam antea factum fuerat a Maioribus ipsorum, post solutam Babylonicam captiuitatem. Adde quod, quo tempora fuerunt natiuitati Messiae propiora, eo maior lux Iudaeis affulgebat, maiorque fuit inter eos sacrarum litterarum et diuinarum rerum vti studium, sic et cognitio atque intelligentia.... S. Hieronymus his omnibus longe fuit posterior, floruitque tempore apertissimae reuelationis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et in clarissima Euangelii luce vixit; istorumque omnium praecedentium opera et laboribus (in Origenis Hexaplis et Octaplis) subuectus fuit.'

[573] Not to mention figures like Isaac Vossius and Humphrey Hody: see Mandelbrote (2012).

[574] III.16: 'vtra lectio commodiorem et veriorem sensum pariat, eaque optima censenda est...vtraque magis sit analoga, apta, conueniens, et congrua.' For the use of 'canon,' see IV.16.

matches and harmonizes better when compared with the text as a whole – and ultimately, it does not matter which manuscript that reading features in.'[575]

This 'canon' was at the heart of Cappel's proposed method. Ussher's main objection was that Cappel had made it a fundamental axiom when it should have operated as a last resort, once all the arguments from external testimony and the extant manuscripts had been exhausted (arguments which, in Ussher's view, invalidated the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch as sources of readings, and elevated the authority of the Hebrew manuscripts and their Jewish editors). Once one proceeded to an internal examination of the variants, mistranslation and scribal error first had to be ruled out. Cappel thought he could tell the difference between a variation arising from a discrepancy between different Hebrew texts and a variation arising from mistranslation or scribal corruption, but this was difficult to do with any certainty, as his opponents pointed out.[576]

The textual criticism advocated by Cappel, then, differed profoundly from Ussher's model. To Ussher, the value of the Septuagint could not be assessed without first establishing whether it had indeed been translated around three hundred years before Christ by Jewish elders from Jerusalem, as the *Letter of Aristeas* and other sources claimed, and then establishing whether that translation could be reconstructed using any of the surviving Greek manuscripts (and hexaplaric fragments preserved in the Fathers). To Cappel, these questions were more or less irrelevant. He had abrogated all of them by deciding that any

---

[575] IV.16: 'alia via ineunda est, qua quaestio ista certius definiatur: quaerenda nempe sunt argumenta non extrinsecus assumta, sed intrinseca & insita.... Ea nempe lectio indubitato melior est, atque praeferenda, quae sensum parit in se...consequentibus & antecedentibus magis cohaerentem, menti & scopo scriptoris propiorem atque congruentiorem, ac totius scripturae analogiae magis conformem, concordemque, in quocunque tandem Codice illa lectio occurrat.'

[576] Ussher's letter to Cappel, in Parr (1686), pp. 569-70. See also the words of Jean de Croi, quoted by Boate in his letter to Ussher, 6 September, 1651, ibid., p. 565: 'Interpretum Graecorum & Latinorum παρορά̀ματα, hallucinationes, inscitiam, & errores nobis pro totidem variis lectionibus [Cappel] obtrudit.'

manuscript whatsoever could furnish readings, and that those readings were to be selected according to whether they yielded a better text of the Old Testament. Ussher's objections to Cappel seem quite reasonable. He was far from a reactionary: in fact, he was quite optimistic that the editors of the Hebrew text had done a good job of preserving the original readings, and that modern editors could improve on their efforts and rescue what had originally been written, without ever resorting to a form of speculation unanchored in historical evidence. Morin might have agreed with him on these points, although he would have used different versions as the basis for such a reconstruction. How, then, did Cappel seek to justify the intrusion of this 'canon' into the field of Old Testament criticism when so many of its practitioners thought it unnecessary?

First of all, it is debatable whether he really was entering into the same 'field' as Morin and his opponents. Morin was an editor who sought to improve the Roman Septuagint of 1587, as well as the Vulgate, and later contributed to the Paris Polyglot Bible. Johannes Buxtorf the elder had also been an editor – of the Hebrew text – and his son devoted himself to maintaining and defending that legacy.[577] Ussher, too, helped Patrick Young with his edition of the Septuagint, and later Brian Walton with the London Polyglot.[578] Cappel, on the other hand, was not working towards an edition of anything, and he had no time for William Eyre's suggestion that he publish a sample edition of part of the Old Testament corrected according to his critical method and in the light of his discoveries about the vowel points.[579] The attention he paid to *variae lectiones* was meant to 'illuminate' rather

---

[577] At Basel in 1619 he published a new edition of the *Biblia Rabbinica* (Venice, 1525). See Stephen G. Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew learning in the seventeenth century* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 169-202.

[578] See below, III.1.ii, on Ussher and Young; Brian Walton's letter to Ussher, 18 July, 1653, in Parr (1686), p. 590, and Toomer (2009), pp. 800-801, on Ussher and the London Polyglot. For Ussher's interest in the *Biblia Rabbinica*, see Burnett (1996), p. 189.

[579] See Eyre's letter of 19 November, 1635, in the *Defensio Criticae*, p. 411; and Cappel's dismissive reply, p. 414.

than 'correct' the text.[580] Its ideal manifestation was in a treatise or commentary where he had room to expatiate on the merits of different readings. There was a pastoral context for this, in which the utility of Cappel's discussions for theologians was paramount, as the letter Cappel printed from an anonymous French minister revealed.[581] The casual gathering of variants from the ancient translations in Cappel's personal 'aduersaria' had been part of his work as a teacher of Hebrew long before Morin had published his new text of the Septuagint or anything else.[582]

So Cappel was not concerned with the ecclesiastical politics of editing the Old Testament in the way that Morin and other scholars were. In this respect, his work had more in common with the traditions of New Testament criticism and exegesis I have already discussed; and this analogy is one he himself made repeatedly.[583] The relative fixity of the Greek version of the New Testament among Protestants and the lack of debate about the primacy of different translations meant that textual variants were less inherently contentious: that is to say, a specific choice of one manuscript reading over another might prove highly contentious, but the very project of criticism as a whole was not. Nor were editors battling over entire cultural and textual traditions in quite the way that the champions of the Hebrew text and the Masoretes were battling against the supporters of the Septuagint and Vulgate. Such vast swathes of ecclesiastical history were not at stake when a critic weighed up one Greek manuscript of the New Testament against another Greek manuscript of the New Testament. Most importantly, Cappel had plenty of

---

[580] See especially IV.14: 'Satis mihi fuit, aliis viam in hoc genere veluti praemonstrasse, & aditum patefecisse ad nouum genus illustrandi sacrum textum per variarum lectionum obseruationem.'

[581] In the *Defensio Criticae*, p. 618: 'Illius...admiror praestantiam atque vtilitatem maximam, quam ex ea Pastores omnes possunt percipere.' I have not been able to identify this figure.

[582] ibid., p. 493.

[583] See, for instance, I.14 and VI.8. Cappel's *Spicilegium* of 1632 was a sample of his own New Testament criticism.

precedents, both theological and humanistic, of editors who had corrected along similar lines to those he was proposing: Beza, Masius, Casaubon, and Grotius, the last of whom had high praise for the *Critica Sacra* when he saw it in manuscript.[584]

This more liberated New Testament criticism and the 'canon' it entailed had strong affinities with the criticism of secular texts.[585] It should not surprise us to find Henri Estienne cited as Cappel's paradigm. At least one modern scholar may have found his inconsistent use of manuscripts disappointing, and even a cause for expelling him from the school of textual criticism represented by Pier Vettori or the mature Scaliger, but these distinctions did not matter to Cappel.[586] The comparison with secular philology led Cappel to a revealing moment of uncertainty in his response to Buxtorf, where he seems to have hesitated between placing his work in a profane and a sacred literary context: why, he asked, should it matter where a valid conjecture comes from, whether it is the Septuagint or the Masoretic text? Is any harm done to 'Christendom – or, should I say, the commonwealth of letters' – if it comes from the former rather than the latter?[587] Scholars of both confessions who orientated themselves towards editing were much more likely to describe text-critical work as beneficial to the 'Church' than to the 'republic of letters.'[588] Cappel's words place him within a slightly different literary context: that of the relatively secularized criticism of the New Testament outlined above.

---

[584] As Cappel proclaims, p. 415 of the *Defensio Criticae*. The letter is dated 13 October, 1635, and can be found in Grotius' *Briefwisseling*, vol. VI, pp. 280-281. On Cappel's connections with Casaubon in England and Casaubon's New Testament criticism, see Laplanche (1986), p. 187.

[585] IV.16: 'Sic nempe semper factum est a Criticis in omni scriptorum genere, vt ea lectio praeferatur (in quocunque tandem inueniatur Codice) quae sensum fundit veriorem atque commodiorem.' Cf. V.3, VI.8, and Cappel's letter to Ussher, p. 568.

[586] For Estienne, see VI.12. Scaliger is also praised as an editor of classical texts, in the *Defensio Criticae*, p. 366. For a less favourable modern view of Estienne, see Grafton (1983-93), vol. I, p. 86.

[587] *Defensio Criticae*, p. 368: 'An Respublica Christiana, aut vero literaria, detrimentum vllum inde patietur?'

[588] Sarravius's interest in Young's projected edition of the Septuagint is representative. See Sarravius to Ussher, 9 November, 1648, in Sarravius (1654), p. 245: 'Magna quippe in Ecclesiam vtilitas inde redundabit.'

Cappel's vision of criticism had familiar philosophical underpinnings. In the first place, its value stemmed from its position in the curriculum of liberal arts: the exercise of individual critical judgement was the mark of a free, not a servile, man. Rigid adherence to a fixed text sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority was the opposite.[589] One of the consequences of this freer, more speculative use of judgement, however, was a loss of certainty as far as the text was concerned. Conjecture was a matter of mere probability rather than mathematical demonstration. Once again, Cappel's understanding of probability was rooted in Aristotle.[590]

This was a matter of some contention for Buxtorf, Boate and Ussher.[591] They agreed that the kinds of emendations proposed by Cappel, aiming at the reconstruction of a lost, archetypal Hebrew text using sources in other languages, were only ever probable; this was precisely what made them inadequate when matters of ecclesiastical authority and tradition were at stake. How could a Church and its whole Scriptural canon be founded on pure probability? Were history and tradition not more reliable? Once again, Cappel's opponents seem perfectly reasonable, given their confidence in their own ability to validate the authority of their favoured text-critical tradition on an historical basis. On the literary merits of textual variants, too, they took a more historically sensitive position than Cappel. As Boate pointed out, authors (it was unclear whether he meant the authors of the Bible as well as uninspired classical ones) did not always write immaculately in the first place.

---

[589] See I.14: 'liberum esto vnicuique iudicium, non enim ii sumus qui cuiquam velimus legem ponere.' Cf. pp. 271 and 605 of the *Defensio Criticae*.

[590] See his use of the term δύναμις στοχαστική ('power of probable [reasoning]') at e.g. p. 516 of Cappel's letter to Ussher; and Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1141b and *Rhetoric* 1355a for relevant precedents.

[591] See Boate's letter to Cappel of August 1645, printed in the *Defensio Criticae*, p. 442: 'qui a recepta vel punctatione vel lectione discedendum alicubi sibi putauerint, validas facti sui rationes reddere, nec sola probabilitate...contentos esse debere.' Cf. Boate (1650), p. 80; and the rebuttal in Cappel's letter to Ussher, pp. 612.

Their writing was often obscure, rebarbative, or simply inept, and not always out of necessity.[592] Cappel, on the other hand, was committed to the assumption that the original text of the Old Testament, like that of any classical poet, was superior to, and certainly no worse than, its extant witnesses.

It is in this area of the debate, moreover, that Cappel made his most conspicuous move away from a secular argument for the value of humanist criticism and towards a theological one. This theological argument started with a warning against excessive concern for the letters rather than the spirit of Scripture. Ironically, this was articulated as a plea to scholars not to be over-critical, or 'too severe' in the role of Aristarchus when it came to the different versions of Scripture. This was the lesson, as much spiritual as technical or scholarly, deliberately imparted by the authors of the New Testament, who were rarely very precise in their citations of the Old Testament, and flitted between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text.[593] True religion did not depend on minor textual variations, and whatever pertained to 'faith and morals' was so widely diffused throughout the whole text of Scripture that it could not be erased by emending a single passage.[594]

Another such admonition led Cappel to articulate a second element of his 'theology' of textual variants. Sometimes it was difficult to choose between two *variae lectiones*, both

---

[592] Boate (1650), p. 82: 'Neque enim autoribus semper contingit, ut quod dicunt, planius, mollius, cohaerentius, atque commodius dici non potuerit. imò persaepe usu venit, ob varias rationes, ut datâ operâ, atque de industria, duriter, aspere, salebrose, obscure, ac minus commode loquantur, ubi omnia alia facere ipsis proclive fuisset.'

[593] II.4: 'hoc nos docuerunt [the NT authors], vt ne simus in citandis vel conuertendis scripturae testimoniis nimium morosi, verborum minutias sine necessitate consectando, modo a nobis mens atque sententia loci fideliter referatur atque exprimatur. Vnde etiam est quod neque nos decet esse nimium acres Aristarchos in arguendis & diuexandis S. Bibliorum translationibus.'

[594] III.16: 'Nimis equidem sunt meticulosi illi homines, neque satis vident dogmatum fidei, omnemque adeo, quae ad religionem pertinet, momentosam veritatem, ita esse per vniuersum totius Scripturae corpus diffusam, vti spiritus vitalis per vniuersum animalis corpus, vt ea perclitari non possit ex variis eiusmodi variorum codd. discrepantiis atque dissensionibus.' Cf. VI.2 and VI.3.

seeming equally valid and yet endowed with their own special merits. Heated contention over such variations was therefore unnecessary. Individual readers should be free to choose which they preferred; and, more crucially, they should admire God's providential wisdom for allowing two equally valuable but different readings to arise in the same passage. When this happened, neither reading could be called 'false'; and all truth, even in matters of textual criticism, originated in God.[595] In other words, Cappel had reached the position of prizing *variae lectiones* not as cruxes to be resolved by the criteria of secular rhetorical criticism, but as parts of Scripture imbued with an inherent theological value. He came to sharpen this point in his response to Buxtorf, claiming that Scripture could have more than one literal sense, and that this multiplicity was often embedded in its textual variations.[596] Far from being radical or even very original, Cappel's perspective was Augustinian in most of its elements. He would have found that Father complaining against the *morositas*, the over-scrupulous peevishness, of those who make unnecessarily rigid distinctions in matters indifferent to salvation, as well as arguing that the multiplicity of senses and interpretations of Scripture was an argument for, not against, inspiration; and, finally, that any obscure passages it contained were balanced out by perfectly lucid ones, ensuring that the path to salvation remained clear.[597] Cappel's main innovation on Augustine was simply to imbue textual variants between different versions and exemplars, as well as variations in the meaning of a single text, with a theological value.

---

[595] IV.16: 'non raro sensus, qui ex vtraque lectione exsurgit, eiusmodi est, vt difficile sit statuere vter aptius quadret, commodiorue aut verior sit. Atque tum non est acrius de varia lectione contendendum aut dimicandum, quando perinde est vtram sequaris. Liberum esse debet cuilibet hanc vel illam sequi, nec propterea scindenda est Christiana charitas atque vnio, aut in partes trahendus lector. Admiranda potius & suscipienda nobis hic est diuina bonitas & prouidentia, quae sic ista administrauit sapientissime, vt sensus vterque aeque commodus atque aptus ex vtraque lectione exsurgat; omnis enim veritas a Deo est.'

[596] *Defensio Criticae*, p. 328: 'non video, cur negari debeat, Dei Spiritum variis in locis (non vbique) non vnum tantum, sed duplicem aut vero triplicem etiam literalem sensum intendisse, quando vterque est aeque verus, aeque commodus et aptus. Hoc enim pertinet ad πολυποίκιλον eius σοφίαν declarandam et illustrandam.'

[597] See *Ep*. 118; *Confessions*, XII.31; and *De Doctrina Christiana*, II.4-6, respectively.

In the light of all this, we are a long way away from being able to describe Cappel as an avant-garde, secularizing champion of rational critical scholarship, and his opponents, on the other hand, as reactionary, uncritical theologians. Both sides had invested in a fundamentally religious approach to Scripture: Cappel, that of a liberal, minimalistic French Protestantism, and his opponents, that of a confessionalized discourse of ecclesiastical tradition and authority, devoted to establishing a secure biblical canon. However, Cappel's theology of textual variants led him away from the concern for 'documents historiques' to which confessionalization had driven Morin, Ussher, Buxtorf and others.[598]

This is not to say that the *Critica Sacra* lacked any secularizing force. Cappel's occasional analogies with profane philology in its literary-critical mode risked representing the Bible as the product of human rhetoricians rather than the Holy Spirit, especially if it was divorced from his theological account of the transmission, preservation and variety of Scripture. However, there was nothing particularly new or modern about his vision of criticism, even if its application to the Bible remained contentious. In fact, his 'canon' may have seemed somewhat old-fashioned to a generation of clerical, confessionalized Old Testament editors who were learning to sift the historical evidence in an increasingly sophisticated way.

It was also secularizing in the sense that it more or less disregarded the authority of the Church in determining the text of the Bible, promoting the utility of lay, private critical judgement and debate. It did not, however, do very much to secularize biblical scholarship

---

[598] *Pace* Laplanche (1986), p. 185: 'Dans sa démarche scientifique, Cappel garde quelque chose de la tranquillité de Scaliger...en ce qui concerne ses convictions concernant le texte de la Bible, il est réellement inébranable: pour lui, aucun argument d'autorité, aucun raisonnement théologique ne peut contredire une conclusion imposée par les documents historiques.' This is almost the opposite of the truth. See also Haugen (2011), pp. 190 and 192, where Cappel's approach is described as an import from classical criticism.

by placing the text and its various versions in 'historical context'. Some of Cappel's findings, especially regarding the vowel points, could indeed be put towards a destructive, relativizing history of the sacred text (as in the work of Richard Simon), but that was far from the principal aim of the *Critica Sacra*.

In 1653, Francesco Barberini wrote to Morin about the controversy Cappel's book had stirred up in Rome. For all its success in undermining the Protestants' reverence for the Hebrew version, it appeared to contravene the decrees of the fourth session of the Council of Trent, which asserted the absolute primacy of the Vulgate (represented, for Barberini, by the Clementine edition of 1592) against 'bad translators and those who make it their own task to correct and publish Holy Scripture without any assistance.'[599] The right to correct was the Church's and, ultimately, the Pope's. Barberini may have been glancing not only at Cappel, but also Siméon de Muis, who had interpreted the Tridentine ordinance as an attempt merely to quell the competition between different Latin translations then in circulation, not as a judgement on the value of the Greek or Hebrew versions, or a categorical ban on textual criticism when it was practised by trained scholars and addressed to a limited, learned audience.[600] There could be an element of contempt for the Parisian Hebraists in Barberini's remark that the Romans, above all, were 'farthest removed from heresies' ('ab haeresibus remotissimi'). Ironically, de Muis was hardly

---

[599] See Simon, ed. (1682), pp. 427-9, esp. pp. 427-8: 'malos interpretes &...illos, qui sibi facultatem arrogant libros sacros proprio Marte emendandi & edendi.' The date of this letter is not printed. It must predate 25 November, 1653, which is the date of Morin's reply in Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 2185, fols. 73[a]-76[b]. In Simon's edition, the same letter (pp. 430-45) is misdated 1 December, 1653; but the previous letter from Barberini to Morin printed in the sequence (p. 426) is also dated 1 December. Barberini's letter regarding Cappel was probably moved next to Morin's reply in the sequence so that the two could be read one after the other, once Morin's reply had somehow been misdated. It is likely that Simon consulted a draft or copy, which may not have preserved the 'VII' before 'Kal.' that appears in the Vatican MS. For a brief discussion of this correspondence, see Laplanche (1986), p. 227.

[600] See de Muis (1634), pp. 41-9, especially p. 49: 'si quis nouam ex Hebraeo versionem velit cudere, vel antiquum interpretem [i.e. the Vulgate] corrigere, si interdum hallucinatus videatur, poterit ipse plura mutare, praesertim si doctis scribat, qui eiusmodi mutationibus, modò in melius fiant, & citra fidei, ac doctrinae Christianae detrimentum, nunquam offenduntur. Alia enim est vulgi, alia doctorum ratio.'

friendly towards the *Critica Sacra*.[601] The affront he perceived to the Hebrew text evidently weighed more heavily in his mind than his and Cappel's shared commitment to a more liberal textual criticism. Barberini, of course, could not find common cause with de Muis in either of these respects. What he needed was an authentically Catholic response to the *Critica Sacra*, one which reasserted ecclesiastical supremacy over the uncertainties of private critical judgement, especially that of a man who had never wavered from his Protestantism.[602]

Such a response was provided by Morin. He brushed off de Muis as one of a small number of opportunistic Hebraists whose objections to Cappel were designed to uphold their academic profession rather than their Church.[603] He proceeded to salvage the findings of the *Critica Sacra* in a way that preserved Tridentine orthodoxy.

At first, he offered a reading of the book that squared with his own efforts to undermine the Hebrew text: although he had been less emphatic and direct than Morin, Cappel had still done a great deal to upset his coreligionists in this field, and it would be tactically unwise to censure his book when it lent this kind of support to the Catholic cause. But Cappel's downgrading of the value of the modern Hebrew editions was not the only reason why Catholics were embracing the *Critica Sacra*. On a more general level, it had shown that Protestants 'can have no certainty if they do not defer in any respect to the authority of the Church. For if that which is the sole pillar of their faith is so riddled with errors, their faith

---

[601] See Laplanche (1986), pp. 225 and 301. Cappel had actually praised de Muis's exegetical work on the Hebrew Psalter: ibid., p. 191. For another example of its favourable reception by Protestants, see Meric Casaubon's *Letter to Peter du Moulin* (Cambridge, 1669), p. 12.

[602] Barberini mistakenly thought that Cappel was already dead. See Simon, ed. (1682), p. 429: 'apud accusatores auget operis suspicionem auctor extra Ecclesiae sinum mortuus.' This explains why Morin's reply (p. 431) pointed out with such detail that 'Ludovicus Capellus adhuc vivit annum agens ultra 70; non modo haereticus est sed etiam haereseos Minister & Praedicator.'

[603] ibid., p. 435: 'vnum aut alterum Catholicum stulte hebraizantem, ne professioni suae derogaret.'

must collapse entirely.' That this was the ultimate conclusion of Cappel's work was betrayed by his fellow Protestants' fears, and his own numerous attempts to suppress it and, seemingly, to resort to the liberty of private judgement.[604] In fact, Cappel's position on textual variants was one which any Catholic could embrace. It was perfectly acceptable to point them out with reference to the other ancient versions and other Latin manuscripts and discuss them where they contributed to a better understanding of the sacred text. As the Council of Trent had declared, and numerous subsequent orthodox commentators such as Bellarmine had confirmed, the text of the Vulgate was perfect in its expression of 'fidem & mores.' Moreover, even if the Vulgate itself was divinely inspired – a position to which Cappel did not, of course, subscribe, and which Morin carefully described as only 'more likely' ('probabiliorem') – those who copied it were liable to human errors. Finally, Cappel would probably have been happy to follow the example of the Masoretes and place the *variae lectiones* he favoured in the textual apparatus, leaving the established text untouched; although it was unfortunate, Morin, noted, that his preference was motivated by merely 'human reasoning, not Catholic reasoning, which defers to the authority of the Church in this area.'[605]

Morin was defending a form of restricted textual criticism which he himself (not to mention de Muis, although Morin regarded his fondness for the Hebrew text as misguided) had practised. But his conclusions about ecclesiastical authority, and his hesitation about the inspired status of the Vulgate, reached beyond the remit of his own critical project, of

---

[604] ibid., pp. 436-7: 'nihil plane certum esse posse cum Ecclesiae authoritati nihil prorsus deferunt; nam si tam multis scatet mendis id quod est solum eorum fidei columen, fidem eorum necesse est esse caducam admodum...hoc consequens opposuerunt Capello sui & variè animum versat & in omnes partes torquet, ut ei respondeat.... Postremò scribit ad me Eminentia tua nonnullos dicere autorem istum docere unicuique licentiam esse sacros libros emendandi & edendi.'

[605] ibid., pp. 437-43, esp. 443: 'probabile est eum non sensisse Animadversiones illas in vulgatam intrudendas, sed ratione humana persuasus, non Catholica, quae hanc Ecclesiae autoritatem defert; ille enim utpote haereticus Ecclesiae autoritatem in medium nunquam adducit, sed semper praetermittit.'

defending one particular cluster of versions and their ancient editors, while subverting another. It is no wonder that Richard Simon selected this letter as the last in his sequence of correspondence dealing with the text of the Old Testament. It seemed to adumbrate, without entirely fleshing out, the approach he ended up articulating: private judgement was allowed to go far enough to criticize every single version of the Bible, and every single moment in ecclesiastical tradition that pertained to its transmission, before coming to rest in the arms of the present-day Church as the only possible source of stability.

This episode demonstrates the transformative influence of the *Critica Sacra* in seventeenth-century biblical criticism. Much more than in his *Arcanum*, Cappel had undermined the notion that any single text was satisfactory, even the Septuagint or Vulgate. Perhaps more importantly, he had done so on a more abstract methodological basis as well as an empirical one. Whereas Morin made his arguments using the hard historical evidence of external testimonies and manuscripts, Cappel introduced conjecture and speculation to get at historical texts and readings that no longer existed; and the only way to do so was by a mixture of acquaintance with grammatical rules, judgement, and reason. Both methods were historical, but in different ways, and Cappel's was more open to the canons of rhetorical and literary criticism.

There are two principal reasons why it is so important to appreciate the uniqueness of Cappel, whose method's far-reaching implications were recognised by almost none of his contemporaries except Morin, and then only fleetingly. The first is to do with our picture of the so-called 'early Enlightenment.' The connections Simon establishes between himself and these two earlier scholars force us to appreciate the deeper continuities in the history of scholarship that the recent historiography of Enlightenment can sometimes

obscure. As Simon represented them, his tools, ideas, and arguments were not fundamentally new, even if they were circulated in new (that is to say, vernacular) contexts; and yet he has been regarded as a profoundly radical figure. From a certain perspective, however, he may prove no less radical than someone like Richard Bentley or Isaac Vossius, both of whom were taking their cues from seventeenth-century scholar-theologians, not to mention those theologians' humanistic predecessors and contemporaries.

The second reason is the more important one from the point of view of our study. It is that Cappel's answer to the problems posed by inter-confessional debates over the history of Scripture never seems to have had much of an effect on Patrick Young's approach to the Septuagint, if he indeed read the *Critica Sacra* at all; and this will be the key to an explanation of the difficulties Young encountered and his failure to overcome them. Young took the liberal approach to grammatical conjecture and emendation advocated and practised by earlier humanists, and revived by Cappel, without adopting a theoretical or theological framework that legitimized such an approach and freed him from a consideration of the concrete histories of different versions, their manuscripts and their editors.

ii. Patrick Young, the Septuagint, and the limits of humanist philology

A great deal was expected from Young's new edition of the Septuagint. The initial excitement was generated by his edition of Clement in 1633. Further attention was drawn to his work by subsequent publications, as well as the pan-European correspondence

networks in which British scholars participated.[606] Young also used his continental contacts to make samples of Codex Alexandrinus available to interested parties.[607] He used the same contacts for his own benefit, to acquire (or copy) and collate important biblical manuscripts.[608]

Curiosity largely focused on the nature of the previously unknown manuscript Young had acquired. Scholars were aware that there were three basic versions of the text of the Septuagint which differed substantially from each other. One was represented by the Greek Old Testament text of the Complutensian Polyglot; another by the Aldine Septuagint; and the third by the Roman edition of 1587, based on Codex Vaticanus and updated by Jean Morin in 1628. Was Codex Alexandrinus different enough to belong to a fourth category, or was it derivative of one of these three? Might it even trump all the others? Given these concerns, Scott Mandelbrote has been right to attribute the failure of Codex Alexandrinus to have much impact on the study of the Septuagint to the growing disillusionment among critics with the notion that it was possible for a single manuscript to offer an uncorrupted version of the Bible. Textual criticism had simply become too sophisticated to countenance such a possibility. This chapter deepens Mandelbrote's observation by examining Young's manuscripts, correspondence, and printed works, and exposing the problems he encountered in attempting to publish a text of the Septuagint

---

[606] Particularly Young, ed. (1637), whose text of Job was based on Codex Alexandrinus. As far as correspondence is concerned, see Holstenius to Young, 13 December 1646, in Kemke, ed. (1898), p. 106; Heinsius to Young, May 1638, ibid., p. 81 (cf. pp. 99, 101); Isaac Vossius to Ussher, 5 October 1650, in Parr (1686), p. 556, reporting the interest of Queen Christina of Sweden; and Sarravius to Ussher, 28 October 1647, in Sarravius (1654), p. 223 (cf. p. 245).

[607] Such as Hugo Grotius, for his annotations on the Bible: see II.5, above. For Daniel Heinsius's less prolific use of readings from the manuscript, see Heinsius (1639), pp. 553 and 819 (referring to the text of Job in Young's *Catena*). Young also sent collations to Salmasius: see J. F. Gronovius to Young, 19 July 1639, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 90-91 (cf. pp. 95, 97-8).

[608] See Mandelbrote (2006), pp. 84-5. The following chapter is indebted to Dr. Mandelbrote's discussion of Young's work on the Septuagint. I am also grateful to him for allowing me to read his forthcoming piece on 'Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint,' in *Between Scholarship and Science: The Wonderful World of Isaac Vossius*, ed. Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

with Codex Alexandrinus as its basis. Ultimately, however, we will find that to describe scholars like Young as too 'cautious and critical' or 'serious and broad-minded' to arrive at a clear, dogmatic position with regard to Codex Alexandrinus risks giving them too much credit.[609] It also risks understating the fact that textual criticism was never more than a fledgling sub-discipline during the late humanist era. Rather than confidently transcending his former dogmatism about individual manuscripts by means of new critical methods, Young trapped himself in an uncomfortable and uncertain attempt to reconcile the tools of humanist grammar and erudition with the rigours of a historical study of the Bible and its different versions.

Young knew from the beginning that in order to advance a serious argument about the importance of Codex Alexandrinus, he would have to do more than publish a diplomatic edition of it. He would need to collate it with other manuscripts of the Bible, or, where those were not available, printed editions: above all the Roman, Complutensian and Aldine texts, but also other manuscripts whose palaeographical features made them seem particularly old and therefore valuable. In addition to this, he would have to collate his manuscript with citations of the Septuagint preserved in early Christian texts, from the New Testament to the Greek Fathers. The question of the value of biblical and patristic citations for the text of the Old Testament introduced an entirely new set of difficulties. Many of the extant Greek Fathers' writings predated the earliest Septuagint manuscripts, even if the manuscripts of those writings did not. The Fathers presented a second problem. As well as citing the Septuagint, Fathers like Origen and Jerome had edited and translated it. Origen was an unavoidable obstacle for any modern editor of the Septuagint, and so were the other Greek translators whose work had been introduced, via his multi-text

[609] Mandelbrote (2006), pp. 87, 92.

editions, into manuscripts of the Septuagint, corrupting the first Greek translation. Young knew he had to glean as much information as he could about the versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, but he did not know how to go beyond them and isolate the work of the Seventy in every verse of the Old Testament.

On top of this, there was the question, about which Young himself was never very clear, of how to use other versions as a witness to the Septuagint: above all the Hebrew text. Unlike most Roman Catholics and some Protestants, Young never questioned the priority of the extant Hebrew over the Greek version, but although he approached the former with the intention of showing that Codex Alexandrinus reflected it better than any other Greek manuscript, he eventually found his concern for the Hebrew original dragging him far away from this initial goal, and towards broader questions about the nature of the different versions of the Old Testament.

Finally, Young confronted the question of whether he needed to go beyond the manuscript evidence, and how far: whether he could legitimately make conjectures about the original text, and even emend it. He struggled to let go of the liberal, humanistic attitude towards conjectural emendation which he had practised in his edition of Clement and elsewhere, and he still wished to assess the Septuagint using the tools of grammatical, rhetorical, and stylistic evaluation as well as the more sober study of manuscripts. In short, he was a humanist unaware that he needed to transform himself into a textual critic.

Some of these challenges are encapsulated in the first publication that concerned itself with the text of the Septuagint: Young's edition, in 1637, of a *Catena* of patristic commentaries on Job which had originally been compiled by Nicetas, the eleventh-century Bishop of

Heraclea.[610] Young accompanied this with a text of Job taken from Codex Alexandrinus, which the title page advertised as representative of the 'the true and genuine translation of the Seventy Elders' ('veram & germanam Septuaginta Seniorum interpretationem') and as the 'oldest and most important' ('antiquissimo, ac praestantissimo') manuscript in the whole world. For Young, however, the text alone was not enough: its accuracy was confirmed by the citations of the Septuagint by the Fathers in the catena, as well as by the fragment of Origen's famous letter to Africanus which he had placed just before the text of Job.[611] These showed that Codex Alexandrinus was 'absolutely unblemished by any mingling of other translations' ('ab omni aliarum versionum mistura defaecatissimo'). Its antiquity, moreover, was confirmed by palaeographical features: the book was not divided into chapters, nor were the words even separated from each other on the page. Young was sceptical enough to doubt Cyril Lucaris's tale that it had been written by the martyr Thecla, dating it to the time of the Council of Nice, and so he needed new arguments for its antiquity.[612]

Using a patristic catena for textual criticism of the Bible was relatively innovative.[613] The genre had been popular in the later Middle Ages as a means of digesting and arranging an otherwise voluminous body of patristic biblical commentary, and its popularity endured

---

[610] On the catena of Young and that of Comitoli (discussed below), see Georgius Karo and Johannes Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus* (Göttingen: Hortsmann, 1902), p. 319.

[611] Young, ed. (1637), sig. ¶4[a].

[612] 'Sive autem Theclae...sive alterius librarii manu exaratus fuerit,' ibid. Bois was also doubtful: see his letter to John Williams in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 73, p. 5 (an undated copy).

[613] Young did the same with the Psalms: see Trinity College Cambridge, MS O.4.21, a catena on the Psalter collated with Codex Alexandrinus; cf. MS O.3.14, a Psalter collated with several sources including the commentaries of Theodoret, Chrysostom, and Euthymius; the catena of Nicetas on the Psalms and the *Expositio patrum Graecorum in Psalmos* edited by Balthasar Corderius, 3 vols. (Antwerp, 1643-6); as well as the Roman, Complutensian and Aldine Septuagints, and Codex Alexandrinus. See also his collation of Corderius's catena in the margins of his Roman Septuagint: Bodleian Library, Radcl. c. 8, p. 418 e.g.; and his note on Psalm catenas in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 34, p. 48. However, Young was already interested in catenas before receiving Codex Alexandrinus: see his letter to Holstenius in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 55-6, which Kemke dates to May 1625.

into the Renaissance, but largely among Catholics. Young's, however, was quite different. A previous edition of the same catena on Job had been published in 1586, by Paulo Comitoli, a Jesuit.[614] Like Young's catena, it served as a satellite publication of a new edition of the Septuagint, the Roman one of 1587. It was dedicated to Cardinal Antonio Carafa, the overseer of that edition. Unlike Young's, it was published only in Latin translation, and it refused to distinguish between different Fathers' commentaries.[615] It also embraced the chapter divisions of the Latin version of Job, rather than the Greek. Comitoli was happy to mix Latin and Greek ecclesiastical and textual traditions precisely because the Septuagint, as he pointed out, was the shared heritage of the Eastern and Western Churches. Even the latter had used it before the time of Jerome. This was not an uncommon point for Roman Catholics to make. They were comfortable with the historical fact of the Roman Church having previously used the Septuagint, because their arguments in favour of the Vulgate ultimately rested on the authority of the Church to declare any version it wanted as authoritative, as it had done at Trent. In a 1635 lecture on the Septuagint at the Academia Basiliana, Pietro La Sena went slightly further, pointing out that while the Vulgate had been declared canonical and authoritative by the Council of Trent, the Septuagint had occupied the same position of canonicity in the primitive Church.[616]

---

[614] Paulo Comitoli, ed., *Catena in Beatissimum Job Absolutissima* (Lyon, 1586).

[615] ibid., sig. †3ª. The second edition (Venice, 1587) did identify individual Fathers, as well as making numerous other improvements, to the point where Comitoli stated that it was the sole legitimate edition, the first one having been printed very poorly (see his 'Admonitio ad lectorem'). He did not, however, add a Greek text. It is clear from some of Young's complaints that he was unaware of this edition.

[616] Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 1783, fol. 6ª. This manuscript is mentioned by Ingo Herklotz in 'The Academia Basiliana: Greek Philology, Ecclesiastical History and the Union of the Churches in Barberini Rome,' in *I Barberini e la cultura Europea del seicento*, ed. Lorenzo Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze and Francesco Solinas (Rome: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007), p. 149.

Young, on the other hand, had to present the Septuagint as the exclusive preserve of Eastern Christianity, and so he published the text in Greek, with a Latin translation of his own. Otherwise, by naming the Father responsible for each commentary he increased its philological and historical precision, but with no obvious positive result. If Comitoli had given the impression that his catena offered a *consensus Patrum* and hence needed no distinction between individual voices, Young had not reached the point where he could differentiate between one Father and the next in terms of the value of the text of the Septuagint they had cited. The difficulty of situating each Father's use of biblical editions in historical context continued to trouble him, as his numerous manuscript collations show.[617] Neither the catena format nor a simple list of citations of Scripture by a given Father allowed him to attend either to the overall contours of that author's use of the Septuagint, nor to the rhetorical context of individual citations. This was crucial, however, because scholars had used it to show that the Fathers often knowingly paraphrased or conflated biblical passages in order to suit the homiletic point they were making. Young never formulated a method for using or rejecting patristic testimonies, or for ranking individual authors in terms of the value of the witness they bore to the original text.

These confusions gave rise to an even deeper uncertainty: to what extent was Young's research invested in the traditions of the Fathers and the way they had used the Septuagint, rather than in the Septuagint itself? In one manuscript, for instance, Young collected citations of the Old Testament by Chrysostom.[618] At times, his list is arranged according to the order of the books of the Old Testament. He also, however, provides a list arranged according to the order of Chrysostom's works. The former list inevitably focuses on the

---

[617] See, in particular, Leiden University Library, MS VMI 9.

[618] ibid., fols. 11[a]-52[b].

Septuagint itself, with Chrysostom simply providing raw data about the text, waiting to be extracted from his works. The latter list, by contrast, shifts focus on to Chrysostom. Perhaps Young had not yet decided what his edition would look like: would he simply offer, next to each biblical verse, confirmations or *variae lectiones* for that reading taken from the Fathers? Or would there be an opportunity to distinguish somehow between individuals, perhaps with an index at the back of the volume? In any case, the diligence and 'sober scholarship' which Young exercised in piling up citations can also look like a critical ambivalence about patristic tradition.[619]

Nonetheless, Young's edition demonstrates how far the philological battle between Protestants and Catholics over the identity of the Greek Church had escalated in the years since Comitoli. As we have seen, Jean Morin, along with the Barberini circle, had played a significant part in this escalation, honing Catholic arguments against the Hebrew original by resorting to the shared heritage and traditional authority of the Greek and Latin versions. Morin and Holstenius's responses to Young's work were telling.[620]

Morin showed little interest in Young's edition of Clement.[621] His own work specialized in the textual history of the Bible, and he had no time for the kind of playful, multifarious, antiquarian philological commentary Young had practised in that book. He did not write to Young directly until after the *Catena* was published.[622] His letter was a devastating

---

[619] The former interpretation is Mandelbrote's: see 'Origen against Jerome in Early Modern Europe,' in *Patristic Tradition and Intellectual Paradigms in the Seventeenth Century*, eds. Silke-Petra Bergjan and Karla Pollmann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), p. 126.

[620] On Morin, see above.

[621] See II.5.

[622] The letter of Morin to Young of 26 August 1638 published by Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 138-9, is abridged from fifteen pages to two. For a full printed edition, see Simon, ed. (1682), pp. 273-88; and for a manuscript copy by Thomas Smith, Bodleian MS Smith 75, p. 227 ff. In 1634 Morin had already seen a sample of Codex Alexandrinus, communicated to him by Young via Father Robert Philip, the Scottish confessor to Queen Henrietta Maria (and an Oratorian, like Morin himself). See ibid., pp. 236, 242-3.

rebuttal, to which Young never advanced a serious counter-argument. He did, however, take elements of Morin's constructive criticism on board. Morin advised that he look at Procopius of Gaza's commentary on Isaiah, which preserved many details about which parts of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion had been added to the original Septuagint, along with Andreas Masius's Greek edition of Joshua, because Masius had used what was thought to be a Syriac translation of Origen's hexapla, corrected by Eusebius of Caesarea, and preserving the sigla Origen had used to mark interpolations in the Septuagint from the Hebrew or the other Greek versions. Young promptly took Morin's advice.[623]

When he was collecting fragments of the other Greek translations from Procopius, Young became acutely aware of another of the problems outlined at the beginning of this chapter: the difficulty of studying the Greek text independently from its Hebrew antecedent. Shortly after he started using Procopius, he had noticed that there was already an edition of the fragments of Isaiah, compiled by Johannes Drusius, the great Protestant Hebraist.[624] But he decided to carry on compiling his own list of fragments, because Drusius failed to make clear which parts of Theodotion and the other translators had been added to the Septuagint and which parts had been left out. What mattered to Drusius was whether the Greek of Theodotion offered an alternative gloss on, or even reading for, the Hebrew Bible, one not offered by the extant Hebrew manuscripts or other sources, not whether Origen had used it to interpolate the Septuagint. Young was gesturing at a broader problem: previous Protestant scholars had studied the Septuagint as a means to an end, to understand and perhaps improve the Hebrew text. They had not made much of an effort to

---

[623] See Trinity College, Cambridge, MS O.10.33, fols. 15[a]-27[a] for Procopius; and British Library, MS Harley 1328, fol. 67 for Masius. Young managed, at one point, to use Procopius against Morin, to correct the 1587 Roman edition of the Septuagint: see the note on p. 563 of his copy, Bodleian Library, Radcl. c. 8.

[624] Trinity MS O.10.33, fol. 15[a]. The book in question is Drusius's *Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta* (Arnhem, 1622; published posthumously by Sixtinus Amama, Professor of Hebrew at Franeker), containing a *Supplementum ad Fragmenta Interpretum Veterum in Iesaiam ex Procopio Descriptum*, with a separate title page.

disentangle the different Greek versions from each other, because ultimately those Greek versions all emanated from a single, original, authoritative Hebrew source. No Greek version had any authority by comparison with the Hebrew: they were all simply to be embraced or discarded according to whether their translation of it was helpful or unhelpful.

Young tacitly acknowledged that Morin's approach was much more responsive than Drusius's to the possibility that one Greek version might have more authority, on account of its historical position, than the others. The role of Origen was vital. From Morin's point of view, he was involved in fundamentally the same enterprise as Origen himself. Both had made the unusual step of deciding that a pure text of the Septuagint needed to be published, independent from any interpolations made with reference to any existing or hypothetical Hebrew version.[625] Morin presented Origen as a rational textual critic who had intervened at a particular moment in the history of the Church in order to preserve the text of the Septuagint. In this sense, his hexaplaric edition was the result of an autonomous decision-making process and scholarly method which was knowable and withstood critical scrutiny. Morin was simply trying to reconstruct Origen's work on the Septuagint. His perspective on the Septuagint was a patristic one, focused on a moment in ecclesiastical tradition, and in that sense it was characteristically Catholic (albeit unorthodox in using Origen, as well as Jerome, as the touchstone for an authoritative text).

Young, on the other hand, more or less effaced this vision of Origen as a conscious, intelligent and authoritative editor, because he had not reached an understanding of text-critical authority as divided or historically situated. The sole conceivable source of

---

[625] See Morin's preface to his 1628 Greek Bible, sig. *6^{b}. In his letter to Young he questioned the value of Codex Alexandrinus on the grounds that it seemed to have been corrected according to a Hebrew text (or one of the other Greek versions, which in turn had been corrected using the Hebrew).

authority was the Hebrew text, whether extant or hypothetical (inferred from translations or other sources). The next best source was a perfect, original Septuagint text. For precisely this reason, Young rarely spoke about Origen's active role in establishing the text of the Septuagint. Instead, he reduced Origen to the same status as all the other Fathers whose writings he adduced in his work. They yielded up lists of testimonies whose value was to be assessed according to whether they matched the available Greek manuscripts and, ultimately, the Hebrew text.[626] For Young, to follow Morin and Origen would have been to attribute far too much authority to a Father, as well as reducing the preservation of the biblical text to a matter of human traditions. He had adopted some of the methods and tools of Catholic scholarship on the Septuagint, without adopting the notion of ecclesiastical authority on which they depended. All of the Fathers, Origen included, had to be judged by other, deeper criteria.

As we have seen, Young never stated what those criteria were, but he knew that they ultimately had to have something to do with the bedrock of the Hebrew text. He could not abandon his faith in the 'Hebraica veritas,' to which he often appealed in his notes comparing the Hebrew and Greek versions.[627] This faith manifested itself in two ways: sometimes it relied on textual criticism, but at other times it formed part of a literary-critical approach to the relationship between Hebrew original and Greek translation. The haphazard combination of these two approaches helps to explain why Young never produced a meaningful argument about the history and text of the Septuagint.

---

[626] For instance, Origen was treated as simply one of many commentators who had cited the Old Testament in Young, ed. (1637).

[627] See, for example, British Library, MS Harley 1328, fols. 51[b], 52[b]; Leiden University Library, MS VMI 4, fol. 2[a].

As far as textual criticism was concerned, Young compared different manuscripts of the Septuagint in order to show not simply that Codex Alexandrinus was closest to the Greek text edited by Origen, but also to show that it was closest to the Hebrew text – although in some cases he had to acknowledge that other versions were closer.[628] We can immediately see how this ran counter to his stated aim of treating the traditions of the Greek text independently where Drusius had assimilated them with the Hebrew. He wanted the study of the Septuagint to become more specialized than it had been for an earlier generation of Protestant scholars, but not so specialized as to detach itself entirely from consideration of the Hebrew text.

His reliance on the Hebrew original also manifested itself in the literary-critical dimension of his notes. Throughout his manuscripts, as well as the notes which were printed in the London Polyglot, Young resorts to grammatical, stylistic or rhetorical judgements about the quality of certain renderings of the Hebrew text into Greek, or sometimes Latin. His note on Genesis 1:2 offers a striking example.[629] Young conjectures that ἀόρατος ('invisible,' describing the earth) should be replaced by ἄωρος, which, he contends, could mean 'shapeless' as well as 'untimely' or 'unripe.' The latter 'seems to come closer to the *Hebraica veritas*: but such a daring alteration should not be made when it opposes the faithful testimony of all the manuscript copies and the unanimous agreement of the whole body of Fathers' ('ad veritatem hebraicam propius accedere videtur: sed contra fidem omnium exemplarium & unanimem universorum Patrum consensum nihil ausu temerario mutandum est'). Young repeatedly vacillates between a conjecture which improves the quality of the translation from the Hebrew, and the evidence offered by manuscripts and

---

[628] Such as the Complutensian, in the case of Exodus 36-39: see MS Harley 1328, fols. 49[a]-50[b].

[629] See *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1657), vol. VI, p. 1 of Young's notes; MS Harley 1328, fol. 1[a].

patristic citations. We can also observe the way in which he used the Fathers: rather than treating any one Father as particularly authoritative, he tended to pile up patristic testimonies until he felt that they tipped the scales in favour of a particular reading. This is equally true of his use of manuscripts. But the most surprising aspect of this note is the proposal of a conjecture which Young himself admitted was baseless and had to be rejected. He was clearly reluctant to be constrained by the form of the text-critical commentary he was supposed to be writing, and wanted to venture further towards the kind of work he had done on Clement: not pursuing any one conclusion, but branching out from the text in multiple directions. After one particularly long exegetical note, he had to rein himself in, observing that he was supposed to be writing 'scholia, not commentaries.'[630] He was veering away from the task of the editor and towards the model of biblical criticism eventually espoused by Cappel's *Critica Sacra*.

The value of the Hebrew text for Young, then, was partly that it allowed him to indulge his literary-critical tendencies, and correspondingly abandon the rigours of historical criticism, precisely because he could not suffer the Hebrew text to be historically constructed like any other. This is not to say that Young behaved like an enthusiastic literalist in his use of the Hebrew text. Rather, in a very diffuse and unpremeditated way, it filled the void left by the absence of any account of the formation of the competing versions at different moments in the history of the Church, with different kinds of ecclesiastical authority and scholarly input affecting them. Unlike Cappel, moreover, Young did not wish to argue that the ancient translations might serve as superior witnesses to the original Hebrew text.

[630] *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (1657), vol. VI, p. 10 of Young's notes (on Genesis 36:6).

Young's more speculative conjectures, then, thrived on the use of a latent modern Hebrew text against which the Greek translations could be measured, and presented as deficient. They were a product of his desire to continue presenting himself as an erudite critic-grammarian in the mould of Casaubon, but also of familiar humanist reading practices whose inadequacy for the task of understanding the history of the biblical text Young never seems to have perceived. For example, he copied out John Bois's marginal annotations on the Roman Septuagint and used some of them in his own notes.[631] What Bois's notes gave him were occasionally illuminating but fundamentally disjointed comments on individual passages of the Greek text: they did not provide an overarching theory about the history or value of the Septuagint, because the translators of the King James Bible were not looking for one: they wanted a new perspective on the Hebrew text, rather than an alternative, potentially authoritative version of the Old Testament in its own right.

For all the flourishes Young added, then, he adhered to the same model of criticism represented by Bois in his work on the King James Bible. Developments in biblical criticism over the intervening forty years had rendered it obsolete, but it still dominated Young's understanding of what criticism ought to be. This is reflected in the format of the notes which Young eventually produced as a sort of summary of his work on the Septuagint, parts of which were published in the London Polyglot. He wrote to his friend and former colleague, Lucas Holstenius, not long before his death, announcing that within the next month he planned 'to beginne the edition of the Septuagint, casting the diuerse

[631] The copy (only partial, omitting most of Bois's references to the English translation) is in Leiden MS VMI 4, fols. 6[a]-10[a]. For an instance of Young's use of these marginalia, see p. 8 of his notes in the London Polyglot (discussing Genesis 29:27), where he repeats the identification of 'Boeotian' verb forms on pp. 153 and 230 of Bois's Septuagint (Bodleian Library, D 1.14 Th.Seld). Young must have borrowed the book in the 1640s or 1650s (he copies out the latest datable annotations, those which refer to Grotius's 1641 Gospel commentaries), after Bois had died and Selden had acquired it. See II.3, above.

readings and notes at the end of the whole.'[632] The 'diuerse readings and notes' he ended up producing amounted to much less than the concerted argument in favour of a single manuscript of the Septuagint which some scholars had expected from him. Holstenius had warned Peiresc that Young looked set to 'destroy completely the credit of the Roman edition.'[633] Catholics needed to improve the Roman text in order to defend it against 'heretics' like Young and Drusius. When Young wrote to Holstenius asking him if he could provide any helpful manuscripts from Roman libraries, Holstenius gave him details of a copy of some of the Old Testament prophets accompanied by fragments of the other Greek translators, but he never answered Young's increasingly desperate and disappointed requests to send him transcripts.[634] Young's constant appeals to the common interest and benefit of the *res literaria* apparently meant little to one of Europe's most confessionally entrenched philologists.[635]

It is worth asking why Holstenius perceived Young's work as a serious threat, in line with that of Drusius, while Young himself regarded it as relatively innocuous and confessionally neutral. The likely answer is that Young's hopes for Codex Alexandrinus had been

---

[632] Not printed in Kemke, ed. (1898); see Young to Holstenius, 6 February 1652, in Vatican Library, MS Barb. Lat. 3539, fol. 153ª.

[633] See Holstenius to Peiresc, 7 March 1637, in Holstenius (1817), p. 292. The fears of Catholic scholars were matched by the hopes of some Protestant ones. See Tayler and Boate (1636), p. 205, on Codex Alexandrinus: 'tantae vetustatis, ut ea Vaticanum illud, è quo expressa est Editio Romana, facile provocet. & tamen innumeris in locis quam maximae inter ipsum & Vaticanum discrepantiae intercedunt.'

[634] See the correspondence between them, spanning the years 1646-1652, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 105-7, 109-10, 115; and the letter of 6 February 1652, cited above. Ussher seems also to have sought assistance from Holstenius on the Septuagint, through his Danish correspondent Petrus Scavenius: see Scavenius's letter to Ussher from Rome of 26/3/1650 (in the Julian calendar) in Parr (1686), p. 548, in which he appears to refer to the manuscript of the prophets whose readings Holstenius promised to Young. Also interesting is Scavenius's comment that it is difficult to consult manuscripts in the Vatican because the Catholics are afraid that their own weapons will be used against them: 'Nec desunt, qui inde tela quaesivere, quibus ipsos confodere, ac ita proprio ense ipsos necare studuerunt. Hoc modo Itali malè remunerati, cautiores ac difficiliores in communicando exteris sua mysteria evasere.' See also Sir Kenelm Digby's request on Young's behalf in his letter to Holstenius, 7 January, 1650, in J. G. Fotheringham, 'Unpublished Letters Written by Sir Kenelm Digby to Luke Holstein, Guardian of the Vatican Library,' *The Antiquary* 36 (1900), pp. 13-14.

[635] For a similar account of Holstenius's confessionalized outlook, see Jérôme Delatour, 'Abeilles thuaniennes et barberines: les relations des savants français avec les Barberini sous le Pontificat d'Urbain VIII,' in Mochi Onori, Schütze and Solinas, eds. (2007), p. 168.

substantially downgraded by Morin's response to his *Catena*, and his plans for the edition had been disrupted, if not thrown into disarray. As Morin had pointed out, only an enthusiast could seriously believe that one manuscript alone offered a pristine text of the Septuagint.[636] He freely admitted that this was not even true of Codex Vaticanus, which was occasionally inferior to Young's manuscript.[637] Young's subsequent work tacitly accepts this point, as demonstrated by his willingness to offer conjectures not found in Codex Alexandrinus, and his willingness to note the value and importance of other manuscripts or patristic citations which presented alternative readings to it, especially when those conjectures or alternative readings brought the Septuagint and Hebrew texts closer together.[638] Since Young was not prepared to become an ecclesiastical historian of the biblical text in the manner of Morin, he was forced to oscillate between the twin poles of conjectural emendation and raw collation, uninformed by any historical context or narrative. Young probably realised that neither of these modes of criticism could compete with Morin's account of the text of the Septuagint. At best, they could embarrass the champions of Codex Vaticanus as far as specific passages were concerned, without ever showing that it was fundamentally corrupt.

This potential embarrassment, however, was enough to discourage Holstenius from helping Young. His response shows how unusual and innovative Morin's approach to these problems was, even within Catholicism. For Holstenius, the kind of work Drusius had done was still very dangerous because it risked showing that the various Greek translations were superior to the Latin one. Young did indeed continue this enterprise: in some of his

---

[636] Simon, ed. (1682), p. 275: 'Quis adeo istarum rerum rudis est, aut fatue supersitiosus, ut tam insanam opinionem de quo libuerit Codice Graeco, Hebraeo, Latino in animum suum inducat?'

[637] ibid., p. 285.

[638] For example, the Complutensian reading of Exodus 36-39, cited above.

manuscript notes he readily highlights the ineptitude of the Latin translator.[639] The very manuscript of the Prophets which Holstenius decided to withhold from Young had the power to shore up the credit of the Vulgate.[640] The fragments of Greek translations it exhibited were to be used not in the way Morin might have used them – to purify the Septuagint – but in the way Drusius might have – to aid biblical exegesis in general, as well as to illuminate and defend a particular version of the Bible (in Drusius's case, the Hebrew, but in Holstenius's, the Vulgate).[641] Holstenius was less ready than Young to acknowledge that Morin had made the grammatico-critical battle over individual readings, renderings, and manuscripts look increasingly irrelevant to the historical problems with which he was concerned.

It was Ussher whose work truly challenged Morin's on its own terms, even though he struggled to reach any definitive conclusions about the history of the Septuagint.[642] Toomer has noted that Ussher differed from Selden in his overriding preoccupation with the recovery of an authentic (Hebrew) version of Scripture, and we must remember that it was Selden who lent John Bois's annotations on the Septuagint to Young, making him an accessory to Young's failure to adjust to new forms of text-critical scholarship.[643] Selden wanted Young simply to publish Codex Alexandrinus, rather than a composite of multiple manuscripts aimed at restoring the authentic Septuagint, to the point where he threatened

---

[639] See e.g. the note on Psalm 10:17 in Leiden MS VMI 4, fol. 1[a]. On the same page, however, Young notes that the Vulgate rendering of Psalm 8:2 was in some respects better than the Greek.

[640] See Holstenius to Peiresc, 4 December 1636, in *Epistolae ad Diversos* (1817), p. 276: 'quo Vulgati Interpretis fides plurimis locis stabilitur.'

[641] ibid., pp. 276-7: 'Magnam congeriem veterum interpretationum...collegi, unde maxima ad arcanos intimosque Scripturae sensus penetrandos lux existat.' Again, when Holstenius extended his description of this book, he merely observed that the fragments of other translations accompanying its text of Isaiah would (like those preserved by Procopius) provide a 'larga annotationum materies' rather than a thoroughly revised understanding of the textual history of the Septuagint: Holstenius to Peiresc, 7 March 1637, ibid., p. 291.

[642] As Mandelbrote (2006) points out, p. 87.

[643] See Toomer (2009), p. 813.

to burn the edition at Smithfield – along with its publisher, Cornelius Bee – when he found out that Bee and Young were ignoring his recommendation.[644] One way of portraying Young's struggle would be to describe it as a reluctance to embrace Ussher's rather than Selden's approach to philology, an interpretation supported by Ussher's own response to Young's *Catena*.[645] He pointed out, as Morin had, that parts of Codex Alexandrinus contained interpolations from the Hebrew text, probably those made by Origen, and realised straight away that only he was up to the task of writing a 'just Tractate' about 'the History of the Septuagint, and the variety of the editions thereof.' He offered to publish this treatise alongside Young's finished edition, probably because he had seen that Young neither understood nor was particularly interested in such historical issues.

Many alternative reasons could be cited for the deficiencies of Young's work on the Septuagint. One might be his lack of oriental languages beyond Hebrew, especially Samaritan, on which Morin had relied so heavily; another, his relative indifference to biblical chronology and refusal to involve himself in the debate over the discrepancy between the lifespans of the Patriarchs in the Hebrew and Septuagint texts; or his inability to use post-biblical Jewish literature to historicise the transmission of the Hebrew Bible; not to mention more mundane explanations such as the upheavals of the civil wars or his sporadic ill health.[646]

All of these played their part, but ultimately the problem lay in the convergence of two processes: intellectual specialization, and the confessionalization of certain forms of

---

[644] Smith, *Vita Patricii Junii* (1707), p. 33. Meric Casaubon concurred with Selden: see Casaubon to Young, 18 May 1652, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 115-16.

[645] Ussher to Young, 27 August 1639, in Kemke, ed. (1898), pp. 92-4.

[646] See J. F. Gronovius to Salmasius, 23 August 1639, in Dibon and Waquet, eds. (1984), pp. 76-7 (cf. p. 83).

scholarship. At the start of the period covered by this study, a single scholar could comfortably move between different ways of writing about the Greek versions of the Old Testament. He could criticise the translators' ignorance of Hebrew and point out its chronological lapses without necessarily sensing that he was engaged in two fundamentally separate activities. He could treat manuscripts as source material for discussion of these two issues, rather than as a body of documents posing unique historical problems of their own. The work of Catholics like Morin, and then of Cappel (which Morin was eager to publicise), along with the responses by champions of the Hebrew text like Buxtorf, Boate and Ussher, started to divide these fields of enquiry from each other. Young's attempts to preserve a union of literary and historical criticism, of biblical exegesis and manuscript studies, were beginning to seem incongruous. Cappel's attempt to do so in the *Critica Sacra* was more programmatic, more learned, and less tied to the ecclesiastical politics of Old Testament editing. Unfortunately, Young does not seem to have had the time to read it, much less to absorb the work's methods and conclusions.

By 'confessionalization' we can understand the phenomenon according to which clerical figures such as Morin and Ussher became more interested in uncovering the history of the biblical text than scholars like Young and Selden, who were less invested in protecting the official positions of their Church. It cannot be a coincidence that the seventeenth century's most sophisticated works of biblical criticism were written by a Catholic cleric, Richard Simon, and constituted an absolutist argument for the authority of ecclesiastical tradition in determining the authentic version of Scripture. In matters of biblical criticism, Morin and Holstenius were always conscious of the shadow of Roman orthodoxy looming over their work. Holstenius's desire to follow Morin's suggestions and improve, rather than simply ring-fence, the Sixtine editions of the Septuagint and Vulgate constantly confronted the

reluctance of his Barberini patrons to concede that the official, published texts were inadequate.[647] They were regarded not simply as the best available texts according to the consensus of the philological community, but as infallible, canonised expressions of the Catholic Scriptures.[648]

Although he was the recipient of royal, Laudian, and then parliamentary patronage, Young's work was not directly affected by the same pressures. His task was to advertise himself as a critic on the European stage, for whom literary sensitivity and encyclopaedic erudition were ends in themselves. Ideally, he would have used Codex Alexandrinus in much the same way as Hugo Grotius and Daniel Heinsius had; and when he did set aside some time to write a philological commentary on parts of the New Testament in the manner of those scholars, that is precisely what he did, citing the manuscript piecemeal to support individual grammatical points.[649] This commentary, which draws on the exegetical works of Grotius and Salmasius and offers numerous observations on the King James Bible, shows Young in his element, and demonstrates the flexibility of British New Testament criticism in the moment when the genre was becoming a pan-European literary phenomenon. A later generation of High Church scholars would come to find this flexibility distasteful.[650]

---

[647] See Holstenius to Peiresc, 7 March 1637, in his *Epistolae* (1817), pp. 291-2.

[648] Hence the objections of Scipione Cobelluzzi, Cardinal Librarian of the Vatican until 1626, to Balthasar Moretus's attempt to republish the Greek text of the Antwerp Polyglot, an earlier Catholic edition: see Moretus to Francesco Barberini, 26 February 1627, in Vatican MS Barb. Lat. 2185, fols. 43[a]-44[a].

[649] This commentary is in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 34 (there is a copy intended for publication by Thomas Smith in MS Smith 97). See the marginal note on Romans 14:6, p. 34, for an example of Young's use of Codex Alexandrinus.

[650] See Thomas Smith to James Eckersall, 21 October, 1693, in Bodleian Library, MS Smith 60, p. 124, describing Young's conjectures on the New Testament as 'pretty & ingenious, but withall very phansifull & ill grounded.' Cf. Smith to Thomas Hearne, 17 March, 1705, in MS Smith 127, p. 72.

Just as textual criticism of the Septuagint became more specialized and isolated, so did grammatical criticism, which came to focus on the question of the *lingua Hellenistica* and the relationship between the Greek of the Septuagint and that of the New Testament. As we have seen, Heinsius concentrated more than Scaliger had on the literary aspects of these texts; as far as he was concerned, the problem posed by the Septuagint was literary and exegetical rather than historical.[651] Often, the scholars who sought readings from Codex Alexandrinus were simply looking to enhance the range of possible versions of the text from which to select their favourite: its appeal for Gronovius seemed to lie in the fact that, as he reported to Salmasius, 'every line which has so far been collated with the published version of the Septuagint contains some kind of variation from it.'[652] For some, then, the acquisition of manuscripts was simply a continuation of the quest for rhetorical copia by other means. Nor, in the end, did readers feel Young's failure to construct an argument about the history of his manuscript or the Septuagint as a whole to be especially detrimental to the work he had done.[653]

It was noted at the beginning of this study that Joseph Scaliger downplayed the significance of manuscripts in his observations on the art of criticism, never articulating even a half-formed theory of textual criticism as a practice which began with the available extant manuscripts and filled in the historical gaps stretching back to the original text (even if this is what he himself managed to do in isolated cases).[654] We are now in a position to question again whether what has been identified as textual criticism during this period was

---

[651] See II.6, above.

[652] Gronovius to Salmasius, 25 May 1639, in Dibon and Waquet, eds. (1984), p. 53. This may mean that Gronovius had seen Young's copy of the 1587 Septuagint (Bodleian Library, Radcl. c. 8) and that Young had already begun collating it with Codex Alexandrinus by this date.

[653] See, for instance, the praise of J. A. Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Hamburg, 1705-1728), vol. III, pp. 679, 685.

[654] See I.1, above.

truly characteristic of 'criticism' as a whole. No special term had been devised to denote what Ussher and Morin did, and Young half-heartedly attempted to do, with the history of the versions of the Bible. Rather, the case of Young and the reception of Codex Alexandrinus suggests that a historicising, text-critical approach towards manuscripts and editions remained on the margins of philology. The centre was dominated by the grammatical and stylistic concerns which we have decided to call 'literary criticism,' and an encyclopaedic, antiquarian erudition which earns the name of 'history' only in the Aristotelian sense.[655] Although several scholars had attempted serious textual criticism, the very fabric of the discipline had not yet absorbed it, nor had the readership for philological works begun to demand it as a matter of course. It was not until the era of Richard Simon that it established its own, clearly defined territory within critical methodology, by which time literary criticism and antiquarianism were conquering new disciplinary territories of their own.[656]

---

[655] On Aristotelian *historia*, see I.1 and II.4, above.

[656] For an introduction to Simon, see Patrick Lambe, 'Biblical Criticism and Censorship in Ancien Régime France: the case of Richard Simon,' *Harvard Theological Review* 78.1/2 (1985), pp. 149-77.

III.2: Early Christian ecclesiology and the controversy over Ignatius

The first part of this study surveyed the wide range of approaches to Christian antiquity of which scholars could avail themselves in the opening decades of the seventeenth century, including the spare, biblically orientated patristic textual criticism and exegesis of Henry Savile and his collaborators on Chrysostom; the confessionalized, polemical, vernacular output of Thomas James; and the philologically expansive work of Isaac Casaubon, whose integration into the mainstream of contemporary ecclesiastical history was awkward and contentious, both in the British Isles and abroad. It went on to explore the legacy of continental criticism for the modes of biblical and patristic scholarship practised by Selden and his opponents, such as Richard Montagu; and another, much less volatile, element of its legacy in the curious, erudite, and unpolemical work of Patrick Young on Clement of Rome.

Although Young presented Clement in a relatively uncontroversial light, the text of this author, among others, became much more hotly contested from the 1640s onwards, above all where questions of Church government were concerned. Clerical and secular scholars alike sensed that neutrality, or even the pretence thereof, was no longer an option when they came to focus on Christian antiquity. Long- and short-term, inter- and intra-confessional debates about episcopacy converged on one Father in particular: Ignatius of Antioch, whose collected epistles provided more effusive testimonies than Clement's about the hierarchical superiority of bishops as a distinct order of the clergy. If Ignatius truly was their author, they were most likely the earliest extant Christian writings after the New Testament and the first epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. The Epistles had generally

been embraced by Catholics, and rejected by Protestants as forgeries.[657] In 1645, however, James Ussher published a radical new recension based on previously overlooked Latin manuscripts.[658] Ussher's edition presented only six epistles as genuine, instead of the usual twelve. The new Ignatius conformed to the testimony of Eusebius, who had only mentioned six or seven epistles, suggesting that the rest were post-Eusebian forgeries. In 1646, moreover, Isaac Vossius went one better and published more or less the same recension in its original Greek, from a manuscript he had found in Florence.[659]

This chapter analyses the scholarly reception of this new recension, from both sides, up to John Pearson's *Vindiciae epistolarum S. Ignatii* (1672). Pearson's five-hundred page treatise has commonly been regarded as the definitive, enduring statement of the validity of the seven letters published by Vossius; but a careful consideration of both sides of the argument prior to this publication shows that Pearson was troubled by many of the same difficulties and blind spots as his predecessors.[660] The intense scrutiny applied to the text of Ignatius led scholars to more abstract questions about how to study the ecclesiastical authors as distinguished from sacred or secular ones, and it imparted a great deal of momentum to the specialization of patristic scholarship as a field of inquiry in its own right, no longer as directly complementary to the study of pagan antiquity as it was for Casaubon, Savile, Selden or Young. Above all, the literary-critical techniques that had

---

[657] On Calvin's dismissal of Ignatius, which stemmed from Trinitarian debates more than ecclesiological ones, see Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 106-112.

[658] James Ussher, ed., *Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolae* (Oxford, 1645). On the date of publication, see Quantin (2009), p. 267.

[659] See Isaac Vossius, ed., *Epistolae genuinae S. Ignatii Martyris* (Amsterdam, 1646). Vossius embraced a seventh letter, to Polycarp, which Ussher had rejected. Although he regarded the epistle to the Romans as one of the seven genuine letters, the Florentine manuscript did not actually include it. Ussher subsequently updated his earlier edition with, *inter alia*, Vossius's Greek text: *Appendix Ignatiana* (London, 1647).

[660] As Haugen (2011), pp. 34-38, has rightly pointed out. For praise of Pearson, see Hugh de Quehen, 'Politics and Scholarship in the Ignatian Controversy,' *Seventeenth Century* 13.1 (1998), p. 74.

been at the heart of Casaubon's approach to detecting forgeries came to seem marginal, or even obsolete.

One scholar has attributed the awkward, problematic nature of Pearson's intervention to the inevitable clash between the 'normal' methods employed in 'nonpolemical works of scholarship' and the 'pressure of polemic' which exerted itself on 'even...the most serious churchmen.'[661] Yet there were genuine intellectual motivations for the paths taken by patristic scholars during the middle of the century, as well as confessional and polemical ones. They arose from the changing shape of criticism as a discipline, as well as the influence of professional theology, and they deserve to be taken seriously, for they illustrate one of the principal themes of this study: the dynamic, heterogeneous, and philosophically fraught nature of late humanist philology.

The fact that Ussher made his breakthrough by singling out English manuscripts of Ignatius is an irony which Thomas James did not live long enough to appreciate. Where James had wanted to use English patristic manuscripts to win controversies against Roman Catholics, Ussher used them mainly to defuse a controversy among Protestants. At times, however, he resorted to a Jamesian presentation of his research, going out of his way to take issue with specific doctrinal arguments which Ignatius's Catholic editors had adduced from the text, and refuting them using his new, uncorrupted, 'English' text; or gleefully pointing out where Jesuits had failed to present a united front, disagreeing with each other over the authenticity of certain ecclesiastical texts.[662] Moments like these reveal Ussher's

---

[661] Haugen (2011), p. 38.

[662] Ussher, ed. (1645), xviii-xix; and xlviii-xlix, where he highlights Petavius's rejection of Franciscus Turrianus's claim that the modern text of the Apostolic Constitutions attributed to Clement of Rome was the same as the original one cited by Epiphanius.

status as a fundamentally ecclesiastical scholar: he belonged to the same category as James, in spite of his vastly superior technical abilities.[663]

Hence the massive importance for Ussher of previous scholars' judgements about the text of Ignatius, from antiquity to the present. His discovery of the genuine epistles mentioned by Eusebius, surprisingly to modern readers, did not make redundant the opinion of a Calvin or a Casaubon, a Whitaker or a Whitgift. Nor did it render the Fathers who had read Ignatius in Eusebius's wake much less important than Eusebius himself. For instance, Ussher dedicated part of the dissertation on the genuine and forged epistles which accompanied the new text to Casaubon's judgement on the author, going to the trouble of borrowing the French scholar's notes from his son, Meric, and comparing them with his printed *Exercitationes*, in order to show that Casaubon believed a genuine Ignatius could be rescued from the corruptions of the vulgar recension – and, indeed, that he was planning to do so before he died.[664]

Casaubon's project would have engaged primarily with the internal characteristics of the text, not the manuscript tradition: in the passage of the *Exercitationes* Ussher cited, Casaubon added that the epistle to the Romans' superscription, at the very least, could not be genuine, as anybody with any expertise in Greek could tell.[665] This task was eventually taken up by another Calvinist scholar, Nicolaus Vedelius, who published an edition at Geneva in 1623, in Greek and Latin. Vedelius aimed to separate the genuine from the

---

[663] I have already noted Ussher's disdain for the literary criticism of Scaliger, and enthusiasm for James's patristic collation projects: see above, I.1 and II.2.i, respectively.

[664] Ussher, ed. (1645), cxxxvi, noting Casaubon's promise, in the *Exercitationes* (1614), p. 762: 'nonnullarum ex illis [epistolis Ignatianis] antiquitatem nouis rationibus tuebimur nos alibi, si Deo placuerit'; cf. Pearson (1672), Preface, p. 9.

[665] ibid.: 'Extat etiam inter illas epistolas, vna ad Romanos: cuius titulus si verus est & γνήσιος, (quod Graecè periti nunquam sinent sibi persuaderi:) prolixam laudationem Ecclesiae Ro. continet.' Cf. the passage of Casaubon's notes quoted by Ussher: '*Mihi olim illas percurrenti multa videbantur suspecta*.'

spurious, first by separating the seven letters cited by Eusebius from the five not cited by him, and secondly with 'critical notes' covering the whole text, identifying corruptions even in the Eusebian letters.[666]

Vedelius was clearly an important reference point for Ussher, who described his edition as the most comprehensive then available.[667] He was a moderate Calvinist who had attempted to salvage the original text rather than reject Ignatius entirely. He had even admitted that there was some kind of distinction between bishop and presbyter by the beginning of the second century, a possible date for Ignatius's composition of the epistles, despite being himself a presbyterian.[668] Other Protestant authorities, however, were less amenable, and Ussher had to refute Beza's claim that episcopacy was a merely human institution with passages from Athanasius and Clement of Rome which seemed to argue otherwise.[669] The weight Ussher placed on earlier judgements by modern theologians shows that his edition was a fundamentally backward-looking one, trying to establish a Protestant consensus. Rather than rendering previous objections obsolete through the sheer power of rational criticism, Ussher's presentation of the new text had to be grounded in some sort of ecclesiastical tradition, modern as well as ancient. Later seventeenth-century readers were attuned to this. One annotator of his edition singled out Ussher's treatment of Casaubon, as well as his nuanced disagreement with the anti-episcopal positions of Beza and Salmasius.[670]

---

[666] Vedelius, Nicolaus, ed., *S. Ignatii quae exstant omnia* (Geneva, 1623).

[667] Ussher, ed. (1645), sig. A2[a]: 'omnium locupletissima.'

[668] ibid., cxxxvi-cxxxvii.

[669] ibid., cxxxvii.

[670] See Bodleian Library, 4º Rawl. 477. The signature is illegible, but it is dated 1680. On the verso of the flyleaf before the title page, the annotator writes: 'Cl. Casauboni sententia de Ep. Ignatianis itidem Salmasii et Bezae contra Episcopatum cum redarguitione [*sic*] aliquali (licet non ex professo) Reverendissimi Primatis – vid. p. CXXXVI & seq.'

Ussher's deployment of Athanasius and Clement against Beza shows how the Fathers were used, in time-honoured fashion, to produce a consensus to which Ignatius's treatment of episcopacy conformed. Thus they were regarded as authoritative commentators on Christian doctrine; but they were also, increasingly, treated as authoritative from the perspective of criticism itself. This became more apparent when Salmasius and the French theologian David Blondel entered the fray, on the opposing side.[671] Both more or less rejected the entire text of Ignatius, not just the post-Eusebian epistles. There was plenty of time for the letters to have been forged between the era of the real Ignatius and that of Eusebius, and it was possible for Eusebius to have been deceived. In this, they coincided with the general observation of Jean Daillé in his notorious *Traicté de l'employ des saincts pères*, published at Geneva in 1632.[672] Daillé eventually intervened directly in the Ignatian controversy, on the side of Salmasius and Blondel.[673] This earlier book, however, served as a broader critique of the Fathers and their use in modern-day theological disputes. Daillé pointed out that even Clement of Alexandria, 'the most Learned, and most Polite of all the Fathers, in *S. Hieromes* judgement,' had cited spurious texts as though they were authentic.[674] On the whole, the Fathers were guilty of 'so many small, trifling Faults, both in History, Grammer, Philosophy, and the like,' even though they were 'so well furnished with all sorts of Literature.'[675] It was not much of a leap to conclude that Eusebius could

---

[671] See Blondel, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris* (Amsterdam, 1646), especially p. 46, where he notes Salmasius's agreement with him. Salmasius had already written against episcopacy, under the pseudonym of Walo Messalinus: see his *De Episcopis et Presbyteris contra D. Petavium Loiolitam dissertatio prima* (Leiden, 1641).

[672] An English translation by Thomas Smith was published in London in 1651; an expanded Latin version in Geneva in 1655. On Daillé's treatise and its reception, see Quantin (2009), p. 228ff.

[673] Daillé, *De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur libri duo* (Geneva, 1666).

[674] Daillé (1651), Book I, p. 31.

[675] ibid., Book II, p. 44.

have been taken in by a particularly adept impostor. As Daillé noted, 'if a Man should chance to bring him a Piece of some able Master, that should have fully, and exactly learnt both the Languages, History, Manners, Alliances, and Quarrels of the Family he hath boldly thrust himself into...assure your self that our *Aristarchus* would be here...much puzled to discover this Jugler.'[676]

Daillé was not prepared to assert the superiority of modern over ancient scholarship, nor even of any one particular modern scholar over the ancients, as Scaliger might have been inclined to do. His warnings about the difficulty and fundamental uncertainty of criticism applied to both ages in equal measure, and he was not exactly enamoured with the powers of philology: 'I shal passe by all these minute punctilioes, as more suitable to the enquiries of the *Pyrrhonians* and *Academicks*, whose businesse it is to question all things; then of Christians who onely seek, in simplicity and sincerity of heart, whereon to build their faith.'[677] Similarly, when Blondel and Salmasius rejected Ignatius, they refrained from triumphing in the glory of their own erudition over that of the early Christians, not even calling much attention to Eusebius's error. To a staunch defender of antiquity, however, the battle lines had been drawn. Blondel, although hardly abusive towards the Fathers, had let his guard down and exacerbated the division between the two sides in one moment of flippancy:

> But [one might object that] the Fathers completely trusted those epistles, which we think are forgeries: so what? How many things have always deceived men who are not suspicious or experienced enough, and continue to deceive them daily? Who among the

[676] ibid., Book I, p. 39.

[677] ibid., Book I, p. 36. This mirrors the warnings of Cappel against excessive critical curiosity: see III.1, above.

> ancients, when he read the eight-book poem which a corrupt Chiliast had inscribed with the name of the Sibyl, noticed the impostor's deceit?[678]

Henry Hammond (1605-1660), who had been chaplain to Charles I, seized on this passage to portray his opponents as condemners of ecclesiastical tradition *tout court*: Blondel had accused the Fathers of erring 'not only in their doctrines, but in their relation of the history of the primitive Church...in this, apparently, Blondel alone – or perhaps, of all mortal men, Salmasius too – is more accurate a judge than the entire patristic tradition, which can thus be discounted.'[679] He translated and slightly expanded the same argument when he engaged with John Owen, who shared Salmasius and Blondel's scepticism, adding that, although Blondel claimed to have 'reason on his side,' Ignatius's modern detractors were 'so many hundred years distant' from the events of ecclesiastical history, unlike his ancient readers.[680]

This was part of a broader line of argument taken by Hammond, which asserted the primacy of patristic testimony over 'reasonable' or, as he more commonly termed them, 'probable' arguments. Blondel had alleged that many of the events depicted or implied by Ignatius's correspondence were not 'verisimilar.' Hammond dismissed such objections: 'In historical accounts, nothing is less reasonable than to make demands about their verisimilitude in accordance with our own assessments of things, or to think that arguments we've made up, which seem probable to their creators, can do anything to increase or

---

[678] Blondel (1646), p. 48: 'Sed plenam illis ipsis quos confictas putamus epistolis fidem habuere Patres: Quid tum? quammulta minimè suspicaces ac imparatos, & fefellerunt semper, & quotidiè fallunt? Cui ex veteribus inscriptum Sibyllae nomine ab impuro Chiliasta 8 librorum carmen legenti falsarii fraus suboluit?'

[679] Henry Hammond, *Dissertationes quatuor* (London, 1651), p. 102: 'Nec id quidem in *doctrinis* tantummodò, sed in rerum in *Ecclesiâ* primaevâ gestarum narratione; (istius enim censùs est controversia ista, an *Epistolas* scripserit *Ignatius*) In his quippe, unicum *D. Blondellum*, aut alterum fortassis inter omnes mortales *Walonem Messalinum* rectiùs judicare, quàm *Patres universos*, & sic flocci faciendos omnes, (sic enim [QUID TUM?] interpretamur *Britanni*) quamprimum eos verum sensisse *D. Blondelli* non intersit.' On Hammond in general, see *ODNB*, and J. W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660: with special reference to Henry Hammond* (Manchester University Press, 1969).

[680] idem, *An Answer to the Animadversions on the Dissertations touching Ignatius's Epistles* (London, 1654), p. 21; cf. idem, *Of the Power of the Keyes* (London, 1647), pp. 29-30.

detract from the credit of a historical account, when its credit comes down entirely to the authority of the one relating it.' He signalled what was at stake in his position when he wondered, rhetorically, what would happen to the Bible itself if its interpretation became subject to the criterion of verisimilitude.[681]

Hammond's position on the value of the Fathers as witnesses placed him within a long tradition of patristic theology. Most immediately, however, he owed it to the famous letters which Isaac Casaubon and Cardinal du Perron had written to each other earlier in the century.[682] These were principally concerned with the question of what it meant to be 'Catholic,' but they also discussed questions of ecclesiastical history, such as how to infer a *consensus Patrum*. At times, wrote Perron, the Fathers spoke 'not as Doctours,' expressing normative judgements about doctrine, 'but as witnesses, of the vse and practise of the Church in their ages, & do not say; In my opinion, this ought thus to be belieued, or thus to be vnderstood, or thus to be obserued: but the Church from one end of the world to the other, belieueth thus, or obserueth this.' Crucially, such statements, once they were found in multiple Fathers (Perron's minimum number was ten) led the patristic scholar to 'an absolute demonstration' about ecclesiastical history, not merely a 'probable' one.[683] The fact that Hammond opposed the use of witnesses to 'probable arguments' suggested that

---

[681] Hammond (1651), p. 87: 'In rerum gestarum narrationibus, nihil rationi minùs consentaneum esse, quàm ut earum verisimilitudo ad calculos nostros exigatur, aut argumenta à nobis efficta, tandémque effictoribus probabilia visa, quicquam ad fidem *historiae* faciendam, vel derogandam posse putentur, cùm ea narrantis authoritati tota debeatur.... Piget dicere, quid de ipsâ *Sacrosanctâ historiâ*, aut *paginâ* fiet, si sceleratae hujusmodi quaestiuncularum *periergiāi*, dirísque hisce ingeniorum male feriatorum *Eculeis* [hobby-horses] submiscatur'; cf. Hammond (1647), pp. 26-9; and idem, *A letter of resolution to six quaeres, of present use in the Church of England* (London, 1653), pp. 27-31.

[682] See Hammond's letter to Thomas Smith, 4 January 1653, in N. Pocock, 'Illustrations of the State of the Church during the Great Rebellion,' *Ecclesiastic and Theologian*, 13 (1852), pp. 325-6; quoted by Quantin (2009), p. 146. This letter also criticises Blondel and his presbyterian followers.

[683] *A Letter written from Paris by the Lord Cardinall of* Peron*, to* Mons[r]. Casaubon *in England* (London, 1612), pp. 34-5.

he, too, saw testimony as providing a higher (in neo-Aristotelian language, 'mathematical') level of certainty.[684]

As has been demonstrated, Casaubon's own conception of patristic scholarship had little in common with Perron's position, and he duly sidestepped this part of Perron's letter, saying almost nothing about the distinctions between demonstrative and probable proof, or doctor and witness, and preferring to focus on questions of faith rather than ecclesiastical discipline, which could only be resolved by resorting to Scripture.[685] Daillé, conversely, had tackled these distinctions head on, pouring scepticism on the notion that the Fathers could be reliable witnesses of what was universally believed or practised in their own age; and, indeed, that they had even intended to serve as witnesses in such a way, particularly for future ages as well as their own.[686] The logical conclusion, which Daillé himself did not state, was the one made manifest by some of the practices of Casaubon and Selden: writing an accurate and comprehensive ecclesiastical history was a matter of extracting information from sources which they were not directly attempting to give their readers, as well as attending to their explicit historical propositions; of collating this information and weighing patristic and non-patristic sources against each other; and of accepting that sometimes, only moral, rather than mathematical certainty could be attained. Conjecture, about both events and texts, was an indispensable, if epistemologically compromised, tool of the critic.

---

[684] See I.1, above.

[685] See II.2, above. For Casaubon's dodging of Perron's argument, see *The Answere of Master Isaac Casaubon to the Epistle of the most illustrious and most reuerend Cardinall Peron* (London, 1612), p. 27.

[686] Daillé (1651), Book II, pp. 3-7. See especially p. 7: 'there are but very few Passages, wherein they testifie plainly, and in direct terms, what the Beliefe of the Church in their time hath been, touching the Points now controverted amongst us.'

The position of Du Perron and Hammond, by contrast, implied that such ratiocinative processes were as unacceptable in the witnesses themselves as they were in modern ecclesiastical historians. As Daillé put it (before downplaying the value of the Fathers as witnesses), 'in a *Witness*, there is required only *Faithfullness*, and Truth; but in a *Doctor*, *Learning*, and Knowledg. The one perswadeth us, by the opinion we have of his Ueracity; the other, by the strength of his Arguments.'[687] Much later, Henry Dodwell made essentially the same distinction. The statements of a doctor mixed reasoning with fact; those of a witness were based on fact alone.[688]

All of these factors explain the sheer importance of patristic witnesses in the debate over Ignatius. The most extreme example of this is provided by the controversy over whether Salmasius and Blondel were the first men ever to have rejected all of the epistles, not just the post-Eusebian ones, as corrupt or spurious. In responding to this objection, Blondel as I have noted, dismissively asked, 'so what?' Salmasius, on the other hand, claimed that there was, in fact, at least one important ecclesiastical author who had shared their opinion: Nicephorus (758-828), Patriarch of Constantinople, to whom he attributed an anonymous *stichometria* – a text, often accompanying the works of George Syncellus, that listed the titles and lengths, by number of lines, of the canonical books of the Bible, and of some books not belonging to the canon.[689]

---

[687] ibid., Book II, p. 3. The original French is slightly different: 'Car en vn tesmoin est requise la bonne foi; en vn Docteur le sçavoir. L'vn persaude par la reputation qu'il a d'estre veritable; l'autre par la force de ses raisons.'

[688] See Quantin (2009), p. 373, quoting Dodwell's *Dissertationes in Irenaeum* (Oxford, 1689), p. 60: 'Est tamen hic accurate *distinguendum*, quod miror non fecisse Doctissimos alioqui *Patrum* Adversarios. Sunt enim in duplici discrimine Propositiones quas Patrum fide credendas accipimus. Aliae res gestas *nude* & *Historice*, nec ullis *ratiociniis* admixtas repraesentant; Aliae *sequelas* quasdam quas crediderint Veteres è rebus gestis Apostolorum *colligi* posse firmis *ratiociniis*.'

[689] See Salmasius (1641), pp. 252-3; the rebuttal by Hammond (1651), p. 71ff.; and Daillé (1666), p. 243.

This text placed 'Ignatius' under the heading of 'apocryphal' works. Salmasius and, later, Daillé were not on solid ground in arguing that 'Ignatius' necessarily referred to all the Ignatian epistles, and that 'apocryphal' meant 'forged,' rather than 'apocryphal' in the sense applied to the Books of the Maccabees: neither part of the biblical canon, nor doctrinally necessary, but still worthy of being read. Nor, it must be admitted, did this episode see the other side cover itself in glory. Pearson was even forced to invent a lost didactic work by Polycarp in order to show that all of the works supposedly being rejected under the names of Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Shepherd of Hermas were treatises of Christian instruction written by those authors, not epistles.[690] What is most important for our purposes, however, is the sheer tenacity with which both sides disputed even the most tenuous, apparently inconsequential precedent for the dangerously innovative position of rejecting the Eusebian letters. Joseph Scaliger spent his career proclaiming himself to be the first discoverer of various historical facts, unknown even to the ancients. In the crucible of ecclesiastical scholarship from the 1640s onwards, however, such assertions only served to delegitimate a critic's position.

From a disciplinary point of view, Henry Hammond's attack had two prongs. On the one hand, he was painting Blondel as a sophistic dialectician, reducing written revelation and explicit testimony to a matter of logic and reason. Moreover, Blondel's logic was, in Aristotelian terms, not demonstrative enough: it could only hypothesise about, rather than establish, the facts of the matter.[691] On the other hand, he portrayed Salmasius as a mere critic, neither respectful nor knowledgeable enough about theology to be treated as

---

[690] Pearson (1672), Part I, p. 61.

[691] Hammond (1651), p. 103: 'Ego quidem illud unum [τὰ ἀρχαῖα κρατείτω] ex hoc ipso *Ignatio* didicisse malo, quàm *Dialecticorum*, seu probabilium in re qualibet argumentorum, summus artifex censeri; quorum integram *Myriadem*, ut id semel dicam, ad unam ἀπόδειξιν assurgere non posse, nec (in rei gestae, quae dicitur, quaestione) contra unius boni viri testimonium, multò minus contra *omnium Patrum* consensum quicquam valere'

authoritative.[692] The question of what the critic brought to this debate which the ecclesiastical historian didn't was an operative one from Ussher to Pearson. By claiming the high ground of ecclesiastical testimony, it became possible for critics to be associated purely with weaker, more speculative arguments based on probability and the internal characteristics of texts. Most importantly, Ussher and Vossius's independent discoveries of the Eusebian recension were not described as acts of criticism. As Hammond put it, they represented exactly the kind of scholarship that bypassed the need for critics altogether. Looking back on Vedelius's attempt to reform the text of Ignatius on an internal basis, without any new manuscript evidence, he stated that it was 'a matter of *labour* and *travail* for *Criticks* by their *own conjectures* to make *discoveries* of such *deceits*' and that he always 'wisht for a surer way of reforming *Ignatius*.'[693] Hammond went on to downplay the value of stylistic analysis as a part of criticism: 'the *styles* of men in the same *age* are oft very *different*.... And we know it is the part of an *Aristarchus*, or *skilfull Critick*, and the common way of discerning such or such a *writing*, whether it be his, whose it *pretends* to be or not, diligently to *observe* the *style* or *character*, which could not be any *probable* way of *judging*, if all others, which wrote in the *same age*, wrote the very same *style*.' The letters could not be dismissed on the basis that they were stylistically different from those of Clement or any other of Ignatius's contemporaries. For Pearson, similarly,

---

[692] His terms echoed the standard accounts of the art surveyed in I.1, above. See Hammond (1654), p. 29: '...he was a very *learned* man in severall parts of *good literature*, especially skill'd in *Greek* and *Latine words*, and *phrases*, and *customes*, and his *Plinianae exercitationes* had long since given me that notion of him, as equal thus far to any of his age, and fit to be named with *Scaliger* and *Casaubon* of the preceding. And knowing 1. that *Grammaticus* was antiently a title of *honour* among *learned* men, witnesse *Suetonius* his *Book de Illustribus Grammaticis*; and 2. that of Γραμματικὴ there are three parts, τεχνικὴ, ἐξηγητιχὴ [*sic*], κριτικὴ (the two later of which being peculiarly his *excellencies*, were fully comprehended in the *general* title of *Grammarian*) and *lastly*, that being neither *Divine* nor *Physitian*, nor *Lawyer* by profession, I could not fitly make either of those his *title*, I thought it most agreeable to all these *reasons* to stile him *learned Grammarian*, especially having so little reason, as I then had, to commend his *knowledge* in *Theologie*.'

[693] Hammond (1654), p. 48. See also Pearson (1672), Preface, p. 14: 'Jam verò non ex levibus conjecturis, aut ex sententiâ suâ, ut Vedelius, sed ex Veteris Versionis fide Graecas Ignatii Epistolas recognovit [Ussher],' etc.

only the second Part of his *Vindiciae*, which dealt with internal arguments about the text, rather than testimonies, demanded any 'critical acumen.'[694]

At this point, it seems appropriate to wonder whether, considered as a whole, the common approach taken to the text of Ignatius can properly be called 'humanistic'; or, indeed, 'critical.' The turn to external evidence and witnesses had diminished the forms of literary analysis which Scaliger and Casaubon had found so congenial. More particularly, the turn to patristic witnesses for a patristic text produced an ecclesiastical criticism with different protocols and criteria from historical criticism as a whole. Perron and, by extension, Hammond's conception of the 'witness' was rooted in Christian authors like Vincent of Lerins.[695] It simply did not have a secular precedent, because classical authors and those who studied them were not exercised by the same questions of Catholicity and tradition.

One of the consequences of the special treatment of the Fathers was that they were more likely to be regarded as authoritative, barely fallible witnesses, especially when speaking about Christian rather than pagan history. As we have seen, Daillé and others were happy to point out that the Fathers had been led astray when they ventured into the field of classical studies, and even to imply that they had been deceived by the forgeries and impostures of earlier Christians. Hammond and Pearson, conversely, could not. Eusebius was especially crucial. For Hammond, Eusebius's historical testimony straightforwardly

---

[694] Pearson (1672), Part II, p. 2: 'Dicimus itaque has Epistolas, quas habuit Eusebius, & nos nunc habemus, si penitissimè inspiciantur, si acumine vel maximè Critico discutiantur, si materia & modus scriptionis exactissimè trutinentur, & Autori, & tempori, & occasioni optimè respondere.'

[695] See Perron (1612), pp. 10 and 34; and the hostile response of Daillé (1651), Book I, p. 118, and Book II, p. 30. Selden's opponents in the tithing controversy clearly relied on similar protocols: see Tillesley (1619), p. 1. On the use of Vincent of Lerins, see also Callisen (2012).

trumped that of the much later Eutychius, with little further argument needed.[696] He went out of his way to contradict John Owen's assertion that Eusebius had erred in thinking that Philo of Alexandria wrote a book about the Christians converted by Mark's preaching in that city, and that the book was actually about a Jewish sect, the Essenes.[697]

Pearson was no more flexible. He was assessing witnesses not according to any modern calculus of his own, but in line with the authority which had generally been accorded to them within the Church. He was looking for plain, explicit testimonies of Ignatian authorship.[698] He was also making a strong historical argument for the quality of clerical learning in the early ages of Christianity, especially in the third and fourth centuries, 'when everywhere the Church abounded with very learned men, and various libraries were founded to preserve the writings of the ancient Christians.'[699] Even the earlier Fathers such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian were 'great students, and the sharpest and most learned scholars, of all ancient literature, especially the Christian part.'[700]

---

[696] Hammond (1651), p. 177. On Eutychius, see Selden, ed. and trans., *Eutychii Aegyptii...Ecclesiae suae origines* (London, 1642); Toomer (2009), pp. 600-614; and N. W. S. Cranfield, 'Early seventeenth century developments and change in the doctrine of ἐπισκοπή and understanding of the office of ἐπίσκοπος in the Church of England' (DPhil dissertation, Oxford, 1988), pp. 377-413, which sets the work in the context of contemporary parliamentary debates about the future of episcopacy.

[697] Hammond (1654), p. 218. Eusebius was indeed mistaken about this work, as Scaliger had argued: see e.g. *Thesaurus Temporum* (1606), 'Animadversiones,' p. 255. For a useful discussion of Martin Delrio's attacks on Scaliger over this topic, see Johannes Machielsen, 'Demons and Letters: Aspects of the life and works of Martin Delrio, 1551-1608' (DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2011), pp. 271-309.

[698] Pearson (1672), Part I, p. 2: 'Idoneos autem testes putamus scriptores Ecclesiasticos Veteres, qui antequam haec in Ecclesiâ orta, aut postquam aliquibus oriri visa, est controversia, sententiam suam, ut se obtulit occasio, sine ullâ dubitatione aut haesitatione protulerunt. Hos ego testes incorruptos adducam atque integros; ex horum scriptis…testimonia proferam: ídque eâ modestiâ praestabimus, ut nullius Veterum famae detrahatur, nullius nomini injuria fiat, sua cuique autoritas, qualis & quanta in Ecclesiâ Dei hactenus fuit, illabata conservetur; eâ fide, ut neminem obtorto collo ad judicium ferendum trahamus, omnia planè & nudè repraesentemus, prout in eorum scriptis reperiuntur.'

[699] ibid., Part I, p. 78: 'cùm homines undique doctissimi in Ecclesiâ florerent, & Bibliothecae variae ad veterum Christianorum scripta conservanda conderentur.'

[700] Part I, p. 189.

Pearson's confidence in the erudition of the primitive Fathers led him to identify Daillé as an over-enthusiastic (in the early modern sense) critic of the Fathers, and yoke him to a more surprising target, who had attained an almost unassailable reputation for piously assimilating humanism and Christianity: Erasmus. He quoted the opinion of Pierre-Daniel Huet, a French Catholic who had been educated by Jesuits.[701] In condemning as spurious certain patristic texts, including one attributed to Origen, Erasmus demonstrated his 'temerity...confounding what the ancient Fathers wrote with his own empty conjectures, to such an extent that without the efforts of subsequent theologians to resist him, we would scarcely be able to make any certain judgements about the doctrines of the early Church.'[702] Moreover, Huet added, he had been followed in such dangerous judgements by Protestant historians like the Magdeburg Centuriators. With Huet and Pearson's joint appeal to the labours of recent theologians against those of Erasmus, humanist criticism begins to split along confessional and disciplinary lines.

Alongside Ignatius, the prime object of Pearson's defence of the Fathers was Eusebius.[703] His reluctance to question Eusebius's critical faculties, as well as his authority as an ecclesiastical historian, reveals itself most clearly in Part II. He rejects as spurious an entire edition of Greek letters published in 1637 by Leone Allaci and attributed to the followers of Socrates, with one vital exception: a fragment of a letter purportedly written by Xenophon, preserved and received as genuine by Eusebius. These epistles were hardly

---

[701] See April G. Shelford, *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650-1720* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2007).

[702] Part I, p. 106: '*Castigandus*, inquit ille [Huet], *Erasmus, qui & ipse sentit, & idem ut sentirent Magdeburgenses perfecit, hoc Opus esse hominis Latini pulchre docti & bene diserti*. Imò ut sententiam Huetii de Erasmo suo intelligant Dallaeani, haec ejus verba sunt, *Effraenis profectò, iterum dico, & projecta Erasmi temeritas Veterum Patrum scripta inanibus suis conjecturis ita permiscentis, ut nisi contraivissent posteriorum Theologorum studia, vix certum aliquid de adolescentis Ecclesiae doctrinâ statuere possemus*. Maximè igitur idoneus autor Erasmus Dallaeo, qui de Usu SS. Patrum in eum modum disputat.'

[703] See, above all, the general defence of Eusebius's learning and authority in Part I, Chapter VIII, p. 120 f.

integral to Pearson's argument about Ignatius: he used them in a long list of examples adduced to show how liable ancient forgers were to chronological miscalculations, and how easily their frauds could be detected as a result. He simply could not countenance undermining his patristic witness, Eusebius, on any level. Pearson's suspension of criticism where the authority of Eusebius came under consideration was gestured at by Richard Bentley in his *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* (1697).[704] Bentley, no respecter of tradition, and supremely confident in his own authority, had already condemned Allatius's entire collection.

Bentley was subtly distinguishing between the clerical scholarship of a Pearson or a Hammond, orientated around tradition and authority, and his own freer, more iconoclastic inclinations. He could have looked to Scaliger for a precedent, especially for criticism of Eusebius and the credulity of the rest of the Fathers; or even Selden, whose wranglings with Richard Montagu had touched on similar themes. A more immediate one, however, was provided by another of the participants in the controversy – one, ironically, on the same side as Ussher and Pearson: Isaac Vossius.

Vossius's preface to his edition of the Greek text offered an impassioned yet airy appreciation of the epistles' beauties, striking a different tone from Ussher's dry historicism:

> All things, whether created by nature or constructed by art, have this feature in common: that the longer, and more attentively, we contemplate whatever is more perfect in its category, the more beautiful and artful it seems in our eyes as we behold it. This is more or less what happened to me in the case of Ignatius. Every time I re-read his epistles I appreciated something new which increased my approval of them. Whenever I picked them up again, something always presented itself to me by which I was able to recognise their author as genuine: at one time, that elegant simplicity, which fits

[704] p. 113.

> perfectly the age in which Ignatius lived; at another, the constant, ubiquitous congruence of subject matter with his choice of words, his truth to reality; and again, the zeal and fervor of the martyr, which shines out most of all (but not exclusively) in the letter to the Romans. Ultimately, all of these things were witnesses of their authorship [*autorem suum testabantur*].[705]

Ussher and Pearson's careful distinction between internal arguments from style and other grammatical features, and external ones, based on patristic witnesses (*testimonia*), is collapsed in a few strokes of Vossius's pen, by his use of *testabantur* for the internal qualities of the text. Indeed, he even used the term for the 'vulgar' text that predated his own and Ussher's discoveries. Vossius did go on to show some concern for patristic testimony, but he did not go to nearly the same lengths as Ussher, Hammond or Pearson to evaluate and defend the Fathers' treatment of Ignatius: not even in his rejoinders to Blondel, so much of whose case had rested on discrediting or downplaying external witnesses.

Instead, Vossius sought refuge in arguments which he happily designated as merely 'probable.' At the same time, he espoused a vision of scholarship less exacting and rigorous, but more polite and open-minded than that of Pearson:

> He [Blondel] says that I am making my case without any witness; putting my own whims forward as though they were rational; and taking serious matters lightly....But I tend not to burden my pages and their margins with pointless parallels and countless references...He says that it does not necessarily follow from that [Vossius's use of Irenaeus and Epiphanius] and other arguments I have brought forward, that the Gnostics had some notion of Silence before Valentinus. Did I ever say it did?...I merely felt that I could probably draw that conclusion from those sources....I have, at least, presented some arguments, which may suffice for others, if not for Blondel. He, however, has offered nothing – not even an argument, let alone a probable one. And according to his

---

[705] Vossius, ed. (1646), sig. *3[b]: 'Omnia illa, quae vel natura effinxerit, vel arte sint fabricata, illam habent conditionem; ut quae in genere suo sint perfectiora, quanto diutius, & adtentius, contemplemur, tanto pulcra magis, & artificiosa, intuentium oculis sese offerant. Simile quid mihi evenit in Ignatio; cujus nunquam epistolas relegi, quin semper aliquid novi, quo magis sese mihi probarent, in iis deprehenderim: quoties inquam illas in manus resumsi, toties aliquid adparuit, unde genuinum potuerim agnoscere scriptorem: nunc elegans illa simplicitas, & seculo, quo vixit, convenientissima; nunc rerum & verborum passim & ubiq; congruentia, ac veritas; nunc zelus & martyris fervor, qui cum alibi, tum maxime in epistola ad Romanos elucet; omnia denique autorem suum testabantur.'

> testimony [*teste Blondello*], I am the one putting my whims forward as though they were rational, and taking serious matters lightly![706]

Vossius's letters had engaged with matters of historical and factual, as well as stylistic import, especially when he delved into the early Christian heresies in order to show that a certain passage did not necessarily refute that of Valentinus (and therefore betray the text as post-Ignatian). He also brought his extensive knowledge of ancient geography to bear on the controversy. But he never claimed more than a carefully limited, compromised, moral certainty for his arguments.

A final mark of Vossius's distance from his fellow defenders of Ignatius was his willingness to point out not only Eusebius's errors in learning, but also his fundamental partiality as an ecclesiastical historian. His refusal to accept that two or three men had originally shared the bishopric of Rome led him to confuse the chronology of the accessions to that office.[707] Much graver than such historico-ecclesiological slips, however, was the general tendency of the Fathers, especially the earlier ones, to slide from a sober, literalistic approach to Scripture into a mystical, Platonizing, even superstitious one. Particularly guilty were Barnabas and Clement (less so Ignatius); and, in subsequent generations, Clement of Alexandria and Origen.[708]

---

[706] Pearson (1672), 'Is. Vossii Epistola secunda,' pp. 31-2: 'Inquit me agere sine ullo teste, mihi voluntatem stare pro ratione, me etiam ait in seriis ludere....Verùm non soleo paginas meas earúmque margines inutilibus parallelis, & infinitis onerare citationibus....Ait ex eo & ex aliis quae adtuli argumentis necessariò non sequi Sigen aliquam fuisse Gnosticis illis ante Valentinum. An ego id dixi?....Sed sensi probabiliter indè concludi posse....Attuli tamen aliquot argumenta, quae aliis quàm Blondello possint sufficere. Ipse vero nullum adtulit, non dico argumentum probabile, sed nè argumentum quidem. Ego tamen ille sum (teste Blondello) cui stat pro ratione voluntas, & qui in seriis ludam.' On the debate over Ignatius's reference to 'Silence,' see Haugen (2011), pp. 37-8.

[707] Pearson (1672), 'Is. Vossii Epistola secunda,' pp. 34-5.

[708] Vossius, ed. (1646), pp. 310-311. These criticisms of Barnabas and Clement were, ironically, part of Vossius's argument for their authenticity.

Unlike Vossius, Ignatius's Anglican defenders skipped over, explained away, or explicitly defended such pecadilloes. Clement of Alexandria's value as a witness to Ignatius and his penchant for neo-Platonic speculations were compartmentalized.[709] So, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, were Origen's value as a witness to the text of the Old Testament and his enthusiasm for allegoresis.[710] Moreover, Eusebius's authority as a historian was unimpeachable. Pearson clearly conceived of his work as a general defence of the Fathers, as well as a specific one of Ignatius. Vossius did not share this commitment.

Illustrating Vossius's rather idiosyncratic position and methodology, then, allows us to appreciate the specific characteristics of the other scholars' and clerics' interventions in the controversy; and above all, to see that, although Ussher and his successors had reached a conclusion endorsed by most modern students of the Fathers, their tools for defending that position were no more modern than those of Salmasius and Blondel. They all, with the partial exception of Vossius, came to rely on a theologically inflected notion of testimony – especially of ancient, over modern testimony – that placed the Fathers on a pedestal, and reduced the importance of other philological approaches. In this respect, we can assert, roughly in line with Hugh Trevor-Roper, that Ussher, as a textual scholar, was quite unlike Scaliger, that 'free spirit' who was 'supremely confident of his own genius'; nor was he a man 'of varied and extremely polite learning' in the mould of John Price.[711] We can also perceive, with Kristine Haugen, that Isaac Vossius, and not his English clerical

---

[709] See Pearson (1672), Part II, p. 207: 'Instituit illic [in the *Stromateis*] Gnosticum suum, non vulgaribus Theologiae principiis imbutum, sed ultra aliorum Christianorum sortem elevatum, & ut Magister Origenis mystica quaeque & anagogica ubique sectatur; qualia in Barnabae Epistolâ, & Hermae Pastore plurima occurrunt, in simplicissimis & monitorum tantummodo salubrium plenis Ignatii Epistolis non reperiuntur.' This aspect of Clement's writings was treated separately from, and in no way impugned, his testimony regarding Ignatius.

[710] See III.1, above.

[711] This is Ussher's own phrase ('diffusae politissimaeque doctrinae vir Johannes Pricaeus'), used when expressing his thanks for a copy of a manuscript of a Greek lexicographer (now Leiden University Library, MS VGQ 56): see Ussher, ed. (1647), 'Ignatii et Polycarpi Martyria,' p. 104.

counterparts, provided the main model for the playful yet confident criticism of Richard Bentley.[712]

Equally, however, it must be recognised that Bentley chose to exercise his critical powers largely on secular, not sacred or ecclesiastical texts, even if he landed the occasional glancing blow on Eusebius and other Fathers. If there was less room in the field of ecclesiastical history to practice the criticism of Scaliger or Vossius, it was because of the increasing sophistication and clerical professionalisation of patristic scholarship, in which the debate over Ignatius had played an important part. As is well known, Pearson was an expert in classical literature who helped Thomas Stanley with his edition of Aeschylus.[713] Crucially, however, Pearson preferred not to put his own name on such secular critical publications: he was always either distracted or discouraged from doing so by the need to refute critics of episcopacy. Pearson illustrates the increasing specialization of patristic scholarship, which eventually played a part in what has been described as England's 'clerical enlightenment.'[714] It used cutting-edge philological and historical methods to arrive at conservative defences of Anglican orthodoxy with regard to the Trinity, the canon of Scripture, and religion in general. The story of his and other clerics' work on Ignatius, then, represents a major episode in the story of the fragmentation of humanist philology after Scaliger.

---

[712] See Trevor-Roper (1987), pp. 161 and 156-7, although this essay contains little about Ignatius; and Haugen (2011), p. 67 f. For a slight correction to this portrait of Bentley that discusses his relationship to ecclesiastical and sacred erudition, see N. J. S. Hardy, 'The Enlightenments of Richard Bentley,' forthcoming in *History of Universities* 26.2 (2012).

[713] See J. A. Gruys, *The Early Printed Editions (1518-1664) of Aeschylus: a chapter in the history of classical scholarship* (Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1981), pp. 153-99. In spite of Gruys's complaints about its account of the collaboration between Stanley and Pearson, Eduard Fraenkel, *Agamemnon*, 3 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1950), vol. I, pp. 34-85, remains useful. See also Haugen (2011), p. 24.

[714] See B. W. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in eighteenth-century England: theological debate from Locke to Burke* (Oxford University Press, 1998).

III.3: The marginalization of humanist philology

'The lesser-known, abstruse parts of literature, along with those who study them, are in such bad neglect here; and nobody understands you or even pays you any attention if you're not a natural philosopher or a "real" mathematician, as they put it.'[715] This was the judgement of the Dutch classicist Theodore Ryckius (1640-1690) when he visited England as a young man in 1668.[716] Beyond Meric Casaubon, who helped him with information about his father's manuscripts, John Cotton, Edward Pococke, Thomas Barlow and Thomas Stanley, he asserted that there were few serious scholars left to be found.[717] Erudite men like John Pearson had been diverted from their study of secular literature by the demands of religious polemic.[718] This echoes the complaints made by earlier visitors to English libraries, including Ryckius's own correspondent, J. F. Gronovius.[719] Libraries were difficult to visit, and hardly anybody really knew what was in them. Yet Ryckius also hints at a new phase in the relationship between philological scholarship and British institutions of learning. Now, literary studies were under threat not from dogmatic theology, but from the new philosophy.

Ryckius had already met Casaubon when he lamented the preponderance of natural philosophers and mathematicians in London, and his criticisms are strikingly cognate with

---

[715] Ryckius to J. G. Graevius, 1 July 1668, in Leiden University, MS PER Q 9, fol. 1[b]. The letters in this manuscript are all drafts or copies.

[716] He became professor of history at Leiden in 1672.

[717] See Ryckius to J. F. Gronovius, 23 September 1668, ibid., fol. 2; Ryckius to Petrus Francius, 19 April 1669, fol. 162; and J. G. Graevius to Meric Casaubon, 27 April, 1668, fols. 185[b]-186[a].

[718] Ryckius notes that Pearson has been too busy to continue with his work on Hesychius, because of the ongoing controversies with Jean Daillé and others over episcopacy and the letters of Ignatius.

[719] See Dibon and Waquet, eds. (1984), pp. 30-31; and the whole correspondence of Gronovius from the time he spent in London, May-August 1639. See also Vincentius Fabricius to Salmasius, 1 July 1639, in Leiden University Library, MS PAP 2: 'Illic praeter Seldenum, Spelmannum, Patricium Junium nullos vidi, qui supra vulgus saperent.'

those of his English friend. Even so, other Englishmen shared such resentment at the neglect of erudition. William Sancroft wrote from Emmanuel College, Cambridge:

> The Hebrew and Greek learning [are] out of fashion everywhere, and especially in the other colleges...and the rational learning they pretend to [is] neither the old philosophy, nor steadily any one of the new. In fine, though I must do the present society right, and say, that divers of them are very good scholars, and orthodox (I believe) and dutiful both to king and church; yet methinks I find not that old genius and spirit of learning generally in the college that made it once so deservedly famous.[720]

Meric Casaubon objected just as strongly to the eclectic blending of competing alternatives to Aristotelianism gestured at by Sancroft, and the uncertainties it had fostered. His critique of Descartes, Hobbes and others can shed a great deal of light on the precarious status of philology within English institutions following the Restoration.[721]

Before considering these, however, it is worth assessing the ways in which criticism had become integrated into academic life. The examples provided by undergraduate reading lists are instructive. As we have seen, Thomas James did not bother to include a separate section dedicated to critical or antiquarian material, or indeed many titles falling under that category, in the reading list he devised in the 1620s.[722] Lists from the 1650s and later represent a significant shift. An anonymous example, addressed to 'young (yet Academicall) schollars,' promises to cover 'History Chronology &...Authors in all ye Arts & liberall sciences – with Criticks & Antiquarys &c.'[723] It names Scaliger alongside his

---

[720] Sancroft to Ezekiel Wright, 17 January, 1663, in D'Oyly (1821), vol. I, p. 128; cited in Feingold, 'The Humanities' (1997), p. 422.

[721] This topic has been discussed by Serjeantson in the introduction to his edition of Casaubon's treatise on *Generall Learning* (1999). See also Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes and the Royal Society,' in G. A. J. Rogers and Alan Ryan, eds., *Perspectives on Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), pp. 62-4, reprinted in Malcolm (2002); Michael Hunter, 'Ancients, Moderns, Philologists and Scientists,' in *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy: Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century Britain* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995), p. 220; and Stephen Gaukroger, *The Emergence of a Scientific Culture: Science and the Shaping of Modernity, 1210-1685* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p. 221.

[722] See II.2, above.

[723] Worcester College, Oxford, MS 4.19. The list mentions no works later than Selden's *De Synedriis* (p. 49), the last volume of which was published in 1655.

Jesuit critic Petavius, as well as Thomas Lydiat, in the section on chronology; praises Thomas Farnaby's editions of Latin poets, which are 'for y^{e} text beyond any edit. & for y^{e} notes though short, yet hardly any better'; recommends Selden's *De Diis Syris* and Patrick Young's edition of Clement; and offers a special section devoted to the 'Antiquaries & Criticall Authors of this last Century in whose workes are infinite helps to understand all y^{e} Jewish rites & Ceremonies, & by consequence y^{e} Scripture it self,' including Casaubon's *Exercitationes* as well as the works of Drusius, Nicholas Fuller, Grotius, Heinsius, Louis de Dieu, Scaliger and Selden, among others.

This manuscript is in fact another, unnoticed version of a popular list which was copied several times and has been attributed to Thomas Barlow.[724] Other, fuller versions add comments that point towards an alliance of traditional Aristotelianism with critical erudition:

> Among other Books of Humane Learneing...Your Library must not want Grammarians, and Criticks, those Authors which explaine antient wordes, & things; such as explaine Insolentes dicendj formulas, Ritus gentium solennes, & grandaevas rerum origines a seculo nostro longe remotas.... And because it is a certeine truth, which the Great Philosopher tells vs, πρῶτον ἐξετάζειν δεῖ τι τά ὀνόματα σημαίνει [first one needs to examine what words signify], wee must know wordes, before wee can compasse the knowledge of thinges, all Learneing beeing lockd vp in some Language, & that lock cannot bee opened, but by the help of Vocabularyes, Lexicons, and Glossaries.[725]

Criticism had always laid claim to Aristotelian foundations. The challenges posed by various anti-Aristotelian philosophical programmes, however, had motivated some scholars to reassert and strengthen these claims, in particular that philological learning led

---

[724] It is not one of the copies noticed in Alma DeJordy and Harris Francis Fletcher, eds., *'A Library for Younger Schollers'* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961). There is another partial copy, including the section on works of criticism, in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 288, fols. 197^{a}-8^{b}. I would like to thank Daniel Blank for bringing this manuscript to my attention. For a critical review of this publication qualifying the attribution to Barlow, see Eric Jacobsen in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 63 (1964), pp. 506-16. Jacobsen still attributes the section with which I am concerned to Barlow, however. Other candidates for authorship of other sections include Richard Baxter and John Conant.

[725] DeJordy and Fletcher, eds. (1961), p. 11. I have not been able to locate the passage of Aristotle cited by Barlow.

to knowledge of real things as well as simply words.[726] Casaubon's *Letter to Peter du Moulin* (1669) couples a defence of Aristotle to an argument for the continuity between knowledge of 'words' and 'matter' against John Dury's arguments in *The Reformed School* (1651).[727] The affinity seems to have been particularly important for the discipline of divinity, around which this reading list was orientated, and Casaubon's writings during this period were equally preoccupied with the changing status of theological studies within English intellectual life.

Other lists became more specialized and avoided theology, but continued to place a premium on critical learning. Barlow composed 'Directions for the Study of English History and Antiquities' for a trainee lawyer, reserving particular praise for Selden's *Titles of Honor*:

> A book of so much vse and learning, especially for a Lawyer, that I know no book extant in our language more befitting a Gentleman and a Scholar to read, and read again, till he be well versed in it, not only to furnish himself with ingenious matter of discourse concerning all Titles of Honour and Nobility...but with many excellent things of Law, especially about that grand question of the original, nature and constitution of Parliaments; of the nature of the Baronage of England, (there was such a thing once, and I doubt not you or I may liue to see it again).... In short, it is the best book that euer *Selden* writ, hauing a noble subiect, capable of all his wit and learning, of which he hath been industriously prodigal in the prosecution of that argument.[728]

Compared with Selden, earlier lawyers like William Rastell had done a very poor job of glossing and interpreting legal terminology, owing to the fact that they were 'pitiful

---

[726] For a comparable statement to this one, see Casaubon (1999), p. 92; and p. 160, where he calls Aristotle 'that inestimable magazin of human learning.' See also Serjeantson (1999), especially p. 225, on the blending of humanism and Aristotelianism in the seventeenth century.

[727] See p. 14; Casaubon is citing p. 49 of Dury's book. Parts of this passage are paralleled in Casaubon (1999), pp. 190-91. For more on the affiliation between humanism and Aristotelianism against Descartes, see Dirk van Miert, *Humanism in an Age of Science: The Amsterdam Athenaeum in the Golden Age, 1632-1704* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), esp. pp. 362-3.

[728] Published in John Taylor, *Commentarius ad l. decemviralem de inope debitore in partis dissecando* (Cambridge, 1742): see pp. 63-4. Barlow's list is dated 30 October, 1656.

Critics.'[729] The division of critical reading into divinity and antiquities, however, speaks to a fragmentation of the humanistic discipline of philology which had not yet taken place during Selden's own career. If Selden had successfully combined criticism with legal history and antiquarian learning, this did not imply any lasting success in the field of theology. This sense of the uneven fortunes of different branches of criticism may also lie behind Ussher's melancholy reflections in old age:

> He told me how greate the losse of time was to study much the Eastern languages, that excepting *Hebrew*, there was little fruite to be gatherd of exceeding labour; that besides some *Mathematical* bookes, the *Arabic* itselfe had little considerable.... That Mr. *Seldens* best book was his *Titles of Honer*; That the Church would be destroied by *Sectaries* who would in all likelihood bring in *Poperie*; In conclusion recommended to me the study of *Philologie*, above all humane studies.[730]

As far as divinity was concerned, the philological bubble had burst, even if philologists were still favoured by some students of English law and history. The mid-century explosion of interest in the oriental languages had not yielded the results expected by biblical scholars and ecclesiastical historians, and had failed to sustain itself as an area of secular literary study.[731] Ussher's own prescriptions for young scholars were notably limited in their conception of ecclesiastical history. They echoed the patristic projects of Thomas James and seemed to have little space for the kind of broad philological archaeology of the Church favoured by Isaac Casaubon or Patrick Young.[732] He even supported the civilian Arthur Duck's attack on the confluence of humanistic studies and Roman law, which, with all its attention to elegance and the knowledge of Greek and Latin

---

[729] ibid., p. 67.

[730] E. S. de Beer, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), vol. III, pp. 156-7; quoted in Toomer (2009), p. 813.

[731] This is the broad conclusion of G. J. Toomer, *Eastern Wisedome and Learning: the Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 269f. See especially pp. 309-10: 'after the Restoration the interests of Anglican theologians moved away from minute textual arguments to greater concern with ethics and the use of reason.... As for the hopes of gaining new knowledge from Arabic scientific texts, their content was rapidly made obsolete by the rise of organized experimental science...in the second half of the seventeenth century.'

[732] See Parr (1686), pp. 96-7.

literature, had yielded 'flowers rather than fruit.'[733] Several different fields of historical inquiry were asserting their independence from the literary legacy of humanist philology.

Although philological works had found their way into academic courses of study by the middle of the seventeenth century, the way in which scholars talked about the marriage of philology and divinity betrays a fundamental anxiety about how long this interdependence could last under the pressure of rational theology and other philosophical innovations. The predominance of such concerns casts the study of 'classical' literature (in its modern sense) in an interesting light. Whereas before there may have been awkward tensions between lay study of the classics and biblical or patristic scholarship, now the two were united in the defence of 'literature' as a whole. When Thomas Barlow defended the universities against Hobbes, he wrote that they were 'the seminaries, and Nurseryes of good literature...a happy meanes of much knowledge in all sciences sacred, or ciuil...Seminaries of *all* good Letters [my emphasis]; in which the youth of this Nation may (vpon just principles) be taught religion and Piety towards God.'[734]

Equally, for Gerard Langbaine, the editor of Longinus's *On the Sublime* (1636) and Selden, the university had come to represent a haven not only for theological instruction, but also for the leisured, playful, and, as it has been described elsewhere, 'Gellian' study of non-Christian antiquity.[735] The new political climate threatened this marriage of secular and

---

[733] Arthur Duck, *De usu et authoritate iuris civilis Romanorum* (London, 1653), pp. 32-3. Duck's chapters were signed by Ussher as a mark of approval. On Duck, and the involvement of Gerard Langbaine in this work, see *ODNB*.

[734] Barlow to Hobbes, 23 December 1656, in *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), vol. I, p. 420. Twenty years later, Barlow composed a hostile commentary on Hobbes's treatise concerning heresy: see Queen's College, Oxford, MS 204, fols. 137[a]-182[b]. Many of its objections were philological and historical. See Justin Champion, '*An Historical Narration Concerning Heresie*: Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Barlow and the Restoration Debate over "Heresy,"' in David Lowenstein and John Marshall, eds., *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture* (Cambridge 2006).

[735] On the *Noctes Atticae* as a model for modern scholars, see I.1.v and II.6, above.

Christian erudition. As the former wrote to the latter, 'I feare wee must be forced ere long to bid good night to our Noctes Atticae.'[736] Puritans and other enthusiasts had long preached against excessive learning and curiosity; the more recent, and dangerous, phenomenon, as Langbaine saw it, was the encroachment of this mentality into university life.

Meric Casaubon, too, had spent much of his career working on classical literature as well as ecclesiastical history.[737] Like Barlow, Casaubon reacted to Hobbes's highly controversial account of the universities by foregrounding the marriage of secular and sacred criticism which they, and the theological curriculum in general, had supposedly achieved. He noted Beza's use of authors like Anacreon (notorious as the poet of symposiastic debauchery and erotic desire) to gloss the New Testament.[738] Classical learning, moreover, was perfectly compatible with traditional, oral patterns of academic and ecclesiastical instruction. A scholar should be 'able, being allowed in competent tyme, to give a rationall account of any place in any such author, sacred or prophane, if he be consulted about it': not only, in other words, to publish a learned treatise or write a long Latin letter about it, but to expound it in front of his students, colleagues, or parishioners.[739]

---

[736] Langbaine to Selden, 8 November 1653, in Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 109, fol. 461.

[737] See e.g. Meric Casaubon, ed., *Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1634 and 1643); *Hierocles De providentia & fato* (London, 1655); *The history of the Romans, by Lucius Florus* (London, 1658); and *De nupera Homeri editione Lugduno-Batavica* (London, 1659). Regarding Casaubon and Thomas Gataker's work on ancient Stoic authors, see Jill Kraye, '"Ethnicorum omnium sanctissimus": Marcus Aurelius and his *Meditations* from Xylander to Diderot,' in Kraye and Stone, eds. (2000), pp. 110-119. On Casaubon and experimental science, see Michael R. G. Spiller, *'Concerning Natural Experimental Philosophie': Meric Casaubon and the Royal Society* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980).

[738] Casaubon (1999), p. 96.

[739] ibid., pp. 117, 121-30 (this latter section concerns the deployment of general learning in pastoral rather than academic contexts, such as preaching).

Hobbes, on the other hand, tended to portray the universities as hotbeds of purely theological disputation, which was at best fruitless and at worst subversive to the state religion and its official doctrines.[740] He was a humanist and a classicist of sorts, but unlike Casaubon, he did not seem to envision these activities as overlapping with his writings on ecclesiastical history, or belonging to a structured academic framework.[741] When he talked about 'grammar' it was usually in the context of literary and poetic instruction rather than a broad discipline which held the key to all divine and human knowledge. In fact, he drew a pointed contrast between acceptable (literary) and unacceptable (political and philosophical) uses of grammatical and historical investigation:

> In these western parts of the world, we are made to receive our opinions concerning the institution and rights of commonwealths from *Aristotle*, *Cicero*, and other men, Greeks and Romans, that, living under popular states, derived those rights, not from the principles of nature, but transcribed them into their books out of the practice of their own commonwealths, which were popular, as the grammarians describe the rules of language out of the practice of the time, or the rules of poetry out of the poems of *Homer* and *Virgil*.[742]

This seems to have extended to his view of its utility within institutions. Little attention has been paid to the fact that Hobbes's anti-clerical vision of a 'New and Lay-University, wherein Lay-men should have the reading of *Physiques, Mathematicks, Morall Philosophy*, and *Politicks*, as the Clergy now have the sole teaching of Divinity,' seemed to

---

[740] It has been pointed out that Hobbes saw universities across Europe as preserving toxic residues of Roman Catholic theology in the form of neo-Aristotelian philosophy, and fomenting rebellion against the civil powers: see Richard Serjeantson, 'Hobbes, the universities, and the history of philosophy,' in Conal Condren, Stephen Gaukroger and Ian Hunter, eds., *The Philosopher in Early Modern Europe: the Nature of a Contested Identity* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 126-7. He did not, however, exempt Protestant universities (including foreign ones such as Leiden), from his critique: see pp. 127-31, 135.

[741] See *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, trans. Thomas Hobbes, ed. Eric Nelson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008); and Thomas Hobbes, trans., *The Peloponnesian War*, ed. David Grene (University of Chicago Press, 1989); and, in the vernacular sphere, his well-known 'Answer' published alongside Davenant's *Discourse upon Gondibert an heroick poem* (Paris, 1650). Hobbes's humanist activities can even be read as antagonistic towards the academic and clerical establishment: see Paul Davis, 'Thomas Hobbes's Translations of Homer: Epic and Anticlericalism in Late Seventeenth-Century England,' *Seventeenth Century* 12.2 (1997), pp. 231-55. Similarly, Skinner (1996) links Hobbes's use of classical rhetoric to his anticlericalism: esp. pp. 395-403.

[742] Hobbes, *Leviathan* II.21.

exclude philology from its remit: perhaps because of Hobbes's own silence on this topic.[743] Was Hobbes suggesting that late humanist erudition had become so inextricably linked (in England, at least) to an outmoded theological curriculum that it needed to be purged from institutions of learning altogether? This was clearly the impression his arguments gave to Barlow and Casaubon.[744]

For Casaubon, however, Hobbes's writings posed a threat to intellectual systems as well as institutions. This is why he associates Hobbes with Descartes, a 'cracked brain man, an Enthusiast': and both with Ramus, whose programmes of philosophical and educational reform had failed where Hobbes and Descartes's were succeeding only because 'the age was too learned, for him, or the creditt of his attempts, to hold long.' The new philology which had arrived in Britain with his father Isaac had succeeded in warding off the Ramism which was, in some quarters, then fashionable.[745] Against the second wave of aggressive intellectual modernisation, however, it had failed.[746] Although Hobbes gestured in the direction of sacred and ecclesiastical history in his *Leviathan*, he did not do so as a

---

[743] Hobbes, *Six lessons to the professors of the mathematiques* (London, 1656), p. 60; quoted in Serjeantson (2006), p. 132.

[744] On the early reception of Hobbes, see Jon Parkin, *Taming the Leviathan: the Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England, 1640-1700* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), in which there is little reference to Barlow and none to his philological leanings: the author characterises him as an 'expert in late scholastic philosophy,' p. 173. Meric Casaubon is not mentioned. Similarly, Collins (2005), p. 239, describes Barlow as 'an expert in scholastic theology' (without reference to Parkin). For a balanced account of the 'Aristotelian framework of "general scholarship"' advocated by Barlow and Casaubon, see Rhodri Lewis, ed., *William Petty on the Order of Nature: an Unpublished Manuscript Treatise* (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011), pp. 3-8. See also Richard Muller, 'Thomas Barlow on the Liabilities of "New Philosophy": Perceptions of a rebellious *ancilla* in the era of Protestant orthodoxy,' in Maarten Wisse, M. Sarot, and Willemien Otten, eds., *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in honour of Willem J. van Asselt* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

[745] Casaubon's account is similar to the much more recent assessment of the decline of English Ramism by Mordechai Feingold: 'English Ramism: a Reinterpretation,' in idem, Joseph S. Freedman and Wolfgang Rother, eds., *The Influence of Petrus Ramus* (Basel: Schwabe, 2001).

[746] On Casaubon's notion of enthusiasm, see Michael Heyd, *'Be Sober and Reasonable': the Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), passim. For more on the concept of enthusiasm, see Lawrence Klein and Anthony La Vopa, eds., *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1998); and Scott Mandelbrote, 'The Uses of Natural Theology in Seventeenth-Century England,' *Science in Context* 20 (2007), pp. 451-480.

professional theologian or critic. He appeared to have perverted erudition in the service of his dangerous political philosophy.[747]

The sense of the declining status of *literae humaniores*, then, was conditioned in England by the post-Restoration prevalence of natural theology; the rise of experimental philosophy as a conspicuous discipline making strong claims to its public value; and the challenges of other new philosophies which opposed themselves to Aristotelianism and to late humanist erudition simultaneously. This sense was hardly, however, limited to England, especially as far as the last of these three factors is concerned. In the middle of the seventeenth century, Georg Horn noted that during the revival of learning, a premium had been placed on philology and criticism. All intellectual talent was channelled into correcting and explicating ancient authors, from Erasmus to Scaliger, Casaubon, and Lipsius; and, in the next generation, Salmasius and Daniel Heinsius (who had both recently died). Next came an age of philosophy, whose roots lay in Vives, Francesco Patrizi and Ramus, and whose more recent advocates were Campanella, Gassendi, Descartes and Hobbes, among others, who either brought ancient scientific theories back to life or came up with new ones of

[747] This is the thrust of Johann P. Sommerville, 'Hobbes, Selden, Erastianism, and the History of the Jews,' in G. A. J. Rogers and Tom Sorell, eds., *Hobbes and History* (London: Routledge, 2000), esp. pp. 177-9. For a slight corrective, see Noel Malcolm, 'The Name and Nature of Leviathan: Political symbolism and biblical exegesis,' *Intellectual History Review* 17.1 (2007), pp. 29-58, especially p. 39; and 'Hobbes, Ezra and the Bible' in Malcolm (2002).

their own.[748] This narrative of the displacement of criticism by philosophy became a commonplace of the early Enlightenment.[749]

The fact that Gassendi was included in the second rather than the first list is a measure of how specialized criticism had become. Gassendi had been acclaimed by others for defending the importance of erudition within natural philosophy against the rationalism of Descartes.[750] By this time, however, he no longer seemed to fit within the same intellectual context as figures like Salmasius or Heinsius, who had taken humanist erudition so far as to sever any links it may have had with grander philosophical movements.[751] Gassendi's and Scaliger's dream of uniting a critical history of ancient science and mathematics with modern scientific and mathematical discovery would have seemed improbable to this generation of philologists.[752]

Another point of similarity between Europe and England is that laments for the death of criticism took place on a local, institutional basis as well as broader, national or international ones. In 1653, J. F. Gronovius offered Thomas Reinesius a short explanation

---

[748] Horn, *Historiae philosophicae libri septem* (Leiden, 1655), p. 7: 'Renascentibus literis *Philologia* in pretio erat & *Crisis.* Vt quisque ingenio maxime promtus, ita ad emendandos & illustrandos authores priscos animum applicabat. Id studium coepit in Erasmo Roterodamo, excelsissime floruit sub Scaligero, Casaubono, Lipsio; in Salmasio & Heinsio defecit, paucis quibusdam superstitibus, cum quibus planè desiturum videtur. Huic succedit nostra aetate Periodus *Philosophica,* quae à Ludov. Vive, Francisco Patritio & Petro Ramo initium sumsit, exculta est à Thoma Campanella, Petro Gassendo, Helmontio, Renato des Cartes, Th. Hobbes, aliisque, qui vel veterum obliterata dogmata revocarunt, vel nova excogitarunt.' On this text and Horn in general, see *Models of the history of philosophy, Volume I: from its origins in the Renaissance to the 'Historia philosophica,'* ed. Giovanni Santinello, Constance Blackwell, and Philip Weller (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1993), pp. 236-258.

[749] See Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (Rotterdam, 1702), vol. I, p. 67, s.v. 'Aconce': 'Pendant que le regne de la Critique & de la Philologie a duré, on a vu par toute l'Europe plusieurs prodiges d'érudition. L'étude de la nouvelle Philosophie, & celle des langues vivantes aiant introduit un autre goût, on a cessé de voir cette vaste & cette profonde literature; mais en recompense il s'est repandu dans la Republique des Lettres un certain esprit plus fin, & accompagné d'un discernement plus exquis: les gens sont aujourd'hui moins savans, & plus habiles.' Quoted and translated by Lambe (1988), p. 280.

[750] See Joy (1987), esp. pp. 76-7 for Gassendi's comments about the art of criticism.

[751] See III.1, above.

[752] See II.2, above.

of the poverty of philological learning into which Leiden University had fallen. Its failure to secure an appointment for Isaac Casaubon after Scaliger's death was the beginning. Then an increasingly restrictive theological regime had forced ecclesiastical scholars who refused to toe the Counter-Remonstrant line, such as G. J. Vossius, to go elsewhere. These scholars themselves had failed to leave an institutional legacy by inspiring the next generation of critics. This was partly because their discipline had become too specialized in the eyes of the general reader, losing sight of the ultimate goal of helping people live better lives. Those scholars Leiden had managed to retain eventually became either too consumed by *odium philologicum* to produce anything worthwhile (Salmasius) or had never really loved literature in the first place, preferring to pander to their readers with half-hearted and insidiously politicised displays of erudition (Marcus Boxhorn, the professor of history).[753]

So although Ryckius, visiting in 1668, gave an extremely pessimistic account of English philology in particular, scholars' most nervous and most sophisticated reactions to the changing status of the discipline deserve to be placed within a broader European context. Criticism was breaking up into different fragments, and it was unclear which would be preserved and which lost. The brief tactical union of philology and natural philosophy encouraged by Gassendi and others looked under threat, although it survived in some respects in the early historical research of the Royal Society.[754] Heinsius had taken grammatical and linguistic erudition to the point where it no longer informed other disciplines, and risked descending from consideration of realities into an arid, merely

---

[753] See Gronovius to Reinesius, 23 November, 1653, in Petrus Burmann, ed., *Sylloges Epistolarum* (Leiden, 1727), vol. V, pp. 207-9; mentioned by Pattison (1875), p. 288. This was part of a broader argument about the decline of criticism which Gronovius had been making since at least the 1630s: see his letter to Nicolaus Heinsius, 15 March, 1637, ibid., vol. III, pp. 15-16.

[754] For instance, in the work of John Aubrey: see William Poole, *John Aubrey and the Advancement of Learning* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2010).

literary-critical debate over words, shorn of theological implications.[755] This was the other face of the vibrant literary approach to Christian texts taken by Patrick Young and John Price.[756] Selden's legacy, on the other hand, had become divided. His contribution to a tradition of philological and antiquarian investigation into English law and history was beyond doubt, but the value of his oriental and classical studies was less apparent, even to someone as familiar with his work as Ussher.

The literary humanism represented by Hobbes lacked a reliable institutional foothold, but it thrived outside the universities. This is illustrated by the case of Thomas Stanley, which demonstrates the survival of many aspects of the English philology of the first half of the century, and suggests that the misgivings of Barlow, Ussher and Meric Casaubon were more understandable on an institutional level than they were on an intellectual one. It also, however, confirms the argument of the entire third part of this thesis: confessional pressures on the study of the text of the Bible and Christian antiquity, combined with a process of intellectual specialization, were transforming biblical criticism and patristic scholarship into separate sub-disciplines that borrowed from late humanist philology without owing everything to it.

[755] See III.1., above.

[756] See II.5, II.6 and III.1, above.

Conclusion

Thomas Stanley has principally interested scholars as a poet, man of letters, classicist, and historian of ancient philosophy.[757] He achieved distinction in all of these fields, especially the last two. Among his most interesting, revealing, and almost totally overlooked works, however, was one of biblical exegesis. Readers of this study should not find this fact surprising. The work was a draft, just over a hundred pages long, of a treatise on tithing in antiquity. The full title is 'Ἀκροθίνια. A philological exercise on Hebrews 7:4, concerning the first yield and tithes of the spoils of war.'[758] Ostensibly, Stanley's task was to determine the sense of the complex and obscure term ἀκροθίνια, which the King James Bible had rendered as 'the tenth of the spoils.' In the chapter as a whole, the author was talking about the correspondence (typological, in the eyes of some readers) between Melchizedek and Christ. In this particular verse he expatiated on the reverence due to Melchizedek: 'Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.' What the term actually meant was of great consequence for any modern position on tithe payments.

---

[757] See his *Poems* (London, 1651); edition of Aeschylus (London, 1663); and the *History of Philosophy* (London, 1655, with substantial additions in 1656, 1660, and 1662). For a treatment of his classical studies that also covers the *History of Philosophy*, see Haugen (2011). On the Aeschylus edition, see the excellent article by Margaret Arnold, 'Thomas Stanley's Aeschylus: Renaissance Practical Criticism of Greek Tragedy,' *Illinois Classical Studies* 9 (1984), pp. 229-49. On Stanley's literary connections and poetic activities, see the helpful survey by Stella P. Revard, 'Thomas Stanley and "A Register of Friends,"' in Claude J. Summer and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000). On the relationship between his poetry and politics, see Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford University Press, 2008). On the *History of Philosophy* specifically, see Santinello, Blackwell and Weller, eds. (1993).

[758] 'Ακροθίνια. Exercitatio philologica de primitiis ac decimis praedae ad versum IV capitis VII Epistolae ad Hebraeos.' Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.III.16, fol. vi[a]. See the notice of this manuscript in Margaret Flower, 'Thomas Stanley (1625-1678): a bibliography of his writings in prose and verse (1647-1743),' *Proceedings of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1 (1950), p. 170. Flower adds that there is a copy of this treatise 'in another hand' in Bodleian Library, MS Rawl. D 332, fol. 100, 'so that it was probably known to some of Stanley's learned friends.' However, this is in fact only a partial copy, made by Thomas Hearne. I have found no particular reason to believe that any of Stanley's friends did see either it or the original, especially since this copy was clearly made from the Cambridge manuscript: its page references match that manuscript directly. If the reference to Stanley's Aeschylus commentary, fol. 32[a] (see below for discussion), is to the printed edition, this provides a *terminus post quem* for the treatise of 1663. Otherwise, the latest datable reference is on fol. 10[a], to the second edition of Salmasius, *De Primatu Papae* (Leiden, 1645), ch. III, p. 38.

In practice, then, Stanley came to deal with ancient references to tithing as a whole, and to qualify some of the interpretations that had been put forward on both sides of the earlier debate. His approach, as throughout his work on classical authors, is essentially that of a grammarian and lexicographer, particularly attracted to the explication of linguistic and historical obscurities which other scholars struggled to resolve. He represented himself as such with his choice of epigraph for the monumental edition of Aeschylus:

> Who could state, now, that Aeschylus is easier to explain to someone who knows Greek than the Gospels or the Apostolic Epistles? His *Agamemnon* on its own far surpasses in obscurity any quantity of sacred books with their 'Hebraisms' and 'Syriacisms', and their whole store, or rather jumble sale, of 'Hellenistic' Greek.[759]

As well as advertising his talents in glossing such a difficult author, Stanley was placing his work within the context of secularized, literary-critical New Testament philology outlined above.[760] If the letters of the apostles in the New Testament were generally less in need of such philological expertise, Hebrews 7:4 offered one exception. The other authors to whom Stanley was attracted, primarily the recondite Hellenistic scholar-poet Callimachus, are revealing. In his copy of that author, Stanley quoted Daniel Heinsius's description of him as 'an outstanding poet and critic in equal measure.'[761] How much Stanley modelled his work on Heinsius' conflation of pagan and sacred literature is demonstrated by his note on *Hymn* I.30-31, in which the goddess Rhea, having given birth to Zeus, procures a stream of water for herself by striking her staff against the mountain on which she stood. As well as pointing out an obvious parallel with the Homeric *Hymn to*

---

[759] 'Quis *Aeschylum* possit adfirmare Graecè nunc scienti magìs patere explicabilem, quàm Evangelia aut Epistolas Apostolicas? Unus ejus *Agamemnon* obscuritate superat quantum est librorum sacrorum cum suis Hebraismis & Syriasmis, & totâ Hellenisticae supellectile, vel farragine.' Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius* (Leiden, 1643), p. 37. Quoted in Stanley, ed. and trans., *Aeschyli Tragoediae Septem* (London, 1663), sig. a1^{b}. For more information on the Renaissance topos of Aeschylus's 'obscurity,' see Arnold (1984), p. 230.

[760] In II.6.

[761] 'Poeta summus pariter et Criticus Callimachus': British Library, C.45.e.4 (the 1577 edition by Henri Estienne), sig. ¶¶3^{b}. Cf. Heinsius (1627), sig. *******5^{b}.

Apollo, Stanley also adduces Numbers 20:11: 'And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly.' He proceeds to translate the Old Testament motif into 'Callimachean' Greek, effectively substituting Moses for Rhea in Callimachus's poem, before citing further parallels from Scripture and digressing into a comparison of the Septuagint, Hebrew text, and Targums.[762] No particular philosophical or historical point is built from such marginalia. Rather, they underline the extent to which the genre of biblical commentary in this period was gravitating towards what might anachronistically be termed 'comparative literature.' There was an antiquarian dimension, but as in Young and Price, material objects served to provide more literary parallels: Stanley quoted an inscription published by Scaliger to gloss the word ἄττα ('old man,' with a note of affection), 'a word with which younger men address their elders.'[763]

Similarly, although Stanley's dedication of his *Aeschylus* to Sir Henry Puckering proclaimed that the poet 'is rich in a certain latent wisdom, close to that of the Pythagoreans,' his commentary tended to keep that wisdom latent, concentrating instead on matters of grammar and criticism.[764] This is in keeping with the treatise on tithes. Anybody hoping to explain what ἀκροθίνια meant had to consider 'the history to which the words of the holy author openly refer' (namely, the account of Abraham's offering to Melchizedek in Genesis 14), but also the sense with which 'more respectable' Greek authors use it. At this point, his readers might have been forgiven for expecting two things: on the one hand, a bare account of precisely what was said about this event in the Old

---

[762] British Library, C.45.e.4, p. 3: 'εἶπε καὶ ἀντανύσας μωσης [*sic*] μέγαν ὑψόθι πῆχυν/πλεξε [*sic*] πέτραν ῥάβδῳ.'

[763] ibid., p. 60: 'M. ELDIDIVS PAMPHILVS PLATONI TATAE SVO BENEMERENTI FECIT.' Published by Janus Gruter and Scaliger in the *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani* (Heidelberg, 1603), p. 662, no. 6, with 'ELPIDIVS' where Stanley writes 'ELDIDIVS.'

[764] Stanley, ed. (1663), sig. a2[a]: 'Pollet etiam tacitâ quadam, Pythagoricae affini, sapientiâ.' On the downplaying of this aspect of the poet, and of his Judeo-Christian parallels, compared with previous commentators, see Arnold (1984), pp. 231-8.

Testament and its commentary tradition, coupled with an account of the version of events gestured at in Hebrews; and on the other, a gathering and weighing of parallels and cognates that might illuminate an otherwise unfamiliar term. This is what Stanley offered, but he proceeded to make bigger claims than those of history or philology alone.

In the briefer, 'historical' section, Stanley drew attention to the ambiguity of Genesis 14 itself, in which it was not clear from the Hebrew text whether Abraham was giving to Melchizedek, or vice versa. The orthodox interpretation was the former, and Stanley concurred with it (against Selden), pointing out that it was supported by the Septuagint.[765] Anyway, he added, 'could even a rabbi have any reasonable doubt as to the giver, and so forcefully set about to cheat the Apostle of his argument about the priesthood of Christ?'[766] Philological details aside, the text of Hebrews was clearly drawing an extended comparison between Melchizedek and Christ and showing the typological correspondences between the two, extending to the office of high priest shared by both. The 'rabbi' in question was patently Selden, who had just been mentioned, and had been accused by Montagu of cleaving to the rabbis in order to avoid typology.[767] Stanley does not appear to have felt any contradiction or incongruity in treating the typological argument of Hebrews in a section about the 'history' of Genesis 14. He extended his foray into *iure divino* justifications later in the treatise, taking issue with the proposal that Abraham had offered tithe to Melchizedek voluntarily, rather than out of obligation, and purely to thank him for his blessing (in Genesis 14:19). This proposal had been put forward by none other than Selden's neo-Calvinist partner in justifying a purely historical reading of tithing, David

---

[765] MS Gg.III.16, fols. 2[a]-3[a]. The Septuagint rendering as Stanley quoted it, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀβραμ, would be syntactically odd if Abraham were dative rather than nominative; although Stanley conceded that the proper name was likely to have been a later insertion, and indeed was not present in Codex Alexandrinus.

[766] ibid., fol. 2[a]: 'quis Rabbinorum de donante ulla cum ratione dubitare, adeoque argumentum Apostoli de sacerdotio Christi elusum ire potuisset?'

[767] See e.g. Montagu (1621), pp. 21 (connecting Selden and Scaliger in this respect), 205, 252-3.

Pareus.[768] Rather, Stanley countered, 'whatever Abraham gave was God's, and he gave it to Melchizedek in God's name and in honour of Him.'[769]

That was also the basis, Stanley immediately added, for the gentiles' tithe payments. Throughout the treatise he reinforced the natural law arguments that had been built up using pagan sources by Montagu and others. This was the other side of his attack on Selden, and it was where the pagan grammatical parallels played the most prominent role. He announced it as his explicit intention near the beginning, and defended his argument in an emphatic conclusion.[770] The display of diffuse erudition was familiar from his commentaries – indeed, at one point he cited his notes on Aeschylus, for a list of examples showing that the ancients consecrated the spoils of war to the gods in their temples – but the programmatic, abstract conclusions were peculiar to the format of the learned treatise.[771]

Thus we can see that for all Stanley's profound sense of philological particularism, his ability to gather and sift details from ancient literature, he was hardly averse to constructing grander philosophical arguments using those details. His sources and the tools he used to interpret them were following the trajectories of juristic thought and theological exposition, rather than professional history or literary criticism. The radical, destructive philology of Selden had not taken hold, even in a scholar whose breadth of

---

[768] On the affinities between Selden and Pareus (1609), see II.4, above.

[769] ibid., fol. 55[a]: 'Non igitur Abrahamus "decimas Melchizedecho tribuit ut erga sacerdotem dei pro benedictione gratus esset" ut nugatur Paraeus [*sic*]...sed quicquid Abrahamus dedicavit Dei erat, deique nomine & in honore eius Melchizedecho dedit. Pari ratione & apud Nationes...primitiae praedae dijs dedicatae vatibus aut sacerdotibus concredebantur.'

[770] ibid., fols. 16[a] and 98[a], respectively.

[771] For the citation, referring to *Seven against Thebes*, line 284 (p. 745 of Stanley's commentary), see fol. 32[a]. Cf. the citation of his *Persae* commentary (on line 820, pp. 778-9), fol. 6[a]. Although it is absent from these particular notes, Arnold (1984), p. 248, does observe some explicit reference to natural law theory elsewhere in the treatise.

engagement with classical antiquity in some ways emulated Selden's, and who was helped directly by Selden in his work on Aeschylus.[772] Moreover, Stanley's easy conversion of the commentary form into natural law arguments reminds us not to overestimate the historicizing force of that medium.

The case of Stanley should also warn scholars not to read too much into any humanist's decision to work on apparently classical subjects. Despite not being a clergyman or operating within a strictly defined academic context, Stanley had one foot firmly in the sacred philology that preoccupied British scholars throughout the seventeenth century, but especially in its first half. Critics ventured into this field not out of 'piety' or 'zeal,' but because it had become, over time, part of the common culture of critical scholarship.

In that sense, Stanley may seem an odd choice of figure with whom to finish this study. From the point of view of his treatise on tithes, little appears to have changed over the course of the period I have surveyed. The same battles were being fought, *dubio Marte*, over the status of typology or natural law in relation to philology. Under the surface, however, genuine tectonic shifts may have been taking place. Firstly, although he shared most of their methods, Stanley did not share the institutional commitments of Montagu or Selden's other opponents. In this respect, he reflects the more recent secularization of biblical criticism as far as its professional status was concerned, a movement I have tentatively traced above. From Kristine Haugen's point of view, Stanley anticipated Bentley by producing a major edition of a popular classical poet that gained international

[772] See Gerald Langbaine to Selden, 28 November, 1653, in Bodleian Library, MS Selden supra 109, fol. 452^{b}; and Stanley, ed. (1663), sig. b2^{a}.

recognition.[773] This treatise, however, shows that he also anticipated Bentley in the sense of the union he was trying to achieve between pure criticism by a lay philologist and Anglican orthodoxy.[774] If we are to remain preoccupied by the search for a more secular form of philology in the decades leading up to the Enlightenment, we are less likely to find it in those who match the profile of a nineteenth- and twentieth-century classicist than we are to find it in humanists with no ecclesiastical affiliation who nonetheless sought a certain authority over the interpretation and text of the Bible.

I hope to have made it clear that scholars should also take up the gauntlet thrown down at the beginning of this thesis, and learn to distinguish more carefully between different types of historicism and their radically divergent effects. First of all, the acutest sense of historical specificity was not enough to constitute historical criticism. History as a means of preparing oneself for the higher faculties and history as a governing world-view are quite different things. This can be seen most clearly in the field of New Testament commentary, but also in the moments when philology quite willingly served the demands of theological argument, as in the controversy over tithing. Secondly, there needs to be more appreciation for the pervasive role of literary-critical and rhetorical criteria in shaping the way philologists worked. The form of historicism these criteria promoted was much less rooted in documentary evidence or a proto-scientific culture of fact, but it was no less powerful for that. Indeed, as my case study of Louis Cappel demonstrates, it could

[773] See Haugen (2011), p. 24; and, for examples of this recognition, the letters of praise from Isaac Vossius, 11 February, 1664, and J. G. Graevius, 5 February, 1669, which Stanley copied and inserted into the front of his interleaved copy of his Aeschylus edition, perhaps intending to print them in the updated edition which he was preparing: Cambridge University Library, Adv. b. 44. 1-8, vol. I.

[774] For more on Stanley, Bentley, and sacred philology, see Hardy (2012).

be more powerful, through its wilful, open neglect of the protocols of codicology and ecclesiastical history.

This brings me to my third and final point about the granular sense of historicism I have been trying to excavate from my sources. Often, the strongest, most enduring, and most principled forms of historicism came from within the theological establishment, not from the supposed radical fringes of humanism. I have attempted to demonstrate this in my studies of Isaac Casaubon, Jean Morin, and Ussher, but such an interpretation deserves to be tested more thoroughly than I have been able to. Above all, it would have to engage with the fascinating example of Richard Simon, and show that his vision of the Bible and the ecclesiastical traditions that shaped it emerged from the world of counter-Reformation scholarship represented by Morin and Holstenius. The corollary of this would be that Simon had very little to do with an imagined canon of heterodox, early Enlightenment thinkers such as Hobbes, Spinoza and Isaac La Peyrère, who undermined Revelation with the tools of humanism.[775]

Beyond its attempts to problematize the concept of 'historicism,' this thesis has taken me in other directions. Appreciating the widespread appeal of late humanist philology during this period might transform our account of its literary culture. We need to unlearn the canon of 'literary criticism' handed down to us from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and remember that what passed for literary criticism during this period owed more to a Latinate and European context of philological research than a vernacular, insular one of

[775] For a classic identification of this canon, see Leo Strauss, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965; first published as *Die Religionskritik Spinozas* in 1930). See also Popkin (1982), pp. 64-72; and Justin Champion, 'Père Richard Simon and English Biblical Criticism, 1680-1700,' in James E. Force and David S. Katz, eds., *Everything Connects: in Conference with Richard H. Popkin* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 40, which distinguishes between these three figures and Richard Simon only insofar as Simon's work 'bore the marks of true criticism' in contrast with their less learned writings. Finally, Israel (2001) also connects these figures: see in particular his discussion of Simon's supposed debts to Spinoza, pp. 450-52.

'defending poetry' in the manner of Philip Sidney. This simple lesson should open up new paths for the study of Jonson and Milton, to name two authors whose careers at one time or another involved bids for recognition as critically informed, erudite authors: this happened most conspicuously for Jonson in his ostentatious quarto publications of plays like *Sejanus* (1605), and for Milton in his Latin polemics against Salmasius.[776] Other canonical authors of interest include Donne, Andrewes, Cowley, and Dryden, although it would probably take less time to list those major English authors of the period who evinced no interest in European scholarship than it would to list those who consumed it avidly.[777] However, this study will probably be more valuable for the account it offers of the institutionalization of literary studies in the period than for the light it can shed on particular authors, genres or themes within literature.

This thesis should also interest historians of the book: not so much for its meagre contributions to our knowledge of English and, very occasionally, European archives, as for the argument it offers against the phenomenon of 'bibliomania' and its steady encroachment on the everyday work of intellectual historians. It resists the desire to fetishize the history of the preservation and transmission of the material text, in respect of both early modern and modern scholarly research. So many of the classic studies in the history of scholarship cited in my introduction are studies of the pan-European traffic in manuscripts, or inscriptions, or other remains of the past, and the intellectual and ideological transformations it wrought; not to mention the burgeoning status of epistolary

---

[776] On Milton, see, most recently, Joad Raymond, 'John Milton, European: the Rhetoric of Milton's Latin Defences,' and Estelle Haan, '*Defensio Prima* and the Latin Poets,' in Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Milton* (Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 272-290 and pp. 291-304, respectively. The account of Salmasius in Masson (1859-94), vol. IV, pp. 162-75, remains useful. Milton's use of historical and philological research (principally that of Selden) in other works has been discussed by Rosenblatt (2006) and idem, *Torah and Law in* Paradise Lost (Princeton University Press, 1994).

[777] Peter McCullough has already begun to do so in the case of Andrewes, as I learned from his paper, 'Lancelot Andrewes and Sacred History,' at the conference on 'Historians and the Sacred,' Jesus College, Oxford, 2010.

communication and the republic of letters as objects of study in their own right. In turn, they have relied on and even valorized primary research using such documents and the scholarly communications that clustered around them – whether they took the form of letters, marginal annotations, or simple gifts from one scholar to another.

In one way, the convergence of book history and the history of scholarship has very deep roots, in the early modern genre of *historia literaria* and in even older practices of record-keeping.[778] On the other hand, this convergence has been amplified in the very recent turn towards studying the material text in departments of literature across the world. Although this thesis has benefited greatly from such studies, I hope to have checked, or at least slowed down, this turn, by showing that ideas which were easily accessible to anybody with a superficial humanistic training often did a great deal to advance scholarly method: more, in many cases, than the findings of men at the heart of the European republic of letters, who had a network of correspondents, and a wealth of archival resources, at their fingertips. In the right hands, a copy of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* might do much more to historicize the Old Testament than a newly discovered, venerable manuscript of the Septuagint or one of the Aramaic Targums.

I have made another, related argument: it pertains to the epistemological categories into which critics tried to fit their empirical projects, so many of which were inherited from high and late medieval scholasticism rather than any uniquely 'Renaissance' intellectual or educational movement. In spite of my attempts to uncover some of these categories at work in seventeenth-century philological debates, the story of very late medieval textual

---

[778] See Neil Kenny, 'Books in Space and Time: Bibliomania and Early Modern Histories of Learning and "Literature" in France,' *Modern Language Quarterly* 61.2 (2000), pp. 253-86. I owe this reference to Warren Boutcher.

criticism remains largely untold. Again, it would have very little to do with the material constraints on philological research, and much more to do with a longer history of relatively disembodied ideas.

Otherwise, I hope, at the very least, to have provided a mostly original (if necessarily incomplete) picture of a discipline that has never received synthetic treatment as far as early modern England is concerned, to have unearthed some primary sources that have been undeservedly ignored by literary and intellectual historians alike; and, lastly, to have provided other scholars with enough motivation to fill the gaps in my account and qualify its arguments. This would be enough for a preliminary effort in such a neglected but important field.

Bibliography

Primary works in manuscript

Amsterdam University Library:
MS RK III H 17.

Bodleian Library:
MSS Auct. E. 3. 1-16.
MSS Auct. E. 4. 1-6.
MS Barlow 10.
MS Barlow 54.
MS Casaubon 3.
MS Casaubon 26.
MS Casaubon 29.
MS Casaubon 30.
MS Casaubon 35.
MS Casaubon 53.
MS Casaubon 60.
MS Langbaine 17.
MS Laud Gr. 64b.
MS Laud Lat. 55.
MS Rawlinson D 332.
MS Rawlinson D 817.
MS Savile 37.
MS Selden supra 106.
MS Selden supra 109.
MS Selden supra 110.
MS Selden supra 111.
MS Selden supra 121.
MS Smith 22.
MS Smith 26.
MS Smith 34.
MS Smith 37.
MS Smith 49.
MS Smith 60.
MS Smith 71.
MS Smith 73.
MS Smith 74.
MS Smith 75.
MS Smith 97.
MS Smith 127.
MS Tanner 62.
MS Tanner 67.
MS Tanner 72.
MS Tanner 278.
MS Tanner 437.
MS Wood F. 9.

British Library:
MS Add. 4247.
MS Add. 34599.
MS Add. 36294.
MS Burney 362.
MS Burney 363.
MS Burney 364.
MS Burney 368.
MS Cotton Julius C. III.
MS Harley 749.
MS Harley 750.
MS Harley 1328.
MS Harley 7011.
MS Harley 7053.

Cambridge University Library:
MS Add. 3856.
MS Gg. III. 16.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford
MS 288.

The Hague, Royal Library:
MS 130 E 132.

Leiden University Library:
MS BPG 77.
MS BPL 285.
MS Cun. 1.
MS Cun 2.
MS PAP 2.
MS Per. Q 8.
MS Scal. 61.
MS VMI 4.
MS VMI 7.
MS VMI 8.
MS VMI 9.
MS VMI 31.
MS Vul. 105: 1.

Queen's College, Oxford:
MS 204.

Trinity College, Cambridge:
MS O.3.14.
MS O.4.21.

MS O.5.23.
MS O.10.33.
MS O.10a.33.

University College, Oxford:
MS 155.

Vatican Library:
MS Barb. Lat. 1783.
MS Barb. Lat. 2154.
MS Barb. Lat. 2181.
MS Barb. Lat. 2185.
MS Barb. Lat. 3539.

Worcester College, Oxford:
MS 4.19.

Printed books

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*. 3 vols. Edited by Eduard Fraenkel. Oxford University Press, 1950.
Alexander, Gavin, ed., *Sidney's* The Defence of Poesy *and selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*. London: Penguin, 2004.
Allatius, Leo, *Apes Urbanae*. Rome, 1633.
Alsted, Johann Heinrich, *Encyclopaedia*. Herborn, 1630.
Ashe, Simeon, *Gray Hayres Crowned with Grace*. London, 1655.
Aubrey, John, *Brief Lives*. Edited by Andrew Clark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
Baronius, Caesar, *Martyrologium Romanum*. Antwerp, 1589.
———, *Annales ecclesiastici*. Antwerp, 1596.
Baxter, Richard, *A treatise of episcopacy*. London, 1681.
Bayle, Pierre, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*. Rotterdam, 1697. Later edition: Paris, 1820.
Bellarmine, Robert, *Disputationes*. 4 vols. Cologne, 1628.
Beza, Theodore, *Correspondence*. Edited by Hippolyte Aubert and Fernand Aubert. 36 vols. to date. Geneva: Droz, 1960-.
Bible editions:
Biblia Sacra Polyglotta. Edited by Brian Walton. London, 1657.
Biblia Sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi. Zurich, 1543.
Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta. Edited by Antonio Carafa. Rome, 1587. John Bois's copy: Bodleian Library, D 1.14 Th.Seld. Patrick Young's copy: Bodleian Library, Radcl. c. 8.
Vetus Testamentum, secundum LXX. Edited by Jean Morin. Paris, 1628.
Boate, Arnold, *De textus Hebraici Veteris Testamenti certitudine et authentia, contra Ludovici Capelli Criticam, epistola*. Paris, 1650.
Bois, John, *Veteris Interpretis cum Beza aliisque Recentioribus Collatio*. London, 1655.
Bolton, Edmund, *Hypercritica or a Rule of Judgement for Writing or Reading our History's*. Oxford, 1722.
Borremansius, Antonius, *Variarum Lectionum Liber*. Amsterdam, 1676.

Brodaeus, Johannes, *Miscellaneorum Libri Sex*. Basel, 1555.
Brooke, Ralph, *A discoverie of certaine errours*. London, 1596.
Budé, Guillaume, *Commentarii Linguae Graecae*. Paris, 1529. John Bois's copy: St. John's College, Cambridge, G. 7. 7.
Burmann, Petrus, ed., *Sylloges Epistolarum*. Leiden, 1727.
Burton, William, ed and trans., *Clement, the Blessed Paul's Fellow-Labourer in the Gospel, His First Epistle to the Corinthian*s. London, 1647.
Callimachus, *Hymni & epigrammata*. Edited by Henri Estienne. Geneva, 1577. Thomas Stanley's copy: British Library, C.45.e.4.
Calvin, John, *Praelectiones in duodecim Prophetas (quos vocant) minores*. Geneva, 1581.
———, *Commentarii in Isaiam Prophetam*. Geneva, 1583.
Camden, William, *Britannia*. London, 1586. Later edition: London, 1607.
———, *Britain*. Translated by Philemon Holland. London, 1610.
Cappel, Louis, *Critica Sacra*. Paris, 1650. Later edition, 3 vols.: Halle an der Saale, 1775-86.
———, *Epistola apologetica*. Saumur, 1651.
Casaubon, Isaac, ed., *Athenaei Deipnosophistarum libri XV*. Heidelberg, 1597. Later edition: Heidelberg, 1608.
———, *Animaduersionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri XV*. Lyon, 1600.
———, ed., *B. Gregorii Nysseni ad Eustathiam, Ambrosiam & Basilissam epistola*. Paris, 1606.
———, ed., *Polybii Historiarum libri qui supersunt*. Paris, 1609.
———, *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI.* London, 1614. Second edition: Frankfurt, 1615.
———, *Epistolae*. Rotterdam, 1709. Earlier editions: The Hague, 1638, and Magdeburg and Helmstadt, 1656.
Casaubon, Meric, ed., *Marcus Aurelius*. London, 1634. Latin edition: London, 1643.
———, ed., *Hierocles De providentia & fato*. London, 1655.
———, ed., *The history of the Romans, by Lucius Florus*. London, 1658.
———, *De nupera Homeri editione Lugduno-Batavica*. London, 1659.
———, *Letter to Peter du Moulin...concerning natural experimental philosophie*. Cambridge, 1669.
———, *Generall Learning: a Seventeenth-Century Treatise on the Formation of the General Scholar.* Edited by Richard Serjeantson. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Comitoli, Paulo, ed., *Catena in Beatissimum Job Absolutissima*. Lyon, 1586. Second edition: Venice, 1587.
Colomesius, Paulus, *Bibliothéque choisie*. La Rochelle, 1682.
Corderius, Balthasar, ed., *Expositio Patrum Graecorum in Psalmos*. Antwerp, 1643-6.
Cunaeus, Petrus, *Epistolae*. Leiden, 1725.
Daillé, Jean, *Traicté de l'employ des saincts pères*. Geneva, 1632. English translation: London, 1651. Latin translation: Geneva, 1655.
———, *De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur libri duo*. Geneva, 1666.
de Beer, E. S., ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn*. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
DeJordy, Alma and Harris Francis Fletcher, eds., *'A Library for Younger Schollers.'* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1961.
de Muis, Siméon, *Assertio veritatis Hebraicae adversus Exercitationes ecclesiasticas Morini*. Paris, 1631. Second edition, 1634.

de' Rossi, Azariah, *The Light of the Eyes*. Edited and translated by Joanna Weinberg. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
de Thou, Jacques-Auguste, *Choix de lettres françoises inédites*. Paris: Société des Bibliophiles, 1877.
Descartes, René, *Regulae ad directionem ingenii*. Edited by Giovanni Crapulli. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966.
Des Maizeaux, Pierre, ed., *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pithoeana, et Colomesiana*. Amsterdam, 1740.
Dibon, Paul and Françoise Waquet, eds., *Johannes Fredericus Gronovius: pèlerin de la République des Lettres*. Geneva: Droz, 1984.
Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes LXXX*. Translated by Thomas Nageorgus, edited by Federicus Morellus and Isaac Casaubon. Paris, 1623. Selden's copy: Bodleian Library, C 1.15 Art.Seld.
Drayton, Michael, *Poly-Olbion*. London, 1612. Second edition: London, 1613.
Drusius, Johannes, *De Hasidaeis*. Franeker, 1603.
———, *Ad fratres Belgas epistola, in qua calumnia diluitur recens sparsa de logo creato*. Franeker, 1615.
———, *Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Arnhem, 1622.
Du Duc, Fronton, ed. and trans., *S. Joannis Chrysostomi tractatuum decas*. Bordeaux, 1604.
Duck, Arthur, *De usu et authoritate iuris civilis Romanorum*. London, 1653.
Dury, John, *The Reformed School*. London, 1651.
Erasmus, *Encomium Moriae*. Strasbourg, 1511.
Estienne, Henri, *De criticis vet. Gr. et Latinis dissertatio.* Paris, 1587.
Faber, Tanaquil, ed., *Prima Scaligerana*. Groningen, 1669.
Fabricius, J. A., *Bibliotheca Graeca*. Hamburg, 1705-1728.
———, *Bibliotheca Latina*. Venice, 1728.
Fagius, Paulus, ed. and trans., *[Pirke Avot:] Sententiae Vere Elegantes...Veterum Sapientum Hebræorum*. Isny, 1541.
Farnaby, Thomas, ed., *L. & M. Annaei Senecae atque aliorum tragoediae*. London, 1613.
———, ed., *M. Val. Martialis epigrammaton libri*. London, 1615. Second edition: London, 1633.
———, ed., *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. London, 1618.
———, *Index Rhetoricus*. London, 1629.
Festus, *De Verborum Significatione*. Edited by Joseph Scaliger. Geneva, 1575.
Fotheringham, J. G., 'Unpublished Letters Written by Sir Kenelm Digby to Signor Luke Holstein, Guardian of the Vatican Library,' *The Antiquary* 36 (1900), 8-14.
Gataker, Thomas, *Cinnus, sive Adversaria Miscellanea*. London, 1651.
Gibbon, Edward, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Edited by David Womersley. 3 vols. London: Allen Lane, 1996.
———, *Essai sur l'étude de la littérature*. Edited by Robert Mankin. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2010.
Green, Lawrence D., ed. and trans., *John Rainolds's Lectures on Aristotle's* Rhetoric. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1986.
Grotius, Hugo, *Annotationes in Libros Evangeliorum*. Amsterdam, 1641.
———, *Epistolae ad Gallos*. Leiden, 1648.
———, *Opera omnia theologica*. London, 1679.

———, *Parallelon rerumpublicarum liber tertius*. Haarlem: A. Loosjes, 1802.
———, *Briefwisselin*g. Edited by Bernard Lambert Meulenbroek, Philip Christian Molhuysen and Paula P. Witkam. ‘s-Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, 1928-2001.
Gruter, Janus, and Joseph Scaliger, eds., *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbi Romani*. Heidelberg, 1603.
Heesakkers, Chris, and Constantinus Matheeussen, eds., *Two Neo-Latin Menippean Satires*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
Heinsius, Daniel, *Aristarchus sacer.* Leiden, 1627.
———, *Sacrarum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum libri XX*. Leiden, 1639. Second edition: Cambridge, 1640.
———, attrib., *Pro Daniele Heinsio adversus Ioannis Croii calumnias apologia necessaria*. Leiden, 1646.
Herbert, Edward, *De religione gentilium*. Amsterdam, 1663.
Hesychius, *Lexicon*. Leiden, 1668.
Heylyn, Peter, *Aerius Redivivus, Or, the History of the Presbyterians*. Oxford, 1670.
Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*. London, 1651.
———, *Six lessons to the professors of the mathematiques*. London, 1656.
———, trans., *The Peloponnesian War*. Edited by David Grene. University of Chicago Press, 1989.
———, *Translations of Homer.* Edited by Eric Nelson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008.
Holstenius, Lucas, *Epistolae ad Diversos*. Edited by Jean-François Boissonade. Paris, 1817.
Holyday, Barten, ed. and trans., *Decimus Junius Juvenalis and Aulus Persius Flaccus Translated*. Oxford, 1673.
Horn, Georg, *Historiae Philosophicae libri septem*. Leiden, 1655.
Howell, James, *A German Diet*. London, 1653.
Hutchinson, Lucy, *The Translation of Lucretius*. Edited by David Norbrook and Reid Barbour. 2 vols. Oxford University Press, 2012.
James, Thomas, *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis*. London, 1600.
———, *Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councels, and Fathers*. London, 1611.
Jonson, Ben, *Ben Jonson*. Edited by C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford University Press, 1925-52.
Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*. Edited by Benedikt Niese. 7 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1885-95.
Kemke, Johannes, ed., *Patricius Junius.* Leipzig: M. Spirgatis, 1898.
Langbaine, Gerard, ed. and trans., *Dionysii Longini...Liber De grandi loquentia*. Oxford, 1636.
Latini, Latino, *Epistolae, coniecturae, & observationes sacrae*. 2 vols. Rome, 1659 and Viterbo, 1667.
Le Clerc, Jean, *Ars critica*. Amsterdam, 1697.
Lhote, Jean-François, and Danielle Joyal, eds., *Correspondence de Peiresc & Aleandro*. 2 vols. Clermont-Ferrand: Adosa, 1995.
Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II: S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp*. London: Macmillan, 1885.
Linacre, Thomas, *De emendata structura Latini sermonis*. Paris, 1524.
Malcolm, Noel, ed., *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
Martial, *M. Val. Martialis nova editio*. Edited by Petrus Scriverius. Leiden, 1619.

Masius, Andreas, *Iosuae imperatoris historia*. Antwerp, 1574.
Mersenne, Marin, *Correspondance*. Edited by Paul Tannery, Cornélis de Waard, and Armand Beaulieu. 17 vols. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1945-88.
Migne, J. -P, *Patrologia Latina*.
Montagu, Richard, ed., *Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni in Iulianum inuectiuae dua*e. Eton, 1610.
———, *Diatribae vpon the first part of the late History of Tithes*. London, 1621.
———, *Apparatus ad Origines Ecclesiasticas*. Oxford, 1635.
More, Alexander, *Calvinus: Oratio in qua vir amplissimus H. Grotius refellitur*. Geneva, 1648.
———, *Ad quaedam loca Novi Foederis notae*. London, 1661.
Morin, Jean, ed., *Vetus Testamentum*. Paris, 1628.
Ornsby, George, ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin*. 2 vols. Durham: Andrews & Co., 1869-72.
Pareus, David, *In divinam ad Hebraeos S. Pauli Apostoli epistolam commentarius*. Frankfurt, 1609.
Parr, Richard, *The Life of James Usher* [*sic*]. London, 1686.
Peck, Francis, ed., *Desiderata Curiosa*. London, 1732-35.
Peiresc, Nicolas-Claude Fabri de, *Lettres*. Edited by Philippe Tamizey de Larroque. Paris, 1888-98.
Price, John, ed., *L. Apuleii Apologia*. Paris, 1635.
———, *Matthaeus illustratus*. Paris, 1646.
———, *Annotationes in Epistolam Jacobi*. Paris, 1646.
———, *Acta Apostolorum illustrata*. Paris, 1647.
———, ed., *L. Apuleii Metamorphoseos libri XI*. Gouda, 1650.
———, ed., *Commentarii in varios libros Novi Testamenti*. London, 1660.
———, *Notae in Plinii Epistolas*. Place and date of publication unknown.
Rapin, René, *Reflections on Aristotle.* Translated by Thomas Rymer. London, 1674.
Richardson, Samuel, ed., *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Ro*e. London, 1740.
Rivallius, Aymarus, *Ciuilis Historiae Iuris, siue in XII. Tab. Leges Commentariorum Libri Quinque*. Mainz, 1533.
Rubens, Peter Paul, *Correspondance.* Edited by C. Ruelens. Antwerp, 1887-1909.
Russell, John, ed, *Ephemerides*. Oxford, 1850.
[Salmasius, Claudius], *Walonis Messalini de Episcopis et Presbyteris contra D. Petavium Loiolitam dissertatio prima*. Leiden, 1641.
———, *De Hellenistica commentarius*. Leiden, 1643.
Savile, Henry, ed., *Rerum Anglicarum scriptores post Bedam praecipui.* London, 1596.
———, ed., *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Opera Graecè*. 8 vols. Eton, 1613.
Sarravius, Claudius, *Epistolae*. Orange, 1654. Second edition: Utrecht, 1697.
Scaliger, Joseph, ed., *M. Terentii Varronis opera quae supersunt.* Geneva, 1573.
———, *Opus nouum de emendatione temporum*. Paris, 1583. Second edition: 1598.
———, *In locos controversos Roberti Titi animadversorum liber* (published under the pseudonym Yvo Villiomarus). Heidelberg, 1597.
———, *Thesaurus Temporum*. Leiden, 1606.
Catalogus librorum bibliothecae Illust. Viri Iosephi Scaligeri. Leiden, 1609.
———, *Opuscula varia ante hac non edita*. Frankfurt, 1612.
———, *Poemata Omnia.* Edited by Petrus Scriverius. Leiden, 1615.

———, *De arte critica diatriba*. Edited by Joachimus Morsius. Leiden, 1619.
———, *Epistolae omnes quae reperiri potuerunt.* Leiden, 1627.
Schoppe, Kaspar, *De arte critica*. Nuremburg, 1597.
———, *Scaliger hypobolimaeus.* Mainz, 1607.
———, *Autobiographische Texte und Briefe*. Edited by Klaus Jaitner, Ursula Jaitner-Hahner, and Johann Ramminger. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2004-.
Selden, John, *Iani Anglorum facies altera.* London, 1610.
———, *Analecton Anglobritannicon*. Frankfurt, 1615.
———, *The Historie of Tithes*. London, 1618.
———, ed., *Marmora Arundelliana*. London: 1628.
———, *De diis Syris syntagmata II*. London, 1617. Second edition: Leiden, 1629.
———, *De successionibus in bona defuncti*. London, 1631. Second edition: 1636.
———, *Mare clausum*. London, 1635.
———, *De iure naturali & gentium, iuxta disciplinam Ebraeorum*. London, 1640.
———, *De Synedriis & praefecturis iuridicis veterum Ebraeorum*. London, 1650-55.
———, *Tracts*. Edited and translated by Redman Westcot. London, 1683.
———, *Opera omnia*. Edited by David Wilkins. London, 1726.
———, *Table Talk*. Edited by Samuel Reynolds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.
Sempill, Sir James, *Sacrilege Sacredly Handled*. London, 1619.
Simon, Richard, ed., *Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Orientalis*. London, 1682.
Smith, Thomas, *De recta et emendata linguae Anglicae scriptione dialogus. Paris, 1568.*
Smith, Thomas, *Vitae quorundam Eruditissimorum et Illustrium Virorum*. London, 1707.
Spelman, Henry, *De non temerandis ecclesiis*. London, 1613. Second edition: London, 1616.
Spinoza, Benedict, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. Translated by Jonathan Israel. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Stanley, Thomas, *Poems*. London, 1651.
———, *History of Philosophy*. London, 1655. Later editions: 1656, 1660, and 1662.
———, ed., *Aeschyli tragoediae septem*. London, 1663. Stanley's copy: Cambridge University Library, Adv. b. 44. 1-8.
Tayler, Francis and Arnold Boate, *Examen praefationis Morini in Biblia Graeca.* Leiden, 1636.
Taylor, John, *Commentarius ad l. decemviralem de inope debitore in partis dissecando*. Cambridge, 1742.
Tillesley, Richard, *Animaduersions Vpon M. Seldens History of Tithes*. London, 1619.
Thompson, E. M., ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinu*s. London: British Museum, 1879.
Twine, John, *De rebus albionicis*. London, 1590.
Ussher, James, ed., *Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolae*. Oxford, 1644.
———, *De textus Hebraici Veteris Testamenti variantibus lectionibus ad Ludovicum Cappellum epistola*. London, 1652.
———, *De Graecâ Septuaginta interpretum versione syntagma*. London, 1655.
Valla, Lorenzo, *Opera Omnia*, 2 vols. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1962.
Van Romburgh, Sophie, ed., *For my worthy freind [sic] Mr. Franciscus Junius: an edition of the correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Vossius, G. J., *Aristarchus, sive De arte grammatica libri septem*. Amsterdam, 1635.
———, *De theologia gentili*. Amsterdam, 1641.
———, *Epistolae*. London, 1690.

Wolf, J. C., ed., *Casauboniana*. Hamburg, 1710.
Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses*. London: 1691-2.
Wowerius, Johannes, *De polymathia tractatio*. Hamburg, 1603. Third edition: Leipzig, 1665.
———, *Epistolarum centuriae II*. Hamburg, 1619.
Young, Patrick, ed. and trans., *Clementis Ad Corinthios Epistola Prior*. Oxford, 1633.
———, ed., *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Beatum Iob, Collectore Niceta Heracleae Metropolita...Accessit Ad Calcem Textus Iobi στιχηρως*. London, 1637.
———, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Wigorniensis: Made in 1622-1623*. Edited by Ivor Atkins and N. R. Ker. Cambridge University Press, 1944.

Secondary works

Allan, David, *Virtue, Learning, and the Scottish Enlightenment: Ideas of Scholarship in Early Modern History.* Edinburgh University Press, 1993.

———, *Philosophy and Politics in Later Stuart Scotland: Neo-Stoicism, Culture, and Ideology in an Age of Crisis, 1540-1690.* East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.

Allen, Ward, *Translating for King James*. London: Allen Lane, 1970.

Arnold, Margaret, 'Thomas Stanley's Aeschylus: Renaissance Practical Criticism of Greek Tragedy,' *Illinois Classical Studies* 9 (1984), 229-49.

Auerbach, Erich, *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature: six essays.* New York: Meridian Books, 1959.

Auvray, Paul, 'Jean Morin (1591-1659),' *Revue Biblique* 66 (1959), 397-414.

Backus, Irena, *Historical method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bate, Jonathan, *Shakespeare and Ovid.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Bergjan, Silke-Petra, 'The Patristic Context in Early Grotius,' *Grotiana* 26.1 (2007), 127-46.

Berkowitz, David Sandler, *John Selden's Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England*. Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1988.

Binns, J. W., *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: the Latin Writings of the Age.* Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990.

Bland, Mark, '"Invisible Dangers": Censorship and the Subversion of Authority in Early Modern England,' in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 90 (1996), 151-93.

Botley, Paul, *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: the Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti, and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

———, 'Renaissance Scholarship and the Athenian Calendar,' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 46.4 (2006), 395-431.

Brace, Laura, *The Idea of Property in Seventeenth-Century England: Tithes and the Individual*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

Bravo, Benedetto, '*Critice* in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism,' in *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*. Edited by C. R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Brill's New Pauly. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Brown, Peter, *The World of Late Antiquity: from Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.

Bulman, William, *Constantine's Enlightenment: Culture and Religious Politics in the Early British Empire, c. 1648-1710*. PhD dissertation: Princeton University, 2009.

Burnett, Stephen G., *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish studies: Johannes Buxtorf (1564-1629) and Hebrew learning in the seventeenth century.* Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Burrow, Colin, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

———, 'Pissing on Idiots,' *London Review of Books*, 6 October, 2011.

Callisen, Christian Thorsten, 'Georg Calixtus, Isaac Casaubon, and the Consensus of Antiquity,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 73.1 (2012), 1-23.

Campagnolo, Matteo, 'Entre Théodore de Bèze et Erasme de Rotterdam: Isaac Casaubon,' in *Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605): Actes du colloque de Genève (septembre 2005)*. Edited by Irena Backus. Geneva: Droz, 2007.

Canfora, Luciano, *Convertire Casaubon*. Milan: Adelphi, 2002.

Cave, Terence, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Champion, Justin, 'Père Richard Simon and English Biblical Criticism, 1680-1700,' in *Everything Connects: in Conference with Richard H. Popkin.* Edited by James E. Force and David S. Katz. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———, '*An Historical Narration Concerning Heresie*: Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Barlow, and the Restoration Debate over "Heresy,"' in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture.* Edited by David Lowenstein and John Marshall. Cambridge, 2006.

Chaney, Edward, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian Cultural Relations since the Renaissance.* London: Frank Cass, 1998.

Christianson, Paul, 'Young John Selden and the Ancient Constitution, Ca. 1610-18.' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 128.4 (1984): 271-315.

———, *Discourse on History, Law, and Governance in the Public Career of John Selden, 1610-1635*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.

Collins, Jeffrey R, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Collinson, Patrick, 'One of Us? William Camden and the Making of History,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 8 (1998), 139-63.

Cozzi, Gaetano, 'Paolo Sarpi tra il Cattolico Philippe Canaye de Fresnes e il Calvinista Isaac Casaubon,' *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Storia della Società e dello Stato Veneziano* 1 (1959), 27-154.

Cranfield, N. W. S., *Early seventeenth-century developments and change in the doctrine of ἐπισκοπή and understanding of the office of ἐπίσκοπος in the Church of England*. DPhil thesis: University of Oxford, 1988.

Crawford, Michael and C. R. Ligota, eds., *Ancient History and the Antiquarian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano.* London: Warburg Institute, 1995.

Cummings, Brian, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

———, 'Erasmus and the End of Grammar: Humanism, Scholasticism, and Literary Language,' *New Medieval Literatures* 11 (2009), 249-70.

Daston, Lorraine, 'Probability and Evidence,' in *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy.* Edited by Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

D'Oyly, George, *The Life of William Sancroft*. London, 1821.

Davis, Paul, 'Thomas Hobbes's Translations of Homer: Epic and Anticlericalism in Late Seventeenth-Century England,' *Seventeenth Century* 12.2 (1997), 231-55.

Deitz, Luc, 'Ioannes Wower of Hamburg, Philologist and Polymath. A Preliminary Sketch of His Life and Works,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 58 (1995), 132-51.

———, 'To Corinth and Back,' *Arion* 9.3 (2002), 124-32.

de Jonge, H. J., 'The Study of the New Testament,' in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*. Edited by Theodoor H. L. Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

———, ed., *The Auction Catalogue of the Library of J. J. Scaliger*. Utrecht: H&S, 1977.

———, ‘The Study of the New Testament in the Dutch Universities, 1575-1700,’ *History of Universities* 1 (1981), 113-30.
Delatour, Jérôme, ‘Abeilles thuaniennes et barberines: les relations des savants français avec les Barberini sous le Pontificat d’Urbain VIII,’ ’ in *I Barberini e la cultura Europea del seicento*. Edited by Lorenzo Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze, and Francesco Solinas. Rome: De Luca Editori D’Arte, 2007.
de Quehen, Hugh, ‘Politics and Scholarship in the Ignatian Controversy,’ *Seventeenth Century* 13.1 (1998), 69-84.
de Smet, Ingrid, *Menippean Satire and the Republic of Letters, 1581-1655*. Geneva: Droz, 1996.
———, ‘Giants on the Shoulders of Dwarfs? Considerations on the Value of Renaissance and Early Modern Scholarship for Today's Classicists,’ in Harrison, S. J., ed., *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
Dickson, Donald, ‘The Complexities of Biblical Typology in the Seventeenth Century,’ *Renaissance and Reformation* 23.3 (1987), 253-73.
Douglas, D. C., *English Scholars.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.
Drouin, Sébastien, *Théologie ou libertinage? L’exégèse allégorique à l’âge des Lumières.* Paris: Honoré Champion, 2010.
Dunin-Borkowski, Stanislaus, Graf von, *Spinoza*. 4 vols. Münster: Aschendorff, 1910-36.
Eden, Kathy, *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the ancient legacy and its humanist reception*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
Farmer Jr., N., ‘Fulke Greville and Sir John Coke: An Exchange of Letters on a History Lectureship and Certain Verses on Sir Philip Sidney,’ *Huntington Library Quarterly* 33 (1969-70), 217-36.
Feingold, Mordechai, ‘Reversal of Fortunes: The Displacement of Cultural Hegemony from the Netherlands to England in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries,’ in *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89*. Edited by Mordechai Feingold and Dale Hoak. Stanford University Press, 1996.
———, ‘The Humanities’; and ‘Oriental Studies,’ in *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. IV: Seventeenth-Century Oxford*. Edited by Nicholas Tyacke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
———, ‘English Ramism: a Reinterpretation,’ in *The Influence of Petrus Ramus*. Edited by Mordechai Feingold, Joseph S. Freedman and Wolfgang Rother. Basel: Schwabe, 2001.
———, ‘Science as a Calling? The early modern dilemma,’ *Science in Context* 15.1 (2002), 79-119.
Floridi, Luciano, *Sextus Empiricus: the transmission and recovery of Pyrrhonism*. Oxford University Press, 2002.
Flower, Margaret, ‘Thomas Stanley (1625-1678): a bibliography of his writings in prose and verse (1647-1743),’ *Proceedings of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1 (1950), 139-72.
Ford, Philip and Roger Green, eds., *George Buchanan: Poet and Dramatist.* Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2009.
Frei, Hans, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
Ford, Alan, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early Modern Ireland and England.* Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fumaroli, Marc, 'The Republic of Letters,' *Diogenes* 36 (1988), 129-52.
Fussner, F., *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*. London: Routledge, 1962.
Garnett, George, 'A Great Admirer of Antiquity,' *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 February, 2010.
Gaukroger, Stephen, *Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Early Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
———, *The Emergence of a Scientific Culture: Science and the Shaping of Modernity, 1210-1685*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006.
Gibert, Pierre, 'The Catholic counterpart to the Protestant orthodoxy,' in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: the History of its Interpretation.* 3 vols. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
Ginzburg, Carlo, *History, Rhetoric, and Proof*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
Goldie, Mark, 'The context of the *Foundations*,' in *Rethinking* The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Edited by Annabel Brett and James Tully. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Goulding, Robert, *Defending Hypatia: Ramus, Savile, and the Renaissance Rediscovery of Mathematical History.* Dordrecht: Springer, 2010.
Grafton, Anthony, 'From Politian to Pasquali,' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 67 (1977), 171-6.
———, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983-93.
———, 'Rhetoric, Philology and Egyptomania in the 1570s: J. J. Scaliger's invective against M. Guilandinus's Papyrus,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 42 (1979), 167-94.
———, 'From *De Die Natali* to *De Emendatione Temporum*: The Origins and Setting of Scaliger's Chronology,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 48 (1985), 100-43.
———, 'Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 38.4 (1985), 615-49.
———, 'Higher Criticism Ancient and Modern: The Lamentable Deaths of Hermes and the Sibyls,' in *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays.* Edited by A. C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton and Jill Kraye. London: Warburg Institute, 1988.
———, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*. Princeton University Press, 1990.
———, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800*. Harvard University Press, 1991.
———, 'Humanism and political theory,' in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700.* Edited by J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
———, 'Kaspar Schoppe and the Art of Textual Criticism,' in *Kaspar Schoppe (1576-1649): Philologe im Dienste der Gegenreformation*. Edited by Herbert Jaumann. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1998.
———, *Athenae Batavae: the Research Imperative at Leiden, 1575-1650*. Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2003.

———, 'Conflict and Harmony in the Collegium Gellianum,' in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Edited by Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel Vardi. Oxford University Press, 2004.
———, 'The Identities of History in Early Modern Europe: Prelude to a Study of the *Artes Historicae*,' in *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe.* Edited by Gianna Pomata and Nancy G. Siraisi. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005.
———, 'A Sketch Map of a Lost Continent: the Republic of Letters,' *Republics of Letters* 1.1 (2009). Accessed online on 28 June 2012 at: http://arcade.stanford.edu/journals/rofl/node/34.
———, and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. London: Duckworth, 1986.
———, and Joanna Weinberg, *'I have always Loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.
Güthenke, Constanze, 'Shop Talk. Reception studies and recent work in the history of scholarship,' *Classical Receptions* 1 (2009), 104-15.
Gruys, J. A., *The Early Printed Editions (1518-1664) of Aeschylus: a Chapter in the History of Classical Scholarship.* Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1981.
Haan, Estelle, *From* Academia *to* Amicitia*: Milton's Latin Writings and the Italian Academies.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1998.
———, '*Defensio Prima* and the Latin Poets,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton.* Edited by Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford University Press, 2009.
Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by T. Burger and F. Lawrence. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.
Hamilton, Alastair, *The Copts and the West, 1439-1822: the European Discovery of the Egyptian Church.* Oxford University Press, 2006.
———, 'Isaac Casaubon the Arabist: "Video longum esse iter,"' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009), 143-68.
——— and Arnoud Vrolijk, 'Hadrianus Guilielmi Flessingensis: the Brief Career of the Arabist Adriaen Willemsz,' *Oriens* 39 (2011), 1-15.
Hardy, N. J. S., 'The Enlightenments of Richard Bentley,' *History of Universities* 26.2 (forthcoming in 2012).
Harrison, Peter, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science.* Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Hartnup, Karen, *'On the Beliefs of the Greeks': Leo Allatios and Popular Orthodox*y. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
Hathaway, Baxter, *The Age of Criticism: the Late Renaissance in Italy.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.
Haugen, Kristine, 'Academic Charisma and the Old Regime,' *History of Universities* 22.1 (2007), 199-228.
———, 'Apocalypse (A User's Manual): Joseph Mede, the Interpretation of Prophecy, and the Dream Book of Achmet,' *The Seventeenth Century* 25.2 (2010), 215-39.
———, *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011.
Herendeen, Wyman H., *William Camden: a Life in Context.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.

Herklotz, Ingo, 'The Academia Basiliana: Greek Philology, Ecclesiastical History, and the Union of the Churches in Barberini Rome,' in *I Barberini e la cultura Europea del seicento*. Edited by Lorenzo Mochi Onori, Sebastian Schütze and Francesco Solinas. Rome: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007.

———, *Die Academia Basiliana: griechische Philologie, Kirchengeschichte und Unionsbemühungen im Rom der Barberini*. Rome: Herder, 2008.

Heyd, Michael, *'Be Sober and Reasonable': the Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Hopkins, David, *Conversing with Antiquity: English Poets and the Classics, from Shakespeare to Pope*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Hotson, Howard, *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications, 1543-1630*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hunter, Michael, 'Ancients, Moderns, Philologists, and Scientists,' in *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy: Intellectual Change in Seventeenth-Century Britain*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995.

Huppert, George, 'The Renaissance Background of Historicism,' *History and Theory* 5.1 (1966), 48-60.

Ijsewijn, J., *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. Louvain: Louven University Press, 1990-1998.

Israel, Jonathan, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750*. Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jacobsen, Eric, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 63 (1964), 506-16.

James, Susan, *Spinoza on Philosophy, Religion, and Politics: The Theological-Political Treatise*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Jaumann, Herbert, *Critica: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Literaturkritik zwischen Quintilian und Thomasius*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

———, ed., *Kaspar Schoppe (1576-1649): Philologe im Dienste der Gegenreformation*. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1998.

———, ed., *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik im Zeitalter des Konfessionalismus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.

Jehasse, Jean, *La Renaissance de la critique: l'essor de l'humanisme érudit de 1560 à 1614*. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 1976.

Jensen, Kristian, '*De Emendata Structura Latini Sermonis*: The Latin Grammar of Thomas Linacre,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 49 (1986), 106-25.

———, *Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Grammar: Julius Caesar Scaliger's Theory of Language*. Munich: Fink, 1990.

Jones, R. F., *Ancients and Moderns: A Study of the Rise of the Scientific Movement in Seventeenth-Century England*. St. Louis, Mo.: Washington University, 1961.

Joy, Lynn Sumida, *Gassendi the Atomist: Advocate of History in an Age of Science*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Kahn, Victoria, 'Humanism and the Resistance to Theory,' in Patricia Parker and David Quint, eds., *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Karo, Georgius, and Johannes Lietzmann, *Catenarum Graecarum Catalogus*. Göttingen: Hortsmann, 1902.

Keene, Nicholas. 'John Ernest Grabe, Biblical Learning, and Religious Controversy in Early Eighteenth-Century England,' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 58.4 (2007), 656-74.

Kelley, Donald R., *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law, and History in the French Renaissance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
———, ed., *History and the Disciplines: the Reclassification of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe.* Rochester, N. Y.: University of Rochester Press, 1997.
Kenney, E. J., *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
Kenny, Neil, 'Books in Space and Time: Bibliomania and Early Modern Histories of Learning and "Literature" in France,' *Modern Language Quarterly* 61.2 (2000), 253-86.
Ker, N. R., 'Thomas James's Collation of Gregory, Cyprian and Ambrose,' *Bodleian Library Record* 4 (1952-3), 16-30.
———, 'Salisbury Cathedral Manuscripts and Patrick Young's Catalogue,' in *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*. Edited by Andrew G. Watson. London: Hambledon, 1985.
Kingsbury, Benedict and Benjamin Straumann, eds., *The Roman Foundations of the Law of Nations: Alberico Gentili and the Justice of Empire.* Oxford University Press, 2010.
Kinney, Arthur, *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England.* Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.
Klein, Dietrich, 'Inventing Islam in Support of Christian Truth: Theodor Hackspan's Arabic Studies in Altdorf, 1642-6,' *History of Universities* 25.1 (2010), 26-55.
Klein, Lawrence and Anthony La Vopa, eds., *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850.* San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1998.
Knöll, Stefanie A., *Creating Academic Communities: Funeral Monuments to Professors at Oxford, Leiden and Tübingen, 1580-1700*. Haren: Equilibris, 2003.
Kraye, Jill, '"Ethnicorum omnium sanctissimus": Marcus Aurelius and his *Meditations* from Xylander to Diderot,' in *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy.* Edited by Jill Kraye and M. W. F. Stone. London: Routledge, 2000.
Kugel, James, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its history*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
Kunst, Christiane, *Römische Tradition und englische Politik: Studien zur Geschichte der Britannienrezeption zwischen William Camden und John Speed.* Hildesheim: Olms, 1994.
Lambe, Patrick, 'Biblical Criticism and Censorship in Ancien Régime France: the case of Richard Simon,' *Harvard Theological Review* 78.1/2 (1985), 149-77.
———, 'Critics and Skeptics in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters,' *Harvard Theological Review* 81.3 (1988), 271-96.
Laplanche, François, *L'Ecriture, le sacré et l'histoire: érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVIIe Siècle.* Amsterdam: APA-Holand University Press, 1986.
———, 'A propos d'Isaac Casaubon: la controverse confessionelle et la naissance de l'histoire,' *History of European Ideas* 9.4 (1988), 405-22.
———, *La Bible en France entre mythe et critique (XVI^{e}-XIX^{e} siècle)*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994.
Lardet, Pierre, 'Entre grammaire et philosophie, la philologie, science ou art? Sur l'*emendatio* à la Renaissance et au-delà,' in *Philologie als Wissensmodell*. Edited by Denis Thouard, Friedrich Vollhardt, and Fosca Mariani Zini. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
Leanza, S., 'Iura, verpe, per Anchialum,' *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 3 (1973), 18-25.

Lebram, J. C., 'Ein Streit um die Hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta,' in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*. Edited by Theodoor H. L. Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

le Brun, Jacques, *La Jouissance et le Trouble: Recherches sur la littérature chrétienne de l'âge classique*. Geneva: Droz, 2004.

Leighton, C. D. A., 'Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell,' *History of European Ideas* 31 (2005), 1-16.

Levine, Joseph M., *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

———, *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

———, *The Autonomy of History: Truth and Method from Erasmus to Gibbon*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Levitin, Dmitri, 'Matthew Tindal's *Rights of the Christian Church* (1706) and the Church-State Relationship,' *Historical Journal* 54.3 (2011), 717-40.

———, 'From Sacred History to the History of Religion: paganism, Judaism, and Christianity in European historiography from Reformation to "Enlightenment,"' forthcoming in 2012.

Lewis, Rhodri, 'A Kind of Sagacity: Francis Bacon, the *Ars Memoriae* and the pursuit of natural knowledge', *Intellectual History Review*, 19.2 (2009), 155-75.

———, ed., *William Petty on the Order of Nature: an Unpublished Manuscript Treatise.* Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2011.

Loop, Jan, 'Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620-1667) and the "Historia Orientalis,"' *Church History and Religious Culture* 88.2 (2008), 169-203.

———, 'Divine Poetry? Early Modern European Orientalists on the Beauty of the Koran,' *Church History and Religious Culture* 89.4 (2009), 455-88.

Lynch, Jack, *The Age of Elizabeth in the Age of Johnson.* Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Machan, Tim William, 'When English became Latin,' in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*. Edited by Brian Cummings and James Simpson. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Machielsen, Johannes, *Demons and Letters: Aspects of the Life and Works of Martin Delrio, 1551-1608*. DPhil thesis: University of Oxford, 2011.

Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice.* Cambridge University Press, 2002.

———, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric, 1380-1620.* Oxford University Press, 2011.

Macray, W. D., *Annals of the Bodleian Library*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1984.

Malcolm, Noel, 'Hobbes and the Royal Society,' in *Perspectives on Thomas Hobbes.* Edited by G. A. J. Rogers and Alan Ryan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

———, *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

———, 'Hobbes, Ezra, and the Bible: the History of a Subversive Idea,' in *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

———, 'Private and Public Knowledge: Kircher, Esotericism, and the Republic of Letters,' in *Athanasius Kircher: the Last Man who Knew Everything.* Edited by Paula Findlen. London: Routledge, 2004.

———, 'The Name and Nature of Leviathan: Political symbolism and biblical exegesis,' *Intellectual History Review* 17.1 (2007), 29-58.

Malone, Edward A., ed., *British Rhetoricians and Logicians, 1500-1660*. Detroit: Gale Group, 2001-2003.
Mandelbrote, Scott, 'English scholarship and the Greek text of the Old Testament, 1620-1720: the impact of Codex Alexandrinus,' in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Edited by Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
———, 'The Uses of Natural Theology in Seventeenth-Century England,' *Science in Context* 20 (2007), 451-80.
———, 'Origen against Jerome in Early Modern Europe,' in *Patristic Tradition and Intellectual Paradigms in the Seventeenth Century*. Edited by Silke-Petra Bergjan and Karla Pollmann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
———, 'Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint,' in *Between Scholarship and Science: The Wonderful World of Isaac Vossius*. Edited by Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming in 2012.
Martin, Julian, *Francis Bacon, the State, and the Reform of Natural Philosophy.* Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Martindale, Charles, *John Milton and the Transformation of Ancient Epic.* London: Croom Helm, 1986.
——— and A. B. Taylor, eds., *Shakespeare and the Classics.* Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Masson, David, *The Life of John Milton.* London: Macmillan, 1859-94.
McCullough, Peter, ed., 'Making Dead Men Speak: Laudianism, Print, and the Works of Lancelot Andrewes, 1626-1642,' *The Historical Journal* 41.2 (1998), 401-24.
———, *Lancelot Andrewes: Selected Sermons and Lectures.* Oxford University Press, 2005.
McDowell, Nicholas, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
McKendrick, Scot and Orlaith O'Sullivan, *The Bible as Book: the Transmission of the Greek Text.* London: British Library, 2003.
McPherson, David 'Ben Jonson's library and marginalia: an annotated catalogue,' *Studies in Philology* 71.5 (1974), 1-106.
Mercer, Christia, 'The Vitality and Importance of Early Modern Aristotelianism,' in *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: the Tension between the New and Traditional Philosophies from Machiavelli to Leibniz.* Edited by Tom Sorell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
Miller, Jeffrey Alan, *Theological Typology, Milton, and the Aftermath of Writing*. DPhil thesis: University of Oxford, 2011.
Miller, Peter, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
———, 'Taking Paganism Seriously: Anthropology and Antiquarianism in Early Seventeenth-Century Histories of Religion,' *Archiv Für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (2001): 183-209.
———, 'The "Antiquarianization" of Biblical Scholarship and the London Polyglot Bible,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62.3 (2001), 463-82.
———, 'Making the Paris Polyglot Bible: Humanism and Orientalism in the Early Seventeenth Century,' *Die Europäische Gelehrtenrepublik Im Zeitalter Des Konfessionalismus*. Edited by Herbert Jaumann. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
———, ed., *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences.* University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Milton, Anthony, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Milton, J.R., '"Delicate learning," erudition and the enterprise of philosophy,' in *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy.* Edited by Jill Kraye and M. W. F. Stone. London: Routledge, 2000.
Mochi Onori, Lorenzo, Sebastian Schütze and Francesco Solinas, eds., *I Barberini e la Cultura Europea del Seicento*. Rome: De Luca Editori D'Arte, 2007.
Momigliano, Arnaldo, 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13.3/4 1950, 285-315.
———, 'The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography,' *History* 43 (1958), 1-13.
———, *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge University Press, 1975.
———, 'The Fault of the Greeks,' *Daedalus* 104.2 (1975), 9-19.
———, 'The Greeks and Us,' *New York Review of Books*, October 16, 1975.
Mortimer, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: the Challenge of Socinianism*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Moss, Ann, 'Language Can Change Minds,' in Lodi Nauta, ed., *Language and Cultural Change: Aspects of the Study and Use of Language in the Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
Moul, Victoria, *Jonson, Horace, and the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
Moyn, Samuel, 'Amos Funkenstein on the Theological Origins of Historicism,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64.4 (2003), 639-48.
Muller, Richard, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition.* Oxford University Press, 2003.
———, 'Thomas Barlow on the Liabilities of "New Philosophy": Perceptions of a Rebellious *ancilla* in the Era of Protestant Orthodoxy,' in *Scholasticism Reformed: Essays in Honour of Willem J. van Asselt.* Edited by Maarten Wisse, M. Sarot, and Willemien Otten. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
Mulsow, Martin, 'Christian Humanism in the Age of Critical Philology: Ralph Häfner's Gods in Exile,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70.4 (2009), 659-79.
Nauta, Lodi, ed., *Language and Cultural Change: Aspects of the Study and Use of Language in the Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
———, *In Defense of Common Sense: Lorenzo Valla's Humanist Critique of Scholastic Philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.
Nelles, Paul, 'The Uses of Orthodoxy and Jacobean Erudition: Thomas James and the Bodleian Library,' *History of Universitie*s 22.1 (2007), 21-70.
Nisbet, H. B. and Claude Rawson, eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume Four: the Eighteenth Century.* Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, and Politics*, 1627-1660. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Norton, David, *A Textual History of the King James Bible*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Norton, Glyn, ed., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume Three: the Renaissance.* Cambridge University Press, 1999.
Osmond, Patricia J., 'Edmund Bolton's Vindication of Tiberius Caesar: A "Lost" Manuscript Comes to Light,' *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 11.3 (2005), 329-43.

Ovenden, Richard, 'The Libraries of the Antiquaries (*c*. 1580-1640) and the Idea of a National Collection,' in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland, Volume 1*. Edited by Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Owen, A. L., *The Famous Druids*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Packer, J. W., *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660: with special reference to Henry Hammond.* Manchester University Press, 1969.

Padley, G. A., *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500-1700: the Latin Tradition*. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Panofsky, Erwin, 'Renaissance and Renascences,' *The Kenyon Review* 6.2 (1944), 201-36.

Parenty, Hélène, *Isaac Casaubon, Helléniste: Des Studia Humanitatis à la Philologie*. Geneva: Droz, 2009.

Parkin, Jon, *Taming the Leviathan: the Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England, 1640-1700.* Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Parry, Graham, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century.* Oxford University Press, 2007.

Patrides, C. A., 'Renaissance Estimates of the Year of Creation,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 26.4 (1963), 315-22.

Patterson, W. B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Pattison, Mark, *Isaac Casaubon*. London, 1875.

Pearson, David, 'Patterns of Book Ownership in Late Seventeenth-Century England,' *The Library* 11.2 (2010), 139-67.

Percival, W. K., *Studies in Renaissance Grammar*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Pfeiffer, Rudolf, *History of Classical Scholarship: from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

———, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Philip, I. G., *The Bodleian Library in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* Oxford University Press, 1983.

Phillipson, Nicholas and Quentin Skinner, eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Plett, Heinrich. *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.

Pocock, J. G. A., *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History.* London: Methuen, 1972.

———, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge University Press, 1957; second edition, 1987.

———, *Barbarism and Religion*. Cambridge University Press, 1999-.

Pomian, Krzystof, 'Le Cartésianisme, les érudits et l'histoire,' *Archiwum historii filozofii i myśli społecznej* 12 (1966), 175-204.

Pomata, Gianna, and Nancy G. Siraisi, eds., *Historia: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 2005.

Poole, William, *John Aubrey and the Advancement of Learning*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2010.

———, 'Oxford Printing in Divinity, c. 1580-1780,' in *The Oxford History of the Oxford University Press*. Edited by Ian Gadd. Oxford University Press: forthcoming.

Popkin, Richard, 'Cartesianism and Biblical Criticism,' in *Problems of Cartesianism*. Edited by Thomas W. Lennon, John M. Nicholas and John W. Davis. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1982.
———, *The History of Scepticism: from Savonarola to Bayle*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
Portal, Ethel M., 'The Academ Roial of King James I,' *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1915-16), 189-208.
'The Presence of the Historian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano,' *History and Theory* 30.4 (1991).
Purser, L. C., 'Laud's Manuscript of Apuleius,' *Hermathena* 15 (1909), 425-37.
Quantin, Jean-Louis, 'Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity,' in *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*. Edited by C. R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin. Oxford University Press, 2006.
———, 'L'Orthodoxie, la censure et la gloire: la difficile édition princeps de l'epître de Barnabé, de Rome à Amsterdam (1549-1646),' in *'Editiones principes' delle opere dei Padri greci e latini.* Edited by M. Cortesi. Florence: Galluzzo, 2006.
———, 'Les jésuites et l'érudition anglicane,' in *XVII^e Siècle* 237 (2007), 691-711.
———, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588-1613),' in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters.* Edited by Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.
———, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
———, 'Reason and Reasonableness in French Ecclesiastical Scholarship,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 74.3 (2011), 401-436.
Rademaker, C. S. M., 'Gerardus Joannes Vossius and his English correspondents,' *Lias* 19 (1992), 173-213.
Raymond, Joad, 'John Milton, European: the Rhetoric of Milton's Latin Defences,' in *The Oxford Handbook of* Milton. Edited by Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith. Oxford University Press, 2009.
Rebhorn, Wayne, *The Emperor of Men's Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
Reedy, Gerard, *The Bible and Reason: Anglicans and Scripture in late seventeenth-century England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
Rees, Graham and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI.* Oxford University Press, 2009.
Revard, Stella, *Milton and the Tangles of Neaera's Hair: the Making of the 1645* Poems. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997.
———, 'Thomas Stanley and "A Register of Friends,"' in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Edited by Claude J. Summer and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000.
Reverdin, Olivier, 'Isaac Casaubon et Genève de 1596 à 1614,' in *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul-E. Martin par ses amis, ses collègues, et ses élèves*. Geneva: Comité des Mélanges P.-E. Martin, 1961.
Reynolds, L. D., and Nigel Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: a Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature.* Oxford University Press, 1991.

Rietbergen, Peter, *Power and Religion in Baroque Rome: Barberini Cultural Policie*s. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
Roebuck, Thomas, *Antiquarianism and Regionalism, 1580-1640*. DPhil thesis: University of Oxford, 2010.
Rosenblatt, Jason, *Torah and Law in* Paradise Lost. Princeton University Press, 1994.
———, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden.* Oxford University Press, 2006.
Russell, William, 'The Invention of the Critic in England, 1570-1640.' PhD dissertation: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009.
Sandys, J. E., *A History of Classical Scholarship*, Cambridge University Press, 1903-1908.
Sanford, E. M., 'The Study of Ancient History in the Middle Ages,' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 5 (1944), 21-43.
Santinello, Giovanni, Constance Blackwell, and Philip Weller, eds., *Models of the History of Philosophy, Volume I: from its Origins in the Renaissance to the 'Historia Philosophica.'* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1993.
Scaglione, Aldo, 'The Humanist as Scholar and Politian's Conception of the *Grammaticus*,' *Studies in the Renaissance* 8 (1961), 49-70.
Schiffman, Zachary Sayre, 'Renaissance Historicism Reconsidered,' *History and Theory* 24.2 (1985), 170-82.
———, *On the Threshold of Modernity: Relativism in the French Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
———, *The Birth of the Past.* Foreword by Anthony Grafton. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.
Schmitt, Charles, *Aristotle and the Renaissance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.
Schüssler, Rudolf, 'Jean Gerson, Moral Certainty, and the Renaissance of Ancient Scepticism,' *Renaissance Studies* 23.4 (2009), 445-62.
Sellin, Paul, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England.* Leiden University Press, 1968.
Serjeantson, R. W., 'Testimony and Proof in Early-Modern England,' *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 30.2 (1999), 195-236.
———, 'Hobbes, the Universities, and the History of Philosophy,' in *The Philosopher in Early Modern Europe: the Nature of a Contested Identity.* Edited by Conal Condren, Stephen Gaukroger and Ian Hunter. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Sheehan, Jonathan, 'Sacred and Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism and the Polemics of Distinction in the Seventeenth Century,' *Past & Present* 192.1 (2006), 35-66.
———,'When was Disenchantment? History and the Secular Age,' in *Varieties of Secularism in a Secular Age.* Edited by Michael Warner, Jonathan VanAntwerpen, and Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.
Shelford, April G., *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650-1720*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2007.
Shuger, Debora K., *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
Siraisi, Nancy, *History, Medicine, and the Traditions of Renaissance Learning.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007.
Skinner, Quentin. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes.* Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Smitskamp, Rijk, Philologia orientalis*: a Description of Books Illustrating the Study and Printing of Oriental Languages in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe.* Leiden: Brill, 1992.
Soll, Jacob, *Publishing the Prince: History, Reading, and the Birth of Political Criticism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.
Sommerlad, M. J., *The historical and antiquarian interests of Thomas Tanner, 1674-1735, Bishop of St. Asaph*. DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 1962.
Sommerville, Johann P., 'Hobbes, Selden, Erastianism, and the History of the Jews,' in *Hobbes and History.* Edited by G. A. J. Rogers and Tom Sorell. London: Routledge, 2000.
Somos, Mark, *Secularization and the Leiden Circle*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
Spies, Marijke, *Rhetoric, Rhetoricians, and Poets: Studies in Renaissance Poetry and Poetics.* Amsterdam University Press, 1999.
Spiller, Michael R.G., *'Concerning Natural Experimental Philosophie': Meric Casaubon and the Royal Society*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1980.
Spingarn, Joel, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1908.
Spinka, Matthew, 'Acquisition of the Codex Alexandrinus by England,' *The Journal of Religion* 16.1 (1936), 10-29.
Spurr, John, '"A special kindness for dead bishops": the Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth-Century Protestantism,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), 313-34.
Stevenson, Jane, *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century.* Oxford University Press, 2005.
Strauss, Leo, *Spinoza's Critique of Religion*. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.
Tamizey de Larroque, Philippe, 'Deux lettres inédites de Jean Price à Bourdelot,' *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, April 1883, 145-58.
ter Horst, D. J. H., *Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655)*. Utrecht: Hoeijenbos en co, 1934.
Timpanaro, Sebastiano, *The Genesis of Lachmann's Method*. Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Toomer, G. J., *Eastern Wisedome, and Learning: The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
———, 'Selden's "Historie of Tithes": Genesis, Publication, Aftermath.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65.3/4 (2002), 345-78.
———, 'John Selden, the Levant, and the Netherlands in the History of Scholarship,' in *The Republic of Letters and the Levant*. Edited by Alastair Hamilton. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
———, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645*. London: Macmillan, 1940.
———, *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays.* London: Secker & Warburg, 1987.
Tuck, Richard, 'Grotius and Selden,' in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700.* Edited by J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
———, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: the rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

———, ‘Lancelot Andrewes and the Myth of Anglicanism,’ in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560-1660.* Edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000.

———, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c. 1530-1700*. Manchester University Press, 2001.

van der Wall, Ernestine, ‘Between Grotius and Cocceius: the “Theologia Prophetica” of Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722),’ in *Hugo Grotius, Theologian: Essays in Honour of G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes.* Edited by Henk Nellen and Edwin Rabbie. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

van der Woude, S., ‘Sir Henry Savile’s Chrysostomus Edition in the Netherlands,’ in *Studia Bibliographica in honorem Herman de la Fontaine Verwey.* Edited by S. Van Der Woude. Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1966.

Vanek, Klara, *Ars corrigendi in der frühen Neuzeit*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.

van Miert, Dirk, *Humanism in an Age of Science: The Amsterdam Athenaeum in the Golden Age, 1632-1704.* Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———, ‘The Limits of Transconfessional Contact in the Republic of Letters around 1600: Scaliger, Casaubon, and their Catholic Correspondents,’ in *Between Scylla and Charybdis: Learned letter writers navigating the reefs of religious and political controversy in early modern Europe*. Edited by Jeannine de Landtsheer and Henk Nellen. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

van Rooden, Peter, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn L’Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Vickers, Brian, ed., *English Renaissance Literary Criticism.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Viljamaa, Toivo, *The Renaissance Reform of Latin Grammar*. Helsinki: Turun Yliopisto, 1976.

Vine, Angus, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England.* Oxford University Press, 2010.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich, *History of Classical Scholarship*. Translated by Alan Harris. London: Duckworth, 1982.

Warren, Christopher, ‘Gentili, the Poets, and the Laws of War,’ in *The Roman Foundations of the Law of Nations: Alberico Gentili and the justice of empire*. Edited by Benedict Kingsbury and Benjamin Straumann. Oxford University Press, 2010.

Waquet, Françoise. ‘Qu’est-ce que la République des Lettres? Essai de sémantique historique,’ *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes* 147 (1989), 473-502.

Waszink, J. H., ‘Classical Philology,’ in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*. Edited by Theodoor H. L. Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Weinberg, Bernard, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance.* University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Wellek, René, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, 8 vols. London: Jonathan Cape, 1955-1992.

———, *Concepts of Criticism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Wheeler, G.W., *The Earliest Catalogues of the Bodleian Library*. Oxford University Press, 1928.

Wickenden, Nicholas, *G. J. Vossius and the Humanist Concept of History*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.

Woolf, D. R., ‘Edmund Bolton, Francis Bacon and the Making of Hypercritica, 1618-1621,’ *Bodleian Library Record* 11 (1983), 162-8.
———, ‘Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England.’ *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987), 11-48.
———, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and the* ‘*Light of Truth*’ *from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. University of Toronto Press, 1990.
———, ‘From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700.’ *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005), 33-70.
Young, B. W., *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke*. Oxford University Press, 1998.
Zeeman, Nicolette, Kantik Ghosh, and Dallas G. Denery II, eds., *Uncertain Knowledge: Interdisciplinary Conversations about Doubt and Scepticism in the Middle Ages.* In preparation.