

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION  
IN THE REPUBLIC OF LETTERS:  
THE USES OF LATIN AND FRENCH  
IN THE CORRESPONDENCE OF JOSEPH SCALIGER\*

PRELUDE

On 22 March 1608, the French scholar Joseph Scaliger wrote to the Arabist Stephanus Ubertus:

It is no surprise that the pronunciation [of Arabic] differs from region to region, considering that in the time of our own grandfathers there was the same diversity in the pronunciation of Latin, especially in the case of the natives of Brittany: when they spoke Latin, the Italians thought there were speaking French. Even the most learned Englishmen pronounce Latin very badly. Here in Leiden, one of them once addressed me for a quarter of an hour and I wouldn't have understood him any better than if he had spoken Turkish. I begged his pardon that my English was poor. The man who had introduced him to me burst out in such guffaws that I was as much ashamed as he was amused.<sup>11</sup>

\* I would like to express my gratitude to Anthony Gratton for funding, from his Balzan Prize, from proceeds of the Mellon Foundation and from Princeton University, two post-doctoral fellowships at the Warburg Institute, which allowed me not only to collaborate in editing the correspondence of Joseph Scaliger, but also to study various aspects of its contents. My colleague Paul Bodley has helped transcribe some of the letters to and from Scaliger cited in the footnotes below. I am also grateful to those who commented on different versions of this paper, which was presented at a *Republics of Letters in Early Modern Europe* seminar, All Souls College, Oxford, organised by Ian Maclean and Noel Malcolm (17 January 2007), and at the international conference *Bilingual Europe: Latin and Vernacular Cultures ca. 1300-1800*, organized by Jan Bloemendal and Juliette Groenland, at the University of Amsterdam (18 September 2009). I also thank Henk Nellen (Huygens Institute) for his very useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper; the editors of this journal for a number of suggestions and corrections; and Anthony Osse-Richardson (London) for the care he took in revising my English and for pointing out some discrepancies. Of course, I myself remain solely responsible for flaws in contents and style.

<sup>11</sup> Pronunciationem vero ita inter eos variare mirum non est, quum memoria patrum nostrorum eadem diversitas in Latina lingua animadvertenda fuerit, praesertim in Gallis Francoceltis, quos Latine loquentes, Itali putabant Gallice loqui. Anglorum vero etiam doctissimi tam grave Latine loquentes, ut in hac urbe, quum quidam ex ea gente per quadranthem horae integrum apud me verba fecisset neque ego magis eum intelligerem quam si Turcice loquutus fuisset, ego hominem rogaverim excusatum me habere, quod Anglice non bene intelligerem. Ille, qui eum ad me deduxerat, tantum cacinnam sustulit, ut mea non minus interfuerit pudere quam ipsius ridere. (Joseph Scaliger, *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, Paris, 1610, p. 454). This seems to be the anecdote which was recalled by

Understanding spoken Latin was even harder than reading it, as Francoise Waquet has taught us in her rich study of the language's vicissitudes in the last three centuries. And if any text reflects the spoken language, it is that of epistolary correspondence, which, since antiquity, had been conceived of as a conversation with absent friends.<sup>2</sup>

This article will review the circumstances and considerations influencing the choice between Latin or French in early modern letter-writing. Since these writers' conscious reflection on this matter is disappointingly rare, I will rather look for quantitative patterns in the extant bodies of epistolary material. In particular cases, I will also give qualitative analyses.

## INTRODUCTION

The *questione delle lingue*, that is, the debates on the relative merits of Latin and the vernaculars, was already long-standing, flourishing especially during the 'coming of age' of vernacular literature. The usual perspective from which the subject is now treated is that of the transition from a Latinate world to a vernacular one. This transition indeed took place, but it took half a millennium before Latin disappeared entirely: from Dante to Kant, Europe's intellectual culture was basically bilingual. For centuries, many considerations governed a writer's choice of language: that is, it was not exclusively a choice between nostalgia and modernism, elite and popular cultures, or universality and nationalism. Users of language seldom had to reckon with one consideration only, but had to make a new choice for every work they wrote: commercial ones, depending on printers and public, religious ones, depending on confessions and church hierarchies, political ones depending on patrons and power struggles, literary ones, depending on genre and theory, social ones, depending on education and gender, etc. More and more, scholars of today are looking at the subject from a less polemically anti-Latinate viewpoint. For instance, Francoise Waquet's work on the position of Latin in education and society over the last three centuries puts Latin itself in the centre of her study and explores the increasing problems people had in dealing with the Latin heritage. Hers is a story of slow dis-

tegration as well, albeit one which reveals that the process was uneven, with ups and downs dependent on time and place. Manfred Fuhrman has taken the history of Latin as a point of departure for an essay on the educational system in Germany over the last millennium<sup>3</sup>. In Tore Janson's popularising history of Latin from 600 BC to 2000 AD, disappointingly little attention is given to the Neo-Latin of the Renaissance humanists. Although he does give many examples of the impact of Latin on the vernaculars, his is strictly a linguistic history rather than a cultural one<sup>4</sup>. Wilfried Stroh's 'short history' of Latin is more satisfying from the latter angle, although it is not intended to be rigorously systematic<sup>5</sup>. Most studies concerning the relation between Latin and the vernacular deal primarily with the Middle Ages.

When it comes to the historiography of the Renaissance itself, during which Europe's elite was largely bilingual, scholarly attention is being increasingly turned to Neo-Latin texts, despite falling rates of Latinity among historians<sup>6</sup>. In this renewed interest for the importance of Latin during the early modern period, the study of its impact has been revived as well. More particularly, the impact of Latin rhetorical and poetical theories, both ancient and early modern, on vernacular literature has started to attract attention<sup>7</sup>. A recent French work has provided a large number of case-stud-

<sup>3</sup> Manfred Fuhrman, *Latin und Europa. Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis Wilhelm II.* (Cologne, 2001).

<sup>4</sup> Tore Janson, *A Natural History of Latin*, Oxford, 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Wilfried Stroh, *Latein ist Tot, es lebe Latein! Kleine Geschichte einer grossen Sprache*, Berlin, 2007.

<sup>6</sup> Christopher Celena, *The Lost Italian Renaissance. Humanists, Historians and Latin's Legacy*, Baltimore, 2004; See also the successful bilingual *Villa I Tatti* series, published by Harvard University Press, which provide Latin texts with English translations of major Italian Renaissance authors (see the review article of this by Anthony Gratton, 'Splendors and Sorrows of Latin in the Modern World', in id. *Worlds made by Words. Scholarship and Community in the Modern West*, Cambridge MA, 2009, pp. 137-159; other notable series of bilingual editions are the *Serie Textos*, published by the *Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos* in Cádiz; and the *Bibliotheca Latiniana Novae*, set up by British and Dutch academics and published in Assen.

<sup>7</sup> Ioan M. Ferrante, 'Was Vernacular Poetic Practice a Response to Latin Language Theory?', *Romance Philology* 35, 1982, no. 4, pp. 586-600 (esp. 586); Estelle Haan, Thomas Gray's *Latin Poetry: some Classical, Neo-Latin, and Vernacular Contexts*, Brussels, 2000; Eckhard Lefèvre and Eckart Schäfer (eds), *Daniel Heinsius. Klassischer Philologie und Poesie*, Tübingen, 2007, pp. 297-398; Jan Bloemendal has, for example, set up two research programmes, one concerning the relation between Latin and the vernacular in the case of theatrical plays (*Latin and Vernacular Cultures: Theatre and Public Opinion in the Netherlands, ca 1510-1625*), the other concerning the impact of Dutch Latin poets, notably Daniel Heinsius, on German poetry in the seventeenth century (*Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular. The Role of Self-representation, Self-perception and Inauging in the Field of Cultural Transmission, Exemplified by the German Reception of Dutch Poets in a Bilingual Context*). See also the forthcoming proceedings of a three-day conference *Bilingual Europe: Latin and Vernacular Cultures, ca. 1300-1800*, which took place in Amsterdam, from 17 to 19 September 2009.

Guy Patin, who, however, changed the Englishman into an Irishman. See *L'esprit de Guy Patin tiré de ses conversations, de son cabinet et de ses ouvrages*, Amsterdam, 1709, p. 205, as quoted in Francoise Waquet, *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign. From the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, London and New York, 2001, pp. 160-161 and p. 314, n. 52.

<sup>2</sup> For Waquet's study, see above, n. 1. On the theory of epistolography, see Abraham J. Malherbe, ed., *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, Atlanta, 1988; Frans Jozef Worstbrock (ed.), *Der Brief im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, Mitteilung IX der Kommission für Humanismusforschung, Weinheim, 1983.

ies from all sorts of late medieval and early modern intellectual fields<sup>8</sup>. Few scholars, however, have drawn attention to the uses of Latin and the vernacular within the nexus of scholarly networks known as the Republic of Letters. Scholarly communication in the Republic has been well studied by Habermas, Bots, Waquet, Fumaroli, Goldgar, Miller, Furey and others<sup>9</sup>. Humanist epistolography, meanwhile, is an established field of research<sup>10</sup>. However, the linguistic choices made by correspondents are rarely the focus. A valuable contribution has been made by Dominique de Courcelles in the case of Sepúlveda's letters<sup>11</sup>. James Mehl has focused on the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, a collection of fictitious letters in which bad Latin (in which the vernacular shines through) is mocked<sup>12</sup>. Erika Rummel has studied another type of bilingualism – the use of Greek in Erasmus' Latin letters<sup>13</sup>. But overall, language choice in epistolography remains understudied.

My approach here will be sociolinguistic (investigating writers' social status) and as well as rhetorical (examining the style of letters as a literary genre). The social status of letters' authors and recipients can be broken down into five categories: politics, religion, profession, gender and circula-

<sup>8</sup> Emmanuel Bury (ed.), *Tous vos gens à Latin. Le Latin, langue savante, langue mondaine (XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Geneva, 2005.

<sup>9</sup> Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, Neuwied am Rhein and Berlin, 1962; Johannes A.H.G.M. Bots, *Republik der Letteren. Ideal en werkelijkheid*, Amsterdam, 1977; Marc Fumaroli, 'The Republic of Letters', in *Diogenes* 143 (1988), pp. 129-154; Hans Bots and Françoise Waquet (eds), *Commercium Litterarum. La Communication dans la République des Lettres. Forms of Communications in the Republic of Letters, 1600-1750*, Amsterdam and Maarsse, 1994; Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning. Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750*, New Haven and London, 1995; Hans Bots and Françoise Waquet, *La République des Lettres*, [Paris], 1997; Peter N. Miller, *Perseic's Europe. Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century*, New Haven and London, 2000; M. Sebök (ed.), *Republic of Letters. Humanism, Humanities. Selected Papers of the Workshop Held at the Collegium Budapest in Cooperation with NIAS between November 25 and 28, 1999*, Budapest, 2005; Constance M. Furey, *Erasmus, Contarini, and the Religious Republic of Letters*, Cambridge, 2005. See also the useful comments in Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, Oxford, 2002, pp. 539-541.

<sup>10</sup> For a selection of secondary literature, mainly focused on late Northern European humanism, see <http://warburg.sas.ac.uk/scaliger/indexjiscaliger.htm>, under the heading 'Some secondary literature'.

<sup>11</sup> Dominique de Courcelles, 'Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490-1573), traducteur du Grec et historiographe en langue Latine: sur le choix de l'écriture en langue Latine en Espagne vers 1540', in: *Tous vos gens à Latin* (as above, n. 8), pp. 347-362.

<sup>12</sup> James V. Mehl, 'Language, Class, and Mimic Satire in the Characterization of Correspondents in the Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25, 1994, pp. 289-305.

<sup>13</sup> Erika Rummel, 'The Use of Greek in Erasmus' Letters', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 30, 1981, pp. 55-92. For Erasmus' correspondence see also *La correspondance d'Erasmus et l'épistolographie humaniste. Colloque international tenu en novembre 1983*, Travaux de l'Institut Interuniversitaire pour l'étude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme 8, Brussels, 1985.

tion. The text's rhetorical tradition, meanwhile, may be subdivided into subject matter (contents) and epistolographic theory (form).

Let me first introduce these categories with examples of what each might entail. With regard to politics, I ask whether a writer's adherence to a certain political faction influences his choice of language. As to religion, one might think of a generally accepted, albeit recently criticized identification of Calvinism with the use of the vernacular. When it comes to profession, it seems obvious that a professor at university was more inclined than a diplomat to use Latin with fellow countrymen. In the case of gender, it is certain that women had little opportunity to learn Latin and would therefore not normally correspond in that language. In light of the (limited) circulation of a letter, meanwhile, the linguistic abilities of an addressee's circle have to be taken into account.

As far as the second basic category is concerned, that of rhetorical conditions, we may observe that scholarship was more likely to be phrased in Latin, whereas, for instance, a complaint about high prices due to war would rather have been stated in French. When it comes to theory, it should be noted that the literary tradition of epistolography did not address the vernacular.

I shall explore this set of parameters with reference to the correspondence of Joseph Scaliger, but some of them are equally important for other types of literature.

## 1. THE SOCIAL POSITION OF AUTHOR AND RECIPIENT

### Politics

Our first aspect concerns the political affiliations of a letter's writer and addressee. It is plausible that a person who strongly identified himself with a nation would have shown a special preference for its language. Such a person may have been tempted to use that nation's vernacular to satisfy his own taste, or to promote the language. But we might also argue that someone involved in the programme of enhancing a culture perceived as 'national' would be more prone to using Latin<sup>14</sup>. After all, paradoxically, efforts to promote a 'national identity' were directed not only towards the writer's own group, but towards people of other nations, who constituted, by default, a much larger public. After the disintegration of vulgar Latin and its development into different branches of romance languages, a given-language

<sup>14</sup> De Courcelles, 'Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda' (as above, n. 11), p. 343: 'les affirmations des nationalismes'.

community in Europe always formed a minority in European perspective<sup>15</sup>. Charles V may have had an empire in which the sun would never set, but that empire had no standard language. Latin would have been the one language understandable to the cultured of every language community. But writing in Latin necessarily reduced the size of one's non-élite audience at home. Despite this, many programmes of patriotic literary production opted for Latin. However, such patriotism does not usually involve the writing and publication of letters. Correspondence was usually intended to promote the individual, not his fatherland. Therefore, one should not expect this first part of our model to apply strongly to an epistolary context.

Looking at Scaliger's letters, it seems that his political affiliation indeed had little influence on his choice of language. In the sixteenth century there seems to have been no political objection to the use of Latin. This may have related to its extraordinary status as nobody's native tongue. Latin was, at least within Europe, politically neutral and impartial. The reason for not using it, then, was rather practical: Latin was a difficult language to master. This is not to say that there is little diplomatic correspondence in Latin in early modern Europe. Smaller countries especially, such as those of Scandinavia, used Latin when corresponding with representatives of other native tongues<sup>16</sup>.

Scaliger was born in Agen in 1540. He remained in France during the wars of religion, but when victory seemed certain for the Catholics, Scaliger, as a Huguenot, accepted an invitation to come to Leiden University in 1593. He remained in Leiden for the rest of his life; a period of sixteen years<sup>17</sup>. Scaliger probably never corresponded in languages other

than French (interspersed with Latin remarks) and Latin (interspersed with a lot of Greek, and occasionally some Hebrew or Arabic). Scaliger also spoke a little Dutch, although he himself admitted that his grasp of the language was limited<sup>18</sup>. This was not due to a lack of political identification with the Dutch State. Scaliger seems to have supported the Dutch revolt and had many native Dutch colleagues who also ignored the language in their correspondence. It was simply practical to use French or Latin, for French was also used by the Dutch nobility and learned classes. In fact, French was not just the vernacular tongue of the French people, but developing itself into the truly international language it became in the course of the seventeenth century<sup>19</sup>.

By the same line of reasoning, conscious political considerations appear to have been less important than the practical consequences of political boundaries. Put differently: if we take it that territorial borders are the outcome of politics and that these borders roughly demarcate language boundaries, it is due to political processes that one person learns Dutch and another German, even before the rise of language-enforcing nation states.

When Scaliger moved to Leiden, he was drawn into the world of Northern European late-humanism. This is easily observed in his correspondence: contact with German humanists, and especially Calvinists, increases<sup>20</sup>. Since German was probably double Dutch to Scaliger, and since the Germans would have found it easier to write in Latin than in French, it was more convenient for both sides to correspond in Latin. The same holds for his correspondence with the Dutch. Once Scaliger moved to Leiden in 1593, therefore, Latin took over from French. This is clear from the chart below.

<sup>15</sup> I will not be addressing the Middle-East or the Far East.

<sup>16</sup> Swedish diplomats such as Axel Oxenstiern, or those in Swedish service, such as Hugo Grotius, would use Latin, but here again, practical reasons seem to have been most important. See C.G. Styffe et al. (eds), *Rikskansleren Axel Oxenstierns skrifter och brevföring*, Stockholm, 1888-[1977]. See also Grotius's correspondence with Oxenstiern in Philip C. Mohlhyssen et al. (eds), *Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius*, 17 vols, The Hague 1928-2003, vols III-XVI, and supplement vol. XVII. See also the edition of the correspondence of Elisabeth Stuart by Nadine Akkerman (ed.), *The Letters of A Stuart Princess: The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Electress Palatine of the Rhine, and Queen of Bohemia*, Oxford, 2010 [in the press]. For more examples of the survival of Latin in diplomacy, see Waquet, *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign* (as above, n. 1), pp. 95-99.

<sup>17</sup> See Philip C. Mohlhyssen, *De komst van Scaliger in Leiden*, Leiden, 1913; on Scaliger in general, see Anthony Gratton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. I: *Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, Oxford, 1983; Vol. II: *Historical Chronology*, Oxford, 1993; Id. and Henk Jan de Jonge, *Joseph Scaliger. A Biography 1850-1993*, in: Rijk Smitskamp, *The Scaliger Collection. A Bibliography of Antiquarian Books by and about Josephus Justus Scaliger, with Full Descriptions. With a Checklist of all Known Scaliger Publications. With a Checklist of the Scaliger annotations. With a Full Index to Bernays' Scaliger biography (1855)*, Preface by Alastair Hamilton 'Supplement', pp. i-xxx, Leiden, 1993.

<sup>18</sup> Pierre Des Maitzeaux (ed.), *Scaligerana, Thuana, Perroniana, Pitheoana, et Colomesiana. Ou Remarques historiques critiques, morales & littéraires de Jos. Scaliger, J. Aug. de Thou, le Cardinal Du Perron, Fr. Pitou, & P. Colomnis. Avec les notes de plusieurs savans*, 2 vols, Amsterdam, 1740, vol. II, s.v. Junius, p. 411: 'Lorsque... parlois Flanand, encore que je ne parle guere bien...' This source, which drops from Latin to French and back to Latin within sentences, seems to reflect Scaliger's actual mingling of the two languages in his spoken communication; see Anthony Gratton, 'Close Encounters of the learned Kind: Joseph Scaliger's Table Talk,' *American Scholar* 57, 1988, pp. 581-588.

<sup>19</sup> See Waquet, *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign* (as above, n. 1), passim; Etienne Wolf, Jérôme Cardan (1501-1576) et le Latin', in: *Tous vos gens à Latin* (as above, n. 8), pp. 379-386 (esp. 355).

<sup>20</sup> German students, especially from the Calvinist Heidelberg, a political and religious ally of Holland, would come to Leiden and meet Scaliger. As Heidelberg was a centre of learning and a hub of intellectual exchange, with its richly furnished Palatine Library and its brilliant scholarly printer Jérôme Commelin, Scaliger would naturally stay in touch with these scholars. For Heidelberg as an important centre of late humanism, see Axel E. Walter, *Späthumanismus und Konfessionspolitik: Die europäische Gelehrtenrepublik um 1600 im Spiegel der Korrespondenzen Georg Michael Lingelshelms*, Tübingen, 2004.

Table 1: Letters to and from Scaliger; total number of letters = 1653  
Absolute and relative proportions of French/Latin and ante/post 1593 letters

	ante 1593	post 1593	Total
French:	227	409	636 (36% ante 1593; 64% post 1593)
Latin:	123	889	1012 (12% ante 1593; 88% post 1593)
other:	1	4	5 (20% ante 1593; 80% post 1593)
Total	351: 64.8% French; 35.0% Latin; 0.2% other	1302: 31.4% French; 68.3% Latin; 0.3% other	1653: (21% ante 1593; 79% post 1593) 1593) 38.5% French 61.2% Latin 0.3% other (e.g. Hebrew, Italian)

The first column lists the letters which survive from the period preceding 1593; the box at the bottom of this column shows that 64 per cent of those pre-Leiden letters is in French and 35% in Latin; after 1593, the ratio is reversed, as we can see in the second column: now Latin tips the balance with 68%. The figures are also split up in another way, in the column on the far right: these figures, too, make the clear the prominence of French letters before 1593, and the dominance of Latin after that date. We should be aware that both chance and preferences of posterity play a significant role in survival and transmission of these letters. But as far as evidence survives, the figures suggest that Latin took over from French after Scaliger moved to Leiden.

It is significant that, in the case of the Leiden professors, identification with the Dutch state seems to have had few consequences for their choice of language. To be sure, the use of Dutch was promoted in Leiden. Prince Maurice of Orange supported Simon Stevin, a Dutch mathematician, inventor and champion of the vernacular. In 1600, Maurice initiated the Dutch Mathematical School in Leiden.<sup>21</sup> Jannus Dousa, the curator of Leiden University, and the driving force in the campaign to bring Scaliger to Leiden, was a friend of Jan van Houw, the secretary of the city and the university, who promoted the use of Dutch and wrote Dutch poetry, even persuading Dousa to try his hand at it.<sup>22</sup> But Dousa's Dutch production never really took off; even for a patriotic and vernacular-championing Dutch

nobleman, the humanist tradition proved more important. One may conclude that political affiliation was less important than other considerations.

### Religion

Closely related to political identity is religious affiliation. Traditionally, Protestantism (at least in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) has been associated with the growth of literacy, although there are a number of caveats.<sup>23</sup> Literacy in this case meant the ability to read and write in the vernacular. Luther was not the only one who advocated the use of the vernacular for religious education; many Catholics, at least initially, also sought to imbue the individual with God's word. But whereas the predominance of Latin was quickly restored in Catholic territories, the vernacular persisted in Protestant countries. And although the Reformation 'was not just a matter of introducing the vernacular', as Waquet has put it,<sup>24</sup> for Catholic believers individual reading was not deemed as essential as it was for Protestants. The dominion of Latin was confirmed by the Council of Trent, which prescribed the Mass to be celebrated in Latin – a measure abolished only at Vatican II in 1965. However, in secular contexts, Latin was perhaps more neutral and cannot be expected to have been preferred more frequently by Catholics than by Protestants. It might be expected that Gallicism – a French nationalist Catholicism claiming a measure of independence from Rome – would give preference to the use of French. The ultramontane Catholics, on the other hand, might have wanted to stimulate Latin as the traditional language of the Catholic, that is, the *universal* Church. Do such assumptions or expectations prove to be true when looking at Scaliger's correspondence?

The question can be answered only partly on the basis of this corpus: the distinction between Gallicans and Ultramontanists is irrelevant, since he hardly corresponded with the latter. Representatives of the papacy, in turn, were very careful in contacting Scaliger.<sup>25</sup> I have therefore drawn no dis-

<sup>23</sup> See Robert A. Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe. Culture and Education 1500-1800* (Harlow, 2002), pp. 157-158; Wilhelm Frithof, 'The Confessions and the Book in the Dutch Republic', in: Heinz Schilling and Stefan Ehrenpreis (eds), *Frühneuzeitliche Bildungsgeschichte der Reformierten in konfessionsvergleichender Perspektive. Schwaben, Lesekultur und Wissenschaft* (Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beiheft 38), Berlin, 2007, pp. 185-211 (esp. 200-210).

<sup>24</sup> Waquet, *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign* (as above, n. 1), pp. 41 (quotation); 44-50.

<sup>25</sup> See my forthcoming article 'The Limits of Transconfessional Contact in the Republic of Letters: Joseph Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon and their Catholic Correspondents', in: Jeanine De Landtsheer and Henk Nellen (eds), *Between Scylla and Charibdis. Learned Letter Writers Navigating the Reefs of Religion and Political Controversy in Early Modern Europe*, Leiden, 2010 [in the press]. Scaliger polemical against the Jesuits. For his particular bad language directed at Jesuits, see my article 'Scaliger Scatologus: Rhetorical Roots of Obscene and Abusive Language in the Letters of Joseph Scaliger', *Studies in Early Modern France* 14, 2010 [in the press].

<sup>21</sup> See Eduard Jan Dijksterhuis, *Simon Stevin. Science in the Netherlands around 1600*, Den Haag, 1970; Frans Westra, *Nederlandse ingenieurs en de fortificatiewerken in het eerste tijdperk van de Tachtigjarige Oorlog, 1573-1604*, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1992, pp. 82-89.

<sup>22</sup> Chris L. Heesakkers, 'Lipsius, Dousa and Jan van Houw: Latin and the Vernacular in Leiden in the 1570s and 1580s', in: Karl Eikenkel and Chris L. Heesakkers (eds), *Lipsius in Leiden. Studies in the Life and Works of a Great Humanist*, Voornissen, 1997, pp. 93-120; see also Jan A. van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons and Professors. Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers and the Leiden Humanists*, Leiden and Oxford, 1962, pp. 108-114.

inction between the two. Nor have I drawn a distinction between Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians and Anglicans.

Table 2. Absolute and relative proportions of religious affiliations of and use of French/Latin by Scaliger's correspondents; total number of correspondents = 232

	Protestant	Catholic	Unknown	Total
French	28	38	30	96
Latin	62	28	27	117
Both	8	7	2	17
Unknown	0	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>	98 28.6% French 63.3% Latin 8.1% both	74 51.3% French 37.8% Latin 9.5% both 1.4% unknown	60 50% French 45% Latin 3% both 2% unknown	232 (42.2% Prot.; 31.9% Cath.; 25.9% unk.) 41.4% French 50.4% Latin 7.3% both 0.9% unknown

The first column suggests that Protestants were more inclined to use Latin than French, whereas Catholics (second column) more often opted for French than for Latin. This would contradict the common belief that Protestants were more likely than Catholics to use the vernacular. But the figure may be misleading. The large ratio of Protestant Latin users can be probably attributed to these correspondents' poor level of French, given their German, Dutch or English nationality. (The same may apply to intra-confessional contact within southern Europe: Catholics from Spain, Italy and France would probably also prefer Latin in stead of French in contact with Catholics from other language communities, but since these contacts are outside of Scaliger's network, this question remains open to further research.)

The second column looks at the Catholic correspondents. The figures suggest that over half of the Catholics used French, almost thirty-eight per cent used Latin, and the rest both. The third column warns us that for more than a quarter of the correspondents we have been unable to identify any religious affiliations, but this group seems to follow the 'Catholic' pattern.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Establishing religious affiliations of individuals is a difficult procedure. I have tried to identify at least the publicly professed belief, regardless of what individuals privately thought. I have sometimes relied on indirect evidence: professors at the University of Paris, for instance, were not allowed to be Protestant. Although some correspondents are known to have converted during the period involved, their number is rather small. Justus Lipsius appears rather exceptional in his shifting between Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism; he is here regarded as Catholic, the faith into which he was born and in which

In the final cell, we see that more than forty percent of Scaliger's correspondents were Protestant, little over 30 percent were Catholic. Underneath the figure 232 we learn that little over forty per cent of the correspondents wrote in French (this agrees well with our judgement that 38.5% of the actual letters were written in French); half of the people preferred Latin (but sixty percent of the actual letters are in Latin, which suggests that the Latin correspondents were more active); and a number of people corresponded in both, but this number is due largely to dedicatory letters in Latin to or from people who normally used French: I will return to these further down below. We might draw the cautious conclusion that, at a time when the Republic of Letters was under pressure to confessionalize<sup>27</sup>, at least within the network of an exiled Huguenot such as Joseph Scaliger, who had slightly more contact with Protestants, Latin was the dominant language.

### Profession

The third social factor which I have mentioned is the writer's profession. Does someone's employment, or, less strictly defined, someone's daily task in society, influence the choice of language choice when communicating by means of letters? In many cases, the answer is obviously yes: a trained university lecturer would have been better able to express himself in Latin than someone who had been to university but made his career outside academia, let alone someone who had never formally learnt the language. Indeed, the distinction between professional scholars and others seems to follow the demarcation line between Latin and the vernacular, at least as far as Scaliger's correspondence is concerned. A case in point is Isaac Casaubon, who, with Jacques-Auguste de Thou, was Scaliger's closest friend. Scaliger corresponded with Casaubon regularly and – probably because both were famous – their conversations remain almost intact. It is the largest single exchange in our corpus, taking up sixteen per cent of all the surviving letters.<sup>28</sup> Both Scaliger and Casaubon were native French speakers, and yet every one of their 246 extant letters is in Latin. Casaubon, eighteen years Scaliger's junior, was the first to make contact, and he addressed him in Latin. It may have been a sign of reverence for the senior scholar, who had established his reputation throughout Europe, whereas Casaubon at the time (1594) was still at the start of his career. Since both men specialized as classicists, Latin was the obvious choice in the light of the predominant subject

<sup>27</sup> he died. For a more detailed analysis see Van Miert, 'The Limits of Transconfessional Contact' (as above, n. 25).

<sup>28</sup> For a survey of this subject see Walter, *Späthumanismus und Konfessionspolitik* (as above, n. 20) and *Between Scylla and Charibdis* (as above, n. 25).

<sup>29</sup> 145 letters from Casaubon remain and 113 from Scaliger.

matter which covers most of the letters (see further down, the paragraph headed *Contents (2): political news*). In the case of Casaubon, a certain measure of identification with his scholarly profession no doubt also played its part. This becomes clearer if we compare his letters to those of de Thou. De Thou (or Thuanus), was the author of the great Latin history of the French wars of religion. However, Scaliger corresponded with him in French. Their friendship was longstanding: the first letter dates from 1571, 23 years before Casaubon came into contact with Scaliger. De Thou was then known as the son of the prime president of the Paris Parliament<sup>29</sup>. De Thou's high social position, then, made that he did not have to look up to Scaliger and he therefore did not have to resort to Latin for reasons of formality. Another reason for De Thou's preference for French in correspondence was that, not being a professional scholar, his spoken Latin was no match for his beautifully composed prose<sup>30</sup>. If he had to labour over his written Latin, he may not have wanted to waste precious time on his correspondence. By contrast, 'professional' scholars such as Scaliger and Casaubon, who breathed Latinity, were no doubt equally proficient in both Latin and French.

One might assume that the use of the vernacular symbolizes intimacy or familiarity by contrast to Latin. But this would imply that Scaliger was less intimate with Casaubon than with De Thou, which is contentious. I think that Casaubon's Latin, and De Thou's French, should be attributed rather to professional self-identification<sup>31</sup>. In other words, one's belonging to a particular profession led him to prefer the language appropriate to his field. Professional self-identification may have been stronger in the case of Casaubon than in that of Scaliger, who was more confident than Casaubon about his reputation as a brilliant scholar (to put it mildly). Casaubon, by contrast, hardly wrote in French: there are only ten letters written entirely in French among the 1156 letters in the third edition of his correspondence;

<sup>29</sup> Christophe De Thou was succeeded by his son-in-law Achille de Harlay, Jacques-Auguste's brother-in-law. Jacques-Auguste himself became *président* in 1594.

<sup>30</sup> For De Thou's inability to speak Latin, see Waquet, *Latin, or the Empire of a Sign* (as above, n. 1), p. 156, where further examples of poor spoken Latin are mentioned. See also Wolf, 'Cardan', pp. 380-382 (as above, n. 19). The style associated with letters was 'sermo', a colloquial or plain style. This requirement made Justus Lipsius, in his manual on the art of letter writing, prescribe what its modern editors call 'a calculated disorder' or 'a stylish lack of style'; see Justus Lipsius, *Epistolica Institutio*, Principles of Letter-Writing, Robert V. Young and M. Thomas Hester (ed. and transl.), Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1996, p. xxvi. See also the forthcoming lemma on 'Epistolography' in Anthony Gratton, Glenn Most and Salvatore Settis (eds), *The Harvard Companion to the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, MA (in the press).

<sup>31</sup> The two men never met, but one wonders in what language they would have communicated (and in what language they would have continued to communicate in writing afterwards).

three less than the number that he wrote in Greek. In nine cases Casaubon used a mixture of Latin and French<sup>32</sup>. The remaining 98 percent are in Latin. Interestingly, Casaubon wrote to De Thou in Latin, as he did to fellow countrymen as Jacques Gillot and Jacques Bongars – people with whom Scaliger corresponded in French<sup>33</sup>. In fact, Casaubon used Latin even in his personal diary, which he did not likely intend for publication<sup>34</sup>.

Another example can be found in the scarce remains of Scaliger's correspondence with Theodoros Beza: two letters from each. Beza addressed his first letter to Scaliger in Latin. The remaining letter from his hand dates from twenty-seven years later and is in French, even though the discussion touches on a technical issue of chronology<sup>35</sup>. At some point then, the exchange must have dropped from Latin into French. In this case, professional identity seems to have played little role for both men: Beza was a scholar just as Scaliger was, and his first address in Latin probably indicates formality. Once the exchange was established, perhaps Beza felt it would be

<sup>32</sup> On five occasions, Casaubon uses both French and Latin; his correspondents answer 7 times in French, and once in a mixture of French and Latin, but it should be said that the proportion of French letters among the answers (7 out of 50, i.e. 14%) is much larger than the proportion of French letters written by Casaubon himself (1 percent).

<sup>33</sup> See Isaac Casaubon, *Epistolae, insertis ad easdem responsionibus, quatuor hacenus reperiri poterunt, securum seriem temporis accurate digestae. ... Curante Theodoro Iansson ab Ameloveen*, Rotterdam, 1709, third page numbering. Four letters in French to Plessis-Mornay: pp. 224-225, no. 419; p. 240, no. 451; pp. 268-268, no. 509; pp. 327-328, no. 624; two mixed ones to Vertunien, p. 241, no. 453; pp. 278-279, no. 533; two French letters wrongly printed as being addressed to Scaliger pp. 247-248, nos 463 and 464; one in French to an anonymous official (p. 291, no. 557); another mixed one to his son Méric, p. 338, no. 648, which reads: 'Video te iam incipere themata Latina componere'. Three mixed ones to Van der Myle (p. 351, no. 671; p. 379, no. 718; p. 459, no. 789). One to Hubertus, with a salutation in French, drops halfway through a sentence into Latin (as if this were easier), returning to French only at the valediction (p. 485, no. 831); two in French to cardinal Du Perron (pp. 505-506, no. 839; pp. 630-631, no. 1090); one in French to the chancellor of France, p. 630, no. 1011; one to Villeroi, the king's counsellor (pp. 631-632, no. 1092). One in French to anonymous lords (p. 635, no. 1104), five to Downay in Greek (p. 557, no. 1949; pp. 581-582, no. 995; pp. 597-598, no. 1027; pp. 614-615, no. 1054; p. 638, no. 1109) one in Greek to Dosschius (p. 568, no. 970); four in Greek to Paetus (p. 598, no. 1028; pp. 600-601, no. 1034; pp. 602-603, no. 1038; p. 637, no. 1105). Two in Greek to Le Brochion (p. 600, nos. 1032 and 1033); one in Greek to Petragius (p. 608, no. 1044). Among the 50 answers which Casaubon received and which are printed in this edition by Almeloveen, we find three letters from Jacques Gillot writing in French (pp. 647-648, no. 12; pp. 667-668, no. 44; p. 672, no. 50); three from Du Plessis in French (pp. 656-657, no. 31; pp. 658-659, no. 35; p. 659, no. 36); a mixed one from Pelagrange (pp. 657-658, no. 34); one from Leschaster in French (pp. 663-664, no. 41).

<sup>34</sup> Johannes Russell (ed.), *Ephemerides Isaaci Casauboni cum praefatione et notis*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1850.

<sup>35</sup> Beza to Scaliger, 23 October 1571 (Alain Dufour, Béatrice Niccollet and Mario Turchetti (eds), *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze, recueillie par Hippolyte Aubert*, vol. XII, Geneva, 1986, pp. 204-205, no. 867; Beza to Scaliger, 6 August 1598 (Gregorian style; Jacobus Revius (ed.), *Epistres françaises des personnages illustres et doctes, à Mons. Joseph Juste de La Scalla*, Harderwijk, 1624, pp. 202-204).

easier to communicate in French. (Scaliger reportedly said about Beza: 'There are plenty of Gallicisms in his [Latin] poetry')<sup>36</sup>. It is not necessarily circular to explain a writer's preference for Latin on the basis of his scholarly profession, but, when a scholar did not use Latin, to suppose that his professional *identity* was less pronounced than those of Latin-using colleagues. Individual preferences can be generalised into an institutional practice, which may then be taken as a yardstick for other individuals. The question is how many examples will justify a generalisation.

Scaliger's correspondents did, of course, hold other 'professions'. There were, for example, diplomats and people holding a political position. Since Latin was harder for most to write, and since rulers tended to have poorer Latin than their secretaries, the vernacular was more economical between native speakers. Hence, Henry IV of France let his secretary write to Scaliger in French. The king also wanted the preface of De Thou's *Historia sui temporis*, which was addressed to him, to be translated into French, in order to better understand its contents<sup>37</sup>. Scaliger's own employer in France, Louis Chasteigner de La Rochepeyrou, a nobleman and military officer during the Wars of Religion, received regular lessons from Scaliger in Latin grammar, Greek literature and classical culture in general. However, he would correspond with Scaliger in French<sup>38</sup>. Jacques Gillot, who owned a copious library and who kept Scaliger informed of both literary and political news, did so in French, but with Casaubon, Gillot corresponded in Latin<sup>39</sup>. This linguistic disparity reflects the difficulty of ascribing a single role to Gillot: he was a politician, a jurist, a canon, and a priest. He was appointed assistant *conseiller* of the *Parlement* of Paris in his early years, later coming to govern an abbey. On the other hand, he contributed to the

famous *Menippean Satire* against the Catholic League (1594), and published scholarly works on law and religion. Here we are confronted with the difficulty of categorising actual people, especially at a time when professions were not clearly defined. But such categorisations have their utility, for they shed light on the different aspects of an individual's interests, and allow us to assess these aspects with greater focus, producing a more balanced portrait of a man such as Gillot. If it is true that the vernacular was the language of politics, he may have defined himself, when dealing with Scaliger, more as a politician than as a scholar, but with Casaubon, more as a scholar.

French was also employed by non-native speakers, such as Dutch diplomats, representatives of the States, and noblemen. In the occasional letters they addressed to Scaliger, they used French, which was, as said before, a more common language for diplomats to use than Latin within small language-communities such as the Dutch.

To conclude: the position of being a statesman, a diplomat, or a member of parliament on the one hand, and a scholar and poet on the other, influenced Scaliger's correspondents' choice between Latin and French<sup>40</sup>. Further descriptive analysis will undoubtedly reveal patterns, which may be applied back to individual correspondents.

### Gender

Women had no access to Latin school or university, and could be instructed in the language only by private teachers or family members – some joined the private lessons given to their brothers. Among Scaliger's correspondents we find eight women<sup>41</sup>. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to find many biographical details of these correspondents, although some were, either as widows of famous men or by their own lights, women of influence. Others were family members: one addresses Scaliger as 'mon cousin'. They share a common language: French. The one exception is Elisabeth Jane Weston, who presented Scaliger with a Latin poem: she is also the recipient of the sole surviving letter which Scaliger addressed to a woman. This might not be a coincidence: it shows that a Latin letter to a

<sup>36</sup> *Scaligeriana*, vol. II (as above, n. 18), s. v. Beza, p. 232: 'Il y a bien des gallicismes dans ses vers.'

<sup>37</sup> François Verminien to Scaliger, 14 June 1604, in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 354-355: 'Sainte Marthe en est un; qui me compia ces derniers jours que le Roy avoit pris un singulier plaisir au subject de l'Epistre dedicatoire de l'histoire de France de Monsieur de Thou, et luy avoit commandé la faire traduire en François et puis l'imprimer'; Jacques Gillot to Scaliger, 30 March [1605], in *Ibid.* pp. 418-421: 'Monsieur le President de Thou a eu de grands assauts pour son livre. Tantost l'on le vouloit defendre tout à fait, tantost censurer, tantost reformer, les grands offensés de la liberté et peut estre de la vérité. Le Roy a voulu que l'on luy en aye tourné la preface [sic] ou l'epistre, qui s'adresse à luy'. Gillot reported news which was already old.

<sup>38</sup> Nine letters from Chasteigner to Scaliger survived, printed in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 7-10, 52-56, 194-195, 226-227, 373-376.

<sup>39</sup> See his letter printed in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 92-116, 247-263, 416-441; and in Petrus Burmannus (ed.), *Syllages epistoliarum a viris illustribus scriptarum tomii quinque*, 5 vols, Leiden, 1721, vol. II, pp. 369-371. Gillot also answered Casaubon's Latin letters in Latin: see Casaubon, *Epistolae* (as above, n. 33), pp. 18, 58-59, 69, 85, 87, 88-92, 95, 105, 217, 219, 445, 624, 629 (nos 27, 110, 125, 160, 164, 168, 169, 172, 173, 183, 205, 407, 411, 765, 1071, 1088); letters from Casaubon to Gillot) and pp. 640-641, 646-647 (nos 2 and 12; letters from Gillot to Casaubon).

<sup>40</sup> De Courcelles, 'Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda' (as above, n. 11), p. 361. Sepúlveda's *Epistolario* appeared in 1557. He defends his exclusive use of Latin. One of his correspondents answers that he prefers Latin because Castilian does not fit with his own intellectual activities of that moment. He does not despite the rich and beautiful Castilian, but because he likes to receive Latin letters from a great scholar such as Sepúlveda, rich in erudition and elegant in style.

<sup>41</sup> Elisabeth Jane Weston, the Neo-Latin poet; Madame d'Abain (née Claude du Puy), the wife of Scaliger's patron Louis Chasteigner; Louise de Colligny, widow of William the Silent; Catherine de La Tremouille, princess of Condé; the noble sisters Anna and Barbé de Hylle; Marie de Blitterswyck-Van den Berch, Scaliger's landlady in Leiden; Leonor de Bremen, an aunt of Scaliger's; and his niece Marguerite de Cantarel.

learned woman was perhaps more interesting to preserve than personal news in French. Weston herself, at least, took measures to secure the letter, for we know it only from her own printed works<sup>42</sup>.

Scaliger was no exception to the rule that in the eyes of male scholars, females were by default not scholars. In 1587 Scaliger wrote to Claude du Puy: 'To be regarded as wise today, you need only be judged by a courtier, or a woman.'<sup>43</sup> A female addressee, then, was a good reason to use the vernacular, although, since women were, as a rule, not scholars, this category may be subsumed under that of profession. In the relatively unusual instances that women wrote scholarly letters, they often did so in Latin<sup>44</sup>.

### Circulation

The choice of a particular language may also have depended on the abilities or customs not only of the letter's writer or recipient, but also of the recipient's circle of people. It is commonly known that manuscript letters often circulated within a group of peers around the recipient: addressees would occasionally allow friends or colleagues to copy out parts of the letters they received, thus contributing to the spread of news. Within such a 'scribal community', as Harold Love has labelled such groups, one could speak of a limited form of 'publication'<sup>45</sup>. These groups were often centred in geographical 'pockets': academic, political or economic centres, such as (in the case of Scaliger) Leiden, Paris, Heidelberg, Augsburg, and Hamburg<sup>46</sup>. Here, diplomats and scholars mingled and the postal services between these centres were established by the frequent coming and going of diplomats, merchants and, to a lesser extent, students on their Grand Tour<sup>47</sup>. Letter writers were aware that what they wrote was often showed to third

parties; this forced them to be careful not to disclose certain information, but also helped them to strategically spread other news, or make sure that people around the recipient or even a correspondent of the recipient received particular information indirectly<sup>48</sup>. An example of such a letter is one in which Marcus Welsler posed a question to his fellow Augsburg David Hoeschelius which Scaliger was supposed to answer. Hoeschelius forwarded the letter to Scaliger, who responded to Hoeschelius. Only after Hoeschelius showed this response to Welsler, did the latter take up his pen to address Scaliger directly<sup>49</sup>. Another example: as Scaliger's 'man in Paris', Casaubon read many letters which Scaliger addressed to other Parisians well known to him: Jacques-Auguste De Thou, Jacques du Puy and his brothers Auguste and Christoph (and, later, Pierre), and Jacques Gillot. These men regularly met at De Thou's library, where the basis was laid for what later was to become the Cabinet du Puy. In his preface to a posthumously-published collection of Scaliger's opuscula and letters, Casaubon wrote to De Thou that Pierre du Puy had transcribed most of the texts from Scaliger's autographs<sup>50</sup>. Du Puy, then, had access to letters and treatises sent by Scaliger to a variety of people. Some were in French, others in Latin. The choice between Latin and French may have been made in consideration of the linguistic abilities of the intended readers. Decisions may even have been made after explicit discussion with the recipient on which language to use, although no such examples have been found in Scaliger's correspondence: nobody doubted, for example, that his Parisian circle understood both Latin and French<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> An interesting example of letters which spiraled out of their author's control is presented in Lisa Jardine, 'Defamiliarising Erasmus: unstitching P.S. Allen's edition of the letters', unpublished paper, delivered at the *unFamiliar Letters* conference, London, July 2002 (previously available on <http://www.livesandletters.ac.uk/projects/lissaspaper.pdf>).

<sup>43</sup> See David Hoeschelius and Marcus Welsler to Scaliger, [before 8 June, 1598] (Leiden University Library, ms. BUR F 8; printed in Marcus Welsler, *Opera historica et philologica, sacra et profana*, Nuremberg, 1682, no. 1, p. 787; Scaliger to Hoeschelius, 8 June [1598] (Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Supplex Epistolica, ms. 59, no. 136, fols 37<sup>v</sup>-38<sup>r</sup>); Welsler to Scaliger, 9 September 1598 (Welsler, *Opera*, no. 2, pp. 788-789).

<sup>44</sup> Scaliger, *Opuscula* (as above, n. 1), sig. é ii<sup>r</sup>: 'Quin pleraque omnia ex autographis auctoris manu sua curate descripti Petrus Puteanus tuus.'

<sup>45</sup> An interesting case from a slightly later period merits mentioning at this point. The correspondence which Isaac Vossius (1618-1689) conducted with his father Gerardus Johannes (1577-1649) was written in Latin. The father would orally translate into Dutch the letters he received from his son during the latter's *peregrinatio* in France and Italy. As Isaac's biographer has noted: 'The Dutch correspondence with his mother has not been preserved, except for the letters she wrote together with her husband: she would begin in Dutch and her husband would continue in Latin.' See Frans F. Blok, *Isaac Vossius and his Circle. His Life until his Farewell to Queen Christina of Sweden, 1618-1655*, Groningen, 2000, p. 77.

<sup>42</sup> G. Martinus a Balduoven (ed.), *Parthenicum Elisabethae Johannaë Westoniae liber II-III*, Prague, [1606], III.2; Weston's own letter is kept in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, ms. Clm 10383 (=Collectio Camerariana, Vol. 33), fol. 277<sup>v</sup>; it was printed for the first time in Andreas Alciatus, *Tractatus contra vitam monasticam; sylloge epistoliarum virtorum clarissimorum, quae varian doctrinam continent; vetera aliquot testamenta*, Leiden, 1695, pp. 328-329, no. 124.

<sup>43</sup> Scaliger to du Puy, 12 May 1587: 'Et pour estre estimé savant aujourd'hui, il ne fault prendre aultre juge qu'un courtisan, ou une femme' (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, ms. Coll. du Puy, 496, fol. 94<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>44</sup> See for example the cases of Olympia Morata and Caritas Pruckheimer in Ursula Hess, 'Oratrix humilis. Die Frau als Briefpartnerin von Humanisten, am Beispiel der Caritas Pruckheimer', in Worstbrock (ed.), *Brief im Zeitalter der Renaissance* (as above, n. 2), pp. 173-202.

<sup>45</sup> Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*, Oxford, 1993.

<sup>46</sup> See also Van Miert, 'The Limits of Transconfessional Contact' (as above, n. 25).

<sup>47</sup> See for example Marika Kebussek, 'Book Agents, Intermediaries in the Early Modern World of Books', in Hans Cools, Marika Kebussek and Babeloch Noldus (eds), *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe*, Hilversum, 2006, pp. 97-107.

## 2. RHETORICAL CONDITIONS

Social conditions alone are not enough to account for the choice between Latin and French. Equally important were the traditions of letter writing with regard to content and form. As far as contents are concerned, there are three principal themes in Scaliger's correspondence: scholarship, politics, and personal life.

## Contents (1): scholarship and scholarly news

In general, scholarly matters were discussed in Latin, and political and personal matters in French. The division, however, is far from absolute. Scientific discussions are not frequent in Scaliger's letters, but concerning the attempts to measure longitude at sea, he corresponded in French with Guillaume le Nautonier. With Tycho Brahe and Johannes Kepler he communicated in Latin about historical astronomy: perhaps because Kepler was unable to write in French, but Kepler corresponded with many Germans in Latin. Most of the news conveyed in Scaliger's correspondence, however, was not of a natural scientific, but of a scholarly nature. As for scholarly matters, De Thou and Gillot both wrote to Scaliger in French, and both reported extensively on new books rolling from the Paris presses. Nevertheless, De Thou and Gillot usually limit themselves to listing titles, rather than assessing contents.

This applies also to Scaliger's epistolary exchange with the Genevan preacher and historian Simon Goulart: there is a mixture of political and bibliographical news, but few letters address the problems which both men encountered in the historical or philological texts with which they worked.<sup>52</sup> The few French letters which survive from Scaliger's correspondence with the president of the *Parlement* of Rouen, Claude Groullart, also offer political and, occasionally, some bibliographical news.<sup>53</sup> The letters exchanged with Jacques Bongars, the French ambassador in the German states, are all in French and in them, Scaliger discusses matters such as the following:

I have received your letter, in which you give me your opinion on George Syncellus, as continued by Theophanes, who took many fragments from Eusebius's *Chronicle*, and a copy of which can be found in the Royal Library in Paris. This has whetted my appetite, but my desire is in vain, for there is no hope of retrieving anything, given that M. De Thou, President of the Court and head of the library, was not willing to help me even in easier matters. Therefore I beg you to look for the fragments which you have collected from the Vatican Library. ... I have recovered about three quarters of the Greek text of the *Chronicle*, and

made a decent volume out of them. I have collated the book against various manuscripts. I will add some notes to please the good people. And I dare say that the sauce is as good as the capon [i.e., the notes are as good as the edition]. If you can find your extracts, it would be best to send them to me as soon as possible. You should address them all to [the printer] Jean Commelin, whom you know.<sup>54</sup>

All of this information concerns scholarly matters, but remains at the level of reference, without analysis. This is to say that the French letters avoid subjects such as textual criticism. It made more sense to write in Latin about the technicalities of the classical tradition, since all the reference works on such matters were in Latin. Although there are examples of French letters in which technicalities are discussed, there is a general distinction.

This distinction is perhaps most clearly shown in the case of dedicatory epistles. From the 85 letters which Scaliger sent to Claude du Puy, for example, only one is in Latin. Typically, this is the one which precedes Scaliger's edition of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius.<sup>55</sup> Scaliger's *De emendatione temporum*, his complicated book on the correction of the calculation of calendars, contains a Latin dedicatory letter to Achille de Harlay, the *premier président* of the Paris *Parlement*.<sup>56</sup> A French dedication in a Latin work would have been inappropriate, and may have appeared patronising to Harlay. Scaliger also dedicated his second edition to Harlay.<sup>57</sup> For this he wrote a new dedication, again in Latin. In the second case, Harlay responded with a short note thanking and praising Scaliger.<sup>58</sup> This response was in French. If Harlay had wanted to respond at greater length, with queries about particular passages or other detailed observations, he would probably have been forced to use Latin. But Harlay made no real effort: his

<sup>54</sup> Scaliger to Jacques Bongars, 16 July 1606: 'J'ai recueu la vostre, par laquelle vous me donnez avis de Georgius Monachus Syncellus, continué par Theophanes, qui auroit beaucoup de fragmens du *Chronicon* d'Eusebe, et qu'il en y a un en la Bibliothèque du Roi. Cela m'a fait venir la salive en la bouche. Mais c'est desirer sans effect, car il n'y a nulle esperance d'en pouvoit rien retirer, veu qu'en plus legeres choses Monsieur de Thou President en la Court et grand Maître de la librairie n'a voulu rien faire pour moi. Parce je vous supplie de chercher ces eschantillons que vous en avez recueilli de la Vaticane.... J'ai retiré le grec à plus de trois quartz de ce *Chronicon*, et fait bien un juste volume. J'ai conféré le livre avec plusieurs manuscrits. Nous y adjousterons, pour contenter les gens de biens [sic] quelques notes. Et oserai bien dire que la sauce vaudra bien le chapon. Si vous pouvez trouver vos extraicts, nous l'envoier au plusost: seroit le meilleur. Il faudra adresser le tout à Jehan Commelin, que vous cognoistres' (Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, ms. Supplex epistolica 29, fol. 57<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>55</sup> Scaliger to Claude du Puy, 2 August 1576 (Scaliger (ed.), *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii nova editio*, Paris, 1577, sigs a2<sup>r</sup>-a6<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>56</sup> Joseph Scaliger, *Opus novum de emendatione temporum*, Paris, 1583.

<sup>57</sup> Joseph Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum... opus novum*, second, revised edition, Leiden, 1598.

<sup>58</sup> Achille de Harlay to Scaliger, 2 July [1598], in *Epistres françaises* (as above, n. 35), p. 453. We do not know if De Harlay responded to the first dedication.

<sup>52</sup> On Goulart, see Leonard Chester Jones, *Simon Goulart 1543-1628: étude biographique et bibliographique*, Geneva and Paris, 1917.

<sup>53</sup> See Groullart, see Eugène-François Grenier, *Étude sur Claude Groullart, premier président au Parlement de Normandie*, Rouen, 1868.

answers are but a few lines long, and couched in general terms. On the basis of the language, then, one is led to suspect that Harlay never actually bothered to read the book.

Another example is Scaliger's exchange with his employer, Louis Chasteigner de La Rocheposay; we have nine French letters from Chasteigner to Scaliger; but only one from Scaliger to Chasteigner, and this is a Latin one: the dedication of his Latin *Coniectanea* on Varro.<sup>59</sup>

There is another indication that Latin was more appropriate for scholarly communication: Latin clearly takes over from French after Scaliger moved to Leiden, where he suddenly found himself in an environment of scholars. Of course, he also made new friends who were more than just colleagues, but little written evidence has survived of these more intimate contacts, presumably because there was no need to correspond with people whom he could more easily meet in person.<sup>60</sup>

Occasionally, scholarly discussion touched upon the etymology of words. These are the only occasions at which vernacular words were used in a Latin letter. But even then, Erasmus and Scaliger's father Julius Caesar would prefer to discuss the characteristics of a vernacular word without actually mentioning it, but only referring to it with a Latin translation<sup>61</sup>. In Scaliger's Latin correspondence, one encounters no literary quotations from a vernacular source, even not in Latin translation. Even in Scaliger's French correspondence, no quotations appear from authors such as Rabelais, Ronsard or Montaigne: the boundaries between Latin and the vernacular, and between ancient literature and vernacular contemporary literature seem to be tight.

To conclude this section on scholarly subjects: technical analyses are, as a rule, transmitted in Latin, whereas more general news about the appearance and transport of books was communicated either in Latin or in French with the occasional Latin phrase.

<sup>59</sup> Chasteigner's nine letters are printed in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 7-10, 52-56, 194-195, 226-227, 375-376; Scaliger's letter is found in his edition of Varro, Paris, 1565), sigs \*2.\*4\*.

<sup>60</sup> This is, paradoxically, the reason why those closest to the early modern letter writer often remain invisible to today's scholar. The fact that there are many letters dating from Casaubon's Paris period to Jacques-Auguste de Thou and other Parisians, suggests that sharing a city did not necessarily obviate written correspondence. Nevertheless, those who not only shared an urban but also an institutional environment, such as colleagues at a university, tended to correspond less with each other. See for example the case of Gerardus Johannes Vossius and Caspar Barlaeus, who seem to have exchanged no letters when both held posts as professors in Amsterdam in the period 1632-1648 and lived there next to each other. See Gerard Anton C. van der Lem and Cor S.M. Rademaker, *Inventory of the Correspondence of Gerardus Johannes Vossius (1577-1649)*, Assen and Maastricht, 1993, p. 445.

<sup>61</sup> Pierre Lardet, 'Langues de savoir et savoirs de la langue: la refondation du Latin dans le *De causis linguae Latinae* de Jules-César Scaliger (1540)', in: *Tous vos gens à Latin* (as above, n. 8), pp. 69-112 (esp. 97).

One last observation should be made: once the salutation of a letter is in Latin, it does not drop into French. French letters, however, do shift to Latin when discussing the topics mentioned. This applies to the correspondence of Scaliger, but the same is true of Casaubon's correspondence: there are five letters in his printed *Epistolae* which use a mixture of French and Latin, but these letters always start in French. Latin was a 'key' to which the instrument of the scholarly letter was attuned. As a mode of communication, at least in the case of classical scholars such as Casaubon and Scaliger, it seemed to have been more firmly established and better respected than the vernacular.

### Contents (2): political news

As with news of books, both Latin and French are used to communicate political developments. However, the language of the politics is also the dominant language of its news. Thus, the aforementioned Jacques Gillot regularly reported in French to Scaliger on French politics.<sup>62</sup> A typical example is the following, where Gillot rounds off a letter with the following remark:

I have no news. It seems that they are preparing for war in Savoy, and they talk about the wedding [of Henry IV] with the Princess Maria de Medici.<sup>63</sup>

The remark 'I have no news' comes after approximately twenty lines about books and new titles and about who is working on which project. For Gillot, 'news' seems to have meant: political news. On another occasion, he writes, in passing: 'I promise you that nothing passes here of which I do not inform you'.<sup>64</sup> Clearly, Gillot saw himself as something of a modern day 'correspondent' in the sense of a reporter or journalist. In this role, he used French as his instrument of communication. Studies of genres other than epistolography, such as the encyclopaedia, suggest that the vernacular was associated with practice, ethics and politics.<sup>65</sup> Scaliger was also informed, and kept others informed of political developments, in Latin: his exchange with Casaubon testifies to this.

There is one interesting case of how the same piece of political news was communicated in French by Gillot and in Latin by Casaubon. Using only

<sup>62</sup> Germans also report on political events, and Latin is used for the reasons set out above. Gillot to Scaliger, 5 July [1599], in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 115-116:

'Nous n'avons rien de nouveau. Il semble que l'on se prepare pour guerre en Savoye, et parle l'on de mariage avec la Princesse de Florence.'

<sup>64</sup> Gillot to Scaliger, 15 February [1603], in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 94-98: 'Je vous promets qu'il ne se passera rien icy dont je ne vous face part.'

<sup>65</sup> Jean-Marc Mandouso, 'Encyclopédies en Latin et encyclopédies en langue vulgaire (XII<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)', in: *Tous vos gens à Latin* (as above, n. 8), pp. 113-136 (esp. 135).

one Latin expression (the idiomatic 'sed frustra'), Gillot described how an important Jesuit, Pierre Cotton, was accused of having had a conversation with the Devil during a session of exorcism, something which could harm Cotton's reputation as a devout Catholic:

I believe I have not written to you since Père Cotton's consultation with the devil miraculously fell into my hands. It is written in his own hand and he cannot deny that I'm waiting to send you a genuine copy, together with the equally true story. Everything is well known and confirmed. He has made moves against it, but *in vain*. He has complained to the king, has done everything he could to recover the original. Until now, due to silence or negligence, he hasn't advanced a single step.<sup>67</sup>

Casaubon was much more careful: his reference is less explicit, shorter, and in Latin. When the information is particularly sensitive, he put the matter in Greek, so as to conceal the message even better. Even then, he uses a pseudonym in referring to Cotton:

I believe you have received the small account of the problems which arose when the man surnamed the Gossypion interrogated the impure spirit. Our Biturician friend recently told you the story and sent a copy of the questions.<sup>68</sup>

'Gossypion' is the Latin word for cotton-tree. 'Biturix' is an unusual toponym relating either to Bordeaux, Berry, or Bourges – all located in south-western France. It is difficult to identify this messenger with Gillot, who was from Langres, in the north-east. Gillot, although a Catholic priest, was sympathetic to Protestants and hostile to Jesuits, especially at the time of writing, two years after the Jesuits, after an exile of ten years, had been allowed back into France. The Protestant Casaubon had to be much more careful with what he wrote. As the personal favorite of Henry IV and custodian of the Royal Library, he had a delicate position at the French court. He was regularly visited by learned cardinals attempting to persuade him to convert<sup>68</sup>. Casaubon, then, had to maneuver with a measure of circumspection which Gillot could afford to ignore. Thus the character of the news

itself was not crucial in a writer's choice between writing in Latin or in French: the tongue which had already sustained a long correspondence was not to be changed depending on the subject matter, although there exists a tendency to drop from French into Latin or from Latin into Greek as soon as quotations are given or sensitive information is to be conveyed.

See for example the following letter from Pierre del Bene to Scaliger, in which the author complains about the state of France, having been accused of supporting, variously, the Catholic League, the Protestant champion Henri de Navarre, and the Duc d'Espemon, Henri III's right-hand man. He phrases his misgivings in Latin and Italian quotations and phrases. All Latin and Italian is italicised in the following translation:

For when they acknowledge that – as Caesar would have wanted his wife to be – 'I am under no suspicion' of belonging to the League, they want to sue me both for being a *Navarrist* and an *Epergonist*. ... I will tell you, if I have the pleasure of seeing you, why 'the gods have so great a wrath' – if they can be called gods (or gods, rather) at all! In short – for when dealing with princes, as the Italian proverb goes, 'he who gives offence will not be pardoned' – I have resolved to go to Italy for two or three months in case I can reach it safely and listen from afar to the furies of the genuinely Gallican mobs. For 'things perceived by the ears give less irritation', etc.<sup>69</sup>

Dropping from Latin into French is much less frequent. But as a rule, once communication was established in Latin or in French, the language does not change. One exception to this rule is that of Pierre Pithou: the first four letters Scaliger addressed to him, all written in the period 1568–1571, are in Latin, but from November 1571 to December 1594, the remaining 32 letters are in French (including the single surviving letter from Pithou to Scaliger). There are no examples of an exchange which starts in the vernacular and shifts to Latin in its course. The subject matter of politics, then, is a rather weak factor in the linguistic decision.

69

Pierre del Bene to Scaliger, 11 April [1588?], in *Epistres Francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 199–201: 'Car quand on reconnust que – comme Caesar vouloit que sa femme fust – 'carebam etiam suspicione' d'estre de la Ligue, l'on me vouloit faire mon proces tantost pour Navarriste, tantost pour Epergoniste.... Je vous contery, si j'ay ce bien de vous voir, cur 'tamæ animus caelestibus iræ' – si caelestes (aut scelesti potius) dicendi sunt. Brief, parce que en matiere de Princes, comme dict le proverbe Italien, 'chi offende non perdona', je me suis resolu de m'aller promener pour deux ou trois mois en Italie, si j'y puis passer seulement, et ouir de loing les fureurs des tumultes vrayement gallickes. Nam 'segnus irritant animum demissis per aures' etc.' The first reference seems not to be to Caesar but to another low-level school author, Nepos, *De virtis illustribus: Pausanias*, 3.5: 'hinc tamen se expediuit, neque eo magis carebat suspicione: nam opinio manebat eum cum rege habere societatem.' The second quotation refers to Vergil, *Aeneid*, 1.11. The last reference is to Horace, *Ars poetica*, verse 180, and is followed there by stating that visual perception has more impact.

<sup>67</sup> Gillot to Scaliger, [undated; August or November 1605?], in *Epistres Francoises* (as above, n. 35), pp. 431–433: 'Je croy que je ne vous ay pas escrit depuis que la consultation faicte par le pere Cotton avec le Diabole est tombée miraculeusement entre mes mains, escrite de sa main, et qu'il ne peut desuir. J'attends à vous en envoyer une copie fort veritable, avec l'histoire aussi veritable. Tout a esté icy bien cognu et verifié. Il s'en est remuë, sed frustra. Il s'en est plainct au Roy, a faict tout ce qui se peut pour ravoïr l'original. Jusques icy, par un silence ou negligence, il n'a rien profité.'

<sup>68</sup> Casaubon to Scaliger, 27 September 1605, in Casaubon, *Epistolae* (as above, n. 33), pp. 252–253: 'Accepisti, credo, indiculum τῶν τροφῆνιάρων, ὃν περι τὸ ἀκρίβειον πνεύμα ἐπαύρησεν ὁ τοῦ Γαυρνίου ἐπιβρύχος. Historiam tibi nuper scriptis amicis noster Biturix et simul quaestionum exemplum misit.'

<sup>69</sup> For the curtailment which Casaubon suffered in Paris in the decade 1600–1610, see Mark Patison, *Isaac Casaubon 1559–1614*, second edition, Oxford, 1892, pp. 135–156, 163–196, 207–225, 245–246.

## Contents (3): personal news

Occasionally personal news is communicated: this category includes subjects like dinner invitations, complaints about ill health, weather, high prices, etc. This kind of news is more often present in French letters than in Latin ones. On the whole, we hear very little – I am inclined to say: disappearingly little – about Scaliger's or others' private lives. It is only when reading his testament that we realise that he had a maid servant around him, supposedly to attend to his clothing or prepare his meals. This 'Anna' must have been the person he saw most frequently in his life, but without the testament, we would not have known that she even existed: she is never mentioned in any of the 665 surviving letters written by Scaliger after he moved to Leiden. In the process of the transmission of Scaliger's letters, scribes and editors may well have deemed personal news less important than scholarly discussions. Family news was prone to being destroyed, although any news about Scaliger's family would have been interesting for posterity in the light of the controversy over the noble origins he (like his father) claimed. We occasionally hear of sickness or his teeth falling out, and we find complaints about the state of his housing. A glimpse into his social life is given by an invitation to a dinner party with the Dousa family, the botanist Carolus Clusius and the professor of Greek, Bonaventura Vulcanius. In letters to Vulcanius and Dousa, Scaliger emphasizes that the latter's wife is also invited. There seems to have been some confusion over her presence: perhaps she wondered what she was to do as the only woman in the company of men who would communicate in Latin or French about Latin poetry, Byzantine chronicles and exotic plants.<sup>70</sup>

After Scaliger's former employer Chasteigner died, the latter's wife Claude du Puy, kept Scaliger, then already in Leiden, up to date on the lives of her family; it is only at this point that we realise that Scaliger, while he stayed at various castles of the Chasteigner family, had been surrounded by

<sup>70</sup> Scaliger to Bonaventura Vulcanius, [23 May 1598]: 'Mementis cras ad prandium. Scribo nobilissimo Douse una adit cum tota familia. An integram famulum sine conuige pueri, viedo. Certe si aliter animatus est, exprobrabo illi' (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Scal. 60 B, fol. 187); Scaliger to J. Dousa *pater*, 23 May 1598: 'Iterum velo aurem vobis de prandio, cui condixistis mihi cras, ea quidem lege ut omnis familia patrem familias comiter, lectissima uxor, filiae filique. Oro te, mi nobilissime Douza, ut omnes veint esurire mecum. Expectabo igitur omnes ad prandium, crastina die' (London, British Library, Burn. 371, fol. 141<sup>r</sup>). For Clusius' presence, see his letter to Justus Lipsius, 25 May 1598: 'Iosephi Scaligeri conuivia heri fui, qui epulum praebuit Iano Douse et omnibus eius liberis ob reditum Georgii ipsius filii, qui recens Constantiopolitani redit, allatis aliquot veteribus Graecis codicibus et epistola patriarchae Constantiopolitano ad patrem. Hodie apud Bonaventuram Vulcanium omnes prandebimus. Unam in utroque conuivio tu praesens!' (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Lips. 4 (14); printed in Burmannus (ed.), *Syllage*, (as above, n. 39), vol. I, no. 325, p. 329).

women and children never mentioned in his letters. His only references to children are to the health or progress of his male students.

Scaliger is quite straightforward in his letters. He wastes little time on rhetorical remarks, apart from a salutation or some praise. Unlike, for instance, Justus Lipsius, he was not much of a teacher: he does not moralise and is not sententious. He is very quick to give his opinions, although he tends to get carried away in his scorn for Jesuits. Scaliger is not unfriendly towards his correspondents, but he is usually rather businesslike. Maintaining scholarly contacts seems to have been his major reason for writing letters – service to (potential) patrons or others in high places was of less concern, especially after he gained financial security in Leiden.

He never asks Casaubon how his family is coping with their difficult situation; it should be said that Casaubon himself, in his letters to Scaliger, mentions his wife, or even his beloved daughter, only when they are ill. This is not necessarily surprising: although letters had long been used to communicate personal news, along with scholarly and political news, it has been observed that fifteenth-century Latin epistolography was concerned largely with ethics, politics, scholarship and patronage, and not with personal details<sup>71</sup>. The fifteenth-century Italian context did not necessarily lay out the practices which informed early seventeenth-century epistolography, but the art of letter writing did have a long and strong tradition.

This brings us to the second category of rhetorical conventions: the letter as a literary genre.

## Form: epistolographical customs

The only instances where Scaliger makes explicit use of epistolary customs, is when he concludes letters by apologizing that they are too long. In a letter to Melchior Goldastus, Scaliger writes: 'I cannot find space in a letter for the relevant matters; see the discussion dedicated to this subject in my notes to Eusebius.' He ends the letter with the words: 'But I already feel I am exceeding the length of a letter. Farewell.'<sup>72</sup> Several times, Scaliger decided not to discuss certain issues in letters, for they would cause him to write more than was appropriate for a letter. In a letter to Casaubon, Scaliger writes: 'The size of a letter, which I seem to have exceeded, does not allow to discuss this at greater length, as the importance of the matter asks for. So about this some

<sup>71</sup> Helene Harth, 'Poggio Bracciolini und die Brieftheorie des 15. Jahrhunderts. Zur Gattungsform des humanistischen Briefs', in Worstbrock (ed.), *Brief im Zeitalter der Renaissance* (as above, n. 2), pp. 81-99 (esp. 82).

<sup>72</sup> Scaliger to Stephanus Ubertus, 12 March 1608, in Scaliger, *Opuscula* (as above, n. 1), pp. 450-461 (indeed a very long letter), esp. 456-457: 'Quae huc pertinent, neque per modum epistolae hic locum habere possunt, pete ex Diatriba ei rei in Eusebianis nostris dicata.' (461): 'Sed iam sentio me modum epistolae excedere. Vale.'

other time. For this is work for a book, not for a letter.'<sup>73</sup> No other considerations concerning the art of letter writing have been found.

Scaliger was no doubt aware of epistolographical theory. It is not necessary here to review the long history of this art; it will suffice to recall that Cicero's example of the 'familiar letter', that is, one addressed to friends and members of the family and household, provided a model for communicating scholarly, political and personal news. The discovery of Cicero's letters in the fourteenth century expanded the medieval tradition of the *ars dictaminis* as an administrative and scribal profession, into a literary art of self-presentation by means of a controlled exchange of professional and personal news. Early modern theorists of epistolography struggled with the ancient models. As in the Middle Ages, their practice was very much conceptualized within a framework of classical rhetoric. According to this theory, there were three genres: the political oration, leading to an answer to the question: 'What to do?' by means of a thorough investigation of pros and cons; secondly, the *genus iudiciale*: the defence or critique of a case in front of a jury; and lastly, the demonstrative or epideictic genre: bestowing praise or blame on someone or something. As part of a dialogue rather than an oration, Desiderius Erasmus in his voluminous 1522 manual on the art of letter writing added the 'familiar' letter as a fourth genre. He goes on trying to subdivide the 'familiar' letter into numerous other categories, according to its many purposes, which depend partly on the contents<sup>74</sup>.

Erasmus struggled to categorise the familiar letter, and the reality is indeed that many different kinds of subjects are treated in one letter, which makes it hard to define straightforward subject-categories influencing the choice of language. Usually, a variety of subjects were touched upon, in an ordered manner: we find a salutation, confirmation of received letters or information about previous letters, often giving voice to the fear that letters have got lost on their way. Then usually follows a list of different subjects, introduced by formulas such as 'As far as so and so is concerned', 'As to what you wrote about this and that', etc. Naturally then, political news, news about books, more technical discussions of texts and personal news could be incorporated in one letter, and were thus to be communicated in one language only. Moreover, once communication in one language was

established, it proved difficult to switch to another, so one tended to convey all of one's ideas in that particular language.

At the same time, letters were, following a definition Cicero gives in one of his own letters, half of a conversation with absent friends. No one contested this idea<sup>75</sup>. Florent Chrestien's son phrased this elegantly in a letter to Scaliger, speaking of his late father:

Since his death I have been thinking of making a trip solely to kiss your hand and tell you that I was his heir. But seeing that domestic affairs delay such a trip for me, I have been forced to resort to this paper visit, which I will often make without missing any opportunity, as long as I know that such a visit does not put you out<sup>76</sup>.

As a rule, the manuals on the art of letter-writing did not consider any other language than Latin, although even French letters, as the one cited above demonstrates, echoed the conceptions laid out in these manuals<sup>77</sup>. The possibility of using French is still ignored in another significant treatise on the art of letter writing: Justus Lipsius' *Institutio Epistolica*, published in 1591<sup>78</sup>. One treatise of this period, however, does mention the possibility of vernacular letters: this was the 1534 *De conscribendis epistolis* by Juan Luis Vives<sup>79</sup>. Vives seems to have anticipated the enormous popularity of, for example, Pietro Areينو's Italian letters of 1557<sup>80</sup>.

#### Final remarks

This paper has aimed to provide an analysis of how both the context and the contents of a letter affected its writer's choice of language. With the help of the model presented above, it will be possible to analyse other networks in the Republic of Letters as well. It may turn out that such networks show similarities, which would suggest the possibility of a typology of scholarly networks around 1600. It may also turn out that our pattern is characteristic only of Huguenot scholars, or even that it is unique to Scaliger's network.

<sup>73</sup> See references above, in n. 2.

<sup>74</sup> Claude Chrétien to Scaliger, 16 August 1605, in *Epistres francoises* (as above, n. 35): 'Je pensois toujours depuis son deces faire une voyage exprès pour vous baiser les mains et dire que j'estois son [Chrétien's father Florent] heritier. Mais voyant que les affaires domestiques me recouloyent tous les jours ce voyage, j'ay esté contrainct d'avoir recours à ceste visite de papier que je féray souvent sans en laisser perdre aucune occasion si je scay qu'elle ne vous soit point importune.'

<sup>75</sup> See also above, n. 62.

<sup>76</sup> Lipsius, *Epistolica Institutio* (as above, n. 30).

<sup>77</sup> Juan Luis Vives, *De conscribendis epistolis*, Charles Fantazzi (ed. and transl.), Leiden and New York, 1989, chapter 79.

<sup>78</sup> Charles Fantazzi, 'Vives versus Erasmus on the Art of Letter-Writing', in: Toon Van Houdt e.a. (eds), *Self-Presentation and Social Identification. The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times*, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia vol. XVIII, Louvain, 2002, pp. 39-56 (esp. 55).

<sup>73</sup> Scaliger to Casaubon, 21 September 1603 (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, ms Coll. du Puy, 394 ter, fols 67r-68r; printed in Scaliger, *Opuscula* (as above, n. 1), pp. 496-500 (esp. 499): 'quod longius disquirere, ut rei dignitas postulat, non sinit modus epistolae, quem excessisse videor. Itaque de eo alias. Nam libri opus est hoc, non epistolae.'

<sup>74</sup> Jean-Claude Margolin (ed.), *Desiderius Erasmus. De conscribendis epistolis*, in *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterdami* vol. 12, Amsterdam, 1971, pp. 153-579; translation by Charles Fantazzi in J. Kelly Sowards (ed.), *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. 25, Toronto, 1985, pp. 1-254.

A comparative approach is indispensable, but possible only if the same methodology is rigidly applied in different cases. For such research, we still lack inventories of correspondences, and above all of digital ones which facilitate easy quantitative analyses. Fortunately, promising steps are being taken in the direction of compiling meta-databases of early modern scholarly correspondences.<sup>81</sup>

The Hague

Dirk van Miert

<sup>81</sup> Notably in a web-based humanities' collaborative project on correspondences as part of the *Circulation of Knowledge* project at the Huygens Institute (The Hague) of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (Circulation of Knowledge and Learned Practices in the 17th-century Dutch Republic). For other interesting initiatives, see Oxford University's *Cultures of Knowledge* project on <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/cofk/> and the *Electronic Enlightenment* project at Stanford University, <http://www.e-enlightenment.com/>