An Antiquary between Philology and History

Peiresc and the Samaritans[1]

Peter N. Miller

Once upon a time, when the world of learning was smaller and its prospects were grander, antiquaries prowled the landscape collecting, describing, comparing, ordering, and re-ordering all that could be known of the world's history. Their questions and practices have since been lost to posterity with the subsequent partition of that homeland where philology, philosophy, anthropology, and archeology once met and mingled. The antiquary worked with antiquities, what Bacon called "history defaced, or remnants of history which have casually escaped the shipwreck of time." Indeed, it is Bacon who has left us one of the most evocative and perspicuous accounts of this practice.

> *Antiquities*, or remnants of histories, are (as was said) like the spars of a shipwreck: when, though the memory of things be decayed and almost lost, yet acute and industrious persons, by a certain perseverance and scrupulous diligence, contrive out of genealogies, annals, titles, monuments, coins, proper names, and styles, etymologies of words, proverbs, traditions, archives, and instruments as well public as private, fragments of histories scattered about in books not historical,—contrive, I say, from all these things or some of them, to recover somewhat from the deluge of time; a work laborious indeed, but agreeable to men, and joined with a kind of reverence; and well worthy to supersede the fabulous accounts of the origins of nations; and to be substituted for fictions of that kind.[2]

New interest in the history of early modern scholarship and in the history of art and archeology has served to focus attention on antiquarianism.[3] The classic work on the subject by Arnaldo Momigliano[4] has begun to be revisited and the present essay, a sketch of a particular antiquary's interest in a circumscribed subject that turns out to have far-ranging implications, is a contribution to this deepening engagement.

Why Peiresc? Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637)[5] was one of the most famous Europeans of his generation, hailed by Momigliano as "that archetype of all antiquarians" and celebrated in *Tristram Shandy* as an "indefatigable labourer . . . out of love for the sciences." In the *Polyhistor*, Daniel Morhof singled out Gassendi's *Vita Peireskii* as the examplary scholarly life and Guez de Balzac merged person and practice when he identified Peiresc, in an echo of Bacon, as himself "a piece of the shipwreck of antiquity and relic of the Golden

Age."[6] Looking carefully at how he worked can help us understand the antiquaries' place in the history of scholarship. Theirs is a story that branches off from the main line that runs from Scaliger and Casaubon to Bentley and veers towards the foundation of that edifice to be built, later, by Gibbon, Burckhardt, and Huizinga. It is by studying texts and objects with equal seriousness, and seeking to augment their quantity by catalyzing a wide-ranging intellectual network that extended from England to Ethiopia, and which included the planning of scholarly expeditions, that Peiresc presents a striking example of an intellectual practice that stands poised between philology and cultural history.

Like many of the antiquaries, Peiresc was also a polymath; his studies of antiquities took place alongside dissections and telescope-aided observation of, among other items, the Medicean planets and the first nebula, in the constellation Orion, which he discovered. Contemporaries recognized that what was being constructed was "*votre Encyclopedie*."[7] No man, claimed Gassendi in his biography of Peiresc, "was more desirous then he, to run through the famous Encyclpoedia, or whole Circle of Arts" (*celebre illud liberalium disciplinarum coronamentum*). Jean-Jacques Bouchard, too, in his funeral oration, praised Peiresc's letters as so crammed with all sorts of learning that he might "have been said to have gone through the whole Encyclopedia or perfect Orbe of all Learning and liberal Arts" (*universum omnium doctrinarum et liberalium disciplinarum orbem*).[8] Much of the interest in people like Peiresc is derived from an ongoing effort to understand better early modern encyclopedism, including of course, the volume in which this appears. Our encyclopedia, however, looks very different, and as it began to crystallize in the later seventeenth century people like Peiresc ceased to fit—and then ceased to matter.

Why the Samaritans? They re-emerged on to the scholarly map in the seventeenth century for the first time since late antiquity because they offered an alternative version of Judaism to an age obsessed by the beginnings of Christianity.[9] But they also represented a link in the transmission of culture from East to West since their alphabet was shared by both ancient Jews and Greeks. Scaliger was the first to perceive that these two stories coincided in the history of the Samaritans and Peiresc seized on the implications of this for understanding the relationship between Biblical and classical history. With this step three important developments in the early modern history of scholarship hove into view. First, the antiquaries' study of the ancient Near East marks the extension to the extra-European world of the recognition that past and present were discontinuous that was the fruit of Renaissance historical thought. Second, the way in which the Bible's account of the ancient Levant could now be fit into the received history of the classical world succeeded, finally, in making the Bible into history. It was this very success in making the sacred *historical* that was to render it vulnerable to all the skepticisms that beset the study of the human past. Third, the antiquaries' researches provided a means of forging a common narrative that could integrate the classical and the extra-classical, or

non-European, worlds with all of the obvious implications for what counted as the *oecumene* and its natural forms of morality, religion, and society.

References to Joseph Scaliger in Peiresc's work mark this trail from philology to the broader study of culture. It was, typically, in Italy that the twenty-year-old from Aix first came into contact with Scaliger, a French exile in Leiden. Equally typically, this contact was epistolary. The letters they exchanged prior to Scaliger's death in 1609 show Peiresc continually striking the pose of client, protesting his willingness and desire to serve Scaliger's interests. These included the acquisition of Hebrew books and coins and information concerning della Scala family history. In addition, he took upon himself the task of seeing to the recovery of Scaliger's newly-acquired Samaritan Pentateuch that was lost with the foundering of the *St. Victor*. "I will employ all my friends in Marseilles who trade with the Levant to endeavor to recover it. All that I desire in this world is to have occasions to render such service."[10]

What was the intellectual legacy of Scaliger for Peiresc? As Anthony Grafton has shown, Scaliger applied philological methods to texts and artifacts of the non-classical East that were communicated to him by both scholarly travellers and well-informed natives.[11] It was precisely this approach that led him to the breakthrough in historical chronology constituted by *De emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurus temporum* (1606). Chronology itself, as he envisioned it, was a discipline whose essence was synthetic: time was the same for the Babylonians, Chinese, Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, and Christians.[12] Since their local narratives ought, then, to fit together, chronology could be projected as the foundation for a universal history—or a new encyclopedia.[13] Scaliger classified etymology as pseudo-science,[14] but recognized that a historically-informed comparative linguistics could provide rich results.[15]

Scaliger offered a model that a young admirer like Peiresc could emulate. Although lacking the technical skills and intuition that enabled Scaliger to work through the chronological material, Peiresc pursued the insight that classical philology together with oriental studies could yield a new history of civilization. As Momigliano has argued, Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* was the eventual fruit of this insight.[16] Peiresc's synthetic approach to questions of ancient metrology and comparative linguistics pushed at the limit between classical and non-classical history and fed on a constant flow of new materials relayed from residents of the extra-European world and travellers he kitted out and dispatched with shopping lists. What La Popelinière, in his famous letter to Scaliger of 4 January 1604, theorized as the next and necessary step towards "the perfection of history," namely scholarly travel, Peiresc took as a given.[17] Peiresc also understood the relationship between chronology and universal history. In a letter of 1632 he politely refused to loan out his copy of the *Thesaurus temporum* because it was covered with marginal comments "for my use in diverse places."[18] Peiresc was, as Grafton has noted, an "imitator" whose interests and approach,

even if broader and more diffuse than Scaliger's, nevertheless constituted the "true continuation" of his work.[19]

Perhaps nowhere is this clearer than in Samaritan studies. Scaliger had been drawn to them because of their calendar;[20] this, in turn, drew him into a much wider investigation of Second Temple and rabbinic Judaism.[21] In response to a letter accompanying their calendar in 1584, Scaliger addressed a series of questions about their rituals to leaders of the Samaritan community. Their replies of 1590 never reached him, but they were eventually recovered by Peiresc in 1629 and sent to Paris to help Jean Morin with his work on the Samaritan Pentateuch.[22] Copies of the Latin translation in Peiresc's hand are annotated in his customary fashion of underscoring passages of interest.[23] He paid closest attention to geography (the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim), rituals (observance of Sabbath, Passover, and Circumcision) and, in particular, the institution of the priesthood and the tradition which linked the first high priest, Aaron, with the current one, Eleazar, the letter writer himself. In addition, Peiresc underlined those questions addressed by the Samaritans to Scaliger and which were precisely the sort that Peiresc included in the instructions that he drew up for travellers to alien lands: What language do you speak? Where do you live? Who is your ruler? What is your law? Who are your priests?[24] In Scaliger's questions, the Samaritans' answers, and Peiresc's annotations it is already clear that the scholarly study of the Bible could be shaped by the antiquary's practice: texts were illuminated by a context that could be literary, material, or living, and in the best case, as with the Samaritans, all three.

But Scaliger also grew interested in the Samaritans because they conserved the ancient Hebrew alphabet that was shared with the Phoenicians. In a much reworked passage in the *Thesaurus temporum* Scaliger argued for the Phoenician derivation of the Ionic alphabet. Anthony Grafton has noted the importance attached to this argument by its author and a friendly reader, Isaac Casaubon, who commented simply: "Digressio de literis Ionicis, admirandae eruditionis."[25] In a late letter to Richard Thomson (23 September 1607) Scaliger extended this same argument backward in time, observing that "Phoenician letters" were used in Canaan at the time of Abraham and served as the script of the ancient Jews; after the alphabet shift they remained in use solely among Samaritans.[26] Hence the implied claim that study of the Samaritan language could shed much light on the crucial Phoenician link between Biblical and classical history. In Jacques Leschassier's (1550–1625) memoire preserved in Peiresc's oriental register (see below) both passages in which Scaliger makes the Phoenician argument are recorded. Indeed, this same theme dominates Leschassier's letter to Peiresc of 10 May 1610.[27] Peiresc was, then, clearly aware of the importance contemporaries were beginning to attach to the Samaritans in the construction of a new world history.

Peiresc's interest in the Samaritans was fired by word received from Girolamo Aleandro in Rome in the late spring of 1628 of plans to publish their Pentateuch in the Paris Polyglot Bible.[28] Aleandro had received the news in a letter from

the prospective editor and translator, Jean Morin of the Oratory, who had just published a new edition of the Septuagint with a preface stressing the utility of the Samaritan Pentateuch for biblical scholarship. Morin had written to inquire about the existence of ancient shekel coins bearing Samaritan inscriptions. In reply, Aleandro mentioned that two additional Samaritan Pentateuchs could be found in Rome, one obtained by Scipione Cobelluzzi, Cardinal of Sta. Susanna, and the other by Pietro della Valle, the famed aristocratic traveller.

Scaliger dominated Peiresc's involvement in *cose Samaritane*, and his posthumous authority was especially relied upon in the early stages when Peiresc needed to motivate others to work on his behalf. On the heels of Aleandro's letter, Peiresc informed Pierre Dupuy that there existed in Rome a Samaritan text "which I would esteem much more than all the rest. It would be worth undertaking an edition containing both. The late M. della Scala would have desired to see this with an extreme passion."[29] A week later, on 27 May, Peiresc wrote to Aleandro acknowledging his desire to help accelerate the appearance of Morin's edition of the Pentateuch. Peiresc agreed that if it were possible to include della Valle's text in "the true Samaritan language"—Samaritan-Aramaic as opposed to Hebrew in Samaritan characters—this ought to be done without depriving him of the original. What had captured his imagination was word that della Valle possessed a Bible that was written in "Egyptian" with the Arabic version on the facing page "which," Peiresc adds, "I esteem a treasure, among the richest and most noble of all antiquity."[30] Peiresc's repeated conjunction of Samaritan and "Egyptian" (really Copic) reflects his working hypothesis that comparative linguistics held the key to discovering, and rigorously establishing, the connection between the ancient eastern Mediterranean societies.

Peiresc's letters of Autumn 1628 to his chief intellectual contacts in the Barberini court, Lucas Holstenius and Aleandro, are full with questions and theories about the relationship between Greek, Coptic, and Samaritan. Holstenius is asked to examine the "Egyptian" fragments and advise him on the "language" and "characters" in which they were written.[31] In a letter to Holstenius of 10 November, Peiresc applauds his effort to familiarize himself with the oriental languages "from which derive the most notable origins of antiquity." In particular, he suggests that Holstenius make the acquaintance of della Valle and view his collection of manuscript books retrieved from the Levant and "especially the Samaritan and Egyptian."[32] Writing to Paris on the 22nd, Peiresc notes the arrival of letters from Rome, including one from della Valle, whose Samaritan and Egyptian books "are exquisite pieces that the late Mr. de l'Escale would have found perfectly to his taste."[33]

Finally writing directly to the famed traveller Pietro della Valle, Peiresc acknowledges his "great pleasure" in learning about these books. He agrees on the necessity of supplying a Latin translation, which he thought Morin could fashion. Peiresc does, however, admit that "it would be difficult to persuade me that one can rely on the diligence" of Morin for such a task, given his complete absence of familiarity with the Levant or with Samaritans. Peiresc's comments

here shed some light on how he believed rare languages ought to be learned. Travel and immersion were one option, while living with a group of native language speakers in Europe was another. Both of these could be accomplished through the initiative and philanthropy of a "Great Prince." Morin had done neither and so his learning was less than the best. Nevertheless, Peiresc believed that it was necessary to keep him involved, so long as he worked with dispatch.[34]

The great Scaliger, Peiresc wrote, who so carefully studied oriental languages "had had such a great desire to penetrate into the Samaritan traditions" in order to read a computus that he spared no effort to acquire Samaritan texts. How did Scaliger learn the language? Since a Psalter was all he possessed, he read it alongside the Latin so as to master the vocabulary and form a grammar "which he showed me several times." Scaliger's unfulfilled desire was to acquire a Pentateuch which would substantially further his knowledge of the language. Peiresc declared that it was "for love of him for this purpose only" that he himself had written to the Levant to locate and purchase such a volume. Though his subsequent success was thwarted by shipwreck, della Valle's acquisition would "give greater ease to the *letterati* and practitioners of oriental languages who could extract from it a grammar . . . [and] . . . finish the work that Scaliger had only begun."[35]

In another letter to della Valle, this of October 1630, Peiresc turned to the question of the link between pronunciation and provenance. While Peiresc's newly-acquired Samaritan Targum, or paraphrase, came from Damascus, he recalled that Aleandro had mentioned that della Valle's was brought back from Persia. He speculated that differences between them in spelling and pronunciation reflected cultural factors, whether a harshness more common in the eastern Samaritan dialect, or the influence of Coptic on the Samaritan spoken in Egypt. Peiresc was wrong both in the particular—della Valle's Pentateuch was also purchased in Damascus—and in the general—there is no acknowledged differentiation between eastern and western Samaritan. But there was already, thanks to Scaliger, an awareness that there were Aramaic dialects that varied from Jerusalem to Antioch to Babylon, and one sees Peiresc applying something of this distinction as well as contemporary platitudes about the influence of climate on speech.[36] Peiresc was later to invite Morin to view his collection of medals with Phoenician and Punic legends. He had just received an inscription recovered from off the African coast written in Punic characters which merited closer inspection and "principally those which could have some relationship to the shape of some of the ancient Hebrew characters, or the modern Samaritan."[37]

Peiresc's support for Samuel Petit reflects this same intellectual commitment to the value of the Samaritans as a bridge between the Classical and Biblical worlds. In a letter to Pierre Dupuy of July 1629 Peiresc introduced Petit, a Protestant minister from Nîmes, who had shown him a small work he had written on the Samaritan computus which drew on material unknown to

Scaliger.[38] In a later letter to Lucas Holstenius, Peiresc described Petit as a translator of Punic who was trying to establish the rules governing the relationship between it and oriental languages.[39] Peiresc tried to find for Petit a position in the group of scholars working on the Paris Polyglot and praised him to his friends.[40]

How seriously did Peiresc treat the study of Samaritan? Was he, for example, able to read it?[41] His file on oriental languages in the Bibliothèque Nationale preserves a short Samaritan grammar entitled *Lashon Shamraita: Lingua Samaritica*, written by one Christopher Crinesius, professor of public theology at Altdorf and author of a Syriac grammar and several works on comparative Semitics. The text is more of a brief history of the origins of the language than a proper grammar. Its entry into Peiresc's collection can be precisely dated. In a letter of 20 March 1629, Jacques Dupuy, after acknowledging receipt of della Valle's book on Persia, notes that the book entitled *Lingua Samaritana* was no longer available and that he believed there were never more than 4 or 5 exemplars printed. He was sending Peiresc the copy he had obtained.[42] In the return letter of 14 April, Peiresc observes that he "did not find in this discourse on the Samaritan language what I expected, at least from the author's contribution."[43]

In the early letters to della Valle, Peiresc wished most of all to understand the relationship of the Samaritan language to Hebrew, Syriac, and Aramaic. Was it dependent on one or the other of these or, rather, a pastiche in which all "participated"?[44] In a subsequent letter, Peiresc emphasized the importance of philological collation. "And the comparison would make it easier to choose what would be more appropriate and more conforming to the Hebrew text." After requesting a sample from Deuteronomy, Peiresc repeated that his criterion for choosing amongst the variants was that it be "the most proportionate and most conforming to the most ancient Hebrew."[45]

Peiresc did indeed compare the passage with that in his own Samaritan Targum. A memoire preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale records his comments (see appendix 1). The document shows Peiresc's ability to navigate the Samaritan alphabet and exactly how a seventeenth-century antiquary set about the task of "comparison." It also illustrates how Peiresc's particular multilingualism—fluent in French, Italian, and Provençal—enabled him to perceive immediately how language changed over time within families across dialect lines. Hence, differences between Samaritan texts from different locations could be assimilated to those between Gascon and Provençal.

A fascinating exchange of letters with Denys de Sailly, Prior of the Charterhouse in Aix, revisits the family relationship between languages now called Semitic in a model of the antiquary's comparative method. De Sailly's first letter (3 July) was prompted by Peiresc's gift of Morin's *Exercitationes Biblicae* (1631). It was precisely Morin's historical argument that the ancient Hebrew script abandoned by the Jews in the time of Ezra was retained by the Samaritans that elicited de Sailly's response. How could the Jews have exchanged the

letters with which God himself wrote the Ten Commandments for those of the Assyrians, their idolatrous enemies? Morin had argued that the existence of ancient Judean coins bearing inscriptions resembling the modern Samaritan demonstrated that at a certain point the alphabet was shared. De Sailly's reponse—underlined by Peiresc as part of his filing system along with the earlier mention of R. P. Morin and "Characteres desquelz s'est servi Esdras"—is that this showed that the Jews employed two alphabets, one for sacred writing and the other for profane.[46] This "Egyptianizing" argument, since it followed from the contemporary view of the hieroglyphs as sacred letters, could accommodate the appearance of the Assyrian script while minimizing the importance of the Samaritans as a privileged source solely because they used this alphabet. De Sailly asked to borrow Pieresc's copy of Simon de Muis's work (a bitter critic of Morin's thesis) and to have his opinion on these matters.[47]

Peiresc's long response of 6 July, a clean copy of which he retained under the filing title "De Samaritanorum characteribus" (appendix 2) indicating its importance as his statement on the subject, takes as its point of departure the nature of change in a culture—here its alphabet—over time. It was, he thought, no more difficult to imagine the Jews abandoning the script in which God wrote on the tablets than Moses shattering them by his own initiative. Second, and much more central to Peiresc's answer, since comparison of the ancient and modern "Chaldaic and Syriac" scripts showed signs of change why could the same process not have affected Hebrew? His own collection of ancient and more recent Hebrew manuscripts revealed just such a variation. Moreover, reflection on the historical development of the European vernacular scripts offered a third proof of the ease with which alphabets could alter in very short periods of time. In any event, conclusive argument depended upon the presentation of contemporary evidence.[48]

Scaliger had sought out Jews to learn Hebrew, Maronites to learn Syriac, and Samaritans to learn Samaritan. A generation later, Peiresc could rely on printed grammars like Crinesius's; his initiative was in recognizing the broad intellectual implications of Scaliger's scattered scholarly intuitions and turning them into research projects. If the difference between Scaliger's interest in the Samaritans and that of his teacher Guillaume Postel[49] marks one transition in the history of humanist orientalism, that between Scaliger and his "disciple" Peiresc marks another. This is perfectly illustrated in a *memoire* preserved in Peiresc's volume of oriental manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. It has been the subject of a fascinating article by J. G. Fraser, and while both the specific authorship and dating of the text remain somewhat uncertain, the import is clear.[50] Scaliger's interests in Semitic epigraphy, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and religious practices are reflected in excerpts from his writings. Separate headings are then annotated to reflect the current state of evidence. This material ranges chronologically from Jerome through Scaliger to Claude Duret (*Thresor de l'histoire des langues de cest univers*, 1613). The final heading, listing "Books to be Recovered" seems exactly the sort of practical extrapolation typical of

Peiresc. As Fraser notes, this last list closely resembles the memorandum prepared for Theophile Minuti on the eve of his expedition in 1629.

While fascinated by the historical connections that the comparative study of objects and languages facilitated, Peiresc frequently put his tentative conclusions to the test: would further research bear them out? Not content to wait and depend on what others brought back to Europe for scholarly scrutiny he established his own independent network of diplomats, merchants, and missionaries who were given background briefings and lists of questions before departing, and were often debriefed in Provence upon their return. These provided a steady stream of raw material for his philological observations. In a long letter to Dupuy of 7 November 1629, for example, Peiresc announced the impending arrival in Marseilles of a Samaritan grammar and a Pentateuch in three columns, all in Samaritan script, but each in a different language, Hebrew, Samaritan-Aramaic, and an "ancient vulgar" that some judged to be Arabic and others Syriac.[51] The Samaritan "grammar" was actually a nearly complete dictionary in ten notebooks. Each word was defined in three different languages, leading Peiresc to surmise that the dictionary was meant to accompany the Samaritan triglot and that its languages were Hebrew, Samaritan, and either Syriac or "old Arabic," about which, Peiresc declared, he "understood nothing or almost nothing." There were, in addition, some seven or eight other notebooks each containing fragments of a grammar.[52]

The great Scaliger, Peiresc hastened to add, would have been able to draw some valuable observations from even these fragments, since he himself had gone through the "agony of fabricating a sort of grammar in this language." Peiresc suggested inquiring of his executor, Daniel Heinsius, if Scaliger had left any unpublished materials which could be of use to Morin in drawing "something more solid" from these remaining fragments. As for himself, Peiresc believed that these two versions of the Pentateuch would greatly assist in the study of the Samaritan language and the content of its literature. In the meantime, Peiresc would have his agents continue their search for Samaritan materials. He concluded, characteristically, that "it was necessary to see if he could succeed in either the one or the other and aid the public in every way possible."[53]

Among all those who did Peiresc's bidding in the East, Theophile Minuti, the Minim monk, was given the most detailed instruction. He was furnished by Peiresc with a list of contacts in Constantinople, Aleppo, Jerusalem, and Cairo, and with a series of memoranda designed to guide acquisitions. In the "Memoires sur les medailles et pierres precieuses Gravées, qui [se] peuvent reschercher et recouvrer en Levant," Peiresc stressed that he was interested in Greek coins "but above all those which are found written in characters resembling the Samaritan, of whatever sort of metal." In the event that any were found, sketches were immediately to be made "so that these could serve as instruction, at least for those who are doing research." Moreover, "since the Samaritans are of greater curiosity than the others," if their owners refused to sell, then Minuti was to

press for permission to have lead or plaster casts made of the medals. Peiresc urged Minuti to look for engraved gems, especially those with inscriptions in Greek, Latin, and Samaritan. Whatever quantity could be acquired at a price "bien moderé" was to be purchased, but, he added, "principally those in which one could recognize Samaritan characters."[54] That six of the eight paragraphs concerning procurement gave priority to Samaritan things is, surely, a reflection on Peiresc's thinking in the year 1629, the year of his deepening involvement with della Valle and Le Jay.

A contemporary document, the "MEMOIRE POUR LES INDES" prepared for the trip of Ferrand Nuñes and Manuel da Costa Casseretz to Goa, includes the same sort of instruction. Medals with Greek, Latin, or Arabic inscriptions were to be purchased, but special care was to be taken "above all with those where there are Samaritan characters, or those which resemble them."[55] Copper coins in Greek or Samaritan "or those closely resembling" Samaritan were specifically mentioned. Just as the conjunction of Samaritan and "Egyptian" in the letters to della Valle reflects Peiresc's effort to place Egypt in the history of oriental languages, that of Samaritan and Greek points towards Peiresc's view of Samaritan as a fossilized form of Phoenician that could help explain the origins of the Greek alphabet in the ancient Levant. A comprehensive inquiry pursued along these lines would yield a history of the encounter between the Levant, Egypt, and Greece that was the subject of so much contemporary romance and scholarship. A fragmentary memo that seems to date from this period addresses the question of language families and their historical development: "Envoyer un eschantillon des trois Langues, et des Prieres, et des Epistres, pour faire determiner ce qui est du vray Language de chascune soit Hebreu, Syriaque, Arabe, ou Cophte, ou Samaritain."[56]

Minuti was also charged with the acquisition of books. This is detailed in a fragmentary autograph note preserved at the Bibliothèque Méjanes in Aix, "Les livres des Samaritaines qu'on desire avoir du Levant" (see appendix 3). At the top of the list was the Pentateuch in Samaritan Hebrew, which Peiresc describes as "touts divers des carateres Hebreus vulgaires." In terms of priorities, Peiresc was, as usual, exactingly clear. Alongside the first entry was a cross, and at the bottom of the page Peiresc explained that "One desires principally the first of these books which is crossed. And for the others, if they could be had easily then they should be acquired, but if not, one will be content with the first."[57]

On the verso, the "Memoire concernant les livres Sa[maritains] qu'on desire avoir du Levant" contextualizes what had been presented schematically. It begins by describing the Samaritans as a sect of Jews found mostly in Palestine in the area around Mt. Garizim who had preserved many books in Hebrew and Samaritan. "Of which I desire to have as many as could easily be recovered," Peiresc writes, "but principally the five books of Moses." At this point, more than half the text on each line is lost, but enough remains to indicate that Peiresc went on to mention the presence of Samaritan communities in Egypt

and the advisability of inquiring there for the range of books listed on the reverse.

Fortunately, still another memoire prepared for Minuti illustrates Peiresc's knowledge of the Samaritan diaspora in Egypt, entitled "JUIFS, SAMARITANS, JUIFS de la Columbe au CAYRE." "In Cairo," it begins, "all the Jews are constrained to live in a single quarter that is not far from that of the French. There are three sorts, namely, those who adore the dove, who are the Samaritains, and who never exceeded the number of nine persons." In the margin Peiresc has noted that the Cappucin Gilles de Loche reported "that there are not 12 families of Samaritains in the entire Levant." The note describes the other types of Jews as "ordinary" and those called "Carrains" [Karaites], who have "more than 60 Synagogues in Cairo and hold the Pentateuch alone" sacred.[58]

These memoranda that Peiresc retained offer a glimpse of his intellectual practice. They show how he sought to apply book learning to experience and thereby create a deeper and more secure foundation for knowledge. The scholarly travel that he organized and the collection that he amassed reflect the seriousness with which he pursued, in the world, questions raised in ancient and modern texts. In the context of this quest for better texts and more documentation of a wider sort, new questions were being asked about the peoples of the Levant. Peiresc's goal, as it was that of Scaliger and Selden, and would be of Montfaucon and Creuzer, was to provide a documentable account of the origins of European "civilization."

Appendix 1

(Paris, Bibl. nat. MS. Nouv. acq. fr. nouv. ff. 23–24)

[23r]

SAMARITANORUM
Dialectus

Notes sur le specimen du Samaritain
du sr. Pietro della Valle de Rome envoyé
par le P. Morin de Paris[1]

ex vers.1.capt.xv.Exod[.]

Les poincts de distinction ne sont poinct aprez la troisiesme parolle [sic] משה ains seulement aprez la onziesme למימר.[2]
la quattriesme parole le ב est en la place ובני et non un ר [.]
En la huictiesme le ד est fort distinctement exprimé par un dalet.

ex vers.27 & 28.cap.xii.Deuteron.

La lettre Aleph en la quattrisme parole ne semble poinct abusivement inserée, ואדמה car elle est pareillement repetee en la neufviesme ואדם[3] pour dire *sanguis* selon le language *Syriaque*. En la parole antepenultiesme du 28me, באזת, on a fort bien recogneu qu'il y debvoit avoir faulte ou equivoque du Coppiste, qui avoit obmis quelque lettre, ou n'en avoit pas sceu bien distinguer les figures. *Car au lieu de la letre Aleph* א quil y met pour la seconde, *dans mon M.S. il ya deux lettres* ע *ayin et chet* ח qui faict בחעות[4] BAHAZUTH, OU IN CONSPECTU. Ce qui prent bien le sens, tant del' Hebreu IN OCULIS, que de l'Arabe, ענד, qui faict CORAM.

La troisiesme parole du 28me verset ne se trouve poinct veritablement dans le texte Hebraique des Juifs. mais elle est dans l'hebraique des Samaritains, comme dans les 70. et dans leurs deux versions vulgaires, tant Arabique que Syriaque ou Samaritaine. Il est vray qu'il ya cette differance, Que dans mon M.S. ou Syriaque ou Samaritain, *il y a une lettre Tau de plus* qu'en l'exemplaire du Sr Pietro della Valle de Rome aprez la premiere lettre vau, Et s'y lict ותעבד pour dire, ET FACIES, comme en la precedante et deuxsiesme parolle, il insera un autre Tau, aprez le Vau, pour dire ET AUDIES. Et ce pour mieux exprimer l'Hebreu des Samaritains qui use des mots ושמעה ועשית.

La neufiesme n'est pas non plus dans l'Hebreu des Juifs, ne dans les Septante, mais elle n'est pas obmise en mon MS. En toutes les trois langues pour dire HODIE. Il est vray quil y a cette differance que *au lieu que dans les MS. de Rome il finit par la lettre He* ה *dans le mien y a une lettre Nun* יומן.

[23v]

En la seconde parolle du 27me verset, dans mon MS. *y a une lettre de plus qui est un* ' *devant la derniere lettre*, qui change la signification du singulier au plurier, et respond beaucoup mieux au texte Hebraique tant des Juifs et Samaritains que des Septante, qui signifie HOLOCAUSTA, au lieu que celuy de Rome voudroit dire HOLOCAUSTUM, au singulier qui ne se trouve nulle part. Et possible n'est ce qu'une obmission du Coppiste.

Les poincts de distinction sont mal aprez la sixiesme parole du 27me verset, au lieu qu'il doibt estre aprez la huictiesme comme il est dans mon M.S. [o]u il y a aussy bien à propos un autre poinct *de distinction aprez la XVme* [Domini dei tui] au lieu que *dans le M.S. de Rome elle est mise hors de place ~~aprez la XVII mot~~ Jusques aprez le premier mot du 28me verset, ce qui monstre que si le MS. de Rome est ainsi punctué, il fault qu'il vienne d'une main bien mal adroice, pour ne dire fort incorrecte ou ignorante*.

Le *premier mot du 28me* verset est de trois lettres en mon MS. טור[5] *celle du mitan desfaillant* en celuy de Rome, qui en rend le sens ou interpretation un peu plus difficile, et moings asseurée ~~si le temps~~.

En la sixiesme parolle [sic] dudit 28me verset מליה. *La redupplication des deux premieres lettres* ממלל, n'est poinct en mon M.S. et rend *la prononciation plus doulce*, et plus convenable à l'Hebreu qui veut dire [verba] que celuy de Rome[.] Mais cela se peult neantmoings tollerer bien que rude, comme un *Chaldaisme* ou *Cophtisme*, et pourroit faire inferer que cette version de Rome, eust esté à l'usaige de peuples habitez ~~plus avant~~ en l'AEgypte. *Et de faict Sr Pietro della Valle disoit l'avoir trouvé en Perse; et le nostre est de la Palestine*.[6]

La dixiesme parole dudit 28me verset à en teste dans le MS. de Rome, un ל qui n'est poinct au mien, et semble *surabondante*, selon l'usaige des langues plus corrumpues, et moins pures.

[24r]

En la onziesme[7] *le MS. de Rome entrelasse un Tau entre les deux Jots, qui change de l'actif au passif*, bien que l'hebreu n'ayt point de tel passif en usage, Et *ne met pas un Dalet* qui est en mon MS. au commancement du mot et qui faict mieux la liaison du discours. En cette sorte דיהטב. Ut [bonum sit] tibi.

En la XVIme de *mon MS. y a un lamet de plus* au commancement לעלם, qui faict difference comme qui dizoit [usque aethernum] au lieu de dire [usque in aethernum] et qui peult neantmoings passer pour surabondante.

En la XIX^me^ mon MS. à le mot דשפר [quod pulchrum est], dont *les lettres sont transposées* en celuy de Rome en cette sorte דפשר, qui est possible une aequivoque du Coppiste, autrement le sens n'y seroit pas bien intelligible si ce n'est que cette transposition ou soit ~~du Dia~~ de la corruption du dialecte, plus barbare, comme quand les Gascons disent CRABE pour CABRE, qui ne signifient pas moings l'un que l'autre, entre les Gascons, et Provençaulx chascun chez soy.

Notes to Appendix 1

1. All Samaritan characters have been transcribed into the modern ("Assyrian") Hebrew script.
2. Also after the sixth word in the printed version of della Valle's text in the sixth volume of the Paris Polyglot Bible (1645[1631]). All references will be to this edition.
3. In the printed version: ודם.
4. In printed version: בחזות.
5. In printed version: טר.
6. This last sentence is crossed out with vertical lines.
7. In printed version: twelfth word.

Appendix 2

(Paris, Bibl. nat. Ms. Lat., fols. 79–79)
'De Samaritanorum Characteribus'

[f9]

Monsieur mon R.P.

Je vous suis trop redevable de l'honneur de votre souvenir et de la participation qu'il vous plaist me faire de voz bonnes et devotes prieres donc j'ay bien ressenty les effectz, en sortant de la grande maladie qui m'avoir accueilly dont je vous remercie trez humblement. Et vous envoye le livre *de Mons. de Muys* que vous me demandéz, ayant esté bien ayse que vous avez trouvé de l'entretien agreable en celluy du P. Morin. Quant à l'antiquité des Caracteres Samaritains, ce n'est pas une petite question, ne qui se puisse facilement traiter, et conclure dans une lettre missive, seulement vous diray-je, que quant il n'y auroit aultre Inconveniant que celluy qu'il vous a pleu de toucher sur le scrupule que pouvoit faire Esdras, d'abbandonner l'ancienne facon de l'escripture mosaique pour sa dignité, puis qu'il sembloit que dieu l'eust sanctiffiée en escripvant les tables de la loy, Je n'y trouverois pas tant d'Incompatibilité si on supposoit comme il se pourroit faire qu'elle eust esté lors comme prophanée puis que Moyse mesme n'avoir pas faict de difficulté de rompre et fracasser les tables de la loy, qu'il venoit recepvoir de la main de dieu, par une juste indignation contre le peuple d'Israel, qui s'en estoit rendu Indigne. Et quant à l'autre difficulté que vous faites sur la difference du Caractere moderne, tant Syriaque comme Caldaique, je vous diray que je n'estime pas que lesdits Caracteres modernes tant Caldaique comme Syriaque soient guieres anciens, ne possible guieres conformes, à ceux qui pouvoient estre du temps d'Esdras, non plus que les Caracteres, dont se servent les nations Italienne, Françoise, Espagnolle, & autres de l'Europe, pour escripre en langage tant latin que vulgaire, ne sont guieres conformes a ceux dont se servoient les Romains, avant la decadence de leur Empire, car les Caracteres majuscules, dont on s'est servy pour [79v] les frontispices des livres, depuis environ un siecle en cà, a esté emprunté & Imité du temps de nos peres seulement. Sur les marbres et Inscriptions anciennes, ou les vrayes figures et proportions du Caractere latin s'estoient conservées, Car la forme d'escripre en langue latine, qui sont conservée par traditive de pere à filz, n'a pas esté Inventée tout en un Coup soudainement pour passer d'une extremité à l'autre, à scavoir du beau Caractere majuscule & quarré, à celluy qui est arrondy que l'on apelle auiourdhuy dans les Imprimeries le Caractere Romain ou Italique, ou à celluy que l'on appelle dans les escrolles des Escripvains de Paris la lettre financiere, mais cela s'est abastardy petit a petit et par degréz ainsi qu'il se peut veriffier par les marbres mesmes, sur lequelz on voit bien de la difference de l'escripture de ceux qui sont gravéz de quelques siecles plus tard les uns que les autres. Et se recongnoist encores mieux dans les livres manuscriptz dans lesquelz l'escripture

changeoit de mode à chasque siecle, tout de mesme comme le language vulgaire & comme les habillementz voire la diversité des nations à produict une grande diversité de Changementz comme il se voit par la Comparaison des Caracteres modernes tant Italique et Francois que Allemand. Or J'estime que la mesme chose est arrivée non seulement aux Caracteres Caldaiques et Syriaques modernes, ainsy que je l'ay recongnu par la Comparaison de deux manuscriptz que j'ay en langue Syriaque, dont l'un est plus ancien que l'autre de deux ou trois cens ans, mais aussy aux Caracteres Hebraiques modernes, dont je n'estime pas que la forme, ay esté arrestée en la facon qu'elle est de plus grande antiquité, que celle du temps de Mazorets ayant mesme des fragmentz de vieux livres hebraiques dont le Caractere à beaucoup de difference d'avec celluy qui est le plus en usaige, et le Caractere mesme des Rabins n'est pas tousjours Conforme a soy mesme non plus que l'autre, J'ay mesme des vieux manuscriptz ou se trouvent des allegations en [80r] language hebraique dont le Caractere est si different de Celluy des Mazoretz qui n'est presque pas recongoissable. C'est pourquoy je ne tiens pas qu'il faille trouver estrange que la difference soit sy grande du Caractere Hebraique au Samaritain, n'estimant pas mesmes que les Samaritains dans le scrupule et superstition qu'ilz ont eu pour cela ayent peu conserver si religieusement la figure du Caractere Mosaique quilz ne l'ayent de beaucoup alterée, sinon en tout, au moins en plusieurs Caracteres de leur Alphabet et surtout en la lettre Tau, dont Il semble quilz ayent affecté d'abolir la forme quelle avoir d'une Croix, en haine du Christianisme, aussy bien que les Juifz, ne se pouvant point revoquer en doubte que les Juifz, n'ayent retenu le mesme Caractere, que l'on appelle aujourdhuy Samaritain, fort long temps aprez Esdras, Et d'estimer quilz en eussent deux si differentz entr'eulx, comme se trouvent aujourdhuy celluy que l'on appelle Samaritain & celluy que l'on appelle Hebraique, c'est ce que je ne me scaurois persuader sans voir d'autres preuves plus precises et plus concluantes que tout ce que j'en ay peu voir à presnt, dans les livres du temps, si vous en avéz d'autres que cela, vous m'obligerez bien fort de m'en faire part et encores plus de me commander Monsieur, Comme votre tres humble & tres obeissant serviteur de Peiresc

A Boysgency ce 6 Juillet 1632

à Monsieur le R.P. Dom denis de Sailly prieur de la Chartreuse d'Aix a Aix

Appendix 3

(Aix-en-Provence, bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 1168 unfoliated)

[recto]

SAMARITAINS

Memoire concernant les livres Sam[aritains]
qu'on desire avoir du Levant[e]

Il y a en la Palestine tout plein de SAMARITAINS, qui est
une secte de Juifs diverse des Juifs ordinaires.
Les principaux prebstres de leur Loy se tiennent
au MONT GARIZIM qui est prez de la Ville de Caesarée Hi[. . .
Et se font appeller d'un nom en leur Langue qui sign[ifie]
en Langue Francoise (Les Dependants du Mont B[enedictus])
Cez prebstres ont plusieurs livres, tant en langu[e Samaritaine]
Que en Langue Hebraique, escripts neantmoings en [caractere?]
Samaritain. Desquels on desire avoir tous . . .
pourront commodement recouvrer, Mais par [ticulierement?] . . .
les cinq livres de Moise. Ils on [E] . . .
residents au Grand Caire et en autres gro . . .
lesquels dependent tous de ceux de ce de la . . .
ont quelques ungs desdits livres, mais n . . .
abondance. Et ceux de la Palaestine en . . .
du Caire et autres lieux, des Almanachs . . .
toutes les années en leur Langue et leur . . .
leurs autres livres selon qu'ils en [ont] besoing . . .
De sorte que si ceux qui ghab [itent] . . .
difficiles à despartir de l . . .
avoir plus tost par . . .
du Caire ou autres villes . . .
dudit Mont Garizim.

[verso]

Les livres des Samaritains qu'on desire
avoir du Levant

[1] Les cinq livres de Moyse en langue Hebraique escripts en
Caracteres/ Samaritains qui sont touts divers des Caracteres Hebreus Vulgaires.

[2] Les mesmes cinq livres de Moyse, traduicts en Langue/
Samaritaine, escripts en mesme Caractere Samaritain./
Le livre qu'ils appellent IOSUE qui est une chronique/
de leur Histoire depuis le deceds de Moise jusques à cent ans aprez Jesus Christ./

Une Grammaire en langue Samaritaine, qu'ils appellent/
leur Alphabet./
Une petit sommaire de leur chronique depuis Adam qui avoit esté continué jusques à
l'an de Christ 1584/
Leur Almanach, qu'ils renouvellent touts les ans/
ou Computation des jours de leur année &c./
Les autres livres qui se pourront trouver escripts en caractere/
desdits Samaritains./

On desire principalement le premier des susdits livres qui est croixsé, & pour les autres si on les peult avoir commodement on en serà bien aise, sinon, on se contenterà du premier.

. . . . entre les mss. apporteez par M. de Sancy, le Pentateuche

Notes to Appendix 3

1. . . . [ce]-uz que lon/ . . . [des]ire voir/ principalement/ sur tous les autres
2. These are bracketed by Peiresc with the comment "Pour ceux icy on . . . / qu'aultant qu'il../ commodement et à . . . "

Notes

1. A version of this essay was presented at a panel of the Renaissance Society of America in April, 1995, in New York. I wish to thank Agnés Bresson, Tom Cerbu, Anthony Grafton, and Ingrid Rowland for reading earlier drafts and generously sharing with me their knowledge of early modern antiquarian culture. I am extremely grateful to Agnés Bresson for her invaluable assistance in preparing the appendices for publication. I acknowledge the support provided this project by the American Philosophical Society.

2. Francis Bacon, "De Augmentis Scientiarum," *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. John M. Robertson (Freeport, NY, 1970), 2.6.433.

3. Some recent important works include: Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1991) and *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, (Oxford, 1983, 1993), 2 vols.; Francis Haskell, *History and Its Images. Art and the Interpretation of the Past*, (New Haven and London, 1993); Alain Schnapp, *La Conquête du passé. Aux origines de l'archéologie*, (Paris, 1993); Francesco Solinas, ed. *Cassiano dal Pozzo. Atti del Seminario Internazionale di Studi. Napoli, 18–19 dicembre 1987*, (Rome, 1987); Bruno Neveu, *Erudition et religion aux XVII^e^et XVIII^e^*.

4. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13 (1950): 285–315; "L'eredità della filologia antica e il metodo storic o *siècles* (Paris, 1994); and *Documentary Culture. Florence and Rome from Grand-Duke Ferdinand I to Pope Alexander VII*, eds. E. Cropper, F. Perini and F. Solinas, (Bologna, 1991)," *Rivista Storica Italiana* 70 (1958): 442–58; and *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1990), esp. 54–79. Revisitings include, among other projects now in train, the memorial volume published by the Warburg Institute, *Ancient History and the Antiquarian. Essays in Honor of Arnaldo Momigliano* (London, 1995) and Mark Phillips, "Reconsiderations on History and Antiquarianism: Arnaldo Momigliano and the Historiography of Eighteenth-century Britain," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57 (1996): 297–316.

5. Peiresc's name remains a source of some mystification, often found written in a variety of ways by himself and by others. Its pronunciation, too, is uncertain. Gassendi, in the *Vita*, suggests that the Latin Peireskius conveyed the proper pronunciation. But letters preserved in Leiden offer a different perspective. In the correspondance with Charles de l'Escluse (Clusius) in the Universiteitsbibliothek Leiden (Vulc. 101) the first three letters (1602-4) are signed N.C. fabri de Callas. But in the postscript to that of 25 February 1604, Clusius is asked no longer to address correspondance to S^r^ de Callas but "Au Sr. de Peirets: chez mons^r^ le conseiller de Callas" (his father). In a letter written only two days later, however, Peiresc signed "N.C. Fabry." Clusius, upon receipt, nevertheless annotated the overleaf "1604 N.F. de Peiretz." The next two letters from Peiresc (15.ii.1605 and 25.viii.1605) were signed "N.C. de Peirets." In the last preserved letter, of 15 February 1606, the familiar "Peiresc" was scrawled at the bottom. A postscript gives some explanation for this latest change: "Notre petit village de Peiresc s'appelle dans les vieux cadastres Latins *Castrum de Petrisco*." (It was ommitted by Tamizey de Larroque in the printed version of this letter, *Lettres de Peiresc*, ed. Tamizey de Larroque (Paris, 1888–98), 7 vols. 7:956. These letters are printed from the *minutes*, not from the autographs in Leiden, and often lack signatures or postscripts.) For a person with distinct regional, professional, familial, and personal identities the choice of a name was, in fact, a choice. I thank Tom Cerbu for first alerting me to the question of pronunciation.

6. Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, 54; Laurence Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, 2.xiv; *Danielis Georgi Morhofi Polyhistor . . .* (Lübeck, 1708), 239; Balzac to Chapelain, quoted in Jean Jehasse, *Guez de Balzac et le Genie Romain 1597–1654*, (Paris, 1972), 422. The best modern treatments of Peiresc are those of Agnès Bresson in the apparatus of her edition of Peiresc's *Lettres à Claude Saumaise et à son entourage* (Florence, 1992); Cecilia Rizza, *Peiresc e l'Italia* (Turin, 1965), Sydney H. Aufrère, *La Momie et la Tempête. N.-C.F. de Peiresc et la "curiosité Egyptienne" en Provence au début du XVIIe siècle* (Avignon, 1990), and the essays of David Jaffé, most recently "Peiresc—Wissenschaftlicher Betrieb in einem Raritäten-Kabinett,"

Macrocosmos in Microcosmo, ed. Andreas Grote, (Opladen, 1994), 301–22 and "Peiresc and New Attitudes to Authenticity in the Seventeenth Century," *Why Fakes Matter. Essays on Problems of Authenticity*, ed. Mark Jones (London, 1993), 157–73 and "Aspects of Gem Collection in the Early Seventeenth Century-Peiresc and Pasqualini," *The Burlington Magazine* 135 (1993): 103–20.

7. De Sailly to Peiresc, 23.viii.1632, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Latin 9340, fol.67v. For discussions of this theme, see Helmut Zedelmaier, *Bibliotheca Universalis und Bibliotheca Selecta. Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit*, (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 1992) and 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): 132–51.

8. Pierre Gassendi, *Viri Illustris Nicolai Claudii Fabricii de Peiresc Vita* (1st ed. 1641), translated by William Rand as *The Mirrour of True Nobility and Gentility* (London, 1657), 186, 265.

9. For modern accounts of this encounter, see Philippe de Robert, "La Naissance des études samaritaines en Europe aux XVI^{e} et XVII^{e} siècles," 15–27, and Mathias Delcor, "La Correspondance des savants européens, en quête des manuscrits, avec les Samaritains du XVI^{e} aux XIX^{e} siècle," 27–43, both in *Études samaritaines. Pentateuque et Targum, exègèse et philologie, chroniques*, ed. Jean-Pierre Rothschild and Guy Dominique Sixdenier (Louvain-Paris, 1988); Jean-Pierre Rothschild, "Autour du Pentateuque samaritain. Voyageurs, enthousiastes et savants," *La Bible au Grand Siècle*, ed. Jean-Robert Armogathe, (Paris, 1985) 61–74; J.G. Fraser, "A Checklist of Samaritan Manuscrits Known to Have Entered Europe before A.D. 1700," *Abr-Nahrain* 21 (1982–83): 10–27; and the editor's introduction in Jean-Pierre Rothschild, ed., *Catalogue des manuscrits samaritains de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1985).

10. Peiresc to Scaliger, 15.ii.1606, in *Epistres françaises des personages illustres et doctes à Joseph-Juste de la Scala*, ed. Jacques de Reves (Harderwijk, 1624), 142.

11. Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship. II: Historical Chronology* (Oxford, 1993), 181–82, 241.

12. Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum* (1583), 2, quoted in Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger II*, 262.

13. Scaliger himself told students at Leiden that "even if he had been really rich, he would not have built a great library but would have travelled extensively" (quoted in Grafton, *Scaliger II*, 108.

14. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger II*, 88, 710.

15. Alasdair Hamilton has shown how William Bedwell took up Scaliger's insight by studying Arabic and Turkish together against the common backdrop provided by Islam (*William Bedwell the Arabist 1563–1632* [Leiden, 1985], 85).

16. Arnaldo Momigliano, "A Prelude to Mr. Gibbon," *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Rome, 1980), 1:249–63.

17. La Popelinière to Scaliger, 4.i.1604, *Epistres françoises*, 303–7.

18. Peiresc to Dupuy, 18.xii.1632, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 3:396. Peiresc's two copies of Scaliger's *De re nummaria* (Leyden, 1616) were also heavily annotated. See H. Omont, "Les manuscrits et les livres annotes de Fabride Peiresc," *Annales du Midi* 1 (1889): 316–39.

19. Grafton, *Scaliger II*, 242.

20. In 1581 Scaliger wrote to Claude Dupuy asking him to contact their mutual friend in Padua, Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, the later patron of Peiresc, and request him to acquire a Samaritan *Computus* through a Jewish friend in Constantinople. In a casual but revealing aside Scaliger speculated that Coptic texts might also be accessible through the same channel (Scaliger to Dupuy, 4.ix.1581), *Lettres françaises inédites de Joseph Scaliger*, ed. Tamizey de Larroque (Paris-Agen, 1879), 117–18). This casual conjunction of Samaritan and Coptic was to reappear as a research program in Peiresc's correspondance of the 1630s.

21. See Grafton, *Scaliger II*, 413–21.

22. On the back of a broadside published by Marseilles's municipal government and cannibalized by Peiresc for scrap paper, he recorded information concerning the provenance of his Samaritana, including these letters. They fell into the hands first of M. Genebrard, then of M. Pol Hurault the Archbishop of Aix, and finally came to M. Billon, who passed them to Peiresc's friend Gallaup de Chasteuil, from whom they reached Peiresc in August of 1629 (Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol.93r).

23. Originals are in Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Sam. 11; Peiresc's Samaritan, Hebrew, and Latin copies are in Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fols.95–103.

24. Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fols. 102–3.

25. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger II*, 631 n.48.

26. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger II* 737 n.30.

27. Leschassier to Peiresc 10.v.1610, Aix-en-Provence, Bibliothèque Méjanes, Ms. 204 (1022), 127–29.

28. For a discussion of this part of the story see my "Les Origines de la Bible polyglotte de Paris: *philologia sacra*, Contre-Réforme et *raison d'état*," *XVII^{e} Siècle* (forthcoming).

29. Peiresc to Dupuy, 19.v.1628, *Lettres de Peiresc* , 1:617.

30. Peiresc to Aleandro, 27.v.1628, Rome, Vatican, Barberini-Latina Ms. 6504, fol. 216r.

31. Peiresc to Holstenius, 24.ix.1628, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 5:293.

32. Peiresc to Holstenius, 10.xi.1628, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 5:297.

33. Peiresc to Dupuy, 22xi.1628, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 1:751.

34. Peiresc to della Valle, 26.xi.1628, Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol. 242r-v; Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213 (1031), 63.

35. Peiresc to della Valle, 26.xi.1628, Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol. 242v; Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213 (1031), 64.

36. Peiresc to della Valle, 9.x.1630, Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol. 249r; Aix-en-Peovence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213 (1031), 83.

37. Peiresc to Morin, 8.xi.1632, *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis*, [ed. Richard Simon] (London, 1682), 190–92.

38. Samuel Petit, *De Epocha annorum Sabbaticorum apud Samaritanos*, Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol. 85.

39. Peiresc to Holstenius, 6.viii.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 5:341. In a letter to della Valle of 7 September 1633, Peiresc addressed precisely this issue of formulating a Phoenician grammar from the well-known passage in Plautus (Rome, Vatican, A.S.V. Archivio della Valle-del Bufalo 52, fol.6r; Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol. 251r; Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213, (1031), 93), which Petit himself deciphered by reading the characters as Hebrew and then inserting the missing vowels. Petit sent a copy of this analysis, dated July 1629, to Peiresc (B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol. 83). Examples of Petit's Phoenician scholarship preserved in Peiresc's papers also include a brief examination of the relationship between Hebrew, Canaanite, Phoenician, and Punic (fol. 84).

40. Peiresc to Dupuy, 21.vii.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:133–34. In January 1630, Peiresc wrote to Gassendi, then in Paris, introducing Petit, whom he described as possessing much that "would link you in friendship with him." Peiresc thought that Petit could make an important contribution towards deciphering the Samaritan texts as he had already, following in the footsteps of Scaliger, "found beautiful things to write about the Computus of the Samaritans" (Peiresc to Gassendi, 18.i.1630, *Lettres de Peiresc* 5:238–39).

41. While his comparison of della Valle's Targum with his own seems to show familiarity with Samaritan, and therefore Hebrew, a letter from François de Gallaup-Chasteuil of 1630 indicates that Peiresc left it to him to comment on a Samaritan computus (Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol. 76).

42. Dupuy to Peiresc, 20.iii.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:687. The text is currently in Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fols. 51–56.

43. Peiresc to Dupuy 14.iv.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:68. Crinesius began, as was common in this genre, with the history of the Samaritans out of Biblical sources and then added the observations of scholars like Scaliger. In doctrinaire Protestant fashion he rejected the newly received view that the Samaritan alphabet was older than the familiar Hebrew letters. It was precisely this style of *parti pris* erudition that Peiresc scorned (*Lashon Shamraita: hoc est Lingua Samaritica* (Altdorf, n.d.) esp. sigs. [A4]-B.

44. Peiresc to della Valle, 2.v.1630, Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol. 248v; Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213 (1031), 80–81. It is part of a shipment of letters to the usual

Roman addressees (Cardinal Barberini, Suares, Menestrier, dal Pozzo, Cardinal Bentivoglio, Francesco Gualdo, Christophe Dupuy, and Holstenius) sent on the 15th (see "Les Petits mémoires de Peiresc," ed. Tamizey de Larroque, *Bulletin Rubens* 4 (1896): 99–100; this record of Peiresc's correspondence is preserved in Paris, B.N., Ms. nouv. acq. fr. 5169).

45. Peiresc to della Valle, 9.x.1630, Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1871, fol.249v; Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms. 213 (1031), 83–84.

46. Denys de Sailly to Peiresc, 3.vii.1632, Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol.81r.

47. De Muis was professor of Hebrew at the Collège Royal and the author of a series of stinging attacks on Morin's "Samaritan thesis" entitled "Assertio veritatig hebraicae" (1631, 1634). He was said to have been encouraged by Richelieu in response to Le Jay's refusal to let him take over patronage of the Polyglot and have it bear his name.

48. Peiresc to de Sailly, 6.vii.1632, Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fols. 79–80.

49. In a letter as late 12.i.1603 to his closest friend, J.A. de Thou, Scaliger wrote of Postel, whom he had encountered in Paris in 1562, that "Jamais homme ne m'enseigna tant que celui-là" (*Lettres françaises inédites*, 351).

50. On this see J.G. Fraser, "A Prelude to the Samaritan Pentateuch Texts of the Paris Polyglot Bible," in *A World in Season. Essays in Honor of William MacKane* (Sheffield, 1986), 223–47. Fraser relates the problem of dating to the question of authorship; he suggests a dating between 1613 and 1616, with the third section most likely Peiresc's.

51. Peiresc to Dupuy, 7.xi.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:192–93.

52. Peiresc to Dupuy, 18.xi.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:203. Much the same information was conveyed to della Valle in a letter of 4 March 1630.

53. Peiresc to Dupuy, 18.xi.1629, *Lettres de Peiresc*, 2:203–4.

54. Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1821, fol.486r.

55. Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1821, fol.454r.

56. Paris, B.N., Ms. Latin 9340, fol.49r.

57. Aix-en-Provence, Bibl. Méjanes, Ms.1168, [unfoliated].

58. Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine, Ms. 1864, fol.261r.

MUSICAL SCHOLARSHIP IN ITALY AT THE END OF THE RENAISSANCE, 1500–1650

From Veritas to Verisimilitude

Ann Moyer

Music had been a well-defined and well-established discipline since the Middle Ages. It was among the first fields affected by the extension of humanist methods, including history, into subjects outside the *studia humanitatis*. In fact, the sixteenth-century debates over the nature of music and its study helped define the humanists' studies of philology and history as methods that could be applied to other disciplines. These debates resulted not only in the reclassification of music but also in the development of new ways of classifying subjects more generally, and raised questions about how fields of knowledge related to one another. Thus the field of music and its changes offer an early example of the establishment of new disciplinary definitions and boundaries that occurred during the next two centuries.

The existence of "music" as a discipline meant, of course, that the disciplinary term referred not only to music compositions or performances but also to scholarly writings about music. In this respect music differed from subjects later seen as related to it, such as the visual arts; Europeans produced works of art in great numbers long before formal writings about art were undertaken, let alone identified as a field in their own right. Indeed, studying music could and often did mean the reading of texts rather than the production or analysis of musical compositions. Both the existence of a strong classical and postclassical textual tradition and the ephemeral nature of musical performances themselves worked together to give music a unique relationship to historical analysis. For not only did past writings about music exist in abundance, but they were much more accessible to historical study than were past performances. In addition, the discipline of music was closely identified with a particular philosophical tradition—the Platonic and Pythagorean—which lay behind its claims that it was a master discipline, one both prior and essential to the study of others.

By the late sixteenth century the scholarly methods of late humanism, rather than Pythagorean mathematics, came instead to serve more and more as the ways to define and study music. This art of music was now distinguished from the closely related science of sound.[1] The introduction of humanist analysis meant that for the first time both musical thought and musical style could be studied historically. Yet in the process music—while still seen as an important arena for scholarship and practice—came to be seen less as a master discipline than as one studied with the tools of other fields.

History and the Disciplines

The Reclassification of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe

edited by

Donald R. Kelley

THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER PRESS 1997