THE MAKING OF THE HUMANITIES

First International Conference
on the History of the Humanities

Conference website: http://www.illc.uva.nl/MakingHumanities/

Title page: Egidius Sadeler after Hans von Aachen, *Minerva Introduces Painting to the Liberal Arts,* engraving, © Rijksmuseum Amsterdam.

Editing and lay-out: Thijs Weststeijn

THE MAKING OF THE HUMANITIES

FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE HISTORY OF THE HUMANITIES

The Emergence of the Humanities in Early Modern Europe

23-25 October 2008, University of Amsterdam
Doelenzaal, Singel 425, Amsterdam

Program and Abstracts

Doelenzaal (conference venue): Singel 425

SPUI25 (public event): Spui 25

De Waag (conference dinner): Nieuwmarkt 4

Mayor's residence (reception): Herengracht 502

Preface

HOW DID THE HUMANITIES DEVELOP from the *artes liberales*, via the *studia humanitatis,* to modern disciplines? This is the first of a biennially planned conference that focuses on the comparative history of the 'humanistic sciences'. Although there exist separate histories of single humanities disciplines, a comparative history would satisfy a long-felt need and fill a conspicuous gap in intellectual history.

The theme of the current conference is 'The Emergence of the Humanities in Early Modern Europe (1400-1800)'. The papers deal with the history of philology, linguistics, logic, rhetoric, music theory, *ars historica* and *ars poetica*, with an emphasis on their interrelations as well as their impact on the other sciences in the early modern period. An edited book is planned, with the provisional title *Another History of Science: The Making of the Humanities*.

We gratefully acknowledge support by the European Science Foundation (ESF), the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC) of the University of Amsterdam. We also thank Karin Gigengack and Peter van Ormondt for their help in organizing the conference.

The organizers:
Rens Bod, Jaap Maat and Thijs Weststeijn

Program

For a map of locations see page 4

Thursday 23 October

9.45-10.15: Coffee and tea
10.15-10.25: Opening of the conference by José van Dijck, Dean of the Faculty of Humanities

Chair: Eric Jan Sluijter
10.25-11.15: Invited paper by Ingrid Rowland (University of Notre Dame School of Architecture).
"Describing the World: From Metaphor to Science"

11.15-12.25: **Heretics and Humanists in Italy**
11.15-11.50: Hilary Gatti (U. of Rome, La Sapienza). "Giordano Bruno and Metaphor"
11.50-12.25: Bernward Schmidt (U. of Münster). "„In Erudition there is no Heresy." The Humanities in Baroque Rome"

12.25-13.30: Lunch

Chair: David Rijser
13.30-15.15: **Painting and Poetry as Liberal Arts**
13.30-14.05: Marieke van den Doel (U. of Amsterdam). "Painting and the Orphic Lyre: the Liberal Arts According to Ficino"
14.05-14.40: Thijs Weststeijn (U. of Amsterdam). "Pictography and Uto pianism in the Seventeenth Century"
14.40-15.15: Cesc Esteve (King's College London). "The History of Poetry in Early Modern Literary Criticism"

15.15-15.45: Coffee and tea; snacks

Chair: Juliëtte Groenland

15.45-17.30: **Language and Education**

15.45-16.20: Michael Edwards (U. of Cambridge). "Rhetoric, Text and Commentary in the Philosophy of the Schools, 1550-1640"

16.20-16.55: Paivi Mehtonen (U. of Tampere). "Towards the Obscure Discipline of Comparative Literature: A.G. Baumgarten (1714-1762) and George Campbell (1719-1796) on Rhetoric and Poetics"

16.55-17.30: Michiel Leezenberg (U. of Amsterdam). "Wilhelm von Humboldt and Adamantios Korais on Language, Nation and Education"

17.45-18.45: **Reception** at the Residence of the Mayor of Amsterdam, Job Cohen, Herengracht 502
(ten minutes walking from the conference venue)

Friday 24 October

9.45-10.15: Coffee and tea

Chair: to be announced

10.15-11.05: Invited paper David Cram (Jesus College, University of Oxford).
"The Changing Relations between Grammar, Rhetoric and Music in the Early Modern Period"

11.05-12.15: **Linguists and Logicians**

11.05-11.40: Jaap Maat (U. of Amsterdam). "The artes sermocinales in Times of Adversity: How Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric Survived the Seventeenth Century"

11.40-12.15: Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam). "Formalization in the Humanities: From Valla to Scaliger"

12:15-13.15: Lunch

Chair: Wijnand Mijnhardt

13.15-14.05: Invited paper Floris Cohen (Univerity of Utrecht). **"Music as Science and as Art – The 16th/17th-Century Destruction of Cosmic Harmony"**

14.05-15.15: **Science versus Art**

14.05-14.40: Gabriela Ilnitchi Currie (U. of Minnesota). "Partially Modern: Scholastic Sound Particles and Empiricist Overtones"

14.40-15.15: Cynthia Pyle (New York U.). "Renaissance Humanism and Science: A Different View of the Development of the Humanities in Early Modern Europe"

15.15-15.45: Coffee and tea; snacks

Chair: Dirk van Miert

15.45-16.55: **Early Humanism and its Impact**

15.45-16.20: Lodi Nauta (U. of Groningen). "Lorenzo Valla's Critique of Scholastic Language and Philosophy"

16.20-16.55: Juliette Groenland (U. of Amsterdam). "Humanism in the Classroom, a Reassessment"

17.30-18.45: **Public Event on the History of the Humanities** at Spui 25

19.15-21.30: Conference dinner in De Waag, Nieuwmarkt 4 (Conference dinner voucher needed)

Saturday 25 October

9.45-10.15: Coffee and tea

Chair: Ingrid Rowland

10.15-11.05: Invited paper Anthony Grafton (Princeton University). **"How Late was Late Humanism? Renaissance Learning and the Research University"**

11.05-12.15: **Defending the Text**

11.05-11.40: Már Jónsson (U. of Iceland). "Manuscript Hunting and Philological Progress in the Seventeenth Century"

11.40-12.15: Dirk van Miert (U. of London). "Humanism and Warfare: Philology and Military Engineering in the Decades around 1600"

12-15-13.15: Lunch

Chair: Thijs Weststeijn

13.15-15.00: **Philology and Philosophy**

13.15-13.50: Martine van Ittersum (U. of Dundee). "All in the Family: How Hugo Grotius' Relations Shaped the Writing, Circulation and Publication of His Work"

13.50-14.25: Piet Steenbakkers (U. of Utrecht). "Spinoza in the History of Biblical Scholarship"

14.25-15.00: Martine Pécharman (CNRS-EHESS). "The Import of the Debate between Richard Simon and Antoine Arnauld"

15.00-15.30: Coffee and tea; snacks

Chair: Michiel Leezenberg

15.30-16.40: **The History of History**

15.30-16.05: Jacques Bos (U. of Amsterdam). "Renaissance Historiography: Framing a New Mode of Historical Experience"

16.05-16.40: Wouter Hanegraaff (U. of Amsterdam). "Philosophy's Shadow: Jacob Brucker (1696-1770) and the History of Thought"

Chair: Anthony Grafton

16.40-17.15: General Discussion:
Towards a Comparative History of the "Humanistic Sciences"?
Publication plans and future conference

17.15-18.15: Closing and drinks

Thursday 23 October

10.25-11.15: Invited paper by Ingrid Rowland (University of Notre Dame School of Architecture).
'Describing the World: From Metaphor to Science'

The rise of experimental science in the early modern period coincided with changes in literature, art, and imagery. Metaphor and allegory made room for expository prose, personifications shared space with graphs. Raphael's School of Athens provides an evocative point of departure, for it provides, though personification and allegory, a detailed portrait of philosophy's range in the early sixteenth century, but also an early and powerful example of information presented in graphic form. The differences between this fresco and the paintings of Caravaggio or the printed illustrations of Athanasius Kircher are in many ways the same differences that distinguish sixteenth- from seventeenth-century writing; these differences express, with unusual clarity, discrete and distinct habits of thought.

11.15-12.25: **Heretics and Humanists in Italy**

11.15-11.50: Hilary Gatti (University of Rome, La Sapienza).
'Giordano Bruno and Metaphor'

'When the divines speak as if they found in natural things only the meanings commonly attributed to them, they should not be assumed as authorities; but rather when they speak indifferently, conceding nothing to the vulgar herd. Then their words should be listened to, as should the enthusiasm of poets, who have spoken of the same things in lofty terms. Thus, one should not take as a metaphor what was not intended as a metaphor, and, on the other hand, take as truth what was said as a similitude'. (*The Ash Wednesday Supper,* Dialogue 4)

As its starting point, the paper will take this passage, which seems to compare metaphor unfavourably with scientific truth. The Copernican discussion within which this statement occurs makes it quite clear that the Copernican principle of heliocentricity, particularly when expanded to include the infinity of the universe, is considered by Bruno as a cosmological picture of universal truth, and not as a purely instrumental hypothesis to facilitate astronomical calculations. The passage suggests that Frances Yates was wrong to consider Bruno's Copernicanism as a Hermetic hieroglyph or diagram – let us say a metaphor – within which, hidden and concealed, lay 'potent divine mysteries'. On the contrary, the Copernican heliocentric principle is, for Bruno, the divine truth itself, which has recently been brought to light. Copernicus is, for Bruno, the genius who dragged the heliocentric principle from under the shadows of a centuries-long distorted picture, or false metaphor, of a geocentric universe, supplying Bruno with the foundations on which to construct what he thinks of as a true picture of an infinite universe. Metaphoric expression and scientific truth seem at this point to be antithetical.

Does this mean that for Bruno metaphor as such is to be banned? Surely not. Rather metaphor seems to define what we may call for Bruno 'the humanities' as opposed to natural philosophy or science: that is to say, the universe of words and images through which the mind conducts its search for truth. Bruno associates 'the humanities' in this sense with above all three groups: the true divines, or those philosophers who attempt to reveal the hidden face of divine truth; the true poets, who are closely associated by Bruno with true divines (this is consistent with his choice of the Biblical *Song of Songs* as one of the greatest texts ever written), and the true painters, whose visual images combine with words to form Bruno's universe of languages. The intimate relationship that Bruno envisages between these three groups is expressed in an early work on the art of memory where he writes: 'Philosophers are in some way painters and poets; poets are painters and philosophers; painters are philosophers and poets. Which is why true poets, true painters and true philosophers search for and admire one another.'

Within this universe of languages, which is the context in which the human mind is destined to work, it thus becomes essential to distinguish

between bad and good metaphors, or what modern linguistic philosophers call dead and live metaphors. Such a distinction involves not only the written language but also the language of images, both mnemonic and geometric, which form such an important part of Bruno's work.

The main part of the paper will be dedicated to this aspect of Bruno's thought, underlining the emphasis on creativity which lies behind his definition of the imagination: individual creativity rather than general rules of the mind. In this sense, Bruno can be seen as attempting to dissolve the orthodox Renaissance tradition of the humanities, which tended to stress fidelity to classical rules and models as a necessary condition for the intellectual disciplines to develop within the modern world.

11.50-12.25: Bernward Schmidt (University of Münster).
'"In Erudition there is no Heresy." The Humanities in Baroque Rome'

At first glance, it seems hard to believe that Rome should have been a centre of erudition and humanities in the first half of the 18th century as it is rather associated with the inquisition, which is said to have ruined the Italian Renaissance culture, than with eminent scholars. However, their number was not as small as it might appear; the probably best known among the Roman scholars are Giovanni Giustino Ciampini, Francesco Bianchini, Domenico Passionei, or the future pope Prospero Lambertini. These inquisitive intellectuals included recent publications in their own books and tried to reach the level that 'ultramontane' scholars already had achieved. Being real members of the Republic of Letters, whose networks spread all over Europe, they were provided with information from the entire continent by their correspondents and by learned journals.

As Roman universities were engaged rather in teaching than in research, concentrating on single scholars who were interested in the humanities is more profitable than to examine their professors. Strikingly, most of them were at the same time counselors or members of the Roman Inquisition or the Congregation of the Index, where they had to censor those books which they loved to read for their private studies (above all: forbidden protestant literature!). This apparent contradiction allows a

new perspective on the situation of the humanities in Baroque Rome: intellectual elites welcomed new developments, especially in historiography – Jean Mabillon was much honored during his visit – but only to a certain extent: theological questions, the papal authority or (above all) the interpretation of ecclesiastical history were excluded of the discussion. It was thus a 'controversistical' scheme of reading and censoring Roman scholars used; undoubtedly, theology was the leading discipline, the humanities had to submit.

In my contribution, I shall examine the specific conditions of scholarship in Rome between the Republic of Letters and the Inquisition from ca. 1670 to 1760 and present the results of my recent research on the Roman scholars. The model of the *pio letterato* seems to describe quite exactly the attitude of these men towards scholarship and the humanities: (controversial) theology remained the basis of their work, but they were eager to find out about developments in the humanities and science. For them, there existed no contradiction between learning and censoring.

13.30-15.15: **Painting and Poetry as Liberal Arts**

13.30-14.05: Marieke van den Doel (University of Amsterdam).
'Painting and the Orphic Lyre: the Liberal Arts According to Ficino'

The Florentine philosopher Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) was one of the first humanists to suggest that painting, which was until then regarded as a craft, should be included among the *artes liberales*. In his main work, *Theologia Platonica* (1482), Ficino compares his own time to a Golden Age that 'has brought back to light the Liberal Arts which had almost been extinct; Grammar, Poetry, Rhetoric, Painting, Architecture, Music and the ancient art of singing to the Orphic Lyre'. In this way, Ficino formulates an almost completely new *quadrivium*.

Throughout all of his works, Ficino provides many examples of the ways in which practicing these seven *artes* establishes conclusive proof of the divinity of the human soul. In pursuing and studying the liberal arts as formulated by Ficino, man makes extensive use of his imagination and ul-

timately contends with nature. Surprisingly, to demonstrate his theory, Ficino adduces mainly visually and auditively oriented examples; the *trivium* is of no relevance. The disciplines of painting, music and 'singing to the Orphic Lyre' compete in this way for excellence among the *artes*; their goal is to provide proof of man's divinity.

As the present paper investigates, Ficino's varied and frequent remarks on the supremacy of sight over hearing, and of painting over music, were used by art theorists such as Vasari, De Holanda and Comanini to raise the status of painting above that of a craft. In addition, Ficino was cited to argue that in painting, more than in any of the other arts, man is able to surpass nature and thus to imitate God. The paper will demonstrate that Ficino, who is generally seen as one of the 'defenders of the text' on the basis of his seminal translations of Plato, effectively wielded a highly idiosyncratic view of the hierarchy of the arts in which scholarship and science were entirely subordinate to beauty.

14.05-14.40: Thijs Weststeijn (University of Amsterdam).
'Pictography and Utopianism in the Seventeenth Century'

The Dutch Golden Age engendered conspicuous development in philology as well as in the visual arts. On the fault line of these two realms, pictography became a topical subject of scholarly interest. On the basis of the Aristotelian notion that 'the mind never thinks without images', the visual arts played a central role in theories about philosophical language and in reconstructions of the 'primitive language' supposedly spoken by Adam.

This talk will reveal how topics as varied as emblems, the hieroglyphs, and Chinese as well as Meso-American writing were discussed in the context of pictography. References to Vossius, Hornius, Kircher and Comenius will clarify how the Chinese characters became a particular focus of interest. They were interpreted as universally intelligible ideograms that had made possible a peaceful empire reigned by philosophers. Ultimately, Leibniz saw Chinese writing as key to his ideas for a utopian society. By contrast, the orthodox Protestant Elias Grebnitz thought that every time the name of God was written in Chinese, one committed a sin

against the Second Commandment. When Andreas Müller finally found the *clavis sinica*, that was a key to the hieroglyphs as well as to Chinese, he was even accused of heresy.

The heated discussions about pictography reveal how seventeenth-century scholars, searching for new routes for the attainment and dispersal of knowledge, were keen on combining widely different disciplines – in this case, bringing together linguistics, art theory, archaeology and political thought. Apparently, information about distant civilizations could serve as a catalyst in this 'interdisciplinary' process, which was characteristic of the Baroque world view of 'universal knowledge' while at the same time heralding a more integrated approach of the humanities.

14.40-15.15: Cesc Esteve (King's College London).
'The History of Poetry in Early Modern Literary Criticism'

Most of the literary treatises written in the 16th century furnish an account of the origins of poetry. Early Modern *ars poetica* adopts this narrative from the medieval and humanist traditions of defenses and praises of poetry, where, in order to justify that it is a discipline worth studying both for moral and educational purposes, it is argued that God gave the gift of literature to men, that verse was the first language of theology and philosophy, that the Bible contains excellent models of poetry, and that poetry gave birth to the rest of sciences. Historians of Renaissance poetics have long considered that these accounts cannot be treated as a genuine historical discourse on poetry because they deal in myth rather than historical fact, because they search for the nature, or the essence, of poetry, rather than trace historical change, and above all because the quest for origins is not really motivated by an interest in the past: it is predominately an apologetical means to legitimize the activity and the theories of the critics.

However, a close comparative examination of these accounts in some of the most influential 16th century Italian, French and English *artes poeticae* – from Pietro Bembo to George Puttenham, through Jules Cesar Scaliger and Estienne Pasquier – will show that this humanist discourse does in fact evolve towards more secular and scientific approaches to the

literary past. My paper will argue that the interests, forms and functions of the research into, and the narrative of, the origins of poetry – both classic and vernacular – share many of the principles, methods and ideological targets of contemporary cultural and political historiography. In short, literary historiography has much in common with the *cognitio historica* as it is prescribed and practised by the authors of *artes historicae* in the Early Modern period.

15.45-17.30: **Language and Education**

15.45-16.20: Michael Edwards (University of Cambridge).
'Rhetoric, Text and Commentary in the Philosophy of the Schools, 1550-1640'

Accounts of the transformation that university disciplines such as natural philosophy and metaphysics underwent by the end of the seventeenth century often discuss a significant shift in the approach adopted by Early Modern scholastic and Aristotelian authors. This transition is commonly described as a move away from commentaries towards more synthetic philosophical textbooks, in which philological approaches to Aristotle's text informed by humanist techniques were replaced by a new, more pragmatic ordering of material designed for teaching convenience.

But this process, in which the textbook replaced the commentary as the dominant form of Aristotelian philosophical publication by about 1610, is still strangely obscure, partly because intellectual historians have often been inclined to take contemporary criticisms of the 'barbaric' and torturous style of the scholastics at face value – few have been interested in thinking about these texts from a *rhetorical* point of view.

This paper will argue that taking the style and structure of Early Modern scholastic texts more seriously has several clear benefits: it reveals some of the (often quite sophisticated) rhetorical strategies used to address the substantial expansion of material and new arguments that challenged late Aristotelian authors, and it also gives a more nuanced picture of the connections between Aristotelian philosophy and 'humanities' disciplines such as rhetoric and philology in this period.

I will look at two case studies in particular, drawn from both Protestant and Catholic Aristotelian natural philosophy and metaphysics. The first examines the approach of Jesuits such as Suarez and the Collegium Conimbricense to the activity of textual commentary, focusing on the strategies they used to integrate new material and depart from Aristotle's text itself. The second concerns the persistence and mutation of the commentary approach within philosophical textbooks, often in the form of notes and commentaries on significant earlier texts. Here, I will consider contemporary Lutheran responses to Melanchthon's *De anima,* such as Johannes Magirus's textbook *Anthropologia* (1603), a number of which were structured around annotations and commentaries, not on Aristotle, but on Melanchthon's text. In this tradition, it was not the case that the textbook abruptly replaced the familiar techniques and approaches of Aristotelian commentary – rather, the two cross-pollinated.

My overall argument is that historians of philosophy should be willing to consider not just the subject-matter of late Aristotelian philosophy, but also its form.

16.20-16.55: Paivi Mehtonen (University of Tampere).
'Towards the Obscure Discipline of Comparative Literature: A.G. Baumgarten (1714-1762) and George Campbell (1719-1796) on Rhetoric and Poetics'

The problematic conjunction of words, ideas and objects came to constitute a burning issue in the eighteenth century. This paper will investigate the German and British conflicts in which the opposing camps gathered on the one hand the sciences of words – the traditional *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, supplemented with poetics) – and on the other the 'solid' studies of objects, perception and thought. In the conflicts of these disciplines various conceptions of linguistic tradition were also set at odds. The disputes assumed protean forms: the universal scepticism of the Early Modern period versus the alleged dogmatism of medieval linguistics; Humanism versus Scholasticism; Rationalism versus Empiricism. In these controversies one further pair of concepts emerged in a new light: clarity versus obscurity.

In the eighteenth century both the Rationalist and Empiricist students of language treated the matter of obscurity as one of the challenges to the study of language and thought. This tradition was the direct source of inspiration for two theorists: A.G. Baumgarten (1714-1762), commonly regarded as the German father of aesthetics, and George Campbell (1719-1796), Scottish philosopher, theologian and rhetorician. While the philosophical influences underlying Baumgarten's thought stemmed from German Rationalism (Leibniz/Wolff), Campbell's philosophy of rhetoric was inspired by British Empiricism (Locke/Hume). Nevertheless, they meet – at least in the realm of conceptual history – in the process where rhetoric and poetics were defended as parts of a unified theory of knowledge. In Baumgarten and Campbell the traditional legacy of the *trivium* was condensed into interdisciplinary conceptions by systematising the linguistic and philosophical elements of traditional poetics and rhetoric. Baumgarten and Campbell developed defences of obscurity which were to be of great significance in the development of the study of literature.

This paper will argue that both Baumgarten's aesthetics (as *theoria liberalium artium*) and Campbell's philosophy of rhetoric represent metasciences (or -disciplines) of the liberal arts. These metasciences deduce general principles from fields which had traditionally been linked to the practice of speaking and writing well. In this project both Baumgarten and Campbell were interested in the challenge of obscure language and thought. By theorising this field they participated in creating intellectual space for the emergence of *Literaturwissenschaft* as a discipline that was (decades before the dawn of Romanticism) conceptually ready to defend both its existence and its interest in obscure discourses.

16.55-17.30: Michiel Leezenberg (University of Amsterdam).
'Wilhelm von Humboldt and Adamantios Korais on Language, Nation and Education'

Wilhelm von Humboldt is rightly seen as a pioneer of comparative linguistics and as the arch father of *Bildung*, the modern educational ideal of the humanities; but the link between his linguistic and his educational views is surprisingly rarely made. Yet, the link between language, educa-

tional reform and nation is central to his work. This link is even clearer in Von Humboldt's contemporary Adamantios Korais, who did more than anyone else to create both the modern Greek language of education (*katharevousa*) and a corpus of secular classical Greek literature to serve as the basis for a modern, educated nation. The careers of both are intriguingly parallel: both have played a crucial role in reformulating classical Greek antiquity as a pivotal element of modern national education. Interestingly, both lived in Paris during the French Revolution; but their reactions to it differed significantly. By confronting Humboldt and Korais, the links between enlightenment ideals of education and civilization and romantic ideals of popular sovereignty and language as the soul of a nation are thematized anew. It will appear that both authors share crucial backgrounds in the work of Condillac and the French *idéologues*.

Friday 24 October

10.15-11.05: Invited paper David Cram (Jesus College, University of Oxford).

'The Changing Relations between Grammar, Rhetoric and Music in the Early Modern Period'

This paper will explore the changing orientations of the liberal arts disciplines in the 'longer' seventeenth century, with particular focus on grammar and music. Both of these disciplines underwent radical changes and developments over this period. In the case of music this is more clearly manifest in a dramatic realignment from the *quadrivium* to the *trivium* — from the *artes reales* to the *artes sermonicales*.

The starting point of the paper will be 17th-century schemes for the construction of a philosophical language, and the position of universal grammar in the context of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*. From this perspective I will then look at various aspects of music which relate to 17th-century thinking about language and communication. One area is the issue of combinatorics, and the manner in which such an approach groups language and music together for a range of thinkers from Kircher through to Leibniz, and including the British philosophical language planners. A second area is the place of music in thinking about the origin of language. It is striking that in the mid-seventeenth century British thinkers were preoccupied both with the combinatorial properties of language, and also with the reconstruction of the Adamic language, but music played a role only the former and not in the latter debates. In the eighteenth century, by contrast, music comes to play a central role in discussions of the origin of languages (e.g. in Herder and Rousseau). A third general area that I will explore is the place of music in discussions of the role of language and communication in theological contexts, and in particular what can be termed 'linguistic eschatology'. The counterpart of the Adamic language is the harmony of angelic song in the world to come.

The main thrust of the paper is that larger-scale shift of music from the *quadrivium* to the *trivium* is the result of a set of complicated developments which have knock-on effects for all the disciplines involved. Furthermore, what appears to be a simple structural realignment is in fact part of the very process whereby an older architecture of knowledge is fundamentally dismantled, and a new division between humanities and natural sciences emerges.

11.05-12.15: **Linguists and Logicians**

11.05-11.40: Jaap Maat (University of Amsterdam).
'The artes sermocinales in Times of Adversity: How Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric Survived the Seventeenth Century'

Bacon's influential call for a renewal of learning at the beginning of the 17th century was particularly harsh for the disciplines that were traditionally concerned with language in various ways, logic dealing with speaking truly, grammar with speaking correctly, and rhetoric with speaking elegantly. Not only were the methods and rules of these arts rejected, but their common subject matter, language, was regarded as a source of confusion and misunderstanding rather than as a rewarding topic for study. Whereas the investigation of the real world seemed to promise unlimited progress, the disciplines concerned with language required years of efforts to be mastered but yielded few benefits, and could even be harmful. In spite of this widespread attitude towards language and its study, the traditional arts course remained the backbone of university education. The paper explores the effects of this paradoxical situation on the way logic, grammar and rhetoric developed during the 17th century, identifying three major trends.

First, the boundaries between disciplines, especially grammar and logic, tended to be loosened, in extreme cases resulting in hybrid works such as Caramuel's *Grammatica audax*, and less dramatically, in an increase of logical considerations within grammar writing, e.g. in Vossius's *De arte grammatica*. Secondly, there was a retreat to basics, especially in logic, exemplified by writers such as Wallis, who aimed to purify Aristotelian logic

from later accretions, and the Port Royal logic, which claimed to retain a useful core of logical knowledge, while discarding the superfluous fringes. Thirdly, a break with the traditions took place, leading to a range of unprecedented developments.

New linguistic horizons were opened, new standards for good style were set, artificial languages were invented, and philosophers as different as Locke and Leibniz envisaged a new type of logic. Thus, by the end of the century, the study of language turned out to be as capable of renewal, and as valuable as the study of nature even to those emphasizing the defects of languages. Typical in this regard was John Locke's admission that he had never intended to discuss language when he set out to write his *Essay*. However, he felt forced to devote an entire part to it, and ended up identifying semiotics, or logic, that is, the study of language, as one of the three major fields in which all science can be divided.

11.40-12.15: Rens Bod (University of Amsterdam).
'Formalization in the Humanities: From Valla to Scaliger'

What was the role of early humanism in the development of the new sciences? In this paper I will argue that the methods developed in philology, rhetoric and history had a significant impact in the new sciences. I will focus on two case studies: Lorenzo Valla's argument that the Donatio Constantini was a forgery, and Joseph Scaliger's chronology of world history.

In 1440 Valla demonstrated that the document known as the *Donatio Constantini* could not possibly have been written in the historical era of Constantine. Valla's method of historical text analysis with indirect, counterfactual reasoning became an exemplar for others, not only for humanists but also for the defenders of the new science, in particular Galileo who used a strikingly similar combination of historical texts with indirect reasoning in his *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*. Galileo was a skilled controversialist trained in humanistic rhetoric, and his argumentative process can be traced back to the writings of Carbone, Riccobono down to Valla's famous refutation.

There is a direct line from Valla via Poliziano, Erasmus and Bodin to Joseph Scaliger who formalized historical philology into a "rational

procedure subject to fixed laws", as Mark Pattison put it. Influenced by the damage that forgeries had done to history writing, Scaliger proposed to apply a single historical principle: that the earliest source, that is, the closest one to the events described, is the most trustworthy source.

This idea to reconstruct history from a single, formal principle was a major innovation in the sixteenth century when philology was highly eclectic and based more on rhetorical skills and common sense than on exact principles. The use of clear-cut formal principles, which are no longer reliant on rhetoric, forms a precursor to what is usually seen as one of the greatest innovations of the new science: that the natural world should be understood on the basis of fewest principles. Scaliger applied his principle of earliest source with exemplary rigour in his *Thesaurus temporum* of 1606, where he discovered that the first Egyptian Dynasty lay well before the presumed date of the Creation. While Scaliger himself did not take the ultimate consequence this discovery, it was used two generations later as evidence that the presumed age of the Earth could not be correct.

The methods and discoveries of Valla and Scaliger illustrate that the humanities were not separated from the sciences, but were deeply intertwined, both in method (such as the use of formal principles) and in content (such as the problem of the earth's age).

13.15-14.05: Floris Cohen (Univerity of Utrecht).

'Music As Science and As Art – The 16th/17th-Century Destruction of Cosmic Harmony'

In ancient Greece a close correspondence was discovered between certain well-sounding musical intervals and the ratios of the simplest integral numbers — 1:1 for the unison, 1:2 for the octave, 2:3 for the fifth, and 3:4 for the fourth. Out of this emerged the Pythagorean conception of the cosmos as governed by none but these harmonious relations. In Western Europe, the conception was first adopted, then challenged, rescued and expanded, but finally disrupted for good.

One early agent that caused the conception to be challenged was the 12th century rise of polyphony, leading in due course to treatment by prac-

ticing musicians of the pure major third as a harmonic interval, too (4:5, rather than the Pythagorean major third, 80:81). By mid-16th century a choir master, composer, and musical theorist, Gioseffo Zarlino, managed to unify considerations from musical practice, from elementary mathematics, and from natural philosophy, with a view to incorporating the major third in an expanded version of cosmic harmony.

New challenges followed at once. Musical humanists revived an ancient counterview which found the irregular flow of the melody more distinctive of music than any consideration of harmonic regularities. 'Sense', they felt, deserves priority over 'reason' in the judgment of musical effects. It also turned out that, once the major third is allowed, one cannot have all harmonic intervals sound pure in one and the same scale — some practical concessions ought to be made, of a nature hard to square with the idea of cosmic harmony. The man to lead the attack, the composer and musical theorist Vincenzo Galilei, tried to settle the issue by means of experiments with strings in vibration. His son Galileo followed suit, ironically reinstating for a little while the very harmonies contested by his father.

The most formidable challenge of all was due to the event which Galileo pioneered — the rise of modern science. The very mode of natural-philosophical thought that underlay the conception of cosmic harmony was undermined at a fundamental level from the early 17th century onward. By 1700, music was no longer part of some cosmic scheme, but represented little more than just itself. Increasingly, the analysis of musical effects went two separate ways, as either aesthetics or natural science, with the latter split up in its turn over a budding, experimental science of acoustics, and refined mathematical analyses of the intricacies of the scale.

A retrospective overview of these developments shows that the disruption of cosmic harmony came about due to developments in the exact sciences and in the humanities alike. More than that, for the longest part of the period here under scrutiny it is quite unhistorical even to make such a distinction in the first place.

14.05-15.15: **Science versus Art**

14.05-14.40: Gabriela Ilnitchi Currie (University of Minnesota).
'Partially Modern: Scholastic Sound Particles and Empiricist Overtones'

Fourteenth-century scholars concerned with the nature and propagation of sound had at their disposal two fundamentally different intellectual choices: the Pythagorean position, which accounted for sound in a purely numerical fashion, and the Aristotelian, which began with experience and looked beyond numbers for the physical and causal explanation of sound. The present paper investigates the interrelationships between Pythagorean and Aristotelian positions, as perceived by scholars at the time and as manifest in their development of acoustic theories, with particular attention to Nicole Oresme's ontology of sound as outlined in his *De configurationibus qualitatuum*.

Oresme clearly grappled with the physics of sound and the formative mathematics of aesthetically pleasing continuous qualities, and often invoked the support of empirical data. Ultimately, the Oresmian ontology of the sensible continuous sound and sound particles emerges as a conjectural synthesis of all contemporaneous acoustic considerations and of two competing philosophical positions: the Aristotelian sound-motion-time connection, and the Neoplatonic-Pythagorean mathematical formative mechanisms. Moreover, as we shall see, they are the ultimate 'thought experiments,' and as such they carried scholastic acoustics to their absolute, pre-modern epistemological limits, limits that would remain unchallenged until the Renaissance.

14.40-15.15: Cynthia Pyle (New York University).
'Renaissance Humanism and Science: A Different View of the Development of the Humanities in Early Modern Europe'

The development of the *studia humanitatis* from the liberal arts of the Middle Ages has been studied over many years since the definitions of Renaissance humanism advanced by Augusto Campana and Paul Oskar Kris-

teller in the 1940s. This paper develops the working hypothesis underlying my research over the past thirty years on a parallel that I (first trained and published as a biologist) noted as a humanities graduate student in the late 1960s and early 1970s. That is, that there is a deep correspondence between the ways in which the Italian humanists of the fifteenth century were beginning to study the ancient texts they unearthed in mouldering manuscripts, and the doing of at least some science.

The ideas of many historians and philosophers on the relationship between the humanities and science have been based on comparisons with the physical sciences. When one transposes the analogies to what I term the historical natural sciences (particularly the life sciences, natural history and its more modern manifestation, evolutionary biology, but also geology, palaeontology, even astronomy) the parallels become clearer. When one considers archaeology, a science begun in the modern age by Leon Battista Alberti and his contemporaries, the correspondence with the humanists' development of philological and historical methods becomes unmistakable.

The parallels between the doing of history and the doing of the historical natural sciences go deeper than the old ideas of seeking 'laws' from history, or making 'predictions' from history – positivistic attempts to pretend that historical work can become an exact science (itself a problematic concept). The historical natural sciences provide a far more flexible model, working from observation, analysis and the open questioning of one's own and others' hypotheses, to create understandings of the data available from, for example, the fossil record or the archaeological record, both of which share with the historical record the quality of incompleteness.

This paper will pursue these ideas, as applied to the work of such figures of the 14th and 15th centuries as Francesco Petrarca, Lorenzo Valla, Leon Battista Alberti, Angelo Poliziano, and life scientists of the 15th and early 16th centuries like Leonardo da Vinci and Conrad Gessner (with reference to their art and its effect on their science).

15.45-16:55: **Early Humanism and its Impact**

15.45-16.20: Lodi Nauta (University of Groningen).
'Lorenzo Valla's Critique of Scholastic Language and Philosophy'

In this paper I want to look at the critique of scholastic language by the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla (1406-1457), most prominently expressed in his *Repastinatio dialectice et philosophie*. This work is a vehement critique of Aristotelian-scholastic metaphysics, natural philosophy and ethics, and an attempt at radically transforming Aristotelian logic. Rejecting the scholastic, scientific approach towards language, Valla argues that the study of language – from the meaning of singular words to the analysis of extended forms of argumentation – should thoroughly be based on a close empirical study of language. Words and arguments should not be taken out of context, for this invariably brings with it a change in meaning, and consequently gives rise to philosophical problems were none existed. What we should do therefore, he holds, is to follow the linguistic custom of the ancients rather than to construct abstract theories about language and argumentation in general. The basic assumption, naturally hardly questioned by Valla, is that classical Latin provides us with all the resources for giving us an adequate, reliable and common sense picture of the world, and of our thoughts and feelings about it. Based on my forthcoming book on Valla (*In Defense of Common Sense*, Harvard University Press, March 2009) my paper explores some of the fundamental assumptions of Valla's humanist critique.

16:20-16.55: Juliëtte Groenland (University of Amsterdam).
'Humanism in the Classroom, a Reassessment'

In their thought-provoking study *From Humanism to the Humanities* (1986), Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine argued that the humanist educators failed to put their high moral aspirations into practice. To expose the bookish, ineffective classroom practice of the humanists, primary sources from the pioneer pedagogue Guarino were called to testify to a dull daily word-for-word analysis. As Grafton and Jardine have it, the traditional

scholastic method fostered active and independent thinking, whereas the humanist educational reform produced docile yes-men for the ruling elite of the Italian courts and city-states. When the *studia humanitatis* were carried across the Alps, the gap between ideals and practice supposedly widened even more, given the Christian objectives that were now set for the study of ancient writings. Continuing the line from humanism to the humanities even the present-day status of the humanities was called into question.

On the basis of my Ph.D. thesis (2006) on the school practice of the pioneer northern humanist pedagogue Joannes Murmellius (1480-1517), performing the less eye-catching but not to be underestimated fieldwork in the shadow of contemporary fellow humanists like Erasmus, Reuchlin and Von Hutten, I would like to review the efforts and lasting achievements of the humanist educational reformers. The more than 50 writings Murmellius, (con)rector in Westphalia and Holland, produced provide an exceptional case study into the correlation between theoretic ends – as put forward in a treatise like *Didascalici libri duo* (1510) outlining a study program of the traditional *artes liberales* with a humanist twist – and practical means – successful school books like Murmellius' *Flores* of ancient love poets (1502), reprinted until the 18th century, and his Latin manual for beginners *Pappa puerorum* (1513) spread as far as Poland and Hungary.

My review will not only involve a more subtle insight into the way the humanist credo 'morality through orality' was put into practice, but it will also show how the allegedly elitist reform was in fact a bottom-up movement inspired by humble schoolteachers and unemployed university teachers entering into conflict with the academic establishment of theologians. The humanist reformers, self-consciously reacting against the scholastic education they had received, not only managed to educate docile citizens, but also creative and independent minds vouching for the tolerance and emancipation that can also be realized by both the *studia humanitatis* and the humanities.

Saturday 25 October

10.15-11.05: Invited paper Anthony Grafton (Princeton University).
'How Late was Late Humanism? Renaissance Learning and the Research University'

Scholars of many kinds use the expression 'late humanism.' Unfortunately, they do so in very different – and sometimes contradictory – ways. For historians of political thought, 'late humanism' refers to the Lipsian model of scholarship, in which philology and antiquarianism were turned to practical military and political ends. Others have identified 'late humanism' with the obsessive networking and letter-writing that knitted the Republic of Letters together, or with the revival of Stoicism. Yet even the emphasis on practical results is not universal. For classical scholars, for example, the term designates the polymaths of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, whose sterile, bloodless pursuit of minutiae brought the humanist tradition into discredit from which only 19th-century historicism could rescue it. Each of these disparate traditions has something to tell us about the scholars of the late Renaissance and seventeenth centuries. But case studies will suggest that none of them exhausts the subject – and that their work and world were more tightly connected to the new universities of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries than historians have realized.

11.05-12.15: **Defending the Text**

11.05-11.40: Már Jónsson (University of Iceland).
'Manuscript Hunting and Philological Progress in the Seventeenth Century'

As late as the 1630s, two Dutch historians, Johannes Meursius and Johannes Pontanus, managed to write with great eloquence and persuasion on the medieval history of Denmark without using a single manuscript,

only printed editions. The next history of Denmark, written by the Icelander Thormod Torfæus, was published in 1702, and nine years later he published a voluminous history of Norway until the year 1387. In his books, Torfæus made extensive use of unpublished manuscripts and he critically assessed their textual quality and historical value. In doing this he was helped by his even more meticulous and somewhat younger countryman Arnas Magnæus, or Árni Magnússon, royal archivist and professor of history at the University of Copenhagen, an avid collector of manuscript if there ever was one.

Magnæus and Torfæus were inspired both by Italian humanists of the 15th and 16th centuries, such as Flavio Biondo, as well as the scholarship of Jean Mabillon, Daniel Papebroek, Conrad Samuel Schurzfleisch, Pierre Bayle and other contemporary luminaries. However, they took things one step further, Magnæus in particular, by claiming that all extant manuscripts should be tracked down and consulted, and also that transcripts should be made with great care and exactitude. They were hardly influential scholars in a European context, except for Torfæus in his views on the chronology of Danish kings, but in this paper I will use their friendly but animated jostlings on philological, historical and literary matters in the years 1688-1702 as the indicator of an increased severity, so to speak, in the sifting of evidence in manuscripts and other documentary sources, as fables were distinguished from plausible facts and textual inconsistencies explained. Even the age of medieval manuscripts came to be determined and their intricate connections, a difficult task that had not been tackled with confidence before. This may not have been a philological revolution in the sense of an overarching and sudden change in practices, but it was indeed a change for the better and some of the methods and ideas developed in these years still retain their validity and have hardly been improved.

11.40-12.15: Dirk van Miert (University of London).
'Humanism and Warfare: Philology and Military Engineering in the Decades around 1600'

One of the primary ways in which humanism stimulated the development of technology was by the edition of technological treatises from antiquity. Humanists were usually baffled by such treatises, especially if they contained numbers. Besides, technical tracts were usually transmitted without images, which made them even more difficult to make sense of them. Increasingly, editors sought to add images of things described in the edition of technical treatises, in order to enlighten the text.

Some of the most appealing images appear in editions of texts dealing with military strategies and warfare. There seems to be major upsurge in editions in the last decades of the sixteenth and first decades of the seventeenth centuries, when Europe was shaken by civil and religious wars, accompanying the development of nation states. It was precisely in this field that the bookish knowledge of humanists could be of relevance to the powers that be. Justus Lipsius' *De militia Romana* is well known as having inspired the army reforms of Prince Maurice, and his *Poliorcetica* is major contribution to the genre, but Lipsius' treatise was one of many in a long string of publications across Northern Europe. Scholars plunged into the obscure but fascinating aspects of warfare and thus contributed not only to the advancement of war, but also to the development of technology. In this paper a number of such treatises, never studied before, will be dealt with, assessing the scholars' familiarity with military engineering and the influence they had on its development.

13.15-15.00: **Philology and Philosophy**

13.15-13.50: Martine van Ittersum (University of Dundee).
'All in the Family: How Hugo Grotius' Relations Shaped the Writing, Circulation and Publication of His Work'

The publications of Ann Moss, Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton have inspired many scholars to take a closer look at the transition from human-

ism to the humanities in the Early Modern period. So far, the 'new' history of the book has focused on humanist education, particularly on reading practices such as the creation of commonplace books and annotations in the margins of printed books. Yet the circulation of knowledge in the Republic of Letters involved far more than just a writer and his readers. Printers could make or break a humanist's career, for example. Erasmus and Lipsius owed their 'star quality' to a large degree to Manutius in Venice, Froben in Basel, and Plantin in Antwerp, respectively, whose printshops were the intellectual powerhouses of the sixteenth century. To what extent was the production of knowledge a cooperative enterprise outside the printshop, however?

While literary scholars have investigated the continued circulation of manuscripts in the age of print, they have generally done so in the context of debates about Early Modern censorship. Yet manuscript circulation is also indicative of the importance of scholarly collaboration in the Early Modern period. This was not peer review in the way that we understand it today. Early Modern authors allowed their manuscripts to circulate in order to gauge the (potential) political or religious impact of their work, for example,[3] rather than to solicit comments about its commensurability with discipline-specific requirements.

In my conference talk, I intend to show that the intellectual projects of the Dutch humanist and jurist Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) were, to all intents and purposes, collaborative enterprises and, indeed, family affairs. Henk Nellen has rightly pointed out that Willem de Groot (1592-1662) served as Grotius' literary agent in the Dutch Republic, following his elder brother's flight to Paris in 1621. Yet it would be more accurate to say that Grotius received the input of his relations at every stage of intellectual production. For example, Grotius' brother and father carefully read John Selden's *Mare clausum* (1635) soon after its publications, for no other reason than to mark the places that could easily be refuted by Grotius in a defense of *Mare liberum* (1609). Willem was also the repositor of important works that remained in manuscript, such as the *Annales et historiae* (which Grotius refused to publish, despite Willem's urging) and the *Anthologia Graeca* (for which no publisher could be found. In my conference talk, I intend to examine these and other instances of family involvement in the

production and circulation of Grotiana. By means of this case study, I will explore the difference between our current concept of 'authorship' and the working practices of Early Modern scholars.

13.50-14.25: Piet Steenbakkers (University of Utrecht).
'Spinoza in the History of Biblical Scholarship'

For all his mathematical rigour, Spinoza – unlike Descartes and Leibniz – did not contribute anything to the development of mathematics; nor to the development of physics either, despite his skill in optics. But he did leave his mark on the subsequent history of biblical scholarship. From a twenty-first century perspective, associating mathematics, physics and philology may seem to require some explanation. The concept of 'science', particularly in the English-speaking countries, now virtually coincides with that of the natural sciences. Such a concept of science is a fairly recent phenomenon: it was unknown to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. If it makes sense to speak of 'science' in the seventeenth century, it must include philology, an established discipline that was considered normative for other 'scientific' practices. That Spinoza's interest in the Bible was not strictly 'philosophical', but had strong philological and linguistic penchants, too, is clear not only from the sustained and meticulous analysis he offers in the *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, but also from his endeavour to write a Hebrew grammar. As far as Spinoza was concerned, in investigating the *historia* of the Bible he was not involved in an undertaking completely different from what he was doing in the *Ethica* or in the Hebrew grammar – a text, which he had also intended to expound *more geometrico*. Nor is it any different from the study of nature: 'I hold that the method of interpreting Scripture is no different from the method of interpreting Nature, and is in fact in complete accord with it' (*Tractatus theologico-politicus*, ch. 7).

The topic is an important one, on account of the unparalleled status of the Bible in Western civilization, and the part played by Spinoza in the dramatic decline of that status. At present I am involved in developing a research project, together with Dr Henk Nellen (Huygens Institute), on *Biblical Criticism and Secularization in the Seventeenth Century*. The aim is to

situate Spinoza's contribution to the development of biblical scholarship within the broader tradition of philology of a humanistic lineage, a scientific discipline whose role, we feel, has been underrated in historical research so far. In my paper for the conference I will focus on Spinoza's role as a philologist, and his place in the history of biblical scholarship.

14.25-15.00: Martine Pécharman (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique - École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales).
'The Import of the Debate between Richard Simon and Antoine Arnauld'

According to Richard Simon, the literality of a holy text depends on the 'rules of critique', which oppose its alterations and corruptions. Biblical critique aims to re-establish the text according to the very multiplicity of its readings. Instead of the primitive text that has not been preserved, a similar text can be restored, made up of everything of the different readings that must be preserved. The method for translating the Bible is itself deduced from this historical critique. One must determine which are the various readings and preserve the best in the body of the translation, putting the variants in the margins. The translation of the *New Testament*, be it from Greek or from the Latin of the Vulgate (Simon's own choice), has thus to conform to a rule of uniformity. In this regard, Simon's *Histoire critique des versions du Nouveau Testament* involves a lengthy criticism of Port-Royal's *Nouveau Testament* of Mons, which mixes the differences of the Greek in with the Latin. Simon's requirement for translation is textual unity, even if this is only a reconstructed unity, what is referred to as Greek or Latin being multiform before the original is restored. Moreover, the excess of words used in the Mons version in relation to the Vulgate is for Simon an indication that this is an explained translation, governed by theological prejudice, which substitute a theological meaning for a grammatical and literal meaning.

Arnauld's vigorous response (in the *Difficultés présentées à M. Steyaert*) both refutes Simon's rule of the uniformity of translation forbidding the differences between the Greek and the Vulgate from being integrated into the text, and answers the accusation that Port-Royal aimed at a theological

explanation of passages in *New Testament* rather than at their grammatical meaning. Purely logical criteria are required for determining the meaning of words. The principles of 'general and reasoned grammar' interact with the analysis of signification in the *Art de penser*. The *New Testament* of Mons contains everywhere the expressions which are, according to the very principles of human language, most suited to the intention of the author. Simon's accusation of a confusion between exegesis and translation misses the point, because it misses the true definition of the grammatical or literal meaning of a text. The knowledge required for a translation is not merely the knowledge of particular languages, but the knowledge of the universal foundations of the different vernaculars, that is to say, of the modalities of thinking. What Simon takes as the symptom of a theological concern, is strictly linked to the deduction of the parts of discourse from the division of our thoughts. Besides, this vindication brings on a new acceptation of the 'rules of critique'. Textual criticism must involve an epistemological concern for the probability of knowledge. The real object of biblical critique is not the text itself, but the evidence giving the mind a sufficient reason for choosing one meaning against another one, less probable. Critique has to become an *ars conjectandi*.

15.30-16.40: **The History of History**

15.30-16.05: Jacques Bos (University of Amsterdam).
'Renaissance Historiography: Framing a New Mode of Historical Experience'

In his recent book *Sublime Historical Experience,* the Dutch historical theorist Frank Ankersmit suggests that the rise of modern historical consciousness can be related to the disastrous events that took place in Italy in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (e.g. the invasion by the French king Charles VII in 1494 and the sack of Rome in 1527). For Renaissance historians such as Machiavelli and Guicciardini these events were deeply traumatic, in the sense that they painfully experienced that the old world of the Italian city-states in which they had played a significant role was irretrievably lost. According to Ankersmit, this amounted to

a 'dissociation' of the past, and with this dissociation the past became a potential object of investigation.

In this paper I will discuss how Machiavelli and Guicciardini created a disciplinary framework around this new mode of historical experience, how they actually turned the past into an object of study. In order to answer these questions two dimensions of the historical writings of Machiavelli and Guicciardini will be examined more closely. In the first place I shall look at the ontological assumptions underlying their work, focusing on their views on human agency and individuality. Secondly, I shall analyse the way in which they defined history in relation to other disciplines. In this analysis the emphasis will lie on two disciplines, moral and political philosophy on the one hand and philology on the other hand. It could be argued that philology provided a method for the examination of the past, while the connection with moral and political philosophy made the study of the past relevant. Furthermore, the mainly implicit assumptions on individuality and agency in Machiavelli's and Guicciardini's historical writings can be clarified by looking at the way they deal with these topics in their political writings.

The paper will be concluded with a comparison between the historical work of Machiavelli and Guicciardini and nineteenth-century historicism. In a different context, historicist authors such as Ranke were engaged in a similar project of defining history as an object of investigation. In the nineteenth century history was turned into an academic discipline, which also involved certain assumptions about individuality and agency and a positioning of history in relation to philology and philosophy.

16.05-16.40: Wouter Hanegraaff (University of Amsterdam).
'Philosophy's Shadow: Jacob Brucker (1696-1770) and the History of Thought'

The history of philosophy began to emerge as a separate discipline during the second half of the 17th century, as German Protestant authors battling against the 'hellenization of Christianity' sought to sharply distinguish the history of rational thought from biblical revelation and pagan superstition. This development culminated during the 18th century in the histo-

riographical oeuvre of Jacob Brucker, whose *Historia critica philosophiae*, published in six massive volumes from 1742 to 1744, is generally considered *the* Enlightenment monument of the history of philosophy. Not only was Brucker the international standard reference in this domain, but almost all the historical information about philosophy in extremely influential dictionaries such as Johann Heinrich Zedler's *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon* (68 vols.; 1732-1754) and, most notably, Diderot's *Encyclopédie* (1751-1765) turns out to be paraphrased or simply plagiarized from Brucker. In this contribution I will analyze the conceptual foundations of Brucker's historiography, with special attention to how his rejection of Roman Catholic 'apologeticism' led him to sharply demarcate the true history of philosophy as based solely upon human reason from a second history: a false one consisting of pagan superstition concealed as philosophy or religion. Brucker's legacy is still with us today: while he found it important to analyze the superstitious 'shadow of philosophy' and its doctrines in meticulous detail, later generations excluded it from the history of thought altogether, thereby condemning it to a twilight existence in the margins of the humanities.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Hans Bertens, University of Utrecht, Hans.Bertens@let.uu.nl
Annemarieke Blankesteijn, University of Utrecht, Annemarieke.blankesteijn@let.uu.nl
Rens Bod, University of Amsterdam, rens@science.uva.nl
Jacques Bos, University of Amsterdam, j.bos@uva.nl
Jeroen Bouterse, University of Utrecht, j.bouterse@hotmail.com
Priscilla Brandon, University of Utrecht, p.brandon@students.uu.nl
Bianca Chen, European University Institute (Badia Fiesolana), bianca.chen@eui.eu
Floris Cohen, Univerity of Utrecht, Floris.Cohen@let.uu.nl
Cory Cotter, University of Leiden, csc5p@virginia.edu
David Cram, Jesus College, University of Oxford, david.cram@jesus.ox.ac.uk
Gabriela Ilnitchi Currie, University of Minnesota, ilnit001@umn.edu
Meagan Curtis, University of Utrecht, M.J.Curtis@students.uu.nl
Federico D'Onofrio, University of Amsterdam, F.Donofrio@uva.nl
Austen Dorresteyn, Equilibris Publishing, dorresteyn@equilibris.nl
Marieke Drost, University of Utrecht, mriekedrost@gmail.com
Michael Edwards, Christ's College, Cambridge University, mje28@cam.ac.uk
Els Elffers, University of Amsterdam, els.elffers@uva.n
Cesc Esteve, King's College London, cesc.esteve@gmail.com
Hilary Gatti, University of Rome "La Sapienza", Hilary.Gatti@uniroma1.it
Norma Goethe, National University of Cordoba, ngoethe@ffyh.unc.edu.ar
Anthony Grafton, Princeton University, grafton@princeton.edu
Juliette Groenland., University of Amsterdam, mail@murmellius.com
Wouter Hanegraaff, University of Amsterdam, w.j.hanegraaff@uva.nl
Chris Heesakkers, University of Amsterdam/University of Leiden, chris.heesakkers@xs4all.nl
Harald Hendrix, University of Utrecht, Harald.Hendrix@let.uu.nl
Jo Heirman, University of Amsterdam, csc5p@virginia.edu
Koen Hilberdink, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, koen.hilberdink@bureau.knaw.nl
Victoria Höög, Lund University, victoria.hoog@fil.lu.se
Carlette Jannink, University of Amsterdam, carlette@gmx.de
Már Jónsson, University of Iceland, marj@hi.is
Peter Kirschenmann, Free University, Amsterdam, jorakir@hotmail.com
Stephanie Koerner, University of Manchester, Stephanie.Koerner@man.ac.uk
Femke Kuiling, University of Utrecht, F.Kuiling@students.uu.nl
Michiel Leezenberg, University of Amsterdam, M.M.Leezenberg@uva.nl
Harro Maas, University of Amsterdam, H.B.J.B.Maas@uva.nl
Jaap Maat, University of Amsterdam, j.maat@uva.nl

Nima Madjzubi, University of Utrecht, N.Madjzubi@students.uu.nl
Karianne Marx, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, kj.marx@ph.vu.nl
Päivi Mehtonen, University of Tampere, Paivi.Mehtonen@uta.fi
Wijnand Mijnhardt, University of Utrecht, wijnand.mijnhardt@let.uu.nl
Ruud Moesbergen, University of Utrecht, R.J.Moesbergen@students.uu.nl
Lodi Nauta, University of Groningen, L.W.Nauta@rug.nl
Martine Pécharman, CRAL, CNRS-EHESS Paris, Martine.Pecharman@ehess.fr
Almut Pollmer, University of Leiden, a.pollmer@let.leidenuniv.nl
Maro Polydorou, English School Nicosia, polydorou.maro@englishschool.ac.cy
Fransje Praagman, University of Utrecht, F.Praagman@students.uu.nl
Louise Pross, University of Utrecht, L.C.Pross@students.uu.nl
Cynthia Pyle, New York University, cmp2@nyu.edu
Marlise Rijks, University of Utrecht, m.n.rijks@students.uu.nl
David Rijser, University of Amsterdam, D.Rijser@uva.nl
Ingrid Rowland, University of Notre Dame School of Architecture, irowland@nd.edu
Merel Schelland, University of Utrecht, M.Schelland@students.uu.nl
Kasper Schipper, University of Utrecht, K.Schipper@students.uu.nl
Bernward Schmidt, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, bernward.schmidt@uni-muenster.de
Eric Jan Sluijter, University of Amsterdam, E.J.Sluijter@uva.nl
Floris Solleveld, University of Amsterdam alumnus, floris.otto@gmail.com
Piet Steenbakkers, University of Utrecht/Erasmus University Rotterdam, Piet.Steenbakkers@phil.uu.nl
Abel Streefland, University of Utrecht, a.h.streefland@students.uu.nl
Bert Theunissen, University of Utrecht, L.T.G.Theunissen@phys.uu.nl
Maarten Trimp, University of Utrecht, mtrimp@gmail.com
Lotte van den Berg, University of Utrecht, a.l.vandenberg@students.uu.nl
Ernst van den Boogaart, Amsterdam, e.van.den.boogaart@freeler.nl
Marieke van den Doel, University of Amsterdam, M.J.E.vandenDoel@uva.nl
P.J. van den Haak, Free University Amsterdam, p.vandenhaak@hetnet.nl
Joppe van Driel, University of Utrecht, J.vanDriel@students.uu.nl
Martine van Ittersum, University of Dundee, m.j.vanittersum@dundee.ac.uk
Astrid van Kimmenade, University of Utrecht, a.f.m.vankemenade@students.uu.nl
Dirk van Miert, The Warburg Institute London, dirk.vanmiert@sas.ac.uk
Kasper van Ommen, Scaliger Institute Leiden, K.van.Ommen@library.leidenuniv.nl
Peter van Ormondt, University of Amsterdam, pormondt@science.uva.nl
Ari Wesseling, Universiteit van Amsterdam, a.h.wesseling@uva.nl
Thijs Weststeijn, University of Amsterdam, M.A.Weststeijn@uva.nl
Lennart Wilmink, University of Utrecht, L.J.Wilmink@students.uu.nl