

*The Making of the Humanities
Conference V*

5-7 October 2016

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Conference Location

The Charles Commons
3301 N. Charles St.
Baltimore, MD 21218



Reception Location

The Peabody Library
17 E. Mt. Vernon Place
Baltimore, MD 21202

October 5, 6:30-9:00 PM

Transportation will be provided



Organized by the Society for the History of the Humanities



SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY
OF THE HUMANITIES

International Board: Rens Bod, Christopher Celenza, Hent de Vries,
William Egginton, Bart Karstens, Julia Kursell, Fenrong Liu, Jaap
Maat, Helen Small, Thijs Weststeijn

Local Organizing Committee: Melanie Mossman, Stephen Nichols, Emilie Raymer,
Winston Tabb

Supported by:



The Alexander Grass Humanities
Institute of
The Johns Hopkins University



Amsterdam Centre for
Cultural
Heritage &
Identity

Vossius Center for the History of
Humanities
and Sciences



Program & Abstracts

Program Overview

Day 1, October 5

8:00-9:00 AM: Registration, Charles Commons and Continental breakfast (Nolan's)

9:00-9:05 AM: Opening of Conference by Rens Bod, President of the Society for the History of the Humanities (Salon C)

9:05-10:05 AM: Keynote, Sarah Kay, "*Inhuman Humanities and the Artes that Make up Medieval Song*" (Salon C)

10:05-10:30 AM: Coffee Break (Nolan's)

Parallel Sessions

	Salon A	Salon B	Salon C	Barber Conference Room
10:30 AM-12:30 PM	Epistemology of the Humanities	History of Art History	The Humanities at Johns Hopkins	

12:30-1:30 PM ----- Lunch at Nolan's-----

1:30-3:30 PM	History of Linguistics	History and Architecture	Was there a Republic of Letters in the 19 th Century?	
--------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

3:30-4:00 PM ----- Coffee Break at Nolan's-----

4:00-6:00 PM	The Humanities and the Social Sciences	The Making of Architectural Knowledge: Intersections of Architecture and Science	Intellectual Events, or What Can Historiography and Philosophy Learn from Each Other?	Historiography of Science and Medicine
--------------	--	--	---	--

6:15 PM: Shuttle transport to Peabody Library

6.30 PM: Reception at Peabody Library 8:30 PM: Shuttle transport back to campus begins

Day 2, October 6

8:30-9:00 AM: Continental breakfast (Nolan's)

9:00-10:00 AM: Keynote, Karine Chemla, *Writing the History of Ancient Mathematics in China and beyond in the 19th Century: Who? For Whom?, and How?* (Salon C)

10:00-10:30 AM: Coffee Break (Nolan's)

Parallel Sessions

	Salon A	Salon B	Salon C	Barber Conference Room
10:30 AM- 12:30 PM	History of Literary Studies	History of Information and Digital Humanities	Museums in the Making of the Humanities	

12:30-1:30 PM ----- Lunch at Nolan's-----

1:30-3:30 PM	Historiography	History of Criticism	How the Humanities Have Changed the World	
--------------	----------------	----------------------	---	--

3:30-4:00 PM ----- Coffee Break at Nolan's-----

4:00-6:00 PM	Institutions of the Humanities	History of Archeology & History and Text Analysis	History of Philology	
--------------	-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------	--

Day 3, October 7

8:30-9:00 AM: Continental breakfast (Nolan's)

9:00-10:00 AM: Keynote Anthony Grafton, *Christianity and Philology: Blood Wedding?* (Salon C)

10:00-10:30 AM: Coffee Break (Nolan's)

Parallel Sessions

	Salon A	Salon B	Salon C	Barber Conference Room
10:30 AM-12:30 PM	East and West	A Comparative and Quantitative Analysis of the Use of Primary Sources in the Humanities	Democracy and the Humanities: Humanities Reports in America, 1828-Present	

12:30-1:30 PM ----- Lunch at Nolan's-----

1:30-3:00 PM	Edgar Poe and the Critics	History's Religion	Comparison and the Modern Humanities	
--------------	---------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------------	--

3:00-3:30 PM ----- Coffee Break at Nolan's-----

3:30-5:00 PM	Anthropology and Historical Research in the Context of the Cold War	Roundtable: The Classics of the Humanities	Between Magistra Vitae and Academic Discipline: The Nature of Enlightenment Historiography	
--------------	---	--	--	--

5:15 PM: Presentation of Graduate Student Paper Award, and Closing Remarks, Rens Bod and Bill Eggington (Salon C)

Program Details

Day 1, October 5

8:00-9:00 AM: Registration, Charles Commons Conference Site (Continental breakfast in Nolan's)

9:00-9:05 AM: Salon C: Opening of the conference (Rens Bod, President of the Society for the History of the Humanities)

9:05-10:05 AM: Salon C: Keynote Sarah Kay (New York U.) *Inhuman Humanities and the Artes that Make up Medieval Song*

Introduction by Stephen Nichols (Johns Hopkins U.)

10:05-10:30 AM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

10:30 AM-12:30 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: Epistemology of the Humanities

Chair: Bart Karstens (U. of Amsterdam)

- Jaap Maat (U. of Amsterdam), *The History of a Field as Part of the Field*
- Rik Peels (Vrije U. Amsterdam), *The Epistemic Values of the Humanities*
- Stefani Engelstein (Duke U.), *Divisive Loves: Philology's Hierarchies*
- Andrew J. Kluth (UCLA), *On Music's Capacity to Refigure Worlds: The Relevance of the Hermeneutic Turn in Music Studies*

Salon B: History of Art History

Chair: Thijs Weststeijn (U. of Amsterdam)

- Olga Olkheft (European U. Saint Petersburg), *Sitting on the Collection: The Production of Art History in the State Hermitage Museum*
- Eleonora Vratskidou (TU Berlin), *Art Academies, an Alternative Institutional Framework for Art History During the 19th Century*
- Shannon M. Lieberman (UCSB), *Just a Story: Mistress Narratives and the Art Historical Canon, 1965-1976*
- Bennett Gilbert (Portland State U.), *What the History of Early Printing Can Learn from the History of Early Photography*

Salon C: The Humanities at Johns Hopkins

Chair and respondent: Peter Jelavich (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Stuart W. Leslie (Johns Hopkins U.), *Whatever Happened to the History of Ideas?*
- Hent de Vries (Johns Hopkins U.), *After and Beyond Structuralism: The Humanities Centre at Johns Hopkins, Then and Now*
- Dorothy Ross (Johns Hopkins U.), *John Higham, John Pocock and the Shifting Fate of Cosmopolitanism in the Writing of American History*

12:30-1:30 PM: Lunch (Nolan's)

1:30-3:30 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: History of Linguistics

Chair: Jaap Maat (U.of Amsterdam)

- Julia Claire Hernandez (U. of Georgia), *Comparative Historical Linguistics in 16th-century Spain: Pedro Simón Abril's 'Gramática griega escrita en lengua castellana'*
- Stella Gevorgyan-Ninness (Arcadia U.), *German Comparative Linguistics in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Scholarship*
- James McElvenny (U. Potsdam), *Linguistic Aesthetics at the Turn of the 19th to the 20th century: Otto Jespersen and Charles Bally*
- Bart Karstens (U. of Amsterdam), *Paradigms in Linguistics?*

Salon B: History and Architecture

Chair: TBA

- Bernd Kulawik (Bibliothek Werner Oechslin), *New Results from the Accademia della Virtù / Accademia Vitruviana at Rome (c. 1537 – 1555): Tracing the First International Network of Interdisciplinary Research Further*
- Irena Fatsea (NTUA), *A 'Modern' Student of the Humanities in the Streets of Post-Napoleonic Berlin: Classical Taste and Prejudice in the Rise of a Nationalist Architectural Aesthetic*
- Daniel C. Sherer (Yale U.), *Panofsky on Architecture: Construction and Reception of an Iconology of Built Form 1939-1953*
- Aleta Quinn (Caltech), *William Whewell's Philosophy of and Practice of Historical Science*

Salon C: Was There a Republic of Letters in the 19th Century?

Chair: William Egginton (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Dirk van Miert (U. Utrecht), *Fichte and the Republic of Letters in Germany*
- Floris Solleveld (Forschungszentrum Gotha, U. Erfurt), *A Public Republic of Letters?*
- Melanie Conroy (U. of Memphis), *Nineteenth-Century Salons: A Latter-Day 'Republic of Letters'?*
- Olaf Simons (Forschungszentrum Gotha, U. Erfurt), *From the Republic of Letters to the Debate about Literature. A History of Productive Solutions*

3:30-4:00 PM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

4:00-6:00 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: The Humanities and the Social Sciences

Chair: Rens Bod (U.of Amsterdam)

- Katherine Arens (U. of Texas), *James, Wundt, and Griesinger: From Psychology to the Varieties of Religious Experience*
- Bican Polat (Johns Hopkins U.), *"Culture and Personality": Anthropology Meets Psychoanalysis*
- Katharina Isabel Schmidt (Princeton U.), *From Evolutionary Functionalism to Critical Transnationalism: Comparative Legal History, 1780s to Present*
- Katharina Natalia Piechocki (Harvard U.), *Cartographic Poetics and the Rise of German Humanism: A Contribution to the Making of the Humanities*

Salon B: The Making of Architectural Knowledge: Intersections of Architecture and Science

Chair: Christopher Drew Armstrong (U. of Pittsburgh)

- Marrikka Trotter (Harvard U.), *Temporal Sublime: Robert Adam and James Hutton in the Scottish Enlightenment*
- Allison Ksiazkiewicz (U. of Cambridge), *Making Bricks and Antique Landscapes in Late-Enlightenment Britain*
- Courtney S. Long (U. of Pittsburgh), *The Unbinding of Natural and Architectural Knowledge*
- Pandora Syperek (Paul Mellon Centre), *Monad to Man: Gendering Shifting Ideologies in the Natural History Museum*

Salon C: Intellectual Events, or What Can Historiography and Philosophy Learn from Each Other?

Chair: Larry S. McGrath (Wesleyan U.)

- Larry S. McGrath (Wesleyan U.), *The Intellectual as National Ambassador*
- Mou Banerjee (Harvard U.), *The Question of the Moral Nature: Rabindranath Tagore on Civilization and Nationalism, at Harvard*
- Jacob Levi (Johns Hopkins U.), *The Davos Debate: Heidegger, Cassirer, and the 'Ramification' of Intellectual Events*
- Matthew Shields (Georgetown U.), *How to Think Diachronically: The (Missed) Encounter between Quine and Kuhn on Changes in Meaning*

Barber Conference Room: Historiography of Science and Medicine

Chair: Bart Karstens (U. of Amsterdam)

- Zhy Yiwen (Sun Yat-sen U.), *Shaping the Early History of Mathematics in Ancient China*
- Leander Diener (U. Zürich), *The Birth of Clinical Medicine out of Primitive Medicine: Ethnological Influence in Erwin Heinz Ackerknecht's Historiography of Medicine, 1906-1988*
- Ohad Reiss Sorokin (Princeton U.), *History of Science vs. Philosophy of Science in Princeton University 1961-1981*
- Jinhui Wang (Tsinghua U.), *Rethinking the Chinese Translation of "Humanity" as "人文"*

6:15 PM: Shuttle transport to Peabody Library

6:30 PM: Reception at Peabody Library

8:30 PM: Shuttle transport back to campus begins

Day 2, October 6

8:30-9:00 AM Continental breakfast (Nolan's)

9:00-10:00 AM: Salon C: Keynote Karine Chemla (CNRS Paris Diderot) *Writing the History of Ancient Mathematics in China and beyond in the 19th Century: Who? for Whom?, and How?*

Introduction by Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam)

10:00-10:30 AM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

10:30 AM-12:30 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: History of Literary Studies

Chair: William Egginton (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Selene Maria Vatteroni, (Scuola Normale Superiore) *The Dante of Alessandro Torri: Between Eighteenth Century Tradition and Modern Criticism*
- Alfred Sjödin (Lund U.), *Historical Scale and the Swedish Model of Literary Studies*
- Matthijs Engelberts (U. of Amsterdam), *Modernist Literature and the Making of 'English' in the Humanities*
- Tye Landels-Gruenewald (Queens U.), *Hamlet's Problems Reconsidered: The Positivist Turn in Shakespeare Studies*

Salon B: History of Information and Digital Humanities

Chair: Susan Weiss (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Estelle Blaschke (U. of Lausanne), *Creating Infrastructures: Microfilm as a Scientific Aid*
- Chris Alen Sula (Pratt Institute), *The Early History of Digital Humanities*
- Judith Kaplan (MPIWG Berlin), *Computing for Cognates*
- Elyse Graham (SUNY Stony Brook), *Joyce and the Graveyard of Digital Empires: Textual Criticism and the Making of the Digital Humanities*

Salon C: Museums in the Making of the Humanities

Chairs: Jennifer P. Kingsley (Johns Hopkins U.) and Elizabeth Rodini (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Jennifer Donnelly (U. of Pittsburgh), *From Mannequins to Physiognomy: The Development of a Chronology at the Musée des Monuments Français*
- Susanne Mersmann (Philipps U.), *Between the Lines: The Emerging Globalization in Viollet-le-Duc's Conception of Gothic Art at the Trocadéro in Paris*
- Adrianna Link (Amherst College), *A Museum for Humankind: Integrating Human Ecology and Anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution, 1968-1976*
- Sigrid Lien and Hilde W. Nielssen (U. of Bergen), *Multi-Layered Museum Stories: Exhibitions in the Intersection between Academic Disciplinary History, Politics, and Aesthetics*

12:30-1:30 PM: Lunch (Nolan's)

1:30-3:30 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: Historiography

Chair: Floris Solleveld (U. of Amsterdam)

- Cesc Esteve (U. of Barcelona), *Censorship and the Making of Modern Historiography: from Repression to Disciplining*
- Timo van Havere (KU Leuven), *Scatterbrains and Greenborns: Dissatisfaction with a 'Newfangled' Historiography and Its Archival Practices in Belgium (1825-1845)*
- Emma Hagström Molin (The Swedish Institute), *Materialising Historical Knowledge: Beda Dudik's Encounter with Moravian Spoils of War in Sweden and Italy 1851-1852*
- Adriana Markantonatos (Philipps U.), *A Goethian Look at Reinhart Koselleck's History of Theory of History (as History of Theory)*

Salon B: History of Criticism

Chair: Fenrong Liu (Tsinghua U.)

- Nicolas VanDeviver (Ghent U.), *Edward Said and the Crisis of the New Criticism*
- Andy Hines (Vanderbilt U.), *New Criticism as Dead and Alive: The Cycles of Disciplinary History and Anti-Blackness*
- Yung-Hsing Wu (U. of Louisiana), *Close Readings of the Feminist Kind*
- J.E. Elliott (Nagoya U. of Commerce and Business), *Manufacturing Dissent: Brand English in the Corporate University*

Salon C: How the Humanities Have Changed the World

Chair: Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam)

- Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam), *How Ideas from the Humanities Migrated to Science and Technology*
- Frederik Stjernfelt (U. of Aalborg), *From Historical to Current Breakthroughs in the Humanities*
- David Budtz Pedersen (U. of Aalborg), *Understanding the Societal Impact of Humanities Scholarship*

3:30-4:00 PM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

4:00-6:00 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: Institutions of the Humanities

Chair: Fenrong Liu (Tsinghua U.)

- Shiuon Chu (Brown U.), *"Imperial Examination (Keju) as Intelligence Test": Detaching a Meritocratic System from Classical Knowledge in Twentieth Century China*
- John David Loner (U. of Cambridge), *"As Good as a Babe in Arms": Women Philosophers, Wittgenstein and "Inclusion" in the University of Cambridge*
- Lasse Johansson (U. of Aalborg), *Recent Changes in Humanistic Research Practices: An Analysis of Danish PhD Dissertations 1992-2012*
- Cynthia M. Pyle (New York U.), *The Role of Libraries in the Making of the Humanities*

Salon B: History of Archeology

Chair: Christopher Celenza (Johns Hopkins U.)

- William Stenhouse (Yeshiva U.), *French Archaeologies in the Early Modern Period*
- Agnes Meyer (Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne), *The Alexanderzug, a German Archaeological Expedition in Afghanistan*

Salon B (continued): History and Text Analysis

Chair: Jaap Maat (U.of Amsterdam)

- Fenrong Liu (Tsinghua U.), *Argumentation in Ancient China: from an Agency Point of View*
- Yves van Damme (U. of Leiden), *When Scholarship and Religious Inspiration Meet. One Hundred Years of Research into Middle Dutch Spiritual Literature, a Historiography*

Salon C: History of Philology

Chair: Stephen Nichols (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Mats Malm (U. of Gothenburg), *Gendered Philology: The Apostle Junia[s] in Scandinavian Bible Translation*
- Matthew Strother (New School for Social Research), *The Advantages and Disadvantages of Reading for Life*
- Kimon Markatos (European U. Institute Florence), *The Ever-Changing Landscape of Greek Literary Criticism: The Transition from Philology to Theory 1974-2010*

Day 3, October 7

8:30-9:00 AM: Continental breakfast (Nolan's)

9:00-10:00 AM: Salon C: Keynote Anthony Grafton (Princeton U.) *Christianity and Philology: Blood Wedding?*

Introduction by Christopher Celenza (Johns Hopkins U.)

10:00-10:30 AM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

10:30 AM-12:30 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: East and West

Chair: Susan Weiss (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Lu Jiang (Sun Yat-sen U.), *The Historiography of Philosophy as Science in the Coimbra-Commentary on Aristotle's Logic and in Its Chinese Translation*
- Thijs Weststeijn (U. of Amsterdam), *The Rise and Fall of a Standard Model: the Sino-Egyptian Hypothesis*
- Peng Peng (Princeton U.), *Max Loehr and his Contribution to the Study of Chinese Bronzes and Paintings*

Salon B: A Comparative and Quantitative Analysis of the Use of Primary Sources in the Humanities

Chair: Anthony Grafton (Princeton U.)

- Giovanni Colavizza (École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne) and Mario Infelise (Ca' Foscari U.), *On the Use of Evidence in Venetian Historiography*
- Matteo Romanello (École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne), *Leveraging Canonical References to Write a Quantitative History of Classics*
- Maximilian Schich (U. of Texas), *"... and Then we Gave Up and Used Deep Learning!"*

Salon C: Democracy and the Humanities: Humanities Reports in America, 1828-Present

Chair and respondent: Andrew Delbanco (Columbia U.)

- Johann N. Neem (Western Washington U.), *The Yale Report and the Rise of Public Opinion*
- Ethan Schrum (Azusa Pacific U.), *Mobilizing the Humanities to Defend Democracy in the Era of Totalitarianism*
- Annette Gordon-Reed (Harvard U.), *Making a Case for the Humanities in the 21st Century*

12:30-1:30 PM: Lunch (Nolan's)

1:30-3:00 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: Edgar Poe and the Critics

Chair: Gabriella Dean (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Barbara Cantalupo (Pennsylvania State U.), *Poe's Evolving Theory of Beauty in 'The Domain of Arnheim'*
- J. Gerald Kennedy (Louisiana State U.), *Beneath the 'House of Usber': Poe's Subterranean Strategy*
- Stephen Rachman (Michigan State U.), *Remembering 'The Raven': Poetics and Celebrity*

Salon B: History's Religion

Chair: Floris Solleveld (U. of Amsterdam)

- Mario Wimmer (U. of California), *Ranke's Protestantism: Epistemological Optimism in the Writing of History*
- Henning Trüper (Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies), *Heteronomous Metaphysics: Usener, Cassirer and the Historicization of Personal Deities*
- Jonathan Sheehan (U. of California), *Wellhausen and Sacrifice: A Deep History of Theology and Comparative Religion*

Salon C: Comparison and the Modern Humanities

Chair: Thijs Weststeijn (U. of Amsterdam)

- Mimi Winick (Rutgers U.), *Comparison, Conjecture and a History of Feminist Critique*
- Devin Griffiths (U. of South California), *The Comparative Method and the History of the Humanities*
- Avi Alpert (Federal U. of Bahia), *Bad Comparisons and the History of the Dialectic*

3:00-3:30 PM: Coffee break (Nolan's)

3:30-5:00 PM: Parallel sessions

Salon A: Anthropology and Historical Research in the Context of the Cold War

Chair and respondent: Eugenio Refini (Johns Hopkins U.)

- Daniele Cozzoli (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Science, Natural Magic and the Subaltern Worldview in Post-War Italian Scholarship*
- Alexandre Coello de la Rosa (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Rethinking War and Aggression Among the Yanomami: an Approach from Historical Anthropology*
- Joao Melo (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Race and Empire in Portuguese Historiography and Anthropology, 1950-1990*

Salon B: Roundtable: The Classics of the Humanities

- Kasper Eskildsen (Roskilde U.)
- Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam)
- Kevin Chang (Academia Sinica)

Salon C: Between Magistra Vitae and Academic Discipline: The Nature of Enlightenment Historiography

Chair: Eleá de la Porte (U. of Amsterdam)

- Wyger Velema (U. of Amsterdam), *Ancient Historiography and History in the Dutch Enlightenment*
- Anton Matytsin (Kenyon College), *Contesting Time: Ancient Chronologies at the Académie des inscriptions*

5:15 PM: Salon C: Presentation of Graduate Student Paper Award, and Closing Remarks by Rens Bod and Bill Egginton

Johns Hopkins Exhibition

THE ENIGMATIC EDGAR A. POE IN BALTIMORE & BEYOND: SELECTIONS FROM THE SUSAN JAFFE TANE COLLECTION

The Enigmatic Edgar A. Poe in Baltimore & Beyond features highlights from the Susan Jaffe Tane Collection of Edgar Allan Poe, the finest private collection of Poe materials in the world. Focusing on Poe's peripatetic career and innovative responses to an unstable publishing environment, the exhibition provides historical context for Poe's creative production—and offers insight into his legacy: its development in nineteenth-century translation and its continued evolution through popular adaptations. The exhibition includes a first edition of *Tamerlane*, Poe's first book of poems—one of only twelve known copies; manuscripts and manuscript fragments; photographs, letters, and artifacts from Poe's life; newspaper, book, and magazine printings of Poe's stories and poems in his life-time; the *New-York Tribune* obituary that ruined Poe's reputation; and comic book versions of his stories.

The exhibition is free and open to the public. The exhibition runs through Sunday, February 5, 2017 at the George Peabody Library, 17 E. Mount Vernon Place, Baltimore, MD 21202. The George Peabody Gallery is open Tuesday through Thursday 10 – 5, Fridays and Saturdays 10 – 3, and Sundays 10 – 1.

Abstracts

Day 1, October 5

Keynote Address: Inhuman Humanities and the Artes that Make up Medieval Song

Sarah Kay (New York University)

The *artes* on which the medieval teaching of song relied straddled the division in the liberal arts between the language-based and number-based disciplines, drawing on *grammatica* on the one hand and on *musica* on the other. Such a combination feels right today when we think of song as setting words to music, though it tended to be understood differently then, since *grammatica* was more closely related to performance (whether of words or music) whereas *musica* was a more theoretical and abstract area of thought. But song is not limited to these two fields, as a much-discussed image in a pontifical in Reims BM attests. An interesting early vernacular encyclopedia, the *Thezaur of Peire Corbian*, in fact represents song as deriving from all the liberal arts, which are reviewed one by one as if they prepared for and culminated in the production of *baladas e dansas*. The art to which Peire pays most attention is astronomy, and I intend to follow him in exploring the privileged relation to song of astronomy and some of the phenomena associated with it. These are interesting because of the way they are invested with animation and thus with a relation to breath and voice, as well as to whatever is the principle of anima (“soul”). Just as bestiaries represent the sublunary world as teaming with living beings, so too the sky is envisaged as thronging with animate creatures. Both bestiaries and astronomy treatises are school texts that are found in a range of manuscript compilations, some dominated by the trivium and others by the quadrivium. This paper will look at some examples in order to show the relationship of these arts with medieval secular song. In conclusion, it can be seen not only that song draws on disciplines that we would now see as “sciences” rather than as “humanities” but also that it depends on a wider concept of animation than the human, in line with contemporary approaches in the humanities that are inflected by ecology and the posthuman.

Epistemology of the Humanities

Jaap Maat (U. of Amsterdam), *The History of a Field as Part of the Field*

Today, to be a scientist is one thing; to be a historian of science is quite another. Likewise, linguistics is not at all the same thing as the history of linguistics. By contrast, the history of philosophy continues to be relevant for philosophy; at least, academic philosophers are typically well trained in the history of philosophy. Likewise, literary scholars usually have a more than superficial relation to the history of their own field.

This paper argues that asking how far the history of a field is relevant to current research in that field is not only a useful means to characterize differences between contemporary academic disciplines, but may also provide a valuable perspective on the history of the humanities. First, asking this question draws attention to a phenomenon to be studied and explained as a significant development in the history of certain fields. For example, the knowledge embodied in the disciplines concerned with language and logic in early modern Europe overlapped to a considerable degree with knowledge of the previous history of these disciplines – a characteristic that is absent from modern logic and

Day 1, October 5

linguistics. It will thus be important to understand why and how this change took place. Secondly, the question may highlight an aspect to be focused on in cross-cultural comparisons. The paper illustrates the first point by sketching the development mentioned and tentatively explores the second point by looking into the history of logic in China.

Rik Peels (Vrije U. Amsterdam), *The Epistemic Values of the Humanities*

Over the last few decades, the pressure on universities to deliver socially and technically useful knowledge has brought the humanities in dire straits. Since the kinds of learning that the humanities produce is less tangible and less directly and visibly relevant to topical social and technological concerns, they have been put in the dock and are sometimes actively marginalized.

From an historical and epistemological point of view, we can think of this as a lopsided focus on a narrow set of epistemic values and responsibilities – to wit, those having to do with practical knowledge or ‘techne’ – at the cost of other, broader epistemic values, such as understanding, wisdom, and intellectual character formation (Maxwell 1984; Midgley 1989; Kronman 2008). This might go some way toward explaining the staggering findings that many students hardly show any improvement in learning on standardized tests after four years of college education (Arum 2011).

In this paper, I explore what the relevant epistemic values of the humanities are and how, in various periods in history, they have been articulated in defense against scientific attacks on and criticisms of the humanities. I also argue that broadening the range of epistemic values that universities ought to pursue, including intellectual humility, open-mindedness, and wisdom, calls for a central place for the humanities at contemporary universities.

Stefani Engelstein (Duke U.), *Divisive Loves: Philology's Hierarchies*

In the long nineteenth century, fields emerged that domesticated human diversity by positioning their objects – languages, races, religions, and species – within living systems of adaptation and descent from (common or divergent) ancestors. In spite of shared structures and methodologies, these genealogical fields soon split into the three cultures. A primary divisive element was the causal mechanism for change over time, understood as natural law, accident, or human will. Embedded in the question of mechanism lay an attitude towards divisiveness itself. William Jones, in the foundational lectures of modern comparative philology, noted that science divides while fancy combines. The combinatory tendencies attributed to the mind’s humanistic creative powers were discovered not only in myth, religion, and fiction, but also in violent human histories of conquest and in the proliferation – often coercive – of mixed-heritage populations. Located at the disciplinary fault line, philology from Jones, Schlegel, and Humboldt to Max Müller, Renan, and Nietzsche generated rupture between literary humanities that disciplined caprice, and linguistic sciences that aimed to sublimate history into immutable laws of divergence. Unruly fancy thus embodies a paradox: it precipitates the impure races and insecure borders for which the incorruptible purity of language must compensate, and yet it also signals the (Aryan) apex of a racial hierarchy of creative dominance. “We Philologists,” however contested the term in recent calls for reinvigoration through return to philology, must follow the historical mandate alongside the hermeneutic and the textual and not neglect the ugliness in our own genealogy.

Day 1, October 5

Andrew J. Kluth (UCLA), *On Music's Capacity to Refigure Worlds: The Relevance of Hermeneutic Turn in Music Studies*

The New Musicology of the 1980s and 90s replaced historiography and formal analysis of music with a focus on socio-cultural power structures, and the implications of musical phenomena in their construction and maintenance. These relatively new critical methodologies do important work in addressing the complex position of music in social reality, but they often take what may be music's most basic, first-order significance for granted: its capacity to affect practitioners and listeners; to refigure their worlds of experience. Critical musicology analyzes the trace of music in social reality, but to rigorously discuss the work music does to change subjects' worlds, it is helpful to consider music from an onto-phenomenological theoretical position; a hermeneutics of music. From this analytical position, it is clear that musical works are not aesthetically autonomous objects, nor merely texts, but that they are hermeneutically autonomous worlds, the fusion of whose horizons with the horizon of an historically situated subject, can occasion ontological disclosure; a refiguring of said subject's world. In this paper, I trace some of the methodologies and theoretical approaches that make up the intellectual history of musicology, and suggest a philosophical/phenomenological hermeneutics approach to music study that characterizes the power of music to disrupt social realities and engender alternative ways of being in the world. Via the work of Hans Georg Gadamer, Paul Ricoeur, and Roger Savage, I argue for the relevance of the hermeneutic turn in music studies to effectively address music's capacity to construct and maintain identities and to refigure worlds.

History of Art History

Olga Olkheft (European U. Saint Petersburg), *Sitting on the Collection: The Production of Art History in the State Hermitage Museum*

This paper presents the results of an Ethnography of the museum, jointly organized by the European University at St. Petersburg and The State Hermitage. The museum occupies a special position in Russian culture, unique by its size and the wealth of its collection. It is both the most visible icon of the city, and one of the most opaque institutions. With more than two hundred keepers of collections, the Hermitage is also one of the most populous Russian research centers in the field of visual arts and material culture.

The State Hermitage has grown in isolation since the 1917 revolution. After WWII, Soviet science was strongly stricken by the anti-cosmopolitanism campaign and the Hermitage became one of the very few places in the soviet art history landscape where keepers could study Western European art. Isolated from the developments abroad, most Hermitagers insulated themselves from other Soviet colleagues as well and invented their own standards of professionalism. If the Hermitage is now open if not fully integrated into the international art world, the traces of an isolationist scientific tradition persist among Hermitage scholars paying more attention to their colleagues next door than to international experts in their field. In pursuit of preserving the intellectual and aristocratic traditions of the Imperial Hermitage, the museum is still a successor of the soviet system, which assumes closeness, a strong hierarchy and a slow rotation in key positions. Keepers usually hold their collections until the end of their life, a situation that establishes a symbolic appropriation of the collection.

Day 1, October 5

Eleonora Vratskidou (TU Berlin), *Art Academies, an Alternative Institutional Framework for Art History During the 19th Century*

Accounts of the disciplinary formation of art history have been mainly focused on the university and the museum, neglecting the role played by institutions of artistic training. Since the late 18th century, courses in art history, along with courses in history, archaeology, art theory and aesthetics, had been systematically incorporated into the curricula of art academies, schools of design and academies of architecture. Spaces of art education count indeed among the first institutional homes of art history, and contributed significantly to the shaping of the discipline well before the establishment of autonomous university chairs –a development largely overlooked not only in the field of art historiography but also by the history of art education.

This paper examines the ways in which particular conditions prevalent in the art academy such as the contact and interaction between practitioners and scholars and the direct exposure of the latter to the problems of artistic practice affected the discourses and knowledge produced within this context. The analysis will concentrate on a Greek and a German case study: the teaching of Grigorios Pappadopoulos at the Athenian School of Arts from the 1840s to the 1860s and the lectures of Karl Bötticher at the Akademie der Künste and the Bauakademie in Berlin during the same period. I will argue that in both cases adapting to the needs of artistic training gave way to analytical rather than historical approaches that privileged taxonomical thinking and systematic classification (of forms, techniques and genres) over chronological ordering, construction of narratives and historical contextualisation.

Shannon M. Lieberman (UCSB), *Just a Story: Mistress Narratives and the Art Historical Canon, 1965-1976*

This paper examines three art exhibitions held in the United States between 1965 and 1977: Women Artists of America, 1707-1964 at the Newark Museum, Old Mistress: Women Artists of the Past at the Walters Art Gallery, and Women Artists: 1550-1950 at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art. Organized in the midst of the feminist movement in the United States, these exhibitions were recuperative measures that attempted to gain recognition for the work of marginalized women artists throughout history and, in turn, challenged the authority of art history's master narrative. The mistress narratives constructed through these exhibitions and their accompanying texts functioned as supplements to the official, male dominated master art historical narrative, but none of them proposed a wholesale replacement of the master narrative or its canon. I argue that these exhibitions were groundbreaking in that they drew new attention not only to the work on view, but also to the larger issue of how art history was constructed, by whom, and under what conditions. These exhibitions and the mistress narratives they constructed were a vital part of rethinking the concepts of artist, quality, and woman, and the relationships between these terms specifically because they revealed the master art historical narrative and its ideological underpinnings as constructs that could be changed. Turning the master narrative into just one possible story, these exhibitions provided models for feminist interventions in art history and can be read more broadly as part of a widespread effort toward recuperating women's contributions to culture.

Day 1, October 5

Bennett Gilbert (Portland State U.), *What the History of Early Printing Can Learn from the History of Early Photography*

The historical development of the humanities has required technologies for the reproduction and diffusion of texts and images. These technologies are central to Western humanities' self-conception. Proto-photography is the only parallel to proto-typography as an instance of the deployment of reproduction technologies and, being nearer to us in date and better attested than proto-typography, can be useful in accounting for the origins of print techniques c. 1375–1450. But printing history scholars have not made use of this comparison.

This conference presentation will be a brief statement of what the similarities and differences between the two suggest as to the development the humanities through the press at the start of early modernity.

The history of the study of proto-photography for this purpose sheds light on basic types of reproduction, the desire for making copies, single and multiple “inventors,” the deep roots of fundamental conceptions, questions of truth and evidence, notions of light and visibility, the importance of the inscription point, and the global sources of materials and ideas.

Also, accounts of proto-photography reflect theoretical issues common to historical studies, including the long dispute over the legitimacy and value of intellectual history and the relations of abstract conception, psychic drives, and material production.

These thoughts are part of a long-term research project, begun in 2014, to re-conceive the origins of printing by contextualizing it anew in the moral world of technology and philosophy at the end of the Middle Ages and the start of the Renaissance. In the work resulting from this project I will develop this line of inquiry at length both as to method and as to the substantial topics briefly suggested by the heuristic of proto-typography.

Humanities at Johns Hopkins

From its founding in 1876 as the first true research university in the US, Johns Hopkins has served as a vital node within the global network of the humanities. Most of the early faculty in the humanities had done their graduate work in Europe, and brought the seminar method with them to Hopkins. Its graduates in turn brought the Hopkins method to other leading American universities. That transatlantic conversation continued throughout the 20th c, with important consequences not only for individual disciplines but for the humanities as a whole. This panel will explore three key episodes in the history of the humanities at Johns Hopkins, each from a different era in the university's history and each with a cosmopolitan reach.

Stuart W. Leslie (Johns Hopkins U.), *Whatever Happened to the History of Ideas?*

From the 1920s through the 1940s the History of Ideas, most closely associated with Johns Hopkins philosopher Arthur Lovejoy, represented a major if not unchallenged interdisciplinary paradigm for the humanities. This paper charts the rise, fall, and recent resurgence of the History of Ideas through the writings of philosophers Arthur Lovejoy and his Hopkins colleague George Boas and also in their roles as conveners of the famous History of Ideas Club and as founders of the Journal of the

Day 1, October 5

History of Ideas. The the New Intellectual History of the 1970s, led by political historians John Pocock and Quentin Skinner, and later the linguistic and cultural ‘turns’ informed by philosophers and historians more interested in the meaning of texts, seemed to have successfully supplanted the History of Ideas and changed the fundamental questions of the field, “From History of Ideas to History of Meaning,” as William Bouwsma famously reformulated it. In recent years, however, a number of historians, including Anthony Grafton and Daniel Wickberg have taken a closer and more sympathetic look at the original History of Ideas and its often neglected influence on current historiographical trends.

Hent de Vries (Johns Hopkins U.), *After and Beyond Structuralism: The Humanities Centre at Johns Hopkins, Then and Now*

This paper will assess the impact of the Humanities Center from its sponsorship of the famous “Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man” symposium in 1966 to its current iteration as a unique interdisciplinary space for reconsideration of humanistic theory across literary studies, history, the history of art, philosophy, and religion.

Dorothy Ross (Johns Hopkins U.), *John Higham, John Pocock and the Shifting Fate of Cosmopolitanism in the Writing of American History*

This paper describe how Higham and Pocock brought cosmopolitan perspectives to a branch of the humanities that –probably more than any other – was bounded by nationalist perspectives, US history.

Both emerged from internationalist postwar milieu and moved to Hopkins in the 1970s when the department was widely known for its cosmopolitan reach, i.e. its study of early modern Europe, Africa, and the movement of people, goods, and institutions across the Atlantic, as well as for its links to European centers of such study. In different ways, Higham and Pocock brought cosmopolitan perspectives to the writing of American history, Higham by constructing a hopeful, pluralist American nationalism that would fit into a liberal internationalist world, Pocock by bringing to bear on American history a tradition of political thought that developed in ancient Rome, Renaissance Italy, and early modern Britain.

History of Linguistics

Julia Claire Hernandez (U. of Georgia), *Comparative Historical Linguistics in 16th-century Spain: Pedro Simón Abril’s ‘Gramática griega escrita en lengua castellana’*

This paper explores the history of Early Modern historical linguistics by considering the influence of grammatical treatises on linguistic identity in 16th-century Spain. Specifically, it focuses on Spanish humanist Pedro Simón Abril (c.1530-c.1599), whose grammar of Ancient Greek was one of the first to apply what modern linguists call a comparative methodology to explain diachronic language change. By applying this methodology to seek the shared linguistic roots not only of Castilian and Latin, but also, more innovatively, of Castilian and Greek, Simón Abril’s Greek grammar reflects contemporary Humanist desires to establish a Greek heritage for European languages in addition to a Roman one. Moreover, Simón Abril’s search for Castilian’s Greco-Roman roots was influential in constructing a Classically-based identity for his contemporaries, an identity which, when exported to

Day 1, October 5

the Americas, profoundly shaped Spanish valuations of non-Indo-European indigenous languages and cultures.

Despite his innovative comparative methodology, Simón Abril lacked the crucial data, namely contact with Sanskrit and other South Asian languages that have allowed modern investigators to definitively reconstruct the Proto-Indo-European ancestor of Ancient Greek, Latin, and many modern European languages. By assuming a genealogical relationship between Greek, Latin, and Castilian, then, Simón Abril relied on a culturally conditioned desire to link these languages rather than on accurate Proto-Indo-European reconstructions. Simón Abril's comparative Greek grammar, nevertheless, remains an invaluable tool for considering 16th-century Spanish linguistic identity precisely *because* the author, lacking these reconstructions, was forced to rely on his perceptions of the three languages' relative prestige in order to demonstrate their relationship.

Stella Gevorgyan-Ninness (Arcadia U.), *German Comparative Linguistics in Late Imperial and Early Soviet Scholarship*

Inspired by Darwin's theory of evolution, European comparative linguistics created a new system of classification for languages. Attempts to organize languages into a hierarchy from perfect to inferior was seen as a major step in making their field more "scientific". Late Imperial and early Soviet linguists severely criticized this type of comparative research denying the existence of a common Indo-European proto-language. Early Soviet scholars viewed the different approaches as an epic confrontation between advanced Soviet science and the backward bourgeois scholarship of the West. The Soviet alternative was Nikolai Marr's New Theory. In the Caucasus, however, Indo-European comparative linguistics continued to exist. Armenian linguists turned to comparative linguistics conducted mainly by German scholars for various reasons. Hübschmann's classification of Armenian as an independent language branch provided a link between Iranian and Indian languages. These ideas made their way from Germany to the Caucasus. Major Armenian linguists promoted a theory about the double nature of Armenian. The Indo-European research of Western Europe suited the national agenda of Armenian Orientalists. Despite the various reactions to Western European language scholarship, one thing is clear. In Germany, new ideas in linguistics and the impact of Orientalism provided new tools for scholarship which scholars in Imperial Russia or the later Soviet Union could not ignore.

James McElvenny (U. Potsdam), *Linguistic Aesthetics at the Turn of the 19th to the 20th century: Otto Jespersen and Charles Bally*

Modern linguistics is a largely dispassionate science, which treats languages as value-free systems to be studied in the abstract. This was, however, not always so: 19th-century linguistics is replete with attempts to classify and rank languages according to their perceived relative value. Otto Jespersen (1860–1943) stood at the end of this tradition and, in his theory of "progress in language", marks the beginning of a new era. Against the traditional ranking that put the "synthetic" classical Indo-European languages – Sanskrit, Greek and Latin – at the highest level, Jespersen praised the modern "analytic" languages for their "simplicity" and "efficiency". His new evaluation brought aesthetics in linguistics in line with several notable streams of modernism with which he was in personal contact: contemporary mathematical logic, the monistic metaphysics of Wilhelm Ostwald (1853–1932), and the international language movement.

Day 1, October 5

One of the most interesting contemporary reactions to Jespersen's theory came from Charles Bally (1865–1947). Bally rejected any kind of “progress” in language as well as Jespersen's criteria of simplicity and efficiency, but maintained a key principle of the value-judgements of the previous century, the notion that languages reflect the mentalité of their speakers. For Bally, however, mentalité is not perceptible in the language system itself, but rather in its use.

In this presentation, I will examine Jespersen and Bally's contrasting views and their intellectual background, which is intimately entwined with the emergence of structuralism.

Bart Karstens (U. of Amsterdam), *Paradigms in Linguistics?*

If the many publications, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the appearance of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, demonstrated anything, it is that Kuhn's thought is still relevant for historiography of science today. First, there is a growing feeling that the radical constructivist turn coming after Kuhn has gone too far. As Kuhn has always been a fierce critic of social constructivism, his arguments against it are worth considering again. Second, Kuhn significantly developed his core idea of alternating periods of normal and revolutionary science in his later work. Because historians of science have only sparsely adopted Kuhn's later ideas on, for example, academic specialization and the role of virtues in theory choice, these ideas still offer room for exploration.

For the history of humanities a third reason can be provided why reflecting on Kuhn could still be relevant. In the past few years, the discussion about the similarities and differences of the sciences and humanities has considerably flared up. For Kuhn, in order to count as ‘full-grown’, a discipline *needs* to go through a series of paradigmatic stages. That is, a discipline has to be denied the status of a proper science if it rests in a pre-paradigmatic state. If we take such a state as typical for the humanities, then this results in a division between the two domains of knowledge. If, on the other hand, it is possible to demonstrate that Kuhn's model is also applicable to the humanities, it is much harder to maintain the picture of a strict division between the sciences and the humanities.

Linguistics has often been seen as a field of study that has never managed to transcend its pre-paradigmatic state because the many different aspects of language, and the many ways of studying these aspects, have never been integrated into a single paradigm. While some historians of linguistics are inclined to share this view, others have on the contrary argued that Kuhn's model is very well applicable to the history of linguistics. Interestingly however, there is no unanimity in this group of scholars as to where to lay the fault lines! Finally, a third group of historians have argued that the application of Kuhn's model leads to misrepresentations of the history of linguistics because it obscures all kinds of continuities and similarities in the various approaches to the study of language that history has witnessed. In my contribution I will review these three positions and argue that they all lack support, mainly because they revolve around the ‘old’ Kuhn and fail to take into account later sophistications of his model. This conclusion invites us to once more reflect on the relation between the sciences and humanities.

History and Architecture

Bernd Kulawik (Bibliothek Werner Oechslin), *New Results from the Accademia della Virtù / Accademia Vitruviana at Rome (c. 1537 – 1555): Tracing the First International Network of Interdisciplinary Research Further*

Day 1, October 5

Since my presentation of a first sketch regarding the Renaissance corpora of sources presumably created by the so-called Accademia della Virtù in Rome in 2014 some considerable steps ahead have been achieved: While the corpus of architectural drawings documenting ancient Roman ruins could be extended from about 220 up to 660 sheets with more than 3,200 single drawings, other materials collected by members of the Accademia for its immense program could be identified and are studied by colleagues from Germany and the Netherlands. More and more it becomes clear that the Accademia could rather be described as a research network of independent but collaborating working groups in Rome with connections to scholars all over Central and Western Europe. This network may not only have been the first of its kind, but also one of the largest ever active — and almost surely the one with the largest surviving output: And though some of these materials have already been used, e.g. the collection of Latin inscriptions by the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, they never have been identified as belonging together and to this network. The paper will present the most recent achievements in the ongoing research which can itself only be regarded as a first step and preparation for the establishment of a new interdisciplinary, international network of scholars to further study this material, identify related sources and meta-sources (like letters and archival records) and to reconstruct this almost forgotten scientific network of humanists, architects, doctors, churchmen and many other professionals.

Irena Fatsea (NTUA), *A 'Modern' Student of the Humanities in the Streets of Post-Napoleonic Berlin: Classical Taste and Prejudice in the Rise of a Nationalist Architectural Aesthetic*

Stephanos Koumanoudis, a Balkan of Greek descent and student of the Humanities in Berlin, expresses his scepticism of the new interpretations of classicism he encountered in the post-Napoleonic city on her way to modernization. This paper focuses upon Koumanoudis's formation as both an enlightened 'modern' and pro-Greek classicist in the footsteps of J. J. Winckelmann and under the spell of his mentor, philhellene Friedrich Thiersch. Specifically, the ideological stand of the later eminent philologist and archaeologist of the Greek state is both analyzed and assessed with a special eye on his theoretical views on aesthetics vis-à-vis the intellectual context of his current movement of German Idealism. The paper probes into the contrasting variations of neoclassical architecture in Munich and Berlin – mainly as shaped by its two key representatives, Leo von Klenze and K.F. Schinkel, respectively – and Koumanoudis's attitude to both as evidenced by his numerous critical accounts of building sites he visited as a student. By recourse to extensive archival material, the paper exposes the Humanities as the predominant 'science' of post-1850s Greece and its determining role in shaping ideological discourse about all the arts (incl. architecture) before the disciplinary formation of the specific fields in the Greek university.

Daniel C. Sherer (Yale U.), *Panofsky on Architecture: Construction and Reception of an Iconology of Built Form 1939-1953*

Panofsky's investigations of architecture are inseparable from his iconological interpretation of the other arts. For Panofsky, architecture, like painting and sculpture, is a bearer of meaning both intrinsic and extrinsic which attaches to form in different ways. My talk will trace three moments in Panofsky's reading of architecture that prioritize the relation of form and meaning according to specific and diversified registers. At issue is not only a method of interpretation aimed at elucidating architecture, but also Panofsky's response to other readings of architectural form and meaning in the Warburg tradition and the responses by historians and architects outside of this tradition to

Day 1, October 5

Panofsky's readings of architecture. Implicit in the analysis, therefore, is a complex situation of exchange and critical reception.

The first moment is represented by what is perhaps the most celebrated of Panofsky's architectural analyses: Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism (1951). In this study an analogy is proposed linking the logical system of scholastic philosophy to the structural system of Gothic ecclesiastical architecture. Arguably, this argument is the closest that Panofsky ever came to an interpretation of architecture connecting it to contemporaneous philosophical developments in the manner of Wittkower's Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (1947): one can thus propose an implicit response to Wittkower's method in this text. A major difference divides the two approaches however: where Wittkower proposed a form/idea connection linking architecture and Neoplatonic thought, Panofsky argued for a form/form analogy linking architecture and scholastic thought. E. H. Gombrich attacked this argument as an attempt to revive the questionable notion of the Hegelian *Zeitgeist* in art history, though a private discussion with Panofsky did elicit interesting observations on Gombrich's part regarding the relation of the work of art and/or architecture to its contexts, and particularly in the first case, the relation of the artwork to its potentially architectonic and sculptural frame.

At issue in the second moment is the problem of levels of interpretation. This became of interest particularly in the wake of Panofsky's elaboration of the aims of iconology in Studies in Iconology (1939), dividing the object of iconological reading into the three levels of perceptual form, extrinsic and intrinsic meaning. This division informs the trope of "disguised symbolism" in Early Netherlandish Painting (1953) in which the transition from the Old Dispensation to the New is symbolized by the contrast of Synagoga, signified by a structure in Romanesque style, and Ecclesia, a structure in Gothic style in several Netherlandish altarpieces of the fifteenth century. This architectural antithesis represents the historical supersession of the Judaic Law by Christian redemption as a function of the synthesis of architecture and painting.

The third moment, represented by "The Neoplatonic Movement and Michelangelo," of 1939, is similar to the second, as it addresses the synthesis of architecture and sculpture. This synthesis shaped the Medici Chapel, where Panofsky sees this strategy as an integral part of the mode of transmission of the idea of Neoplatonic transcendence. Unlike Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism, this reading received a varied but generally positive response from art and architectural historians, establishing a new methodological consensus without however achieving the wide reception that Wittkower enjoyed in the immediate postwar period not only among art historians, but among practicing architects.

Aleta Quinn (Caltech), *William Whewell's Philosophy of and Practice of Historical Science*

William Whewell analyzed historical sciences - those sciences that attempt to reconstruct the past - as a group in his *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837) and in his *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1840). Whewell's work on historical science has received some attention from historians and philosophers of science. Whewell's own work on the history of German Gothic church architecture has been touched on within the context of the history of architecture. To a large extent these discussions have been conducted separately. I argue that Whewell intended his work on Gothic architecture as an attempt to (help) found a science of historical architecture, as an exemplar of historical science. I proceed by analyzing the key features of Whewell's philosophy of historical science. I then show how his architectural history exemplifies this philosophy. Finally, I show how Whewell's philosophy of historical science matches some developments in a science (biological

Day 1, October 5

systematics) that, in the mid- to late- nineteenth century, came to be reinterpreted as a historical science. I comment briefly on Whewell as a potential influence on 19th century biology and in particular on Darwin.

Was There a Republic of Letters in the 19th Century?

Historians of knowledge generally assume that specialisation, academic institutionalisation and nationalism, as well as the numerical increase in active scholars and scientists, caused the Republic of Letters or *Gelehrtenrepublik* or Commonwealth of Learning, to go into mortal decline around 1800. Yet, the Cult of Correspondence was maintained, learned societies mushroomed, public interest in science & scholarship increased, salons in Paris and Rome continued to be interdisciplinary and international meeting placings. The term ‘Republic of letters’ or *République des Lettres*’ was still sometimes used by 19th-c. intellectuals to describe intellectual communities, although much less frequently than in the early modern period. It would appear that the lingering use of the phrase ‘Republic of Letters’ in the 19th-c was meant to describe rather the world of literature than the world of learning. This would signal a major split in the field of the humanities, for the 18th-c. tradition of *Historia Literaria* still treats learning and literature concomitantly. So did the Republic of Letters turned into a *République des ‘belles’ Lettres*? Does the word ‘literae’/’letters’ take up a new meaning in the 19th century in light of the rise of the disciplines? What role did the Republic of Letters play in a century of academic specialization? In what contexts and for what purposes is the Republic of Letters referenced? And what can that tell us about a sense of international commonality in the world of learning and literature at time which saw the rise of the Humanities? These are the questions which will be addressed by the speakers on this panel.

Dirk van Miert (U. Utrecht), *Fichte and the Republic of Letters in Germany*

The Republic of Letters disintegrated in the years between the early modern and the modern age, variously labeled the “Age of Revolution” by Eric Hobsbawm, the *Sattelzeit* [Saddle Time] by Reinhard Koselleck, and *Achsenzeit* [Axial time] by Bernard Giesen (adapting a famous idea of Karl Jaspers). The revolution in philosophical thought that took place in Prussia during the last two decades of the eighteenth century was crucial in creating an atmosphere where the vitality of the Republic of Letters was greatly diminished. And yet, as significant as this philosophical revolution was, historians have not yet given attention to reflections on the state of the Republic of Letters in this period of transition, nor to typologies of its citizens formulated by thinkers of the period. Whereas Immanuel Kant (d. 1803) never used the phrase ‘Gelehrtenrepublik’, the term does occur in the writings of other Germans in his network, notably in those of Johann Gottlieb Fichte (d. 1814), whose ideas played a crucial role in the conceptualisation of the Humboldtian ideal of *Bildung*. In this talk, I will tease out the contexts in which Fichte uses the notion of the Republic of Letters, and I will give an impression of the German Idealist *Gelehrtenrepublik* around 1800 by presenting the new website MaGIC Net (Mapping German Idealist Correspondence Networks).

Floris Solleveld (Forschungszentrum Gotha, U. Erfurt), *A Public Republic of Letters?*

There is a gap in our understanding of the history of scholarly journals. It is well known that journals like the *Journal des Savants*, *Acta Eruditorum* and *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* were crucial in shaping the Republic of Letters in the late 17th and early 18th century, and that specialist journals were equally important for the professionalization of scholarship in the second half of the 19th. But in the period in between, scholarly debate also changed shape, not in the last place because of the rise of

Day 1, October 5

learned journals that addressed a wider audience, like the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, British Reviews and Quarterlies, and the *Revue des deux Mondes*. While the notion of a ‘Republic of Letters’ became less and less common in the 19th century, learned journals, at least in the first half, continued the old practice of providing a broad, international, trans-disciplinary or pre-disciplinary overview of learning. But they also did something new: they included reviews in essay format, independent essays, and sometimes outspoken programmatic texts.

My presentation is concerned with how this affected the learned world as a community. Appeals to the learned world as a group became rarer, because the target audience was now either larger (the reading public) or smaller (fellow specialists). But did this change of rhetoric and publication format also reflect a wider change in scholarly practice, or in the self-conception of the learned world?

Melanie Conroy (U. of Memphis), *Nineteenth-Century Salons: A Latter-Day ‘Republic of Letters’?*

Salons were core institutions of the early modern Republic of Letters, especially in France where absolute monarchy assured that freethinking went underground or took place in private homes. The Republic of Letters is not normally considered to extend past the French Revolution, yet salons did outlast the Old Regime. Through the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, gatherings in private homes brought together writers, artists, academics, politicians, and artists for wide-ranging discussions. In what way did these gatherings differ from early modern salons? Can the societies that these salons brought together be considered a latter-day ‘Republic of Letters’? This presentation draws upon data and visualizations from the Salons Project, a database containing information about European salons, which was created as a part of Mapping the Republic of Letters, a project housed at Stanford University that “examines the scholarly communities and networks of knowledge during the period 1500-1800.” Through the study of Parisian salons from 1700 to 1914, I find that salons continued to play a fundamental role in knowledge production and circulation in elite French circles until World War I. While the proliferation of academies, schools, newspapers, and publications meant that correspondence played a declining role in knowledge production, salons retained their role as informal semi-private institutions that brought together people of diverse backgrounds with varied interests. Throughout the nineteenth century, Parisian salons were semi-formal spaces that contributed to the production of knowledge and artistic excellent in fields as varied as literature, music, history, and philosophy.

Olaf Simons (Forschungszentrum Gotha, U. Erfurt), *From the Republic of Letters to the Debate about Literature. A History of Productive Solutions*

The “republic of letters” disappeared almost silently around 1800 – only to re-emerge as the “scientific community”, so one could say. The Republic of Letters’ “constitution” (as N.H. Gundling called it), was “*Historia Literaria*”. This ‘history of learning’ lost its position around 1800, and re-emerged decades later as the new ‘Literary history’, now dealing not with ‘learning’, but with poetry, plays and fiction. Through a divergence of developments we moved into the new era of the natural sciences yet also into the world of the 19th- and 20th-century humanities. To fully grasp how this transition took place, we will need a better understanding of a paradoxical crisis of the old Republic of Learning around 1700 and of the productive solutions that began in the 1730s:

Day 1, October 5

- The immensely personal literary debate of the old republic defended its success in a move towards topics of a far wider impact – the change of the definition of literature we are observing.
- The academic studies redefined their project in a contrastive *theoretical turn* that destabilised the individual and its eclectic erudition – the change that repositioned the natural sciences after 1750.
- The humanities profited from both these developments: They emerged as new authorities corroborating the nationalist programs of the modern nation state and its educational system and ready to define and to constantly destabilise all the public debates in the wider field of human artefacts and their designs.

This intricate history can apparently not be untangled in a mere history of the concepts involved. In my talk I therefore wish to go beyond *Begriffsgeschichte* of the adjective 'literaria' as it pertained to Respublica and Historia.

The Humanities and the Social Sciences

Katherine Arens (U. of Texas), *James, Wundt, and Griesinger: From Psychology to the Varieties of Religious Experience*

My presentation addresses the epistemology of disciplinary historiography by contesting a pervasive narrative convention: connecting significant persons or theories as "influences" or "sources." I suggest that considering "influences" as *prior to* a project under investigation needs to be interrogated as an epistemological and ethical choice, and that "influence" is more profitably modeled as an adaptation bridging multiple spheres of power and interest, considering sources and key questions as intertexts, rather than evolutions.

William James' psychology of religion becomes here the case study for revising the idea of influence. *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1901/02) outlines a rigorous taxonomy of mental experience, and then uses this work to argue American religion as a specific, positive historical epistemology. Two of James' intertexts undervalued as "influences" are critical to understanding his objectives: German psychiatrist Wilhelm Griesinger's *Mental Pathology and Therapeutics*, first translated in 1845 and central to treatment in the Civil War era, and Wilhelm Wundt's various texts on psychology, reaching back to the 1870s. James had visited Griesinger in Berlin; he had hired Wundt's student in 1892 to establish a modern psychology lab. Considered as an interlocutor with the visible leader of understudied psychological discourses, James emerges less the American innovator and more dependent on dialogues with the vanguard of European thought. James can be seen as a part of an international scholarly paradigm that needs to be included in any assessment of the novelty, or scope of his work (where it stands in the *intentionality* of the epistemological paradigm).

Bican Polat (Johns Hopkins U.), *"Culture and Personality": Anthropology Meets Psychoanalysis*

This paper examines the influence of Freudian psychoanalysis on the formation of the "culture and personality" movement of American anthropology during the interwar period. I explore how psychodynamic explanations were deployed in the ethnographic work of Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, and Cora Du Bois in order to buttress and elaborate on the two chief methodological

Day 1, October 5

principles of the Boasian approach to culture: (1) reference to cultural relativism, by which one escaped the limits of one's own ethnocentrism and (2) adoption of a developmental perspective, in which the social and environmental factors were considered to determine identity formation in a given culture. I first explore the distinct ways in which these anthropologists invoked psychoanalytic ideas in their ethnographic investigations of how early childhood experiences influenced the development of adult personality in diverse societies. More specifically, I track how Freud's conceptualization of developmental stages such as weaning and toilet training set new objects for ethnographic inquiry, prompting the collection of systematic data on child-raising practices in the non-west. Second, I examine the contributions of these ethnographies to anthropological theory by tracking the distinct kind of knowledge they made available through the investigative techniques of psychoanalysis. I discuss how psychoanalytic and psychodynamic techniques such as dream analysis, projective tests, and clinical interviews played a key role in the development of a person-centered approach in ethnographic writing. Providing a critical reconstruction of the discourse on culture and personality, this paper thus examines how its objects, methods, and theories were informed by a specific cultural practice, i.e., psychoanalysis, whose claims to universality were paradoxically taken up and deployed to counter universalism, hereditarianism, and ethnocentrism in the interwar United States.

Katharina Isabel Schmidt (Princeton U.), *From Evolutionary Functionalism to Critical Transnationalism: Comparative Legal History, 1780s to Present*

In 1827 German legal historian Eduard Gans delivered his first lecture on *Universalrechtsgeschichte*—universal legal history—at the University of Berlin. Though temporally, geographically, and philosophically ambitious, Gans's project was well in keeping with his time. Nineteenth century legal history was comparative, if not global, in scope, firmly rooted in Hegelian critical dialectics. Things couldn't be more different today. Legal historians have grown suspicious of intellectual boundary-crossing. The discipline is more parochial than it has ever been.

How did this happen? Comparative legal history rose to prominence in the late eighteenth century with the emergence of instrumentalist perspectives on law and the rise of teleology, historicism, and evolutionism across the humanities and, later, the social sciences. Its methodological postulate, evolutionary functionalism, did not survive the twentieth century, however. By the 1900s, comparative arguments about law came to stand as proxy for the civilizational development of a people. Comparative legal history went on to play an integral part in imperialist, fascist, and cold war projects.

By way of response, scholars after WWII retreated to the safe confines of the nation state and its laws. As was widely acknowledged at the time, this caused a rupture with adjoining fields, considerably impoverishing the discipline. In a recent effort to restore to legal history some of its nineteenth century panache, all the while distancing themselves from its twentieth century pitfalls, scholars have embraced transnational methodologies. It is this transformation from evolutionary functionalism to critical transnationalism I wish to explore in my paper.

Katharina Natalia Piechocki (Harvard U.), *Cartographic Poetics and the Rise of German Humanism: A Contribution to the Making of the Humanities*

In his recent study of the rise of the concept of metrical space in early modern Europe, *La crisi della ragione cartografica*, Franco Farinelli argues that the advent of early modernity is defined by its new

Day 1, October 5

approach to space: unlike the medieval world, the early modern world is experienced indirectly, as a copy of a map. This new worldview was made possible by the emergence of a new humanistic discipline, cartography, and an increased production of maps. While the intricate relationship between cartography and poetics has been explored in Renaissance Italy, it has, quite paradoxically, not yet been studied in Northern Europe and Germany, in particular. This paper, then, investigates the crucial role of the German lands in the formation of cartography and Renaissance poetics. My paper focuses specifically on the city of Nuremberg—where the first terrestrial globe was produced in 1492—and on Germany’s first poet laureate, Conrad Celtis, the discoverer of the so-called Peutinger Map. Celtis’s poetic work, *Quattuor libri amorum* (1502), is a milestone in the development of a cartographic poetics that radiated across Europe in the early sixteenth century. A sustained reading of this Neo-Latin work allows us to rethink the role of cartography as a fundamental humanistic discipline that informed poetics. Furthermore, the joint vantage point of cartography and poetics redirects our understanding of Europe’s early modern borders, while opening up new spaces to explore the boundaries of humanism and the Humanities, more broadly.

The Making of Architectural Knowledge: Intersections of Architecture and Science

The entwined nature of art and science has become a central issue for understanding the making, circulation, and practice of knowledge in the humanities during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Exchanges between artists, architects, and natural philosophers directly influenced investigations and expressions of humanity’s relationship with Nature: in particular, studies of botany and the earth supported and incorporated concepts developed in parallel with architectural theory. As seen in British architectural practice and production, art and architecture maintained a regular dialogue with scientific studies of Nature. Likewise natural philosophers employed history of the fine and practical arts in thinking about how Nature worked. The four papers presented here investigate these themes through architecture as an expression of resistance to scientific controversy; as debate regarding the nature of antique building technologies; through the organization knowledge in visual taxonomies; and according to gendered tensions between novel design in architecture and scientific visual culture.

Marrikka Trotter (Harvard U.), *Temporal Sublime: Robert Adam and James Hutton in the Scottish Enlightenment*

During the last two decades of his life, the Scottish architect Robert Adam (1728–1792) created approximately one thousand romantic landscape watercolors. In these paintings, invented castles are set amongst real and imagined geological formations that reflect the theory of the earth then being advanced within Adam’s intellectual circle by James Hutton (1726–1797), the father of modern geology. Likewise, Hutton’s published account of his theory relies strongly on architectural terms and analogies, and his cyclical model of perpetually self-effacing and self-aggregating strata corresponds to the combinatorial treatment of classical antiquity that Adam pioneered in British architecture. Adam’s design technique reached its apex in the late “castle style” projects he produced at the same time as his watercolors. Influenced by Hutton’s geological collaborator, John Clerk of Eldin, who was also Adam’s brother-in-law, these designs recast architecture as a form of cultural resistance to a new and deeply challenging picture of the earth as an entity with a history of its own – one that dwarfed the history of humanity and all life forms. In fact, both Adam and Hutton relied on a uniquely Scottish formulation of the Sublime—applied to human productions like architecture and natural systems alike—to mitigate the inhuman timescale Hutton’s geological theory proposed. This

Day 1, October 5

intellectual cross-pollination speaks to the complex ways in which knowledge developed during the Scottish Enlightenment.

Allison Ksiazkiewicz (U. of Cambridge), *Making Bricks and Antique Landscapes in Late-Enlightenment Britain*

The history of human history, society, and the rise of civilization as a subject of late-Enlightenment scientific and philosophical investigation particularly affected studies that directly addressed a human-Nature relationship. In the earth sciences for instance, laws that governed Nature were considered analogous to those that affected laboratory experiment and shaped the geological landscape as observed in the field. In this way, natural and artificial processes and objects could be used to justify each other and develop scientific and cultural theory in a type of circular argument. Appropriating new antiquarian-methodologies, in which local technological innovation from antiquity blended with historical generalizations about society and civilization, earth studies embraced theories on the progress of the arts and new definitions of ‘natural’ as part of the burgeoning new science: geology. What counted as artificial and natural is excellently expressed in the long-standing debate over the ambiguous identification of vitrified ruins as found on several hilltops in Scotland. First described in 1777, antiquarians, geologists, and savants argued whether the summits of particular Highland mountains were the vestiges of iron-age forts or evidence of extinct volcanoes. The vitrified fort controversy and the ensuing investigations into brick-making technologies of past and present cultures highlight the entwined nature of science and art in the long eighteenth century, in which geological narratives directly engaged a broad cultural interest in the progress of society and its rise from Nature.

Courtney S. Long (U. of Pittsburgh), *The Unbinding of Natural and Architectural Knowledge*

In 1809 Jean-Baptiste Lamarck published *Philosophie Zoologique* to present his theory on the process of organic change and the inheritance of acquired characteristics through an idea of the “mutability of species” over time. Michele Foucault observes that Lamarck’s theory departed from established ideas about the “static” nature of organisms within natural history by suggesting that species’ development was “flexible.” Foucault describes this transition as an intellectual shift in the way that natural history is understood and written about through the “substituting of anatomy for classification, organism for structure, [...] the series for tabulation.”¹ How this was investigated pictorially in natural history can be seen in the transition from taxonomies of individual types (clusters of leaves, for example) to diagrams picturing relationships among and between specimens across geographical and chronological boundaries, as seen in Lamarck’s *tableau* of mutating species. Focusing on the transmission of methods and insights across disciplines, this paper engages some of the ways that British architectural historians adopted a theory about *transitional specimens* from natural history to map the process of change over time in medieval architectural history. As such, this paper examines the creation of *visual taxonomies* as a means to study and produce natural and architectural knowledge in Great Britain between 1800 and 1850.

Pandora Sypererek (Paul Mellon Centre), *‘Monad to Man’: Gendering Shifting Ideologies in the Natural History Museum*

The transition from the reigning paradigm of natural theology in the mid nineteenth century to the new science of evolution in its later decades has formed a focus within architectural studies of

Day 1, October 5

London's Natural History Museum (1881): the idiosyncratic building is often viewed as a microcosm of the warring factions that dominated the Victorian scientific landscape, best exemplified by the showdown between sculpted statues of Richard Owen and Charles Darwin positioned to overlook its Central Hall. The obsolescence of Owen's 'cathedral to nature' under the subsequent evolutionist regime forms a well-worn narrative. This paper seeks to complicate this reading and its implications of linear scientific progress by considering the role of art and aesthetics in the design and reception of the Museum. Late nineteenth-century criticism responded not only to the building's scientific obsolescence, but also to its aesthetic modernism – in contrast with typical neoclassical museum architecture, its neo-Romanesque design resonated with the budding Arts and Crafts and Aesthetic movements. I argue that the feminine associations conjured by these movements' embrace of decorativeness and techniques traditionally associated with women's work were behind contemporary challenges to the architecture's suitability. However, tensions equally exist between presumed sober and masculinist professionalization of science and new evolutionary displays, which echoed the highly feminized commercial designs in boutiques and department stores. Re-examining the vicissitudes of the Natural History Museum according to broader assemblages of architecture and display reveals a heterogeneous space indicative of the complexity of Victorian scientific thought and gender norms.

Intellectual Events, or What Can Historiography and Philosophy Learn from Each Other?

Intellectual events take place when thinkers meet. Ideas do not simply resonate or migrate. There is an embodied encounter.

Our panel explores intellectual events at the crossroads of historiography and philosophy. By exploring cases where thinkers traverse traditions and geographies, we seek to understand not only the itineraries of cross-cultural dialogue and debate. Our presentations also question how material and institutional contexts shape the transmission of ideas over time.

The particular aim of the panel is to bring together intellectual history and the history of philosophy. Historically, each has been concerned with ideas' receptions. When kept to themselves, however, these disciplines often prove limiting. Intellectual events call for new interpretive methods that move beyond histories of appropriations (*Rezeptionsgeschichte*) and histories of effects (*Wirkungsgeschichte*), as well as idealist categories such as "influence" and "diffusion." Through our explorations of thinkers' movements across boundaries (both physical and philosophical), we re-examine the relationships among contexts, ideas, and history.

Larry S. McGrath (Wesleyan U.), *The Intellectual as National Ambassador*

On the eve of World War I, psychologists, philosophers, poets, and scientists travelled from Europe as official envoys to the United States. Their mission was to disseminate humanistic ideas and also to secure diplomatic support in case of European conflicts. These transnational cultural networks demonstrate that intellectual ambassadorship constitutes a vital aspect of international relations.

During the early twentieth century, foreign ministries capitalized on the cultural caché that European intellectuals held in the American imagination. I focus on three cases: the Spanish neuroscientist Santiago Ramon y Cajal came to Clark University in 1899 in order to share his discovery on the neuron doctrine; the French philosopher Henri Bergson lectured on psychology and free will before droves of New Yorkers in 1913; and the British philosopher Bertrand Russell presented on logic and mathematics during his visit to Harvard in 1914.

Day 1, October 5

My aim is to enrich our understanding of “transatlantic conversations,” a theme that has swelled in American intellectual history over the past decades. I argue that Cajal, Bergson, and Russell open a historiographical window for studying the mobility of ideas across their cultural power, political efficacy, and philosophical significance. These thinkers spoke in the language of universality; yet they travelled as national representatives. Their moral authority as government emissaries paradoxically depended on their transcendence from the state. By tracing the itineraries and institutions that facilitated the travels of these intellectual ambassadors, my presentation reveals the surprising yet heretofore under-examined connections between ideas’ migration and foreign relations forged outside the official strata of statecraft.

Mou Banerjee (Harvard U.), *The Question of the Moral Nature’: Rabindranath Tagore on Civilization and Nationalism, at Harvard*

This paper examines Rabindranath Tagore's 1912 and 1916 visits to the USA. By focusing specifically on the lectures Tagore gave at Harvard University, which were published in the collections, "Sadhana - The Realization of Life" and "Nationalism" I analyze the intellectual collaborations and cultural inter-flows which informed this visit. Tagore's own global journeys, contextualized beyond the particular specifics of British colonial and intellectual imperialism as well as the colony-metropole methodological framework, help to reformulate conceptions of Asian-American historical exchanges. His presence in Harvard first drew attention because of the mystique of his Indian origins. But they provoked debate and criticism when he went on to question the western foundations of what he perceived as chauvinistic nationalism and materialist civilizational values - speeches termed as "\$700 dollars a scold".

These visits and the significance of Tagore's lectures were predicated on the philosophy of universal humanism. I argue that in the years that were to witness the devastation of World War I, Tagore's philosophical inquiries posited an early oppositional and corrective ethical stance, which counterbalanced the hardening of militant nationalism being embraced by most nation-states (including the USA) in the era of refashioning and reformulation of national identities.

Jacob Levi (Johns Hopkins U.), *The Davos Debate: Heidegger, Cassirer, and the ‘Ramification’ of Intellectual Events*

Few events in 20th Century philosophy have taken on the outsized importance of the 1929 Davos debate between Martin Heidegger and Ernst Cassirer. Organized as an *Arbeitsgemeinschaft*, the debate showcased the two leading philosophers’ interpretations of Kant’s philosophy. While their disagreements were largely technical - Heidegger advanced an ontological-metaphysical reading of Kant and Cassirer’s interpretation was epistemological-scientific – these positions opened onto larger philosophical schisms.

Retrospectively, Davos took on epochal proportions, viewed as a clash between philosophical titans locked in polemic dispute. Heidegger’s followers left Davos convinced that he had won a decisive victory, whereas Cassirer may not have even been looking for such a fight, but only a forum to discuss the finer points of his position. Nonetheless, observers and commentators have rendered Heidegger and Cassirer the embodiment of the great philosophical clashes of the time: Husserl and Phenomenology versus the Marburg School of Neo-Kantianism, or the “new” generation versus the old. Further, they were made stand-ins for the most divisive identitarian opposition in the Weimar

Day 1, October 5

era: Cassirer, the urban bourgeois Jew, versus Heidegger, the anti-modernist Protestant (and soon-to-be Nazi) from rural Swabia.

In my presentation, I argue that Davos took on aggrandized historical clarity after the fact. Building on Peter Gordon's claim that philosophical concepts "ramify" through history, I explore the gossip and legend that followed from these philosophers' encounter. Even though subtler aspects of the debate were obfuscated, the memory of Davos testifies to the constitutive importance of historical events in the formulation of philosophical concepts.

Matthew Shields (Georgetown U.), *How to Think Diachronically: The (Missed) Encounter between Quine and Kuhn on Changes in Meaning*

As Michael Wolf has argued, mid-twentieth century analytic philosophy was distinguished in part by the abandonment of the pursuit of a Cartesian, absolute foundation for our knowledge of the world.¹ For some philosophers, the result was an increased sensitivity to the ways the meaning of even our most seemingly foundational sense-making categories can shift radically over time. Two philosophers at the center of this turn were W.V.O. Quine and Thomas Kuhn.

Quine and Kuhn overlapped at Harvard while engaged on their respective projects exploring the philosophical implications of conceptual change. Kuhn is thanked in the Preface to *Word & Object*, and in a retrospective interview on his career, he singles out the similarity between Quine's concerns and his own and explains that their contrasting approaches motivated him "to figure out why I was so sure [Quine] was wrong."² In "Commensurability, Comparability, Communicability," Kuhn lays out his criticism in detail and argues that Quine conflates an essential distinction between *translation* and *interpretation*. It is precisely with this distinction, however, that I think we can begin to see just how complementary these two positions are – how they throw different, but reciprocally illuminating light on how we can render the content of revolutionary changes in understanding intelligible, content that inevitably appears to us, at first, as *unintelligible*. I argue that a reconciling of the two positions sets the stage for a contemporary and novel approach to conceptual change generally.

Historiography of Science and Medicine

Zhy Yiwen (Sun Yat-sen U.), *Shaping the Early History of Mathematics in Ancient China*

Modern historians have deeply and widely studied the sources and early history of Chinese mathematics based on modern historical methods. In fact, these issues were essential for scholars in ancient China, and the corresponding sources have not yet been fully studied. This paper will begin with a careful analysis of narrations of early history of Chinese mathematics written in different kind of sources, in particular, mathematical books, official histories, and Confucian canonical literature. These sources include Liu Hui's [third century] historical narrative in the preface for his commentary on the *Nine Chapters on Mathematical Procedures* [*Jiuzhang suanshu*], and Li Chunfeng's [seventh century] treatment of the topic in the monographs of two official histories that he composed, *Book of Jin* [*Jinshu*] and *Book of Sui* [*Suishu*]. They also include records in the *Rites of Zhou* [*Zhouli*], including commentaries written by a second and seventh century commentators, resp., Zheng Xuan [second century] and Jia Gongyan [seventh century]. Their difference and sameness will be captured from the perspective of the different elements [e.g. people, activities, systems] they used in shaping the early history of mathematics, and their different historical contexts. Finally, a thirteenth century book on the history of mathematics, namely *Source and Development of Mathematics* [*Suanxue yuanlin*], will be discussed for revealing the historiographical influence of these early records on later histories.

Day 1, October 5

Leander Diener (U. Zürich), *The Birth of Clinical Medicine out of Primitive Medicine: Ethnological Influence in Erwin Heinz Ackerknecht's Historiography of Medicine, 1906-1988*

Erwin Heinz Ackerknecht was undisputedly one of the leading historians of medicine of the 20th century. Among his writings, probably the most influential idea is his attempt to divide the history of modern medicine into different periods; the concepts “bedside”, “hospital” and “laboratory medicine” are well known and widely used – not least because of the discussion Nicholas Jewson raised in the 1970s. In this paper, I will examine the genesis of this idea by looking at Ackerknecht’s academic career in the 1930s and 1940s. His works on primitive medicine of the 1940s, starting with his collaboration with Henry Sigerist at Johns Hopkins University, reveal a key to understanding the emergence of modern history of medicine. It allows to understand how “medicine” became a cultural product of a specific societal environment. We need to pay attention to the ethnological theories and methods Ackerknecht acquired during his time in Paris and New York (particularly from Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Marcel Mauss and Ruth Benedict) in order to understand his departure from traditional medico-historiographical Whiggism.

Looking at the history of the historiography of medicine, we find two things: First, the discipline developed elaborate ways of telling the history of medicine in a non-linear way in the middle of the 20th century, and second, the field was opened up to scholars who did not belong to the medical profession. It comes out that these two characteristics of modern history of medicine can be traced back to Erwin Heinz Ackerknecht and to his academic socialization in ethnology.

Ohad Reiss Sorokin (Princeton U.), *History of Science vs. Philosophy of Science in Princeton University 1961-1981*

While scientists surely do science, they almost never deal with “Science”. However, this upper-case “Science” is an important object for other discourses such as: journalism, policy-making, and - in the academic setting – (sub-) disciplines as the History and the Philosophy of Science. “Science” is, in fact, a knowledge-object of the Humanities.

In my paper I will tell the story of the History and Philosophy of Science of Princeton University, from its foundation by Charles Gillispie, Carl Hempel, and Hilary Putnam in 1961; through the 1971 crisis caused by Thomas Kuhn’s resignation from his role as the head of the program; down to its reorganization as a History of Science program in 1981. Drawing on archival documents as well as published work by the protagonists, I hope to explain the 1981 breakup. I plan to argue that the term “Science” changed its meaning from the 50’s to the beginning of the 80’s. While at the beginning the idea of a shared HPoS program seemed both reasonable and desirable, it was no longer conceivable in the end since the two disciplines no longer studied the same object. Focusing on science as an object for humanistic knowledge will give us a chance not only to trace the different paths taken by History and Philosophy in the second half of the twentieth century, but also to watch humanistic disciplines produce contrasting visions of the humanities’ “other” – “Science”.

Day 2, October 6

Keynote: Karine Chemla, *Writing the History of Ancient Mathematics in China and beyond in the 19th Century: Who? For Whom?, and How?*

In several letters to Jesuit missionaries active in China at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century, Leibniz posed questions on mathematics in China past and present. The formulation of these questions shows that his curiosity was comparative. It also indicates that Leibniz intended to carry out comparison on various features of mathematical practice and knowledge. It finally reveals that through mathematics Leibniz took peoples as comparanda. Like Leibniz, from the 17th century onwards, many scholars East and West became interested in mathematical knowledge and practices of the past in China and in other “non-Western” areas (as they are too often called), and they wrote essays on these subjects. The three facets outlined above characterize Leibniz’s way of inquiring into the past of mathematics. Likewise, the purpose of this talk is to characterize various ways of inquiring into and writing about mathematics of the past in China and beyond, as testified in various scholarly publications, mainly since the 18th century. I will show that the context in which these scholars carried out their work and their personal projects allow us to account for major differences in their ways of approaching and describing mathematics of the past.

History of Literary Studies

Selene Maria Vatteroni, (Scuola Normale Superiore) *The Dante of Alessandro Torri: Between Eighteenth Century Tradition and Modern Criticism*

My paper focuses on Alessandro Torri (1780-1861), a scholar active in the area of Verona. In 1826, on account of his liberal ideals, Torri was forced into exile and settled in Pisa, where he devoted his scholarly activity to Dante. His edition of the *Ottimo commento* to the *Divine Comedy* and, in particular, of Dante’s minor works, both reflect Torri’s aspiration of completing Giovan Jacopo Dionisi’s editorial plan and of fostering his philological approach. Dionisi’s method predicated both on the exegesis of the letter and “explaining Dante with Dante”. This was a rather obsolete approach in nineteenth-century Italy, where the literary-aesthetic and the civil reading of Dante dominated. Moreover, Torri intended to establish an international collaboration in the field of Dante studies. Not only did he keep a private correspondence with key-scholars, such as the German philologist Karl Witte, but he also invited some of the most illustrious exegetes of the time to contribute prefatory critical essays to his collection of Dante’s minor works. The study of Alessandro Torri’s life and works cracks the perspective open on a crucial cross-section of Italy’s cultural history before its unification (1861). This liminal phase, in between the legacy of the Veronese erudite tradition and the new Risorgimental approach, instances the opening to various European schools as the prerequisite for the birth of modern Dante criticism.

Alfred Sjödin (Lund U.), *Historical Scale and the Swedish Model of Literary Studies*

Literary studies in Sweden were never based on philology, but on aesthetics, and originally took for its object ” general literature”. It was only in the latter half of the nineteenth century that the demands of documentation and archival research grew, in tandem with the professionalization of history. Swedish literary history became its near-exclusive concern, and the comparative aspect became a question primarily of the study of sources and cultural contacts. Most research on the history of Swedish literary studies has been concerned with the internal philosophical aspects of this shift. I would instead like to focus on this process as a change in historical scale, to some extent

Day 2, October 6

independent of its philosophical motivation. The endurance of this scale in later times, when much of its theoretical underpinning was obsolete, seems to indicate that it has been constitutive of disciplinary identity, yet rarely discussed.

Today, when the problem of World literature and the limitations of the national paradigm are frequently discussed, it might be fruitful to revisit this earlier debate.

I will analyze this scalar shift and its consequences in the work of two literary scholars: Gustaf Ljunggren (1823-1905), the last of the aestheticians, and Henrik Schück (1855-1947), “Sweden’s Gustave Lanson”. The results will be interpreted in a comparative frame, in order to specify the place of the Swedish tradition in the development of literary studies in Europe as a whole.

Matthijs Engelberts (U. of Amsterdam), *Modernist Literature and the Making of 'English' in the Humanities*

It has sometimes been pointed out in passing that there is a connection between ‘modernist’ literature and the academic study of literature in university departments from the period of modernism onward: T.S. Eliot is probably the prime example of the modernist author whose academic alter ego shapes the reception, academic study and teaching of his own work and of modernist writing generally. The fact that the rise of modernist literature and the making of ‘English literature’ departments (or major qualitative and quantitative changes in these departments across the globe) roughly coincide can also be considered as indicative of a specific link between modernist writing and the ‘English literature’ degrees in the academy. In this contribution, I would like to examine to what extent modernism and its ‘difficulties’ (Leonard Diepeveen) can be viewed as living in symbiosis with (the development of) the academic study of English in university departments – and certainly not only with the ‘patron-investors’ that Laurence Rainey brilliantly identified as the backers of modernist literature. The issue at stake will not be the psychology of modernist writers’ academic trajectory as a student, for instance, or their ambiguous relation to the academy (see for instance Steven Connor on Beckett) and their later honorary doctorates, but the functioning of their work and their personae in the academy, as exemplary of the way modernism relates to – nurtures and to some degree depends on – the rise of ‘English lit.’ as a degree subject in the university.

Tye Landels-Gruenewald (Queens U.), *Hamlet's Problems Reconsidered: The Positivist Turn in Shakespeare Studies*

This paper considers the influence of logical positivism on early twentieth-century Shakespeare criticism. I examine three well-known readings of *Hamlet* for the ways in which they apply positivist frameworks. In “Hamlet and his Problems” (1919), T.S. Eliot declared *Hamlet* a failed work of art because Hamlet’s vengeful emotions lack an “objective correlative,” which he defines as “a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that *particular* emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked.”¹ In this definition, Eliot advances a positivist framework in which one’s emotions must wholly correspond with one’s environment. I observe a similar positivist framework in the work of Eliot’s contemporaries, W.W. Greg and J. Dover Wilson. In “Hamlet’s Hallucination” (1917), Greg argues that Hamlet’s excessive emotions produce his father’s ghost as a hallucination.² In *What Happens in Hamlet* (1935), Wilson refutes Greg, arguing that the ghost exists because it corresponds with Elizabethan beliefs about spectres.³ Both Greg and Wilson evaluate Hamlet’s emotions by proving the ghost a valid or invalid objective correlative in Eliot’s sense of the term. In this regard, the criticism of Eliot, Greg, and Wilson represents a radical break with the kind of

Day 2, October 6

romantic “character” criticism typified by A.C. Bradley. By adopting terms and methods associated with logical positivism, these critics sought to establish a new, more rigorous genre of Shakespeare criticism appropriate for the professional setting of the twentieth-century academy.

History of Information and Digital Humanities

Estelle Blaschke (U. of Lausanne), *Creating Infrastructures: Microfilm as a Scientific Aid*

The history of microfilm ties into the earliest and deepest imaginaries present since the invention of photography: the dream of collecting everything, of providing access to vast archives and collections and of rendering objects mobile by means of their reproduction. By investigating seminal projects and events between 1920 and 1950, this paper sheds light on the formation of transnational networks of people, companies, research units, and public institutions that solidified the idea of microfilm as an information technology of the future. While the modern history of microfilm is rooted in Europe, it was developed, tested and advanced in the United States in the form of large-scale copying programs for foreign manuscripts, books, scientific journals, newspapers, and pictorial materials, as well as government and business data. In a close collaboration between public institutions and research libraries (LOC, ACLS, Universities of Harvard, Yale, Chicago et al.), philanthropists (Rockefeller and Carnegie) and the photographic industry (Eastman Kodak), the United States aspired not only to enhance their research collections and facilities, but also to take lead in the hope to monopolize on a presumably global information technology. This paper reflects on the intellectual, economic and political apparatus that was put in place to enhance the ways in which especially scientific and historical sources were shared, diffused, preserved and appropriated through photography. As a missing link between the world of paper and the digital, the study of microfilm is vital in contributing to the writing of the pre-history of the digital humanities.

Chris Alen Sula (Pratt Institute), *The Early History of Digital Humanities*

The digital humanities present new possibilities for applying computational technology to humanistic inquiry, for better understanding the role of that technology in our world, and even for rethinking the nature of the humanities and what it means to be human. Many authors (Hockey 2004; Svensson, 2009, 2010, 2012; Kirschenbaum, 2010; Dalbello, 2011) date the emergence of this field to 1946 and Roberto Busa’s *Index Thomisticus*, an IBM-sponsored project encoding the works of Thomas Aquinas on punch cards for search, retrieval, and analysis. From there, the history is told in terms of text and linguistics, with the plot revolving around corpora of increasing size and susceptibility to machine analysis—until quite recently, when digital humanities is suddenly said to be a “big tent” (Pannapacker 2011a, b), encompassing everything from digital archives and databases to GIS, network analysis, new publishing formats, digital pedagogy, game design, and so on. How did this narrative come to be, and what counternarratives does it exclude or constrain? This paper presents an empirical perspective on the early history of digital humanities by tracing publications in two foundational journals in the field (*Computers and the Humanities*, established in 1966, and *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, established in 1986), focusing on the disciplines of their authors and of the works those authors cite. Analysis of this network—and its evolution—reveals points of similarity and convergence across the humanities and, tangentially, the social and applied sciences, painting a broader and more inclusive picture of the digital humanities than has been presented to date.

Day 2, October 6

Judith Kaplan (MPIWG Berlin), *Computing for Cognates*

This paper explores the relationship between machine translation and anthropological linguistics in the Americas during the postwar period. First proposed in 1949 as an idealistic “solution to the world-wide translation problem,” machine translation had wrought lasting changes in linguistics by the mid-1960s. It gave crucial impetus to the development of syntactic theory, became the foundation of the new field of computational linguistics, and promoted the disciplinary autonomy of the language sciences as a whole. For these reasons, historians have linked the early success of machine translation to a move away from historical and anthropological commitments. But there is evidence to suggest that researchers in these branches were similarly engaged with the tools of machine translation. It was used, for example, as a means of identifying cognates cross-linguistically, and it was applied to the controversial work of “lexicostatistics.” In other words, machine-aided translation fueled conceptual developments not only in syntax and semantics, but in descriptive and comparative linguistics as well. As the anthropological linguist Morris Swadesh observed in 1965, “In many instances the planning for machine work has led to important new insights on the analysis of the languages and to questions of comparative phonology and structure.” By calling attention to such broadly anthropological applications, my paper seeks to reframe the twentieth-century historiography of linguistics with special emphasis given to the role of computing technologies in its historical and anthropological branches.

Elyse Graham (SUNY Stony Brook), *Joyce and the Graveyard of Digital Empires: Textual Criticism and the Making of the Digital Humanities*

This talk focuses on about the thinking and conceptual models of literary scholars who pioneered early projects in what would become known as the digital humanities. The talk is structured around an incidental pairing. The example of Shakespeare has loomed large in the discipline of book history in English, largely because Shakespeare’s plays present specific problems—the “bad” quartos; the absence of manuscripts; etc.—that book historians have found useful in working out their theories. His plays are “good to think with.” As it happens, the example of James Joyce has loomed large in the theoretical formulations of scholars working in the early decades of the digital humanities. *Ulysses*, in particular, was seen as an example of hypertext *avant la lettre*, and Joyce’s works were made the focus of many pioneering digital humanities projects.

Not all of these projects were successful, which is to say that not all of them came to fruition or sustained themselves for later scholars to use. In fact, *Ulysses* has become something of a graveyard of empires for digital humanities projects. But still; for these scholars, working to convert the theoretical concepts of new media into principles for scholarly work, Joyce proved good to think with. Focusing on the relationship between book history and new media theory, this talk asks what we can learn from the fate of some of the earliest literary digital humanities projects, and how these lessons may guide efforts to design new platforms for exploring textual materials in the digital age.

Museums in the Making of the Humanities

Museums have historically overlapped with universities as sites of knowledge production. Although the twentieth century witnessed the sense that academic and museum scholarship constituted distinct and even divergent fields of practice and method, today many fields question this assumption. Our panel argues that museums instantiate and shape important questions about disciplinary boundaries

Day 2, October 6

and methods, ranging from how to approach the arts in a global perspective to anthropology's place at the intersection of humanistic, biological and social sciences.

The four papers in this panel offer new insights into the formation of and connections between the academic disciplines—not only in the humanities, but also between the humanities and the natural and social sciences. They consider the dialogue between spaces of practice and humanistic inquiry, and illuminate the changing relationship between academic knowledge, politics, and the public at a moment when the value of humanistic inquiry is under intense scrutiny.

Jennifer Donnelly (U. of Pittsburgh), *From Mannequins to Physiognomy: The Development of a Chronology at the Musée des Monuments Français*

Yoked to the national legacy of the French Revolution by both its creation in 1795 and its closure in 1816, the Musée des monuments français (Museum of French Monuments) and the work of its creator, Alexandre Lenoir, have together been unilaterally framed as a foundational moment in the emergence of modern patrimony, one dominated by a traditional understanding of the French Revolution as the unprecedented historical event that inaugurated modernity. Lenoir, however, understood his museum as an international destination and an educational alternative to the academic tradition. This presentation maps the emergence and transformation of Lenoir's chronology from 1790 to 1800 as a dialogic tool that engaged the subjectivity of individual experience into a multi-faceted space of humanistic inquiry. The museum emerged as a provisional space where visitors conversed with the dead, mused over the tangibility of distant centuries, or admired the clarity of scientific classification and artistic progress. By contextualizing his chronology in stages and investigating its influences, I demonstrate that Lenoir's organizational framework, frequently interpreted as a nationalist translation of Winkelmann's art historical system, was in fact a fluid integration of Enlightenment theories of physiognomy and the French Revolution's investment in the cultural potential of the symbolic body. Participation in the museum engaged the visitor in the corporeal negotiation of the historical memory, material legitimacy, and temporal subjectivity of the artistic fragments of the *ancien régime*. This in turn created a uniquely immersive system of art historical periodization and revealed new boundaries between the object and the viewing subject.

Susanne Mersmann (Philipps U.), *Between the Lines: The Emerging Globalization in Viollet-le-Duc's Conception of Gothic Art at the Trocadéro in Paris*

The *Musée de sculpture comparée* of 1882 opened in the Parisian Palais du Trocadéro during an era in which the diversity of various cultures no longer existed merely in the consciousness of French long-distance travelers. This awareness was present on site in Paris—for instance as a result of the World Exhibitions. Discussion of the 1878 Exhibition held at the Palais du Trocadéro concerned whether the display of objects should be described as art historical or ethnographic. In 1879, against this background, the architectural theorist Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc wrote his two *Rapports*, which were crucial for the posthumous implementation of his museum concept.

My paper will explore two classification principles central to this concept, contrasting that applied to global arts (outside Europe) with that used for European sculpture (chronological). The global approach relied on a tripartite structure that separated peoples according to ascribed and purported characteristics. I argue on the one hand that Viollet-le-Duc developed a globalising approach to the history of art that, simultaneously and by means of exclusion, makes it seem as if the French Gothic and classical Greek art forms were the only crowning achievements. On the other hand, a splitting of disciplines occurred as a result of the topos of peoples without a history that Hegel in particular had

Day 2, October 6

coined. Notably, Viollet-le-Duc was also involved in the planning of the Musée d'ethnographie, also located at the Palais du Trocadéro, in the opposite wing.

Link (Amherst College), *A Museum for Humankind: Integrating Human Ecology and Anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution, 1968-1976*

This presentation analyzes efforts to establish a museum-based approach to human ecology through the construction of a Museum of Man at the Smithsonian Institution during the late-1960s and 1970s. The brainchild of the Institution's eighth Secretary, conservationist and ornithologist S. Dillon Ripley, the proposed museum sought to integrate perspectives from the biological and social sciences (especially anthropology) in order to prepare humanistic displays educating the public about the relationship between human beings and the environment. He argued that the museum provided the ideal atmosphere for facilitating such collaborative work, since it allowed scientists and staff to more easily cross disciplinary boundaries than would have been possible in a university setting. Moreover, the Smithsonian's status as a quasi-federal agency offered access to wider sets of financial and infrastructural resources, enabling experimentation with new types of scientific inquiry. I show how the Museum's combined function as a site for educating the public and for supporting interdisciplinary research proved critical to Ripley's organization of human ecology—a field notorious for lacking a firmly established academic tradition. Yet highlighting the centrality of anthropology within his vision necessitates an examination of some of the ethical, intellectual, and practical concerns surrounding the inclusion of displays of human cultures within museums of natural history, especially following decolonization. By tracing the development of human ecology in the Museum of Man alongside parallel transformations in museum anthropology, this paper ultimately speaks to the potential and limitations of museums as sites for integrating the sciences and the humanities.

Sigrid Lien and Hilde W. Nielssen (U. of Bergen), *Multi-Layered Museum Stories: Exhibitions in the Intersection between Academic Disciplinary History, Politics, and Aesthetics*

This paper argues that museum stories may be seen as formed through multiple layers. Drawing on a recent book on Norwegian cultural history museum displays (Lien and Nielssen 2016), the paper presents readings of two contrasting exhibition narratives, the ethnographic display at the Museum of Cultural History in Oslo and the national history exhibition at Lillehammer Museum. While the latter speaks about the national self, the museum in Oslo addresses the nation's radical other. In spite of this contrasting thematic focus, the museums have much in common. They are both institutions born out of a closely integrated network of university scholars and museum entrepreneurs/collectors. As centers for research and dissemination of knowledge, they were and still are integral to the formation of two major humanistic disciplines: history and anthropology, as they evolved in the Norwegian context. Today this evolution with its various shifts and ruptures are visible as traces, or layers, in the exhibitions themselves. We argue that such multi-layered museum stories may be understood not only as intersections of shifting disciplinary knowledge regimes and the concomitant curatorial practices, but also as entangled with concrete political agendas. However, these layers may appear as unintended subtexts, appendages, or depositions deriving from past epistemologies and practices. It is precisely such signatures from the past that often create a sense of "unsettlement" within museum exhibitions. As we demonstrate in our paper, accumulated layers of an unsettled past embedded in exhibitionary/aesthetic practices contribute to perpetuate aspects and visions of past epistemologies or knowledge regimes.

Day 2, October 6

Historiography

Cesc Esteve (U. of Barcelona), *Censorship and the Making of Modern Historiography: from Repression to Disciplining*

Several studies in the last three decades have made a significant contribution to revising the role of censorship in the history of the Humanities in the modern era. The ideological and political censorship exercised by civil and ecclesiastical institutions used to be regarded as simply an instrument for controlling and repressing ideas and an obstacle to the development of knowledge and the modernization of the Humanities. This idea has given way to interpretations that contemplate the collaboration of scholars in the institutions of censorship, helping develop its instruments, such as the indexes of prohibited books. These new interpretations have also revealed that censorship employed a good many of the theoretical principles and methods of criticism that were used to legitimate and regulate the Humanities as genuine knowledge disciplines and fruitful forms of learning.

My aim is to explore this line of interpretation in greater depth and to show the complex implications of censorship in the shaping of modern historiography. I shall explore the places, uses and meanings given to censorship in a representative sample of treatises on the art of history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; my analysis will show, on the one hand, how theory used censorship as an instrument of indoctrination, and also demonstrate, on the other, that considerations of history as a victim of ideological and political censorship and as a censoring agent of power had very significant effects on the disciplining and legitimization of historiography as knowledge.

Timo van Havere (KU Leuven), *Scatterbrains and Greenhorns: Dissatisfaction with a 'Newfangled' Historiography and Its Archival Practices in Belgium (1825-1845)*

The 'archival turn' of historians has been studied regularly, with particular emphasis on the struggle of archival pioneer Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) to enter the Austrian and Italian archives in 1827-1831. In the United Kingdom of the Netherlands no such struggle was necessary. All public archives had been declared open to historical research in 1829, to foster national sentiments. After 1830, this policy was continued in newly independent Belgium.

While the Belgian historiography of the mid-nineteenth century never earned much praise, its archival system enjoyed European fame. This was mostly the merit of national archivist Louis-Prosper Gachard (1800-1885), who revealed the riches of the archives in a series of 'notices', which sought to increase their accessibility. Bartholomeus Gyseleers-Thys (1761-1843), city archivist of Mechelen since 1802, objected to this ever-increasing enthusiasm.

Gyseleers-Thys had spent years exploring the city archives in solitude, gathering material that was to be used by a future 'Author' to write the national history. However, when young (and exigent) historians set about doing just that in the 1830s, the archivist clashed with them, eventually refusing all cooperation. His dissatisfaction was shared by some, but the old archivist, filled with anger and confusion, combined with an all-too frank attitude, proved to be too eccentric.

Thanks to his numerous writings, Gyseleers-Thys can serve as a useful albeit singular guide to a 'newfangled' liberal archival world. This case of the reluctant 'doyen of Belgian archivists' offers a

Day 2, October 6

new perspective on the historiographical and archival changes and continuities in nineteenth-century Europe.

Emma Hagström Molin (The Swedish Institute), *Materialising Historical Knowledge: Beda Dudík's Encounter with Moravian Spoils of War in Sweden and Italy 1851-1852*

During the nineteenth century, the status of historiography increased tremendously, and modern historical inquiry became a professional activity under the ontological and methodological influence of Prussian historicism (Bos 2012). While it has been extensively debated what exactly characterised historicist thought, the very material conditions of modern historical scholarship, and its impact on historical knowledge production have seldom been considered. Consequently, this paper focuses on the profound importance of situated material objects in the shaping of historical knowledge by analysing the scientific practices of Moravian historian, and Benedictine priest, Beda Dudík (1815–1890) in Sweden and Italy in 1851–1852. Following Dudík's research on seventeenth-century spoils of war of Moravian origin, published as *Forschungen in Schweden für Mährens Geschichte* (1852) and *Iter Romanum* (1855), the paper will demonstrate how historical knowledge emerged from a variety of encounters between a historian and material objects in the specific epistemic settings of different historiographical institutions. Drawing upon the last decades' theorisations of the relationship between man and the material world (de Laet & Mol 2000; Latour 2005), historical objects will be considered as simultaneously context-dependent and affective. By focusing on scientific practises, the knowledge-creating encounters between Dudík and the historical objects that he researched are made comprehensible. Ultimately, the paper will demonstrate how historical knowledge materialised, and how these materialisations were entangled with, and affected, nineteenth-century historical thought and culture as a whole.

Adriana Markantonatos (Philipps U.), *A Goethian Look at Reinhart Koselleck's History of Theory of History (as History of Theory)*

“Wie einer ist, so ist sein Goethe” - the way one is, such is one's Goethe, the literary scholar Ernst Bertram once observed, alluding to the remarkable connection between biographical writing on Goethe and the autobiographical background of its writer.

It was in 1993 that the German Historian Reinhart Koselleck (1923-2006) was invited by the Weimar Goethe-Society to give a lecture reflecting “Goethe's History”, resulting in a (self-reflective) portrait of “Goethe's Untimely History”, and ending up in a Goethian (self-)awareness, “that I have naively found my own theory of history in Goethe's history”, Koselleck wrote down soon after.

Presenting unpublished correspondences and autographs of Koselleck's archive as well as looking at some of his personal copies of Goethe's writings, the paper will examine the long-standing tradition of describing oneself through analyzing Goethe on a more profound level, contributing to the history of theory of history, while dealing briefly with the history of theory in the humanities, thereby addressing intersections between poetry and truth, fact and fiction, and objectivity and subjectivity. A very short review of Koselleck's *Critique and Crisis*, known as the “most successful literary dissertation of a German humanities scholar in the 20th century”, will illustrate more concretely what has been reviewed as “a rare synthetic vision” (David Carr) and may have been essentially drawing on a Goethian notion of imagination, recalling general questions about the role of sensual evidence and intellectual intuition, respectively, in the history of the humanities.

Day 2, October 6

History of Criticism

Nicolas VanDeviver (Ghent U.), *Edward Said and the Crisis of the New Criticism*

This paper addresses the intellectual genealogy of Edward Said in relation to the history of U.S. literary studies from 1930 to 1966. The period is delineated by the rise and institutionalization of the American New Criticism on the one hand, and by the advent of European (post)structuralism at the seminal Johns Hopkins conference on ‘The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man’ in 1966, on the other. That same year, Said published his first work *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (1966), a reading of Conrad’s short fiction and letters. Though Said’s works are most commonly associated with poststructuralism – mainly due to the success of *Orientalism* (1978) – his book on Conrad is existential-phenomenological in its approach and reacts against the New Critical theory of reading as it had become in its institutional practice. The subject of this paper is twofold. First, I want to discuss the evolution of the New Criticism from a humanist formalism in the 1930s and 1940s, to a dehumanized textual practice in the 1950s and 1960s. Second, I want to address Said’s reaction to the New Criticism that seeks to rehumanize literary studies. To do so, I want to single out the impact of R. P. Blackmur and the Princeton Gauss Seminars in Criticism of the early 1950s on Said’s critical practice. I argue that Said’s work on Conrad is symptomatic of a rarely discussed development in U.S. literary studies in the 1950s and 1960s that, prior to the arrival of poststructuralism, seeks to blend French existentialism with the New Criticism.

Andy Hines (Vanderbilt U.), *New Criticism as Dead and Alive: The Cycles of Disciplinary History and Anti-Blackness*

The disciplinary history of literary studies is haunted. The New Criticism, a movement of the late 1930s and early 1940s that popularized “close reading,” has come to be understood as both “dead” in its effect on the present discipline because of subsequent epistemological developments, but as “alive” and foundational for those developments and the discipline’s present form. With this haunted historical form, literary studies mirrors the philosophy of history of the Atlantic cycle of capital accumulation in the long twentieth century outlined by Ian Baucom. He argues that commodity fetishism intensifies and expands phases of capital that have supposedly past; for example the speculative and anti-black logic that insured and valued black slaves during the eighteenth century remains essential to the recent boom of finance capital. This paper argues that Baucom’s account, in particular its attention to slavery, supplies a crucial link towards understanding literary studies’ philosophy of disciplinary history.

My paper attends to the New Criticism’s system of valuations tied to its nostalgia for the plantation. Many New Critics were also Southern Agrarians who sought to return the U.S. South to a traditional and agricultural way of life. The New Criticism’s theory of the autonomous literary object provides an instrument to repeat the Agrarian nostalgia for the plantation. Works that were designated as literary by being formally “resolved” were understood to be timeless and therefore traditional, while works, often by black writers, that did not meet this capriciously applied criteria, were deemed “sociological” or “political” and therefore not historically relevant. I explore this anti-black and speculative practice both within disciplinary categories and, importantly, the historicization of the discipline itself.

Day 2, October 6

Yung-Hsing Wu (U. of Louisiana), *Close Readings of the Feminist Kind*

Recent discussions of critical practice have returned to reading, and interestingly, to the place close reading occupies in literary studies. This return might seem unlikely given the familiar narrative that New Criticism gave close reading its prominence — and that when the former, with its belief in isolated textuality, gave way to more politicized work, the latter lost its hold. Yet in 2000, when Franco Moretti first described “distant reading” he noted it would likely not receive a warm reception in the United States, “the country of close reading.”¹ And in the following decade, defenses of close reading appeared on the lecture circuit and in the pages of institutional fora even as the emerging developments “surface” and “descriptive” reading positioned themselves against close reading and the strictures associated with it.² Fact and touchstone, symptom and signature trait: in these accounts close reading remained, still one index of disciplinary coherence.

In this essay, I argue that feminism recast this history precisely through its own account of the closeness of reading. For the women who became the first generation of feminist literary critics, trained to value textual closeness, also found in consciousness-raising sessions and informal academic networks a vocabulary for closeness that valued identification and intimacy. Their eventual intervention, less a stance than a sensibility, would come to value a textual *and* affective closeness of reading. While not explicit expressions of practice, these testified to the connections taking place on paper, in the metaphors of interiority, depth, and intimacy that bristle on the pages of *Sexual Politics* (Millett, 1969) and *Thinking about Women* (Ellmann, 1968), of *The Female Imagination* (Spacks, 1972), *Literary Women* (Moers, 1976), and *A Literature of Their Own* (Showalter, 1977), of *The Madwoman in the Attic* (Gilbert and Gubar, 1978) and *The Resisting Reader* (Fetterley, 1978).

J.E. Elliott (Nagoya U. of Commerce and Business), *Manufacturing Dissent: Brand English in the Corporate University*

This paper advances the argument that dissent culture in English Studies and other humanities fields since 1966 (the benchmark JHU conference on the Languages of Criticism and Sciences of Man) is not convincingly attributable to macronomic factors in society, politics, or the economy, much less to a policy-driven protest ethos among tenured radicals, but rather to the branding of commercially and technologically underproductive disciplines in the time and temper of universal higher education. Institutionally, the manufacture of dissent has provided a curriculum for students outside the STEM and professional program mainstream, articulated a social mission (as diversity and inclusiveness) for American higher education in the age of money, fostered coalition building among the “dominated dominant” in the academic community, and provided both jobs and a sense of public purpose for a humanities professoriate without external markets for their teaching and research. Historically, the cultural turn, expansion of writing programs, and canon and science wars have born witness to the deprofessionalization of English Studies as well as to the field’s remarkable disciplinary refashioning. My theoretical orientation tracks Adorno and the Frankfurt School on the commodification of culture, the “manufacturing of consent” hypotheses in organizational theory (Burowoy, Chomsky/Herman), and relevant research on professionalism and theory construction in the sociology of culture and sociology of science (Merton, Bourdieu, John Ziman, Eliot Freidson). Attention is paid to both North American developments in global context and to the promise of the digital humanities as challenge to, and/or reinforcement for, dissent culture.

Day 2, October 6

How the Humanities Have Changed the World

There is a preconception about the humanities so deeply rooted in our culture that even humanists believe it. This is the assumption that the humanities do not lead to breakthroughs, that they do not solve concrete problems, and that they do not result in technological applications. Yet a quick glance at the history of the humanities shows otherwise: contrary to common wisdom, ideas from the humanities resulted in breakthroughs, solved concrete problems and even led to new technology. To be sure, these feats of the humanities emerged indirectly: only after some time – if at all -- ideas from humanities disciplines are picked up and applied elsewhere. Thus the linguistic notion of formal grammar has been used in computer technology to develop the first high-level programming languages, and the method of historical source criticism has become one of the powerful tools in court.

The phenomenon that academic insights find applications outside academia is well known in the exact sciences. Yet, contrary to the sciences, the applications of the humanities are widely underestimated. This panel will highlight the far-reaching effects of humanistic inquiry, and will discuss what we can conclude from humanistic applications.

Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam), *How Ideas from the Humanities Migrated to Science and Technology*

The idea that the sciences and the humanities are, and have always been, separate is as much alive as ever. It structures the entrenched organization of the university; it is taken for granted in academics' everyday thinking. And yet it is wrong. It fails to fit the practice and the organization of scholarship prior to the 1880s, when Dilthey, Windelband and other leading German thinkers began to call the sciences 'law-establishing' ('nomothetic') as opposed to the allegedly 'idiographic' humanities. It fails likewise to fit what happened in their own time, and what has happened ever since.

In this talk, I will discuss how certain practices and methods in the humanities migrated to the sciences. Thus the method of 19th-century stemmatic philology was transferred to evolutionary biology and later to DNA technology. And the precise historical dating of events by historians was transferred to astronomy, its most famous case being the exact dating of a supernova explosion (in 1054) as reported in a Chinese Song manuscript. In my talk I will put these migrations of methods and practices in the wider frame of past and current thinking about the actual as distinct from the conventionally assumed relationship between the humanities, science and technology.

Frederik Stjernfelt (U. of Aalborg), *From Historical to Current Breakthroughs in the Humanities*

In the process of charting the history of the humanities, Rens Bod has highlighted important historical breakthroughs of knowledge in source criticism, linguistics, musicology, and much more. A desirable extension of this mapping would be an overview over important recent breakthroughs of the humanities, say, in the period after WW2. Due to the many different humanities disciplines and schools, such an overview is not easy to establish, and an attempt aiming at completeness would require a network of specialists from many fields along with comparative generalists, working in tandem for a longer period. What is presented here, then, does not make any claims of completeness but rather a first overview over important breakthroughs of the following types: 1) new discoveries in the sense of the establishment of new empirical findings, data, excavations etc. giving rise to overall

Day 2, October 6

changes in the conception of the humanities; 2) the establishment of new points of view, rearticulating existing data and knowledge in a new framework; 3) the development of new theories adding to or challenging existing conceptions of what it means to be human; 4) new cross-faculty connections of knowledge and data establishing insights bridging between humanities on the one hand and natural or social sciences on the other. In this paper, some prime examples of these types of breakthroughs will be listed as an opening to further research.

David Budtz Pedersen (U. of Aalborg), *Understanding the Societal Impact of Humanities Scholarship*

The critical problem for understanding the societal impact of humanities scholarship is that we currently have no satisfactory tools for understanding how wider social impacts occur and, by implication, very few guidelines for stimulating a reflexive dialogue about the influence of the humanities in society. An important assumption in this paper is that impact should be studied both from conceptual, qualitative and quantitative perspectives. Any approach that focuses merely on scientific outputs (such as publications or citations) or that relies on purely bibliometric indicators will result in an incomplete and hence misleading picture of research outcomes and their causality. In this paper, I explore how the emerging research impact agenda is embarking on the humanities and which tools and frameworks are available for tracing and mapping the impact of humanities breakthroughs in society. Examining both quantitative and qualitative tools, the paper argues that we need a better and more comprehensive understanding of the role the humanities as part of a wider web of societal institutions, networks, and agents. Granted that the impact of humanities breakthroughs cannot be located at clearly demarcated or specified units, but takes place along a continuum of dynamic exchanges among multiple agents and institutions, I introduce the term “dynamic artifacts” as the main vehicle for understanding research impact in the humanities. Such artifacts consist of datasets, ideas, analyses, performances or engagement but they rarely take the form of “fixed artifacts” such as patents, intellectual property, contracts or documents trails, which hitherto has been the standard for assessing scientific breakthroughs. Having established this distinction between fixed and dynamic artifacts the paper concludes by showing how the impact of humanities can be traced by utilizing different methods such as impact narratives, altmetrics, network analysis, co-creation and ethnographic fieldwork.

Institutions of the Humanities

Shiuon Chu (Brown U.), *“Imperial Examination (Keju) as Intelligence Test”: Detaching a Meritocratic System from Classical Knowledge in Twentieth Century China*

In contemporary Chinese societies, imperial examination (*keju*)—a system assigning statuses and offices by test on Classics from the seventh century to 1905—is often compared to intelligence test, which was introduced from the U.S. into China in the 1920s. By detaching a fair and rational testing system from its obsolete contents, the analogy provides a powerful argument to defend the use of centralized and high-stake examinations. To trace the historical context of the analogy, my discussion begins with a 1926 article “On *keju* as Intelligence Test” by Zhang Yaoliang (1893-1964), who received training of quantitative educational research at Columbia Teachers College and, in 1922, became the first president of the Chinese Association of Psychology. Zhang has been an obscure figure in intellectual history, but two of his concepts have brought fundamental changes to understanding of knowledge and institution in twentieth century China. First is an abstract concept of mental capacity that were detachable from classical knowledge. This enabled argument that the

Day 2, October 6

Chinese people, despite their “backwardness” in scientific knowledge, was traditionally superior in terms of intelligence. Second is a procedural definition of fairness based on quantitative research on the *keju*. In Zhang’s research on education in the Qing dynasty (1644-1912), “*keju* as intelligence test” warranted the use of number of examination degrees as an indicator of regional performances. This quantitative perspective made *keju* a fair system regardless of its curriculum of Classics, and eventually invoked a popular nostalgia of traditional and meritocratic social order, which was believed to be lost after the imperial examination’s abolition in 1905.

John David Loner (U. of Cambridge), *"As Good as a Babe in Arms": Women Philosophers, Wittgenstein and "Inclusion" in the University of Cambridge*

Despite the rich insight recent portrayals of British highly-trained professional men have provided, most notably Andrew Warwick’s superb 2003 monograph, historians of elite gender have yet to offer an argument robust enough to accommodate the equally important role to which women students played in the maintenance and reincorporation of late-imperial English patriarchy in the post-First World War era. In assessing the professional lives of interwar Cambridge post-graduate students Alice Ambrose-Lazerowitz and Elizabeth Anscombe, then, my paper advances a new approach to the study of elite gender and gender performance in the modern English university. Through a judicious examination of extant papers and correspondence, my presentation details how these two female pupils, despite their institutionally-enforced status as non-official members of the University of Cambridge, together assented to an ambivalent ethos of inclusion, distinct from the former misogynistic “ideal of the liberal man” their prewar male colleagues upheld as well as the ironically egalitarian pedagogy of their shared supervisor Ludwig Wittgenstein. By demonstrating the extent to which both Ambrose-Lazerowitz and Anscombe time and again reasserted this newly-instated gender normative in their scholarly contributions and in their collaborations alongside the absent-minded Wittgenstein, my paper will redress what Katherine Angel has recently referred to in her analysis of women in philosophy as the “dispiriting dynamics” of disciplinary philosophy’s overall resistance to feminist challenges, ultimately providing scholars with both a haunting and timely portrayal of male-dominated gender inclusion in the history of the humanities.

Lasse Johansson (U. of Aalborg), *Recent Changes in Humanistic Research Practices: An Analysis of Danish PhD Dissertations 1992-2012*

The present paper analyzes changes in research practices in the humanities around the turn of the millennium. The analysis is based on a reading of all humanistic PhD dissertations in Denmark between 1992 and 2012 (N=1,958). For every dissertation we recorded not only language, format, co-authors and supervisors but also the theoretical sources, data types and analytical methods/techniques used. We show that, while the share of article-based dissertations (as opposed to monographs) is relatively stable, the share of English dissertations grows from around 18 percent in the beginning of the period to around 48 percent at the end of the period. English language is especially common among the article-based dissertations (71 percent for the entire period). We also identify a growing convergence with the social sciences, which is reflected in an increased use of more “social scientific” data types and analytical methods/techniques such as qualitative interviews, participant observation, categorized coding and statistical analysis. With respect to theoretical sources, many humanistic PhD dissertations also converge with the social sciences. We discuss these findings in the light of the situation in the national and transnational scientific fields and in the light of Danish and European research policy around the turn of the millennium. The paper contributes to the history of the humanities by offering a detailed analysis of changes in research practices across all

Day 2, October 6

humanistic disciplines. It also contributes by its focus on more marginal or, at least, non-canonical works.

Cynthia M. Pyle (New York U.), *The Role of Libraries in the Making of the Humanities*

The humanities are increasingly taken for granted, hence underfunded. Yet for our society to function, literacy and education in the humanities is crucial. The role of collections of books (libraries) in education has long been recognized, from Antiquity through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance on into the present.

This paper will discuss the history of the role of libraries in the evolution of the humanities, and current developments in that history, including digitization. Attention will be paid to the institutions collecting knowledge, and to the needs of scholars in accessing that knowledge.

In particular, the paper will discuss the evolution and the cultural and intellectual consequences of types of collections and media, with particular emphasis on three periods: 1) the collections in antiquity of texts on clay, wax, parchment, papyrus and other supports; 2) the transition in the 15th and early 16th centuries from libraries composed primarily of texts in those hand-written traditions to the development and collection of various types of printed book; and 3) the transition today from hand-written and printed collections to “virtual libraries.”

History of Archeology

William Stenhouse (Yeshiva U.), *French Archaeologies in the Early Modern Period*

In this paper I will examine the relationship between research into the material remains of antiquity and the emergence of national histories by looking at early modern scholars in southern France. Following Peter Miller and others, I will argue that we should see antiquarian practices – including the collection, comparison, and analysis of all sorts of relics from the past – at the root of a variety of modern disciplines, including archaeology, art history, and anthropology, as well as history. I will then show how we can see antiquarianism at work by considering a series of responses to artefacts in Provence. Scholars, and the towns and aristocrats who patronised them, saw that ancient objects, when contextualized, offered a means to documenting and understanding the region’s past that complemented textual narratives. Provence only became part of the French king’s territory at the end of the fifteenth century, and objects offered tangible proof for histories independent of royal control. In towns like Nîmes and Arles scholars used pagan Roman material, but also Greek and early Christian objects, to articulate local, regional, and national identities. Their contributions to a “material turn”, including displays of objects as well as written accounts, span modern disciplinary fields, but should be recognized as an important stage in the emergence of what we now know as the humanities.

Agnes Meyer (Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne), *The Alexanderzug, a German Archaeological Expedition in Afghanistan*

In 1960, the director of the German archaeological Institute, Erich Boehringer, went to Kabul with other German scholars. He wanted to understand how the Greek civilization had penetrated the Persian-Indian territory. The mission involved various disciplines, such as prehistory, Indianism, Islamic art and history, or geography. The goal of this journey was to get a first feel of the Afghan

Day 2, October 6

territory, and more specifically the Sistan area. Boehringer also needed to understand which relations he could hope to build with the institutions and individuals who worked in Afghanistan: the Afghan archaeological Institute; the French archaeological Delegation, which had a monopoly on the Afghan territory since 1922; the Italian scientific institute IsMEO, which also worked in Iran; the American archaeological community, whose theories and methods came from anthropology; and the representatives of UNESCO, who favored international work and interdisciplinarity. Considering the history of this mission, from its beginnings to its impacts, aims to contribute to the understanding of the difficult evolution faced by scientific institutions like the German archaeological institute, in a time when new technologies were used and new ideas about archaeological theories and methods were formulated. Why did Boehringer want to extend the activities of the DAI to East Asia? How did he choose the territories to study? How did he conceive the discipline? Did this mission have an influence on later German actions in the country? How were his goals and his actions perceived by the German and the foreign scientific community, or even by the states?

History and Text Analysis

Fenrong Liu (Tsinghua U.), *Argumentation in Ancient China: from an Agency Point of View*

Understanding ways of thinking and reasoning is one of the keys for decoding a philosophy and a culture. There has been much research into Chinese philosophy, but less attention has been paid to its underlying logical reasoning patterns. Moreover, traditional studies of reasoning in Chinese texts have tended to look only for analogies or differences with standard logical systems such as propositional or predicate logic. This is problematic for several reasons, one of them being that these systems were developed in the setting of foundations of mathematics, which was not a concern in classical Chinese philosophy. Indeed, the main setting of the classical texts is argumentation and disputation, that is, multi-agent discourse activities with a wide range of interactive moves and strategies. As it happens, this is highly congenial to developments in modern logic that put argumentation and information-driven agency at center stage. In my analysis, I will use modern models of rational interaction, in particular, logical games played between opponents and proponents of certain claims. I hope this will shed new light on the intellectual modus operandi behind the old texts.

Yves van Damme (U. of Leiden), *When Scholarship and Religious Inspiration Meet. One Hundred Years of Research into Middle Dutch Spiritual Literature, a Historiography*

When scholars first showed an interest in medieval Dutch spiritual and mystical literature, their research was clearly inspired by an ideological agenda. This paper seeks to give an insight into the way strong nationalistic ideals, personal spiritual convictions and the membership of certain (religious) denominations influenced the research.

To do this I will turn to the personal archives of some of the most important Dutch and Belgian scholars of mystic literature and discuss the results of a systematic analysis of the scholarly work itself. Here I focus on the research on the monastery of Groenendaal (Brussels), the centre of mysticism in the Low Countries. I will show how Jozef Van Mierlo (1878-1958) and his followers used medieval authors like Ruusbroec and Hadewijch for their Flemish nationalistic and Catholic political action. They were able to define the agenda of a whole research field for decades to come. Up until today demarcation lines like Flemish vs. Dutch or Catholic vs. Protestant are still at play in some of the most vehement scholarly debates.

Day 2, October 6

Finally, I will argue that as a result of these highly politicized and confessionalized agendas a theological and literary approach came to dominate all research within the field; even the more recent all-encompassing histories of the topic almost completely ignore ‘functionalist’ and ‘lived religion’ theories which could be used to uncover the social and psychological motives behind the medieval spiritual literature. It is exactly because of this that the research into medieval mysticism still has difficulties placing itself within the broader tradition of comparative religious studies.

History of Philology

Mats Malm (U. of Gothenburg), *Gendered Philology: The Apostle Junia[s] in Scandinavian Bible Translation*

The history of textual criticism is so closely entangled with the history of translation, that the two are not always possible to separate from each other. This may be most apparent in works on the Bible, a sphere where philological practice encounters a number of competing arguments, related to world view and dogma.

One well-known example is the apostle Junia of Romans 16.7, who in the 19th century was transformed into a male apostle Junias in a majority of translations and editions. As there were no strong philological arguments for this emendation, toward the end of the 20th century, she gradually was regendered into a woman again. This development displays a dominance of translation practice over philological analysis, but also actualizes issues concerning the institutional development of philology, biblical criticism and notions of gender.

The development, however, was different in the Protestant tradition. Martin Luther already in his first translation of the New Testament 1522 made the apostle masculine – but the Scandinavian translations which were the direct effect of Luther’s translation handled the apostle’s gender in a variety of ways.

This presentation will focus on the negotiations of textual authority, philological practice and ideological conviction in the Scandinavian Bible translations.

Matthew Strother (New School for Social Research), *The Advantages and Disadvantages of Reading for Life*

Over the course of his tenure at the University of Basel, Nietzsche moved away from the 19th-century ideal of the disinterested, disembodied philologist toward something altogether new and – to his academic colleagues – scandalous: a philology of and “for life.” But was this still philology? Or something entirely new? A “centauric” combination of science, art, and philosophy?¹ This paper will trace Nietzsche’s development from *wissenschaftlich* philologist to “philosopher of the future” by examining the evolution of his reading practice against the methods and norms of his philological training.

There is no doubt Nietzsche held philology in high esteem. At the same time, he accused scholars who “care more about science than humanity” of turning it from a means to an end. In his second ‘untimely meditation,’ Nietzsche framed this criticism as a failure to read “for life.” What does this mean? After all, the scholars whose reading practices Nietzsche criticized were “alive” in a biological

Day 2, October 6

sense. What, then, was this “life” that Nietzsche wanted to reclaim as the vital source of *Wissenschaft*? And in reclaiming it, could he still be a scholar on the academy’s terms?

After sketching the ideal type of the 19th century philologist in the context of disciplinary specialization, I will draw from Nietzsche’s letters, journals, and *Untimely Meditations* (in particular the unpublished essay, *We Classicists*) to ask why Nietzsche increasingly found “life” to be in conflict with the vocation that taught him “the art of reading well.”

Kimon Markatos (European U. Institute Florence), *The Ever-Changing Landscape of Greek Literary Criticism: The Transition from Philology to Theory 1974-2010*

The period between 1974 and 2010 most commonly referred to in the local literature as the ‘Metapolitefsis’ (polity change), was one of the most radically transformative periods in the history of modern Greece. The Greek economy, society, and public sphere were completely restructured, first under the May 1968 waves of influence that were shaping the south-European post-dictatorial states (Spain, Greece, Portugal) during the 1970s, and later in a process of rapid “modernization” that characterized much of the same areas in the 1980s and 1990s. During these years, literary criticism underwent significant changes.

Whether through the ‘arrival of theory’ or through the rising influence of the Anglo-American turn, intellectuals who dealt with the analysis and criticism of literary texts had to change their practice as well as their perception of their object of study. Clear reflections of these changes can be found in the debates concerning the so-called postmodern challenge. The proposed paper aims to trace these changes through the reception and development of the ideas related to postmodernism in the Greek intellectual milieu, and to historicize them in the framework of the academic, institutional and political changes taking place in the period under examination. More particularly, it will attempt to sketch and analyze the public debates on postmodernism among philologists and literary specialists that took place in the Greek academic and popular press of the 1990s and 2000s (journals and newspapers), as well as to situate them in the political and institutional context in which they took place.

Day 3, October 7

Keynote Anthony Grafton (Princeton U.), *Christianity and Philology: Blood Wedding?*

Historians of philology often treat it as purely secular in its origins, inspirations and methods. They define it, very reasonably, as a set of methods and practices, created in its western form in the Hellenistic world and designed for the study of literature. And they see it as better designed to strip scriptural texts and narratives of their aura of sacrality than to shore up their credibility. In particular, Christianity seems a particularly odd partner for philology. Sacred and authoritative Christian texts are often of deeply problematic authorship and authority. Christian authorities, for their part, have imposed limits on scholars' freedom of thought and research. For much of western history, however, Christian beliefs and programs have also driven innovation in the research and writing of history, the establishment and stabilization of texts, and the recreation of past societies and cultures—innovations that might not otherwise have taken place when they did. This lecture will examine the marriage of Christianity and philology that took place in the early modern west, between the fifteenth and the eighteenth century, and that provided as creative as it was stressful in many domains of the humanities.

East and West

Lu Jiang (Sun Yat-sen U.), *The Historiography of Philosophy as Science in the Coimbra-Commentary on Aristotle's Dialectics and in Its Chinese Translation*

Although one could argue that the history of science as an academic discipline was developed only in the twentieth century, we can find historiography of the human pursuit of knowledge already with Aristotle, who gives us an account of the development of the natural philosophy of Presocratic philosophers in both his *Metaphysics* and *Physics*. Philosophy is treated by him as an "episteme," a term often translated as science, which is defined by Aristotle himself as systematical and demonstrative knowledge. Thus, in the Aristotelian tradition dominating the following centuries until as late as into the 17th century, historiography of philosophy as a science was established as an academic tradition. In the Coimbra-Commentary on Aristotle's logic works (i.e. the *Organon*) of year 1606, which is also an introduction to philosophy in the Jesuit curriculum, we can find a detailed account of ancient philosophical schools dating back to the Pre-Socratics. The Aristotelian school is treated as one among many others. However, its Chinese translation of year 1631 offers a quite different narration: Aristotle is treated as the most venerable founder of philosophy whose personal connection to King Alexander was elaborated and enhanced in a way which cannot be found in the original version. This paper intends to explore the historical backgrounds of this difference in narration and tries to explain how this helped to shape a different understanding of philosophy in the Chinese version.

This Weststeijn (U. of Amsterdam), *The Rise and Fall of a Standard Model: the Sino-Egyptian Hypothesis*

Various recent studies have called attention to how the maritime expansion of the Dutch Republic resulted in new scientific knowledge. By contrast, the impact on the humanities of the global network of the Dutch trading companies has remained understudied. In fact Dutchmen not only collected books, artworks, and material culture from Asia on an unprecedented scale but also attempted to fathom the challenges these imports posed for traditional Western knowledge. The first European translation of a sizeable Sanskrit text (Bhartṛhari's *Vairāgya*) was one into Dutch (1651); a Dutch translation of Confucius's *Analects* (1675) preceded the more famous Latin one by twelve years. This paper will single out four questions that Asia presented in different strands of the humanities. 1) Chronology:

Day 3, October 7

did Indian and Chinese civilizations precede the Judaeo-Christian one?; 2) Linguistics: could Asian languages represent reality more adequately than the Western ones?; 3) Iconography: could European and Asian religious imagery be traced back to a single origin?, and 4) Antiquarianism: could the Western Classical Tradition bear comparison with the arts of Asia? This exploration will suggest that the early Orientalists Abraham Rogerius, Johan van Hoorn, Isaac Vossius, and Nicolaas Witsen were more willing than most of their European counterparts to understand Asia on its own terms, within a Dutch context where Biblical literacy and academic authority were increasingly being challenged. While most of the Dutch texts on Asia explicitly glorify the success of the Dutch East India Company, implicitly a growing cultural anxiety comes to the fore: the Western center seemed unable to hold within a mental horizon that was expanding Eastward.

Peng Peng (Princeton U.), *Max Loehr and his Contribution to the Study of Chinese Bronzes and Paintings*

Max Loehr (1903-1988) is one of the most prominent historians of Chinese art. With many major figures in the field as his disciples and followers, his academic DNA is widespread in almost every branch of Chinese art history. Different from his teachers Ludwig Bachhofer and Heinrich Wolfllin, Loehr did not believe style as a predetermined law that dominated the evolution of art form. For Loehr, art history is history, and style is only for historical description. His stylistic analysis always requests to rely on empirical observation, synthesize understanding of artworks and look for artistic intentionality. Till now, Loehr's most celebrated work on Chinese bronzes, "The Bronze Styles of the Anyang Period" (1953), still underlies the current research in the field. Loehr's influence on the study of Chinese paintings may have been even greater. What are the most fundamental contributions Loehr made to the Chinese art history? What are the limitations of Loehr's theory and methodology? What happened after Loehr and how much the field has moved forward? My study will try to answer these questions.

Jinhui Wang (Tsinghua U.), *Rethinking the Chinese Translation of "Humanity" as "人文"*

In English-Chinese dictionaries, "humanity" is translated into "Ren2wen2(人文)", "ren2xing4(人性)" or "ren2dao4"(人道), and this essay concentrates on its translation as "人文". Chinese characters themselves represent ideas rather than sounds, and the essay traces back to the ancient ideograms of these two characters, comparing their similarities and concerns with the relationship between one and the other, and argues that another translation should be introduced, which is "仁 (ren) " and this character is also proved to be linked profoundly with道 (Dao) , which is regarded as Chinese logos in this essay. Through the pictographic and philosophic study of the three characters: 文, 仁 and 道, this essay aims to weave together western and eastern wisdom, and compare the minute difference between the two. The essay aims to pound on 3 issues: 1. Seeking for humanity is such a fundamental and universal theme that scholars from different geographical areas, have been laboring on it all the time, though with different languages. And the issue of humanity cannot be solved by any other means except by humanity itself; 2. It is not that ancient wisdom needs to be rejuvenated, instead, it is modern human beings that need its guide to struggle out of present unsatisfactory chaos; 3. The Golden Rule about one and the other should be adjusted to deal with the present clash of civilizations, just as translation of the classics should always be adapted to the particular age.

Day 3, October 7

A Comparative and Quantitative Analysis of the Use of Primary Sources in the Humanities

This panel addresses a fundamental question in the history of the humanities: the humanist's relation with sources. Recently, and for the first time, the digital availability of both scholarly publications and reproductions of primary evidence allows for the large-scale investigation of such relation, for example via the systematic analysis of formal references to sources over time and fields. These developments might not only impact the retrieval of information, but also contribute to our understanding of the history of humanities from a quantitative and comparative perspective. We propose to compare and discuss methods and results from the analysis of the use of primary sources by humanists from three different fields: Historiography, Classics and Art History.

Giovanni Colavizza (École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne) and Mario Infelise (Ca' Foscari U.), *On the Use of Evidence in Venetian Historiography*

We investigate the methodological turns in the post-WW2 historiography on Venice through the historians referencing to different archival sources from the State Archive of Venice. We work on citation data from the archives of four journals specialized in venetian history: *Archivio Veneto*, *Ateneo Veneto*, *Studi Veneziani* and *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto*, spanning roughly from the 1950s to nowadays. References to archival sources are automatically extracted and normalized, yielding citation counts over time, and networks of co-cited sources (i.e. related because cited by the same scholarly article). Documents can be analyzed at different granularities, given by their archival hierarchy: funds, series within a fund, and even archival units and individual documents can be used as the analytical unit for our purposes. Our main question is: to what extent can we reconstruct the main turning points into the last sixty years of the historiography on Venice, using references to primary sources? Are these turning points characterized by the exploration of new sources, the critical re-evaluation of previously known ones, or both?

Matteo Romanello (École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne), *Leveraging Canonical References to Write a Quantitative History of Classics*

The system of canonical references, used by classicists to refer to their primary sources, has remained largely unchanged after stabilizing itself (i.e. becoming canonical) through the activity of scholars-printers at the end of the XVIth century. In this paper I shall illustrate how these references—which can be seen as the “traces” of the scholarly debate left by classicists over the last four centuries—could be analyzed quantitatively so as to help us shed some light on the history of classical scholarship, and especially scholarly text reception. Such an analysis enables us to investigate how the fortune of ancient authors varies over time as reflected by diachronic variations in the frequency of such references. But it could also be used to investigate the effects that the use of digital tools has on our scholarly practices. In fact, the introduction of electronic concordances like the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) or the Packard Humanities Institute Latin texts (PHI) has made it infinitely easier for classicists to retrieve parallel passages of classical works. Is this change confirmed by an increase in the average number of canonical references that can be found within classics publications? In this paper I illustrate how such hypothesis can now be investigated by adopting a quantitative approach. In particular, I shall present the preliminary results of an ongoing research dealing with the extraction and analysis of canonical references extracted from the over 130,000 Classics-related journal articles in JSTOR.

Day 3, October 7

Maximilian Schich (U. of Texas), “... *and Then we Gave Up and Used Deep Learning!*”

Over time art historians have harnessed secondary sources such as drawings, prints, casts, photographs, slides, and digital images to understand the process of art history. Meanwhile the original art objects have been examined more directly, stared at, touched, measured, even examined for texture with the human tongue. However, like the secondary sources above, the original art objects themselves can hardly be considered primary, as the objects and their context change over time, sometimes radically. As a consequence, the characterization of bias in observation, measurement, preservation, and documentation, even of single objects, becomes one of the most crucial activities in research. Facing the situation with the desire to understand the original configuration, circumstance, and dynamics of art objects, quantification has been used for centuries, from the collection and survey of large numbers of samples, to explicit statistical models, and most recently implicit quantification in so-called convolutional neural networks. In this talk I will outline a variety of cutting edge quantitative methods in art history and explore their ancestry, from early modern practitioners such as Aldrovandi and Dal Pozzo, to modern pioneers, such as Geymüller, Lanciani, Warburg, Barr, Malraux, and Kubler. Aiming for a mutual reevaluation of historical and modern quantitative methods, the talk will be useful for both traditional and computational art historians.

Democracy and the Humanities: Humanities Reports in America, 1828-Present

What is the relationship between democracy and the humanities in the US? Our panel addresses this question by examining a particularly American form of literature—the humanities report. Starting in 1828, every generation has justified humanistic education before a skeptical public. Specifically, we ask, how did democracy shape the *public language* of the humanities?

We propose to answer these questions through three key moments. The first is 1828, when Yale issued its “Report” to justify humanities education before a newly-empowered white male mass electorate. The second is the after World War II, when the humanities were charged with securing American democracy against totalitarianism. The final moment is the present, when inherited arguments for the humanities no longer convince, and a new rationale is demanded. Each paper provides context for changes in the public reasons offered to sustain the humanities in a democratic society.

Johann N. Neem (Western Washington U.), *The Yale Report and the Rise of Public Opinion*

The Yale Report of 1828 set the paradigm for 19th-century liberal education. Emphasizing “mental discipline” and “faculty psychology,” the liberal arts were celebrated for generating the transferable skills necessary for civic life and success in the world beyond. Historians have tended to dismiss the document for offering a deadening skills-based model of liberal education, but, in light of changing justifications for the humanities today, David Potts, in his recent book *Liberal Education for a Land of Colleges*, argues that the Yale Report bred life to 19th-century colleges precisely because it offered a rationale for the humanities based in broad skills development.

My paper disagrees. For starters, the Yale Report emphasized not just skills, but the “furniture” of the mind. The reporters specifically urged the importance of knowledge, and the insights available from subject matter. The authors celebrated the imagination. The fact that we only emphasize one half of the Report reflects its legacy in a democratic society. Collegians realized that arguments defending the specific benefits of academic subjects had no traction in the court of public opinion.

Day 3, October 7

And here lies the real significance of the Report. Previously, liberal education was deemed the necessary preparation for entering public deliberation. In a democracy with universal white male suffrage, however, the tables were turned. Recent scholarship has made clear that the rise of a democratic public sphere granted immense power to public opinion. And thus, liberal education now had to be justified before public opinion rather than being the precondition for it.

Ethan Schrum (Azusa Pacific U.), *Mobilizing the Humanities to Defend Democracy in the Era of Totalitarianism*

This paper examines the three major reports of the 1940s on the relationship between liberal education and the American political order: the American Council on Learned Societies' *Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy* (1943), Harvard University's *General Education for a Free Society* (1945), and the President's

Commission on Higher Education's *Higher Education for American Democracy* (1947-48). While a surfeit of recent scholarship has addressed the Harvard report, historians have neglected the President's Commission and (especially) ACLS publications. This paper argues that bringing all three reports back into conversation is essential for understanding the competing conceptions of the humanities' role in undergraduate education that were circulating at the takeoff of American higher education's postwar boom. It reconstructs two aspects of the context that gave rise to the reports. First, it describes the general education movement and the novel arrangements that movement spawned, such as Alexander Meiklejohn's Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin and the Basic College at Michigan State. Second, it explores how fears of totalitarianism sparked concerns to mobilize higher education to support democracy. The ACLS report portrayed the humanities, especially history and philosophy, as central in educating for democracy, but the President's Commission marginalized the humanities in favor of the social sciences. The paper concludes by assessing attempts by the ACLS report's lead author, philosopher Theodore Meyer Greene (a disciple of Meiklejohn), to institutionalize its framework for the humanities in Princeton's Special Program on the Humanities, in Directed Studies at Yale, and at Scripps College.

Annette Gordon-Reed (Harvard U.), *Making a Case for the Humanities in the 21st Century*

In February of 2011, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences announced the formation of a National Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences, of which I was a member. The AAAS acted on the basis of a bi-partisan request from members of Congress. We were directed to answer the following question: "What are the top ten actions that Congress, state governments, universities, foundations, educators, individual benefactors, and others should take now to maintain national excellence in humanities and social scientific scholarship and education, and to achieve long-term national goals for our intellectual and economic well-being; for a stronger, more vibrant civil society; and for the success of cultural diplomacy in the 21st century?" The Commission met periodically over the course of three years to discuss how to go about answering the question asked and writing the report. The final report, "The Heart of the Matter" was released in 2015. My paper will compare this effort with other attempts to rally support for the Humanities, discuss the different ideas about how to support the humanities that arose among members, talk about the ways in which the Commission has tried to extend the life and importance of the report, and try to gauge the success of our effort.

Day 3, October 7

Edgar Poe and the Critics

It could be argued that Edgar Allan Poe launched American literary criticism, in more ways than one. Not only did his book reviews, *Literati* profiles, and editorial jobs earn for Poe his meager living, but even his tales and poems often advanced aesthetic philosophies and cultural critiques. At the same time, Poe's status has always served as an index of the American critical enterprise itself. He has been a literary celebrity, a target of slanderous biography and contemptuous critical judgment, and the focus of reputation reclamation and scholarly re-evaluation. In this session, we will examine Poe as the agent and object of criticism through specific items that are also on view in the exhibition *The Enigmatic Edgar A. Poe in Baltimore & Beyond: Highlights from the Susan Jaffe Tane Collection*, allowing a fresh appraisal of Poe's role in American critical history.

Barbara Cantalupo (Pennsylvania State U.), *Poe's Evolving Theory of Beauty in 'The Domain of Arnheim'*

Poe's ideal artist, Ellison, first appears in print in 1842 in *The Ladies Companion* in a story entitled "The Landscape Garden." As editor and owner of *The Broadway Journal*, Poe reissued the story in the September 1845 number. Two years later, the *Columbian Magazine* for March 1847 published it with a new title, "The Domain of Arnheim." In this last version, the narrator announces in the beginning of the tale that Ellison's life profoundly overturns the widely held belief that "in man's very nature lies some hidden principle, the antagonist of bliss." In this story Poe not only rejects this assertion, he erases the belief expressed in his early poem, "Alone," that the image "Of a demon in my view" will prevail. In creating Ellison, Poe creates the possibility that dedication to a few rules of healthy living and the gift of wealth allow an artist to find bliss in "the *creation of novel forms of Beauty*." This tale as well as Poe's last, "Landor's Cottage," picture beauty as a balm that offsets worldly cares and allows for domestic bliss. These two stories would have formed a trilogy that Poe planned, but his unexpected death intervened. Poe's profound ability to see—not merely the depth of human depravity or the impact of political excesses or the whimsy of chance but visual beauty—impacts his writing both in content and style and presents a Poe many may not know.

J. Gerald Kennedy (Louisiana State U.), *Beneath the 'House of Usher': Poe's Subterranean Strategy*

The print debut of Poe's landmark tale, "The Fall of the House of Usher," in Burton's *Gentleman's Magazine* in September 1839 helps us to understand better his emerging resistance to literary nationalism. In the middle of an issue larded with features calculated to stir American pride, Poe folded a narrative foreign in its cultural setting but surprisingly pertinent to the planter aristocracy of the South and darkly prophetic of its fate. What advantages did Poe discern in a strategy of displacement, and why did he set himself against the national myth-making of the 1830s and 1840s? In ways we have yet to appreciate fully, Poe's stint with Burton, a recent English immigrant and literary entrepreneur, helps to explain Poe's scorn for affected hyper-nationalism and his use of foreign subjects to disguise potentially controversial material. "Usher" evokes an apparently European setting to avoid suspicion as a critique of southern insularity and inbreeding, while projecting a hypochondriac protagonist possibly inspired by the late John Randolph of Roanoke. The tale avoids slavery but hints at a fatal weakness, perhaps incest, that portends inescapable death. While Burton pandered to chauvinism, Poe sought through anti-nationalistic satires (like "The Man that Was Used Up") and Gothic fables to critique American assumptions about cultural progress.

Day 3, October 7

Stephen Rachman (Michigan State U.), *Remembering 'The Raven': Poetics and Celebrity*

The publication of *The Raven and Other Poems* in November 1845 in Wiley and Putnam's Library of American Books (the eighth volume in the series) marked the formal consolidation of Poe as a preeminent figure in the literature of the United States. It capped off the pivotal year of triumph and turmoil in Poe's literary life as he went from being a brilliant, if erratic and caustic editor/critic and author of striking if obscure tales of genuine power to becoming Edgar Allan Poe, the poet—the author of "The Raven." In the words of Nathaniel Parker Willis in his headnote to the poem's first book publication, it was "the most effective single example of 'fugitive poetry' ever published in this country.... It will stick to the memory of everybody who reads it." In a scant nine months, Poe went from being an interesting notable on the American literary scene to being a literary sensation, a genuine celebrity, and a dark, monumental figure of poetic genius. In 1845, Poe and "The Raven" went viral; they went straight into the culture—and they have never left it. The Wiley and Putnam volume was a recognition of this change in status and an attempt to remove the poem from its ephemeral or "fugitive" condition, to accord it a greater degree of permanence in a volume of Poe's poetic output; Willis was prescient in his comment about "The Raven" sticking "to the memory of everybody." The poem's perennial power indeed arises from the way it activates the themes of memory and forgetting. In this presentation, I will discuss the poem in terms of what it meant for Poe and his poetics, his biographical and mythic status, and for literary culture as a whole.

History's Religion

Along with classical philology, legal scholarship and ethnographic knowledge, the concept of "religion" and the return to the biblical text had a major impact on modern humanist scholarship and western notions of history. History, scholars came to agree throughout the nineteenth century, was to be based on written documents and other material evidence. However these materials from the past were not just subject to scientific scrutiny but were to be understood with reference to transcendental concepts. Revisiting W. Hardtwig's notion of "Geschichtsreligion" we will be looking at how intellectual practice and thought was informed by religious terms. Moreover, the intellectual and institutional formation of historical knowledge across humanist disciplines would have been impossible without reference to transcendental conceptions from religious traditions. Yet we understand "religion" as a peculiar notion introduced to the interpretation of human culture by post-reformation Protestantism and further differentiated by religious studies. Therefore the papers aim at, *first*, spotlights in a long history of intellectual practice of history's religion, and, *second*, a critical evaluation of Hardtwig's conception of "Geschichtsreligion" in the light of recent scholarship in religious studies and the history of the humanities.

Mario Wimmer (U. of California), *Ranke's Protestantism: Epistemological Optimism in the Writing of History*

The paper explores how religious belief figured in Ranke's historiographical practice and enabled the exceptional productivity of an "ordinary historian," as Hegel put it. Ranke understood his writing of history as "a kind of religious mission" and "ethereal mandate." Taking an ethnographic perspective on Ranke's religious beliefs and his particular understanding of Protestantism, I will show how it came to shape his practice as historian. Tracing different instances of this relation between history and Protestantism from his early writings on Luther, to his archival voyages or his late work on a World History, I will show how his religious belief was not only the motor of an irresistible epistemological optimism but also a way of obscuring the status of violence and conflict as motive in

Day 3, October 7

and movens of the historical process. Already early on, Ranke was working on a biography of Luther. In these fragmentary writings, I want to argue, we can encounter a first attempt to think of Luther as an “historical figure,” a notion that will turn out to be pivotal to Ranke’s historiographical practice. Even after Ranke had committed to become a professional historian accepting an appointment at the University of Berlin he negotiated a leave of absence to explore the archives of Austria and Italy. In and out of the archive he came to understand his office as historian as “service to God.” As I will demonstrate in close-readings of some of his major publications, this understanding of the historian’s task would have a lasting impact on his scholarship and his detached notion of world history.

Henning Trüper (Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies), *Heteronomous Metaphysics: Usener, Cassirer and the Historicization of Personal Deities*

The problem of the intertwining of historical and religious thought pertains, as Wolfgang Hardtwig has argued, to the metaphysical posits that inevitably accompany historical thought; and, more specifically, to the “ontotheological” question of the non-empirical, transcendental foundations assumed to underpin the very reality of the historical process without forming part of it. Usually, this problem has been regarded as part of the terrain of the philosophy of history, and scholars outside the philosophical canon are treated as recipients and appliers rather than as contributors to *Geschichtsreligion*. In this presentation I want to challenge this assumption and explore the agency of concrete historical and philological working practices in the dynamism of this terrain in the late 19th century. The metaphysics of history will appear to have been transformed into a heteronomous field with rules imposed from elsewhere. I will pay particular attention to the fortunes of the notion of the personal deity – with its ontotheological connections to the concepts of naming, agency, creation, and dialogue – in the context of a specific philological research project, Hermann Usener’s *Götternamen*, and Ernst Cassirer’s reception of this work. As I will argue, this case example offers insight into how history’s “religion” reshaped the very notion of the metaphysical foundations of history in philosophical discourse.

Jonathan Sheehan (U. of California), *Wellhausen and Sacrifice: A Deep History of Theology and Comparative Religion*

Like many nineteenth century thinkers, the German Biblical scholar and orientalist Julius Wellhausen has become a figure of some fun for contemporary students of religion. The theologian John Milbank’s evaluation – that Wellhausen “constructed his ‘original’ sacrifice not from evidence but from his own liberal Lutheran preferences”—can stand as paradigmatic of the view that nineteenth century scholarship was a projection of liberal Protestant theological prejudice. This paper wants to challenge this view by looking at the deep history of scholarship on sacrifice. It will suggest that Wellhausen at least came by his mistakes honestly, insofar as he labored within frameworks already in formation since the early sixteenth century. These frameworks, not Wellhausen or liberal Protestantism, made sacrifice a peculiar and powerful thing for the nineteenth century: both origin of human culture and that which must be overcome for humans to achieve their autonomy.

Day 3, October 7

Comparison and the Modern Humanities

This panel aims to historicize the so-called comparative method as the defining approach to humanistic inquiry in modern Europe. Devin Griffiths establishes the central role of a new kind of comparativism—a “comparative historicism” that shaped Victorian thinking about the humanities. Mimi Winick shows how the first generation of professional women scholars in Britain adopted comparison and conjecture (the practice of inferring data from analogy) to write feminist histories of religion and literature that went on to shape literary, religious, and especially later feminist critical practice. Avi Alpert reveals the originary “bad comparison” behind the modern dialectic, arguing that this history can lead us to a new version of a historically informed comparative practice. Together, these three papers offer histories of the comparative method and its close relations, conjecture and dialectic, in modern Europe, and suggest how these histories may illuminate our current humanistic endeavors.

Mimi Winick (Rutgers U.), *Comparison, Conjecture and a History of Feminist Critique*

Complementing recent histories of scholarship (James Turner, Ted Underwood), this paper sketches an alternative history of humanistic scholarship in which writers marginal to higher education (women, amateurs, occultists) were primary shapers of the most widely disseminated humanistic theories and methods in twentieth-century Britain. These scholars made fresh use of the “comparative method,” a practice with a long history that yet came to be seen as a particularly modern approach to the humanities in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Comparison and its central tactic of conjecture became prominent parts of a critique of empiricism by those who found empiricism limiting and out of reach. In contrast, conjecture was accessible: one did not need to know ancient languages to infer connections among published etymologies. Moreover, it promised fulfilling, totalizing experiences of knowledge: one could conjecture about phenomena that could not be observed directly due to temporal or geographical distance, location in psychological interiority, or scale.

In this paper, I consider the linked work of two conjectural scholars, the classicist Jane Harrison and the Arthurian scholar Jessie L. Weston (both 1850-1928). Each used comparison and conjecture to construct woman-centered religious and literary histories out of fragmentary empirical evidence and disciplined exercises of the imagination. They published this work both with university presses and in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Widely disseminated, their theories shaped popular literature, new religions, and alternative scholarly practices. Ultimately, their simultaneously peripheral and popular comparative scholarship inaugurated a tradition of twentieth-century feminist humanistic inquiry that challenged academic norms.

Devin Griffiths (U. of South California), *The Comparative Method and the History of the Humanities*

Inspired by Franz Boas’s revolutionary comparative study of American immigrants, W. E. B. Du Bois argued that anthropologists, sociologists and “scientific thinkers as a class” should collectively criticize the “fallacy” of taking a “momentary instead of a historic, a fixed instead of a comparative” method. Though Du Bois sees this perspective as something new, my paper recognizes comparative historical study as a long-influential “style of reasoning,” in Ian Hacking’s sense, a *comparative historicism* central to nineteenth-century scientific and humanist research. This new “historical

Day 3, October 7

epistemology” (as Loraine Daston has put it) was driven by research in a range of fields, from comparative anatomy and philology, to anthropology, history, and mythology. Jon Klancher has argued that the eclectic pages of nineteenth-century periodicals and reviews proved fertile ground for such interdisciplinary exchange. My paper turns to the periodical writings of George Eliot and George Henry Lewes—writers, naturalists, and two of Victorian Britain’s most influential theorists of academic research—to sketch the contours of this historical sensibility. When Eliot, as defacto editor of the *Westminster Review*, removed the national subdivisions that had segregated reviews of “contemporary” (i.e. humanist) literature, in favor of a “connected and comparative history of Contemporary Literature,” she turned comparative historicism to account as a way to explore historical patterns within disparate fields and across distinct national languages—a new way to theorize the disciplinary formations of the humanities. Our disciplinary histories are still conditioned by this comparative method.

Avi Alpert (Federal U. of Bahia), *Bad Comparisons and the History of the Dialectic*

Most histories claim that dialectical thought emerges from multiple sources in German Idealism, including the secularization of Christianity, the return to Greek and Medieval sources, and the rising science of magnetism and polarity. This paper proposes another source: an anecdote told by Jean Baptiste Du Tertre, missionary to Guadeloupe, comparing French and Caribbean trading practices. This anecdote made its way into Rousseau’s *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, and, from there, into the foundation of modern dialectics in Schiller and Hegel. Recent works by Timothy Brennan and Susan Buck-Morss have suggested that the dialectic, as an abstract universal, was *applied* by Hegel to make anti-colonial arguments. But this paper shows how the concept was itself *constituted* by colonial stereotypes. This history troubles Idealism’s underlying assumption that the dialectic would find an analogue in every situation, and thus could be applied everywhere to show the movement of history in the march of freedom. As Frantz Fanon wrote, “The dialectic that introduces necessity as a *point d’appui* for my freedom expels me from myself.” Reconstituting the geographic history of the dialectic leads me to break with Brennan and Buck-Morss’ universalism. Comparison cannot be about finding analogues everywhere, but must rather begin with the difficult process of sorting out the ways in which our very concepts are informed by histories and representations beyond our control. Only once we are mindful of these complexes can we begin to compare the constituted forms of our scholarly practices.

Anthropology and Historical Research in the Context of the Cold War

This panel aims to analyse the complex relationships between historical studies and anthropological research within the dynamics of the Cold War. On the one hand, the work of anthropologists shaped Western patterns of understanding of indigenous cultures. But at the same time it led scholars from different humanistic disciplines to rephrase questions, change their focus, and develop new interests. Between the 1950s and the 1960s, the influence of anthropological studies questioned methodologies and disciplinary boundaries in the humanities. Lévi-Strauss’ work, for instance, transcended the study of indigenous cultures and had a pervasive influence on scholarship in human sciences. Jean Pierre Vernant’s, Pierre Vidal-Naquet’s and Marcel Detienne’s seminal work on Greek mythology was largely inspired by Lévi-Strauss’ work, including his interpretation of the Amazonian civilizations. At the same time, both anthropological research and its appropriation, assimilation, elaboration by humanist scholars was framed in the context of the Cold War.

The panel will be organized in three talks. In the first talk, Alexandre Coello de la Rosa will introduce the discussion, by assessing the background role of Viet-Nam war in shaping the debate on Yanomámi violence. In the second talk, Daniele Cozzoli will focus on how the relationship between

Day 3, October 7

science and magic in post-war Italian scholarship was elaborated in the light of the anthropological debate on "the subaltern", highlighting the differences between Italian and US' scholarship. Finally, Joao Melo will focus on the Lusotropicalism movement in Portuguese historiography and anthropology, highlighting how the research agendas of the American universities, defined by the vicissitudes of the Cold War, influenced the historical and anthropological research on the Portuguese colonial empire.

Daniele Cozzoli (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Science, Natural Magic and the Subaltern Worldview in Post-War Italian Scholarship*

Focusing on the work of the historians of early modern science and philosophy Eugenio Garin and Paolo Rossi, the anthropologist Ernesto De Martino, and the historian Carlo Ginzburg, this paper aims to frame the relationship between science and magic in post-war Italian scholarship within the National and the International context of the Cold War. In the 1950s, Garin and Rossi investigated the 17th century science's roots in Renaissance authors. In the same years, De Martino carried on fieldwork on the magical worldview of farmers of Southern Italy, aiming to explain how such doctrines had been connected and somehow shaped by the *élites* cultures since Renaissance. Some years later, Ginzburg, explicitly inspired by De Martino's work, investigated popular magic of 16th- and 17th-century Friulan peasants and its relationship with the *élites* culture. All the above-mentioned scholars were influenced by Gramsci. Garin and Rossi focused on Gramsci's notes on Machiavelli, whereas De Martino's and Ginzburg's interest was caught by Gramsci's notes on folklore. In this paper, the Italian interest for science and magic is explained both in the light of the post-war debate on the modernization of the country and on the cultural and social policies of the Italian Communist Party. The scarce interaction between the philosophers, and De Martino and Ginzburg is ascribed both to the above-mentioned context and to the rigidity of disciplinary boundaries in post-war Italian academia. Furthermore, the international connections are investigated, being crucial in the shaping of the Italian scholarship interests. Contrasts and differences with scholars such as P.O. Kristeller, F. Yates and N. Zemon-Davis are framed within the dynamics of the Cold War years.

Alexandre Coello de la Rosa (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Rethinking War and Aggression Among the Yanomami: an Approach from Historical Anthropology*

The Yanomami are a group of indigenous people living in villages in the Amazon rainforest on the border between Venezuela and Brasil. Starting from Napoleon Chagnon's first portrayal of Yanomami as the quintessence of chronic and endemic "tribal" warfare, I want to rethink epistemological study of violence in the Venezuelan and Brazilian "primitive world" by focusing on historical anthropology. Are Yanomami aggressive by nature? Is Western influence and massive violation of human rights by the Brazilian government responsible of much of Yanomami's violence? Without denying that considerably conflict and aggression exists among the so-called "fierce people", it is also true that the opinion of their illustrious advocates, such as H. E. Barnes (1923), L. H. Keeley (1996) or N. Chagnon (1968) himself, is idiosyncratic. While some anthropological research (Biocca, Lizot) has centered on different aspects of Yanomami's culture, I want to contextualize Chagnon's research from US American obsession with violence. The fact that Chagnon's book appeared during the Vietnam War is a case in point, helping us to understand that the Yanomami are not an anachronism; the only anachronism, as Sponsel (1998) has recently remarked, is the way some authors have characterized the Yanomami. War is no less important than peace, but no attention has been paid to it. To conclude, this paper wants to place peace and war in post-II World War anthropology and the debates it ensued in international academia.

Day 3, October 7

Joao Melo (Pompeu Fabra U.), *Race and Empire in Portuguese Historiography and Anthropology, 1950-1990*

The increasing international pressure for decolonization after the end of World War II forced the Portuguese *Estado Novo* dictatorship to invest in a new ideological framework that could support the continuity of its colonial project in Africa. In an attempt to offer a scientific legitimacy to Portuguese colonialism, the regime elected the Lusotropicalist thesis developed by the Brazilian sociologist and anthropologist Gilberto Freyre. However, Freyre's vision of a benign Portuguese colonization shaped by miscegenation and without racial violence collided with the new perspectives on race and colonialism which emerged in the 1960s, against the backdrop of decolonization and the civil rights movement in the USA. Indeed, during the late 1950s and early 1960s, a series of works by American and British historians and anthropologists such as Charles Boxer, James Duffy, Marvin Harris or Richard J. Hammond presented new critical assessments of the race relations within the Portuguese empire which questioned the validity of the lusotropicalist thesis. Fearing the repercussions of these new perspectives on Portuguese colonialism, the regime funded the so-called 'Projecto David', a research programme which aimed to promote the Estado Novo's colonial agenda in the American academia. Indeed, the project main result was the publication in 1969 of *Portuguese Africa: A Handbook* by the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University. Through an analysis of the contexts of production and reception of Charles Boxer's highly influential *Race relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, 1415-1825*, this paper intends to explore (1) the influence of Lusotropicalism and its critiques in the evolution post-war Portuguese historiography and anthropology, and (2) how the research agendas of the American universities, defined by the vicissitudes of the Cold War, influenced the historical and anthropological research on the Portuguese colonial empire between the 1950s and the 1990s.

The Classics of the Humanities

Roundtable participants: Kasper Eskildsen (Roskilde U.), Rens Bod (U. of Amsterdam), Kevin Chang (Academia Sinica)

What are the classics of the history of humanities scholarship? Most historians of science or philosophy would be able to produce a list of classical texts within their field in a short time. Few would question if, say, Galileo's *Sidereus Nuncius* or Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* belonged on the list. Such texts are well-known, often reproduced and translated, and recommended on syllabi and in readers around the world. Nothing similar exists for the history of humanities. Even if many in recent decades have criticized the idea of great books, there may be good reasons why we need them. An established list of classics would not only make the history of humanities a more teachable topic, but could also promote new research in the field. On the one hand, such a list could inspire scholars to reinvestigate the classics. On the other hand, it could provoke others to question what should and should not be considered classics, as it has happened in recent decades in other historical fields. But if we need such as list, how should we select the classics? What makes a text into a classical text in the history of humanities? How should we find a balance between Western and non-Western traditions of scholarship and can we find selection criteria that would be relevant for both? Would it be legitimate to select texts that had a lasting influence in humanities scholarship and therefore remain relevant today? Even if we could agree upon these questions, it would still be an open question which texts should be selected. The purpose of this round table is to open up a discussion about what could be considered the classics of the history of humanities scholarship. We will offer

Day 3, October 7

three different perspectives on the question, but also invite the audience to come with suggestions and ideas.

Between Magistra Vitae and Academic Discipline: The Nature of Enlightenment Historiography

For a variety of reasons, Enlightenment historiography has long been regarded as of relatively little significance and interest. The shock of the cataclysmic political events of the late eighteenth-century, the early nineteenth-century rise of academic historiography and its attendant methodology, and the new historical sensibility associated with the romantic movement led the nineteenth century to regard the historical achievement of the Enlightenment as inadequate and unsatisfactory. This harsh verdict has, remarkably enough, continued to resonate in scholarship for a considerable time and has survived until deep into the twentieth century. It is only recently that historians have started to engage in the attempt to study the historiography of the Enlightenment in a less anachronistic manner and have thereby opened the way for a new appreciation of its considerable intellectual importance and originality. Enlightenment historians, it is now increasingly realized, succeeded in overcoming the deep crisis into which the rise of Pyrrhonism had plunged the traditional humanist approach to the past by creatively integrating erudition and narrative. Replacing both humanist and providential history with the secular vistas of *philosophie*, they constructed new master narratives conceived in terms of the progress of the human mind or the progress of society through the stages of hunting, pasturage, agriculture, and commerce. They freed themselves from the limiting classical and humanist focus on politics and war and expanded the field of historical inquiry to include the economy, society, and culture. The geographical scope of this new and enlightened history, moreover, was considerable. Indeed, Enlightenment historiography may in many respects be regarded as broader in scope and more versatile than its rather narrowly focused Rankean successor. Salutary as this renewed appreciation of the importance of Enlightenment historiography undoubtedly has been, it is nonetheless still only in its first phase and has so far left a great many crucially important aspects of the Enlightenment contribution to historical writing unexplored. This panel therefore aims to contribute to the further exploration of the historical world of the Enlightenment by addressing a number of underexplored but central issues in Enlightenment historiography: the struggles to arrive at a consistent historical chronology, the attempts to write new forms of global history, and the ways in which the historiography of the Enlightenment dealt with both the work of ancient historians and the history of the classical world.

Wyger Velema (U. of Amsterdam), *Ancient Historiography and History in the Dutch Enlightenment*

Although a great many sources testify to the fact that the eighteenth-century Dutch were intensely interested in the ancient Greek and Roman world, subsequent historians have largely ignored this almost obsessive preoccupation. This paper explores the Dutch Enlightenment interest in the classical world from the perspective of historiography. It first of all analyzes the reputation of Greek and Roman historiography during the Dutch Enlightenment and demonstrates that whereas some eighteenth-century Dutch commentators such as Elie Luzac and Laurens Pieter van den Spiegel started to regard classical historiography as entirely superseded by modern developments in the field, others continued to show considerable respect for the historical writings of the ancients. The Harderwijk professor Kornelis Willem de Rhoer, for instance, in 1789 argued that the historiographical achievement of Herodotus was deeply impressive and demonstrated an exemplary critical attitude to the sources. The paper then moves to the actual writing of the history of ancient

Day 3, October 7

Greece and Rome in the Dutch Enlightenment. The bulk of this second part of the paper will be devoted to an analysis of the *Roman Histories* of Martinus Stuart, an extremely successful work which appeared in thirty volumes between 1793 and 1810, constituted the first lengthy history of ancient Rome in the Dutch language, and has hitherto been unjustifiably neglected by historians of historiography.

Anton Matytsin (Kenyon College), *Contesting Time: Ancient Chronologies at the “Académie des inscriptions”*

The *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*—a French national academy that was originally founded as part of King Louis XIV’s image-making campaign in 1663—dramatically transformed the way in which Enlightenment historians understood the past. When the members of the *Académie des inscriptions* began looking beyond the histories of ancient Greece and Rome, they encountered a number of inconsistencies and conflicts that profoundly destabilized Judeo-Christian universal histories. Attempts to reconcile the Biblical and non-European timelines of the Indian, Chinese, and Middle Eastern civilizations deeply preoccupied scholars of the early Enlightenment. Indeed, the question of universal chronology was one of interest to a wide variety of scholars in the early 18th century, including Isaac Newton, who attempted to correct the timeline of the world in his *Chronology of the Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (1728). Nicolas Fréret, a prominent member of the *Académie* who attempted to refute Newton’s hypothesis, became one of the most active researchers of this question. The paper will look at the ways in which Fréret and other historians of antiquity of the *Académie des inscriptions* attempted to reconcile the various ancient non-Judeo-Christian chronologies with the Biblical timeline.

Conference Participants

first name	family name	affiliation	email
Avram	Alpert	Federal University of Bahia	avi.alpert@gmail.com
Katherine	Arens	University of Texas	arens@austin.utexas.edu
Christopher Drew	Armstrong	University of Pittsburgh	cda68@pitt.edu
Mou	Banerjee	Harvard University	moubanerjee@fas.harvard.edu
Estelle	Blaschke	Université de Lausanne	Estelle.Blaschke@unil.ch
Rens	Bod	University of Amsterdam	rens.bod@uva.nl
Stephen	Campbell	Johns Hopkins University	Stephen.campbell@jhu.edu
Barbara	Cantalupo	Pennsylvania State University	bac7@psu.edu
Kevin	Chang	Academia Sinica	kchang@sinica.edu.tw
Christopher	Celenza	Johns Hopkins University	celenza@jhu.edu
Karine	Chemla	CNRS Paris Diderot	chemla@univ-paris-diderot.fr
Carol	Chiodo	Yale University	carol.chiodo@gmail.com
Shiuon	Chu	Brown University	shiu_on_chu@brown.edu
Frederic	Clark	New York University	fnc1@nyu.edu
Alexandre	Coello de la Rosa	Pompeu Fabra University	alex.coello@upf.edu
Giovanni	Colavizza	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	giovanni.colavizza@epfl.ch

Melanie	Conroy	University of Memphis	mrconroy@gmail.com
Daniele	Cozzoli	Pompeu Fabra University	daniele.cozzoli@upf.edu
Elea	De La Porte	University of Amsterdam	e.j.delaporte@uva.nl
Hent	De Vries	Johns Hopkins University	hentdevries@jhu.edu
Gabrielle	Dean	Johns Hopkins University	gnodean@jhu.edu
Andrew	Delbanco	Columbia University	andrew.delbanco@columbia.edu
Leander B.	Diener	Universität Zürich	leander.diener@access.uzh.ch
Jennifer	Donnelly	University of Pittsburgh	Jed82@pitt.edu
William	Egginton	Johns Hopkins University	egginton@jhu.edu
John E.	Elliott	Nagoya University	jeelliott@post.harvard.edu
Matthijs	Engelberts	University of Amsterdam	m.engelberts@uva.nl
Stefani	Engelstein	Duke University	stefani.engelstein@duke.edu
Kasper	Eskildsen	Roskilde University	eskild@ruc.dk
Cesc	Esteve	Universitat de Barcelona	cesc.esteve@gmail.com
Irena	Fatsea	National Technical University of Athens	idfatsea@uth.gr
Stella	Gevorgyan-Ninness	Arcadia University	stgev@yahoo.com
Bennett	Gilbert	Portland State University	bbg2@pdx.edu
Annette	Gordon-Reed	Harvard University	agordonreed@law.harvard.edu
Anthony	Grafton	Princeton University	grafton@princeton.edu

Elyse	Graham	SUNY Stony Brook	jean.graham@stonybrook.edu
Devin	Griffiths	University of South California	devin.griffiths@usc.edu
Emma	Hagström Molin	The Swedish Institute	emmahmolin@gmail.com
Julia Claire	Hernandez	University of Georgia	lexjulia@uga.edu
Andy	Hines	Vanderbilt University	andrew.j.hines@vanderbilt.edu
Mario	Infelise	Ca' Foscari University	infelise@unive.it
Peter	Jelavich	Johns Hopkins University	jelavich@jhu.edu
Lu	Jiang	Sun Yat-sen University	jianglu.sysu@gmail.com
Lasse G.	Johansson	Aalborg University	lassegj@gmail.com
Judith	Kaplan	MPIW Berlin	jkaplan@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de
Bart	Karstens	University of Amsterdam	b.karstens@uva.nl
Sarah	Kay	New York University	hsk8@nyu.edu
J. Gerald	Kennedy	Louisiana State University	jgkenn@lsu.edu
Jennifer P.	Kingsley	Johns Hopkins University	jkingsley@jhu.edu
Andrew J.	Kluth	UCLA	kluth.aj@gmail.com
Caryn	Koplik	National Humanities Center	ckoplik@nationalhumanitiescenter.org
Allison	Ksiazkiewicz	University of Cambridge	allison.ksiazkiewicz@cantab.net
Bernd	Kulawik	Bibliothek Werner Oechslin	be_kul@me.com
Tye	Landels-Gruenewald	Queens University	tyelandels@gmail.com

Stuart W.	Leslie	Johns Hopkins University	swleslie@jhu.edu
Jacob	Levi	Johns Hopkins University	jelevi@jhu.edu
Shannon M.	Lieberman	UCSB	shannon02@umail.ucsb.edu
Sigrid	Lien	University of Bergen	Sigrid.Lien@uib.no
Adrianna	Link	Amherst College	alink3@jhu.edu
Fenrong	Liu	Tsinghua University	fenrong@tsinghua.edu.cn
John David	Loner	University of Cambridge	jdl50@cam.ac.uk
Courtney S.	Long	University of Pittsburgh	courtneylong@pitt.edu
Jaap	Maat	University of Amsterdam	J.Maat@uva.nl
Mats	Malm	University of Gothenburg	mats.malm@lir.gu.se
Adriana	Markantonatos	Philipps Universität	a.markantonatos@posteo.de
Kimon	Markatos	European University Institute	Kimon.Markatos@EUI.eu
Anton	Matytsin	Kenyon College	matytsina@kenyon.edu
James	McElvenny	Universität Potsdam	james.mcelvenny@mailbox.org
Larry S.	McGrath	Wesleyan University	lmcgrath@wesleyan.edu
Joao	Melo	Pompeu Fabra University	joao.melo@upf.edu
Susanne	Mersmann	Philipps Universität	susanne.mersmann@leuphana.de
Agnes	Meyer	Paris I Panthéon Sorbonne	meyeragnes@orange.fr
Johann N.	Neem	Western Washington University	johann.neem@wwu.edu

Stephen	Nichols	Johns Hopkins University	Stephen.nichols@jhu.edu
Hilde W.	Nielssen	University of Bergen	hilde.nielssen@uib.no
Olga	Olkheft	European University St. Petersburg	okaukhchan@gmail.ru
David Budtz	Pedersen	University of Aalborg	davidp@hum.aau.dk
Rik	Peels	Vrije Universiteit	mail@rikpeels.nl
Peng	Peng	Princeton University	pengpeng@princeton.edu
Katharina Natalia	Piechocki	Harvard University	kpiechocki@fas.harvard.edu
Bican	Polat	Johns Hopkins University	bicanpolat@jhu.edu
Cynthia M.	Pyle	New York University	c.m.pyle@nyu.edu
Aleta	Quinn	Caltech	aletaquinn@gmail.com
Stephen	Rachman	Michigan State University	rachman@msu.edu
Eugenio	Refini	Johns Hopkins University	erefini1@jhu.edu
Ohad	Reiss Sorokin	Princeton University	oreiss@princeton.edu
Elizabeth	Rodini	Johns Hopkins University	erodini@jhu.edu
Matteo	Romanello	École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne	matteo.romanello@epfl.ch
Dorothy	Ross	Johns Hopkins University	dottross@comcast.net
Maximilian	Schich	University of Texas at Dallas	maximilian.schich@utdallas.edu
Katharina Isabel	Schmidt	Princeton University	kis2@princeton.edu
Ethan	Schrum	Azusa Pacific University	eschrum@apu.edu

Jonathan	Sheehan	University of California	sheehan@berkeley.edu
Daniel C.	Sherer	Yale University School of Architecture	dcs116@columbia.edu
Matthew	Shields	Georgetown University	mbs98@georgetown.edu
Olaf	Simons	Forschungszentrum Gotha, Universität Erfurt	olaf.simons@uni-erfurt.de
Alfred	Sjödín	Lund University	alfred.sjodin@litt.lu.se
Floris	Solleveld	Forschungszentrum Gotha, Universität Erfurt	floris.otto@gmail.com
William	Stenhouse	Yeshiva University	stenhous@yu.edu
Frederik	Stjernfelt	University of Aalborg	stjern@hum.aau.dk
Matthew	Strother	New School for Social Research	matthew.c.strother@gmail.com
Chris Alen	Sula	Pratt Institute	csula@pratt.edu
Pandora	Syperek	Paul Mellon Centre	pandora@panworks.com
Winston	Tabb	Johns Hopkins University	wtabb@jhu.edu
Marrikka	Trotter	Harvard University	mtrotter@fas.harvard.edu
Henning	Trüper	Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies	henning.trueper@gmail.com
Yves	Van Damme	Leiden University	y.a.a.van.damme@hum.leidenuniv.nl
Peter	Van Emde Boas	University of Amsterdam	peter@bronstee.com
Timo	Van Havere	KU Leuven	Timo.VanHavere@KULeuven.be
Dirk	Van Miert	Utrecht University	d.k.w.vanmiert@uu.nl
Nicolas	VanDeviver	Ghent University	nicolas.vandeviver@ugent.be

Selene-Maria	Vatteroni	Scuola Normale Superiore	selene.vatteroni@sns.it
Wyger R. E.	Velema	University of Amsterdam	wre.velema@uva.nl
Eleonora	Vratskidou	Technische Universität Berlin	evratskidou@gmail.com
Jinghui	Wang	Tsinghua University	jh.wang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn
Susan	Weiss	Johns Hopkins University	Weiss.susan@gmail.com
Thijs	Weststeijn	University of Amsterdam	thijs.weststeijn@uva.nl
Mario	Wimmer	University of California	wimmer@berkeley.edu
Mimi	Winick	Rutgers University	mimi.winick@gmail.com
Yung-Hsing	Wu	University of Louisiana	yhwu@me.com
Zhu	Yiwen	Sun Yat-sen University	zhuyiwen@ymail.com

