



International Balzan Foundation

Anthony Thomas Grafton

2002 Balzan Prize
for History of the Humanities

Excerpt from

Premi Balzan 2002, Milan

(revised and enlarged edition, 2010, including a Balzan Lecture:
The Republic of Letters, delivered in Washington on 3 October 2006)

*This publication (containing two short pieces
by Anthony Thomas Grafton) has been
re-issued on the occasion of the Balzan Distinguished Lecture 2010
at the Semper Aula, Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 20 December 2010,
based on the Agreements on Collaboration between the
International Balzan Foundation “Prize”, the
Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences, and the
Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*

CONTENTS

2002 Balzan Prize for History of the Humanities Prize Citation and <i>Laudatio</i>	5
Prizewinner's Acceptance Speech at the Awards Ceremony Rome, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 13 November 2002	7
<i>A Premature Autobiography?</i> A panoramic synthesis of his career, realized by Anthony Thomas Grafton, on the occasion of the 2002 Awards Ceremony in Rome	9
<i>The Republic of Letters: The European Intellectual Community in an Age of Religious War, 1500-1700, and its Relevance Today</i> A Balzan Lecture given by Anthony Thomas Grafton Washington, Embassy of Switzerland, 3 October 2006	17
Research Project – Abstract	29
Biographical and bibliographical data	32
International Balzan Foundation	35

2002 Balzan Prize for History of the Humanities

Prize Citation and *Laudatio*

For his outstanding work on the history of scholarship, especially of the classical tradition in European intellectual history since the Renaissance, including the history of the evolution of scholarly practices, techniques and attitudes and the links between humanist learning and the development of modern science.

Anthony Grafton is a brilliant intellectual historian of early modern Europe. He took the history of the classical tradition in the late Renaissance as a starting point for his studies, producing two magnificent volumes on one of the greatest scholars of that age, Joseph Scaliger (*Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* Vol. I. *Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, Oxford 1983; Vol. II. *Historical Chronology*, Oxford 1993). In order to evaluate Scaliger's merit as an erudite, innovative editor and exegete of Latin texts, Grafton immersed himself in the world of late Humanism. He gained a rare encyclopaedic familiarity with the output of countless humanists as well as with the ancient texts they so admired. In this way he was able to write his pioneering biography on Scaliger, which deals not only with its main subject, but also conjures up a network of contemporary scholars and their manifold activities. As for Scaliger himself, Grafton had to study not only how and why the great scholar set out to recover the original form of classical texts, and who and what inspired him, but also his work in historical chronology, or the study of dates and calendars in ancient and recent history. This is a discipline in the history of the humanities that is shunned by many scholars because of its technical complexity. Moreover, the Renaissance debate about chronological questions – the date and nature of the various biblical texts for instance – was enlivened by controversies which are more often than not rather perplexing to us. Grafton successfully undertook the daunting task of piercing the armour of mystery enveloping the subject in general and Scaliger's efforts in particular.

Grafton never judges the manifestations of historical change he studies with an anachronistic or teleological eye. On the contrary, considering the transmission

of culture as a creative process in which change is always charged with meaning, he sets out to describe and analyse the coherent and complete intellectual background to the scholars on whom his attention is focused. This attitude has led him to study various other aspects of Renaissance culture, in particular the history of science and the history of books and readers, integrating these into an overall view of the times in which humanism and science were still conjoined. Grafton's biographies of Girolamo Cardano and Leon Battista Alberti are a case in point (*Cardano's Cosmos. The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer*, 1999; *Leon Battista Alberti. Master Builder of the Italian Renaissance*, 2000).

His continuing interest in the history of textual transmission was responsible for *Defenders of the Text. The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800* (1991), a witty account of an intellectual scene in which learned opinions handed down since classical times could still be at odds with the budding empiricism of science. The lighter side of his profound scholarship is evident from such works as *Forgers and Critics. Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (1990) and *The Footnote. A curious history* (1997). In the former Grafton examines the link between forgery and scholarship, defending the bold thesis that forgery is the "criminal sibling" of scholarly criticism. In the latter Grafton presents a critical history of that pillar of historical writing, the footnote, which is at the same time a defence. The development of certain scholarly practices and techniques through the ages – whether it is textual transmission and exegesis or forgery, criticism, footnotes, and their considerable impact on scholarly traditions – figure prominently in Grafton's work.

Many of Grafton's publications are based on previously unpublished or undigested material, which he handles with great skill. His inquisitive mind and his engaging sense of humour, which helped him to uncover many a case of human folly committed by serious scholars, are mirrored in his lucid and accessible style of writing. Although he is, in a sense, a scholars' scholar, Grafton is also committed to serve a wider public. Evidence of this is his important contribution to the organization of two major exhibitions: *New Worlds, Ancient Texts. The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Recovery* (1992) and *Rome Reborn: The Vatican Library and Renaissance Culture* (1993). Considered from the point of view of the history of the humanities at large, his multi-faceted contributions to the history of scholarship from the Renaissance onwards are truly outstanding.

Prizewinner's Acceptance Speech

Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei – 13 November 2002

*Mr. President,
Ladies and Gentlemen,*

The news that I would receive one of this year's Balzan Prizes came as a complete and stunning surprise. For the last quarter century and more, I have been engaged in an investigation of the practices of learning in the West, studying the ways in which scholars have read texts, written histories, and taught their disciplines to the young. These interests have led me into some of the darkest recesses of intellectual history. Pursuing them brought me to the brick house in Leiden, now a karate school, in which, in the years around 1600, Joseph Scaliger transformed the study of chronology. Ten years of work enabled me to find out how he reconstructed the calendars and established the epoch dates that still serve as the foundations of ancient and medieval history. They also took me to the libraries, archives and seminar rooms in Berlin in which, in the years around 1820, Leopold von Ranke transformed the writing of history. Happy weeks passed in his archive in Berlin, where I watched him transplant into narrative history the methods and literary forms of classical philology and antiquarianism. The pursuit of other technical questions about scholarship and its past has led me back to the ancient world and forward to the twentieth century, induced me to make the acquaintance of painstaking archive-keepers and unscrupulous forgers, required me to follow individual lives and to reconstruct institutions and disciplines – and given me endless pleasure.

This long walk down dark, and rather dusty, corridors has brought me more – much more – than information about my own professional predecessors. As a student, I came into contact with great teachers, learned men and women who guided me into the history of scholarship and gave me the example of their own remarkable practices. As a researcher, I met others who shared my interests and soon became my colleagues and my friends. Their advice and criticism have guided me for decades. As a teacher, finally, I had the good fortune to find students who shared my passion for my curious subject, and whose work has ex-

tended, corrected and superseded mine. If I have engaged in a long pursuit of an obscure and technical object, if I have dedicated myself to studies that few university teachers – and even fewer readers outside the university world – found interesting, I have done so with the best of guidance and in the best of company. No life of scholarship could have been more satisfying.

The Balzan Prize has crowned these decades of work at one of the darkest and most obscure coalfaces of scholarship with public recognition of a sort I had never expected to receive. I thank the Balzan Foundation and its advisers, from the bottom of my heart, for singling out my work. The Foundation's generosity will enable me to continue my own studies in the best of conditions and to woo younger scholars to carry on this kind of research for another generation. Though I cannot claim to deserve the extraordinary distinction conferred upon me here, I accept it with deep gratitude, not only on my own behalf, but also on that of the subject which I have tried to develop and the teachers, colleagues and students to whom I owe so much.

Anthony Thomas Grafton

A Premature Autobiography?

by Anthony Thomas Grafton

A panoramic synthesis of his career, realized on the occasion of the
2002 Awards Ceremony in Rome

1. A strange journey

For thirty years, I have been walking down an imaginary street – a long, winding, cobbled lane. Its inhabitants are the dead – but only the dead of a particular kind: scholars, who did their best to understand old texts, recreate lost beliefs, and reconstruct lost institutions. I seek out their houses, knock at their doors, and beg for a few minutes of their time. And they, in their humanity, allow me to interrupt their studies and welcome me, as they welcomed contemporaries who called on them, armed with the proper letters of recommendation. They show me the thickly annotated books on their shelves, let me examine the crabbed and crowded pages of their notebooks, allow me to read and copy letters they have received from colleagues and drafts of the letters they have sent, even give me access to the first and second drafts of their own treatises. At the end of long days in their company, I return home, exhausted, my own notebooks full of extracts, and try to understand what they have told me and shown me.

These men – and a few women – devoted their lives to the preservation of traditions. They examined, compared and emended manuscripts and inscriptions. They assembled information about slavery and marriage, food and dress, death and religion in societies other than their own. They charted the positions of the ancient societies they studied in time and space, creating minutely detailed maps and tables that even now, centuries after their time, continue to serve as the foundations of our knowledge. And they drew lessons, endlessly, from the treasures of ancient experience that they brought back to life: lessons about the relevance of ancient politics to modern states and of ancient laws to modern societies. They too, in other words, spent their lives wandering down endless ancient streets, conversing with men and women who died centuries before them – with the Greek and Roman poets, philosophers and politicians who, they believed, held the keys to the kingdoms of wisdom and morality.

How did an American – born in the 1950s in a typical suburb, raised watching Technicolor movies about the old West – end up trying to join this endless conversation across the centuries? It was partly a matter of chance. Early reading of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* convinced me, before I reached my teens, that I wanted – needed – to learn Greek. Classics were in decline, and though an excellent, frightening teacher offered good courses in Latin in our town, our school then offered no classes in Greek (a few years later, the schools repaired this deficiency, when Varian Fry, who had spent his twenties saving Jewish writers and artists in unoccupied France, began to teach early morning courses in Greek). So my parents, ever generous, found me a tutor. A few years later, they sent me to a boarding school, founded in the eighteenth century and still steeped in tradition, where I could learn Latin and Greek in a rigorous way. Homer proved as magical in Greek as I had expected him to be, and more so. I thought, for many years, that I would become a teacher of the classics in my turn. But even in these early years, other models for studying the past caught my attention as well. The Sherlock Holmes stories of Arthur Conan Doyle, T.H. White’s magical books about King Arthur – these interested me in other pasts besides the Greek one, and suggested that bringing the past back to life was an intellectual and artistic enterprise of deep interest.

But it was at the University of Chicago that I found my path – one suggested, almost dictated, by the curriculum undergraduates followed there. A peculiar institution, the most austere and scholarly of American universities, Chicago dedicated itself, in the sixties, to conversations about tradition and its maintenance. Every student had to take a yearlong course on what was traditionally called “Western Civilization” – a course that began with the Greeks and ran to the middle of the twentieth century. We read endless original sources, in translation, with learned, gifted teachers – in my case, an ancient historian named Charles Hamilton, and the great historian of modern Italy, Eric Cochrane, who, some years later, supervised my doctoral dissertation. Our professors challenged us, over and over again, to think about traditions – how they persisted and how they changed, how the same text could take on different meanings in new contexts, how the same term could change its connotations in the hands of new writers. The course fascinated me – so much so that I took it twice, the second time with one of its originators, Christian Mackauer, a German émigré who had written for the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in the thirties and later devoted his life to teaching Chicago undergraduates to think hard about the past.

Other courses at Chicago gave my new interest direction. Hanna Holborn Gray introduced me to the study of Renaissance humanism, and I found that I could apply my training in Greek and Latin to a *mare magnum* of absorbing texts that almost no one had examined before me. Noel Swerdlow initiated me into the history of science, and I discovered a rich modern literature that offered a new version of intellectual history. Historians of science also examined traditions, some of which stretched back to ancient Greece or Mesopotamia. But they asked not what ideas their subjects held, but how they had worked, what methods and practices they had adopted and how they had applied these to particular objects. Why not, I wondered, ask questions like these about the history of history and other forms of scholarship as well? Other members of Chicago's extraordinary group of young historians, assembled by William McNeil, offered stimulation and provocation of many kinds: from Keith Baker, who told me about a stimulating French writer on history named Michel Foucault, to Lester Little, who first suggested that I might find the world of late Renaissance humanism rewarding to explore.

I stayed at Chicago to pursue a doctorate in history, and one day Swerdlow suggested a dissertation topic that would bring together all my disparate interests. Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), a French humanist of Italian descent, edited a long series of Greek and Latin texts, and wielded both philological and astronomical techniques as he tried to reconstruct the whole framework of dates that underpinned ancient and medieval, near eastern and western history. His work fell into the no-man's-land that interested me most. I had never heard of Scaliger before this conversation, but he seemed an appropriate, even awe-inspiring figure to work on. No one had written about him at length, moreover, since Jacob Bernays, who published a masterly biography in 1855. Swerdlow and Cochrane agreed that only one person could really supervise research on Scaliger: Arnaldo Momigliano, then in his last years as professor of ancient history at University College London. A Fulbright scholarship enabled me to settle in London, where I spent a year doing research in the British Library and attending Momigliano's seminar at the Warburg Institute. He defined the history of scholarship as a central form of intellectual history, one so demanding that few could usefully pursue it, but also one that shed a uniquely strong light on the formation and life of traditions. He also saw it as a millennial tradition: Renaissance scholars had used the methods of their ancient predecessors to reconstruct the ancient world, and the scholars of the eighteenth, nineteenth and even twentieth centuries remained – or should remain – in dialogue

with their early modern successors even as they set out to explore previously un-studied sectors of the ancient world.

Momigliano's example and guidance enabled me to follow the path that I had discovered at Chicago, and that I have continued to follow over the decades. He gave me a practical way to pursue my interest in antiquity and its interpreters, to take part in the millennial conversation that goes by the anodyne term "classical tradition" – words more suggestive of plaster busts on mantelpieces and graduation speeches than of the passionate arguments that antiquity has always provoked. In the dark halls of an urban college in rainy London – above the preserved bones and plaster bust of Jeremy Bentham, across the street from the Warburg Institute – the long strands of interest and obsession that reached back through Chicago to suburban Connecticut took on the form that they have retained for me to this day.

Momigliano also taught me that learning and scholarship are social, as well as intellectual, pursuits. An intellectual autocrat who remorselessly condemned those who did not meet his standards, Momigliano ran his seminar on strikingly democratic lines. He always took care to thank the friends and students who read and commented on his work. I too had the good fortune, from the start of my research, to find teachers, friends, and, finally, students of my own who offered advice, correction and the brilliant examples of their own work. It seems only appropriate to offer my most heartfelt thanks, at this point, to those whose guidance has meant so much to me, over the years, and whose companionship has meant even more: my first teachers, whom I have already named; Carlotta Dionisotti, and Henk Jan de Jonge, and Charles Schmitt, whose advice did so much to shape my work and whose example of learning and generosity I have tried, over the years, to emulate; and many, many friends of extraordinary tolerance and generosity, especially David Quint, Lisa Jardine, Joseph Levine, Glenn Most, Nancy Siraisi, Ingrid Rowland, Ann Blair, Peter Miller, Jake Soll and – *sine qua non* – Jill Kraye. The study of tradition remains a conversation.

2. Arrivals

My long voyage through the West's memory palace of traditions has taken me to many destinations, some of them more predictable than others. Until 1993,

when the second and final volume of my study of Scaliger appeared, he and the context he worked in occupied me most of the time. My two books on him represented, when they appeared, something of an experiment in intellectual biography: a massive study of the development of a scholar's practices and methods, as well as his career and the world in which he pursued it. I followed him into fields I knew and fields I did not, reading what he had read, identifying the predecessors and contemporaries who had meant most to him, trying to understand what he found fascinating in the vast range of ancient books and problems that he explored. In particular, I tried to understand chronology: the formidably technical discipline that, it is usually said, Scaliger created, and that concerns itself with reconstructing past calendar systems and establishing the dates of major historical events. For centuries, chronology has seemed the driest of pursuits; Voltaire remarked that it could establish only the dates on which persons of no significance were born or died. In Scaliger's day, however, chronology mattered deeply. It laid out the framework within which scholars read the Bible, it analyzed the origins of Christian liturgy, and it imposed a clear pattern on the chaotic order of events in the past – a pattern that seemed, to most scholars, to reveal a divine hand at work, and might make it possible to predict the future. Chronology fascinated great astronomers like Regiomontanus and Copernicus, Tycho Brahe and Johannes Kepler, as well as erudite scholars like Carlo Sigonio and Onofrio Panvinio. Scaliger's books on chronology established him as the great polymath in Europe's great age of polymaths. They won him the offer of a research professorship at Leiden, a brand-new university and the most innovative one in Europe. And they provoked the formidable attacks of Catholic scholars – especially the Jesuits, whom this stern Calvinist and close friend of Gallicans loathed. The few modern historians who mentioned Scaliger described him as a brilliant innovator who had created a discipline in the teeth of ferocious opposition.

As I read the books that mattered most to Scaliger, as I followed the development of his own books in the field, a different story emerged. It became clear that he had not invented chronology at all. He saw himself as reconstructing a field invented by ancient scholars like Ephorus and Eratosthenes. His own work rested on foundations laid both in antiquity and, more surprisingly, in his own time – partly by well-known figures like Copernicus, partly by men now forgotten, like the brilliant chronologer Paulus Crusius, who first used the data provided by the ancient astronomer Ptolemy to establish what remain the central

dates of Greek history. He engaged in debates not only with contemporary Jesuits, but also with much less reputable figures, like the Dominican Giovanni Nanni da Viterbo, who forged a series of texts on ancient history that appeared in 1498 and still dominated ancient history almost a century later, when Scaliger entered the field. His own achievement, finally, was not the restoration of order in the past, but the creation of chaos. In the Byzantine world chronicle of George Syncellus, Scaliger discovered evidence that the kingdoms of Egypt and Babylon had existed before the biblical Flood, and even before the biblical date for the Creation. Dates that openly contradicted the biblical account of time could not be true. But data preserved in sources that were clearly not forgeries must be preserved, published and explicated. For the century and more after Scaliger's *Thesaurus temporum* appeared in 1606, the new evidence he brought to light fascinated, troubled, even obsessed every scholar who worked on chronology or the Old Testament, from Newton to Vico. It wrenched at, and eventually destroyed, what had seemed the flawless, solid biblical framework for world history. By the time he died in 1609, so it seemed, Scaliger inherited the same territory of doubt that more obvious rebels of his time, like Bruno and Campanella, had already explored and settled.

The research needed to reconstruct Scaliger's achievement brought me into contact with a vast range of scholarly problems and traditions, many of which I explored in shorter books and articles. Study of his work as an editor of Latin texts led me to the history of textual commentary and interpretation, to which I have devoted many articles and a short book, *Commerce with the Classics*. Examination of the major role that forgeries, ancient and modern, played in his thought and that of his friend Isaac Casaubon, led me to dedicate articles and a little book to the work of *Forgers and Critics*. And reading the later works of classical scholars on the themes that mattered most to him – especially those of German scholars – led to a collaborative study of Friedrich August Wolf, and to a long series of further monographs.

My research on Scaliger's philology and that of his period was naturally accompanied by work, over the years, of a very different kind: teaching the cultural and intellectual history of early modern Europe to very able students. The development of chronology and similar technical fields should not, it seemed to me, form the subject of lecture courses and seminars aimed at undergraduates. But other forms of research did bear more directly on my courses. The history

of education in early modern Europe – and, later on, the history of the ways in which scholars interpreted texts for young aristocrats – formed a natural addition to my work on Scaliger, and one that involved canonical figures like Erasmus. A series of studies – several of them conducted in collaboration with Lisa Jardine – treated these topics. In further monographs, similar to these in method, I tried to shed light on the later history of scholarship and education, down into the twentieth – though not yet the twenty-first – century.

In particular, one of Princeton's most intensive and rewarding programs for undergraduates – the Program in European Cultural Studies, founded by Carl Schorske and carried on in later years by Jerrold Seigel, Robert Darnton and others – gave me the chance to develop courses on art, science, and courtly culture in Renaissance Europe. Teaching in collaboration with an immensely learned and generous art historian, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, sharpened my interest in and extended my knowledge of the history of art. In the end, giving these courses inspired me to write a number of essays, to collaborate with Nancy Siraisi and Bill Newman in organizing two collections of essays, to produce books on Cardano and Alberti, and to undertake a study of the tradition of learned magic in the Renaissance, on which I am currently engaged.

Intensive engagement with teaching has shown me how rewarding it can be to try to communicate the sort of work I do to an audience not wholly composed of professional scholars. My efforts to do this have resulted in many essays and reviews, some of which Harvard University Press has recently collected, and in a short work on the long history of the footnote.

3. Departures

Research plans for the next twenty years and more continue to occupy me. In the next few years, I hope to research and write – among other things – a history of Renaissance Europe and a study of the Jesuit scholar Athanasius Kircher in his world, the latter in collaboration with Ingrid Rowland. I hope to continue and complete a study, already begun, of proofreading and the origins of the modern editor, and to complete a collaborative study of the library of Caesarea in the fourth century, the latter in collaboration with a young scholar, Megan Williams. I hope to edit Scaliger's correspondence. Above all, I hope to recon-

struct, in a book on a very large scale, the chronological scholarship and debates of the seventeenth century – the further history of that explosive collision of the classics and the Bible, theology and hermeneutics, philology and astronomy that Scaliger's work helped to bring about. The support and encouragement offered by the Balzan Foundation will ease these tasks in countless ways, and I should like to close by thanking the Foundation and its advisers, with all my heart, for the distinction they have conferred upon me.

*The Republic of Letters:
The European Intellectual Community in an Age of Religious War, 1500-1700,
and its Relevance Today*

A Balzan Lecture given by Anthony Thomas Grafton
Washington, Embassy of Switzerland, 3 October 2006

For the last thirty years and more, I have been doing my best to survey and explore a strange imaginary land – one that had few of the distinctive marks by which we nowadays identify a state. It had at least one of the marks of a country, a distinctive name: the Republic of Letters. Its citizens agreed that they owed it loyalty, and all of them spoke its two languages – Latin, the language of scholars from 1500 to 1650 or so, and French, which became the language of polite society after that. But it had no borders, no government, no capital. In a world of sharp and well-defined social hierarchies – a world when men and women dressed in ways that graphically revealed their rank and occupation – its citizens insisted that all of them were equal, and that any special fame that one of them might enjoy had been earned by his own efforts. As one observer put it in 1699, “The Republic of Letters is of very ancient origin... It embraces the whole world and is composed of all nationalities, all social classes, all ages and both sexes ... All languages, ancient as well as modern, are spoken... Praise and honor are awarded by popular acclaim” (la Bruyère). The Republic of Letters, in its ideals if not always in reality, was Europe’s first egalitarian society. It was a society of intellectuals, to be sure – but it was no trade-union of the unworldly, no feeble academic Utopia.

What drew me to this world in the first place was the passion that has led so many historians to their life work: sheer, unadulterated curiosity. The scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the last Europeans – the last Westerners – who could plausibly claim that they were masters of their entire civilization. We live in a world of specialists. Whether in engineering or in mathematics, progress depends on defining a problem precisely and solving it in a neat, definitive way. Only other specialists, we believe, can or should tell us if such problems have been solved. We find ourselves baffled and worried when, as has recently happened in the super-specialized realms of mathematics and physics, the specialists don’t seem to agree on such important questions as who

proved the Poincare conjecture or whether string theory will ever reveal something about the real world. But specialists and professionalism are modern creations: the denizens of a world in which everyone ideally has a particular function, and has obtained a formal license to practice it.

In sixteenth and seventeenth century Europe, specialists were rare. For the whole system of education was geared to produce generalists. Every learned person became a classicist at school. Even the most gifted mathematicians studied Greek and Latin and history at school and logic and philosophy at college, before they turned to numbers. Nowadays we remember Leibniz and Newton as scientists, the great men who created calculus and modern physics. But they did not see themselves only as specialists in any single field. A great philosopher and a brilliant student of the origin and development of human languages, Leibniz was also a superb historian. Newton spent years of his life performing alchemical experiments, reworking the history of the ancient world, reconstructing the Temple of Solomon and trying to interpret the prophecies of Daniel and the Book of Revelation. Thousands of pages of his tightly written notes record his efforts in these multiple fields – each of which he took as seriously as the rest.

As you explore the Republic of Letters, this world of intellectual omnivores, you see that you are entering a kind of Pedantic Park: a world of wonders, many of them man-made, inhabited by scholarly dinosaurs. They haunted libraries, frequented museums, and particularly enjoyed anatomy theaters – at least in the winter, when the bodies didn't stick as badly. These preferred habitats reflected their eclectic tastes: every one of them was an encyclopedia in its own way, designed to teach about man and nature, science and history. As to the dinosaurs themselves – they included everything. Most of them were mild plant-eaters, like the scholars you know. Vast lumbering monsters of erudition somehow managed to write much more than any modern scholar could possibly read and have adventures much wilder than anything a modern professor could imagine. Swift, vicious little raptors fought and tore their way to prominence. The last 30 years and more, which I have spent on getting to know these men and women, have passed, for me, very quickly indeed. It's been an enthralling experience.

Now I didn't just jump into the sea of books and documents that these graphomanes produced and start swimming without a direction in mind. I wanted to understand how it was possible in this world for men and women to be

masters of the whole range of disciplines and texts; what it was like to be as skillful at interpreting ancient history as at reading the movements of the planets. So I chose to study a discipline that has nowadays largely been forgotten: technical chronology, the formal study of the dates at which events happened in ancient and medieval history. In fact the subject demanded, and demands, extraordinary skills: to practice it you had to be able to interpret ancient texts, decipher ancient inscriptions, and even to plot the dates of the eclipses and other astronomical events mentioned in ancient texts (for only eclipses and the like can give these events absolute dates). Chronology was a microcosm of the larger Republic of Letters. It was also a hot field. And it was hard. Chronology posed problems that remain extremely difficult, and to some extent unsolved: for example, how to reconcile the chronology of the Old and New Testaments with that of secular texts. To my astonishment, I found that a great many early modern scholars could wield this scary palette of technical skills with ease and dexterity. They included the French scholar Joseph Scaliger, 1540-1609, to whom I dedicated my dissertation and then, over the next 18 years, a 1200-page, 2-volume study profuse with detail. But chronology also fascinated great astronomers like Nicolaus Copernicus and Johannes Kepler, the important musical theorist named Seth Calvisius, and the most original historical thinker of the whole pre-modern period, Giambattista Vico. They did extraordinary, wrenchingly difficult work; and by 1700 they had created most of the armature of dates on which modern scholars still hang the flesh and blood of ancient and medieval history.

The experience of doing this research gave me an extraordinarily rich and vivid lesson in the pastness of the past: it's another country, they do things differently there. It also cured me of my original, somewhat naïf hero worship. Scaliger and Kepler turned out to be as phenomenally learned and analytical, as wide-ranging in their interests and as precise and prophetic in their results as I had believed before I entered the labyrinths of their books and manuscripts. But I also learned that these great men were very, very human. They misreported one another's ideas; they failed to give credit where credit was clearly due (Scaliger and Crusius); they ripped one another's work apart with a fantastic zeal that would have been far better spent on other objects. And sometimes they were simply one or two sandwiches short of a picnic.

Yet even as I realized that my chronologers were not such consistent models of scholarly and human virtue as I had hoped, I found myself learning a larger les-

son – and one that still has relevance today. These men – and their colleagues who specialized in other areas of inquiry – offer what seem still to be valid models for the conduct of intellectuals. They devised ways to conduct historical research with rigor, even when its results were uncomfortable; to publicize their results, without fear or favor; and, again and again, to rise above their prejudices without losing their convictions and to stand up for tolerance in an era of intolerance. They still, I now believe, have much to teach us: not only about the forgotten intellectual worlds that they inhabited and explored, but also about how modern intellectuals could and should serve the public good in our own poisoned public sphere.

Let's remember, first of all, that the period in which the republic of letters flourished most was no golden age for Old Europe. The Republic took shape in the consciousness of scholars around 1500, less than 20 years before Martin Luther and his Reformation split forever the Catholic church, which up to then had been unified for more than a thousand years. It survived the years from 1550 onwards, when militant Catholics and Calvinists in France and the Low Countries created the first national revolutionary parties, organized by cells and inspired by absolutist ideologies, and fought civil wars of terrifying brutality. These were marked by such terrible events as the Massacre of St Bartholomew and the assassinations of Kings Henry III and IV of France and William of Orange, the leader of the Dutch revolt against Spain – assassinations made easy, as Lisa Jardine has shown, by the rise of the handgun, a curse then, as now. The Republic flourished during the first half of the seventeenth century, even as every European power was drawn into the 30 years' war that turned Germany, then known as the Holy Roman Empire, into an impoverished and backward set of principalities. It continued to respond to changes in the world outside scholarly enclaves. Scholars ditched backward-looking Latin for the up-to-date language of civilization, French, even as the wars of Louis XIV turned much of northern Europe into a wasteland, and systematic oppression and abuse almost destroyed France's own Protestant communities.

All this is to say nothing of such subsidiary matters as the witch trials of the same period, that deprived something like 70,000 people, most of them women, of life itself on the grounds that they had had intercourse with devils, called up storms to destroy crops, and stole men's penises, which they hid in birds' nests; or of the imposition of censorship in much of the Catholic world; or of the sys-

tematic oppression of Jews. It was a harsh world, as one might expect, since it was ruled for the most part by men of absolute conviction. As a young historian, Brad Gregory, has recently shown in a stunning book, hundreds of men and women died for their religious beliefs after the Reformation began. But not a single one of the officials who imposed these punishments and watched them carried out, whether Catholic or Protestant, Lutheran or Calvinist, seems to have felt any qualms about inflicting martyrdom – to say nothing of converting to the martyrs' faith.

Across this dark and brutal world – so we historians have been learning over the last half-century and more – islands of light gleamed: small communities of scholars, who did their best to maintain a different kind of society, with its own rules and its own values. Some of the Republicans of Letters had official positions in universities, courts, or academies; but many were barred from such posts by their conviction that they could not serve the state or the institutional church without being swallowed up by it and forced to violate the teachings of their consciences. Such men and women congregated in a small number of cities. They liked certain cities that enjoyed a certain measure of autonomy, and whose governors did not share the general belief that torture and execution were the appropriate tools for reducing religious and intellectual dissidents to submission. They also needed to be near certain urban institutions: libraries, for example, and the printing presses that gave men and women of letters their only power, that of publicity. Their favored places, the capitals of the Republic, included Strasbourg, a border town, cosmopolitan and tolerant; Leiden and Amsterdam, the Dutch trading centers, in which Catholics and Calvinists, Anabaptists and Jews rubbed elbows in mutual tolerance – and all of them joined to reject what they called “the Genevan Inquisition,” when doctrinaire preachers tried to carry out an ideological cleansing; and, of course, Basel, with its massive communities of French and Italian immigrants, many of them refugees from oppression in their native countries. London and Berlin also figured, as both of them accepted many of the refugee French Protestants who made up a major share of the republic's population.

The citizens of the Republic carried no passports, but they could recognize one another by certain marks. Not wealth, of course; then as now, scholar did not rhyme with dollar. But they looked for learning, for humanity, for generosity, and they rewarded it. Any young man, and more than a few young women,

could pay the price of admission. Just master Latin (and, ideally, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic); become a proficient master of what now seem such diverse skills as mathematics and astronomy, history and geography, physics and music; and turn up at the door of any recognized scholar from John Locke in London to Giambattista Vico in Naples, bearing a letter from a senior scholar and able to greet your host in acceptable Latin or French and write an impromptu Hebrew poem in his or her album – and you were assured of everything a learned man or woman could want: a warm and civilized welcome, a cup of chocolate (or, later, coffee); and an hour or two of ceremonious conversation on the latest editions of the classics and the most recent sightings of the rings of Saturn.

If this state had no maps, no administrative officials, and no borders, how do we know it existed at all? And how can we define it more precisely? Well, we know it, in the first instance, from what its citizens tell us about it – and the documents in which they discussed it form the primary archive from which we can draw both description and evaluation. Above all, we have hundreds of their letters – letters which combined the official and professional with the personal in a way that now seems rather surprising, but which long ago seemed entirely natural. Tucked into letters were reports on barometric experiments and the movements of falling bodies, the descriptions of newly discovered manuscripts of ancient texts, the historical and political information that enabled men and women to know what was happening in the great world outside their little town – and to compile the great syntheses of political, historical, philosophical and scientific information that we still read; the work of Grotius on natural law, *Galileo on natural philosophy*, Locke on the nature of property. To a world that has largely abandoned letters except when asking for money in a good cause, these letters – with their formal Latin salutations and intimate details of urinalysis and kidney stones, astrological predictions and monstrous births – may seem odd. In their day, however, they constituted the fragile but vital strands that connected the diverse parts of the republic. Together they formed a capillary system along which information could travel from papal Rome to Calvinist strongholds in the north, and vice versa – as long as both had inhabitants, as they did, who wished to communicate.

The constant writing and sending of letters was more than a system for collecting and exchanging information. The citizens of the Republic saw it as a moral duty: the only way to show their sympathy and affection for those from whom political and religious borders separated them. Consider just one instance: Erasmus, the

great teacher and letter-writer, whose textbooks dominated the schools and universities of northern Europe until the middle of the seventeenth century, and whose own correspondence fills 12 volumes in the great modern edition published by the Clarendon Press. Erasmus treated the letter as a literary genre in its own right, setting down rules for the composition of effective, eloquent letters. In one of his textbooks – the aptly named *On Copiousness in Words and Ideas* – he goes further, offering 150 ways to say “As long as I live, I shall remember you” and 250 ways to say “Thank you for the letter” in elegant, correct Latin. The effort seems disproportionate to the task – until we realize, as the great literary scholar Kathy Eden has shown, that Erasmus deeply believed both in the community of intellectual and literary property (“all the property of friends is held in common,” he liked to say, quoting the ancient Greek thinker Pythagoras) and in the connection between the language one used and the state of one’s mind and soul. The scholar, for Erasmus, must school himself to write, over and over again, to critics as well as supporters, enemies as well as friends, professing friendship and concern. By doing so, he would knit the raveled strands of particular relationships together. But he would also turn himself into a true friend, one genuinely devoted to and concerned for others. The vast piles of letters that fill dozens of volumes in every great European library are the relics of a great effort, inspired by Erasmus and many others, to create a new kind of virtual community: one sustained not by immediate, direct contact and conversation so much as by a decades-long effort of writing and rewriting. Many of them – for example, those that Erasmus exchanged with Melanchthon – remain very moving.

As this example suggests, I have arrived at the qualities of the republic of Letters that give it, in my view, a profound contemporary relevance. First – and not least – is the conscious effort that its citizens made to create communities, both of people and of information, that crossed political, linguistic and religious borders. Second – and also not least – came the management of information. This was the first great modern age of efforts to capture, organize and make available to all the vast amounts of information flooding into Europe from travelers, compiled by scientific observers, and excavated by historians – a flood duplicated thousands of times, and thus not only reproduced but magnified, by the printing press. The tools they forged included not only scholarly correspondence of a personal sort, but also more impersonal models for stockpiling information and making it available: the bibliography, for example, and the journal. From the 1660s onwards, a swarm of new printed publications, in both Latin and

modern languages, compiled new information, reviewed new books, and made it possible, for the first time, for intellectuals across Europe to have reliable, regular information on the doings of scholars – and kings – across the European world. Trade had become global in the fifteenth century. Now information also joined the global flow, as French protestants in exile in Berlin and Potsdam informed the European world about recent science and scholarship in French, and the great Vico, isolated but well-informed in Catholic, southern Naples, used Dutch journals published in Latin as his primary sources for the new theories of Spinoza and Locke. Like the blogs that have accelerated the movement of facts and ideas in recent years, the new journals and publishing houses had a profoundly unsettling effect on kings, who tried – and failed – to ban them. The Republic of Letters stood, in the first instance, for a kind of open intellectual market – one in which values depended not on a writer's rank but on the quality of his or her work. Such markets, as my colleagues in Economics like to assure me, are very creative – but their chief tool is destruction.

The Republic, moreover, was more than a sprawling series of social and intellectual networks, loosely linked by curiosity about nature and history. It would be wrong to suggest that it had a single ideology or an official set of beliefs. Its citizens, after all, included Catholics of different sorts, Protestants of every flavor, a few Sephardic and an even smaller number of Ashkenazic Jews – and, as time went on, Unitarians and others who abandoned all the established churches. Patriotic Dutch scholars presumably felt a shiver a pride – and patriotic British ones just a shiver – when a Dutch fleet sailed up the Medway and burned much of the English navy.

And yet, scholars were linked by certain key convictions. Just about all of them, for a start, believed that it was simply wrong – morally wrong and intellectually wrong – to break off communications with those who didn't share their religious beliefs or their political views. Knowledge and sociability, after all, mattered most: and restrictions could only hamper the flow of information and ideas. That helps to explain why a long series of Vatican librarians, in the heart of papal Rome, admitted Protestant scholars as freely as Catholic ones: in a collection of that size, where no librarian can know more than a fraction of the materials, any hard-working and intelligent visitor who asks a new question may make discoveries that surprise the locals. That helps to explain why Scaliger – a fierce Calvinist who believed, as many of his co-religionists did,

that the Pope was the Antichrist – told his students to view the great Catholic church history by Cardinal Baronio with respect. “Every history is good,” he explained: all information mattered, and you could learn far more from a great scholar whose opinions you didn’t share than from a charlatan with whom you went to church.

A fair number went further. In this age of brutal persecution, when torture was the Continent’s usual method for extracting information and confessions, it was the scholarly citizens of the Republic of Letters who first objected – who first pointed out, forcibly and clearly, that torture could make people admit anything, and who first insisted that the vast tottering structure of dogma that underpinned the persecution of witches was far too rickety to bear so great a weight. It was an early citizen of the Republic, Johannes Reuchlin, who dared the disapproval of influential men and women across Germany when he wrote a powerful legal defense of the right of Jews to retain their own books, which some Catholics wanted to burn. Most remarkably of all, it was another citizen of the Republic – and of Geneva – Sebastian Castellio, who first elaborated an even more radical idea, one that flew in the face of religious authority from Saint Augustine on. Once a great admirer of John Calvini’s, Castellio was horrified by the execution of the heretic, Michael Servetus, in 1553. He took action – the sort of action that the Citizens of the Republic took. Working with Italian emigres who shared his loathing of coercion and violence, Castellio argued that the state had no right at all to persecute those who did not accept the beliefs of its established church. The great Basel printer Joannes Oporinus, whose list included authors of every conceivable ideology and religion, printed the work. Castellio and his colleagues insisted that “When Servetus fought with reasons and writings, he should have been repulsed by reasons and writings.” More radically still, they argued that authorities should have “no concern with matters of opinion” at all. The book wound up with a passionate plea for religious tolerance: “We can live together peacefully only when we control our intolerance. Even though there will always be differences of opinion from time to time, we can at any rate come to general understandings, can love one another, and can enter the bonds of peace, pending the day when we shall attain unity of faith.” Castellio’s arguments weren’t rigorous, from a philosophical point of view: in the end, he suggested that one should judge people by their conduct – a theologically naïve view that could not be reconciled with any Protestant understanding of grace and salvation. But there’s a reason for that: they came not from abstract reason-

ing but from the lived experience of Basel, where Castellio had seen that men and women of different religions could manage and negotiate their differences.

Castellio's book won few adherents at first – yet his ideas percolated into the minds of writers like Montaigne and even, so it seems, a few rulers – notably William of Orange, the great Dutch rebel, and Elizabeth I of England. Other citizens of the Republic carried it on, using the literary tools at their disposal since they lacked political ones. The battle against religious prejudice and persecution did not end, of course, in this period – and has not ended since. Pierre Bayle – a later citizen of the Republic, a brilliant, bitter critic of absolutism in State and Church who lived in Holland and tormented the authorities with his dazzling pamphlets – shocked many readers when he argued that a society of atheists could in fact live together at peace. And the great philosophers of the 18th century – men like Voltaire, who famously left his refuge near Geneva in order to confront the forces of darkness over the Calas case – argued cases like Castellio's far more radically. But at the root of these attitudes – at the root of the very idea of separation of state and church, so daring that many Americans still find it hard to accept, though it stands at the root of our society – are the first speculations of learned men, forced into exile for their beliefs and instructed in the bitter school of political and religious experience that compulsion should never play a role in matters of belief.

These attitudes, moreover – free communication of ideas; tolerance in principle if not always in practice; open contact with those of other faiths; publication of results even when they raised theological difficulties – really manifested themselves not only in such famous and controversial cases as that of Servetus, but in the everyday life and work of scholars. Let me give you just a few examples, from my own favorite realm of historical studies – the larger world within which technical chronology was studied. To study the Christian past you had to understand the Jewish calendar: not just the sequence of years and months, moreover, but also the nature of religious holidays and observances. Scaliger and his close friend, Isaac Casaubon, realized in the last decades of the sixteenth century that they could not reconstruct the sequence of events or understand the meaning of individual episodes in the Gospels themselves without mastering Jewish scholarship.

How were Christians to gain this knowledge? Both men were masters of language, steeped in the Bible; learning to read Hebrew, in the first instance, just meant work-

ing out which words were which in the Hebrew version of Genesis, since they already knew it by heart in Latin and French. But the Bible offered nowhere near enough information. To understand exactly the world in which Jesus preached, they had to explore the entire enchanted castle of Jewish learning – chronicles, rabbinical commentaries, even the Talmud. And for guidance through these labyrinths they turned to Jews. Scaliger worked for 6 months with a very learned Jew, Philipus Ferdinandus, who helped him to see that many of Jesus's precepts, in the Gospels, did not contradict, but actually reflected, Jewish moral teachings. Casaubon invited a learned Sephardic Jew from Italy, Jacob Barnet, to stay with him for a month at his lodgings at Drury Lane, in London. At every meal – one would love to know what they ate – the two men eagerly discussed Jewish texts – including, evidently, the legal ones that Casaubon could not read on his own. Barnet showed Casaubon discussions of Jewish burial practice – which made clear, to the brilliant Calvinist, that Jesus had been buried in a normal, Jewish fashion.

Neither Scaliger nor Casaubon was especially philo-Semitic in everyday life. But the ethics of scholarship as they understood it brought them into contact with Europe's local Others. And the contact had a tremendous effect on both men. Scaliger, the most arrogant scholar in an age of scholarly arrogance (well, maybe all ages are ages of scholarly arrogance), admitted after Ferdinandus died that no Christian could hope to understand the Talmud and other Jewish texts as his friend had – and wept, in a very human way, for his loss. Jacob Barnet, whom the Oxford authorities had destined for public conversion in St Mary's Church, rebelled, ran away, and wound up confined, in miserable conditions, in the university jail. Casaubon intervened. He insisted that such treatment was un-Christian – and he professed, with utter honesty, that Barnet had been his teacher and he owed him much. He went so far as to appeal to King James I – himself an erudite man – and he succeeded; Barnet was removed from prison and put on the next ship to France, where he would soon turn up, man of parts that he was, at the royal court. The openness that men like Scaliger and Casaubon showed to others whose faith and culture they definitely did not share offered them no practical advantages and could have caused them endless difficulties. It is a tribute to the deontology of the Republic of Letters – and a sign of its historic importance – that they behaved as they did.

Both Casaubon and Scaliger, in the course of their work, took ideas and ways of doing things on board that would have shocked – that did shock – many of their

contemporaries. Casaubon, after his years of biblical study and his intensive work with Babel, sometimes even prayed in Hebrew. Scaliger, after even longer years of historical study, made a chronological discovery so profound that even his brilliance could not cope with it: Manetho and the dynasties. Both men made clear that Christianity represented, in many ways, less a break with the Judaism of the time of Jesus than a new development within in – a radically shocking idea. History was supposed to form a neat and tidy structure, one that showed the hand of providence, working to bring Christianity into being. Their ideas undermined – and in later hands destroyed – this structure. Yet both men published what they learned – and by doing so disturbed and irritated more orthodox thinkers across the whole European world.

I suspect that by now it's obvious where I'm going. The citizens of the early modern Republic of Letters created a virtual community not of those who shared beliefs, but of those who differed. They made up rules for civility: rules that could be used to judge the conduct of all those who offered their intellectual wares for sale in the new, largely free market. They developed new tolerances, for those who disagreed with them on fundamental matters and for facts that challenged their most basic verities. What unified them was a common respect for truth, for civility, and for the integrity of the human being – a respect not founded, perhaps, in the deepest philosophical arguments, but certainly solid enough to make them bold when they confronted what they saw as superstitions. One of the most prominent citizens of the Republic, the Swiss Jean Le Clerc, born in Geneva, who moved to Amsterdam to enjoy intellectual freedom – put it well: “If a thing is bad in itself, the example of the ancients does not make it better. Nothing should stop us from improving on them. The Republic of Letters has finally become a land of reason and light, and not of authority and blind faith... Nowadays numbers prove nothing, and there are no more cabals.” Am I wrong – a bumbling historian, blinded by stepping from the cool dark archives into the bright light of public life – to think that intellectuals across the world could, and should, emulate them now – and scatter our own little cities of light across the growing darkness around us? We may not win – the citizens of this republic rarely did. We may be remembered less for our positive achievements than for our ability to suggest views that would not find practical effect for centuries. But perhaps we can comfort ourselves with the thought that, three or four hundred years on, historians may look back again – and find comfort and sustenance in what we do.

Research Project – Abstract

Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609). Edition of the Correspondence Warburg Institute, University of London

Adviser for the Balzan General Prize Committee: M.E.H. Nicolette Mout

Half of the Balzan Prize awarded to Anthony Grafton in 2002 has been devoted to the creation of a complete critical edition of the correspondence of the great French humanist and historian Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609). A complete edition of Scaliger's correspondence has long been the wish of Anthony Grafton. In an era of great encyclopaedic minds, Joseph Scaliger was recognized by friends and enemies alike as the most learned and intelligent man in Europe – as the only one who could rival Aristotle as the “greatest scholar of all times”. An erudite philologist, Scaliger could restore ancient texts like Virgil, Festus, Catullus, Tibullus, Apuleius, Caesar and Polybius to their original form. He also wrote treatises of “historical chronology”, the highly complicated but indispensable study of dates and calendars in ancient and recent history, and made fundamental contributions to various fields of knowledge.

Anthony Grafton has dedicated an important and innovative biography to Scaliger (*Joseph Scaliger. A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, Vol. I. *Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, Oxford 1983; Vol. II. *Historical Chronology*, Oxford 1993) that not only deals with the man, but also presents a network of his contemporaries describing their many-faceted activities.

As a leading figure of intellectual life and a privileged witness of the political and religious events of his time, Scaliger, through his correspondence, played a central role in the trans-national community of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Scaliger's letters, in French and Latin, are especially rich, but they have never been edited or analysed as a whole.

The Scaliger Project was established at the Warburg Institute in September 2003 by Professor Anthony Grafton of Princeton University, to produce a critical edition of this important correspondence. Two editors, Dr. Paul Botley and Dr. Dirk van Miert, were appointed to undertake this task. By the end of the fourth year of the project, the text of the corpus had been established. The surviving correspondence of Joseph Scaliger amounts to some 1650 letters, written between 1561 and 1609. The entire correspondence has been transcribed and

collated with its extant sources; this text has been edited and provided with a full textual apparatus; every letter has been provided with textual and contextual headnotes; and every letter has been supplied with an English synopsis.

Efforts during the fifth year have focused on compiling elucidatory footnotes to accompany the letters, and on the preface and bibliography for the entire edition. Most of the textual work has been done from microfilms, photographs and photocopies: final visits to Paris, Munich, Hamburg and Copenhagen were made in September 2009 to check the original manuscripts where these reproductions are unclear.

As part of their Fellowships, Dr. Botley and Dr. van Miert spent one day a week on their own research. Dr. Botley contributed to the teaching of the MA in *Cultural and Intellectual History, 1300-1650*, and taught Latin at the Institute and at Queen Mary, University of London. He is compiling an inventory of the correspondence of Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) for which he received a small British Academy grant in January 2009, and preparing a monograph on the Anglo-Dutch scholar Richard Thomson (c.1570-1613). Dr. van Miert contributed to the teaching of the MA course *Aspects of Humanism* at the Institute, and taught two undergraduate courses in the History Department of the University of Amsterdam. He has been preparing for the press a number of articles and two conference volumes, has co-organized an international symposium in Leiden (autumn 2009), and has submitted to the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research a substantial research proposal entitled *The Philological Roots of Early Modern Science*. At the end of 2008, Dr. van Miert left the Project to take up a position as a postdoctoral fellow at the Huygens Institute of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences in The Hague. Dr. Botley remained to complete the six volumes of the letters. He will also compile the seventh volume, an essential companion to the text, containing undated letters, a number of textual and exegetical appendices, an extensive biographical glossary, and the indices.

Dedicated website: <http://warburg.sas.ac.uk/scaliger/indexjjscaliger.htm>

Publications: The complete edition of Scaliger's Correspondence is to be published in seven volumes.

Publications by Dirk van Miert:

– *Anne Mercier: Xantippe of Tanaquil? Een herwaardering van een hoogleraarvrouw uit de Gouden Eeuw*, in: Frans Blom et al. (eds), *De brede Gouden*

Eeuw. Opstellen voor Henk van Nierop bij zijn zestigste verjaardag, Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 113-120.

- Keuchenius, Robertus and Scaliger, Joseph for the *On-line Bio-Bibliography of Dutch Humanists*, The Hague, (www.humbio.nl/biografi_een_nederlands).
- *Neolatinisten Nieuwsbrief nr. 21* (co-edited, with H.J.M. Nellen and A. Wesseling), The Hague, September 2008.

Lectures by Dirk van Miert:

- ‘Humanism and Warfare: Philology and Military Engineering in the Decades around 1600’, *The Making of the Humanities. First International Conference on the History of the Humanities*, Amsterdam, 24 October 2008.
- ‘Confessionalisering in de Republiek der Letteren’, *History Department, University of Amsterdam*, 19 November 2008; ‘Scaliger Scatalogus. Retorische en filosofische achtergronden van scheldkannonades in de brieven van Joseph Scaliger’, *Classics Department, University of Amsterdam*, 3 December 2008.
- ‘De Canon van Amsterdam: het Athenaeum Illustre’, *Beliën & Van Tol Stadsverkenningen, Amsterdam Historical Museum*, 14 December 2008; ‘De filoloog met de hamer. Radicale filologie in de briefwisseling van Joseph Scaliger’, *History Department, University of Amsterdam*, 26 May 2009.
- He was also a panel member, with Anthony Grafton and Marika Keblusek, for a public discussion on ‘The Republic of Letters’, *Historisch Café*, Amsterdam, 25 February 2009.

Publications by Paul Botley:

- *Latin Translation in the Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti, and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396-1529: Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2010.

Lecture by Paul Botley:

‘The Letters of Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614) and Richard Thomson (c.1570–1613)’. Cultures of Knowledge Project, Oxford University, June 23, 2010.

Paul Botley is currently preparing an inventory of the correspondence of Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), working towards an eventual edition.

Biographical and bibliographical data

Anthony Thomas GRAFTON, born on 21 May 1950, is an American citizen.

He studied History and History of Science at the University of Chicago and University College London. In 1974-75 he taught History at Cornell University; since 1975 he has taught at Princeton University, where he is currently Henry Putnam University Professor of History and the Humanities. At Princeton he founded the Freshman Seminar Program, which he directed for ten years. Since then he has served as Director of the Program in European Cultural Studies of the Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Research and at the Council of the Humanities.

Anthony Grafton is a member of the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a corresponding fellow of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften and the British Academy. He has received fellowships from the American Council of Learned Societies, the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Science Foundation, and the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. As a visiting professor, he has taught at the Collège de France, Columbia University, the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, the Warburg Haus in Hamburg, and the University of Munich. He has been a Resident at the American Academy in Rome and has held visiting memberships at Pembroke College, Oxford; Christ's College, Cambridge; Trinity College, Cambridge; and Merton College, Oxford. In 2002 he received the Balzan Prize for History of the Humanities, and in 2003 the Mellon Foundation Award for Distinguished Achievement in the Humanities.

His books include:

- *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, Vol. I: *Textual Criticism*, Vol. II: *Historical Chronology*, Oxford UP 1983-93.
- (with Lisa Jardine) *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth and Sixteenth-Century Europe*, Harvard UP 1986.
- *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*, Princeton UP 1990.

- *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800*, Harvard UP 1991.
- *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*, University of Michigan Press 1997.
- *The Footnote: A Curious History*, Harvard UP 1997.
- *Cardano's Cosmos: The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer*, Harvard UP 1999.
- *Leon Battista Alberti: Master Builder of the Italian Renaissance*, Harvard UP 2000.
- *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation*, Harvard UP 2001.
- (with Megan Williams) *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, Harvard 2006.
- *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge UP 2007.
- (with Brian Curran, Pamela Long and Benjamin Weiss) *Obelisk*, MIT 2008.
- *Worlds Made by Words*, Harvard UP 2008.
- *Codex in Crisis*, New York: The Crumpled Press, 2008. Video: Anthony Grafton: *Codex in Crisis*, Authors@Google, February 12, 2009.
- (with Joanna Weinberg) «*I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue.*» *Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and A Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship*, Harvard 2011.

He has also contributed articles and reviews to *American Scholar*, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *London Review of Books*, the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, the *New York Review of Books*, the *New Yorker*, and the *Times Literary Supplement*.

He is currently finishing a book on Renaissance proof correctors and studying histories of Christianity in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.