A case for ‘European’ Dictionaries

Summary
The author, an historian of political ideas, makes the case for multilingual European dictionaries, which should replace the current, bilingual dictionaries. While these are the product of a ‘Europe of nations’, the multilingual dictionaries from a historical point of view prove that European history is a unified entity, while, from a political point of view, they aim to render more complete the consciousness of such a unity, and to create a more ‘common civilization.

In the second part of the paper a number of ratios in the OED are closely scrutinized, reaching the conclusion that often they do not give due attention to Greek and Latin sources, thus abandoning, slowly but inexorably, the roots of our civilization.

Giacomo Leopardi on German translations
Let me think the organizers of this Seventh International Symposium on Eurolinguistics for inviting me to speak here, in this splendid city of Berlin, one of the most splendid European cities, which naturally recalls to my memory the great German culture of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Winckelmann, Schiller, Goethe and, obviously for an historian of political thought as I am, the great philosophers, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, who explained the mystery of human society; not to forget, obviously, Wilhelm and Alexander von Humboldt, to whom the Berlin University owes its existence. I think we should all pay homage to what this great nation has given to the advancement of knowledge, with its universities that were the pride of nineteenth-century Europe, where almost every discovery came from Germany, both in the scientific and in the historical and philological field. And, as for myself, I want to add that I was tempted to deliver this paper in German, but the circumstance that, nowadays, English is the official language of communication, prevented the accomplishment of this desire.

On the occasion I have read with a renewed attention, and with a fresh interest, a few pages from Giacomo Leopardi’s Zibaldone (Compendia Book, or Latini Communis), that the Italian spirit of literature died down on 29-30 June 1823, and that he brought to my attention by my distinguished colleague and friend Dr. Francis Celoria, of the university of Keele.3

The reasoning of Count Leopardi, an expert in the Greek language, was defended by Georg Barthold Niebuhr, then ambassador at the papal court, a chair of Greek philosophy in Prussia, but apparently not equally expert in German language and literature, appears rather confused and illogical, since it moves from premises that lead its author to conclusions that should be logical, but that are not.4 Nevertheless, they are the typical reflections of a great spirit of the Romantic age, when the idea of nation, or Nation, was paramount, and had conquered hearts and minds. I represent, in fact, the liberation from the concepts of the previous century, when, in the name of the goddess Reason, the kingdoms were thought of according to principles often disrespectful of their historical development, in consequence of which local communities, and countries, and nations, had acquired their peculiar features. They were used to be formed, instead, according to abstract principles of rationality, that considered past history as a sequel of deviations and errors, and only aimed at enlightening minds against superstition. But the great German philosophers were then taking a vigorous step forward, towards the knowledge of society. Immanuel Kant, with his Kritizismus, the most mature fruit of Enlightenment, had taught our minds no more abstract rationality, but how to reason critically about contemporary society and history, and his principles paved the way towards the more mature concepts of liberalism in politics.

And Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, soon after him, moving from the concept that ‘the real is the rational’, so deeply penetrated into the science of history, that the historical method, we can safely assume, if considered as a mature consciousness, substantially dates back from his great works, although Giovan Battista Vico, ‘the Neapolitan’, as he was called, needed not to be forgotten. But Leopardi, although a great spirit, although an enlightened one, was a man of his own age, as all of us inevitably are, and had to confront himself with ideas then current, and necessarily destined to be superseded by ideas proper to subsequent ages.

The ‘European’ dimension
The world has been rapidly changing since then, more rapidly than ever in the past, thanks to the new means of communication, and we wonder whether the world of learning is actually confronting itself with these changes. The idea of a European constitution, in particular, has been rejected, and this proves how the Dutch feel more Dutch than we could suppose, the British more British than ever, and so on.

The problem is, whether the respective ‘worlds of learning’ are still merely national, or whether they begin to perceive the European dimension, and the Western dimension, of our civilization.

To be more explicit, the ‘European’ nations are substantially the product of post-medieval and modern age, and received their emphasis with the Protestant Reformation and, later on, with Romanticism. But national history, from a political point of view of commercial intercourse, the world is substantially unified, in Europe and the West we still live in linguistic islands, scarcely capable of communicating and of understanding each other.

This is not only a matter of education. The roots are in fact so deep, that it will take generations to eradicate them. If we go back to medieval and Roman times, by contrast, we find a substantial unity of European civilization and world of learning. We do not want to emphasize beyond the measure the role of Latin as the common cement of our civilization, as it actually is. Nevertheless, the abandonment of Latin, the product of nationalism, is recent. Still in 1742 Francis Hutcheson published in Latin his Philosophiae Moralis Institutio Compendiaria and, while lecturing at the university of Glasgow, it was the opinion of a former student that he ‘told and spoke, at least we thought so, better in Latin than English’. Elsewhere we have spoken about the role that Latin exerts in English and German languages today, a role that is not replaceable. But, while in German the Latinate vocabulary is a necessary borrowing, because it has very few, if any, highly disputable this is for English, where the learned vocabulary is 90% of Latin origin, while in the daily use the vocabulary of Germanic origin, we willingly admit, occurs with more frequency. In any case, to use the words of John Tolkan, ‘nothing mysterious in the European languages today, and the world of learning is becoming, and must become, growingly aware of this.

A language of learning
Therefore, are we proposing a language of learning? A language that, in the vocabulary of Historicism, as opposed to the category of Enlightenment, is not natural but artificial, designed, consequently, not to take roots and to perish? It would be true were the Latinate vocabulary without roots in the European languages today, but this is not the case. Apart from the Romance languages and English itself, Russian vocabulary, for example, is 20% of Latin origin. The Russian world of learning in the 18th century realized that the cultural history of their country must be ‘European’, because there was no alternative. “In 1685 wurde die berühmte Moskauer Slavo-Griecho-Lateinsische Akademie begründet, die ‘Academia Scientiarum Imperialis Petropolitana’, Publikationssorgan waren die Commentary und Acta, als Karl Vossen put its in his brilliant book Mutter Latein und ihre Töchter, Europä Sprachen und ihre Herkunft. Later on, in the eighteenth century, Latin was displaced by French, and the ‘Academia Petropolitana’ became ‘Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Petersburg’. But the reform of the educational system at the beginning of the 19th century ‘gab dem klas- sischen Charakter der Ausbildung erneut Auftrieb, wobei das deutsche Gymnasium als Munster diente. So war die klassische Ausbildung zu Beginn des 20sten Jahrhunderts weit verbreitet, tatsächlich existierte der humanistische Gymnasialunterricht bis 1917. Entgegen hörten Latein und Abgriechisch zur Ausstattung des gebildeten Russen’. Nevertheless dates back from his great works, although Giovan Battista Vico, ‘the Neapolitan’, as he was called, needed not to be forgotten.

In Hungary, the official language of the Diet until 1843,
was Latin. The conclusion is that we must decide between a language of learning, that, at least, allows communication. The two languages of the vulgar, or of the natural development of society: between John Milton and Shakespeare, as for English.

Advocacy for Latin
We must doubt whether these interna-
tional symposia, and at the eyes of the readers of our journal, 2000. The European Journal, as the advocates for Latin, as nol-
taligic people who look at a past that is irrecoverably gone, and our books are their last character of a political manifestation. Nevertheless, we see no alterna-
tive to the Latinate vocabulary, if we want to understand each other, at least as for what con-
cerns the world of learning. The language of learning we are submitting to the attention of our colleagues is in fact the common cement of European and national life. In support this idea we have descended into the arena with our little journal, that was founded with a very purpose. In the 1950s the distinguished scholar Clive Staples Lewis (1898-1963) attacked the destruction at the Renaissance of ‘everyday Latin in favour of a form of Latin that we must consider as a uni-
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Political education and the challenge of modernization - 1

Summary
Schmitt’s well-known answer to the question of what politics is, the distinction between friend and foe. This classical definition of politics has become obvious under the pressure of modernization. The author counters it with the answer that it is the mediation between business partners. The present modernization makes the control of its unintended effects our first priority. Achieving this control is an almost impossible task because humans must learn to become rational beings in the true Kantian sense.

Der Begriff des Politischen
“The specific political distinction to which all political actions and motives can be reduced, is that between friend and foe.”

This was Schmitt’s definition of politics. In 1933 Schmitt realized in it. I wondered why I thought it wrongheaded. His was a Darwinian view of life, but that view has become an obvious tradition and of the collaboration of distinguished scholars, but they are worth examining. I hazard here, at my own risk, a judgment. In fact, as you know, and as I repeat, I am not a Linguist, but an historian of political thought, and what I do in the field of linguistics is a function of my specific field of studies. I do not presume to add anything to the science of linguistics. By contrast, my efforts aim at influencing the English civilization, rendering easier the mutual understanding, and helping to overcome the separation between nations. This is my social, cultural, political aim. From this point of view my research work must be judged.

For the etymologists of the OED, Schmitt is the supreme authority, as was obvious, my task is no fear to depart from it, but sometimes they do not give due attention to Latin and, more often, to Greek etymologies. In sum, they seem to add ‘modernizing’ Schmitt, thus aban- doning, slowly but inexorably, the origins of our civilization.

Vincenzo Merolle
University of Rome “La Sapienza”
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Modernization
With the progression of modernization, modernization started to dictate the course of change. In this way it now challenges political practice to find an answer to the problems that the unintended effects do cause. The second aspect of modernization is that groups, nations and states can only succeed in benefiting from this pace of change, if they can guarantee their members and citizens justice, security, liberty and democracy. The reason for this is obvious. If modernization is indeed a blind process it means that no one can control how the political community has to rely on the co-operation of its members to profit from the challenge of change. Modernization has promoted a politics of co-operation within and between political communities and the outdated policies of friend and foe can only damage the achievements of modernization, and judging from this one can only stop the process temporarily.

In a recent book three American authors provide a graphic illustration of how cooperation between individuals who do not know each other, but who share a common interest in selling and buying goods, can give an enormous push to the creation of wealth.1 They argue that Internet based business webs have created fast growing organizations, which sometimes remain "virtual" in the sense that they only exist as electronic transactions completed on the Internet. They mention four types of business webs: The agora (such as a digital stock market community such as Ebay), the aggregation (such as a digital gossip, where you can order your groceries by way of the Internet and have them delivered on your doorstep), The value chain (like the web of the Ford Motor Company, where you can order your customized car and bargain about the price) And finally the smart and the stolid, the rich and their needs, where individuals and business firms cooperate via the Internet on a voluntary basis. They represent these four types of business webs according to others even formed it. Although I cannot try to describe the process of modernization with scholastic precision for the space I would like to discuss two characteristics of the process. The first is that it is a process of a premeditated ed policy. It obviously is the outcome of human activities, but never creates unintended effects that continuously tend to destroy the status quo within society.
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has changed. Formerly culture was instrumental in creating group identities; it provided symbols, which were essential to the maintenance of group identity. Culture also played an important role between groups. The agonistic impulse, Huizinga wrote, was a vital part of the cultural force. Formerly that agonism found its expression in the political, cultural and the technical world in which we are creating! Postmodernist critics seem to think that we can bring back political gamesmanship by appealing to the semblance of politics. My colleague Ankersmit has written a brilliant book on Aesthetic Politics in which he argues that an emphasis on strong images of representation will restore the vitality of democracy. To me this is a recipe that will not work. Politics is not just substantive issues, it is not a form of shadow-boxing. The substantive issue of our time is the control over the process of modernization. That is a daunting task for two reasons. The process of modernization itself is the last refuge of man's irrational impulses and control means that we subject these to a higher form of rationality than the one prevailing in common economic activities. Secondly, it is almost an inconceivable task to contemplate, because we would have to transcend our native impulses and transform our loyalty to certain group cultures or at best national symbols into a message of universal brotherhood. In the political essays that Kant wrote as an old man, he sketched the programmatic points of such a message. Whether we can turn this message into an effective political program remains to be seen. If Huizinga's diagnosis is correct we must not only transcend the agonistic impulse in our souls. We must start to think of culture as the cultivation of Reason. We can play innocent games and exercise in sports as much as we want, but will this slake our thirst for adventure? And can we manage the culture of Reason?

Jefferson and representative democracy

So what is politics? Jefferson wrote to one of his friends in 1816. "The introduction of this new principle, that the sovereignty of the people, and the pressure of democracies has rendered useless almost everything written before on the structure of government."

With these bold words Jefferson cast off a tradition of political philosophy that started with Plato and Aristotle and ended with Hume and Hegel. Yet his statement was right for its time. The teaching of traditional political philosophy tended to obscure the unpalatable fact that representative democracy is the only option. Pragmatism in the form of modern political science took this lesson to heart towards the end of the 19th century. However, the process of how we can control the process of modernization to suit our ends, is not within the competence of political science as it is taught in our schools. If we consider the cultivation of reason as a way out of our predicament the teaching of classical political philosophy may help us. In our situation it is in terms of rationalizing how it is to do things as it is to have expertise. And as classical political philosophy is a branch of technical knowledge it may even help us to discover our potentiality as moral beings.

Michael Oakeshott’s essay

For an illustration of this second problem I will turn to Michael Oakeshott’s essay Rationalism in Politics and his inaugural Political Education. I will illustrate that there is an element of obscurantism in Oakeshott’s criticism of ‘rationalism’ and his plea for a certain type of university education. Oakeshott’s influence on his philosophy as a subject of our intellectual legacy often has contempt for the nuts and bolts of democracy and so become intellectual teachers.

Summary

What is needed to teach is simple. These are the values of democracy, liberty, justice and security. For this teaching we must turn to the political philosophers. The author uses the example of an influential teacher of political philosophers, Michael Oakeshott, to indicate that many in the intellectual community have a disdain for technical knowledge, which is assumed to be of the domain of the modern. There is a case for wisdom going beyond the technical knowledge, but to think that wisdom can replace technical knowledge is a counsel for disaster. Wisdom and technical knowledge are both necessary. Oakeshott wrote: ‘The purpose of this educational program is to teach the nuts and bolts of democracy to educate people to use a system that is defective. In order to meet the standards of liberty, justice, security and democracy we need something more. We need to find a way to manage modernization in such a way that the results of this process are brought under control. To set our priorities we have to turn to the political philosophers of the past, but the history of political thought is not an open book. We must read it by heart, learned by heart, learned by rote, and applied mechanical- ly.”[16] Oakeshott confronted his opponents with the statement that ‘practical knowledge’ that is superior to technical knowledge and indispensable, if the latter can be applied with profit. Practical knowledge ‘exists only in use, is not reflective and (unlike technique) cannot be formulated in rules.”[16] It can be neither taught nor learned, but only imparted and acquired. It is a higher form of practice, and the only way to acquire it is by apprenticeship to a master – not because the master can teach it (he cannot), but because it can be acquired only by continuous contact with one who is practicing it.[17]

I suggest that this distinction between ‘technical’ and ‘practi- cal knowledge’ is a form of obscurantism. Oakeshott has contempt for technical knowledge and the rationalism that it represents. However, we cannot organize modern life without the application of ‘technical knowledge’ as defined by Oakeshott. People are no longer in the position of masters of modernization, but it is in order to master the rules of ‘technical knowledge’ we need highly sophisticated skills and intelligence. And it would be the prime duty of the teacher to create the conditions for learning this type of knowledge. Can we use the insights derived from ‘practical knowledge’ in learning and applying ‘technical knowledge’? Probably not, but Oakeshott’s idea of the status of practical knowledge appears to be rather arrogant. It is generated by the exclusive relationship between master and apprentice and has to be learnt in isolation from any form of technical or vocational training.

Vocational training imparts the ‘literature’ of a certain body of technical knowledge. Oakeshott writes about it as something easy to learn and to apply, but we know that it is not. Teachers in medical, law and business schools, teachers of economics and the social sciences know that the application of their type of knowledge is difficult and often unenrewarding. Oakeshott describes ‘empirical’ activities as doing whatever one likes and finding an ideological justification for it afterwards. His idea of ‘political education’ is not to teach the abstract tenets of an ideology, but to cultivate the kind of knowledge that Oakeshott claims as knowledge and the technical activities that reflect the tradition of our communities. In splendid Burkean language Oakeshott writes: ‘In political activity, then, men sail a boundless and bottomless sea; and whether they have as their only task to make a shelter on shore for shelter nor floor for anchorage, neither starting-place nor approved destination. The enterprise is to keep afloat on an even keel: the sea is both friend and enemy; and the seamanship consists in realizing to the highest degree of a traditional manner of behaviour in order to make a friend of every hostile occasion.’[18]
We know that authentic and immediate insights do not come to us in a mechanical and bureaucratic fashion, and often slip away when we try to formulate them in writing. Versed in the best writing of centuries we tend to forget the spirit of sincere friendship and the silly jargon of Internet communication. When we want to leave our closets and try to make friends with other human beings, how can we do so without seeking an alliance in some sort of cultural "knowledge"? Oakeshott's metaphor is quite revealing in this respect. How can we sail the seas without our navigational devices? We learn by experience how to handle a sailing vessel and how to calculate the hazards of the sea in order to give them a more personal and friendly character. This mental switch tends to reflect the relationship of the personal and the public, making the switch with the community he cherishes. In Oakeshott's case this is the community of scholars to which he belonged.

This conclusion is important and should, in my view, be turned into a statement because Oakeshott's community is a select, but by no means small one. In fact it encompasses all scholars who are serious about studying human nature and who – in the case of the application of this study of politics – draw comfort and insight from the canon of political thought, produced by their philosophy. Oakeshott's appeal to his imagined community is so powerful, because it strikes a familiar cord in all scholars, whatever their differences.

If our subject is political education the fact of Oakeshott's influence raises two questions: How are we to educate a future generation of scholars? What are these scholars going to teach the public?

The teachers of the past

The great teachers of the past have instructed us to respect civilised standards of conduct and have inspired us to believe that human beings can teach and maintain these standards. On reflection, however, their instruction remains inconclusive unless we derive from these civilised standards according to constantly changing circumstances. Keith Baker has far from obvious. Michael Tremblay of Concordia University suggested to me that "Derrida's Politcs of Friendship" is neither a political programme for me, because I expected to find in his study a key to the pressing problems of our modern world we tend to cooperate as business partners, but we know that this type of cooperation is not enough to solve our difficulties. Is there a way to change a society (Gerechtehchkeits of business) dealt with by Oakeshott (imagined) community of friends? We have seen that Derrida is quite effective in deconstructing Scholastic distinctions of politics. However, as to the politics of friendship he proposes, I derived little comfort and no enlightenment reading his book. "Friends, there are no friends". This sentence accords well with the title of his text as a Poltergeist. Presumably it means that if you want friends, you should rather give than expect friendship. Yet given his ultimate sentence I am not sure this is what this means: When will we be ready for an experience of freedom and equality of scholars? I do not know why he is being so respectful of experiencing the friendship, which would at last be just, beyond the law, and measured up against its measurerslessness?

"O my democratic friends … How should we end this sentence? "Oh my democratic friends, there are no friends"? A rather disheartening bit of advice for those not skilled in a form of dialectics that out Hegel Hegel. Or should it be "Oh my democratic friends, we are friends?" It is hard to imagine that Derrida would end pages of the most obscure mental gymnastics with such a platitudinous. It is essential to learn what Derrida understands by democracy, at the freedom and equality of scholars he is talking about or does he include the general equality that is capable of friendship? His prediction for Nietzsche (he often uses a coloquium of quotations from Nietzsche to make his argument) is a bad sign. Nietzsche's thought, a narcissistic for all scholars Nietzsche's thought is a narcissistic for all scholars. In penetrating prose he tries to reverse their reaction against mass society and the unworthiness mix of vulgarity, nativist, and hysteria it often manifests. And more than any other 199th century writer Nietzsche has created the image of an artist whose mass liberates the sophisticated and the erudite from his humdrum existence in mass society. As any artist, Nietzsche's message creates illusions. The most powerful is that as part of an elite the intellectual as Superman can manipulate the masses for his own purposes. Nietzsche is not responsible for the Nazi ideology, but there is a systematic relationship between the faction of their ivory towers is not just ludicrous, but also disastrous. In order to bring the modernization process under control the expertise of the scholar is essential and the public needs to be persuaded that this control will serve its long-term interests. Ernest Bloch, the greatest utopist of the 20th century

The ideal of a global imagined community should be the ultimate goal of political education. For those who consider this to be an unrealistic and “utopian” idea it is worth to quote Ernest Bloch, the greatest utopist of the 20th century. He writes: "To cling to things, or to fly over them is both wrong … Wherever the horizons of utopian thinking as a higher form of reality. And perhaps we can draw comfort from his vision and mark this moment in time as an opportunity for the politics of utopian pragmatism. In the face of large-scale pollution, global warming and regional but yet global conflicts there is an ever growing need for long term policies. It is an exciting time for those teaching politics. At the end of the first part of this essay I pointed out that the history of political thought may not be relevant in solving current political problems, but it can still help us to acquire wisdom and detachment. To that extent Oakeshott's teaching is vitiated. But we will continue to
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Ernst Bloch, the greatest utopist of the 20th century: an intermixture of...
Aesthetics in the Lecture Lists of the Universities of Halle, Leipzig, Würzburg, and Prague, 1785–1805

The introduction of the teaching of fine arts and sciences (schöne Künste und Wissenschaften) into the programmes at faculties of arts (Philosophische Fakultäten) was, as early as the reign of Empress Maria Theresa, an important part of the efforts to secularize Austrian universities, which had hitherto been controlled by the Jesuits. The teaching of fine arts and sciences gained further importance in the reforms of her son Joseph II. The Josephinian regulations renamed the existing chairs of schone Wissenschaften chairs of aesthetics and classical literature, and included them among the five ordinary chairs (the others being philosophy, mathematics, physics, and general history) at the universities throughout the Habsburg lands. In the third year, aesthetics was taught every day, and examinations in the subject were obligatory for all students who wanted to graduate properly from the faculty of arts and open the way for themselves to further study at the so-called higher faculties of theology, medicine or law.

The Vienna reforms

The Vienna reforms were an important part of the efforts to secularize Austrian universities and to open them to the modernization. The name of the Protestant town of Vienna was maintained throughout the period, but, as a term competing with the term ‘aesthetics’, it appeared regularly. Together with Eberhard, other Halle teachers offered lecture courses in aesthetics in this period. The number of all their colloquia did not, however, equal the number given by Eberhard, who offered aesthetics eighteen times, whereas Johann Gebhard Ehrenreich Maß and Ludwig Heinrich Jakob six times, Rudolph Grothold Rath three times, and Christoph Gottfried Everbeck (or Ewerbeck) and Samuel Friedrich Günther Wahl once. The Halle lecturers on aesthetics were the Privatdozenten, Extraordinarius, and Ordinarius. With the exception of Wahl, the professors who lectured on aesthetics were professors of philosophy; Wahl was an Extraordinarius of oriental languages. The Halle Ordinarius, Eberhard, Jakob, and Maß, lectured on aesthetics from their own books and notes. Other teachers used various textbooks, most often those by Eberhard, Johann Joachim Eschenburg (Entwurf einer Theorie und Literatur der schönen Wissenschaften, 1783) and Christian Wilhelm Snell (Lehrbuch der Kritik des Geschmackes, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Kantische Kritik (Berlin: Lebrecht deutsch, 1795). It was precisely the use of these works, which made the period under discussion different from what preceded it, when Charles Barteux, Friedrich Justus Riedel and Georg Friedrich Meier dominated at Halle.

Leipzig

In the German lecture lists at Leipzig the name schone Wissenschaften was maintained throughout the period, but, as a term competing with the term ‘aesthetics’, it was not, however, as a term dominating with the term ‘aesthetics’, but only sporadically with the period, separated from all related subjects, including the theory of literature and rhetoric. At Leipzig, the term ‘aesthetics’ was first used as the name of a lecture course at the latest in the mid-Sixties. The only Leipzig teacher who regularly offered aesthetics throughout the period was Ernst Platner, Extraordinarius of the chair of medicine. Nevertheless, he did not dominate aesthetics here. This is testified to by the work both of the large group of authors who offered aesthetics only sporadically (Christian August Heinrich Groth and Johann Gottfried Grohmann, Johann Gottfried Samuel Leuchter, Karl Adolph Casar, Johann Georg Eck, the Younger, Christian Weiss and Karl Heinrich Ludwig Politz) and, in particular, four who systematically devoted themselves to it – Ordinarius of morals and politics Johann Georg Eck, Extraridnarius of philosophy Karl Gottfried Schreiter, Ordinarius of philosophy Karl Heinrich Meyendorf and Privatdozent Christian Friedrich Michaels. Similarly to those at Halle, aestheticsians at Leipzig did not base themselves on only one textbook. Sporadically they turned to Alexander Pope, Karl Wilhelm Ramler and Johann August Eberhard, most often basing themselves on Kant’s Critique of Judgement, the kantian textbooks of the Hoff brothers and their own texts. Eschenburg’s Entwurf was not used in the collegia on aesthetics at Leipzig.

Schöne Wissenschaften

From the mid-Eighties onwards the name ‘aesthetics’ began to be used regularly in the lecture lists at the Roman Catholic University of Würzburg. Bonaventura Andres, who till the summer semester of the 1803/04 year was the only Leipzig teacher of aesthetics, announced to alternate with the collegia on aesthetics collega on the theory of rhetoric from what sciences as well. In the announcements of Andres’s lecture courses the term schone Wissenschaften appeared for the
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