Introduction

In Great Britain, the designer and author Humphry Repton not only coined the term “landscape gardener,” but advanced the garden as a place for enjoyment and as a civilizing influence on the lower classes. 1 In the early 1800’s Richard Payne Knight (1750-1824) – a contemporary of Lord Findlater – was the chief critic of Repton’s work. He championed the dramatic scenery of the picturesque style of garden. Before him, however, Horace Walpole had already captured the attention of his 18th-century audience with his claim that England had already captured the attention of their plans there. Findlater was an exceptional case. His work, it is true that Samuel Johnson compiled his own Dictionary in nine years, but we are not English, as he was proud to declare himself. We are just Europeans, and we believe that such an undertaking should be the task of an Academy, or of publishers who enjoy the necessary support.

It’s determined to go on. When we receive messages like that of a younger and talented French colleague (‘continuez vos travaux… dans l’intérêt de tous’), how could we surrender? How could we betray the hopes of many, distinguished colleagues, particularly of the youngest among them? Regarding the European Dictionaries we have, as you know, put on the internet1 the part that we have been able to compile, which has cost us five years of hard work. It is true that Samuel Johnson pointed out, and is a pity that learning should follow, not precede it. On this occasion let us humbly disagree with our Master Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, who said that philosophy is like the owl of Minerva, which starts flying only at sunset. At least in part, the world of learning should envisage future events, not simply follow them.

Dear Colleagues,

Or volge l’undecimo anno’, sang Petracch in the eleventh year of his love for Laura. For us, more modestly, it is the tenth year of this little journal, and publishing it for ten years has not been in vain.2

With no help from the institutions, but with the help of our colleagues, and this is what really matters, we have done our part for knowledge of European history and ideas, and we are determined to go on. When we receive their plans there. Findlater was an exceptional case. His work, it is true that Samuel Johnson compiled his own Dictionary in nine years, but we are not English, as he was proud to declare himself. We are just Europeans, and we believe that such an undertaking should be the task of an Academy, or of publishers who enjoy the necessary support.

It’s determined to go on. When we receive messages like that of a younger and talented French colleague (‘continuez vos travaux… dans l’intérêt de tous’), how could we surrender? How could we betray the hopes of many, distinguished colleagues, particularly of the youngest among them? Regarding the European Dictionaries we have, as you know, put on the internet1 the part that we have been able to compile, which has cost us five years of hard work. It is true that Samuel Johnson pointed out, and is a pity that learning should follow, not precede it. On this occasion let us humbly disagree with our Master Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, who said that philosophy is like the owl of Minerva, which starts flying only at sunset. At least in part, the world of learning should envisage future events, not simply follow them.

Lord Findlater
and his impact on continental landscaping

James Ogilvy, 7th Earl of Findlater and 4th Earl of Seafield, was born on 10 April 1750 at Huntingtower Castle near Perth, the home of his maternal grandparents. He grew up in Cullen, Banffshire, the seat of his father, known as Lord Deskford. He inherited the estates and Cullen House in 1770 at the age of twenty after his father, the 6th Earl of Findlater had committed suicide. He was educated at Oxford and enjoyed a high reputation for Latin scholarship, and especially for his knowledge of Vergil.14 He lived abroad much of his life following his marriage in 1779 but nevertheless took a keen interest in all decisions concerning the estate. Robert Adam was commissioned to prepare a plan for a new house whilst James Playfair was asked to prepare alterations to the design of the existing house and the kitchen garden.15 Thomas White prepared plans for the policies in 1789-90 in which Adam’s designs for the site of a new house and stable block were incorporated and, whilst these particular ideas were not taken up, their suggestion of re-siting the village of Cullen from around the church to its present situation around the harbour was acted on, although not until some years later. In his ink drawing of 1770, Robert Adam deliberately chose a low viewpoint to emphasize the height of the single span bridge approaching Cullen House, built by his father in 1744. Elegant trees planted on the grounds frame the composition, underlining its picturesque character. Figures provide a sense of scale and human interest. This work, held by the National Gallery of Scotland, is one of hundreds of drawings he made throughout his career, exploring the relationships between buildings and settings, which formed his own so-called castle style.

In the course of research into early Scottish gardens, a remarkably complete gardener’s inventory for the substantial garden of Cullen House for 1760 has come to light. The gardener wrote out a detailed account of where the different fruit trees and bushes, shrubs, roses and perennial border flowers were growing in different sites in the garden. In August 1773, James Boswell and Dr. Samuel Johnson passed the estate on their way to the Hebrides and found it “admirably laid out.” Lord Findlater is often listed among those who “settled abroad because of their sexual proclivities” such as Viscount Courtenay, Sir William Meredith, the Hon. Edward Onslow, the Earl of Leister and 3rd Marquess Townshend, Lord Valentia and many more.10 If Findlater was forced into exile or if it was his own choice still needs clarification.

Moyna Cowie relates that he made an unfortunate jest at the expense of Jane Duchess of Gordon. It seems that a ship had been built called The Duchess of Gordon, replete with copper sheathing on its underside to help deter rot and marine animals, as was the innovation of the era. The Earl of Findlater was overheard to remark to Brodie of Brodie, “I aye kent the Duches had a brass neck and a brazen face, but I niver kent she had a copper arse.” The Duchess was not amused, and pursued the matter in the courts. Findlater fled to his estate in the German country of Saxony, and never returned to Scotland.12

The date of this occasion is probably 1791. From this date onwards, John Ross, a retired professor of Aberdeen University, published his estates.13

Findlater at Carlsbad

For anyone convalescing, exercise of the body during the visit of a spa is a daily need; the climbing of hills around the town is facilitated by numerous, very comfortably built and always well maintained hiking and walking trails. From the Age of Enlightenment onwards, straight roads have been considered to be unnatural and the serpent had been declared as “line of beauty” by William Hogarth.14 The footpaths through Carlsbad’s forests were established in the late 18th century when people were ‘rediscovering the wilds of nature’ and when the Gothic revival suggested the inclusion of woods into landscaping.15 The first installation of this kind was the Chotek walk of 1756. Others followed, their construction to a large extent funded by the Earl of Findlater and Seafield, who made fourteen visits to Carlsbad between 1793 and 1810, and to whom the town owes much of its development, not only due to
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1 Sorry for citing myself again, but on the internet they appear under google, Venice Merlo, Dictionary Europeo/European Dictionary.
numerous beautifications of the surroundings of the city but also
due to substantial donations to the Lincoln’s Inn Fields carpet-
ship’s princely estates in Scotland yielded about £40,000 per
annum as was disclosed after his death by the Inverness Journal of 29 November 1811. This budget, comparable to £60,000 today, gave plenty of room for investment, charity and gifts.16

During the long and final abdication in 1807, Findlater was embroiled in a scandal that
took him out of the political arena. He sold and resisted as much as they
could. With the help of his partners Johann Georg Fischer, Findlater had, by the end of 1805, finally acquired five out of the eight vineyards. Although vineyards had been planted in England, Findlater does not consider them to be typical of its landscape. As Andrew Eburne points out, the Age of

mountain, where today Linger Castle rises to the sky, Findlater had the master builder Johann August Castanaill employ the pedimented obelus (8 m) that he put into the Tepa valley and was erected during which Goethe recalled all
their Brompton Park Nursery, three different kinds of vine from their

tree of personal memories of the old Earl.17 It can be assumed that Goethe was a companion who was
standing as regards the pro-
clyves of his lord-
ship’s building. Goethe explains: “Goethe was also certainly aware of a wide variety of expressions of friendship, and possible and human love. His con-
stant support of the historian Johann Michael Ritter von der Reuth, who was embroiled in a scandal that revealed his homosexual inclina-
tion, also demonstrates Goethe’s impetus and immorality consideration (i.e. “ob turpem causas”).18 Fischer’s wife, who lived with them at the Findlater’s villa in Helfenberg, divorced her husband when she found out about the type of rela-
tionship, but when Fischer died at the age of 87 he was buried in Findlater’s tomb in front of
Loschwitz church.19 From the point of view of publication29 attributed to Lord Findlater I would like to point out the “Deutschland in bea-
tiful architecture”30, a splendidly illustrated book of engraved architectural plans and elevations of existing and proposed build-
ings. The work was first published in Leipzig and Paris in nine parts between 1798 and 1800 under the title “Plante et des-
sins tirés de la belle architecture”. The second, an abridged and less expensive edition contains an introductory essay by the German scholar and architectural historian Christian Stieglitz, who has been wrongly assumed to be responsible for the whole work. In fact the collec-
tion of existing buildings was compiled by the 7th Earl of Findlater. The plates of existing buildings, including a number of British palaces, were pub-
sumably taken from prints and drawings in Findlater’s own col-
lection. The later suggested designs appear to be his lord-
ship’s own work. The impor-
tance of this work lies in the sig-
nificant role it played in intro-
ducing neoclassical architecture in the style of the Adams office to Germany.31 According to one theory it is assumed that Findlater had been involved in the reconstruction of the Neues Schloss at Potsdam in Neoclassical style. This work, which was fin-
ished by 1790, was commis-
sioned by Otto Karl Friedrich Graf von Schlabendorf and served as a county court until 1852. From his presumably abundant correspondence only three sets of the manuscript and 1072 letters from the Scotish writer Henry Mackenzie in the National Archives of Scotland, an engraved edition of the beautiful Elbe terraces with pergolas, ponds and vines. A ter-
race performed three different functions: it facilitated seeing the views by creating an open space, it added structure to the landscape and it was comfort-
table for strolls. Findlater’s sole heir and partner Johann Fischer, an architect by profession, who had already received the Eckberg estate and the Findlater’s villa in Helfenberg, carried out most of his proj-
ects. It was hardly surprising for him to keep his attachment to Findlater secret, and
to the Scottish heirs protested in court on the ground that the bequets had been mere means of the Findlater’s immoral consideration (i.e. “ob turpem causas”).17 Moreover, Fischer’s wife, who lived with them at the Findlater’s villa in Helfenberg, divorced her husband when she found out about the type of rela-
tionship, but when Fischer died at the age of 87 he was buried in Findlater’s tomb in front of Loschwitz church.19 From the point of view of publication29 attributed to Lord Findlater I would like to point out the “Deutschland in beau-
tiful architecture”30, a splendidly illustrated book of engraved architectural plans and elevations of existing and proposed build-
ings. The work was first published in Leipzig and Paris in nine parts between 1798 and 1800 under the title “Plante et des-
sins tirés de la belle architecture”. The second, an abridged and less expensive edition contains an introductory essay by the German scholar and architectural historian Christian Stieglitz, who has been wrongly assumed to be responsible for the whole work. In fact the collec-
tion of existing buildings was compiled by the 7th Earl of Findlater. The plates of existing buildings, including a number of British palaces, were pub-
sumably taken from prints and drawings in Findlater’s own col-
lection. The later suggested designs appear to be his lord-
ship’s own work. The impor-
tance of this work lies in the sig-
nificant role it played in intro-

Sympathy and Utility, a Comparison of the Moral Philosophy of Hume and Smith*

Introduction

Yea. I wrote an essay about the interesting phenomenon that Hume dropped ‘sympathy’ as a principle of association with Smith. I took it up (possibly being inspired by reading THN) and made it the central concept of TMS. There are still scholars who doubt that Hume dropped sympathy as an associative principle in his two Enquiries, but I have given, I hope, forceful arguments that he did so and why. I am not the first to notice this fact. Norman Keppe Smith and Nicolas Capaldi went before me. What I want to argue in this essay is that Smith and Hume’s moral systems are remarkably similar and that their systems can be used in concert to present a viable alternative to current versions of utilitarianism.

The Impartial Spectator and sympathy

Smith writes: [2000], p. 21-34. (Note 3.1)

It is not the soft power of humanity, it is not that feeble spark of benevolence which Nature has lighted up in the human heart, that is thus capable of counteracting the strongest impulses of self-love. It is a stronger power, a more forcible motive, which exerts itself upon such occasions as reason, principle, conscience, the inhabitant of the breast, the man within, the inner judge and arbiter of our conduct.

Our conscience enables us not only to reach an impartial verdict about the conduct of others but also about the way we behave ourselves. Smith explains this impartiality as follows:

The meaning of ‘impartiality’ is brought out by a contrast with the partiality of self-love engendered by emotion. Even though impartiality is not itself passionless reason, it is a rational appeal to God either.

The man within’ is the ‘viceregent’ on earth and as such has he make the moral decisions himself and so in practice his moral system is as secular as that of Hume. Jerry Evensky’s remark, that ‘the logic of Smith’s moral philosophy does not require a deity’, seems just. Smith’s system does not need God’s intervention in order to function.

It is important that Smith uses the term ‘arbiter’. It means that we make use of ‘the man within’ in our daily affairs. Contemporaries and Hume right and wrong in the abstract is not enough.

The most sublime speculation of the contemplative philosopher can scarce compensate the neglect of the smallest active duty.

The verdict of the impartial spectator effects, according to Grotswold, ‘a refinement of the ordinary exchange of moral life’ and not – we can add – a negation of it. The impartial spectator does not pronounce a remote judgment but actively arbitrates between citizens. Obviously this verdict does not preclude considerations of utility. Smith uses them freely in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* and what else can we expect from the author of *The Wealth of Nations*. However, Smith criticizes Hume for making utility the only standard for judging moral issues. He writes that the superior gift of taste is at first sight appreciated for its utility, although utility is not the main component of our approbation or blame. ‘The idea of the utility of all qualities of this kind is plainly an after-thought, and not what first recommends them to our approbation.’ What applies to aesthetic applies to moral feelings. So we judge on the basis of our spontaneous feelings.

This, however, is not the function of the impartial spectator. He reasons and takes considerations of utility into account. So he comes at the end not at the beginning of our process of approbation. As the ultimate authority he is ‘the great judge and arbiter of our conduct.’ As such we can combine Hume’s use of utility with that of Smith.

Hume on sympathy and utility

In a fine essay Norman Fiering has described the widespread concern with the humanitarian issues which swept through Europe since the late seventeenth-century. For philosophers and theologians such as Henry More, Richard Cumberland, Malebranche, Shaftesbury and many others ‘irresistible compassion’ became a central issue. Another term, next to ‘humanity’, was ‘sympathy’. So the fact that Hume and Smith adopted the term is not remarkable in itself. It would seem that they wanted to be enlightened philosophers. It is the fact that they turned ‘sympathy’ into a criticus technique that is novel and original, and the reason why they developed the term in different directions has to do with their opinions on the impartiality of the moral system. It is at this point that Smith and Hume differ. For Hume ‘sympathy is essentially a principle of communication by which the spectator comes to have a passion that he believes the agent to have and he comes to have it because of this belief.’ For Smith it is possible for a spectator sympathetically to have a passion that he does not believe the agent himself has. ‘So even that he knows the agent cannot have.’ This is a useful distinction. Hume uses ‘sympathy’ to communicate feelings, and not judgment. We do not come to judging them when we are led by sympathy.

As we have seen Smith regards the philosopher as a councillor for active duties. That is how Hume announces the function of philosophy in EHU. ‘Be a philosopher, but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man.’ This emphasis on active duties and practical reason marks both the rewritten products EHU and EPM. In the *Treatise Hume has no regard for his public and his more dramatic passages read as a soliloquy. In the two works he had a more considered strategy to reach his public. They become, indeed, an Enlightenment project.

*Note 3.2*

David Hume

in her letter of 11 June 1795 addressed to Baron Grimm (see footnote 32, p. 26).


Most of his publications / editions were simply translations from English such as: *Mélanges agronomiques, védiges d’après les instructions des meilleurs fermiers anglais* (Leipzig, 1799).


Bewerbung der Königlichen Wirtschaftsböcke zu Windorf (Chemnitz, 1801).

New Erfahrungen, wie man mit- ten im Wintermonat Spargel, Melenen, Gurken, Erlenbohnen, Radiesen, Rüsen, und andere Vegetabilen ohne Mißheir erzei- en könne (Berlin, 1801).


The counterpart of authority is liberty. Both authors are convinced that citizens should be able to pursue their affairs without interference from the state. Smith has a more forward view of the functioning of natural liberty. In the Wealth of Nations he depicts gradual economic progress resulting in a better lot for households of society. Hume on the other hand took a dim view of political developments in the 1760s and 1770s. In the last essay he wrote he insisted that in the contests between liberty and authority "Otto von Bismarck... challenge the preference."20

However, in his economic essays Hume was the first to describe natural order as a kind of self-regulating operation as being beneficial to all actors involved. Smith built on this analysis in his Moral Sentiments and his other national and international division of labour. There is then of course his famous critique of mercantilism. Hume does not mention economic progress. In his History of England he positively refuses the notion of progressive historical development, that is to say he is in his usual remarks.21 They shared their criticism on the "information" (Hume) and the "wholesale merchant" (Smith).22 They did not like people whose economic interests are not firmly anchored in the national soil. It is remarkable that they point at the two actors who helped to unchain the Industrial Revolution. In the 1770s they created the world we live in. Smith and Hume did not so much defend the status quo as the balance of social relations. They suspected with good reason that the future would disrupt this balance and they did not like the prospect.

Sentimentalism and its Worth

Scholars do not agree whether Hume and Smith belong to the broad stream of utilitarianism or whether there is a clean divide between their moral theories and the concept of utility and that of Bentham and his school. Utilitarianism is a more modern academic label coined by John Stuart Mill and Bentham marks an important difference between the two versions which Mill called to a Smith of "sentimentalism".24 Sentimentalism means that Hume and Smith took sentiments to be the prime motive for action and the initial opening for an understanding of morality. In this view the current state of ethical theory Hume and Smith's view seems to be a strength rather than a weakness. The problem with Bentham's utilitarianism is that it is consequent- alism and its narrow view of human motivation. Consequentialism means that we should judge human actions by their consequences and not by the dispositions of the actors. This view easily leads to "government house utilitarianism", i.e. that civil servants and politicians in the making of laws is best for promoting the common good, even when it leads to disregarding individual interests. Robert Stebbins is a sensible defender of "government house utilitarianism", comments that the utilitarianism "is credible" under those special conditions that characterize policy-making, and better than when individual can guide their own conduct.25 This may be true, but the question is whether "those special conditions" can provide real justification to individual interests in the broadest sense. The fact that officials and experts tend to "make" at a fictionalized account of these interests is not helpful. Amatyra Sen and Bernard Williams played a role here.

It is a strange but very striking fact that in its most recent existence as political theory to not have direct relation to moral and economic theory it has lost those connec-
tions.26 There has been a psychological and political reality.26 Critics such as John Rawls and Alasdair MacIntyre, correctly, regard utilitarianism as an impoverished moral theory. Our problem is that we do not seem to be able to find an alternative. MacIntyre's appeal to Aristotle is not helpful. Morality according to Aristotle is teleological. In the pursuit of virtue we aspire to certain ends, but where is the end that covers all the other ones? Aristotle's definition of the good is "the good of the policy. Here is our problem. His definition is too parochial to be of any use to us. What is the goodness of modern society?27 A few like it or not that can only be the product of negotiations between individuals with differing ends in mind. In order to survive nationally and internationally we must cooperate, but there is no tradition anymore that can guide us in our negotiations. So utilitarianism may be a poor procedure, but it is the only one on which we can and must agree.28 Rawls' theory of jus-29 tice is immensely influential, but as it only applies to the political choices we make it does not deal with the formal and informal decisions we make in the market or in our daily lives. It is within the domain of civil society that 'utility' as a concept becomes indispensable.

The Hume of EPM assumes that utilities will automatically feed into human transactions and as Smith put it in his famous metaphor of the invisible hand: human beings (the rich in this case) "thus without intending it, without knowing it, advance the interest of society, and afford means to the new plication of the species." Unintended and beneficial effects are part of the way utilities appear. These are big assumptions of course. Why should human transactions always have beneficial or at least functional results? The assumption behind this question is that we have no welfare, no wealth, and no modernity without the cooperation of individuals who can trust each other. Humans only have implicit notions of the good and the bad and they act according to instinct and convention, but they cannot see the good automatically to emerge from their transactions. When we come to think about it the good is itself simple and indefin-
La «Maison des Sciences»:
le cabinet nîmois de Jean-François Séguier (1703-1784)

Au cœur de la cité languedo-
cienne de Nîmes, le cabinet d’antiquités et d’histoire na-
trale de Jean-François Séguier attire, de la «carrière morte du XVIIIe siècle» une foule croissante de visiteurs, comme en témoigne le petit cabaret sur lequel le savant inscrit les noms de ses visiteurs, loin de moins de 1514 noms.2 Naturalistes, collectionneurs ou voyageurs se définissant eux-
mêmes comme des «curieux, plus amateurs que connaisseurs», viennent en admirer la bibliothèque, les plantes rares et la célèbre série de fossiles.3 L’existence même du carnet de visiteurs, source rare dans un contexte privé, invite à s’interroger sur la manière dont Séguier fait de son cabinet un lieu central de la sociabilité nîmoise, et sur la res-
source qui représentent ces voya-
ges pour un savant désigné des grands centres scientifiques. Le cabinet nîmois apparaît ainsi comme un bon observatoire des dynamiques de la science que des travaux récents ont éclairées pour les capitales européennes du XVIIIe siècle, mais qui demeurent encore confidentielles pour les petites villes.4 La visite au savant
Depuis son installation en 1756, au retour de Vérone où Séguier a passé vingt ans auprès du marquis Maffei, le cabinet fait partie de ce qu’il faut voir à Nîmes, à côté des vestiges de la ville antique et de la ville moderne: en août 1768, le négociant Barthelemy Fornier accueille dans le cabinet Marcassus de Puymaurin, épouse du directeur d’une fabrique de draps réputée, suivis de la famille Cardani (ces jésuites), à la maison carrée, aux fabriques, à la fontaine et chez M. de Séguier.5 Il faut pourtant gar-
der en tête qui peu de voyageurs se rendent à Nîmes dans le seul but de visiter le cabinet. L’immense musée «sort en passant», dans le cadre de dépla-
cements ordinaires et fonction-
nels: familles de la noblesse lan-
daise ou provençale se rendent là pour faire une idée assez précise. Le musée et des financiers. Dès 1757, la nouvelle édition du best-seller «Maison de Salomon» rassem-
ble vers Vérone, mais il se
«fruit de ses voyages et de son
long séjour en Italie», lui don-
nant de faire une incroyable
publicité. «On ne parle ici
Monsieur que de votre belle col-
lection de fossiles», lui écrit de Paris en 1759 le comte d’Argenville.6

L’esprit des lieux
La configuration des lieux joue un rôle important dans cette réputation. L’ouverture du

cabinet, en 1773, coïncide avec le déménagement du cabinet dans le nouvel hôtel particulier que Séguier a fait construire dans les faubourgs de Nîmes. Les témoignages des voyageurs, comme ceux du grenoblois Raby et du strasbourgeois Oberlin, permettent de s’en faire une idée assez précise. Le cabinet d’antiquités, le méda-
ilier, l’herbier, la bibliothèque et la salle de réunion de l’académie de Nîmes (dont Séguier est depuis 1765 le secrétaire perpétu-
el) occupent tout le rez-de-
chaussée de la maison, Séguier, sa sœur et les domestiques habi-
tant les étages. La bibliothèque ouvre sur un jardin planté d’ar-
bres fruitiers et de plantes exo-
tiques et parsemé d’inscrip-
tions, au fond duquel l’orange-
rie abrite les collections natura-
les. Une fois franchi le vestibule de la maison, il est donc posi-
tif de voir l’ensemble des collec-
tions sans jamais utiliser la cage d’escalier qui mène aux appartements privés. L’autonomie des lieux distingue le cabinet de Séguier des autres cabinets de la
découverte de poissons fossiles récentes: en octobre 1774, des archéologiques et scientifiques étrangères et des découvertes nouvelles bibliographiques sont venues s'ajouter au flux de contenus académiques qui s'écoulait de la pratique savante: acheminer une source d'informations, un support de la connaissance. Les échanges se multiplient de part et de rencontre: aux missions diplomatiques et artistiques qui éclipsent le côté mondain de la pratique savante: acheminer une source d'informations, un support de la connaissance.

Au sein de l'Europe des Lumières, le courant des échanges naturels est sensible. La démonstration commence en citant l'exemple de Jean-François Séguier, qui a collaboré avec de nombreux savants étrangers, et en particulier avec les collectionneurs parisiens ou les auteurs de grand succès. Les échanges se multiplient et se diversifient, passant de simples échanges de manuscrits à des collaborations plus étroites, notamment dans le cas de Jean-François Séguier et d'Émile Parnet, qui ont collaboré sur de nombreux sujets scientifiques.

La sensibilité du voyage et des récits de voyage témoignent en effet de la façon dont les savants du XVIIIe siècle s'impliquaient dans le monde scientifique et culturel. Les récits de voyage des écrivains étrangers étaient autant de sources d'information sur la vie des savants étrangers, mais aussi sur la façon dont ils s'impliquaient dans les échanges culturels et scientifiques. Les récits de voyage des écrivains étrangers étaient autant de sources d'information sur la vie des savants étrangers, mais aussi sur la façon dont ils s'impliquaient dans les échanges culturels et scientifiques.

La sensibilité du voyage et des récits de voyage témoignent en effet de la façon dont les savants du XVIIIe siècle s'impliquaient dans le monde scientifique et culturel. Les récits de voyage des écrivains étrangers étaient autant de sources d'information sur la vie des savants étrangers, mais aussi sur la façon dont ils s'impliquaient dans les échanges culturels et scientifiques. Les récits de voyage des écrivains étrangers étaient autant de sources d'information sur la vie des savants étrangers, mais aussi sur la façon dont ils s'impliquaient dans les échanges culturels et scientifiques.
A Dialogue between Halle and Göttingen

Johann Gottlob Krüger’s Psychology (Halle) vs. Albrecht von Haller’s Physiology (Göttingen)

Two small German towns

A non-German observer might react with surprise at a subject which puts two small German towns in the spotlight. London, Paris, Vienna, St. Petersburg, maybe Berlin as well—these seem to be the great cities of European Enlightenment: but Halle and Göttingen? Their historical importance is in their debate about the interdependence of mind and body, of sensibility and neurology. Before discussing that, I would like to recall two methodological principles that I find significant for the examination of the 18th century.

First principle: “L’Aulèrânje et le siècle de Lumières”, as Dominique Bourel has claimed, “is bien des unives mentors dispats.” That means, compared to the siècle des Lumières coined by Paris, that both the multiplicity of the German Enlightenment have to be taken into consideration. Here, Halle and Göttingen represent, with their Reform Universities newly founded in 1694 and 1737, a special, academic vitality, which showed itself at the 18th century and bound to the name of scholars such as Thomasius, Wolff, Francke, Stahl and Hoffmann in Halle, and Haller, Breitinger, Lichtenberg, Michaelis and Heyne in Göttingen.

Second principle: About 10 years ago Robert Danston pointed out as the dictum of a historian: “You should not commit Anachronismus,” meaning that one should not misinterpret historical events not recognizing later processes, for instance identifiable changes of paradigm. In order to introduce our topic, the fact that Albrecht von Haller’s (1715–1759) essay on irritability, published in 1753, introduces the change of paradigm from Iatric-Mechanism to Vitalism, lay beyond the comprehension of the scientific research which predominated in the century before 1753. Even “the creator of the vitalistic paradigm consequently remains mechanism.”

In her recent study about Johann Gottlob Krüger (1715–1759), Tanja van Hoorn suggested two things: First: to liberate the academic and theoretic scientific discussions between the polyphonic experiments of Abraham Tremlber in 1742 and Haller’s differentiation between irritability and sensibility in 1753 from post-Enlightenment, by not applying an a-posteriori act of perspective. And, therefore, secondly, to open up the mind to a new synchronic cut in the landscape of debates around 1750. Then one discovers how research on irritability is done with different methods in different places throughout Europe, differentiating dead from living structure with regard to generative, physical or mental power.

In Göttingen, moreover, physical power of one’s own and the help of anatomic, serial testing of the body. In Halle, on the other hand, there is the dominance of the empiric research on mental-physical interdependence, which also involves the scrutiny of mental powers of motivation, as for instance, imagination and mind, but also the influence of fantasy and passions is an important and sensationally followed by a philosopher in Halle as a secret feature of scholars.

The remaining anatomic, physiological and neurologological divergences and consistencies between Göttingen and Halle, shall not be discussed any further. Matters here is the fact that just when Haller directly criticizes Krüger’s “famous study of irritation,” every sensation is followed by a motion, with reference to his experiments about irritability, he, nevertheless, stays conciliatory. Then Haller approves Krüger’s promotion to another university, and hopes for “more pleasant writings by this spirited mind with his clear style, who knows himself.” This leads to the actual field of competence of a literary scholar.

A ‘significant style’

II. The principal tenor of the Göttingen reviews on publications from Halle is the acknowledgement for a significant style, apart from “scientific progress regarding medical contents.” “Everything is put in a mellow, purely German way,” says Haller in 1745. From a Göttingen perspective, this particular style becomes the trademark of Halle and even a criterion of coherence within the Halle doctors, Krüger, with his German scientific publications, appears to be the great stylist, whose clever, spirited, vivid and animating approach, illuminated by “passages of a few poets” and “even open to a joke”, gains recognition.

The stylistic peculiarity of the Halle doctors is astonishing in many ways. First of all, it brings about a coherent, to some extent group-forming effect, although, in terms of contents, the publications represent post-Stahlian, partly Hoffmannian and partly – as in the case of Krüger, – that intend the body’s “Gemeinmäßigkeit” of Ill. Secondly, the stylistic, deliberate vividness of scientific representation, is based on the effort to reform literary presentation inaugurated in Halle, which has, among others, the aim of delivering academic discourse in a pleasant, kindly and also, if necessary, touching way, in order to make the discourse, for instance, as Georg Friedrich Meier puts it – to “make it understandable to everybody.” This alliance with the usage of rhetorical elements, which intentionally opens access for rhetorical elements, figures and tropes, as well as literary means, such as quotations from poetry, aims at the popularisation of natural-scientific knowledge beyond the borders of the Republic of Letters. The usage of German also serves this purpose which presents a significant feature of the Halle publications compared, for example, to the writings of Haller. While in the 40th Krüger initially publishes the editions of his Naturzwecke (4 vols, 1740–1774) in German, to addresses an educated audience, and only later will publish a Latin translate for the academic practice, the case of Halle is totally different. Haller’s entire scientific work is written only in Latin, to target a different public.

Two different methods
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the systematic gathering of case studies attached to his experimental psychology. Krüger opens up a path in terms of method for later, psychological case collections, for instance Moritz’ Erfahrungsreihen, whereas in comparison to Krüger’s approach of observation, Moritz rather concentrates on self-observation for the empirical data acquisition.12

12 Haller’s goodwill IV. Haller’s goodwill towards Krüger, that is testified in the reviews, prevails, in spite of persisting divergences in terms of method and contents. As evidenced by the correspondence handled down, Haller promotes Krüger’s career. Apart from the recommendation of students, the letters have primarily a function as a vehicle to put forward one’s own views on matters. Over a period between 1747 and 1752, there are eight letters from Krüger to Haller, passed down on us, still unpublished.13 Several Haller Doctores come to Göttingen at the suggestion of Krüger, who takes the opportunity to request from Haller a recommendation for himself for a calling in Göttingen, maybe also in Braunschweig or, as noted in a later document of 1749, in Helmstedt. To emphasize the intention to ‘position oneself’, Krüger dedicates the intention to ‘position himself’, as noted in a later document of 1749, in Helmstedt. To emphasize the intention to ‘position oneself’, Krüger dedicates the intention to ‘position

13 8 letters from Krüger to Haller (Benn, Burgarelibthek, Arch. Krüger 1–8).


14 Krüger to Haller, 20. April 1749.

15 Krüger to Haller, 27. Sept. 1747.
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