

Those of us in small countries have no-one to meet in the common room, but lecturers in larger countries often fail to come into the university at all and make use of their opportunities. Our new society could fulfil this need, and benefit all of us.

seminars consisting of people from all over Europe and America working in related fields has immeasurably expanded our knowledge of numerous areas in intellectual history, and I hope that the new society which we are founding will carry on this tradition of such co-operation.

The final sector I claim to represent consists of scholars from small countries speaking strange tongues. Although we do publish in our own languages from time to time, even in our own countries this counts for very little, and indeed is usually not relevant for promotion. In my department of history in Tel-Aviv, many of the lecturers over the age of forty studied in England; those under forty took their doctorates in the United States. We recognize that our intellectual arenas are abroad, and that the languages of scholarship are English, French, and (to some extent) German. We lack the libraries in any case to pursue research in our own countries. A new society for intellectual history

could provide such an arena for scholarship. I think that even scholars from countries large enough to be a world unto themselves could also profit from a new arena. Universities in the West have largely ceased to be a centre of intellectual exchange, in large part because of the introduction of the personal computer. Professors prefer to work at home, away from the distractions of secretaries and students. Those of us in small countries may find that being the only expert, say, in early modern English history in a country of five million carries a certain benefit, but it is ultimately dispiriting. We have no-one to meet in the common room, but lecturers in larger countries often fail to come into the university at all and thus make use of such opportunities. Our new society could fulfil this need, and benefit all of us.

I should like to conclude with a practical suggestion. I think that rather than having only large conferences on general topics, which is often the case with societies of this kind, we should try to sponsor work groups on more specific subjects. The Foundation for Intellectual History, for example, organized a workshop on the Three Impostors at Leiden in 1991, for the purpose of bringing together scholars over the documents themselves to try to understand the problems involved. I think that the ISIH could play a key role in promoting this sort of activity, which hardly finds a place anywhere else.

INTELLECTUAL HISTORY IN DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES

Art History and Intellectual History

*Thomas Frangenberg
Department of Art History,
University of Leicester
(England)*

In 'What is Happening to the History of Ideas?',¹ Donald R. Kelley makes a statement

¹ *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51 (1990): 16 (reprinted in this issue, p. 44).

which could with little modification be applied to Intellectual History as well: 'The history of the arts maintains a modest place in the history of ideas . . .'. This statement is symptomatic of a lack of symmetry which a Society for Intellectual History might help to overcome: the history of art does not count for much in the context of the History of Ideas and of Intellectual History. On the other hand, the History of Ideas and Intellectual History certainly figure most prominently within the history of art.

Art history is an old discipline, to a significant extent inspired by classical precedents. Many of the characteristics of art history as it is

practised today date back to the sixteenth century, and art theory is more than a hundred years older yet. In its long history, art history has, to a greater or lesser extent, always been an interdisciplinary undertaking. This is not to say that all of art can be reduced to phenomena related to Intellectual History. Artistic style, and artistic choices, cannot be completely explained with reference to theories current at the time. None the less, even artistic style has been analyzed with reference to the intellectual and literary culture of its time, perhaps most successfully in the case of studies of sixteenth-century art. The inherent dangers of such undertakings are illustrated in Panofsky's profoundly problematic book on *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, in which he attempted to explain the formal characteristics of French Gothic cathedrals in terms of the mental patterns which he saw at work in contemporary scholasticism.

The branches of scholarship associated with Intellectual History, and of obvious use in the history of art, are too numerous and diversified to all be mentioned here. Only some examples will be given. Iconographic studies bring the scholar into contact with disciplines such as history of religion, political history, social history, the survival of the classics, and literary genres such as ekphrasis, and emblem theory.

Art theory was developed from the models of rhetoric and poetry; literary theory is therefore one of the main tools in studying the theory of art, complemented by textual criticism, the history of philosophy, and numerous disciplines which are crucial as much in the study of art as in the study of art theory and which will be mentioned below. The study of the history of art-theoretical terms, an obvious part of the study of art theory, may also be genuinely illuminating in defining the character of artworks of the same period.

The purpose of art can be addressed with notions derived from poetics and rhetoric or from philosophy; with theories of the functioning of symbols; with the tools provided by the theories of psychology and perception, and many others.

The understanding of art as imitation, based on an ancient theory and crucial in art theory from the fifteenth century onwards, led to the development of techniques of representation which are directly or indirectly based on developments in contemporary science. Thus, the history of science has an important place in art history; the history of medicine accounts for artists' anatomical knowledge; the history of mathematics

and applied mathematics provides the background for the development, and the more or less competent use, of linear perspective; colour theory, botany, and meteorology all attracted the attention of at least some artists, among whom Leonardo holds a place of prominence.

Questions of perception with regard to artworks were discussed already in the sixteenth century (in some instances following classical models), and were elaborated into sophisticated theories in the following centuries; the theory of perception remains a vital area of inquiry in art history today.

An important area of study is the transmission of knowledge to artists, their schooling, their training in the studio, the languages individual artists read, the books they owned, or had access to, and the uses they made of such books. Questions of education are similarly crucial with regard to the patrons who commissioned or collected works of art, and with regard to artistic advisers, who were in individual cases asked to devise the iconography of artworks. The history of book production is itself related to art history, since numerous books, both in manuscript and in print, were decorated by artists.

Lastly, the history of art history is obviously dependent on an interdisciplinary approach. Individual scholars' philosophical notions, their access to scholarly traditions, and their approaches to questions of methodology, document yet again the close links between many of the tasks art historians set themselves, and the disciplines associated with Intellectual History.

Intellectual Histories of Music?

Michael Fend

*Department of Music, King's College,
University of London
(England)*

Since at present even the definition of music has become problematic, I may be forgiven for not being able to answer the question: What is the intellectual history of music? Musicology veers between an older generation of scholars who confidently answer the question: 'What is music?' by writing a monograph, and the admission of one the liveliest younger contributors to the field professing: 'I am no longer sure