

The history of the university

The university and historiography

The university has a grand and extensive past. On ceremonial occasions it tends to be presented as the European societal institution with the longest unbroken tradition, alongside the monarchy, the judicial system, and the Catholic Church. It ought to be possible to write the rich history of the university employing dissimilar focal points; it should be possible to vary its theme. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how limited the historiography of the university has been – and still is.¹

As a genre, university history is an old phenomenon. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Europe's learned community was inspired by the anniversary celebrations of the church to create a secular commemorative culture of its own. The earliest writings of university history were produced against this background, their principal task being to celebrate the *alma mater*. At the end of the eighteenth century, when historiography gradually developed into a form of professional scholarship, academic publications on the history of universities began to appear. Behind these lay a growing need for scholarly self-reflection; but it was the academic anniversaries that continued to give rise to the great majority of works of university history. This situation remained unchanged during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.²

1 This chapter is mainly based on Johan Östling, 'Bortom konventionens gränser: Universitetshistoria som idé- och kunskapshistoria', in *Universitetets gränser*, ed. by Peter Josephson & Thomas Karlsruhn (Göteborg, forthcoming).

2 The historiography and general character of university histories are discussed in Sheldon Rothblatt, 'The Writing of University History at the End of Another Century', *Oxford Review of Education*, 23:2 (1997); Rainer A. Müller, 'Genese, Methoden und Tendenzen der allgemeinen deutschen Universitätsgeschichte: Zur Entwicklung einer historischen Spezialdisziplin', *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte*,

Thus there has been, since the very beginning, a close relationship between university history and the historical jubilees of the academy. Modern historians have pointed out that while this symbiosis has resulted in a large number of publications of university history, the historiography itself has left much to be desired. Sivert Langholm has suggested that the history of universities must be emancipated from the ‘jubilee syndrome’ and needs to contain a critical dimension. He writes, ‘Laudatory speeches should be held at jubilees, but the one genre should not be confused with the other’.³

-
- 20 (2000); Robert M. Friedman, *Integration and Visibility: Historiographic Challenges to University History* (Oslo, 2000); Sylvia Paletschek, *Die permanente Erfindung einer Tradition: Die Universität Tübingen im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik* (Stuttgart, 2001), pp. 1–8; Rüdiger vom Bruch, ‘Methoden und Schwerpunkte der neueren Universitätsgeschichtsforschung’, in *Die Universität Greifswald und die deutsche Hochschullandschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Werner Buchholz (Stuttgart, 2004); Matthias Asche & Stefan Gerber, ‘Neuzeitliche Universitätsgeschichte in Deutschland: Entwicklungslinien und Forschungsfelder’, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 90:1 (2008); Anne Rohstock, ‘The History of Higher Education: Some Conceptual Remarks on the Future of a Research Field’, in *Education Systems in Historical, Cultural, and Sociological Perspectives*, ed. by Daniel Tröhler & Ragnhild Barbu (Rotterdam, 2011); Sylvia Paletschek, ‘Stand und Perspektiven der neueren Universitätsgeschichte’, *N.T.M.*, 19:2 (2011); Sylvia Paletschek, ‘The Writing of University History and University Jubilees: German Examples’, *Studium: Tijdschrift voor Wetenschap- en Universiteitsgeschiedenis / Revue d’Histoire des Sciences et des Universités*, 5:3 (2012); Anders Ahlbäck & Laura Hollsten, ‘Changing the Narratives of University History’, *Kasvatus & Aika*, 9:3 (2015); and Pieter Dhondt, ‘University History Writing: More Than A History of Jubilees?’, in *University Jubilees and University History Writing: A Challenging Relationship*, ed. by Pieter Dhondt (Leiden and Boston, 2015).
- 3 Sivert Langholm, *Helheten och delene: Hvordan skrive en 200 års historie for Universitetet i Oslo?* (Oslo, 1996), pp. 2–3. See also Paletschek, ‘Stand und Perspektiven’; *National, Nordic or European? Nineteenth-Century University Jubilees and Nordic Cooperation*, ed. by Pieter Dhondt (Leiden and Boston, 2011); and *University Jubilees and University History Writing: A Challenging Relationship*, ed. by Pieter Dhondt (Leiden and Boston, 2015). Gunnar Broberg has pointed out that few ‘genres are as tightly bound to jubilees’ as traditional university history; it belongs to ‘the same world as medals, fireworks, and laudatory speeches’. In addition, he continues, few genres seem to ‘contain as little self-reflection’. See Gunnar Broberg, ‘Från jubileumshistoria till komparativ universitetshistoria’, in *Nordiska universitetskulturer*, ed. by Sten Högnäs (Lund, 1998), p. 15.

However, the criticism does not stop with the fact that a good deal of such university history has consisted of self-justification. A significant majority of all works published during the twentieth century dealt with individual universities, works that were almost without exception written by academics with strong connections to the universities in question. Sheldon Rothblatt speaks of ‘the house history, the general biography of a single university’. Far from all of these writers were historians, and they were far from always linked to newer currents within historical research. In spite of the fact that many books were sound and based on solid empirical investigations, too many writers neglected to put their respective universities into wider social, political, or intellectual contexts. These authors were limited by their own complacency.⁴

In addition to the jubilee syndrome and the focus on an author’s own university, another characteristic can be distinguished in the historiography of the university. Based on German evidence, Matthias Asche and Stefan Gerber argue that university history as a genre has flourished in periods of academic crisis and rapid change. They highlight the decades around the year 1800 and the period from the founding of the German Empire to the First World War as illustrative examples. During these periods the university and its understanding of itself was rocked to its foundations, and this seems to have given rise to a need for examining the historical development of the institution. It is a noteworthy observation. Asche and Gerber see a limitation here, because that connection makes the field of university history over-sensitive to temporal phenomena: not only is it influenced by the recurring academic jubilees, it also tends to flourish whenever the university system goes through rapid change. The first aspect is certainly true, and it has hampered research in the history of the university. However, I find it difficult to see that the second circumstance is a significant problem. Important historical writing feeds off of contemporary issues; it takes hold of and reflects the predicaments of its own time. If anything, the fact that university history is brought to the fore whenever the academic world is being restructured is a testimony to the importance of the topic.⁵

The scholarly history of the university that was written during the past century had varying emphases, but broadly speaking four

4 Rothblatt, ‘The Writing of University History’, 154.

5 Asche & Gerber, ‘Neuzeitliche Universitätsgeschichte’, 159–67; vom Bruch, ‘Methoden und Schwerpunkte’.

specific trends dominated. In the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars engaged in a form of *Geistesgeschichte* in which history was described as a series of consecutive ideas about the nature of the university where the distinction between ideal and reality was not always obvious. Another important approach focused on the university as an institution. Its organisation, administration, financing, and so on were analysed from the perspective of structural history. In the 1960s and 1970s a current of social history emerged, and the social conditions and recruitment mechanisms of the academic system came under scrutiny. The fourth trend, derived from the history of science, regarded the university as primarily an arena of science and scholarship. This approach dealt with disciplines and research environments, but also with individual researchers and over-arching paradigms.⁶

Since the mid-1990s, the history of the university has had something of a renaissance: the field has been vitalised, not least in the German-speaking world. Like the subject of history per se, university history has been transformed through the influence of linguistic and cultural theories. The rituals, myths, and conceptual worlds of the academy have become central areas of research. Other catalysts have been gender history, media history, and studies of systems of power and organisational systems. The chronological focus has shifted, and the modern era has been brought into focus. Several analysts, among them Sylvia Paletschek, have connected this reawakening within university history to the radical changes in academic reality around the year 2000. In Germany, in addition, the experiences of two dictatorships have led to a need for a historical reckoning, a kind of academic *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (approx. ‘coming to terms with the past’). The many studies of the universities under the Nazi and Communist regimes have raised burning issues concerning the relationship between politics and science/scholarship and the responsibility of the individual researcher.⁷

Despite the existence of important impulses for renewal, much of the university history that is being written is still embarrassingly conventional, as if the historiography is shackled by generic demands and jubilatory expectations. This is unfortunate; the subject contains

6 Asche & Gerber, ‘Neuzeitliche Universitätsgeschichte’, 186 and 191.

7 Asche & Gerber, ‘Neuzeitliche Universitätsgeschichte’; Paletschek, ‘Stand und Perspektiven’; Paletschek, ‘The Writing of University History’; Rohstock, ‘The History of Higher Education’; Johan Östling, ‘Universitetshistoria: Friska vindar över gammalt fält’, *Respons*, 2015:2.

too many potential insights to be left to collectors of anecdotes and writers of chronicles. For this reason, I will present a framework drawn from intellectual history and the history of knowledge which may provide university history with relevant themes and methods.

University history as intellectual history and history of knowledge

Writing university history as intellectual history may seem puzzling, almost tautological in fact, because the history of ideas as an academic field has traditionally included the history of universities. In this case the history of ideas should primarily be understood as an equivalent of what is known in English as ‘intellectual history’. Peter E. Gordon has discussed what distinguishes this field from others in an instructive manner. Defining the field as ‘the study of intellectuals, ideas, and intellectual patterns over time’ is factually correct; but in order to create a clearer focus, he compares intellectual history to the ‘history of ideas’. In the latter case, researchers have traditionally concentrated on key ideas and how these have changed over the course of history. ‘An historian of ideas’, writes Gordon, ‘will tend to organize the historical narrative around one major idea and will then follow the development or metamorphosis of that idea as it manifests itself in different contexts and times.’⁸

8 Peter E. Gordon, ‘What is Intellectual History? A Frankly Partisan Introduction to a Frequently Misunderstood Field’ (2013), p. 2, http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/pgordon/files/what_is_intell_history_pgordon_mar2012.pdf (accessed 15 February 2016). For general discussions regarding the history of ideas, intellectual history, *Geistesgeschichte*, *Ideengeschichte*, etc., see Donald R. Kelley, *The Descent of Ideas: The History of Intellectual History* (Aldershot, 2002); Anthony Grafton, ‘The History of Ideas: Precept and Practice, 1950–2000 and Beyond’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 67:1 (2006); and Riccardo Bavaj, ‘Intellectual History, Version 1.0’, in *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte*, http://docupedia.de/zg/Intellectual_History?oldid=106434 (accessed 15 February 2016). Several publications testify to a renewed interest in the history of ideas and intellectual history in the twenty-first century, in both North America and Germany; see, e.g., Ulrich Raulff, Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, & Hellmut Th. Seemann, ‘Einen Anfang machen: Warum wir eine Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte gründen’, *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte*, 1 (2007); Alexander Gallus, ‘“Intellectual History” mit Intellektuellen und ohne sie: Facetten neuerer geistesgeschichtlicher Forschung’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 288:1 (2009); *Global Intellectual History*, ed. by Samuel Moyn & Andrew Sartori (New York, 2013); and *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, ed. by Darrin M. McMahon & Samuel Moyn (Oxford, 2014).

One advantage of this approach is that it is possible to discern intellectual similarities and continuities even when the chronological distance between two phenomena is very great. The classic representative of this type of history of ideas was Arthur O. Lovejoy and his *The Great Chain of Being* (1936). Although Lovejoy's own arguments were more complex than many later scholars have been willing to admit, he was accused of espousing a kind of Platonic view of ideas, where major thoughts and concepts were fundamentally the same throughout history and different manifestations of them were simply variations on eternal themes.⁹

A radical alternative to this older form of history of ideas was expressed by Quentin Skinner and what would become known as the Cambridge School. In a famous essay from 1969, Skinner attacked a context-free, diachronic history of ideas à la Lovejoy. Instead Skinner argued for the notion that ideas can only be understood in specific historical contexts, as responses to contemporary questions or as interventions in ongoing debates. In a large number of studies on the history of political thinking, he and his successors analysed how so-called speech acts worked in both well-known and not so well-known texts. The Cambridge School has, in its turn, been criticised for, among other things, limiting the concept of context and reducing history to a kind of rhetorical struggle.¹⁰

Peter E. Gordon's version of intellectual history represents a fruitful attempt to bridge the gap between Lovejoy's and Skinner's extreme positions. Gordon considers ideas to be 'historically conditioned features of the world which are best understood within some larger context'. The crucial point is the context of the ideas in question – whether this consists of institutions, social environments, economic factors, or broader cultural and linguistic patterns. Sometimes the context is toned down in favour of a more internalist analysis, but in general the aim with this approach to intellectual history is to

9 Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea* (Cambridge, MA, 1936); Grafton, 'The History of Ideas'.

10 Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory*, 8:1 (1969). There are a large number of works on Skinner. See, e.g., *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. by James Tully (Cambridge, 1988); Emile Perreau-Saussine, 'Quentin Skinner in Context', *The Review of Politics*, 69:1 (2007); Joseph M. Levine, 'Intellectual History as History', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 66:2 (2005); and Martin Jay, 'Historical Explanation and the Event: Reflections on the Limits of Contextualization', *New Literary History*, 42:4 (2011).

introduce the ideas into larger structures or locate them in relation to other contemporary forces.¹¹

This is the spirit in which I write the history of the university as intellectual history. At the centre is an intellectual reflection on basic academic issues, but not in isolation from the surrounding world. Throughout, I combine analyses of distinct periods with changes over the longer course of history. In order to fill this framework from intellectual history with specific content from university history, I turn to the emerging field designated as the history of knowledge.

The history of knowledge (*Wissensgeschichte*) deals, at least as the field has developed in German-speaking countries during the twenty-first century, with the forms of more or less rational knowledge, more precisely the social production and circulation of knowledge. So far, however, there is no consensus about what the history of knowledge comprises; and according to Daniel Speich Chassé and David Gugerli in their attempt at articulating a position, the word *Wissensgeschichte* is used without any precise meaning. There are no normative handbooks; there is no established canon.¹²

The Zentrum Geschichte des Wissens ('The Centre for the History of Knowledge') in Zürich has been of major importance for the establishment of the history of knowledge as a field of research. According to the Swiss historians, when working with the history of knowledge 'our common starting point is ... an assumption: We assume that the historical development of knowledge – with all its epistemic, technological, and cultural premises as well as its consequences – has to be understood as an open-ended process'. The important thing is that knowledge – not scholarship, not culture, not ideas – is foregrounded, and that it is placed in relation to a larger societal context.¹³

Philipp Sarasin, one of the leading theoreticians among the Zürich scholars, has emphasised that knowledge is always developing,

11 Gordon, 'What is Intellectual History?', p. 2.

12 Daniel Speich Chassé & David Gugerli, 'Wissensgeschichte: Eine Standortbestimmung', *Traverse: Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 1 (2012).

13 Philipp Sarasin, 'Was ist Wissensgeschichte?', *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur (IASL)*, 36:1 (2011); Speich Chassé & Gugerli, 'Wissensgeschichte'; Johan Östling, 'Vad är kunskapshistoria?', *Historisk tidskrift*, 135:1 (2015); Peter Burke, *What Is the History of Knowledge?* (Cambridge, 2016). Presentation of the Center 'History of Knowledge' at its website, <https://www.zgw.ethz.ch/en/portrait.html> (accessed 15 February 2016).

changing, and being realised anew through its movement among various social spheres. He highlights the fact that knowledge circulates among people and groups because sign systems and discourses can, in principle, cross institutional, social, political, and geographical borders. This is not to say that knowledge is freely disseminated and evenly distributed. But it does mean that knowledge can, intrinsically, be mediated and circulated, and that it can interact with other fields of knowledge. Through these processes, knowledge is simultaneously transformed.¹⁴

In this respect, knowledge is considered a genuinely historical phenomenon. The central issues have nothing to do with certain forms of knowledge being good or bad, useful or useless, but simply with how, when, and why a certain type of knowledge appears and possibly vanishes, and, ultimately, what effects it has, in what contexts it appears, who are its bearers, in what forms it is manifested, and so forth. In studying the history of knowledge, one must therefore take into account what was considered to be knowledge at a given time and in a given context – and what was not.¹⁵

Writing a history of the university as a history of knowledge implies an important clarification: discussions about the idea of the university are not just part of a public debate on ideas or a national tradition. They represent an aspect of the changing nature and institutional foundations of knowledge: the kind of knowledge that is worth achieving, the way in which it is generated and mediated, what its organisation and structure look like, and so on.

Together, recent intellectual history and *Wissensgeschichte* provide a general direction for my investigation into the history of the university. Within both these fields there are, in addition, a number of concepts and methods that can lend stringency and stability to the analysis. However, before I explain in greater detail what this means, the subject matter of my research needs to be introduced.

The history of the Humboldtian tradition

The aim of this study is to create a historical understanding of the Humboldtian tradition and its varying meanings during the modern era. One key task is to investigate the significance of the classic university model (more or less associated with Wilhelm von Humboldt) and how this model has changed over time. At the same

14 Sarasin, 'Wissensgeschichte', 165–66.

15 *Ibid.*, 165.

time, the analysis must be expanded and the debates about the idea of the university must be put in relation to broader patterns of thought. It is especially important to consider the intellectual groupings that interpreted the mission and the basic ideals of the German university. All in all, this provides a basis for reflecting on the place of the Humboldtian tradition in modern German history and its relevance today. This way, the rich German university history is used in order to provide a perspective on the academic self-understanding of our own time.

All attempts to reform a cultural or social institution rest on a set of ideas about the mission and function of this institution. This is especially true of research and higher education. As has been emphasised by Björn Wittrock, the idea of the university cannot be seen as ‘a free-floating abstraction but a guiding conception, rooted in the experiences, traditions, and life-worlds of individuals’. Since the Enlightenment, these ideals have been tested and retested as society has changed. However, none of the major university reforms can be seen solely as a response to the emergence of modernity. ‘They occurred because leaders, thinkers, scholars, and scientists continually questioned the basic nature and meaning of higher learning’, argues Wittrock.¹⁶

One of the most important of these ‘guiding conceptions’, at least today, is the one associated with Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835). This is true not only in Germany but also in the many countries that have been influenced by the German academic model. In the twenty-first century, the main features of the Humboldtian university programme are often summarised through a set of concepts or slogans: the combination of research and teaching; academic freedom (often expressed as *Lehr- and Lernfreiheit*); education rather than training; the idea of the unity of science and scholarship; and the community of students and teachers.¹⁷ Coupled to these academic ideals is a historiography in which the Berlin university emerges as the first modern research university, an institution that

16 Björn Wittrock, ‘The Modern University: The Three Transformations’, in *The European and American University since 1800: Historical and Sociological Essays*, ed. by Sheldon Rothblatt & Björn Wittrock (Cambridge, 1993), p. 347. See also Jens Erik Kristensen, ‘Gamle og nye ideer med et universitet’, in *Ideer om et universitet: Det moderne universitets idehistorie fra 1800 til i dag*, ed. by Jens Erik Kristensen and others (Århus, 2007), p. 19.

17 The specific ideals that are associated with Wilhelm von Humboldt or the Humboldtian university model vary somewhat, but in all essentials the same things recur. On this issue, compare texts as different as *German Universities*

was to provide the model for how research and higher education would be conducted both in and outside Germany.¹⁸

What is customarily presented as an unbroken line of ideas – the Humboldtian tradition – is, however, a much more complex affair. Recent research has problematised both its origins and its development. First, researchers have asked just how original Wilhelm von Humboldt was while emphasising the importance of other German New Humanist philosophers.¹⁹ Second, it became clear that it was a long time before the model had any impact outside of Berlin. And when it was exported, it was always transformed when encountering foreign university cultures.²⁰

Last but not least, a more radical historicisation of the Humboldtian tradition has begun. Somewhat simplified, it may be said that the leading idea in the new research is that Humboldt was

Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?, ed. by Mitchell G. Ash (Providence, RI, 1997); Marc Schalenberg, *Humboldt auf Reisen? Die Rezeption des 'deutschen Universitätsmodells' in den französischen und britischen Reformdiskursen (1810–1870)* (Basel, 2002), pp. 59–62; Sylvia Paletschek, 'Die Erfindung der Humboldtschen Universität: Die Konstruktion der deutschen Universitätsidee in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts', *Historische Anthropologie*, 10 (2002), 184; Robert D. Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914* (Oxford, 2004), p. 51; 'Humboldtsches Bildungsideal', *Wikipedia*, https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humboldtsches_Bildungsideal (accessed 15 February 2016); Mitchell G. Ash, 'Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Transformations of Higher Education in Germany and the US', *European Journal of Education*, 41:2 (2006), 246; and Anne Rohstock, "'Some Things Never Change": The (Re)Invention of Humboldt in Western Higher Education Systems', in *Theories of Bildung and Growth: Connections and Controversies between Continental European Educational Thinking and American Pragmatism*, ed. by Pauli Siljander & Arno Kivelä (Rotterdam, 2012), pp. 172–73.

18 Paletschek, 'The Writing of University History', pp. 151–52.

19 Rüdiger vom Bruch, 'Abschied von Humboldt? Die deutsche Universität vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg', in *Die deutsche Universität im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Karl Strobel (Vierow, 1994); *A History of the University in Europe: Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800–1945)*, ed. by Walter Rüegg (Cambridge, 2004). In a way, this insight has been present long before now, for instance in *Die Idee der deutschen Universität: Die fünf Grundschriften aus der Zeit ihrer Neubegründung durch klassischen Idealismus und romantischen Realismus*, ed. by Ernst Anrich (Darmstadt, 1956).

20 *Humboldt international: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Rainer Christoph Schwinges (Basel, 2001); Schalenberg, *Humboldt auf Reisen?*

born not in 1810, but in 1910. Underlying this drastic statement is the realisation that Humboldt was never particularly present in the nineteenth-century debate about the university. His writings were unknown, his ideas were not widely disseminated, and it was the reform universities in Halle and Göttingen rather than the one in Berlin that formed the points of reference. But at the turn of the twentieth century, Humboldt was suddenly discovered. His manifesto about the university was published and became famous when the Berlin university celebrated its centenary in 1910. At the same time, influential educational politicians and pedagogues such as Adolf von Harnack and Eduard Spranger disseminated his ideas.²¹

Mitchell G. Ash, Rüdiger vom Bruch, Sylvia Paletschek, Walter Rüegg, and other leading representatives of the new research agree:

21 The most important contributions to this new research are Walter Rüegg, 'Der Mythos der Humboldtschen Universität', in *Universitas in theologia-theologia in universitate: Festschrift für Hans Heinrich Schmid*, ed. by Mathias Krieg & Martin Rose (Zürich, 1997); *German Universities*, ed. by Ash; Rüdiger vom Bruch, 'A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the History of German Universities, 1810–1945', in *German Universities Past and Future*, ed. by Ash; Paletschek, *Die permanente Erfindung*; Sylvia Paletschek, 'Verbreitete sich ein "Humboldt'sches Modell" an den deutschen Universitäten im 19. Jahrhundert?', in *Humboldt international*, ed. by Schwinges; Sylvia Paletschek, 'The Invention of Humboldt and the Impact of National Socialism: The German University Idea in the First Half of the Twentieth Century', in *Science in the Third Reich*, ed. by Margit Szöllösi-Janze (Oxford, 2001); Paletschek, 'Die Erfindung'; Schalenberg, *Humboldt auf Reisen?*; Dieter Langewiesche, 'Die "Humboldtsche Universität" als nationaler Mythos: Zum Selbstbild der deutschen Universitäten im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 290:1 (2010); Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 'Wilhelm von Humboldts (1776–1835) Universitätskonzept und die Reform in Berlin – eine Tradition jenseits des Mythos', *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, N.F. XX:1 (2010); and Dieter Langewiesche, 'Humboldt als Leitbild? Die deutsche Universität in den Berliner Rektoratsreden seit dem 19. Jahrhundert', *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, 14 (2011). Critiques of this field of research can be found in Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 4–5, Martin Eichler, 'Die Wahrheit des Mythos Humboldt', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 294:1 (2012), and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 'Wilhelm von Humboldt, ein Philosoph als Bildungspolitiker: Zuschreibungen, historische Praxis, fortdauernde Herausforderung', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*, 69:2 (2017). See also the contributions in *The Humboldtian Tradition: Origins and Legacies*, ed. by Peter Josephson, Thomas Karlsohn, & Johan Östling (Leiden and Boston, 2014), in particular the discussion in Peter Josephson, Thomas Karlsohn, & Johan Östling, 'The Humboldtian Tradition and Its Transformations'.

the discovery of Humboldt during the early twentieth century must be linked with the general development of the German Empire in the decades preceding the First World War. This was a dynamic phase in which science and scholarship, education, and historiography became essential components of the cultural identity that was being shaped in the young German nation state. In addition, Humboldt's principles legitimised trends in the scholarly/scientific community, in particular the increasing importance given to research during these decades.²² This new historicising research – which I have reason to discuss in greater detail in Chapters 2 and 3 – contains key insights: what was presented as a meta-historical idea, the Humboldtian tradition, in fact became entangled in the predicaments of various periods, by turns inspiring criticism, reform, and glorification of former greatness.

Almost all research about the Humboldtian tradition has dealt with the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, whereas the most recent hundred years have been unevenly illuminated. In a way this is a paradox, because there seems to be a consensus that it was during the twentieth century, and in particular during the years after the Second World War, that the university was radically transformed and many time-honoured ideals were fundamentally challenged.²³ For this reason, the chronological focus of this study is the period after 1945. For a long time there was no research-based historical knowledge concerning this period, especially with respect to the transformation of the basic ideals of the university. Many opinions were based on general assumptions or personal memories.²⁴ In the course of the

22 Paletschek, 'Die Erfindung'. See also Chapters 2 and 3 below.

23 See, for instance, Konrad H. Jarausch, 'The Humboldt Syndrome: West German Universities, 1945–1989', in *German Universities Past and Future*, ed. by Ash, and Hans-Albrecht Koch, *Die Universität: Geschichte einer europäischen Institution* (Darmstadt, 2008).

24 This became apparent in the fourth and final volume of the substantial historical account of the universities of Europe, *A History of the University in Europe: Universities since 1945*, ed. by Walter Rüegg (Cambridge, 2011). This work contains many interesting facts about post-war universities, but in countless areas it was impossible to conceal the lack of well-founded knowledge to build on. As a result, several chapters mainly consist of statistical summaries and official reports. The larger historical picture becomes blurred, and the deeper contexts remain unexplained. See Johan Östling, 'Universiteten hämmas av krav på effektivitet', *Svenska Dagbladet*, 17 October 2011, and Anne Rohstock, 'Walter Rüegg (Hg.): Geschichte der Universität in Europa', *sehpunkte*, 12:1 (2012).

last few years, however, more detailed research has been conducted about the post-war period, in Germany and in other countries. For example, thanks to studies by Olaf Bartz, Anne Rohstock, Nikolai Wehrs, Barbara Wolbring, and others, the reform debates, research policy, and academic culture of the old Federal Republic have begun to assume firmer outlines.²⁵ In a wider perspective, their works are also a sign that broad themes in the intellectual history of the post-war era are gradually being subjected to historical analysis. I have every reason to revisit this newer research on university history in the ensuing chapters.²⁶

25 Olaf Bartz, *Der Wissenschaftsrat: Entwicklungslinien der Wissenschaftspolitik in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1957–2007* (Stuttgart, 2007); Boris Spix, *Abschied vom Elfenbeinturm? Politisches Verhalten Studierender 1957–1967: Berlin und Nordrhein-Westfalen im Vergleich* (Essen, 2008); Anne Rohstock, *Von der ‘Ordinarienuniversität’ zur ‘Revolutionszentrale’? Hochschulreform und Hochschulrevolte in Bayern und Hessen 1957–1976* (Munich, 2010); Stefan Paulus, *Vorbild USA? Amerikanisierung von Universität und Wissenschaft in Westdeutschland 1945–1976* (Munich, 2010); Konstantin von Freytag-Loringhoven, *Erziehung im Kollegienhaus: Reformbestrebungen an den deutschen Universitäten der amerikanischen Besatzungszone 1945–1960* (Stuttgart, 2012); Uwe Rohwedder, *Kalter Krieg und Hochschulreform: Der Verband Deutscher Studentenschaften in der frühen Bundesrepublik (1949–1969)* (Essen, 2012); Barbara Wolbring, *Trümmerfeld der bürgerlichen Welt: Universität in den gesellschaftlichen Reformdiskursen der westlichen Besatzungszonen (1945–1949)* (Göttingen, 2014); Nikolai Wehrs, *Protest der Professoren: Der ‘Bund Freiheit der Wissenschaft’ in den 1970er Jahren* (Göttingen, 2014); *Universität, Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit in Westdeutschland: (1945 bis ca. 1970)*, ed. by Sebastian Brandt et al. (Stuttgart, 2014); and Moritz Mälzer, *Auf der Suche nach der neuen Universität: Die Entstehung der ‘Reformuniversitäten’: Konstanz und Bielefeld in den 1960er Jahren* (Göttingen, 2016). See, in addition, two of the most important studies on the university in East Germany: Ralph Jessen, *Akademische Elite und kommunistische Diktatur: Die ostdeutsche Hochschullehrerschaft in der Ulbricht-Ära* (Göttingen, 1999) and John Connelly, *Captive University: The Sovietization of East German, Czech and Polish Higher Education, 1945–1956* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2000).

26 A. Dirk Moses, ‘Intellectual History in and of the Federal Republic of Germany’, *Modern Intellectual History*, 9:3 (2012). For significant, more recent contributions, see, e.g., Jens Hacke, *Philosophie der Bürgerlichkeit: Die liberal-konservative Begründung der Bundesrepublik* (Göttingen, 2006); A. Dirk Moses, *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past* (Cambridge, 2007); Marcus Payk, *Der Geist der Demokratie: Intellektuelle Orientierungsversuche im Feuilleton der frühen Bundesrepublik: Karl Korn und Peter de Mendelssohn* (Munich, 2008); and Philipp Felsch, *Der lange Sommer der*

The form and content of the Humboldtian tradition

My aim is thus to explore the history of the Humboldtian tradition during the modern era: how it has been interpreted and transformed, and how it has provided direction to the debate on the idea of the university. The twin approaches of intellectual history and the history of knowledge supply a general framework for my examination, as well as providing me with concrete categories and methodological tools.

A key methodological question within intellectual history is whether it is possible to combine a *longue durée* of ideas with analyses of central political, ethical, and scholarly scientific concepts. David Armitage has argued that it would be fruitful to follow a complex of ideas over a long period while simultaneously dealing with its manifestations during a specific stage. For him it is not a matter of returning to Lovejoy, but of extending the chronological horizon.²⁷

Armitage emphasises three methodological strategies for producing studies of intellectual history covering longer stretches of time. First, he advocates *transtemporal history*. Transnational history is about connections and comparisons among geographical units without for that reason discounting nations. Similarly, transtemporal history brings contexts, events, and periods together and makes them subjects of analysis without the specific contexts being suppressed or denied. ‘Transtemporal history is not transhistorical’, emphasises Armitage, ‘it is time-bound not timeless’. In contradistinction to the older history of ideas, actors are of major importance, as are questions regarding how ideas are actually transferred, passed on, and received.²⁸

Second, transtemporal history should be done using what Armitage calls *serial contextualism*. By this he means that a historian

Theorie: Geschichte einer Revolte 1960–1990 (Munich, 2015); and also a number of anthologies, such as *Streit um den Staat: Intellektuelle Debatten in der Bundesrepublik 1960–1980*, ed. by Dominik Geppert & Jens Hacke (Göttingen, 2008); *Was war Bielefeld? Eine ideengeschichtliche Nachfrage*, ed. by Sonja Asal & Stephan Schlak (Göttingen, 2009); and *Rückblickend in die Zukunft: Politische Öffentlichkeit und intellektuelle Positionen in Deutschland um 1950 und um 1930*, ed. by Alexander Gallus & Axel Schildt (Göttingen, 2011).

27 David Armitage, ‘What’s the Big Idea? Intellectual History and the *Longue Durée*’, *History of European Ideas*, 38:4 (2012). In *The History Manifesto* (Cambridge, 2014), David Armitage and Jo Guldi also argue enthusiastically for the necessity of long chronological periods in historical studies.

28 Armitage, ‘Big Idea’, 498.

reconstructs a series of synchronous contexts within which clearly distinguishable actors use language in a strategic manner in order to realise their goals. This procedure bears the unmistakable imprint of Skinner, but according to Armitage there is nothing to prevent several distinct contexts from being linked in a larger analytic chain. In this way it is possible to write a transtemporal history that is neither based on artificial units nor on deceptive continuities.²⁹

The combination of transtemporal history and linked contexts ultimately gives rise to what Armitage calls a *history in ideas*. Writing the history of specific ideas becomes a transtemporal narrative encompassing several decades or even centuries. The ideas that form the structure of the account cannot, however, be seen as independent phenomena with an existence of their own, but as ‘focal points of arguments shaped and debated episodically across time with a conscious – or at least a provable – connection with both earlier and later instances of such struggles’. The idea at the centre of a given study is linked to both earlier and later counterparts, and dialogues across time are brought to the fore.³⁰

David Armitage’s methodological programme is couched in general terms, but it is well suited as a point of departure for anyone wishing to write university history as intellectual history. It is particularly applicable to a study of the idea of the university in which it is possible to follow how a configuration of ideas is given different meanings and serves different purposes in distinct periods of time. In the specific case under discussion, this means that the most significant periods of reform from the past century will be foregrounded. For, as has been emphasised by Peter Lundgreen, it is precisely the periods of reform in the history of the university that are especially interesting to study. This is when the intellectual heritage of the institution is brought to life and old ideals are highlighted and placed in contrast to new visions for the future.³¹

Within each period, an analysis drawn from intellectual history is combined with an approach taken from the history of knowledge. In the version of the latter that has been evolved by the Zürich School, genealogies and structural orders of knowledge play a preponderant

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid., 499.

31 Peter Lundgreen, ‘Mythos Humboldt Today: Teaching, Research, and Administration’, in *German Universities Past and Future*, ed. by Ash. See also *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, 13 (2010), which deals with university reforms.

role. This is not the case here. It is true that I wish to understand the origins of the Humboldtian tradition, but not by being genealogical in Michel Foucault's sense of the term. Rather, I follow an intellectual line of thought found in German pedagogical and institutional thinking in order to investigate how the Humboldtian tradition has been reinterpreted in different periods of history. But there are a number of other analytical concepts, drawn directly from the arsenal provided by the history of knowledge, which lend structure to my study: the media forms, actors, concepts, and spaces of knowledge.

The media forms of knowledge takes as its premise the idea that knowledge is in some sense always formatted. That is to say, it does not exist as a pure substance, but entails the need for media for storage, transport, or reproduction. Media conventions simultaneously enable and constrain the creation and transformation of knowledge.³² For me, this becomes primarily a matter of paying attention to those genre conventions that shaped the form of presentation with regard to different historical contexts. In concrete terms, I will identify a number of theoretical core texts concerning the university from each era. Since the end of the eighteenth century in Germany, it is possible to identify a set of texts that have had the 'idea of the university' as their theme. Renowned philosophers and authors, such as Kant, Schiller, Fichte, Schelling, and Schleiermacher, were responsible for several of the earlier ones, and during the twentieth century several of the leading thinkers in Germany contributed to this body of texts as well. The publication of such texts seems to have been particularly frequent during periods when the university was undergoing a crisis or was on the eve of a major transformation. These texts constitute the foundational empirical sources for this study.³³

These theoretical texts about the university can be considered a genre of their own.³⁴ This does not mean that they constitute a type of

32 Sarasin, 'Wissensgeschichte', 168–69.

33 For the 'idea of the university' in general in the German and the English traditions, see Sheldon Rothblatt, *The Modern University and Its Discontents: The Fate of Newman's Legacies in Britain and America* (London, 1997), pp. 1–49.

34 Heinz-Elmar Tenorth has argued that from the end of the nineteenth century there was 'a distinct genre of a literature of reflection' that dealt with the idea of the university. He does not, however, specify what characterises this genre. Heinz-Elmar Tenorth, 'Genese der Disziplinen – Die Konstitution der Universität', in *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden: Genese der Disziplinen: Die Konstitution der Universität*, ed. by Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (Berlin, 2010), p. 10.

text that exhibits conventions and stylistic features that are eternally valid. Rather, I count myself among those who see genre as a kind of manifestation of an abstract structure. Tzvetan Todorov belongs to this group. He regards a genre as a theoretical unit constructed by an observer after the fact. According to Todorov, these units are both prescriptive (like a grammar) and changeable (because of recurring creative innovations).³⁵ It is only posterity that can bring together the philosophical tracts concerning the university to form a genre, even though these are united by a common topic. This is not to say that the texts lacked a reciprocal relationship with one another in their own time. Not everyone who wrote a contribution was aware of the longer tradition, but they conspicuously often made references to older contributions. For instance, when Helmut Schelsky, one of the true protagonists of this book, published his writings about the university in the 1960s, he not only entered into a dialogue with Wilhelm von Humboldt, but also with Max Scheler and Carl Heinrich Becker. The ideological and intellectual arguments about the university took the form of intertextual exchanges of opinions across several generations.³⁶

Within the framework of a common, genre-unifying theme – the idea of the university – approaches, focuses, and tones could vary considerably over time. Clarifying what these variations looked like is a significant aspect of my analysis of the history of the Humboldtian tradition. From the perspective of the history of knowledge, it is also important to take note of the concrete variations in the genre’s media context, though this is not one of my main concerns. For example, during the early post-war period the basic issues of the university were mostly discussed in the form of written speeches that were subsequently printed, while debate books, often of a more voluminous type, were common two decades later. These texts in their turn generated articles in newspapers and journals.

If genre is one of the basic analytical categories, *knowledge actors* is another. Ultimately, this has to do with characterising the personages

35 Chapter 1, ‘Literary Genres’, in Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*, trans. by Richard Howard (Ithaca, NY, 1975).

36 Helmut Schelsky, *Einsamkeit und Freiheit: Idee und Gestalt der deutschen Universität und ihrer Reformen* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1963). In some cases the intertextual connection is completely clear: in *Theorie der Unbildung: Die Irrtümer der Wissensgesellschaft* (Vienna, 2006), Konrad Paul Liessmann expressly attempts to update Theodor W. Adorno’s theses from ‘Theorie der Halbbildung’ (1959) and apply them to the Bologna process. See Chapter 6.

who interpreted the Humboldtian tradition and placing them in their respective contexts. My point of departure is that in each historical period, there was a specific group of people who shaped the view of the cardinal academic issues. They were not in sole control of the debate, but they did leave their unmistakable imprint upon it. The German mandarins appear to have played an especially important role. According to Fritz K. Ringer's influential *The Decline of the German Mandarins* (1969), the mandarins made up a social and intellectual class which, by virtue of their education and academic status, held a special position in German society. Their golden age was the decades around the year 1900; but during the Weimar Republic they were still powerful, and their legacy survived far longer than that. In their perceptions of themselves, the mandarins were bearers of culture (*Kulturträger*), and they felt that they had a special calling to direct the spiritual progress of the nation. In Nazi Germany many of them gave passive or active support to the regime; but there were also those who stayed away from political power and who, after the end of the war, were able to step forward on to the academic stage again. In historical research the concept of the mandarin has been a contested one, and it has often, for Ringer but even more so for other scholars, had simultaneously descriptive and polemical dimensions.³⁷

I, however, use the concept of the mandarin in a purely analytic manner in order to determine whether there were biographical and intellectual aspects that united the major players in the debate on the university during a particular period. It is equally important to assess whether there were common generational experiences that formed the basis for their attitude to the classic German university model. In addition, when the mandarins are seen as a kind of knowledge actors, it is important to understand the significance of the Humboldtian tradition to their identities as academics and scholars or scientists.³⁸

37 Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, MA, 1969). A discussion of Ringer and the criticism levelled at him can be found in James C. Albisetti, 'The Decline of the German Mandarins After Twenty-Five Years', *History of Education Quarterly*, 34:4 (1994). See also Claus-Dieter Krohn, 'Intellektuelle und Mandarine in Deutschland um 1930 und 1950', in *Rückblickend in die Zukunft*, ed. by Gallus & Schildt (Göttingen, 2011), pp. 64–69, and my discussion in the subsequent chapters of the present work.

38 Sarasin, 'Wissensgeschichte', 169–71.



3 A picture from the 1930 film *Der blaue Engel*, based on Heinrich Mann's novel *Professor Unrat* (1905)

Even at this point, though, it should be said that there was only a limited class of people in each period who delved deeply into the basic issues of the university. Professors, and to some extent senior academic administrators, clearly dominated, while students and younger scholars were only gradually able to make their voices heard in the post-war period. Throughout the entire twentieth century an overwhelming majority of these knowledge actors were men, a circumstance that reflected the fact that the university was a male bastion. Only after the year 2000 did the percentage of female professors at German universities exceed ten per cent.³⁹

39 *Bildung und Kultur: Personal an Hochschulen – Vorläufige Ergebnisse*, Statistisches Bundesamt (Wiesbaden, 2015). On female German academics and intellectuals and their place both within and outside the university, see Christine von Oertzen, *Strategie Verständigung: Zur transnationalen Vernetzung von Akademikerinnen 1917–1955* (Göttingen, 2012); *Beyond the Academy: Histories of Gender and Knowledge*, ed. by Christine von Oertzen, Maria Rentetzi, & Elizabeth Watkins Siegel (New York, 2013); and *Eingreifende Denkerinnen: Weibliche Intellektuelle im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (Tübingen, 2015). At a more

Yet another analytic category is made up of *the concepts of knowledge*. This category can be developed with reference to Reinhart Koselleck's programme of conceptual history. Two of his assumptions are particularly important: on the one hand, that human experience is conditioned by language; and on the other, that there are certain basic political-social concepts which are absolutely essential for a person to be able to orientate him- or herself in the modern world. Both of these assumptions can be transferred to other central areas – politics, science, aesthetics – where there are a more or less limited number of basic concepts. Precisely because these concepts are fundamental, debates are largely about engaging in a kind of struggle over their definitions.⁴⁰

In this study, I assume a stance that might be called a state of heightened awareness in relation to the history of concepts. I am interested in the conceptual world of the Humboldtian tradition and how it has changed since the nineteenth century. It is hence important to pay attention to the meaning of the key history-of-knowledge concepts that have, to varying degrees, been associated with a classic German idea about the university: *Einheit von Forschung und Lehre, Lern- und Lehrfreiheit, Bildung, Einheit der Wissenschaften*, and so on (see further Chapter 2).⁴¹

fundamental level one may ask if the German concept of education from the period around the year 1800 was modelled on a male subject, and if so, what the consequences of this have been. See the discussion in Claudia Lindén, 'It Takes a Real Man to Show True Femininity: Gender Transgression in Goethe's and Humboldt's Concept of *Bildung*', in *The Humboldtian Tradition*, ed. by Josephson, Karlsruh, & Östling.

40 Reinhart Koselleck outlined his programme in 'Einleitung' in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. by Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, & Reinhart Koselleck, 8 vols (Stuttgart, 1972–1997), vol. 1 (1972). For discussions of his history of concepts, see Melvin Richter, *The History of Political and Social Concepts: A Critical Introduction* (New York, 1995), pp. 9–57; Helge Jordheim, *Läsningens vetenskap: Utkast till en ny filologi*, transl. Sten Andersson (Gräbo, 2003), pp. 154–70; *Begriffene Geschichte: Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks*, ed. by Hans Joas & Peter Vogt (Berlin, 2011); and Niklas Olsen, *History in the Plural: An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York, 2012).

41 For methodological discussions on the history of concepts and contemporary history, see Kathrin Kollmeier & Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, 'Zeitgeschichte der Begriffe? Perspektiven einer Historischen Semantik des 20. Jahrhunderts: Einleitung', *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History*,

Knowledge always exists in a particular space, and in this case the space is Germany. Like much other research on the university – including recent work on Humboldt – the present research is thus conducted within a national framework. In this lies a potential limitation. The university system is never a result of exclusively endogenous processes, but forms an alloy of native traditions and international influences.⁴² More generally, historians focusing on a single country or a single culture risk falling into methodological nationalism, where the nation is seen as the indisputable object of knowledge, both that which is being explained and that which supplies all the explanations. In order to avoid this type of narrow-mindedness, I will place Germany in relation to other relevant countries through intermittent geographical comparisons, above all in the general discussions of my empirical investigations.⁴³

At the same time, the exploration of the Humboldtian tradition provides a point of entry to an entire intellectual culture, namely that of Germany. The German university model originated in experiences at the national level, and the differences of opinion about the idea of the university were aspects of wider controversies. Consequently, a person who studies the debate about the basic academic principles is able to discern the broader currents of ideas. Having this comprehensive picture clear in one's mind is, in its turn, a prerequisite for being able to understand the nature of the modern research university. In popular as well as in scholarly and scientific contexts, there is a widespread notion to the effect that the German model became an example for others in the nineteenth century, and that it ultimately formed a kind of intellectual foundation for the university of the twentieth century. In its general features this appears to be an accurate description, even if the process – which

7:1 (2010); Christian Geulen, 'Plädoyer für eine Geschichte der Grundbegriffe des 20. Jahrhunderts', *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History*, 7:1 (2010); Theresa Wobbe, 'Für eine Historische Semantik des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts: Kommentar zu Christian Geulen', *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History*, 7:1 (2010); and Jan-Werner Müller, 'European Intellectual History as Contemporary History', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46:3 (2011).

42 *Humboldt international*, ed. by Schwinges; Schalenberg, *Humboldt auf Reisen?*

43 Andreas Wimmer & Nina Glick Schiller, 'Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences', *Global Networks*, 4:2 (2002); Sebastian Conrad, *Globalgeschichte: Eine Einführung* (Munich, 2013).

is still incompletely analysed – was never a linear one. But in order to determine what characterises the modern university, knowledge about its origins is required. For this reason Germany, the birthplace of the Humboldtian tradition, should be given special attention.

In what follows I will initially, in two chapters, outline the formation of a classic German university tradition and its subsequent fortunes up to the Second World War. The first of these, Chapter 2, is devoted to the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt and the establishment of the Berlin university. Following this, there is a survey of the Humboldt renaissance in the period around the year 1900 and the reform proposals of the subsequent decades. The purpose of these two chapters is to supply a basic historical understanding of the Humboldtian tradition, but also to clarify the principal issues and themes of this study. Two chapters that constitute the empirical essence of the book ensue, each of them dealing with a specific period: the years of occupation after the Second World War, when the debate was characterised by a desire to examine and vitalise the academic heritage (Chapter 4), and the first half of the 1960s, when a new generation of intellectuals discussed how the emerging mass university was related to older German ideals (Chapter 5). In conclusion, the early twenty-first-century Bologna process is linked to the Humboldtian tradition and to the overarching importance of that tradition in modern-day Germany. In this final chapter, where I again refer to my points of departure with respect to intellectual history and the history of knowledge, I summarise my insights while expanding the range of my observations.