

INTRODUCTION

A growing number of historiographical approaches shed light on how critical editions and translations of scientific texts have been made, in the past. This has been famously the case concerning ancient Greek mathematics (through the works of Knorr, Vitrac, Netz, and Saito among others¹). These works have underlined how assumptions on what a mathematical text should be, and what its diagrams should look like, gave shape to geometrical classical works of Greek Antiquity. Much still needs to be uncovered in the history of science. More generally, the history of philologies has been the object of a renewed interest.² In this context, the ERC project SAW is organizing a conference whose aim is to gain critical awareness vis-à-vis critical editions and translations that are often the main source materials for historians of science.

Because the SAW project is not restricted to European sources, the conference will deal not only with these sources, but also with scholarly documents produced anywhere on the planet. It further intends, in the wake of Said and Pollock³, to reflect on the kind of critical editions that were produced outside of Europe. As a whole, the texts considered were produced in scholarly milieus that had different ideas of what an author or a text is, and how a text should be read, etc. We aim at understanding how such features were taken into account in past critical editions and translations of these texts worldwide. More generally, the ways critical editions and translations were elaborated and how they shaped specific representations of these texts need to be documented as well. This research will lead us to raise new questions about ways critical editions (and translations) could be made in the present day.

-
- 1 W. R. Knorr. "The Wrong Text of Euclid: On Heiberg's Text and its Alternatives." *Centaurus*, 38:208–276, 1994. K. Chemla. "Commentaires, Editions et autres Textes Seconds: Quel Enjeu pour l'Histoire des Mathématiques? Réflexions inspirées par la note de Reviel Netz." *Revue d'Histoire des Mathématiques*, 5:127–148, 1999. K. Saito. "A Preliminary Study in the Critical Assessment of Diagrams in Greek Mathematical Works." *SCIAMVS* 7:81-144, 2006. R. Netz. "The Texture of Archimedes' Arguments: Through Heiberg's Veil." In *The History of Mathematical Proof in Ancient Traditions*, ed. Karine Chemla (Cambridge University Press, 2012). K. Saito and N. Sidoli. "Diagrams and Arguments in Ancient Greek Mathematics: Lessons Drawn from Comparisons of the Manuscript Diagrams with those in Modern Critical Editions." In *Ibid.* B. Vitrac. "The Euclidean Ideal of Proof in The *Elements* and Philological Uncertainties of Heiberg's edition of the text." In *Ibid.*
- 2 Such as those reflected upon in the "Antiquities and their Entangled Histories Project", http://www.colbud.hu/mult_ant/thirdpage.htm, but also the "Zukunftphilologie" project, <http://www.forum-transregionale-studien.de/en/zukunftphilologie/profile.html> among others.
- 3 E. Said. "The Return to Philology." in *Humanism and Democratic Criticism* (Columbia University Press, 2004), 57-84. S. Pollock. "Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World." *Critical Inquiry*, 35:931–961, 2009.

Thus, the aim of this workshop is to look at specific case studies within these historiographical trends. The questions raised are numerous.

- What were the contexts in which, and reasons for which, editions of scientific texts, for instance Chinese, Mesopotamian, or Indian sources, were carried out from the 18th or 19th century onwards? What texts were chosen to be critically edited?
- What were the intentions of those who decided to work on source materials of the past to make the documents to which they bore witness available for others? Did they want to restore an “original” text? Did they aim at restoring an archetype?
- On which textual basis did the editors operate? Were editors looking at original documents or relying on copies or photographs? Did editors rely on a single document? Or did they, on the contrary, involve several documents? In case they did, which use did they make of these various documents? How did they, for instance, take into account the possible diversity of the time periods, geographical places and social milieus in which these documents were produced? How did editors take into account the specific history of the documents on which they relied and the way in which these documents came down to us? What were the methods used? How was transliteration carried out and used, if at all? Did people work in teams or alone?
- Which parts and features of their sources did authors of critical editions take into account? Which parts and features did they disregard? For instance, how did they deal with measuring units and measured quantities? How did they treat the visual aspects of the ancient texts? How have editors shaped their critical editions? For instance, how have they shaped critical apparatus, if any? How did they deal with mistakes in the sources or so-called missing information? How did they treat damaged portions of the documents?
- When and how did they add elements to the texts they were editing? How were the divides between editing “originals”, translating texts, and sometimes publishing both together elaborated?

The above questions aim at exploring the various meanings and practices that text criticism and critical editions have had over the last two centuries with respect to scientific sources of the past. In order to deal with these questions, contributors to the conference may contrast different critical editions of the same work or text criticism of comparable sources. Contributors may also compare different translations of one text or contrast these translations with critical editions.

Once a critical edition and/or a translation was published, another set of issues can be addressed: How much did the way critical editions were crafted in the past influence the reception of texts? How much and in which ways has it molded today’s scholarship and historiography? How does this critical reflection on philological procedures and their impact affect present-day philological projects?

ABSTRACTS

I - Practices of editing: Numbers & Diagrams

Transliterating and translating numbers and quantities in editions of cuneiform texts

Cécile Michel (ArScAn-HAROC, CNRS, Universités Paris 1 Panthéon – Sorbonne & Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, SAW project) & **Christine Proust** (SPHERE, CNRS & Université Paris Diderot, SAW project)

Numbers and quantities are omnipresent in administrative, economic and mathematical cuneiform texts. Conventions used by assyriologists since the first major editions (late 19th century) for transliterating and translating these notations are extremely varied. They change according to the period, genre, author, editor, and publisher of the text. This "Babel" of transliterations and translations built by assyriologists, since the decipherment of cuneiform writing some 150 years ago, is a serious obstacle for a full understanding of cuneiform texts. Little attention has been paid to this problem up to now. The only systematic effort for elaborating uniform standards for the representation of cuneiform numbers and quantities was undertaken by the CDLI, in the framework of development of large international databases. We will first describe different practices of cuneiform text editors to transliterate and translate numerical and metrological systems. Then we will show the effects of these practices on the interpretation of texts, and suggest some solutions for a renewed approach to these problems.

Cécile Michel will focus on editions of economic and administrative texts, while Christine Proust will focus on editions of mathematical texts.

Reduction of Absurdity? Publishing the Diagrams of Indirect Proof

Reviel NETZ (Stanford University)

In the modern editions of the diagrams of indirect proofs (or proofs by contradiction), there is sometimes a tendency to minimize the impossibility or absurdity of the depicted geometrical configuration, giving rise to a *prima facie* plausible diagram - though, it later turns out, an impossible one. This contrasts with the ancient diagrams which are often more starkly absurd. We will survey the evidence and consider the nature of the diagrams of indirect proofs, ancient and modern, leading on to speculations concerning the motivations, and consequences, of the modern transformation.

II - Practices of editing: Handling evidence

The Impact of the Press in the Tradition of the Nyāyabhāṣya

Alessandro Graheli (Department of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna)

The *Nyāyabhāṣya* (NBh), composed by Vātsyāyana Pakṣilasvāmin in the 5th century CE, is the earliest and perhaps most influential commentary of the *Nyāyasūtra*. These two works constitute the programmatic foundation of Nyāya philosophy, one of the predominant schools of thought in classical India.

Despite the impact of the NBh on the history of Nyāya, its textual transmission has not yet been thoroughly studied. This gap is gradually been fulfilled by the research project “Metaphysics and Epistemology of the Nyāya Tradition” (FWF projects P17244, P19328, and P24388) based at the ISTB, University of Vienna (see <http://www.istb.univie.ac.at/nyaya/>), in the course of which copies of 60 manuscripts of the NBh and of the extant printed editions have been gathered, collated and studied, with a new critical edition in view.

Based on the formidable documentation gathered for the project, this paper deals with the motives and editorial strategies that have inspired the editio princeps of the NBh, *Nyāyadarśana with the Commentary of Vātsyāyana*, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1864-5 and edited by the Nyāya scholar Jayanarayana Tarkapanchanana. Jayanarayana prefaced his edition with a brief foreword in Sanskrit verses, where he mentioned the mission of preserving endangered works undertaken by his employer, the British Government in the form of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In the same foreword he also wrote how the new printed edition of the (at that time) rarely available NBh was undertaken by him under the order of the Asiatic Society to give new life to this important work, and he declared that the new printed edition would not only have saved the NBh from oblivion, but also allowed its multiplication or ubiquity.

In the present paper this Sanskrit foreword is examined, together with some key variants in the NBh text. These passages from the editio princeps are then matched with the data contained in the inventory, description, collation and stemmatic analysis of the NBh manuscripts; as a result, two of the three manuscripts used by Jayanarayana are identified with a fair degree of certainty, and the reasons behind the selection of the manuscripts and of the readings become more distinct and transparent. This inter-textual study also reveals a possible scenario in which a late Sharada manuscript must have been a copy of the editio princeps, a so far unexplored hypothesis in the textual transmission of the NBh that could open new perspectives on the phenomenon of witnesses' contamination.

The First Printed Edition of *Mathematical Treatise in Nine Sections* (*Shushu jiuzhang* 數書九章) and the Text Criticism during 17th to 19th Century

ZHENG Cheng (Institute for the History of Natural Sciences, CAS, China) & **ZHU Yiwen** (ERC project SAW, SPHERE)

The development of Chinese traditional mathematics reached its culminating point in the 13th century (Song and Yuan periods). Nevertheless, since the middle Ming period (15th, 16th centuries), with the rising of abacus computation and the introduction of Western mathematics, the mathematics in Song and Yuan periods gradually became hard to understand. In the second half of the 18th century, scholars began to recover, edit and study the mathematical works of Song and Yuan periods. *Mathematical Treatise in Nine Sections* (*Shushu jiuzhang* 數書九章, hereafter *SS*) completed by Qin Jiushao (秦九韶 1208-ca.1261) in 1247 is one of the most important mathematical works in the history of China. In 1842, the first printed edition of *SS* with critical apparatus was published in the *Yijiatang* collection (*Yijiatang congshu* 宜稼堂叢書). This critical edition (namely *Yijiatang* edition) became the standard version afterwards.

This paper sheds light on the textual history of *SS*, especially the way in which *Yijiatang* edition was elaborated. By comparison between the critical edition and its copy-text, we focus on the special features of a manuscript copy made by Zhao Qimei (1616). This MS not only contains precious information of rod calculus, but also reveals a key transition of traditional Chinese mathematical instruments from counting rods to paper in the 13th century. On this basis, this paper further analyzes the reason why certain contents are missing in the critical edition.

III - From ancient to future edition

What is a Critical Edition? Historical and Methodological Reflections

Glenn W. Most (The University of Chicago and Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa)

The lecture examines a number of historical and methodological aspects of critical editions. Historically, the development of editions from ancient Greece until our own times will be sketched out, concentrating upon Hellenistic and Roman editions, Renaissance tendencies, the method of Lachmann, and contemporary issues. Methodologically, the following questions will be among those addressed: what makes a critical edition critical; to whom are critical editions addressed; to what extent do different kinds of texts require different kinds of critical editions.

THE SUMERIANS EDITING - HOW AND WHY?

Piotr Michalowski (University of Michigan)

Discussions of Sumerian literature concentrate, for practical reasons, on the relatively abundant collections of inscribed clay tablets from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries BCE. Recent studies of this literary material have mainly focused on their practical use as school instructional materials. This synchronic attention to pedagogical matters has been productive, but has become exhausted; here I would like to move back in time a few centuries to contemplate the manner in which the “curriculum” came into being, that is the ancient philological gestures that created this particular version of “Sumerian literature.” This is, of course, a highly speculative undertaking, because it takes us back to a period that is mostly undocumented as far as literary production is concerned.

Many of these texts are preserved in multiple copies from different cities and from different periods, others are known only from one city, or are preserved in single manuscripts. Some texts seem to have been preserved for centuries, undergoing various redactional changes, others survived almost untouched, and still other literary texts had short histories and were quickly forgotten.

How did these texts come to be, how were they edited and why? There are no direct native Mesopotamian answers to such questions. This is not unexpected; there are no abstract narrative explanations of mathematical theory, of the principles underlying divination, or of the structure of the cosmos from these ancient cultures. Is it possible to theorize the social and intellectual contexts that produced literary compositions and the successive redactional ventures that produced the texts that have been recovered? What were the political, psychological and social conditions and consequences of the choice of an artificial idiolect for poetic expression? As a corollary to such questions one must meditate on the ontological status of the examples at our disposal.

IV - The treatment of ancient readers and commentators in modern editions & translations

What do you do with commentaries, what do you do with structure? H. T. Colebrooke, Sudhākara Dvivedin and the mathematical chapter of the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta*

Agathe KELLER (CNRS—SPHERE & ERC Project SAW)

In 1817, Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837) published English translations of different Sanskrit mathematical texts, including a translation of the 12th chapter of Brahmagupta's *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* (628 C.E.), with the help of Pṛthūdaka's Vāsanabhāṣya (fl. 960). Almost ninety years later, in 1902, Sudhākara Dvivedin (1855-1910/11) published an edition of the *Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta* with his own commentary, which refers also to Pṛthūdaka's commentary. Since both texts were crucial to the access one could have to Brahmagupta's mathematics, their point of views durably marked the historiography. Dvivedin's and Colebrooke's publications are striking for the different ways they deal with Pṛthūdaka's commentary in relation to Brahmagupta's treatise.

I will argue that these author's views on commentaries went together with a specific idea of what a Sanskrit mathematical text was to be, informing their editorial choices.

Shaping 'our' Euclid: a parallel examination of the critical editions of the *Elements* and the *Data* (by J. L. Heiberg and H. Menge, respectively)

Michalis SIALAROS (Birkbeck College, University of London)

Euclid of Alexandria is phenomenally famous as the author of the *Elements*. Nevertheless, he wrote a number of other treatises as well, most of which are largely neglected mainly because of the *Elements*' prominence. Arguably, one of the most interesting works in this category is the *Data*. Although it deals with plane geometry—exactly like a great part of the *Elements*—it presents a radically different view of geometrical reasoning, and its usefulness for those who want to learn the basic concepts of geometrical analysis has been highly praised by ancient and later commentators.

In 1986, Menge compiled the critical edition of Euclid's *Data* working in parallel with Heiberg, while the latter was preparing the critical edition of the *Elements*. Over the last few years, the work of Heiberg and the way he shaped our own image of Euclid have been a subject of investigation and debate. Nevertheless, Menge's effort has not received similar attention.

Thus, in this paper, I propose to examine the way the critical edition of the *Data* was compiled in comparison to the *Elements*. My starting point is Taisbak's statement in the preface of his English commentary on the *Data*: '...Menge had a sound judgement,

and little is gained by looking for variants in manuscripts outside his scope: there is, in fact, no doubt as to the content of the *Data*—the doubts are all about its interpretation.’ Fortunately, mathematical treatises do not exist in literary isolation. On this basis, in addition to the extant Greek manuscripts, I examine the secondary sources which refer to the *Data*. A number of interesting questions emerge from this reading: Have all Greek mathematical treatises received the same attention from readers in early and late antiquity? How does this affect the way these texts were altered by their various editors and commentators? In addition, how does this affect the interpretation of the content of these works?

V - A historical approach to philology

A Theory of Philological Practice in Early Modern India

Sheldon Pollock (Columbia University, New York)

While never conceptualized as a discrete form of knowledge, philology—in the narrow sense of text-criticism—was a highly consequential form of cultural practice in India before the modern era. The absence of such conceptualization, however, means not only that we need to dig the data of philology out of its forms of practice, as found above all in commentarial literature, but to distill the theory of these practices ourselves. The systematic analysis of this literature has scarcely begun, but available data reveal several important historical and theoretical trends that I suspect will be borne out by further research. The philology that became dominant in the early second millennium was almost certainly an invention of that epoch (though several key notions, about interpolation, for example, can be traced to the middle of the first millennium), and it grew apace over that period. It was directed generally to texts of literature rather than science—where *how* what is said matters more than *what* is said, and where therefore criteria of grammatical, rhetorical, metrical, and other kinds of normativity that inform philological reasoning can be directly applied—but by the eighteenth century works of systematic thought (such as language analysis) had come to be studied by a similar metrics. In addition to laying out this empirical data, I try to extract from it a theory of philological practice. This is marked by a widely shared sense of the text as an intentional authorial creation, where variation is deviation, but where at the same time variation is driven—and known to be driven—by two powerful currents in the history of Indian textuality: the regionalization of recension, and the transformation effects, in a manuscript culture, of a still living tradition of engagement.

The critical edition of the mathematical texts of Greek Antiquity: questions of method

Micheline Decorps-Foulquier (University of Clermont-Ferrand, SPHERE)

The availability of written sources from Greek antiquity implies not only the existence of medieval manuscripts (or the discovery of papyrus) but also the conception of critical editions that can provide a reliable text, able to bridge or reduce the gap between the witnesses of the text and the original work. Such an undertaking requires the application of critical methods which have been in constant evolution along with the progress of history of the texts which must be both rigorous and flexible since each manuscript tradition requires a specific treatment. My contribution aims at showing the evolution of requirements in editing Greek mathematical texts, and also the risks linked to this enterprise and the effects of editorial choices on the interpretation of the content.

EDITING THE SUMERIANS - HOW AND WHY?

Jerry Cooper (Department of Near Eastern Studies Johns Hopkins University)

Sumerian literary texts appear just before 2500 BC, and only disappear after more than 2000 years in the late first millennium. But when we speak of Sumerian literature, we usually mean the corpus of compositions represented by manuscripts—clay tablets—dating to around 1800 BC, found mainly in the ruins of the Babylonian city, Nippur, and, in lesser numbers, at several other Babylonian sites. These manuscripts were products of an educational curriculum that also produced mathematical and scientific materials, but unlike those, the literary compositions were not intended to impart information or skills, but rather to indoctrinate a scribal elite and construct a Sumerian, or, probably, Babylonian identity.

Although the bulk of these manuscripts was excavated at the end of the 19th century, reliable editions of the Sumerian literary compositions began to appear only in the 1930s. I will trace the history and evolution of Sumerian text editing, focusing on how multiple manuscripts of individual compositions are represented, how variants are evaluated, and how the text of a given composition is reconstructed. I will also explain why text critical methodologies used in Classics or Biblical studies are not applicable to Sumerian literary manuscripts. We do not do stemmata.

But what is the purpose of our critical editions? Without a theory of Sumerian literary production and reception, are these editions anything more than data sets? What are the missing pieces that we will need before we can begin to understand what Sumerian literature really is?

The reception of critical editions of Sumerian literary texts in the scholarly community has been of two sorts, esthetic and curricular. I will review these complementary approaches, with caveats.

Finally, I will briefly mention native approaches to text editing, albeit mainly from first millennium sources.

Babylonian astronomy - editing and interpreting an ancient science

Mathieu Ossendrijver (Humboldt Universitaet, Berlin)

Ever since the rediscovery of Babylonian astronomy in the 19th century, the task of translating, editing and interpreting these tablets has been carried out by a very small group of specialists, usually with a firm background in the natural sciences.

In this paper I explore their editions in order to reconstruct the underlying methods for translating, representing, editing and interpreting Babylonian astronomical tablets. I will then assess how these methods may differ from those in other branches of Assyriology, and how they may have been informed by assumptions about the nature of Babylonian astronomy.

VI - The impact of modern editions on the historiography of ancient scholarship

The Treatise of the Sun and Fitzedward Hall's Edition

Christopher MINKOWSKI (Oriental Studies, University of Oxford)

One of the most widely known schools of Indian astronomical science in the medieval period, the school of the sun, or saurapakṣa, has a history that is unusually conjectural, both textually and scientifically. A solar school is already described as one of five systems of astronomical thought in a doxography surviving from the sixth century, and there is reference there to a treatise of the sun, or Sūryasiddhānta. The school is usually taken, even in this first appearance, to be a composite of earlier systems, especially those of the fifth century astronomer, Āryabhāta. And yet the only manuscripts of a text with this title that survive are from a much later period, and describe a system of astronomy noticeably different in its cosmological models, time reckoning system, and parameters. It is usually hypothesized that an unknown author substantially reworked the saurapakṣa and the Sūryasiddhānta around 800 C.E. The 'modern' work attracted many learned commentaries, and yet, through its treatment by later commentators, the text appears in so much variety that the ninth century text has so far escaped a secure reconstruction. This paper will examine two of the earliest published editions, the partial one by the Abbé Guerin in 1847, and the complete one by Fitzedward Hall and Bāpu Deva Śāstrin, in 1859. A good amount is known about all three of these figures and the context in which they worked. This paper will examine their work and their context, and will seek to consider what effect the process of editing for publication had on the historical understanding of the solar school of thought and its principal treatise. One might well wonder whether, in this case, the imaginary entities of school of thought and textual tradition, usually so helpful for the historical analysis of ancient scientific traditions, have created problems as much as they have solved them.

Mozi's Resurrection: Sun Yirang's (1848-1908) Contribution to the Reappraisal of Mohist Thought in Chinese Intellectual History.

Carine DEFOORT (Leuven University)

It is generally known that in the Qing dynasty, evidential research (*kaozheng*) opened new venues to the study of Masters' texts (*zixue*), among which *Mozi*. This exegetical approach gradually turned to include the interpretation of its content at the end of the Qing and in the Republican era. What is the context in which scholars began to show interest in the *Mozi* (from Ming onward)? Focusing on content rather than exegesis: What are the topics that were selected for attention and discussion? How did this relate to the textual exegesis? In the content discussions, I leave aside the often

mentioned ‘discovery of logic’ in the *Mozi* (as recently described by Joachim Kurtz) and focus on Mozi’s supposed promotion of ten core ideas headed by ‘inclusive care’ or ‘universal love.’ This presentation of early Mohist thought seems to have begun slightly earlier (telling from the earliest pre- and post-faces to the book) than the ascription of logic to Mozi. The topic of *jian ai* is particularly interesting because it had been monopolized by Mencius’ “orthodox” accusation repeated by almost all scholars during ca. 15 centuries, and became the idea with which the “Transmission of the Way” (*daotong*) was being called into question from the Ming onward. “Inclusive care,” along with the other nine central ideas, became the token of early Mohist thought only in this modern era and has retained this position in current scholarship.

VII - What is at stake in editing and translating ancient texts? A

Historical perspective

Rethinking the Ancient Mathematical Text: Ming-Qing Scholars' Critical Reflections on the *Zhoubi suanjing*

Han Qi (Institute for the History of Natural Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences)

Since the arrival of the Jesuits in China, European science and religion were introduced into China. In order to promote the calendar reform and the spread of European science during the late Ming and early Qing, many Chinese scholars developed and expressed different attitudes towards Western learning. In the meantime, they used European science as a tool to interpret the ancient Chinese mathematical and astronomical text. As a case study, I will talk about how Ming-Qing scholars began to be interested in the text of *Zhoubi suanjing*. Firstly I will analyse Xu Guangqi (1562-1633) and his views towards *Zhoubi*. Then I will analyse why the Kangxi emperor (1654-1722) and Qing mathematician Mei Wending (1633-1721) were interested in the study and criticism of Chinese mathematical text, especially the *Zhoubi suanjing*. In addition I would like to talk about the influence of their studies in the mid-eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Finally I will talk about how Qing scholars made different commentaries of the *Zhoubi* text in the late nineteenth century.

Editing a Foundational Work on Classical Indian Medicine: The Printed Editions of the *Carakasamhitā* in Context

Karin Preisendanz (Department of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna)

The paper will attempt to address some of the numerous aspects and highly stimulating questions outlined in the Conference blueprint, by taking the example of the *Carakasamhitā*, a foundational treatise on classical Indian medicine. Since the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1868 by Gangadhar Kaviraj, who was highly instrumental in the renaissance of classical Indian medicine in Eastern India, more than fifty editions of the Sanskrit text, many with second, third or even further editions or reprints, were published mainly from India, in a large variety of regional scripts and often supplied with translations and/or commentaries or annotation in English or vernacular South Asian languages. All available and – wherever appropriate – reported, but unavailable editions will be considered in an analytic survey and from the point of view of their form and historical circumstances (script, presentation, structure, etc.; utilized sources; editor, place, publication organ or publisher, date, etc.). Due to my linguistic limitations, however, in the analysis of issues like the editors' motivation, purpose, self-perception, conceptualization of the nature of the edited text and of its author(s), etc., the focus will have to be on editions

with prefaces and other prefatory matter, translations and commentaries (or annotation) in Sanskrit, Hindi and European languages. As far as can be determined, different editorial policies and conventions will be highlighted and contextualized.

**Poinsinet's Edition of the *Naturalis Historia* (1771-1782)
and the Revival of Pliny in the Sciences of the Enlightenment**

Jeff Loveland (University of Cincinnati) & **Stéphane Schmitt** (CNRS-SPHERE & SAW)

This paper analyses the revival of Pliny's *Naturalis historia* within the scientific culture of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, focusing on a French effort to produce an edition with annotations by scientists and scholars. Between the Renaissance and the early eighteenth century, the *Naturalis historia* had declined in scientific importance. Increasingly, it was relegated to the humanities, as we demonstrate with a review of editions. For a variety of reasons, however, scientific interest in the *Naturalis historia* grew in the second half of the eighteenth century. Epitomizing this interest was a plan for a scientifically annotated, Latin-French edition of the *Naturalis historia*. Initially coordinated by the French governmental minister Malesherbes in the 1750s, the edition was imperfectly realized by Poinsinet a few decades later. It was intended to rival two of the period's other distinguished multi-volume books of knowledge, Diderot and D'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* and Buffon's *Histoire naturelle*, to which we compare it. Besides narrating the scientific revival of the *Historia naturalis* during this period, we examine its causes and the factors contributing to its end in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Greeks on Hellenes, Ancient Greek scientific texts critically edited in 18th-19th century Greece

George N. Vlahakis (Hellenic Open University)

During the so-called Modern Greek Enlightenment (1750-1821) a scholarly movement aimed to develop the intellectual and cultural status of the Greek speaking people in South-Eastern Europe, a number of scientific books had been published. Though some of them were based on contemporary European originals others were translations or critical editions of ancient Greek scientific texts.

The main reason for this activity was to rediscover the ancient heritage, to prove that between ancient and modern Greeks there was a continuous, unbroken link and thus that the Greek national identity could be founded on the ancient kleos.

In this paper we aim to discuss:

- The criteria followed by the Greek scholars to choose the texts they translated or edited.
- Which were their sources? Why they had chosen them?

- How were their attempts received by the Greek scholarly circles? Were they well received or were they heavily criticized? Which were the reasons they faced such a criticism?
- The issue of the language used in these editions. Had the Greek editors used the formal language supported by the conservative purists or they preferred a language more easily understood by the common people?
- Which was their quality? Were these editions equivalent with other relevant ones in Europe?
- Had these publications played finally the role they were intended to do?

We claim that the answers to the above roughly described questions will shed more light on those texts not only from a philological point of view but also from a history of science perspective.