Seventeenth-century England has long been heralded as the birthplace of a so-called ‘new’ philosophy. Yet what contemporaries might have understood by ‘old’ philosophy has been little appreciated. In this book Dmitri Levitin examines English attitudes to ancient philosophy in unprecedented depth, demonstrating the centrality of engagement with the history of philosophy to almost all educated persons, whether scholars, clerics, or philosophers themselves, and aligning English intellectual culture closely to that of continental Europe. Drawing on a vast array of sources, Levitin challenges the assumption that interest in ancient ideas was limited to out-of-date ‘ancients’ or was in some sense ‘pre-enlightened’; indeed, much of the intellectual justification for the new philosophy came from re-writing its history. At the same time, the deep investment of English scholars in pioneering forms of late humanist erudition led them to develop some of the most innovative narratives of ancient philosophy in early modern Europe.
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Notes on the text
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Style is academic, but I have attempted, to the best of my ability, to avoid the jargon that is so prevalent in the modern humanities. I make no apologies for the extensive scholarly apparatus, but I have attempted to confine discussion of secondary literature to the footnotes, unless it is particularly significant for my interpretation. An exception to this is the introductory first chapter: since many of my subsequent arguments depend on a revisionist account of seventeenth-century European and English intellectual culture more generally, it seemed preferable to set out that account at the start, rather than to allude to it constantly in the chapters themselves.