Moreover, Heyne worked for many years as librarian of the Georgia Augusta library, where the copy of the *Scienza Nuova* was acquired in 1774. Heyne’s work as librarian was very accurate: he increased the number of books from sixty thousand to two hundred thousand, and wrote seven thousand reviews. It would be very strange if he hadn’t noticed the presence of a book that deals with a subject so close to his interests. Furthermore, Heyne worked in a University rich in connection with the English *British Society*, where *La scienza nuova* was quite well-known and he also spent time in Leipzig, where were published the *Acta Eruditorum*, a journal that dedicated a review to the *Scienza nuova* in 1727.

Besides these routes, through which Vico’s reflection could have indirectly reached Coleridge, the stronger link between the two authors is a conceptual one.

Vico’s reflection contains indeed lot of theoretical affinities with Heyne’s reflection about myth: they both underline the rough and primitive character of the first men, and apply an historical approach to the study of ancient myth, considering them as a direct record of the way in which the early men perceived and conceptualized the world. There are also lot of lexical similarities between the two authors, who often use similar terms to describe similar concepts. A prime example is the use of the term *conversion*: both the authors use this term to describe the process through which the early men conceptualize the multiplicity. As they do not possess rational skills in order to manage with abstract concepts, they are not able to insert different singular objects and events in a single class. As a result they convert the multiplicity, the abstract, in a singular object that identify all the objects that possess similar characteristics, becoming their incarnation, their imaginative universal. For the first men, in Vico’s opinion, Achille is not an example of courage: he is the courage itself. Every man that does something brave, is not like Achille, *is* Achille. The way in which Heyne characterizes the process that allows the first men to grasp the multiplicity, lacking the power of abstraction, is very similar: the first men’s speech “convertit ingeniorum vim ad substituenda concreta abstractis: convertuntur cogitata in facta” [uses the strength of intelligence to convert the abstract in the concrete; thoughts are converted into facts].

To conclude our journey: after following the clues of the new approach to the study of myth brought us in Germany, let’s go back to Coleridge. One conclusion we can draw is that it’s impossible to prove, with the support of philological evidence, that Coleridge knew Vico before 1825. At the same time, it should be clear that, even though there isn’t any textual element that proves his knowledge of Vico’s work beyond doubt, Coleridge was well acquainted with Vichian themes from the early stage of his career. During the years he spent in Cambridge he participated to the Unitarian movement. Through his

---