

Chapter One

Writing Antiquarianism: Prolegomenon to a History

Peter N. Miller

Fifty years ago Arnaldo Momigliano lamented, “I wish I could simply refer to a History of Antiquarian Studies. But none exists.”¹ If there is still no single-volume history of antiquarianism, many, many pieces of this puzzle have been assembled. Already eight years ago Joseph Connors created an on-line bibliography of early modern antiquarianism of around 680 titles.² Some of the heroes have gotten monographic treatment by now—Ligorio, Panvinio, Orsini, Scaliger, Cotton, Cassiano, Peiresc, Selden, Caylus—while the majority, of course, have not—Cyriac of Ancona, Camden, Pignoria, Worm, Mabillon, Bianchini, Barthélemy, to name but a few. We know something of who the antiquaries were, and something therefore of the history of antiquarian scholarship, but it is still far too early to write that monographic study. Even more, with all that we have learned, we still know almost nothing about the history of the history of antiquarian scholarship.

Momigliano, whose “Ancient History and the Antiquarianism” was not a history of antiquarianism and did not generate any, did nevertheless succeed at inspiring a whole generation of scholars to work on the history of scholarship.³ But with all that there was to do, this question of the history of the history of history was, understandably perhaps, neglected. Some might not even have been aware of it as a question. But Momigliano surely would have been. For his own practice of the “history of historiography” brings to mind the image of the snake swallowing its tail: the historian of today writes about how historians of the past were shaped by what they read and where they lived—and his own work is necessarily transformed by the encounter. At what point does the one touch the other? At what point does the practice of antiquarianism shape the writing of the history of antiquarianism? At what point does the history of antiquarianism affect the practice of history? These are questions we need to answer.

Fifty years ago, when Momigliano wanted to underscore how neglected antiquarianism was, he signalled this by noting the absence of any ready-made history of it. Ironically—though, as ever, with an exquisite perspicuity—the volume that Momigliano pointed to as a second-best answer to his question actually provides the best one to our own.

I. A Morphology of Antiquarianism

Carl (or Karl) Bernard Stark's *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*, whose first part only was completed before the author's death—*Systematik und Geschichte der Archäologie der Kunst* (1880)—is not a well-known book.⁴ Nor is its author well-known, either. Both should change. Momigliano already hinted that this is an extraordinary work, providing not only a summary of how and who studied antiquities, but also a history of the study of those studies.⁵ Stark's work, as the title suggests, also lies on that fascinating fault line separating and connecting the old "antiquarianism" from the new "archaeology." Since this semantic frontier is pregnant with implications for any modern grappling with the antiquarian past it is something that we will have to consider here as well. But as we plunge into Stark's scholarship we also discover something very interesting, if not entirely surprising. For the first real historian of antiquarianism was almost per force a historian of material culture and cultural history. How these fit together *then* suggests something, I think, of how they might fit together *now*.

So, let us begin then with some first attempts to explain the meaning and history of antiquarianism. This situates us in the landscape of the *Handbook*, a purely pedagogical genre that thrived in Germany and only in Germany (what it means that French schoolboys learned about antiquity from novels like Barthélemy's *Voyage du jeune Anacharse* (1788) while Germans read things with titles like *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten* (1858–75) cannot yet be gauged). But the advantage of working with this sort of text is clear: because its intent is to present to the beginning student a comprehensive survey of a field at a given

moment it affords the later inquirer with a ready-made guide to a whole scholarly world.

Stark wrote at least seven monographs on ancient Greek art and history and a thick collection of essays was posthumously published with the telling title *Lectures and Essays from the Field of Archaeology and Art History*.⁶ In addition to his own Handbook, he also collaborated on Karl Friedrich Hermann's four-volume *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten* (1858–75).⁷ This might be a good place to start because its Introduction begins by defining “Alterthümer, antiquitates, archaiologia” as a means of reaching back to grasp ancient man, embracing “all the appearances and expressions of his life and his activities at a certain point in time.”⁸ According to Hermann, adding the study of literature “in its fullness” transformed Alterthümer into “Alterthumskunde or Alterthumswissenschaft”.⁹ In this new conception, antiquities only constituted a small part, though precisely marking the point of engagement with past circumstances of life (“so haftet doch gerade diesen vorzugweise der Gesichtspunkt einer Beschäftigung mit vergangenen Zuständen an”). And for this, Hermann referred to the early modern locus classicus, Francis Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* (II.6), which defined *Antiquitates* as “relics of history, as if some fragments rescued from the shipwreck of time” (“Antiquitates sunt reliquiae historiae, quae tanquam tabulae e naufragio temporum ereptae sunt”)—itself, as so many have noted, paraphrased out of the preface of Biondo Flavio's *Italia Illustrata*.¹⁰ These sources—Hermann refers to monuments of antiquity (“Denkmäler des Alterthums”)—were either passed down through literary transmission or through actual material survivals. Hermann calls them “eyewitnesses and remains of the past” (“autoptische Zeugen und Reste der Vergangenheit”). Such material reminders include inscriptions, medals, implements and images.

But, and this marks an important turn of the argument, while all these antiquities (“Alterthümer”) served as sources and means to an end, they did not exhaust their fullest meaning and importance. And even, he writes, where this

“monumental” *Altertumskunde* shared the name of *Antiquitates* with Archaeology, “it had actually through the connection to general Art History gained a new direction.”¹¹ Hermann does not dilate on this point. But Stark, who edited Hermann’s *Handbuch* before proceeding to write his own, made explicating the turn from antiquitates to archaeology by way of art history his chief task.

Stark began by explaining that Art-Archaeology, “or the science of the visual arts of the peoples of classical antiquity” (“Die Archäologie der Kunst, oder die Wissenschaft von der bildenden Kunst der Völker des klassischen Alterthums”) is an important part of classical Altertumswissenschaft, “or classical philology” in the widest sense, and thus belongs to the field of Philology.¹² Archaeology was a way into the spirit of the past, but Stark made clear that he saw it as an “application” of the philological and even natural scientific research method in order to grasp “the Spirit of Antiquity in general”, and in particular the stylistic development of art.¹³

Philology was, in the nineteenth century, the great polydisciplinary integrator. As its chief spokesman, August Boeckh, proclaimed from his chair in Berlin in 1822, the realm of Philology included “the most important notions to be investigated present in the very nature of the oldest tribes; expressed in the individual parts of ancient cults as in the appearances of images.”¹⁴ Similarly, Ludwig Lange, another professor, used an inaugural lecture at Prague to declare philology the science whose task was to research “the spirit of both the classical peoples” (Greeks and Romans),¹⁵ while Alexander Conze had used his, at Vienna, to locate archaeology at the crossing of classical philology and art history.¹⁶

This recognition that images had something important to say about accessing the spirit of past times seems to have reached consciousness—or at least become a commonplace-- by the middle of the nineteenth century. Boeckh drew an exact parallel between the philology of words and of images. The history of classical art, he wrote, which was for him part of philology, could not be separated from

knowledge of western art monuments. He went on to suggest the creation of a “comparative cultural history of all antiquity” as a chief task for Philology.¹⁷ Interestingly, Goethe, otherwise such a staunch proponent of world literature, is discovered by Stark to have emphasized that these expectations of classical philology could not be extended to extra-European antiquities. They were, to be sure, interesting (his word was “curiosities”) but not helpful for Western cultural self-formation.¹⁸

Asking about the place of Archaeology relative to Classical Philology, as Stark does in his second section, shows how narrow the conception of Archaeology had already become (and which, presumably, Stark hoped to change). In the Introduction to this volume we have talked about the very close, even genetic, relationship between the study of words and the study of things. Today, we might locate the key moment in the work of Christian Gottlob Heyne in the 1760s and 1770s.¹⁹ Stark, however draws “prooftexts” from the work of Boeckh and F.A. Wolf in the first third of the nineteenth century, each of which emphasize the broad commitment to “the reconstruction of the whole life of the peoples of classical antiquity,” to cite the former.²⁰ But through what? Stark offers two different avenues, the first being the medium of transmission itself and the second the various functions that objects performed.

Stark begins with medium-as-material. These included written remains of the past, whether on paper, parchment, stones, clay, wood, ivory, metals, whether in literary works or magic or children’s things, official acts or wills or names of dead. Then there were remains that did not utilize speech or writing, but functioned through “örtliche Fixierung”—space as a primal key—or chemical signature, or weight, or color, or form. Moreover, Stark continued—and all of this is quite brilliant-- even textual material that was transmitted could be studied by the student of the past in terms of, or through, the material form of that transmission, such as the material on which the inscriptions were carved, or papyrus rolls, wood, coins, textiles or the inks utilized. He noted one could add architectural works as a form of inscribing of the human in the landscape and, in

general, “the man-made changes to the earth’s surface of land and water, high up and in the depths, through man-made or substantially altered natural objects, such as food remains, pigments and oils.” In other words, the record of *Cultura* was itself a language that could be deciphered.²¹

Stark identifies both a literary and a monumental philology, and suggests that this latter became identified with archaeology once “art” was added to the mix. On the frontier between these approaches, Stark argues, stand the auxiliary sciences—he mentions in particular Diplomatics, Epigraphy and Numismatics, because they were word-related material culture studies. Indeed, Stark’s argument about medium-as-material seems born out of reflection on the workings of these *historische Hilfswissenschaften*. What Stark does not state here—but which he refers to elsewhere—is that these *Hilfswissenschaften* were developed as skills by antiquaries in the seventeenth century. Thus the antiquarian synthesis of word and object marked the path from philology to archaeology.²²

The second approach to material remains was not to emphasize medium of transmission, but rather function, whether in language, religion, science, art, state, cult, private life, or technology, among others. Here Stark followed Otto Jahn’s argument that the “essence” of a scientific treatment was that it focused not on the object so much as on the reason for the thing being called into existence.²³ This gave a decisive role to archaeology since it was only through the scientific study of remains that this “function” could be assessed.²⁴ Thus, here too materiality mattered—even “function” could not be assessed independently of a discipline he described as “the discipline for the representing of ancient lives” (“des antiken Lebens repräsentirende Disciplin”). “Also the inscription-stone, writing tablet, coin, and papyrus roll which in Antiquity served as manuscript leaves in their external form, in the distribution of writing, the relationship to related imagery and finally in the form of characters themselves, call for an archaeological treatment.”²⁵ This vision actually extended beyond Archaeology as

it was narrowly construed in Stark's own time, and certainly beyond the received view of antiquarians, however respectful of their achievement he was.

Archaeology, thus, could embrace both the specific and the general perspective, the individual, or pointilist inquiry, and the broadly contextual. As if comparing one kind of philology to another, Stark suggested that archaeology could by studying art do what philology achieved by studying literature: it could breath life into the past and capture its spirit—as opposed to some dry kind of annotation. Archaeology offered a synthesizing, second order opportunity. It was a way of seeing rather than a set of protocols for sifting evidence. Citing Otto Jahn, Stark concluded: “Archaeology is to us the scientific study of the important monuments of the peoples of classical antiquity according to their actual expressive means through mass, form and color, and grounded on this the development and existence of visual arts in antiquity as a part of the whole cultural life itself. Or, in short, the scientific engagement with the visual art of Antiquity.”²⁶ It should be clear by now that Stark's idea of archaeology, formulated so close to its origin, is very different from our own. He is concerned with hermeneutics and the evocation of lived life, ours with (typically) excavation technology and interpretation of objects.

The notes to this section reveal how heavily Stark leaned on Boeckh for the idea of this new-modelled archaeology. And Boeckh, in an oration of 1822 beautifully distinguished between the realms of philology and history. The former was devoted to the historical and philosophical cognition of all antiquity—literally, “of the universe of antiquity” (*universae antiquitatis*). And by “universe” Boeckh explicitly intended not the diachronic narrative of history (“ab historia res ex ordine temporum gestas potissimum docente”) but, rather, the whole life of ancient peoples “by parts” (“philologia omnem antiquarorum populorum vitam comprehendat eamque per partes”).²⁷ In German, in his famous lecture course at Berlin—delivered over and over again for fifty years!--Boeckh was even more apodictic about the sovereignty of philology: “Philology is the historical construction of Antiquity,” “the Knowledge of Antiquity in its full extent,” and,

even, “the knowledge of what is known.”²⁸ History was something else, and much less interesting.

In his pursuit of the wholeness of past lived life Boeckh represents the culmination and climax of one line of development that emerged in the early Renaissance fascination with ancient Roman texts. Another, also resumed in this turn to a material philology (Boeckh referred to “Sachphilologie”) which was synonymous with “Archaeology” emphasized visuality. So, Gottfried Bernhardt, in his lecture course on philology, *Grundlinien zur Encyclopädie der Philologie* (1832) defined Archaeology as the “Kunstwissenschaft der Alten.”²⁹ Obviously, this would be a line that would lead back through Winckelmann, Piranesi and Caylus to artist-antiquarians like Ligorio, but also forward to Jacob Burckhardt, a student of Boeckh’s who became an art historian.

Stark was aware that it was possible to identify this broad Classical Archaeology with Cultural History. But, instead, he preferred to link “Culturgeschichte” to the study of costume, manners and material culture; to human history as natural history. In this, he explicitly followed the interpretation of Gustav Friedrich Klemm (1802–67). But while generally sympathetic to the potentially encyclopedic character of a cultural history which paid so much attention to the material world, Stark, whose own interest lay more in the direction of philology than natural history, specified that archaeology was not just about materiality, but about art made matter. For him, “art” separated natural from human history.³⁰

II. A History of Antiquarianism

According to Stark, the ancients used the words *archaiologia* and *antiquitates* to refer to their science of past things. For the Greeks, the former term referred to things so old that they no longer continued to live in the present. These *archaia*, according to Stark, included peoples, spaces, political forms, ways of fighting and lifestyles. Art materials were part of this general set of remains. And “The same

concept of the narration of a past in-itself-completed-life of the people” is what the Romans meant by *Antiquitates*.³¹

Already in antiquity, Stark wrote, the term *antiquarius* referred to an involvement with words and writing, and this was preserved in the medieval use of the term to mean manuscript copyist (and the modern association with rare book dealer).³² The link between study of monuments and the special artistic remains of antiquity-- *res antiquaria*-- emerged in Renaissance Rome. The first such modern to be called an *Antiquarius* was Cyriac of Ancona (fl.1430); the first to create an institution dedicated to its recovery was Pomponio Leto, who founded the Accademia Romana (c.1460); the first to use it in the title of a book was Andreas Fulvius, *Antiquitates Urbis* (1527).³³ By the beginning of the eighteenth century it could refer to an entire, existing corpus of learning: J.A. Fabricius's *Bibliotheca antiquaria* (1709).

The “History of Archaeological Studies” constituted the third part of Stark's book, and is what Momigliano must have had in mind when he described Stark's as the best extant history of antiquarianism. It is divided into four chapters: “The beginnings of archaeological studies in the 15th and 16th centuries in the spirit of the Renaissance,” “The archaeology of art in the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth century under the domination of antiquarian interests: pioneers of the scientific foundation,” “The science of ancient art grounded on the philosophy of beauty and on general history: Winckelmann and his followers (1755-1828),” and “The last fifty years of archaeological studies: the greatest expansion and scientific direction of the study of monuments.”

For the beginning, Stark's key figure was Pirro Ligorio. This is important, for Ligorio's great achievement according to the two best modern students of sixteenth-century antiquarianism was in re-focusing attention on material remains and visual corpora—opening up the path to art-archaeology later seized upon by Winckelmann and celebrated by Stark.³⁴ Stark's account differs markedly, and for the better, from great prior accounts of the history of

scholarship, such as Wachler's at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in his attentiveness to manuscript corpora. The emphasis on Ligorio's key role brings this home: "The greatest and most extensive" collection, he writes, "was not published, or in a very mutilated way only."³⁵ It was only because Stark approached past scholarship as scholarship that someone like Cyriac of Ancona or Ligorio, who lived on through manuscript collections only, could matter so much.

The seventeenth century was the century of the antiquaries. The received view, beginning from the age that deified Winckelmann, was to look down on the century of *Kunst- und Wunderkammern*. But Stark's closer look showed him something else. "Even today we are guided in the greater part of our knowledge of monuments by the publications of that age...Minor archaeological sources were just then sought after and pursued with great zeal and, generally, the whole breadth of the monumental world of antiquity was first assessed."³⁶

Stark provides a very fair, and very competent, overview of the main figures and strands in the later antiquarian tradition—Kircher, Maffei, the English, the French Jansenists and the Dutch encyclopedists Graevius and Gronovius. And we must remember that much as with Momigliano four score and ten years later, there was no narrative for Stark to fall back on: it had to be pieced together through primary research.

The key figure in Stark's historical account was Peiresc. He hails him as "the great Peiresc", "one of the most universal men of modern times, the first archaeological critic, important more through his letters and personal communication than through writings. In him was united for the first time in Europe the breakthrough of the coming study of nature with literary erudition and art sensibility." And Stark noted, too, that he lived—and still lived—under an unlucky star, an *Unstern* that affected also his manuscript *Nachlass*, "which even today is still not fully exploited."³⁷ We could say that a measure of how right Stark *got* the antiquarian tradition is just how precisely he *got* the importance of Peiresc. By comparison,

Stark devotes a paragraph to Kircher, a paragraph to Maffei, a long paragraph to Cassiano dal Pozzo—which was surely unusual at the time, given that Lumbroso had published his *Notizie* only five years earlier—and *five pages to Peiresc alone*. This was more than he allotted to anyone else before the glorious age of Wickelmann (13 pages) and Goethe (7 pages). Stark’s survey of Peiresc’s life is as detailed as anything published between Gassendi’s *Vita* of 1641 and Henri Leclerq’s biographical entry in the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétien et de liturgie* (1939).³⁸

It would be hard to summarize Peiresc’s achievement more succinctly than did Stark.

The great and enduring importance of this man for archaeology lies precisely in his universal scientific position, that universal history [was] to him equally in combination with ethnography and geography the goal for study of monuments, as a prejudice-free, empirical and experimental study of nature; exactly these studies he gave leave to consider with a sharp, comparing, proof-driven observation of the object as a necessary condition.³⁹

Ever perceptive, Stark recognized that comparison drove Peiresc’s studies.⁴⁰ And Stark also caught the importance of the East for Peiresc, but in a fascinating window into the late nineteenth-century German map of the East, he re-describes the Near East as a *Greek*, rather than “Oriental” or even “Levantine” cultural space (in this he overweights the role of Cyprus).⁴¹

Stark pointed to the remains in Carpentras—he even mentions the number of manuscript volumes (82)—and identified which materials are found in which volumes, concluding that “the influence of Peiresc extends into all the important antiquarian works of the age, which he selflessly promoted.”⁴² Jacob Spon, in many ways Stark’s hero for turning attention towards the monumental and aesthetic, “had,” Stark wrote, “in the spirit of Peiresc brought the entire field of monumental sources into his vision,” adding an especial concentration on Greek inscriptions as Peiresc had for oriental materials.⁴³ Mabillon, Montfaucon and

Caylus were others who cited Peiresc's work from time to time, and the latter two devoted enough attention to him as to suggest that they viewed him as something of an ancestor. As late as 1820, C.A. Böttiger, a close collaborator of Goethe's, in his introduction to the first (and last) volume of *Amalthea oder Museum der Kunstmythologie und bildlichen Alterthumskunde* (1820) called Peiresc "the first Archaeologist" and offered that he and his successor, Spon, "actually began Archaeology."⁴⁴

Having traversed the semantic landscape of antiquarianism in the first two parts of his *Handbuch* and the human landscape in the third part, Stark was able to reflect with greater clarity on what he meant by the terms "antiquarianism" and "archaeology." "Nowadays," he wrote, "we expressly separate Antiquitates from Antiquity and the Antiquarian from the Archaeological—or, we designate a certain part of Archaeology specially as the antiquarian, which includes representation of the technology as well as the manner of living." The Roman category of *Antiquitates* referred to the "total narrative of the way of living, institutions and manners," and were divided up in various ways, as in the great summae of the late seventeenth century, by Gronovius and Graevius. But even when studying monuments—what Stark calls "special archaeology"—this antiquarianism was not archaeology because it never included the perspective of the aesthetic.⁴⁵ It bears remembering that Stark's career coincided with the vast nineteenth-century projects of collecting and document large bodies of ancient inscriptions, both Latin and Greek. His sense of the power of antiquarianism, of its reach, and also of its limits, reflects this contemporary activity.

What makes the case of Stark so valuable and interesting is that his own conceptual language is in fact refined by historical study. His whole distinction between antiquarianism and archaeology, and the significance in it of visual culture and art is itself built on the work of Spon. In other words, in reconstructing the history of antiquarianism Stark discovered that past practitioners had actually formulated principles that remained valuable—but which needed to be disinterred by the historian before they could be applied by

the theorist. As he was willing to wear both hats he was able to grasp these forgotten insights.

Jacob Spon, a doctor from Lyon, had coined the term “archaeographia” in the preface to his *Miscellanea eruditae antiquitatis* (1685). He defined his neologism as “knowledge of the monuments through which the Ancients transmitted their religion, history, politics and other arts and sciences, and tried to pass them down to posterity.” For Stark the key was Spon’s emphasis on monuments.⁴⁶ More extensively presented in his *Réponse a la critique de Mr Guillet* (1679) was Spon’s answer to the person who viewed printed books as “history itself” (*l’histoire mesme*) and inscriptions and medals as merely “monuments which serve history” (*monumens qui servent à l’histoire*). This was Bacon’s distinction between antiquities and history, or Momigliano’s between “ancient history and the antiquarian.”⁴⁷

In putting the difference between him and his antagonist in these terms, Spon helped articulate a major turning point in western scholarship: the idea that things—objects, matter—constituted the building blocks of history; that words were not the only source of truth; that narrative alone was not identical with “history” but rather an interpretation of it. “For me,” Spon continued, “I say that books are not more history than medals or inscriptions, and that it is not the one or the other but the pieces from which it is drawn”.⁴⁸

Turning to that science of monuments which his antagonist mocked, Spon set forth the eight parts that constituted *Archaeologia*, or, as he preferred *archaeografia*, “the science of what the Ancients wanted to teach posterity about their religion, their sciences, their history and their politics, by the original monuments which they have left us.” The eight divisions he envisioned, entirely constituted by different material remains, are numismatics, epigraphy, ancient architecture, iconography (including sculpture), glyptography, toreumatographia (the study of reliefs—Spon clearly felt the need for new terms; itself a fascinating window into his sensibility), bibliography and *Angeiographia*, “a vast and

prickly” field that included weights, measures, vases, domestic and agricultural utensils, games, clothing “and a thousand other things whose study does not easily fit in the previous sciences.”⁴⁹

If, Stark notes, in the *Miscellanea*, one adds in also as either subordinate or interstitial, fields of inquiry such as *Deipnographia* (study of dining customs), *Dulographia* (study of slavery), and *Taphographia* (study of funerary customs), then we would indeed be dealing here with a “mixture of archaeological and antiquarian principles.”

In formulating his own categories Spon drew heavily—though not as visibly as one might expect—on his fellow southerner, Peiresc.⁵⁰ Most decisive is his use of Peiresc as the key figure when he needed a reply to his Antagonist’s doubt that an antiquarian could do better than a reader of books “Which he would not, therefore, have done to antiquaries of the highest order, like a Mr. de Peiresk [sic], the most universal who ever there was in these matters.”⁵¹ And then, a bit later, digressing to show “the merit of a real antiquary,” Spon quotes verbatim from a memo drawn up by Peiresc summarizing his meeting with the Netherlandish artist and antiquary Wenceslas Coberg in Brussels, on 30 July 1606.⁵²

As a historian who read unpublished manuscripts as well as printed books, and who paid attention to the theoretical implications of the one as well as the explicit methodological pronouncements of the other, Stark was able to trace the historical impact of antiquarian scholarship from the Renaissance through the seventeenth century and on into the eighteenth-century origins of archaeology. If Spon clearly defended the value of material evidence, the next key step lay in the explicit awareness of the special meaning of objects that were “art.”

From Spon, Stark turned to John Potter, an Oxford fellow and younger contemporary (1673/4- 1747). He was much less sophisticated than Spon and did not talk about monuments in his *Archaeologia graeca or the antiquities of*

Greece (1695-99). But, as if to prove the point, Potter's German translator Ernst Rambach did. In 1778 he added a section in which "Archaeological Investigations" are described as including not just numismatics, metrology and paleography—legacy fields of the "old" antiquarianism just then becoming the "new" *Hilfswissenschaften*—but also architecture, sculpture and painting.⁵³ This addition precisely highlights a change in terminology between 1699 and 1778.

According to Stark, despite the important achievements of the English in the sphere of ancient art—he thought theirs was the most sophisticated culture of antiquity in the eighteenth century—and those of dynamic French antiquaries such as the Comte de Caylus and Jean-Jacques Barthélemy, it was in Germany that Spon found his real heirs (we might rightly disagree with the nationalist priority dispute). According to Stark, the first push towards separating "archaeologia" from "antiquitates" was given by Johann Friedrich Christ (1700–1756) in his lectures on "Literatur oder Archaeologie der Literatur" at Leipzig. His successor, Johann August Ernesti, published his lectures in 1768 as *Archaeologia literaria*.⁵⁴ At the same time, the establishment in Leipzig of a branch of the Dresden Academy of Fine Arts in 1764 put an institution's resources behind the inclusion of art in the conception of antiquity.⁵⁵ But change came slowly. While in Leipzig archaeology was being focused on artistic monuments, at that same Dresden Academy, Philipp Daniel Lippert was Professor of Ancient Art and still thinking like a good seventeenth-century antiquary. "Every stone," he wrote, "will have an explanation from Greek and Latin writers or poets. For every page, against this, will I, as much as possible, attach parallels from statues, sculptures, coins, lamps, paintings and inscriptions, and list the authors, so that at once one has together a whole conspectus of all *Antiquitates*." With this, he thought, difficult passages of ancient literature could be easily explicated.⁵⁶

And yet, meanings were shifting. At around the same time (1767), Lippert's much greater collaborator, Christian Gottlob Heyne, began his lecture course on archaeology at Göttingen, published as *Einleitung in das Studium der Antike* in

1772. He focused Lippert's comparative approach on the description and dissection of ancient art works. Art for him was the object of archaeology, and when his lectures were eventually published ten years after his death they bore the title *Archäologie der Kunst des Alterthums, insbesondere der Griechen und Römer*. Not coincidentally, this was the very title that Stark chose for his own work. Writing in 1880, Stark could proclaim that "Archaeology is now the specific name for lectures on ancient Art, both inside and outside of Germany."⁵⁷

But this triumph of archaeology was bought at the price of an ever narrowed grasp. It no longer dared refer to a general conspectus of *Antiquitates* or *Altertumswissenschaft*, but only the specific vision of an *Archäologie der Baukunst* (Stieglitz, 1801) or *Archäologie der Malerei* (Böttinger, 1811) or *Archäologie der Kunst* (Karl Otfried Müller, 1830). Responsible for this was: Winckelmann. And, again, a century's hindsight can only make us appreciate even more Stark's unerring feel for the history of historical scholarship.

Even as Carl Justi was publishing the first of his monumental three-volume biography of Winckelmann emphasizing Winckelmann the Beautiful, Stark was publishing his own biographical essay on Winckelmann stressing Winckelmann's roots as a "Polyhistor" who did important work on things like Merovingian diplomata. Stark wondered of the bookish Winckelmann how it was that "this kind of so commendable detailed medieval scholarship be done by our Prophet of the Beautiful"—the point being that Winckelmann's position vis à vis the antiquarian tradition badly needed reassessment.⁵⁸ Indeed, the recent work of Ingo Herklotz and Élisabeth Décultot on restoring Winckelmann the *érudit* follows Stark directly.⁵⁹

Both Herklotz and Décultot have noted the relationship between Winckelmann and Peiresc, and there is much here to go into more deeply. There are the explicit references to the "famous Peiresc" ("des berühmten Peiresc") in the *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*, and in his private correspondence, and to the "immortal Peiresc" ("dell'immortale Peirescio") in the *Monumenti Antichi*

inediti.⁶⁰ Each mention is occasioned by reference to the content of unpublished letters from Peiresc to Cassiano dal Pozzo, manuscripts that were then in the collection of Cardinal Albani—whose librarian Winckelmann was! (It is a fascinating irony of unexplored importance that Winckelmann, who drew so heavily on the manuscripts of Cassiano then in Albani’s collection, was Bibliotecario when Cassiano’s collection of drawings, the *Museo Cartaceo*, was sold to the English Crown in the first half of 1762.)⁶¹ And then there are Winckelmann’s reading notes excerpting from Peiresc’s letters. What is notable about these is how exactly representative they are of antiquarian interests at the time. The excerpts include discussions of ancient coins and gems, weights and measures, bronzes, drawings preserved in the Vatican of objects since lost, as well as the moderns who had commented on them already. But Winckelmann also had an ear for what made Peiresc’s antiquarianism distinctive—his common approach to antiquities, natural history and ethnography—recording also Peiresc’s queries about fossils, marine petrifications, Baltic amber and volcanic eruptions in Ethiopia.⁶²

But in addition to these specific references to Peiresc, there are deeper and more alluring parallels of practice. Décultot explains that Winckelmann’s emphasis on the spectator’s affect as an interpretative key required a new kind of ekphrasis; Peiresc was a master of the older form of description.⁶³ Décultot contrasts Winckelmann’s “vertical ethnology” with the “transverse” approach of contemporary antiquaries like Caylus; this, in turn, grew out of Peiresc’s oriental studies of a century earlier.⁶⁴ Décultot draws attention to the importance of natural history for Winckelmann as an autoptic space; Peiresc pursued naturalist observation in parallel with antiquarian observation.⁶⁵ Décultot stresses the ironic point that Winckelmann, who championed knowledge through direct observation, was also deeply committed to the power of the “conjecture” or “hypothesis”; the same was true for Peiresc.⁶⁶ In the *Handbuch*, then, Stark gets Winckelmann right just as he does Peiresc.

Winckelmann's broad vision of art as an index of social change, to borrow from Francis Haskell, had the unintended consequence of investing the project of archaeology with a much broader remit, so that to "*Classical Archaeology*", which was invented then, could be assigned the responsibility of capturing the ethnographic and cultural-historical dimensions of art.⁶⁷ For Winckelmann's total history, in Carl Justi's view, joined the "erudition of the student of antiquity, the wealth of illustrative material of the Roman antiquary, the experience of the sculptor and the thinking of the philosopher."⁶⁸ But, interestingly—and Stark caught this as well—Winckelmann used the term "History," not "Archaeology", to characterize his work. For him, archaeology was already tainted by overmuch proximity to antiquarianism and "antiquarioli."

"Winckelmann and his Century," was Goethe's compelling homage to Montesquieu's attempt to grasp the *Spirit* of a historical development (in one case through law, in the other art). Momigliano was surely right to link Winckelmann's achievement with Gibbon's as the climax of early modern history-writing.⁶⁹ But Goethe actually provides us with even finer analytical tools. First of all, when he tried to write history it came out looking a lot like antiquarianism—Bacon's "unperfect histories" come to mind.⁷⁰ Second, he thought hard about the different ways of thinking that lay behind the different ways of writing. In one of a series of passages aimed at elucidating the function of description in botany he explained that there were four different types of scholars, those who sought knowledge only in order to apply it, those who observed and described, those who insensibly fused the observed into the imagined, and the "comprehensive whom vanity might call creators" who actually came to observation of the world with powerful ideas.⁷¹ Stark saw this, too, and argued that Goethe was so receptive to Winckelmann's project because he perceived the parallel between the study of "style" in art and morphology in botany and comparative anatomy.⁷²

Thus, where Momigliano thought in terms of content when he pointed to Gibbon as the union of "antiquarianism" and "history," Goethe thought in terms of epistemology, and saw Winckelmann as the figure in whom met *a posteriori*

description and *a priori* imagination. Here, indeed, Goethe comes very close to figuring these different modes of historical study in terms of Immanuel Kant's distinction between the "synthetic" and the "analytic." Indeed, in *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert* he actually asserted that the only kind of intellectual work "able to reject or oppose or scorn with impunity the great philosophical movement initiated by Kant" was, in fact, the perfect antiquarian.

By occupying himself exclusively with the best the world has produced and by comparing humbler, even inferior things to those excellent achievements alone, his erudition reaches such a high level, his judgment becomes so authoritative, his taste develops such consistency, that within his own area of competence he appears admirably, even astonishingly well trained.⁷³

F. A. Wolf, in 1807, had seemingly thought of *Altertumswissenschaft* differently, describing it as a "*Statistik* of Remains."⁷⁴ The reference here was not to Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, nor to the antiquarian arts of the Renaissance but to the new political science made famous by Ludwig August von Schlözer who, in his *Lectures on Statistik* published only three years earlier, had famously written that "*Statistik* was static history; history *Statistik* in motion." In this we can see Momigliano's famous diagnosis of early modern historical culture preserved and transformed: structural, synchronic analysis *versus* diachronic narrative. And so, in the end, even as he redescribed the project in Schlözer's terms, Wolf was still pointing back to the old world of scholars and connoisseurs.

Writing in *propria persona*, Stark insisted on the priority of art-archaeology over antiquarianism; of ultimately, Justi's Winckelmann over Wolf's Schlözer. "It remains, therefore," he wrote, "a difficult but necessary task to separate the purely antiquarian from the Art-Archaeological, not to make the non-artistic perspective into the guiding and deciding one."⁷⁵ Antiquarianism, if not each and every antiquary, stopped short of seeing through the monuments to the minds of those who made them. It was therefore only the combined work of archaeologists

and artists—or of their qualities united in a single person, such as Winckelmann—that could reach back and recover the past.

Stark's achievement was itself extraordinary. He did not just pull together a diverse and complex narrative, but he was able to see past the conceptions of contemporary historiography to the vital links between early modern antiquarianism and nineteenth-century philology and archaeology. His contemporary, Jacob Burckhardt, whom he does not talk about, represented the prolongation of Winckelmann's⁷⁶—or Hegel's—view of art as the most telling index of the age. In terms of Stark's historical narrative, Burckhardt the art historian-as-cultural historian represented one possible outcome of the developments he had been analyzing.

III. A Future of Antiquarianism

Nevertheless, the triumph of Art-Archaeology did not mean the disappearance of antiquarianism. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the work of Stark's exact contemporary, Jacob Bernays. For it was Bernays, in a couple of spell-binding articles of the 1870s, who staked out the counter-cultural argument for the debt still outstanding to scholars of the 1620s and 1630s, like Claude Saumaise and Gabriel Naudé. In the 1870s he was lecturing on the study of antiquities from Sigonio and Panvinio up through Gibbon and Niebuhr⁷⁷, and in his contribution to Theodor Mommsen's festschrift—Mommsen, who himself mocked the laborers “auf dem antiquarischen Bauplatz”!—signalled the contribution of the antiquaries to the kind of problem that Mommsen had made, and claimed, as his own.⁷⁸ Bernays had coincided with Mommsen at Breslau—Mommsen at the University, of course, and Bernays at the Jüdisches Theologisches Seminar.⁷⁹ And Bernays' masterpiece seized upon Joseph Scaliger, the leading scholar of the age of antiquaries, as the focal point for an investigation of what marked the profile of the age. It is striking to read Bernays'

biography today for it seems so modern with its emphasis on placing Scaliger's achievements in their context. This is even more extraordinary an achievement measured against the tremendous effort of erudition that was required to know his character from the inside out, and which is so stylishly internalized, and so lightly worn.

Looking at the kind of books written by his contemporaries makes us realize even more how amazing and unique was Bernays' achievement. For he was taking a mass of erudite questions and finding in them the person, the mind, even the mentality, of the man. In short, Bernays tackled Scaliger the way an army scout might tackle a high outcropping: as a crucial vantage point for surveying a whole contested landscape.⁸⁰

Bernays as a cultural historian working in the history of scholarship reminds us that there were other paths to the *Kultur der Renaissance* than the one chosen by Burckhardt. Bernays represents another kind of cultural history, an alternative antiquarian legacy. For him, it is not art so much as the history of scholarship, and in particular *historical* scholarship, which guides us directly into the spirit of the time. We understand this better if we accept Momigliano's later claim—uttered as if a disciple of Bernays—that the history of historical scholarship is nothing less than the history of how our predecessors defined, sought, and found, the truth. Bernays, who paid such careful attention to the scholarly tools of the early modern antiquaries, himself represents something of the perdurance of their approach, or at least their vision, on into the nineteenth century. (Just as Momigliano's admiration for Bernays might suggest its continuity into the twentieth.) Bernays's *Scaliger* shows that such a perspective was still capable of rising to the heights of historical and even human understanding—that scholarship could provide the same access to a cultural vision as art.⁸¹

But Stark's wider oeuvre suggests still a third path to understanding the meaning of the past, neither from art history nor from history of scholarship—this despite his majestic *Handbuch*. For if we were to turn away from Stark's studies of the

ancient world we would find a fascinating book documenting a trip he had taken through France in the Fall of 1852: *Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich* (1855). Half a century earlier, the great antiquary, and first reviver of Peiresc, Aubin Louis Millin (1759-1818) had travelled through the Midi and published what Stark hailed as “the richest work on the Roman monuments of the South.”⁸² Stark is *not* writing this book, though he frequently cites it. Antiquity may be in the title, but his focus is on the moment when cities came together to serve a cultural historical role. “They are given in the title as *city life*, *art* and *antiquity*, as three equal perspectives on the central cultural historical point.” Stark contrasts this with the role of cities in modern industrial and bureaucratic society. And yet, even so, he finds that contemporary cities still retained their role as “bearers of all the new lifestyles” and as the location “of all the highest spiritual life.” What was then still true only residually was wholly true for the ancient world and middle ages.⁸³

Stark’s inspiration came was from the venerable genre of travel-writing; the aspiration was to what we would today call cultural geography, but which did not then exist. Reflecting on his predecessors, Stark noted that his “physiognomic view of the city” was extremely rare. In particular—and this is long before Karl Lamprecht associated himself with the idea of cultural landscape—Stark felt that there were rich and untapped resources for the traveler to study in

the relationship between land and soil, mountains and valleys, above all the relationship to water, to the river, or even to the sea, then the ways, names of streets, the remains of perimeter walls or their replacements, the boulevards, the grouping of chief religious, political and economic buildings relative to one another, the grouping of particular trades in today’s time and those of earlier time only surviving in names, the city-dweller’s way of building that in different neighborhoods often show such garish opposites, the redesign of the lands nearest the city, [and] finally what however only staying longer

can develop, the whole range of local expressions, ways of speaking, manners, [and] forms of law.⁸⁴

The physiognomic approach is perhaps expressed most directly in Stark's comments about Paris. For here it is not the complex relationships in the physical landscape that are the focus—though Stark is right to claim innovativeness for his presentation of these—but the even more complex interactions of the different forms of cultural creation that play out in the different physical spaces of the city. And even today, he writes, and even in a city as well-known as Paris, most people would be unable to identify “specifically urban ways of life, and also which role did Paris play earlier as a city in relation to others, these are questions that can likely be answered by examining the city's physiognomy and using tools of historical evidence.”⁸⁵

“City Physiognomy” and the “historische Hilfsmittel”—a term so hard to translate, and so bound up with the nineteenth century's love for auxiliary sciences-- bridge the gap between antiquarianism, history, and the newer kind of cultural science of urban space that Stark is proposing. With this we can almost look beyond Lamprecht to Walter Benjamin's work on Paris.

At the same time, this turn to cultural geography, or city physiognomies, calls upon a specific, and in Stark's case different, set of talents. “I must not be an Archaeologist,” he writes, nor a scholar fascinated by noble ruins. For “the true historical interest” it was necessary to put the “physiognomy” of today's flourishing cities at the center, modern places like Toulouse, Bordeaux, Lyon, Orleans etc. It was both the continuities across time and the ruptures that he wanted to trace. And in the back of his mind, there was always the Italian example. “And truly, city life in the age of Rome [and] that of the Middle Ages on Gallic soil, can be put on nearly the same page with that of the Italian soil.”⁸⁶

With this the example of Burckhardt's *Cicerone* hoves into view, and an extraordinary ‘what if’: what if Stark's vision of the cultural-geographical travel

book had triumphed over Burckhardt's history-of-art travel book? The one focused on France with a long look back to the ancient world but with an eye towards the modern life of places, the other on Italy, with an emphasis on the arts that made the modern break with the past. The former attentive to material culture—Spon's *angeiographia*—the latter to painting, sculpture and architecture. The one, protestations to the contrary, pointing towards archaeology, the other to art history. These are a set of questions we cannot answer, but they do help clarify exactly what the stakes were—and where the fractures lie—in that mid-nineteenth century breaking and remaking of the connections to the past and the way it was studied.

For Stark belongs to those German decades c. 1850-1870 which saw the birth of the cultural sciences and which Momigliano identified with the disintegration of classical philology as the great disciplinary aggregator. Stark's interest in city portraits and in cultural landscape, like his commitment to the meaning of art in archaeology links him with this same shift.

In 1880, the year Stark published the first volume of his *Handbuch der Archaeologie der Kunst*—and where his history necessarily ends--his praise of the antiquaries would have fallen on not just unreceptive, but uncomprehending ears. "Professional", big-budget archaeology was recording its first great successes, at Pergamon and Olympia, while antiquarian scholarship had long become "antiquarian"—the pejorative description for the small-minded seeking out the small-scale (Winckelmann's *antiquarioli*). Among historians, cultural history of the sort practiced by the antiquaries had long been drubbed off the field, while the influence of Jacob Burckhardt's *Kultur der Renaissance* was rising, though far from the obvious winner it now seems today.

Indeed, in 1880, the star that seemed most ascendent might have been that of Karl Lamprecht. His studies of Romanesque ornamented *incipits* and the Triar-Ada manuscript had just appeared, and he was teaching students like Aby Warburg at Bonn (where Bernays happened then to be teaching as well) about

the relationship between art and historical change while working out his massively researched new economic history-as-cultural history: a study of the Mosel region in the high middle ages (1885-86, 4 vols.). In this work Lamprecht would bring together the study of physical space (*Landesgeschichte*) with the history of law, trade, commerce and art. What emerged looked like economic history from the outside—*Statistik* in an age of statistics—but was a material cultural history through and through. There were antecedents for this kind of work amongst the amateur antiquarians of the earlier nineteenth century *Geschichtsvereine*, but Lamprecht was not about to identify with them.

With Lamprecht and Pirenne—one of Lamprecht’s protégés—and the latter’s god-children, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch, we are firmly in the world of the “new” history of the twentieth century, which with little self-consciousness on this small point, resumed the impetus of these earlier efforts at cultural history but now under the banner of economic and social history. Indeed, as Momigliano himself suggested, the modern cultural sciences emerged out of the decaying antiquarianism.⁸⁷ With this, the antiquarians receded still further into the backcloth. Pedagogical works like Stark’s found the oblivion destined for all such books.⁸⁸

Yet, if we were to reconstruct the afterlife of the antiquarian as carefully as we have tried to reconstruct the afterlife of antiquity, we would be able to trace not just the continuity of practice—one thinks here of the persistence of the “descriptive,” or synchronic mode—but also the ongoing *genetic* relationship between Lamprecht and his twentieth-century heirs. For Henri Berr, whom we know as the French promotor of Lamprecht, Febvre and Bloch, also wrote a sympathetic portrait of Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, after Millin the second modern student of Peiresc.⁸⁹ So there remained a dimly perceived, and usually misconstrued relationship to the antiquarian past; Stark was truly exceptional in the seriousness and sympathy with which he pursued the history of the antiquarian origins of archaeology. Even Momigliano, in the end not so interested in antiquarianism, when turning to Stark for guidance also accepted

some of his prescriptions: most notably that Peiresc was the “archetype” of all antiquaries.⁹⁰ In the history of historiography, the serpent is always reaching for his tail.

¹ Arnaldo Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Rome, 1955), 69.

² Private communication from Professor Connors; the url is no longer supported by Columbia University.

³ For Momigliano’s project see *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, ed. Peter N. Miller (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2007), esp. Miller, “Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism and the Cultural Sciences.”

⁴ Stark is, for example, not mentioned once in the 710 pages of Bruce Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge, 2006, 2nd ed.) nor in Stephen L. Dyson, *In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts. A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006). Stark is mentioned four times in Helmut Sichtermann, *Kulturgeschichte der klassischen Archäologie* (Munich: Beck, 1996) but without discussion of his work.

⁵ Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian,” 69n3.

⁶ K. Bernhard Stark, *Vorträge und Aufsätze aus dem Gebiete der Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*, ed. Gottfried Kinkel (Leipzig: Teubner, 1880).

⁷ Karl Friedrich Hermann’s four-volume *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten* (1858–75).

⁸ “...umfasst alle Erscheinungen und Aeusserungen seines Lebens und seiner Thätigkeit vor einem bestimmten Zeitpunkte,” Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, 1.

⁹ What makes these *Handbücher* such fascinating documents, despite their incredibly turgid style, is that each simple apodictic statement is then supported by such a thick web of references as to provide the modern inquirer with an almost ready-made map with which to explore the question. To support this he refers to Platner, *Ueber wissenschaftliche Begründung und Behandlung der Antiquitäten* (Marburg, 1812) 8; also F.S.W. Hoffmann, *Lebensbilder berühmter Humanisten* (Leipzig, 1837), 58 and A. F. Elze, *Ueber Philologie als System* (Dessau, 1845) for the idea of the wide study of the past, and for the neologisms

he cites F. A. Wolf, *Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft* (Berlin, 1807), 101–45 and his *Vorlesungen*, vol. I ed. Gürtler (Leipzig, 1831) and vol. VI ed. F.S.W. Hoffman (1833).

¹⁰ “...sed gratias mihi potius de perductis ad litus e tanto naufragio supernatantibus, parum autem apparentibus, tabulis haberi, quam de tota navi desiderata rationem a me exposci debere contenderim” Biondo Flavio, *Italy Illuminated. Volume I. Books I-IV*, ed. and tr. Jeffrey A. White (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2005), 4. On the derivation by Bacon from Biondo and what it means, see now Anthony Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 137–8 and the bibliography there.

¹¹ Hermann, *Lehrbuch*, p.2.

¹² Carl Bernhard Stark, *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*. Abt. I Systematik und Geschichte der Archäologie der Kunst (Leipzig, 1880, rpt. Elibron Classics, Boston, MA, 2005), 1,#1.

¹³ “Es ist schliesslich auch die Methode der Arbeit auf dem archäologischen Gebiete, welche als eine Anwendung der philologischen und zugleich der naturwissenschaftlichen Methode der Forschung, der genauesten Feststellung des Thatsächlichen, wie einer in dem Geiste des Alterthums überhaupt und spezielle dieser Stilweise geübten Ergänzung und Wiederherstellung einer nur trümmerhaft uns erhaltenen Kunstwelt sich kundgiebt,” Stark, *Handbuch*, #1,p.2

¹⁴ “Summas esse notiones indagandas veteribus nationibus natura insitas et in singulis antiqui cultus partibus velut in adspectabilibus imaginibus expressas” Boeckh, *Kleine Schriften*, I. Leipzig, 1858, 105, quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 3.

¹⁵ Christian Conrad Ludwig Lange, *Die klassische Philologie in ihrer Stellung zum Gesamtgebiete der Wissenschaften und in ihrer innern Gliederung: eine Antrittsvorlesung* (Prague, 1855), 12; quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 3.

¹⁶ Alexander Conze, *Ueber die Bedeutung der klassischen Archäologie: eine Antrittsvorlesung* (Vienna, 1869), 5: “wo sich der Querdurchschnitt der klassischen Philologie und der Längendurchschnitt der Kunstwissenschaften

kreuzen, da und genau da liegt das Gebiet der klassischen Archäologie.” Quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 3.

¹⁷ “ja ich möchte behaupten, wie sich die vergleichende Sprachenkunde gebildet hat, ebenso dürfte sich eine vergleichende Culturgeschichte des gesammten Alterthums mit der Zeit als eine Hauptaufgabe der philologischen Wissenschaft herausstellen. [Boeckh, *Rede zur Begrüssung der Philologenversammlung in Berlin 1850*. Kleine Schriften II.1859, p.189], quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 3.

¹⁸ “Chinesische, Indische, Aegyptische Alterthümer sind immer nur Curiositäten; es ist sehr wohl gethan sich und die Welt damit bekannt zu machen, zu sittlicher und ästhetischer Bildung aber werden sie nur wenig fruchten” Goethe, *Werke* vol. XXIII, 278, quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 4.

¹⁹ See now, for example, on Heyne, Michael Carhart, *The Science of Culture in Enlightenment Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), chs.3, 4 and 6.

²⁰ F. A. Wolf: “die Erkenntniss der alterthümlichen Menschheit selbst, welch aus der, durch das Studium der alten Ueberreste bedingten Beobachtung einer organisch entwickelten Nationalbildung hervorgeht.” Boeckh: “Reconstruction des gesammten Lebens der Völker des klassischen Alterthums, sämmtlicher Bildungskreise und Erzeugnisse derselben in ihren praktischen und geistigen Richtungen” in Stark, *Handbuch*, 4, #2 “Stellung der Archäologie zu der klassischen Philologie”.

²¹ “Und daneben dehnt sich ein weites Gebiet vor dem Auge des Alterthumsforschers aus: die kolossalen und die kleinsten Architekturwerke, die künstlichen Veränderungen der Erdoberfläche in Land und Wasser, Höhe und Tiefe, die durch den Menschen geformten oder überhaupt veränderten Naturobjekte, wie die Reste der Speise, der Farbenpigmente, der Oele....”. Stark, *Handbuch*, 4, #2 Stellung der Archaöologie zu der klassischen Philologie.”

²² Stark, *Handbuch*, 5–6. Philology, Antiquarianism, Archaeology; for the latter, the “Hilfswissenschaften” were, Stark wrote, Topography and Numismatics. Just as Epigraphy and Diplomatics were graphical as well as material, and so on the

border between purely literary and purely monumental approaches, a fully archaeological mode would have less use for them (*Handbuch*, 74-6).

²³ O. Jahn, “Ueber Wesen und wichtigste Aufgaben der archäologischen Studien” (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich-Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, II (1849), 209ff.: “das Wesen der wissenschaftlichen Behandlung beruht nicht auf der Einheit des Objectes, sondern auf der Einheit des Principes, von welchem sie ausgeht, dessen sie sich bei allen Untersuchungen stets bewusst ist und welches ihr den sichern Masstab giebt, das Wesentliche vom Unwesentlichen zu sondern” quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 11.

²⁴ Stark, *Handbuch*, 7–8.

²⁵ “Die Dinge nun nach dieser Seite selbstständig weiter zu betrachten, sie zu benutzen für den antiquarischen oder sonstigen Gesichtspunkt, das fällt der Aufgabe der diese Seite des antiken Lebens repräsentirenden Disciplin zu, nicht mehr der Archäologie. Auch der Inschriftenstein, die Schreibtafel, die Münze, die Papyrus-rolle, das in das Alterthum hinein reichende Manuscriptenblatt fordern in ihrer äusseren Form, in der Vertheilung der Schrift, in dem Verhältniss zum bildlichen Beiwerk, endlich in der Buchstabenform selbst eine archäologische Betrachtung heraus.” Stark, *Handbuch*, 8.

²⁶ Jahn: “Archäologie ist uns mithin die wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung der durch Masse, Form und Farbe wirkenden Denkmäler der Völker des klassischen Alterthums nach der ihnen eigenthümlichen Ausdrucksweise, und die darauf wesentlich gegründete Erkenntniss der Entwicklung und des Bestandes des bildenden Kunst im Alterthum, als eines Gliedes in dem gesammten Culturleben desselben, oder kurz gefasst die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit der bildenden Kunst des Alterthums” quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 9.

²⁷ Boeckh, “Oratio etc. MDCCCXXII habita,” in *Kleine Schriften*, 105, quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, p.9.

²⁸ Boeckh, *Encyklopädie der philologische Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1877), 25: “Die Philologie ist historische Construction des Alterthums,” “die Erkenntniss des

Alterthums in seinem ganzen Umfange,” and “die Erkenntnis des Erkannten” quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 9.

²⁹ Bernhardt, *Grundlinien zur Encyklopädie der Philologie*, (Halle, 1832), 52, quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 11.

³⁰ Stark, *Handbuch*, 39.

³¹ Stark, *Handbuch*, 44.

³² Guido Panciroli in *De magistratibus municipalibus* (1593) cited patristic and byzantine sources referring to an ancient place called variously in Latin *tabularium*, *antiquarium* or *archium* and in Greek *chartophylacium*, *grammatophilacium* or *archaeion*. Joseph Scaliger in his commentary on the letters of Ausonius (1588) used *antiquarius* as a synonym for *kalligraphos* (cited in Jan Marco Sawilla, *Antiquarianismus, Hagiographie und Historie im 17. Jahrhundert. Zum Werk der Bollandisten. Ein wissenschaftlicher Versuch* (Tübingen, 2009), 238n64, 239n65).

³³ Stark, *Handbuch*, 44.

³⁴ Herklotz, *Cassiano dal Pozzo und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1999); William Stenhouse, *Reading Inscriptions & Writing Ancient History. Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance* (London, 2005).

³⁵ Stark, *Handbuch*, 87.

³⁶ “Jedes nähere Eingehen auf die wichtigsten literarischen Produkte dieser Epoche giebt uns ein anderes Bild. Noch heute sind wir mit einem grossen Theil unserer Monumentenkenntniss auf die Veröffentlichungen jener Zeit angewiesen, ein guter Theil der Durchschnittskenntniss des Publikums ruht auf ihnen. Und zugleich sind die bedeutsamsten Anläufe damals gemacht worden, um zu einer umfassenden und lebensvollen Erkenntniss der antiken Kunst zu gelangen. Die archäologischen Nebenquellen sind gerade damals mit grossem Eifer aufgesucht und verfolgt und überhaupt die ganze Breite der monumentalen Welt des Alterthums erst ermessen worden.” Stark, *Handbuch*, 108.

³⁷ Peiresc was “einer der universalsten Menschen der modernen Zeit, der erste archäologische Kritiker, mehr durch seine Briefe und persönlichen Verkehr als durch Schriften wirksam. In ihm vereinte sich die damals zuerst in Europa zum

Durchbruch kommende Naturforschung mit Sprachgelehrsamkeit und mit Kunstsinn. Ein Unstern hat über seinen gewaltigen literarischen Nachlass gewaltet, der selbst noch heute nicht ausgenutzt ist.” Stark, 110.

³⁸ Henri Leclercq, “Peiresc,” *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétien et de liturgie*, ed. F. Cabrol, 15 vols (Paris, 1939), XIV, pp.1–39.

³⁹ “Die grosse und bleibende Bedeutung des Mannes für Archäologie liegt zunächst in seiner universalen wissenschaftlichen Stellung, die ihn ebensowohl die Universalgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Ethnographie und Geographie als Zielpunkt für die monumentalen Studien, wie eine vorurtheilsfreie, empirische und experimentirende Naturforschung, eine scharfe, vergleichende, prüfende Beobachtung der Objekte als nothwendige Voraussetzung eben dieser Studien betrachten liess. Dazu kam ein entschieden künstlerischer Sinn, der in fortwährendem Verkehr mit Künstlern geübt ist und nichts weniger als einseitig bloß das Alte um des Alters willen bewundert,” Stark, *Handbuch*, 132.

⁴⁰ “Der Vergleich zunächst derselben Objektgattungen wie der Münzen in möglicher Fülle, dann aller verschiedenen Gattungen ward von ihm fort und fort geübt,” Stark, *Handbuch*, 133.

⁴¹ “Wichtiger noch ist der unmittelbare Verkehr mit dem griechischen Orient, den Peiresc durch dort Ansässige wie in Smyrna, theils durch Reisende unterhielt....Cypern ist eine Hauptstation seiner wissenschaftlichen Erwerbungen,” Stark, *Handbuch*, 133.

⁴² Stark, *Handbuch*, 134.

⁴³ “Münzkunde, Epigraphik, antike Baukunde, Ikonographie, worin neben den Statuen und Büsten aber auch alle Arten von Einzelbildern in der Malerei z.B. inbegriffen sind, Lehre der geschnittenen Steine (Glyptographie), Reliefkunde (toreumatographia), Handschriftenkunde, Gefässkunde, worunter überhaupt omne instrumenti genus verstanden wird. Wenn er dann aber Disciplinen wie Deipnographia, Dulographia, Taphographia als den genannten untergeordnet oder zwischen ihnen sich bewegend bezeichnet, so tritt hier noch eine Mischung des archäologischen und antiquarischen Principes hervor. Spon hat im Geiste von Peiresc den Gesamtbereich der monumentalen Quellen in's Auge gefasst,

ganz speciell das bis dahin so vernachlässigte Gebiet der griechischen Inschriften unmittelbar aus den Monumenten herausarbeitend wahrhaft eröffnet” in Stark, *Handbuch*, 140. Stark notes that Spon made his way from Lyon to Rome and Greece by way of Aix, where he stopped off to view the Peiresc papers, then still mostly in family hands.

⁴⁴ *Amalthea oder Museum der Kunstmythologie und bildlichen Alterthumskunde*. Im Verein mit mehrern Freunden des Alterthums. ed. C.A. Böttiger, bd.1 (Leipzig, 1820), xxviii–xxix. The context is Peiresc’s study of the tripod found at Fréjus in 1629; Böttiger also refers to Gassendi’s discussion of this episode in the *Vita Peireskii* bk.IV, 152 as well as the Peiresc letters published in Millin’s *Magazin encyclopédique* in 1812–13. *Amalthea* was no unimportant journal; for Stark “In diesen Zeitschriften [Böttiger started another in 1828] begegnen sich bereits die bedeutendsten, aufstrebenden Kräfte eines neuen wissenschaftlichen Standpunktes mit dem absterbenden Kreise der Weimarischen Kunstfreunde” (*Handbuch*, 223).

⁴⁵ Stark, *Handbuch*, 45.

⁴⁶ “Archaeographia est declaratio sive notitia antiquaorum monumentorum, quibus veteres sui temporis religionem historiam politicam aliasque tum artes tum scientias propagare posterisque tradere studerunt” quoted in Stark, *Handbuch*, 46.

⁴⁷ “Il [Guillet] luy plait d’apeller les Livres imprimez *l’histoire mesme*: mais pour les Inscriptions & les medailles, il leur fait seulement l’honneur de les traiter *de monumens qui servent à l’histoire*.” Jacob Spon, *Réponse a la critique publiée par M. Guillet, sur le Voyage de Grece de Iacob Spon* (Lyon, 1679), 59.

⁴⁸ “Pour moy qui ne cherche pas ces distinctions raffinées, je dis que les livres ne sont pas plus l’histoire que les medailles, ou les inscriptions, & qu’il ne sont les uns & les autres que les pieces d’où elle est tirée. Il ne doit pas mesme s’imaginer que les livres ont un grand avantage parce qu’ils sont plus diffus, & qu’il y a plus de matiere pour en compiler l’histoire,” Spon, *Réponse*, 59.

⁴⁹ “*L’Angeiographie* est une étude vaste & épineuse, qui explique les poids, les vases & les mesures, les instrumens pour l’agriculture & pour le domestique, ce

qui appartenoit aux jeux, aux vetemens, à la navigation, & mille autres choses dont l'examen ne se peut pas commodement rapporter aux Sciences precedentes; & qu'on croit pouvoir comprendre sous le nom d'*Angeia*, quoy qu'il ne soit pas assez general." Spon, *Réponse*, 70.

⁵⁰ Interestingly, however, he only mentioned Peiresc in the last category of Angeiography, or material culture, which is somewhat surprising given that Spon, like Montfaucon and Caylus, is one of the few figures we know to have looked at the Peiresc papers and thus knew that he was active across the range of these fields.

⁵¹ Spon, *Réponse*, 72.

⁵² Spon, *Réponse*, 74-77.

⁵³ Stark, *Handbuch*, 46.

⁵⁴ Stark provides bibliographical details in *Handbuch*, 51.

⁵⁵ Stark, *Handbuch*, 46.

⁵⁶ "Jeder Stein wird eine Erklärung aus griechischen und lateinischen Geschichtschreibern oder Poeten haben. Jeder Seite gegenüber werde ich so viel nur möglich die Similia aus Statuen, Marmoren, Münzen, Lampen, Malereien und geschnittenen Steinen mit beifügen und die Autoren hinzusetzen, damit man auf einmal einen ganzen Conspectum der ganzen Antiquitäten zusammen habe: dass auch sogar Knaben die allerschwersten Stellen in Geschichtschreibern und Poeten nicht allein leicht verstehen, sondern sich auch eine gute Kenntniss von den dahin einschlagenden Büchern zuwege bringen können," from a manuscript cited in Justi, *Winckelmann* I.366, quoted by Stark, *Handbuch*, 177-8.

⁵⁷ "Die Archäologie ist jetzt specieller Name für die Vorträge über antike Kunst, innerhalb und ausserhalb Deutschlands." Stark, *Handbuch*, 47.

⁵⁸ "Und dieser Mann, der bereits in der Mitte der Dreissiger stand, der Mann der Bücherwelt, des staubigen Gelehrtenhandwerks, der in ihrer Art so hoch aner kennenswerthen mittelalterlichen Detailforschung, sollte unser Prophet des Schönen, unser Erklärer einer Welt der Anschauung, ein Wegweiser in das Sonnenland der Kunst werden?" K. Bernard Stark, *Johann Joachim*

Winckelmann, sein Bildungsgang und seine bleibende Bedeutung in Sammlung

gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge, ed. Rud. Virchow and Fr. V. Holkendorff, II. Serie, heft 42 (Berlin, 1867), 24.

⁵⁹ Ingo Herklotz, *Cassiano dal Pozzo und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Hirmer, 1999); Élisabeth Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Enquête sur la genèse de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Puf, 2000), explicitly at 221. Herklotz connects Winckelmann back to the seventeenth-century Polyhistor through his study of artifacts; Décultot through his reading practices.

⁶⁰ Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*. Schriften und Nachlass, Band 4,1: Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums. Text. eds. Adolf H. Borbein, Thomas W. Gaethgens, Johannes Irmscher, Max Kunze. (Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2002): "Vorrede," xxx; Pt. I ch.2 (1764), 106n2; Pt. II (1776), 827; *Briefe, Entwürfe und Rezensionen zu den Herkulanischen Schriften*, Bearbeitet von Marianne Gross und Max Kunze, eds. Adolf. H. Borbein, Max Kunze. *JJW Schriften und Nachlass*. Bd 2: Herkulanische Schriften Wincklemanns. Teil 3. Mainz: P. von Sabern , 2001), 212 note 26, 25: in a letter of 21 February 1761 to Count Büнау, Winckelmann refers to the letters of learned men "welche sich in meiner Bibliothek in MS befinden. Unter anderen sind zween Bände Briefe des berühmten Peirescii an den Commendatore del Pozzo"; *Monumenti Antichi Inediti*, 2dn edn, 2 vols (Roma: 1821), I, 60. Winckelmann's excerpta are Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. Allemand, allemand 63, 67.

⁶¹ For a brief discussion of Winckelmann's relationship to Cassiano, see Herklotz, *Cassiano dal Pozzo*, 117–18 and on his use of the Museo Cartaceo, Henning Wrede, "Die Opera de' pili von 1542 und das Berliner Sarkophagcorpus. Zur Geschichte von Sarkophagforschung, Hermeneutik und klassischer Archäologie," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 104 (1989) 373–414, esp. 389–91.

⁶² Winckelmann excerpted from one letter of Peiresc to Lelio Pasqualini ten to Claude Menestrier, of 25 April 1629, 10 April 1632, 24 March 1633, 3 November 1633, 5 October 1634, 9 February 1634, 22 February 1634, 1 February 1635, 25 February 1635, 4 March 1636, and four to Jean-Jacques Bouchard of 19 March

1631, 2 December 1632, 13 July 1633 and 15 December 1633, B.N. MS. allemand 59, fols 274–77.

⁶³ Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, 114–15; Miller, “Description Terminable and Interminable: Looking at the Past, Nature and Peoples in Peiresc’s Archive,” *“Historia”: Empricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Gianna Pomata and Nancy Siraisi (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2005), 355–60.

⁶⁴ Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, 169; Miller, “The Antiquary’s Art of Comparison: Peiresc and Abraxas,” *Philologie und Erkenntnis. Beiträge zu Begriff und Problem frühneuzeitlicher ‘Philologie’*, ed. Ralph Häfner (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 57–94; “Taking Paganism Seriously: Anthropology and Antiquarianism in Early Seventeenth-Century Histories of Religion,” *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 3 (2001), 183–209.

⁶⁵ Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, 193, 198; Miller, “Peiresc and the First Natural History of the Mediterranean” *Sintflut und Gedächtnis*, eds. Jan Assman and Martin Mulso (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2006), 167–98; “Mapping Peiresc’s Mediterranean: Geography and Astronomy, 1610–1636,” *Observation in Early Modern Letters (1500–1650)*, ed. Dirk van Miert (Oxford: Warburg Institute Colloquia, 2009). Décultot draws specific attention to Winckelmann’s excerpta on optics, 213; for Peiresc’s optical researches see Miller, “Description Terminable and Interminable,” 369–73.

⁶⁶ Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, 231; Peiresc uses the word “conjecture” so frequently to introduce precisely his comparative narratives that no single reference can be given. But limiting ourselves to the letters to Cassiano dal Pozzo alone—which we know Winckelmann read—see his use of the term in letters of 2 August 1635 and 29 April 1636, *Peiresc. Lettres à Cassiano dal Pozzo*, eds. Jean-François Lhote and Danielle Joyal (Clermont-Ferrand: Adossa, 1989), 195–202 and 234–40, respectively.

⁶⁷ Francis Haskell, *History and its Images. Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), ch.8.

⁶⁸ Justi, in his biography of Winckelmann (II.2, 108ff.) presents him as aiming at total history and concludes: “Es ist ein Unternehmen, bei dem die Gelehrsamkeit des Alterthumskenners, die Anschauungsfülle des römischen Antiquars, die Erfahrung des Bildhauers, das Denken des Philosophen zusammenarbeiten müssen” quoted in Stark, 52.

⁶⁹ Arnaldo Momigliano, “Antiquari e storici dell’Antichità,” printed in Riccardo Di Donato, “Momigliano from Antiquarianism to Cultural History,” in *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, ed. Peter N. Miller (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 19.

⁷⁰ “As a rule, however, a concept stands fully before the mind’s eye while its realization proceeds only in a piecemeal fashion. Thus we have had to resign ourselves to providing the materials for such a history rather than the history itself. These materials include translations, excerpts, our views and those of others, indications and hints, an anthology which may not satisfy every expectation but may merit respect for the earnestness and devotion that produced it. In any case it is our hope that such selected yet unsynthesized materials will be all the more acceptable to the thoughtful reader, for he may take pleasure in combining them as he will.” Goethe, “Theory of Color”, *Goethe. Collected Works. Volume 12 Scientific Studies*, ed. Douglas Miller (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 161. Compare Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*, II.2. The amplitude of Goethe’s effort can be somewhat gauged from the Müncher Ausgabe of the *Farbenlehre* where the historical part is double the size of the other two combined.

⁷¹ Goethe, “Excerpt from *Studies for a Physiology of Plants* [A Schematic Fragment],” *Goethe. The Collected Works. Volume. 12. Scientific Studies*, 73–4.

⁷² “Styl ist ihm der Ausdruck ‘um den höchsten Grad zu bezeichnen, welchen die Kunst je erreicht hat und je erreichen kann’, ‘Styl ruht ihm auf den tiefsten Grundfesten der Erkenntniss, auf dem Wesen der Dinge, insofern uns erlaubt ist, es in sichtbaren und greiflichen Gegenständen zu erkennen...Und so gehen in *Goethe* fortan seine naturwissenschaftlichen und Kunststudien Hand in Hand; seine Farbenlehre, seine Metamorphose der Pflanze, seine Studien zur

vergleichenden Anatomie sind immer gedacht in jenem Sinne der Erkenntniss des Styles.” Stark, *Handbuch*, 227.

⁷³ Goethe, “Winckelmann and his Age,” *Goethe. The Collected works. vol. 3 Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. John Gearey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 115.

⁷⁴ F. A. Wolf, *Darstellung der Alterthumswissenschaft* 1807, (new ed. 1833), 38ff.: “also wesentlich eine Statistik des Ueberreste.”

⁷⁵ Stark, *Handbuch*, 62.

⁷⁶ As for instance, in the essays collected in *Jacob Burckhardt und die Antike*, eds. Peter Betthausen and Max Kunze (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1998).

⁷⁷ Wilfried Nippel, “Das *Staatsrecht* in der Diskussion—von 1871 bis heute,” in *Theodor Mommsens Langer Schatten. Das römische Staatsrecht als bleibende Herausforderung für die Forschung*, eds. W. Nippel and Bernd Seidensticker, (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2005), 9–60, at 27n73.

While studying at Bonn (October 1867- August 1869) Wilamowitz-Moellendorff had heard Bernays give a lecture “über das Studium der alten Geschichte von Sigonius und Panvinius bis auf Gibbon und Niebuhr” (Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen* 1848–1914 (Leipzig 1928), 87).

⁷⁸ Jacob Bernays, “Die Gottesfürchtigen bei Juvenal,” *Commentationes philologiae in honorem Theodori Mommseni scripserunt amici* (Berlin, 1877), 563–69, reprinted in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen von Jacob Bernays*, ed. H. Usener, 2 vols., (Berlin, 1885), II, 71–80.

⁷⁹ See Lothar Wickert, “Theodor Mommsen und Jacob Bernays. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Judentums. Zu Mommsens 150. Geburtstag, 30.11.1967,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 205 (1967), 265–94.

⁸⁰ See Grafton, “Juden und Griechen bei Friedrich August Wolff,” in *Friedrich August Wolf. Studien, Dokumente, Bibliographie*, eds. Reinhard Markner and Giuseppe Veltri (Stuttgart, 1999), 9–31, esp. 23 for the extent to which the whole Homeric school of interpretation based in Göttingen had emphasized the Greek-Jewish connection (from Michaelis and Heyne through F. A. Wolff), 23. Others have suggested, with some cause, that Scaliger appealed so much because of his

union of classical and Biblical civilization (Hans I. Bach, *Jacob Bernays. Ein Beitrag zur Emanzipationsgeschichte der Juden und zur Geschichte des deutschen Geistes im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1974), 33. But note Grafton's precision that Bernays omits what he cannot face in Scaliger, namely, 1. the claim of Jewish deceitfulness 2. work on the Masora that historicizes the text 3. Scaliger's use of native informants—like Mommsen's use of him—to acquire oriental knowledge and make living Jews unnecessary for future work (Grafton "Joseph Scaliger, Jacob Bernays and Others," *The Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians*, eds. David B. Ruderman and David N. Myers (New Haven and London, 1998), 16–38).

⁸¹ Jacob Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1965 [1855]), 68.

⁸² Stark, *Handbuch*, 257. For Millin and Peiresc, see G. Matthew Adkins, "The Renaissance of Peiresc: Aubin-Louis Millin and the Post-Revolutionary Republic of Letters," *Isis* 99 (2008), 675–700. Arriving at Aix on his trip through the South, Millin eulogized Peiresc (A. L. Millin, *Travels Through the Southern Departments of France. Performed in the Years 1804 and 1805* trans. (London, 1808), 199–201); so did Stark (*Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich* (Jena, 1855), 65: "des Begründers wissenschaftlichen Lebens in der Provence, dessen literarischer Briefwechsel über ganz Europa sich erstreckte").

⁸³ "Sie sind als Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum auf dem Titel bezeichnet, gleichsam als drei Perspektiven von dem culturgeschichtlichen Mittelpunkt" Stark, *Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich*, "Vorrede", iv.

⁸⁴ "das Verhältniss zu Grund und Boden, Bergzügen und Thalöffnungen, vor allen das Verhältniss zum Wasser, zum Fluss oder gar zum Meer, dann die Richtungen, Namen der Strassen, die Überreste der Umfassungsmauern oder ihre Stellvertreter, die Boulevards, die Gruppierung der religiösen, politischen und staatswirthschaftlichen Hauptgebäude unter einander, die Gruppierungen gewisser Gewerthätigkeiten in jetziger und die in Namen übrig gebliebenen Andeutungen früherer Zeit, die rein bürgerliche Bauweise, die in verschiedenen Stadtheilen oft so grelle Gegensätze bildet, die Umgestaltung des nächsten um die

Stadt liegenden Grund und Bodens, endlich, was allerdings nur längeres Verweilen erschliessen kann, die ganze Fülle von Ausdrücken, Redensarten, Sitten, Rechtsformen, die auf bestimmten Lokalverhältnissen basiren.” Stark, *Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich*, “Vorrede” v.

⁸⁵ “Aber wie ist gerade Paris zu dieser Stellung gelangt, gehen vielleicht noch heutzutage den Meisten unbekannt individuelle, speciell städtliche Lebensformen danebenher, was hat Paris früher als Stadt neben andern für eine Rolle gespielt, das sind Fragen, die eine Anschauung der Stadtphysiognomie, unterstützt durch historische Hülfsmittel, wohl beantworten kann” (Stark, *Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich*, “Vorrede” v).

⁸⁶ “Und wahrlich, das Städteleben der Römerzeit, das des Mittelalters auf gallischen Boden kann sich fast ebenbürtig dem des italienischen Bodens zur Seite stellen,” Stark, *Städteleben, Kunst und Alterthum in Frankreich*, “Vorrede,” vi.

⁸⁷ On this, see Momigliano and *Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences* (Toronto, 2007).

⁸⁸ Eduard Fueter’s massive and authoritative—still!—history of historical writing had nothing to say about the antiquaries (*Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich, 1911) as on principle he did not consider erudition (“der gelehrten historischen Forschung”) to belong to history (v). Moreover, unlike Stark, Fueter did not bother with unpublished material, almost guaranteeing a blindspot where early modern antiquaries were concerned.

⁸⁹ See Miller, “Gassendi à 250 ans,” *Gassendi et la Modernité*, ed. Sylvie Taussig (Brussels, 2008), 9–16.

⁹⁰ Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1990), 54.