

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.05208>

The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origins of Rome in Renaissance Thought, by Philip Jacks, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Reviewed by

James E. Snead
Institute of Archaeology
University of California-Los Angeles

Attempts to understand the history of archaeology must inevitably face the issue of origins; while historical consciousness is common to human society, studying the past through the detailed excavation, analysis, and acquisition of its material remains has until recent generations been largely the domain of European society and its descendants. There is nothing inherently logical about this pursuit; the evolution of archaeology as a way of knowing the past has specific historical roots and antecedents in western society and needs to be understood in light of these circumstances.

The Renaissance is arguably the cultural hearth in which archaeology took shape. Scholars of the age who seem to anticipate our own predilections, such as Cyriaco D'Ancona, are usually to be found in introductory chapters of archaeological textbooks immediately following Nabonidus of Babylon. Jacks takes a more contextual approach, discussing the relationships between scholarship and society in Italy from the late Medieval period through the 16th century. This is not a general history of antiquarian thought during the Renaissance, nor is it a study of the work of a specific individual. The author takes as his focus the

changing perceptions of antiquity held by scholars of the age, with particular emphasis on the construction and manipulation of images of ancient Rome. Origins are a central concern, both for Jacks and the savants whose work he analyzes. The origin of Rome, its unique status, and the role of the Renaissance city as the inheritor of these traditions, are central to the discussion. While this emphasis places constraints on the author, it allows him greater temporal scope and the ability to develop several related themes. From the correspondence, publications, and notes of the Renaissance antiquaries, Jacks develops a composite picture of their construction of the past.

One of the themes which Jacks returns to frequently is that of antiquity as legitimation. In Rome itself, appeals to ancient forms of government, ritual, and symbolism were a standard element of discourse throughout the Renaissance. Relics of earlier eras, such as the bronze figure of the wolf from the Capitoline known as the *Lupa Nutrix*, were used in different contexts to support the legitimacy of contemporary sociopolitics. Interest in the landscape was intense; Roman topography served as a continuing focus of scholarly research, and Jacks describes the changing emphases of scholarly topographic studies from that of Pier Paolo Vergerio in the late 13th century to the *Theatrum Urbis Romae* of Pompeo Ugonio, written in the decades before and after 1600. Maps were integral to these works, and as an art historian, Jacks evaluates them in detail. As products of different levels of technical expertise and as expressions of different conceptual designs, Renaissance maps of Rome portray an evolving concern with the role of the ancient landscape in giving shape to the city of their own time.

This emphasis on the legitimating power of the past took on added significance with the development of humanistic traditions in other Italian cities following 1300. The ambitions of the newer centers of Florence, Siena, Milan, and Venice required a suitable pedigree. Civic pride in the putative tomb of Virgil at Padua, and efforts to link the heraldic wolves of Siena to the *Lupa Nutrix* of Rome, were all part of a larger perception that heritage was essential to prosperity. Local calendric schemes were developed through which dates could be expressed as years "from the founding of the city"; the names of cities, rivers, and other landmarks were tortuously deconstructed in order to imply noble antiquity. Political realities of the day often prompted such historical revisionism. This particular appeal to the past took full form in the Rome of the High Renaissance, where celebrations of the newly-calculated 'birthday' of the city were inaugurated; popes Julius II and Leo X were compared with Romulus and his successor Numa, and a new 'golden age' was anticipated.

Scholars worked feverishly to provide the underpinnings of these ambitions, and another theme investigated by Jacks is the tension between the literary and the material in the study of history. Many of the arguments over the origins of Rome relied on textual analysis of classical literary sources, some of which were rediscovered during this period. Philology thus played an important role in debates over such issues as the derivation of Italian from Latin. The study of material remains, however, was compelling, and the distinction between the two became a matter of philosophical dialogue in which the "moral virtues" of the literary and philological record were contrasted with the material evidence of decay and ruin which dominated the Italian landscape.

Images of the intricate world of the Renaissance antiquarian appear throughout Jacks' work. He describes fierce arguments within and between scholarly communities; debates over the relationship between urbs and civitas, proxies for Rome and its successors, raged for decades. The political significance of such claims was not lost on the interlocutors, many of whom served as diplomats at some point in their careers. The academies which rose in the Italian cities became centers of antiquarian activity. Discussing activity at the Sapienza in Rome, whose members adopted classical-sounding names, Jacks notes that "Not just classical texts and inscriptions but every aspect of daily life in antiquity intoxicated these academicians"(143). He takes a particular interest in Poggio Bracciolini, who served popes in several positions during the early 15th century. Following his discovery of the De Aquaeductis of Frontinus in the scriptorium of Monte Cassino, Bracciolini scoured the roman landscape using it as his guide. In later years and in the employ of Florence he authored treatises pondering civilization's ruin.

The discovery of new antiquities, such as the Severan plan of Rome, were universally greeted with excitement. Pope Julius III sponsored excavations in the ruins of the Domus Augustana in 1552; Fifty years earlier Raphael had embarked on a project to catalog Roman antiquities at the behest of Leo X. Again, however, Jacks emphasizes that none of this effort was expended as "pure scholarship"; the ends to which antiquity could be put by popes and other patrons were clear. The re-erection of ancient obelisks by Sixtus V were events of high political symbolism not lost on visitors to Rome even today.

These interlocking themes are both the strength and weakness of Jacks' work. The diversity of sources and their variable relevance to the central issue of Roman origins makes it difficult for a coherent argument to be pieced together. The literary style of the book, which presents many lengthy and important quotations in untranslated Latin and Italian, also limits its utility for readers less familiar with Renaissance studies. Yet his discussion of the reflexivity of history as perceived by Renaissance humanists, along with their concern for disentangling jural and material evidence for their own past, is a critical contribution. In this it joins other historical works, such as Levine's (1985) analysis of Victorian learned societies and Piggott's (1985) biography of the antiquarian William Stukeley, in contextualizing the history of archaeology. Jacks bemoans the absence of a general history of Renaissance antiquarians; let us hope that he takes this up as his next project.

References Cited

Levine, Philippa

1986 *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians, and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838-1886*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Piggott, Stuart

1985 *William Stukeley: an Eighteenth-Century Antiquary*. Revised Edition. Thames and Hudson, New York

Integrative Paths to the Past: Paleoanthropological Advances in Honor of F. Clark Howell, edited by Robert S. Corruccini and Russell L. Ciochon, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1994.

Reviewed by

Pamela R. Willoughby
Department of Anthropology
University of Alberta

F. Clark Howell retired from the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley in 1991. At Berkeley, and earlier while at the University of Chicago, he was responsible for training a number of specialists in human biocultural evolution, or palaeoanthropology. In fact, Howell is credited with developing the concept of palaeoanthropology (and defining the term itself); he certainly created the framework for this integrated, multi-disciplinary approach to human evolution. For his retirement, former students and colleagues collaborated to produce this volume. Some of the papers were presented at a one day symposium reviewing the highlights of Howell's career along with current research directions in palaeoanthropology. It took place during the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association held in San Francisco in 1992. Howell's long time colleague J. Desmond Clark gave the distinguished lecture at the same meeting. During his career, Howell directed excavations at Isimila in Tanzania, as well as Torralba and Ambrona in Spain (all extensive Acheulean localities), but is best known for his work west of the Omo River in southern Ethiopia. It was there during the 1960s and 1970s that he developed the methods and approaches which would come to characterize the best of palaeoanthropological research.

In the Omo deposits, there are hundreds of metres of fossil-bearing sediments spanning the last four million years (for example, the Plio-Pleistocene Shungura Formation is over 700 m thick). When he began to work here, Howell chose to focus on understanding the palaeoenvironmental and geological history of the region, rather than just prospecting for hominid fossils. The combination of a sequence of datable volcanic tuffs and rich fossil-bearing sediments made the Omo the most important area in East Africa for understanding the framework in which early hominid evolution occurred.

Given this, it is true that the Omo project never got the public attention in the way that work on the east side of Lake Turkana ("Koobi Fora") or the Afar triangle received. Here, numerous, often spectacular, hominid discoveries made the names and careers of their discoverers—Richard Leakey at East Turkana and Donald Johanson at Hadar. A number of people (including several authors in this collection) have suggested that Clark Howell never became "famous" because he failed to discover as many fossil hominid remains, or did not publicize them in the way that others did. This may be true, but there are a surprising number of hominid bits and pieces here, albeit fragmentary, along with tremendous quantities of fossil animal remains. Geologists and palaeontologists were able to create a sequence of depositional units and fossil species which provide the basis for correlating sites elsewhere in the Lake Turkana basin, and even further north into the Hadar and Middle Awash regions where the earliest hominid remains (*Australopithecus afarensis*, and most recently, *A. ramidus*) have been recovered. The exercise in correlation was not always appreciated by geochronologists or palaeontologists working elsewhere, as can be seen in the acrimonious debate about the age of the KBS tuff at East Turkana. This tuff lay well above the layer containing the skull of ER-1470, a large brained hominid now assigned to *Homo habilis* (or to another coeval species, *Homo rudolfensis*). This debate has been well described by Roger Lewin in his book *Bones of Contention* (1987), and is only briefly mentioned here.

This is not to say that the Omo failed to provide data of special importance to palaeoanthropologists. Among the discoveries here may be the world's earliest stone artifacts, a rather unprepossessing assemblage of small quartz fragments struck from microscopic cores which Glynn Isaac (1978:142) once described as the "first example of hominid frustration" due to their diminutive size. They could be as much as 2.3 or 2.4 million years old (mya).