

# 1 Introduction

## A Theory of Renaissance Antiquarianism

---

**Summary** 1.1 Scholarship. – 1.2 History. – 1.3 Methodology. – 1.4 Definition.

### 1.1 Scholarship

The first attempt to describe the phenomenon of antiquarianism as one of the defining moments in the evolution of Renaissance thought can be traced back to the 1950s. Arnaldo Momigliano, in his seminal article *Ancient History and the Antiquarian*, pointed out that the impact of material sources on the development of modern thought became a crucial and active factor in the classical tradition and the history of ideas. According to Momigliano, antiquarianism was a matter of historical method which involved “the systematic collection of relics from the past” and their critical interpretation. He considered it to be strongly linked to mankind’s perception of time which, thanks to the accumulation of remains over the centuries, helped to shape a deeper historical consciousness.<sup>1</sup>

Scholars such as Eugenio Garin, Edgar Wind, Roberto Weiss, and Peter Burke attempted to coax out further aspects of antiquarian studies practiced during the Renaissance by taking into consideration the experience of scholars and artists from a diachronic perspec-

---

An earlier version of this chapter was published in *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 57 (2017), 485-502.

**1** Momigliano 1950.

tive.<sup>2</sup> Garin theorised that the Renaissance attitude towards antiquity could not be reduced to mere admiration or veneration of models; instead it established a new relationship with the past and the classics, which restored their essence by a renewed understanding of the sources, their language, and their meaning. Following the teachings of Aby Warburg and Erwin Panofsky, Wind confirmed that it was impossible to grasp the Renaissance rebirth of antiquity (in art and thought) without analysing in depth how antiquity was received by artists and scholars of the time. This was necessary to comprehend the Renaissance perception of the past as a tool to decode a broader history of classical tradition.<sup>3</sup> Weiss offered general overviews of the many phases of antiquarianism as a cultural movement, setting the coordinates for a first history of the origin of antiquarian scholarship itself. He also studied the antiquarian experiences of single scholars (e.g. Petrarch) and cultural dynamics (epigraphy and numismatics).<sup>4</sup> Burke determined that the Renaissance sense of past differed from the medieval, identifying three main innovations developed from the fourteenth century onwards. These were the sense of anachronism, the awareness of evidence, and the interest in causation, necessary prerequisites to attain a modern antiquarian method.<sup>5</sup>

All these scholars were fully aware that philology was the engine for the expansion of Renaissance antiquarianism.<sup>6</sup> This branch of knowledge, which dealt with the history and evolution of human expression thanks to a critical approach towards written language and texts, represented the capacity of determining the reliability of a text or a source in general, allowing scholars to place it in a historical frame and hence understand it according to the context from which it sprung. It is not by chance that modern scholarship on antiquarianism went hand by hand with the progresses of scholarship on Renaissance philology in general. The most remarkable outputs in this field must be considered the works by Sebastiano Timpanaro and Silvia Rizzo, who both contributed to improving the comprehension of philological awareness and methodology between fifteenth and sixteenth century. While Timpanaro focused on the systematic use of textual emendation by humanists as a hermeneutical tool, showing the variable attitude of scholars towards their sources,<sup>7</sup> Rizzo focused on Renaissance

**2** Garin 1952, 11-24.

**3** Wind 1958.

**4** Weiss 1958; 1969.

**5** Burke 1969.

**6** This was also made clear in Pasquali 1971, where the interaction between philology and history are clearly explained; more recently Herklotz 2007, 131-6.

**7** Timpanaro 1960, 3-13.

philological terminology, from which she could define not only the approaches to textual scholarship, but also understand the evolution of methods and techniques, which were acquired by other branches of erudition that fostered the development of antiquarianism itself.<sup>8</sup>

After these milestones, the foundations of the antiquarian tradition have been investigated thoroughly, from a multitude of angles, by several scholars, through multiple approaches. Important contributions to this area were made by Angelo Mazzocco, who explored the forms of antiquarianism during the fourteenth and the fifteenth century – especially focusing on Petrarch’s and Flavio Biondo’s scholarship.<sup>9</sup> Anthony Grafton opened up remarkable pathways for investigating the various aspects of antiquarian learning between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries: his works on Angelo Poliziano, Joseph Scaliger, and Leon Battista Alberti, as well as his many collections of theoretical essays, still represent fundamental gateways of the field.<sup>10</sup> Salvatore Settis established a general paradigm of antiquarian studies carried out during the Renaissance. Thanks to the magnificent collection of essays on Renaissance memory of antiquity he coordinated and edited, he was capable of creating a pattern through which understanding the path of rediscovery of classical past from late Middle Ages up to the Baroque, dealing with the reuse of antiquity in medieval times, the political resurgence of antiquity during the age of humanism, the birth of archaeology, the contamination of antiquity in figurative art, the creation and expansion of collections, and the interferences that the new antiquarian sensitivity could have with iconography.<sup>11</sup>

The strong foundations put in place by these masters have been built on more recently. Among the others, one cannot avoid mentioning Leonard Barkan. Moving from the field of archaeology, he attempted to write a history of the Renaissance discovery of ancient relics and its representation in literature. In his perspective, the practice of “unhearing the past” could be intended as a hermeneutical process capable to unfold the attitude towards memory of scholars and artists who took part in this activity.<sup>12</sup> William Stenhouse, who led the way in understanding the scholarly tendencies in reading

---

**8** Rizzo 1973.

**9** Mazzocco 1985; 2016.

**10** To mention all Grafton’s publication would be impossible in this context; his works will be cited along this book when specifically related to aspects directly discussed in each chapter. However, here it is worth to mention at least Grafton 1977; 1983-91; 2000; 2006. On Grafton’s method, see the recent essay Soll 2016.

**11** Settis 1984-86. Almost simultaneously, Bober, Rubinstein 1986 published a collection of sources for the rediscovery of ancient sculptures and their reuse by Renaissance artists.

**12** Barkan 1999, which general approach is remarkably mutated by Foucault 1969.

epigraphic inscriptions (both Greek and Latin), numismatics, collecting, and the idea of antiquarianism in general.<sup>13</sup> Christian Dekesel, Federica Missere Fontana, and John Cunnally, who, from different perspectives, broadly increased the approaches in Renaissance numismatics – the former by creating a catalogue of all the books on coins printed during the sixteenth century; the second by unveiling the use coin collectors made of their specimens, within and beyond the field of numismatics itself; the latter by exploring in detail the coin collection of Andrea Loredan.<sup>14</sup> Ingo Herklotz, who analysed the figure of the antiquarian scholar in Rome between sixteenth and seventeenth century, as well as several cases of ecclesiastical antiquarianism and antiquarianism in art.<sup>15</sup> Peter Miller, who approached antiquarianism with a geographical print and its interactions with collecting finds from antiquity, dedicating memorable pages to the scholarship of Nichols Fabri de Peiresc.<sup>16</sup> Monica Centanni, who carried out a profound analysis of the many manifestations of classical tradition and rebirth of antiquity, as well as leading relentless readings of Warburg’s *Atlas*.<sup>17</sup> Kelsey Jackson Williams, who renovated Momigliano’s questions on the definition of antiquarianism, by delineating the state of the art and focusing on seventeenth and eighteenth century antiquarian scholarship.<sup>18</sup> Kathleen Christian and Bianca De Divitiis, who investigated the development of local antiquarian surveys throughout Europe.<sup>19</sup> Maren Elizabeth Schwab, who recently rewrote a thematic history of antiquarianism from its fourteenth-century origins up to its maturity in mid-sixteenth century, with a focus

---

**13** On epigraphy, see Stenhouse 2000; 2003; 2005; 2010; 2019; 2020; on numismatics Stenhouse 2009a; 2019; on collecting see Stenhouse 2009b; 2014; 2017a; 2018; on theory of antiquarianism see Stenhouse 2013; 2017b – while I write, Stenhouse is editing a Brill companion to Renaissance antiquarianism, coordinating the work of some of the most remarkable scholars currently working in the field.

**14** Dekesel 1997; Missere Fontana 2009; Cunnally 2016.

**15** On the figure of the antiquarian see Herklotz 2012a; 2014; on ecclesiastical antiquarianism see Herklotz 2001; 2007; 2012b; 2017a; 2019a; on women antiquarian scholars see Herklotz 2018.

**16** See See Miller 2011a; 2017; 2021; and Schnapp et al. 2013.

**17** See Centanni 2017 and in general the publications within the issues of *La Rivista di Engramma* ([www.engramma.it](http://www.engramma.it)).

**18** Jackson Williams 2016, 56-96.

**19** See Christian, De Divitiis 2018. Both scholars have published extensively and individually on antiquarianism, see e.g., Christian 2010; 2014; on collections in Renaissance Rome, Christian 2008; on the interplay between ancient ruins and gardens; see also De Divitiis 2015; 2019; 2020, who has worked on the impact of antiquarian scholarship in Southern Italian Renaissance. See also De Divitiis, Nova, Vitali 2018.

on the city of Rome.<sup>20</sup> Joan Carbonell and Gerard González Germain, who broadened the views on epigraphic scholarship, moving from the Spanish context they ended up investigating several aspects of European interest in epigraphy in general.<sup>21</sup> Stefan Bauer, who unveiled new aspects of antiquarian studies within the context of ecclesiastical history, with a focus on doctrinal and confessional controversies, as well as on specific figures of the Renaissance antiquarian landscape, such as Bartolomeo Platina and Onofrio Panvinio.<sup>22</sup>

All the works carried out by these scholars have brought new readings to the multifarious and complex interpretations of this field, challenging, expanding, and even disclaiming each other. Nevertheless, the concept of Renaissance antiquarianism, which represents a unique declination of the broader concept of antiquarianism itself, has not yet been completely and fully defined: this remains very much a work in progress which deserves a thorough multidisciplinary examination of the phenomenon both from single local surveys and from a transnational perspective.

In this light, two fundamental questions may function as a compass for the future antiquarian studies, questions that the following pages will only attempt to answer:<sup>23</sup> can a history of Renaissance antiquarianism be settled and described from its origins up to its epilogue? Is antiquarianism an independent discipline, and, if so, how does it relate to other fields of knowledge? These questions imply a more complex problem related to the identification of the nature of Renaissance antiquarianism itself, which cannot be fully embraced without considering the history of the phenomenon and its methodology. However, one must keep in mind that the very nature of Renaissance antiquarianism cannot be reduced to a simple methodological formulation, nor can it be encapsulated in a single history: antiquarianism during the

---

**20** Schwab 2019. The book is cleverly organised in thematic chapters, which discuss various aspects of Renaissance antiquarian scholarship, including philological, epigraphic and numismatic surveys.

**21** See Carbonell, González Germain 2020. Both scholars have published extensively and individually on antiquarianism, see e.g., Carbonell 2005; 2011; 2012; 2016a; 2016b; see also González Germain 2012; 2013; 2017.

**22** See in this regard Bauer 2006; 2020; 2021.

**23** These questions emerge directly from Momigliano's essay. While the former, on the need of a history of antiquarianism, is formulated explicitly (Momigliano 1950, 286: "First of all we must ask ourselves who the antiquaries were. I wish I could simply refer to a History of Antiquarian Studies. But none exists" - in fn. 1, he refers to Stark 1880, Sandys 1906-08, and Holm, Thompson 1942 as works that could be used for this purpose), the latter is derived from Herklotz's more recent review of Momigliano's article (Herklotz 2007, 131: "However, a more fundamental question needs to be raised at this point. Some overlapping of antiquarian and historical interests notwithstanding, did the antiquary really think of himself as being either subservient or in opposition to the historian, as Momigliano implied? In other words, was historiography the primary point of reference for his discipline?").

Renaissance is represented by a multitude of coexisting methods that are expressed through a plurality of histories.

## 1.2 History

There are specific historical reasons why Renaissance antiquarianism became a vital piece in the puzzle of how to approach knowledge.

It probably sprung from what Richard Southern called ‘medieval humanism’, a prominent phenomenon during the Middle Ages, at least from the second half of the eleventh century. This is when scholars, most of whom were confined to monasteries at that time, started investigating theological truths through human parameters and patterns, placing introspection and experience at the centre of their system of thought. Thanks to this process, God, the creator, and the world, its creation, were perceived as intelligible through rational thinking, making it possible for mankind to expand its domains of knowledge.<sup>24</sup> This change within the conception of the world represented a paradigm shift compared to the centuries that followed the fall of the Roman empire. A time when God and the world appeared to be mysterious, distant, and inaccessible to human thought.

This approach echoed in many fields of medieval knowledge and culture, and found a pragmatic application in the encyclopaedic practice, which forced the compilers to deal both with tradition and experience. Yet, this method was still not capable of examining the material gathered with a critical attitude and ended up accepting information without discretion. However, was it thanks to this newly developed approach, which aimed at comprising knowledge in one single all-inclusive system, that scholars started to understand the information collected as means which transmitted knowledge. In fact, this required a concrete counterpart to be proved and accepted. That is to say, the data collected started being perceived as a source.

The first witness of this approach, which was still at a very early stage, could perhaps be identified in Hugh of Saint Victor (1096-1141). In his *Didascalicon*<sup>25</sup> he realised the need to collect information on all

<sup>24</sup> Southern 1970, 29-61; 1995.

<sup>25</sup> On the role of sources in Hugh of Saint Victor, see Southern 2002, 93-103. See also, Hug. S. Vict. *Didasc.* 6.3 [PL 176 0799C-0800C]: “Sic nimirum in doctrina fieri oportet, ut videlicet prius historiam discas et rerum gestarum veritatem, a principio repetens usque ad finem quid gestum sit, [799C] quando gestum sit, ubi gestum sit, et a quibus gestum sit, diligenter memoriae commendes. haec enim quattuor praecipue in historia requirenda sunt, persona, negotium, tempus et locus. Neque ego te perfecte subtilem posse fieri puto in allegoria, nisi prius fundatus fueris in historia. noli contemnere minima haec. paulatim defluit qui minima contemnit. si primo alphabetum discere contempsisses, nunc inter grammaticos tantum nomen non haberes. Scio quosdam esse qui statim philosophari volunt. fabulas pseudoapostolis

disciplines in a granular way to control theoretical assumptions with tangible data and experience. The powerful attraction that sources exerted on Hugh can be summarised in the exclamation uttered at the very beginning of his *De Sacramentis*: “Date auctoritatem!” [PL 176 0549D-0550A], and in the first chapter of his *Expositio in Hierarchiam Coelestem S. Dionysii*, where the truth could be understood thanks to material proofs and visible signs: “Ipsa autem veritas [...] et materialiter figuratur, atque formatur secundum [...] signa visibilia [...]” [PL 175 0948A].

The encyclopaedic practice, which developed thereafter, and the historiographic compilations of the time represented only a potential starting point for what could be defined as an antiquarian trend.<sup>26</sup> In fact, in some cases, encyclopaedias and histories included accurate antiquarian information, such as those carried out by Hildebert of Lavardin (1055-1133) and Otto of Freising (1109-1158), but above all William of Malmesbury’s (1080-1143) descriptions of Roman antiquities included in the so-called *Mirabilia Romae Urbis*.<sup>27</sup> These works, and many others,

---

relinquendas aiunt. quorum scientia formae asini similis est. Noli huiusmodi imitari: *Parvis imbutus tentabis grandia tutus*. Ego tibi affirmare audeo nihil me umquam quod ad eruditionem pertineret contempsisse, [800A] sed multa saepe didicisse quae aliis ioco aut deliramento similia viderentur. memini me, dum adhuc scholaris essem, elaborasse ut omnium rerum oculis subiectarum aut in usum venientium vocabula scirem, perpendens libere rerum naturam illum non posse prosequi qui earundem nomina adhuc ignoraret. quoties sophismatum meorum, quae gratia brevitatis una vel duabus in pagina dictionibus signaveram, a memetipso cotidianum exegi debitum, ut etiam sententiarum, quaestionum et oppositionum omnium fere quas didiceram et solutiones memoriter tenerem et numerum! Causas saepe informavi, et, dispositis ad invicem controversiis, quod rhetoris, quod oratoris, quod sophistae officium esset, diligenter distinxi. [800B] calculos in numerum posui, et nigris pavementum carbonibus depinxi, et, ipso exemplo oculis subiecto, quae ampligonii, quae orthogonii, quae oxygonii differentia esset, patenter demonstravi. utrumque quadratum aequaliterum duobus in se lateribus multiplicatis embadam impleret, utrobique procurrente podismo didici. saepe nocturnus horoscopus ad hiberna pervigilia excubavi. saepe ad numerum protensum in ligno magadam ducere solebam, ut et vocum differentiam aure perciperem, et animum pariter meli dulcedine oblectarem. haec puerilia quidem fuerant, sed tamen non inutilia, neque ea nunc scire stomachum meum onerat. haec autem non tibi replico, ut meam scientiam, [800C] quae vel nulla vel parva est, iactitem, sed ut ostendam tibi illum incedere aptissime qui incidit ordinate, neque ut quidam, dum magnum saltum facere volunt, praecipitium incidunt”.

**26** See Blanchard, Severi 2018, 13-58.

**27** Weiss 1958, 143-4. Also remarkable is the description of Etruscan vases in Ristoro d’Arezzo’s *La compositione del mondo* (1282); see Morino 1997, 311-15: “De li quali vasa, mirabilia per la loro nobiltà, certi savi ne féciaro menzione e’l li loro libri, come fo Esidoro e Sidilio e altri; li quali féciaro de terra collata, sutilissima come cera, e de forma perfetta in ogni variazione. E’li quali vasa fuoro designate e scolpite tutte le generazione de li animali che se puono pensare, in ogne atto, mirabile e perfettamente sì, che passaro denanti a l’operazione de la natura; e féciarli de doi colori, com’è azzurro e rosso, ma più rossi; li quali colori erano lucenti e sutilissimi, non avendo corpo. E questi colori erano sì perfetti che, stando sotto terra, la terra non li potea corròmpare né guastare. E segno de questo che noi avemo detto si è quello ch’avemo veduto che, quando se cavava e’llo nostro tempo per alcuna casione dentro de la città o de fore d’a-

certainly represented the interests that the Middle Ages had towards antiquity in general, and Roman antiquity specifically. Nevertheless, they still failed to create reactions among the objects described and other sources, either analogous or divergent. This would have allowed to put the antiquities discovered and described in their proper cultural frame, by establishing comparisons, grasping relationships and variations, and formulating theories based on the results of their surveys.

To reach this methodological achievement, the Middle Ages had to go through another fundamental process. Taking place slightly afterwards, this concerned the development of the practice of translating Latin into vernacular languages. This literary exercise was widespread throughout Europe, but was it in Italy that it met a major breakthrough, paving the way for the dawn of Humanism.<sup>28</sup> Throughout the thirteenth century, especially during the reign of emperor Fredrik II (1194-1260),<sup>29</sup> translations helped scholars deepen their knowledge of classical Latin. They also increased the possibilities for their own vernacular by expanding the vocabulary, stretch-

---

torno presso quasi a doe millia, trovavanse grande quantità de questi pezzi de vasa, e en tale luoco più e en tale luoco meno: de li quali era presumato ch'elli fòssaro stati sotto terra asai più de milli anni; [...] E de queste vasa me ne venne a mano quasi mezza una scodella, e lla quale erano scolpite sì naturali e sutile cose, che li conoscitori, quando le vedevano, per lo grandissimo diletto raitieno e vociferavano ad alto, e uscieno de sé e diventavano quasi stupidi, e li non conoscenti la voleano spezzare e gettare". In this passage, Restoro described an actual dig where many ancient Etruscan vases were unearthed, to which he claimed assisted in person. He also described the location (in the countryside of Arezzo), their shape (bowl-like), colour (blue and red) and iconographies (animals, plants, humans), and assumed they were more than one thousand years old. Restoro himself affirmed he possessed a piece of these antiquities, half a bowl. The most interesting thing is that he refers to a community of people – he calls them *conoscitori* – that were happy for these kinds of discoveries. Hence, we can postulate a community of collectors which bore some interest in these findings and were able to acknowledge their value. However, according to Restoro nobody was able to date them precisely or to connect them to a specific historical context; it is not by chance that the only literary source he mentioned is Isid. *etym.* 6.5 [PL 82 0715A]: "Aretina vasa, ex Aretio municipio Italiae dicuntur, ubi fiunt; sunt enim rubra. De quibus Sedulius: Rubra quod appositum testa ministrat olus".

**28** Segre 1953, 23-6; Witt 2000, 174-229.

**29** It is probably not by chance that this renovated attitude towards antiquity emerged in the age of Fredrik, who had a certain interest in the rebirth and imitation of antiquity; see Weiss 1958, 147-9. However, as recently proved, some of the primary sources usually utilised to support the thesis that Fredrik was a promoter of archaeology and in general antiquarian investigations were overestimated. The vocabulary is too vague to determine an actual and aware antiquarian propensity. For example, the famous quotation from the *Historia diplomatica* (5.2: 825) "inventiones maximas invenire [...] sperantes inde habere posse proficuum", which for sure refers to digs where ancient finds could emerge, does not explain whether the intention behind the research was genuinely antiquarian, i.e. aiming at discovering antiquities for the cultural value, or merely material, i.e. for their monetary value; see Esch 2005. In this context the word *proficuum* is rather problematic, in that it was interpreted in the sense of 'satisfactory' while it should be intended as 'lucrative', given that the medieval Latin meaning was limited to profit (see Du Change 1883-87, 6: 527<sup>b</sup>: "Proficuum: Lucrum, emolumentum").



ing the syntax and the phrase structure, but above all by analysing the texts they dealt with from a new perspective.

The relationship with the ancient language, and hence with antiquity, was no longer passive; it encouraged instead an active and creative dialogue with its object of research. This fostered, on the one hand, a critical approach towards the text itself, boosting the philological activity essential to complete the task: to translate a text, scholars should understand the meanings of its words and the cultural context in which they were used. On the other hand, it showed how medieval Latin was distant from classical Latin. This severed the link between the two languages, which had been taken for granted to be one until the beginning of fourteenth century and contributed to strengthening the idea of unity between the present and the past.

It was in this phase that the past appeared to be different in quality from the present, and, thanks to the encyclopaedic approach previously developed, scholars could start fulfilling the new perceived gap in knowledge with concrete data acquired directly from the sources they considered more reliable. Of course, this does not mean that a mature and effective antiquarian method had already developed by the fourteenth century. Still, sparks of Renaissance antiquarianism glowed, following a growing philological sentiment combined with an increase in archaeological investigations. This revealed a sort of practical prefiguration of Humanism. Taking its first steps in Italy, antiquarianism spread throughout Europe between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. This continued until the new empiric scientific culture, which was initially favoured by antiquarian studies themselves, began to replace it and establish a decisive influence as society moved toward a new phase of modernity.

The actual origin of antiquarianism is usually dated back to around the beginning of the fourteenth century in Padua, Veneto, where scholars such as Lovato Lovati (1240-1309) and Albertino Mussato (1261-1329) started taking a different approach to considering antiquity. They attempted to restore a classical shape to Latin language and culture by rediscovering the lost or forgotten manuscripts of ancient authors (e.g. the tragedies of Seneca), disputing the actual nature of ancient finds (e.g. the Tomb of Antenor), or copying and interpreting ancient epigraphic inscriptions. Around the same time, Giovanni de Matociis (d. 1337) of Verona adorned the margins of the manuscript of his *Historia imperialis* with pictorial representations of the emperors that corresponded to his narrative, and which were somehow inspired by ancient coins. Finds from different fields confirm a conventional literary history of the Roman empire.<sup>30</sup>

---

**30** Weiss 1958, 149-51; Larner 1976; Zampieri 1980; Billanovich 1986; 1989; Witt 2000, 82-173; Favaretto 2002, 31-42. On the antiquarian interest of Mansionarius, see Bottari 2019.

Concurrent and corresponding phenomena occurred in other areas of Italy. In Rome and its surrounding areas, interest in and investigations of ancient ruins can be detected in two places almost simultaneously: proto-humanists among whom Giovanni Colonna (1298-1343) and Zanobi da Strada (1312-1361) explored libraries discovering ancient manuscripts and started collecting and interpreting ancient epigraphic inscriptions. Cola di Rienzo's (1313-1354) public reading of the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* represents an iconic transitional moment to a new perception of the antique and its role in history.<sup>31</sup> In Florence, Giovanni Villani attempted to describe the origins of his city by considering for the first time archaeological remains, such as aqueducts, walls, and temples, to prove its Roman foundation, as well as the traces of subsequent barbarian invasions.<sup>32</sup>

Even so, the title of founding father of Renaissance antiquarianism can justifiably be attributed to Petrarch (1304-1374), who began developing a philological attitude in parallel with the study of remains from antiquity, attempting to combine them.<sup>33</sup> As well established by scholarship, Petrarch discovered forgotten ancient codices in libraries, and made an effort to exert textual criticism to explain and correct obscure or corrupted passages of the manuscript tradition.<sup>34</sup>

---

**31** On the first philological and antiquarian enterprises in thirteenth-century Rome, see Sabbadini 1967, 1: 49-56; Miglio 1991; Internullo 2015 and 2016. On Cola and the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani*, see Collins 1998, 158-83; on his antiquarian approach, see Weiss 1969, 39-42; on his epigraphic interests, see Silvagni 1924. On his connections with Petrarch, see Blasio 2006.

**32** G. Villani *NC* 2.1: "E in Firenze faceano capo le dette fontane a uno grande palagio che si chiamava termine, capud aque, ma poi in nostro volgare si chiamò Capaccia, e ancora oggi in Terma si vede dell'anticaglia", and 9.36: "E trovandomi io in quello benedetto pellegrinaggio ne la santa città di Roma, veggendo le grandi e antiche cose di quella, e leggendo le storie e' grandi fatti de' Romani, scritti per Virgilio, e per Salustio, e Lucano, e Paulo Orosio, e Valerio, e Tito Livio, e altri maestri d'istorie, li quali così le piccole cose come le grandi de le geste e fatti de' Romani scrissono, e eziando degli strani dell'universo mondo, per dare memoria e esemplo a quelli che sono a venire presi lo stile e forma da'lloro, tutto sì come piccolo discepolo non fossi degno a tanta opera fare".

**33** Clark 1922, 17; Weiss 1969, 30-47; Witt 2000, 230-91. On the influence of the Paduan proto humanists on Petrarch, see Witt 2006, 231-9.

**34** Petrarch's activities as a philologist and a bibliophile are extensively described in Nollac 1907, especially 1: 33-123 (I. *Pétrarque bibliophile* and II. *Les livres de Pétrarque après sa mort*). However, the effectiveness and impact of Petrarch's method were questioned and downsized by Sabbadini 1907, 347-50 and Kenney 1974, 121-2, who both limit the quality of Petrarch's textual criticism, and its reception in the following decades. Thanks to the studies of Billanovich - just to mention the most representative of his pivotal production Billanovich 1947; 1959; 1960; 1974; 1981 - the books of Petrarch, and the exegesis he carried on them, were considered in the development of their tradition and fortune. Vincenzo Fera analysed critically Petrarch's philology in the context of his time and showed that, even if rudimentary compared to the achievements of his epigones, his work represented a breakthrough compared to the state of the art, pointing out, that the practices he came up with ended up becoming the model for the subsequent humanistic approach to texts and their sup-

At the same time, he cultivated an interest in ancient epigraphic inscriptions, ancient coins, and in general a strong cult in everything that could be defined as a ruin.<sup>35</sup> His method and passion are reflected in many of his letters, treatises and poems.<sup>36</sup> With Petrarch ruins and remains from antiquity became ‘sentiment of time’, not statically focusing on the past, but projecting the past into the future – intending the past as a model to be restored.<sup>37</sup>

From Petrarch’s spur, a broader restoration of the Latin golden age took place. A group of Florentine scholars, such as Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406), Niccolò Niccoli (1365-1437), and Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), kept on discovering dispersed manuscripts and observing ruins, representing the most prominent examples of how this renewed humanistic sensitivity helped antiquarianism to develop in complexity.<sup>38</sup> It is important to note that the Loggia dei Lanzi was being erected in Florence at approximately that time (ca. 1396), clear evidence that the antiquarian revival in literary output was matched by a resurgence in classical architecture.<sup>39</sup>

A fundamental contribution to the development of this cultural dynamic was provided by Cyriacus of Ancona (1391-1452), who, on account of his detailed descriptions of antiquity carried out during his many journeys throughout the Mediterranean, could very well be considered to be the initiator of modern archaeology.<sup>40</sup> At much the same time, Giovanni Marcanova (ca. 1410-1467) depicted Roman antiquities in his manuscripts,<sup>41</sup> while Flavio Biondo (1392-1463) rewrote the

---

port; see Fera 1992-93, esp. 373, where Petrarch’s method of researching new manuscripts as described in *Fam.* 3.18 (the *inquisitio librorum*) was adopted across all European libraries.

**35** Weiss 1964; Mazzocco 1977, 203-24; Galbraith 2000; Eisendrath 2018, 24-48.

**36** General archaeological references, though still depending on the *Mirabilia*, are in *Fam.* 5.4.5; 6.2, the letter so-called *Deambulamus*, which is strictly intertwined with the walk across Rome described in *Africa* 8; epigraphy resurfaces in *Fam.* 24.8; *Sen.* 4.4; 5.1; *Metr.* 2.5.97-100; and in *Remed.* 1.41 and 1.114; interest in numismatics is attested in *Fam.* 18.8; 19.3-15 and *Memorand.* 2.73.

**37** Schnapp 2019, 33-4.

**38** Generally, on the heirs of Petrarch, see Garin 1952, 25-57; Baron 1966 and Weiss 1969, 48-58; Fubini 1990; Gordan 1993; Accame Lanzillotta 1994. On Salutati’s role in Florentine humanism, see Ullman 1963; Petrucci 1972; Witt 2000, 292-337; Bianca 2010; Cardini, Viti 2012. On Poggio’s life and works, see Walser 1914; for his *Opera Omnia* see Fubini 1964-69; about his activity as a philologist and as collector, see Castelli 1980; Canfora 2001; Ricci 2016; 2020. About Niccoli, see his epistolary edited by Hart 1984-87.

**39** See Rubinstein 1967; Sexton 1998; Frey 1885.

**40** On Cyriacus’s antiquarian practice there is an extensive bibliography; it’s enough to mention in this context the works by Bodnar, Foss, Mitchell 2015; Paci, Sconocchia 1998; Chatzidakis 2017.

**41** Sighinolfi 1921; Cartwright 2007; Tosetti Grandi 2010; Sassi 2012.

history of Rome and many other Italian cities in his *Roma Instaurata* and *Roma Triumphans*.<sup>42</sup> These scholars systematically linked their classical readings with the findings of numerous inspections made on location. It is also interesting to note that Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1446), inspired by the Pantheon in Rome, designed the dome of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence by applying the knowledge obtained from his observation of Roman ruins.<sup>43</sup> He achieved this through his increased knowledge of forgotten elements of classical architecture and by using them to develop modern solutions: an ancient source became the doorway to new creations.

As sources of different types were uncovered, the understanding gradually dawned that texts and archaeological finds could be complementary elements. This realisation became essential for the interpenetration of history and cultural heritage, which implied the emergence of a renewed sensitivity to the unitary coherence of classical tradition. In essence, the antiquarian perspective embodied the spirit that allowed Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) to read Vitruvius critically, to write *De re aedificatoria*, and to conceive the facade of the Basilica of Sant'Andrea in Mantova as a Roman triumphal arch. Alberti was also the creator of the *Certamen Coronarium* (1441), a poetry contest which celebrated the incorporation of the Latin quantitative metric system into the Italian language – the purpose was to translate the structure of ancient poetry into contemporary language.<sup>44</sup>

Classical philology kept on developing its tools in textual analysis by holding constant meditations on texts and language.<sup>45</sup> Lorenzo Valla (1405-1457) represents the peak of this movement:<sup>46</sup> by working on the tradition of the classics, Valla developed an unprecedented

---

**42** The studies on Biondo's antiquarian practice are boundless. A good resource for browsing these works is <http://www.repertoriumblonianum.org/>. Through this resource it is possible to retrieve the references of many fundamental studies on Biondo, e.g. those by Riccardo Fubini, Angelo Mazzocco and the more recent carried out by Anne Raffarin, Giuseppe Marcellino and Frances Muecke.

**43** On the inference of Brunelleschi's antiquarian observations on his conception of architecture, especially on his work on the Pantheon, see Horster 1973; Pane 1980, 381-8; Gambardella 2002; Gurrieri 2014.

**44** For various information in regard of Alberti's multifarious inspiration from antiquity, see Grafton 2000, which provides an intellectual biography of Alberti; Borsi 2004, on Alberti's approach towards antiquity; Cardini 2005, which tries to reconstruct the Alberti's library, and how he used texts in his antiquarian practice; Cardini, Regoliosi 2007; Grassi 2007, which deals with architecture); Canali 2011, that reconstructs the use of Pliny the Elder by Alberti, and its impact on subsequent scholarship on architecture; and Furlan 2020.

**45** See Fera 1990.

**46** The impact of Valla on European thought is discussed in the collection of essays edited by Regoliosi, Marsico 2013; on his impact on other Italian humanistic environments, see Besomi, Regoliosi 1986 (for Italy in general), Regoliosi 2009 (for Tuscany) and Anselmi, Guerra 2009 (for Bologna). About Valla's *Elegantiae*, see Regoliosi 1993,

critical approach, which attempted to reconstruct and amend texts through a deep analysis of the linguistic and cultural contexts in which they were written. His work reached noteworthy outcomes, exemplified in his *Elegantiae*, which treated Latin language as a body in evolution through history – giving philological foundations to the debate started at the beginning of the fifteenth century by Biondo and Bruni, who attributed the decay of Latin and hence the origin of the vernaculars to the Barbaric invasions.<sup>47</sup>

Alongside, orthography acquired a stronger antiquarian print, as proved by Guarino Veronese's (1374-1460) studies, e.g. his *Vocabula*, and by the works of his contemporaries, like Vittorino da Feltre (ca. 1375-1446).<sup>48</sup> By attempting to restore the original and proper form of ancient words, these scholars sought to understand the usage of ancient writing, from which they intended to provide an explanation of the words themselves.<sup>49</sup> This attitude, which could be equalised to the collecting of archaeological finds and the attempt to explain their form and meaning through observation and comparison, led the way to the more sophisticated and all-encompassing *Orthographia* by Giovanni Tortelli (ca. 1406-1466) and to the *Cornucopia* by Niccolò Perotti (1430-1480).<sup>50</sup>

This interest in pursuing lexicography, which spread throughout the fifteenth century, may have been rooted in the practice of scheidography, a method of teaching grammar derived from Byzantine scholars. This practice involved concise commentaries on a short text

---

and Marsico 2013 (especially on book five). Valla's philological method is very well expressed in his *Antidotum ad Facium*, see Regoliosi 1981.

**47** The question of the nature of Latin language is very well discussed in Fubini 1961, 505-50; Rizzo 2005, 51-95; Tateo 2006; Marcellino, Ammannati 2015; Nauta 2018.

**48** For a general bibliography on Guarino Veronese, see Pistilli 2003. The major contributions on Guarino have been given by Remigio Sabbadini, who has worked on his manuscripts (Sabbadini 1887), on his school and education (Sabbadini 1896), on his epistolary (Sabbadini 1915-19). Significant are also his translations from Greek to Latin – e.g. Herodotus (see Truffi 1902), Basil of Caesarea, Lucian, and most of all Strabo's *Geographia* started in 1454 (see Sabbadini 1909; Sbordonone 1961, 11-32; Diller 1975, 126-9; Aujac 1993, 154-9). On Vittorino da Feltre orthographic studies, see Casacci 1926-27, 911-45; Sabbadini 1928, 209-21; on his library, see Cortesi 1997, 429-51; 2000, 401-16; Bandini 2008, 83-109; Cortesi 2010, 607-35.

**49** The method adopted by the first humanists to restore the classical shape of Latin orthography is analysed in Dionisotti 1968. Comparisons between medieval Latin and classical Latin, as well as comparisons between Latin and Greek, and Latin and vernaculars constituted its foundations, see Tomè 2012, 19 where a reference also to analogies established between Greek and the vernaculars is indicated.

**50** On Tortelli's life, see Cortesi 2019. On his scholarship in general, see Manfredi, Marsico, Regoliosi 2016; on the genesis, methodology and fortune of his *Orthographia*, see the fundamental doctoral dissertation Tomè 2012. On Perotti's scholarship, see the many studies of Jean Louis Charlet, especially Charlet 2001; see also Kristeller 1981; Furno 1995; Stok 2002.

(Lt. *scheda*, Gr. σχέδιον), consisting of lexicographic, orthographic, and etymological notes.<sup>51</sup> If combined with a multiplicity of analogous textual analyses, it is possible to see from where the accumulation process typical of antiquarianism derived. This practice was imported in Italy from Constantinople during the thirteenth century and was handed down in the following decades exclusively in Greek circles until Leontius Pilatus (d. 1366) moved to Florence in 1360. Here, schedography started its diffusion in pre-humanistic environments, which understood how Greek language was unavoidable to comprehend the lost classical world: it is not by chance that Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375), who attended Leontius's Greek courses, mutated aspects of schedography to compile his erudite treatises (*Genealogia Deorum Gentilium* and *De montibus*).

From these early efforts of reconciling Greek and Latin classical studies under the flag of Humanism, a larger interest in ancient Greek culture, literature and thought bloomed in the following decades, thanks to the teachings of Manuel Chrysolaras (ca. 1355-1415), which irradiated the region of Veneto via Guarino, fostered the rediscovery of ancient manuscripts thanks to figures like Giovanni Aurispa (1376-1459) and cardinal Bessarion (1403-1472), and triggered the already mentioned interest in Greek archaeology by Cyriacus d'Ancona.<sup>52</sup>

From the mid-fifteenth century onwards, the driving force behind this evolution of thought was embodied by Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494). Building in fact on the former traditions, he mastered a critical method that was so valuable in terms of textual criticism that it became the benchmark for the antiquarian scholars who followed.<sup>53</sup> The publication of his first *Miscellanea* (1489) represents a synthesis of all his intuitions in the field of classical philology, which were

---

**51** For the diffusion of Greek philology in the late Middle Ages and during the early Renaissance in general, see Pertusi 1964; 1980; Weiss 1977; Cortesi, Maltese 1992; Cortesi 1995a; 1995b; 2007; and the classic Sabbadini 1914. On schedography, see Mercati 1970, 379-84; Browning 1976; Cortesi 1979, 449-83.

**52** The role of Aurispa in the circulation of Greek manuscripts is treated in Wilson 1996; Staikos 1998; Wilson 2017. For his library, see Franceschini 1976; for his epistolary, see Sabbadini 1931. The most recent works on Bessarion's scholarship are the collection of essays Mariev 2021 and the monograph Cattaneo 2020, both attempting to reconstruct the philological method of this scholar. On his collection, see Antetomaso 2017, 351-83. See also Monfasani 1995; Bianca 1999; Zorzi 2002; 2003; Märtil, Kaiser, Ricklin 2013. Bessarion's library, with its 548 Greek codices, 337 Latin codices, and 27 incunabula, was donated by Bessarion himself to the Marciana Library in Venice. These books formed the so-called 'Bibliotheca Nicena', from which Renaissance scholars drew many editions of Greek classics.

**53** It would be too long and dispersive to put together a bibliography related to Poliziano's antiquarian scholarship; for a general overview, see Fera, Martelli 1998; Perosa 2000; Viti 2016. On his *Miscellanea*, see Branca, Pastore Stocchi 1972 and Branca 1983. On the ramifications of Poliziano's method, see Pyle 1996; Celenza 2010; Dyck, Cottrel 2020. About his collection of manuscripts, see Maier 1965.

based on manuscript witnesses, the identification of linguistic usages through the history of language, the constitution of cultural models, the comparative technique, and a rudimentary palaeography. He brought to light what was later referred to as ‘the history of tradition’.

Poliziano approached the text as an ancient finding, from which tangible data could be drawn. He used to measure the lacunas of ancient codices to formulate more reliable emendations. It is astounding to notice that a few years later, Raphael (1483-1520) and Baldassarre Castiglione (1478-1529), in the famous letter to pope Leo X of 1519, determined that the only way to understand antiquity was to measure the ruins to preserve them and formulate assumptions on their original shape.<sup>54</sup>

The purpose of Poliziano’s method was to reconstruct the original shape of ancient textual and cultural inheritance through emendation. However, it was not always sufficient to fill the gaps in the tradition and restore a coherent image of antiquity. In response, the humanists compiled a diverse range of interpretative systems to tackle the weaknesses. One example is the *Castigationes Pliniana*e by Ermolao Barbaro (1454-1493), who drew analogies with the world around him, especially when explaining naturalistic items, to compensate for the general lack of knowledge of these matters at the time.<sup>55</sup> As was the case with language, analogies with the natural world became in many fields a necessary means to comprehend the ancient universe through known and controllable parameters.

In parallel, new encyclopaedic collections started to flourish. Even if Biondo’s works, Valla’s *Elegantiae*, and Tortelli’s *Orthographia* could be recognised as a significant prefiguration of what encyclopaedias would look like if arranged in an antiquarian perspective; a mature expression of Renaissance antiquarian encyclopedism can be found only later, in Giorgio Valla’s (1447-1500) *De expetendis et fugiendis rebus opus*, Raffaele Maffei’s (1451-1522) *Commentaria rerum Urbanarum*, Alessandro d’Alessandro’s (1461-1523) *Dies geniales*, and Celio Rodigino’s (1469-1525) *Antiquae lectiones*. These treatises attempted to confer to the ancient world from a universal perspective, by cross-referencing different literary and material sources, trying to provide a more stratified idea of history.<sup>56</sup>

The idea that history resided in ancient findings and that, through these ancient findings, history still maintained its vitality in the pre-

<sup>54</sup> On the letter, see Di Teodoro 2021.

<sup>55</sup> On the differences between Poliziano’s and Barbaro’s methods, see Fera 1996, 193-4; Griggio 2014. On Barbaro’s geographic approach, see Pastore Stocchi 1996. The edition of Barbaro’s *Castigationes* is carried out in Pozzi 1973. On his library, see Diller 1963, 254-62. On his role Venetian humanism, see Branca 1963, 193-212.

<sup>56</sup> For a theory of Renaissance encyclopedism, see Blanchard, Severi 2018. See also Valla 1500; Maffei 1506; Ricchieri 1516; d’Alessandro 1522.

sent sparked the research of material evidence to the indiscriminate action of counterfeiters. Forgeries were created for the purpose of supporting positions that lacked reliable data; and the frequent attempts to unmask their mendacious nature, at times in vain, represented one of the crucial aspects of the antiquarian investigation.<sup>57</sup> By rejecting the authenticity of the Donation of Constantine, Lorenzo Valla gave impetus to revealing falsifications. Having rejected a testimony which had been blindly trusted during the Middle Ages, he demonstrated that the new vision of sources in their material consistency marked a change in thinking.<sup>58</sup>

Among the most famous antiquarian counterfeiters were Annius of Viterbo (1432-1502) and Alfonso Ceccarelli (1532-1583).<sup>59</sup> The works of Annius became very popular: he produced literary and epigraphic apocryphal texts (such as Berosus, Fabius Pictor, Cato, the *Decretum Desiderii*) to offer a new pseudo-cabalistic reading of the history of civilisation handed down directly from Hebrew and Etruscan sources. The extensive work of Ceccarelli, which remained predominantly in manuscript form, was put to use in genealogical and historiographical studies.

Antiquarian studies were conducted in humanistic circles, the most famous of which was the Academia Romana founded by Giulio Pomponio Leto (1428-1498). Figures as Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481), Sebastiano Manilio (fifteenth century), Manilius Rhallus (1447-1522), Niccolò Perotti and others, frequently participated in its sessions. The humanist inclination of this circle and its desire to 'revive' antiquity triggered an interest in ancient sources, the rediscovery and publication of manuscripts (one of the most important cases being the unearthing the *Codex Farnesianus* that transmitted Festus's *De verborum significatione*), the study of material findings (inscriptions, coins, statues, etc.), the research into institutional and social history, and the customs of ancient Rome.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> For a theory of forgery during the Renaissance, see Grafton 1990.

<sup>58</sup> For a history of the attacks against the Donation, see Levine 1973. Its authenticity was taken for granted during the Middle Ages, in fact, Dante contested it only on a juridical ground, see e.g. his *Monarchia* 3.11-13. On Valla's polemic against the *Donation*, see Antonazzi 1985; Fubini 1991; Regoliosi 1995; Miglio 2001; Watts 2004. For the edition of Valla's work, see Pugliese 1985.

<sup>59</sup> On the fortune of Annius's forgery, see Collins 2000; Stephens 2013; and Rothstein 2018. On the Hebrew inspiration of his scholarship, see Grafton 2018. See also Weiss 1962; Parente 1994; Fubini 1989. On Ceccarelli, see Fumi 1902 and Sivieri 2017.

<sup>60</sup> For a complete and constantly updated bibliography on Pomponio Leto, see <https://www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/index.html>. As already determined by Zabughin 1906, 223-5 and more recently in the life of Pomponio for the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Accame Lanzillotta 2015), Pomponio's antiquarian scholarship developed mostly in the years 1484-98 with his works on ancient Roman magis-



One of the heirs to this cultural experience was Angelo Colocci (1474-1549), who first acquired Pomponio Leto's house in year 1500, where he continued his Accademia, before moving it at the Horti Sallustiani after 1513. Here antiquarian interests flourished: the location was itself an archaeological site, with more than three hundred statues exhibited. This represented the antiquarian context of the meetings, in which poetry was declaimed, orations were recited, debates on antiquity held.<sup>61</sup> Among the participants, Baldassarre Castiglione, Giovanni Pierio Valeriano (1477-1558), Paolo Giovio (1483-1552), and Pietro Bembo (1470-1547), in particular, are worthy of mention.<sup>62</sup>

The presence of the three humanists, Bembo, Valeriano, and Colocci confirms once again that the antiquarian perspective was carried out in parallel with the historical-linguistic theories debated at the time, not only in relation to ancient languages, but also to modern vernaculars, which were put in a historical perspective by actual antiquarian scholars. The impact of the antiquarian vision could tangibly be perceived also in the later works of Theodore Bibliander's (1506-1564) *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et litterarum* and Joachim Périon's (1498-1559) *Dialogorum de linguae Gallicae origine, eiusque cum Graeca cognatione*, and many other.<sup>63</sup>

A new turn in understanding the classical past through a growth of the antiquarian method is due to the immense work of Desiderius

---

trates, which re-writes Andrea Fiacchi's (pseudo-Fenestella) treatise, his history of late Roman emperors, his epigraphic collections and his *Excerpta*, descriptions of ancient Roman ruins. On Pomponio as a collector of antiquities, see Magister 2003. It is important to point out that these erudite works were rooted in his previous philological (1468-80) and lexicographic studies (1480-84), especially related to Varro's *De lingua Latina* (see Accame Lanzillotta 1990; 1998, 41-57) and the many editions of classical texts he carried out (among the others Claudian, Lucretius, Ovid, Quintilian, Virgil). See also Zabughin 1909-12; Piacentini 2007; Accame Lanzillotta 2008; Marcotte 2012. On the activities of the Accademia Romana, see Cassini, Chiabò 2007; Bianca 2008; Marcotte 2011. On the role of Platina in the culture of late-fifteenth century, see Bauer 2006. On the role of Sebastiano Manilio and Manilius Rhallus for the rediscovery of Festus's *Codex Farnesianus*, see Lamers 2013.

**61** On Colocci's archaeological inclinations, see Vittorio Fanelli's collection of essays edited by Ruysschaert 1979, especially 111-34, and the classical Lanciani 1902. It is impossible to separate Colocci's antiquarian scholarship from his immense library and the marginal annotations on its many volumes; see Lattes 1972; Bianchi 1990, 271-82; Bologna, Bernardi 2008. About Colocci collector of epigrams, see Wellington Gahtan 2018.

**62** In a letter to Colocci dated 1529, Jacopo Sadoletto describes the sessions taking place in this Accademia, the topics discussed, and the people who joined the meetings; see Sadoletto 1550, 243-51; Lacelotti 1772, 119; and Fanelli 1959, 67-75 where the life of Colocci by Federico Ubaldini is published with an extensive commentary.

**63** See Bibliander 1548 and recent edition Amirav, Kirn 2011. See Périon 1555 and its recent edition Demerson, Jacquetin 2003. On the history of antiquarian polemics on language, see the still fundamental Simoncelli 1984, where a deep analysis of the so-called phenomenon of the 'Aramei' is carried out. On Renaissance lexicography and its interplay with antiquarianism, see Considine 2008.

Erasmus (1466-1536), especially in the field of classical philology. His textual criticism involved both Greek and Latin literature, not only profane but also sacred. It would be impossible to retrace the entire pattern of his works, but worthy of mention is at least his thorough explanation of ancient proverbs, *Adagia*, which grew and developed in each edition, representing an actual sum of antiquarian knowledge applied to Greek and Roman culture. Different in shape but similar in spirit is his edition, translation, and commentary of the New Testament, which followed the premises earlier established by Lorenzo Valla.<sup>64</sup>

Almost simultaneously, antiquarian erudition grew in other parts of Europe, also building on juridical studies on ancient law. It is not by chance that scholars who dedicated their lives at studying Roman Law, commenting on the *Pandects*, like Guillaume Budé (1467-1540) and Andrea Alciati (1492-1550), were extremely skilled in other branches of antiquarianism. Budé was an ambassador to Rome for the French crown, a disciple of Fra' Giovanni Giocondo (1433-1515) and Janus Lascaris (1445-1535). Even if his initial commitment was to law, Budé was an excellent interpreter of Greek and Latin texts. From this starting point, he arranged his commentaries on Greek language, his theoretical dissertation on philology, and his metrological studies. Alciati worked on the *Pandects* as well, from which he developed a juridical lexicon founded in the interpretation of ancient terms, a metrological booklet, and his memorable book of emblems.<sup>65</sup>

These were the years in which also epigraphy rose to a new level. From the late fourteenth century onwards, scholars gathered inscriptions in manuscript sylloges, which circulated throughout the erudite environments, spreading the knowledge of this branch of antiquarian studies. One of the most famous among these collections was the one arranged by Fra' Giocondo during his journey in Southern Italy at the end of the fifteenth century. Even if a first significant attempt of publishing epigraphic collections was made with Konrad Peutinger's (1465-1547) *Inscriptiones Romanae* (1520), however, the maturity of this research was reached shortly thereafter,

---

**64** For a basic bibliography to grasp Erasmus's approach to classical texts, see Rummel 1985; Reynolds, Wilson 1988; Simeone 2014. On his philological work on the New Testament, see Rummel 1986; Delgado Jara, Pena Gonzalez 2016.

**65** On Budé's philological works, see Sanchi 2006 and Morantin 2017. On his erudition, see Sanchi 2009. On Budé as a multifarious figure, see the collections of essays André, Dangel, Demont 1996; Boehm, Ferrary, Franchet d'Esperey 2016. For his works, see at least Budé 1508 (notes on the *Pandects*); 1514 (on metrology); 1529 (his commentaries on Greek language); 1532 (on philology). There are no specific studies dedicated to Alciati's antiquarian approach; however, it may be interesting to check at least Barni 1958, 25-35. For a first glance at his works, see Alciati 1529-32 (his edition of the *Pandects*); Alciati 1530a (his lexicon); Alciati 1530b (his book on Roman magistrates); Alciati 1530c (his metrological work); Alciati 1531 (his book of emblems).

when two major epigraphic books were sent to press. The former was the *Epigrammatae antiquae Urbis* (1521), edited by Colocci and published by Jacopo Mazocchi (late fifteenth century-1527 ca.), which accumulated inscriptions from the city of Rome. The latter was the *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae antiquitatis* (1534) by the German antiquarian and astronomer Petrus Apianus (1495-1552), which put together texts of inscriptions from all over Europe.<sup>66</sup>

After these works, new exploits in epigraphy were achieved, which culminated in the rediscovery of the *Fasti Consulares* in the Roman Forum (1546), a pivotal moment in the growth of the entire antiquarian movement.<sup>67</sup> This epigraphic finding was soon transferred to the Capitolium under the supervision of Michelangelo. The edition of the text transmitted in these inscriptions triggered a debate among the experts of epigraphy and chronology, in particular Bartolomeo Marliani (1487-1566), Francesco Robortello (1516-1577), Carlo Sigonio (1520-1584), Onofrio Panvinio (1530-1568), Martin Smetius (1525-1578), and Stephen Winand Pigge (1520-1604), who all published it within a few years. The major contribution to antiquarian scholarship provided by this finding was that it represented a new source for ancient Roman chronology, which until then had been known only through literary histories, and represented an official document directly connected to Roman imperial institutions. Previously, Roman chronology had often been reconstructed by comparing Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (whose accounts often contradicted each other), as demonstrated by the Roman seriations of Gregorius Haloander (1501-1531), Johannes Cuspinianus (1473-1529), and Heinrich Glareanus (1488-1563).<sup>68</sup>

Numismatic studies blossomed in parallel with the great season of epigraphy, following analogous dynamics.<sup>69</sup> These were the years when ancient coins began fascinating collectors and scholars, as dem-

---

**66** On Giocondo's scholarship, see Koortbojian 2002; Gros, Pagliara 2014; De Divitiis 2016. On Mazocchi's edition, see Carbonell, González Germain 2020, a collection of essays that attempts to measure the impact of this work on European antiquarianism. A systematic investigation of Apianus's epigraphic scholarship is still missing; for some specific case studies related to his collection, see Conley 2010, 55-79; but especially Stenhouse 2005; see also Williams 1941.

**67** For a general overview on the history of this archaeological discovery, see Henzen 1863; Degrassi 1947, 1-12; McCuaig 1989, 141-59; Stenhouse 2005, 103-12; Mayer 2010, 29.

**68** On this issue, see Glareanus 1531; Haloander 1530; Cuspinianus 1553; McCuaig 1989, 141-9; Ferrary 1996, 116-17; Grafton, Neu 2013.

**69** On the fifteenth-century numismatic collections, see Weiss 1968 and Missere Fontana 1995a, especially on the Bolognese environment. Two publications are specifically dedicated to Andrea Fulvio, i.e. Weiss 1959 and Cristofari 1997. On the diffusion, approach, and variety of numismatic publications during the sixteenth century, see Dekesel 1997.

onstrated by Hans Memling's (1463-1494) iconic portrait of a *Man with a Roman Medal* (1480 ca.). The first actual numismatic book published during the Renaissance was the *Illustrium imagines* (1517) by the Roman antiquarian Andrea Fulvio (ca. 1470-ca. 1527), which had not yet established a systematic cataloguing method, like the following publications, especially those of the second half of the century.<sup>70</sup> From Fulvio onwards, the interest in ancient coins became one of the pillars of Renaissance antiquarian erudition thanks to the many branches of antiquarian knowledge they could support: this included historical, since coins were sources through which it was possible to cross-reference data depending on literary sources; iconographic since the images on the reverse of the coins represented a symbolic language that had to be decoded to be re-utilised; and metrological since each coin possessed a monetary value that needed to be understood in the more complex economic issue of coinage and minting.

The historical approach was carried out systematically by scholars such as Sigonio, who often referred to numismatic specimens in his edition and commentary on Livy, or in his many works *de iure*; the Flemish numismatist Hubert Goltzius (1526-1583), who wrote a Roman history of Julius Caesar's (1563) and Augustus's (1564) times based on ancient Roman coins - he also combined the coins to the *Fasti Consulares* (1574) to link all the names listed in the consular seriation to other material sources; and Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600), who wrote a history of Roman families (1577) based on the coins mentioning their names.<sup>71</sup>

The figures who better embodied the iconographic approach were the engraver Enea Vico (1523-1567), who published several books of coins with their explanation, among the others a monograph on the coins minted for Roman empresses; the Venetian humanist Sebastiano Erizzo (1525-1585), who considered ancient coins only as commemorative medals without actual monetary value; and the Spanish bishop Antonio Agustín (1517-1586), who put together a complex dialogue on ancient coins, after more than thirty years of numismatic studies attested in his epistolary.<sup>72</sup>

---

**70** See Fulvio 1517. On Andrea Fulvio see the still valid Weiss 1959 and the more recent Cristofari 1997. Fulvio was also the author of a book of Roman antiquities; see Fulvio 1527 and Raffarin 2019.

**71** For Livy, see Sigonio 1555a; 1556a; for the juridical works, see Sigonio 1563. For an intellectual biography of Sigonio, see McCuaig 1989. For Goltzius's works on Caesar and Augustus, see respectively Goltzius 1563 and 1564; on his *Fasti*, see Goltzius 1566. On Orsini's Roman families, see Orsini 1577. One must note that the issue of Roman families became a main branch of Renaissance antiquarian scholarship.

**72** On Vico's work as a numismatist in general, see Missere Fontana 1995b; Bodon 1997; 2005; Davis 2013; 2014; 2021. See also Vico 1548; 1558; 1560. His work on Roman empresses is Vico 1557, on which see Flaten 2017, 121-32. On Erizzo's collection, see Palumbo Fossati Casa 1984; see also Erizzo 1559. On Agustín's antiquarian scholarship, see Carbonell 1991, especially on the fortune of his numismatic and ep-

As already mentioned briefly, antiquarian metrology was elevated to actual science by Guillaume Budé, when he first published his famous *De asse et partibus eius* (1514). This work inaugurated a plethora of epigone treatises, such as Andrea Alciati's and Georg Agricola's (1494-1555) *De ponderibus et mensuris*, which not only discussed the value of ancient currency, but also the units of measurement of length, weight, and capacity, and many others.<sup>73</sup>

Moreover, the fundamental role played by architecture underwent a revival in the development of the Renaissance antiquarian spirit. The evocations inspired by classical buildings, which started between the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century and mastered by figures such as Brunelleschi and Alberti, increased their presence and consistency during the sixteenth century, gaining additional theoretical support: in fact, several treatises attempted to provide a more precise and complex codification of classical architecture both through the observation of ancient ruins and the study of classical texts, such as Vitruvius and Pliny.<sup>74</sup> The figures who better interpreted this trend were Fra' Giocondo, who edited Vitruvius in 1511, Cesare Cesariano, who gave the first Italian translation of this work, Sebastiano Serlio (1475-1554), with his books on architecture and his descriptions of ancient buildings, Guillaume

---

igraphic studies. His numismatic work is Agustín 1587a (Spanish edition). The Italian editions are Agustín 1592a (by Ottaviano Sada) and Agustín 1592b (probably translated by Alfonso Chacón, Missere Fontana 2009, 61-72).

**73** On Budé's work as a numismatist (Budé 1514), see Michel 1978 and Crawford, Ligota, Trapp 1990. See also Alciati 1530c. On Agricola, bibliography focused on his metallurgical treatise (Agricola 1555) rather than on his metrological (Agricola 1533; 1550). However, the relevance of his contribution in the latter field is also proven by the diffusion of this work and by the many manuscript notes usually found in the margins of his copies - the most significant cases are BUB A.M.I.5.7, with Ulisse Aldrovandi's notes, and BNCR 71.3.F.20, with Juan Baptista Villalpando's notes. Among the others works on the value of ancient coins, see Hotman 1585 and Scaliger 1616.

**74** On Pliny, see Maragliano 2012; Fane-Saunders 2016; Ghidini 2019. On Vitruvius, see Kanerva 2006; various essays in the collection Folin, Spesso 2003; Pagliara 1986. On Giocondo's edition of Vitruvius, see Salatin 2017 and Mattei, Salatin 2014, the latter discussing the marginal notes on this publication carried out by Budé and Lascaris; Gros 2015; Gros, Pagliara 2014; on Barbaro's commentary on Vitruvius (Barbaro 1556; 1567), see Cellauro 2004. On Philandrier 1544, see Lemerle 2000. On Serlio in general, see Beltramini 2018 and bibliography; Vène 2007, on the editions of his works; Deswarte-Rosa 2004, *passim*; and Hart 1998, 170-85. For his works, see Serlio 1537 and Serlio 1544. This information is mentioned in Atanagi 1565, 2<sup>b</sup>-3<sup>a</sup>; on the effective function an aim of this Accademia, see Moroncini 2016 and Moroncini 2017. An attempt to systematise the work on ancient architecture around Claudio Tolomei is currently carried out by the database <http://accademia-vitruviana.net/> edited by Bernd Kulawik. See also Kulawik 2018. On the influence of ancient architecture on Vignola, see Fiorani 2003; on Palladio, see Burlington 1730; Zorzi 1958; Gioseffi 1973; Ackerman 1994; Gros 2006; Beltramini 2014. On the resurgence of classical architecture during the Renaissance, see Frommel, Ray, Tafuri 1984; Günther 1988; Nasselrath 1993; Fiore 2005; Tafuri 2005.

Philandrier (1505-1563) and Daniele Barbaro (1514-1570), who both commented upon Vitruvius's work. Which was the role of Claudio Tolomei's (1492-1556) project in disseminating the interest towards ancient architecture during the Renaissance it still needs clarification, especially about its existence of an academy "de lo Studio de l'Architettura" in which Tolomei himself may have coordinated an extensive cataloguing work of ancient buildings is confirmed. The theoretical works of these figures undoubtedly influenced the practical output in architecture, especially in Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola (1507-1573) and Andrea Palladio (1508-1580), who were able to combine the study of Vitruvius with practical knowledge, paving the way for a time of deeply rooted classicism, with incredible results.

Between the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth century, antiquarian studies gradually became inextricably linked with collections of antiquities. In fact, the main collections of antiquities built up during the Renaissance were owned by the political and ecclesiastical aristocracy and were often connected to the royal courts. This created a close bond, often of subordination, between antiquarian erudition and power, putting the first at the service of the second. Beyond the political interference that may have taken place, the most important antiquarian works of the sixteenth century emanated from the richest and most heterogeneous collections, such as those which belonged to the Farnese family in Rome, to the Medici in Florence, to the Este in Ferrara, to the Grimani in Venice, or like the Palatine collection in Vienna and the royal collection in Madrid.<sup>75</sup>

Many scholars lived in these environments and many antiquarian works flourished there. Among those who benefited from the vitality of the Roman environment, a major role was covered by Antonio Agustín,<sup>76</sup>

---

**75** On antiquarian scholarship and collecting, see Goeing, Grafton, Michel 2013; see also Stenhouse 2014, 131-44; 2017a; 2017b. On Roman collections between Quattrocento and Cinquecento, see Antetomaso 2007. The collection of Carlo Emanuele I of Savoy is also extremely interesting, see Bava, Pagella 2016. On the Farnese collection, see Falguières 1988; Ajello, Haskell, Gasparri 1988; Bile 1995; Coraggio 1999; Capaldi 2012; Extermann 2019, 59-61. On the role of cardinal Alessandro Farnese in sixteenth-century antiquarian culture, see Robertson 1992. On the Chigi collection, see Barbieri 2014. On the Medici collection in Florence the material is practically boundless; a good tool to browse the primary sources of this field of Renaissance antiquarianism is represented by the database <https://www.memofonte.it/ricerche/collezionismo-mediceo/>; see also Barocchi, Gaeta Bertelà 1993. On the collections of the Este and Gonzaga, see Braglia 2014. On the collections in Venice, see Hochman, Lauber, Mason 2008 and especially Favaretto 2002, 63-128.

**76** On his library, see Alcina Franch, Salvadó Recasens 2007; on his erudite works carried out during Counter-Reformation, see Crawford 1993; on his epistolary exchanges with Lelio Torelli and Jean Matal, see Ferrary 1992. His epistolary was published by Flores Selles 1980.

Fulvio Orsini,<sup>77</sup> and Onofrio Panvinio.<sup>78</sup> It is not by chance that both Agustín and Orsini shared philological, epigraphic, and numismatic investigations: these are witnessed in their massive epistolary exchange, in their editions of Festus (respectively 1559 and 1581), and in their erudite publications dealing with laws, banquets, etc. Similarly, Panvinio was supported by Alessandro Farnese in his ecclesiastical enquiries, in a sort of refiguration on the ecclesiastical antiquarianism that would take place in the last three decades of the sixteenth century.

The philological studies on classical texts conducted by Piero Vettori (1499-1585), the edition of the *Pandects* based on the ancient manuscript from Pisa directed by Lelio Torelli (1489-1576), and the linguistic and antiquarian studies carried out by Vincenzo Borghini (1515-1580) were deeply rooted in the Florentine context, profiting of the invaluable manuscripts housed in the libraries of the city and by the patronage of the grand duke Cosimo I.<sup>79</sup>

The mythographic studies of Lilio Gregorio Giraldi (1479-1552), the linguistic and numismatic of Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541) and Agostino Mosti (1505-1584) were firmly based in the culture of the Ferrarese court, under the shadow of cardinal Ippolito II d'Este

---

**77** Fulvio Orsini is one of the most relevant antiquarians of the sixteenth century. His contribution in antiquarian studies, both Greek and Latin is immense, as witnessed by his archaeological collection and by his library. The primary work on Orsini's scholarship is the old but still unsurpassed intellectual biography by Nolhac 1887. More recently, Cellini 2004 has published a monograph on his antiquarian research and his *Imagines*. Cellini 2001 also described the history of the so-called 'tabula Bembina' in Orsini's collection. Ruysschaert 1985 discussed about Orsini's notes on Latin elegiac poetry. On Orsini's books today housed at BNCR, see Veneziani 1984.

**78** On Panvinio's antiquarian scholarship, see the recent Bauer 2020 and Ferrary 1996. While the latter focuses mainly on the studies on classical antiquity, the former shows very well how his method, initially developed on the classics, was subsequently applied in ecclesiastical archaeology and history. Pivotal contributions are Gersbach 1997 on Panvinio's correspondence with Vincenzo Borghini; Gersbach 1993 on the role of Panvinio's brother Paolo in the posthumous publication of *De primate Petri*; Gersbach 1992 on the manuscript of Panvinio's *Antiquitatum Veronensium libri VIII*; Gersbach 1991 on Panvinio's relations with the Cybo family.

**79** Vettori is one the greatest philologists of his time; yet a recent monograph on his work is missing. For his scholarship. For his life, see Mouren 2014. His epistolary has been published in different collections throughout the centuries, see Bramanti 2009 (letters by Ugolino Martelli); Ghinassi 1968 (various letters by Vettori); Nolhac 1887 (correspondence with Fulvio Orsini); Bandini 1758-60 (Latin letters to Italian and Germans addressees); Vettori 1586 (various Latin letters). On Vettori's role in the culture of sixteenth-century Florence, see Drusi 2012a, 15-38; and Lo Re 2008. On the edition of the *Pandects* (Torelli 1553), see Baldi 2010. On Borghini's erudition, see the fundamental Belloni, Drusi 2002 and Bertoli, Drusi 2005, and bibliography. See also Carrara, Ginzburg 2008. On the relationship between Vettori and Borghini, see Carrara 1999 and Carrara 1998. On Borghini's antiquarian scholarship, see Carrara 2001 and more specifically Carrara 2012, about the information of ancient statues in Florence, and Carrara 2005 about Borghini's own drawings of antiquity. On Borghini's library, see Carrara 2018, 1-11 and Testaverde Matteini 1983, 133-56.



(1509-1572),<sup>80</sup> as well as Pirro Ligorio's (1513-1583)<sup>81</sup> immense manuscript encyclopaedia of antiquity, partially bought by the Farnese family and partially by the House of Savoy. Austria and Spain were also fertile grounds for the works of Wolfgang Lazius (1514-1565)<sup>82</sup> and Jerónimo Zurita (1512-1580),<sup>83</sup> respectively.

In addition, an interesting case of Renaissance antiquarianism is that of the Venice and the Veneto region. Here antiquarian scholarship was tied to several cultural specificities that the environment offered. The philological approach followed the guidelines imposed by Guarino, Bessarion, Ermolao Barbaro. At the same time, a new and unique antiquarian language for figurative art was created and developed by Jacopo Bellini (1400-1470) and Andrea Mantegna (1431-1506).<sup>84</sup> Thanks to Aldo Manuzio's (ca. 1450-1515) contribution to the growth of the press, the antiquarian enterprises in editing and commenting ancient texts – not only Latin, but also Greek – were strongly encouraged. This boosted the number of scholars working on these

---

**80** On the Ferrarese environment in general, see Castelli 1998; On Giraldi's scholarship, see Montalto 2011. On his alchemical interests and his exchanges with Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola, see Secret 1976. On his philological work on Greek tragedies, see Mund-Dopchie 1985. On his mythological scholarship, see Sez nec 1953 and Giraldi 1548. On his antiquarian approach, see Alhaique Pettinelli 1991, 9-62 and Alhaique Pettinelli 1972 (especially on his relationship with Calcagnini). On Giraldi's life and works, see Foà 2001. On Calcagnini's work as an antiquarian, see Missere, Missere Fontana 1993 (especially on his numismatic scholarship) and Lazzari 1936 (on his encyclopedism). On his Latin prose, see Curti 2018. On Agostino Mosti, see the biographical entry Russo 2012 and his own autobiography Solerti 1892. Mosti's relations with Pirro Ligorio are witnessed by a manuscript note *BCA S. Maria in Aquiro XXXVIII*, in which he acknowledged the reception of a copy of Ligorio's book of coins – furthermore, Ligorio dedicated to Mosti his work on ancient banquets (see *BCA II 384 Compilazione dell'antichi convivii detti symposii*). On Ippolito d'Este and his patronage, see Cogotti, Fiore 2013.

**81** On Ligorio's work as an artist and an antiquarian, see Loffredo, Vagenheim 2019; Occhipinti 2011; Gaston 1988. Ligorio's works are being published by De Luca Editore within the *Edizione nazionale delle opere di Pirro Ligorio*. For the codices housed in Naples, see Balistreri 2020 (on ancient clothing); Rausa 2019 (on ancient burials); Gaston 2015 (on ancient water springs, rivers, and lakes); Pafumi 2011 (on ancient measures); Orlandi 2009 (on ancient sepulchral inscriptions); 2008 (on ancient Greek and Latin inscriptions); 2003 (on ancient Greek and Latin inscriptions). For the codices housed in Turin, Serafin Petrillo 2013 (on ancient Greek and Roman coins); Palma Venetucci 2005 (on ancient illustrious persons); Ten 2005 (on the city of Tivoli and some ancient villas); Guidoboni 2005 (on earthquakes). For the codices housed in Oxford, see Campbell 2016 (on Roman antiquities in general).

**82** On Lazius's scholarship in general, see Donecker, Svatek, Klecker 2021. On his collection of epigraphs and epigraphic forgeries, see Weber 2020.

**83** On Zurita's scholarship, see Solano Costa 1986. On Zurita as an historian, see Redondo Veintemillas 2013 and Sarasa Sánchez 2013 – both contributions on his work on the crown of Aragon; Fatás 2013 on his notes on Julius Caesar's *Commentaries*.

**84** On Mantegna, see Favaretto 2010 and Bodon 2010. On Bellini, see Fortini Brown 1992.



subjects and the circulation of books related thereto. Aldo's work on antiquarian publications was followed and further developed by his son Paolo (1512-1574) and his grandson Aldo the Younger (1547-1597).<sup>85</sup> Moreover, the literary works of figures like Pietro Bembo, Sebastiano Erizzo, Giovanni Battista Ramusio (1485-1557), and Daniele Barbaro were often backed by sharply cultivated collections, which helped in increasing the exchanges between word and object, consolidating further the antiquarian method.<sup>86</sup>

Antiquarian circles flourished in Padua as well, within the broader context of the university, throughout the entire sixteenth century and onwards. Among the others, worthy of mention are figures such as Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601), whose library today still represents an incredible resource for understanding Renaissance antiquarian tradition, and Lorenzo Pignoria (1571-1631), who devoted much of his work to ancient mythology.<sup>87</sup>

The connection with the political power of the time allowed the antiquarian investigation to break free from the closed circles of collections and libraries and to be disseminated into the collective imagination, thereby developing into one of the columns of the triumphant Renaissance. When planning their works, it was common practice for artists and architects to receive support from antiquarian scholars, who took on the role of iconographic advisors and enhanced the conceptual coherence of the patron's projects.<sup>88</sup> For example, Giorgio

---

**85** On the Manuzio papers, see Pastorello 1957; 1960. On the contribution of Aldo Manuzio to Renaissance antiquarian scholarship, see the recent Comiati 2019 and bibliography; see also Balsamo 2002 on the diffusion of Greek classics in the Renaissance; Balsamo 1981 on his relations with Alberto Pio from Carpi; Kretzulesco Quaranta 1967; Dionisotti 1960 on his humanistic activity. On Paolo Manuzio, see the Barberi 1985 on his activity as a printer; Pastorello 1962 on his activity as a numismatist; Nolhac 1883 collects some letters dealing with antiquarian topics. On the library of Aldo Manuzio the Younger, see Serra 2007; see also Koortbojian 2001.

**86** On the link between Bembo's antiquarian activity and his works as a humanist, see the exhibition catalogue Beltramini, Gasparotto, Tura 2013; on the origin and implementation of his collection, see Nalezty 2017; on his relationship with figurative art, see Beltramini, Burns, Gasparotto 2013. Giovanni Battista Ramusio gathered an extensive number of texts related to travel literature, which included also reports from the Middle Ages, such as Marco Polo and Geoffroy de Villeharduin. The encyclopaedic approach relies on an antiquarian vision of the matter. In a letter to Fracastoro, he declared openly that through his collection ancient geographic knowledge would be challenged; see Donattini 2016.

**87** The antiquarian tradition in Padua was deeply rooted. On Pinelli's library, see Raugei 2018 and Nuovo 2007. For Pinelli's approach, see Raugei 2001, which collects the epistolary exchange with Claude Dupuy. His activity as an antiquarian is described in Nolhac 1887. On Pignoria, see Maffei 2020; part of his correspondence with Paolo Gualdo, which has many antiquarian references, features in Paitoni 1744.

**88** One of the clearest examples of relations expressing the interaction among artists, iconographers and patron is described in Pinelli 2007, for the *Mascherata degli dei gentili* held in Florence in 1565, and in Robertson

Vasari (1511-1574) was supported by Borghini when decorating the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence, Federico Zuccari by Orsini or Panvinio for the Palazzo Farnese in Caprarola, and Rosso Fiorentino (1495-1540) by a figure who remains anonymous for the Gallery of Francis I in Fontainebleau – probably Lazare de Baif (1496-1547); more rarely, the same artist took on the role of iconographer, and this was perhaps the case with Jacopo Zucchi (1542-1596).

In artistic contexts, it was possible for a stylistic feature of antiquarian origin to enter standard decorative schemes. It was often difficult to distinguish between the reuse of classical elements and a voluntary or unconscious citation. This was especially the case with grotesques, which became commonplace after their rediscovery in the Domus Aurea (ca. 1479) and provoked a debate on their legitimacy and whether they should be subject to censorship. Ligorio, Vasari, and many other artists and scholars took part in this century-long debate: Anton Francesco Doni (1513-1574), Francisco de Hollanda (1517-1585), and Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597), among others, attempted to define meaning and function of an artistic feature deemed as extremely controversial.<sup>89</sup>

Between image and word, another form of antiquarianism in Renaissance cultural life can be seen in emblems and *imprese*. This genre, which was inspired by emblems, combined images and a short text (respectively a poem and a motto), often reutilising erudite elements of the antiquarian investigation and related them to the addressee.<sup>90</sup> Starting with Andrea Alciati, who was the first to codify

---

1988, for the decorations of Palazzo Farnese in Rome. On the collaboration between Borghini and Vasari, see Carrara 2008; Borghini 2007, on the dispute with Girolamo Mei about the origins of Florence; Carrara 2000 about some notes on Pliny in the ms. signed K. 783.16; Carrara, Ferretti 2016. On Vasari's own vision of the antique, especially in his *Vite*, see Barocchi 1958; on Vasari and antiquities in general, see also Cristofani 1983-84. For the fresco paintings in Fontainebleau, see Panofsky, Panofsky 1958, 113-90. Decoration apparently completed without the advice of an iconographer are those by Jacopo Zucchi in Rome and Florence; see D'Amelio, Morel, Rigon 2013.

**89** The bibliography on Renaissance grotesques it is extensive and in constant growth. It is enough to mention Dacos 1969 on the rediscovery of Nero's Domus Aurea; Ossola 1971 on the role of grotesques in Counter-Reformation art; Chastel 1988 on the Renaissance conception of grotesque art; Morel 1997 that formulates a theory of grotesques in Renaissance art; Scholl 2004 that provides a theory of grotesques in Renaissance literature; Zamperini 2007 that writes a history of grotesque painting from antiquity to modern times; Connelly 2012 on the idea of grotesque and its philosophical implications; Morgan 2016 on the interplay between grotesques and gardens; Hansen 2018 that provides a new theory of grotesques as an art of transformation; Conticelli 2018 that decodes the iconographic programme of the Uffizi grotesques; Acciarino 2018 that publishes new literary sources on the matter; 2019 that offers new paradigms of Renaissance grotesques.

**90** Two databases currently provide a wide access to emblems and *imprese*; for Alciati's work, see <https://www.emblems.arts.gla.ac.uk/alciato/>; for emblems in

this ‘figurative literature’, a widespread editorial phenomenon took place involving scholars from all over Europe, including Girolamo Ruscelli (1518-1566), Johannes Sambucus (1531-1584), and Jean Jacques Boissard (1528-1602). One of the most famous mottos of the Renaissance was *festina lente*, mostly presented as an anchor and a dolphin. Originally, this figuration was minted on the reverse side of a coin of the Roman imperial series of Augustus and Titus [RIC I Titus 110]. The image was represented and cited in the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499), adopted by Aldo Manuzio (1449-1515) as the symbol for his publishing house, explained in its original sense by Erasmus in his *Adagia*, and reinvented by Cosimo I de’ Medici, the Grand Duke of Tuscany in his *impresa*.

The number of findings from classical antiquity was greater in Italy than the rest of Europe. Although many humanists of other nations travelled to and resided for long periods in Italy, it was not possible for everyone to directly access a wide range of ancient findings. Nonetheless, antiquarian understanding had developed in the rest of Europe by the mid-fifteenth century and gradually strengthened to the point where Italy’s leading position in this area of knowledge was challenged. The main means through which antiquarianism became a continental phenomenon was the circulation of published books. The philological editions of ancient authors and historiographical texts, especially if they included images, had a significant positive effect on the understanding of indirect records. In this way, the knowledge acquired in Italy was made available to the rest of the European antiquarian community, allowing research to be undertaken where findings were missing.<sup>91</sup>

One of the earliest examples of this circulation of ideas is represented by the arrival in Germany of a partial copy of the *Commentaria* of Cyriacus of Ancona, brought by Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514), which, for example, had a significant influence on the compilation of Apianus’s epigraphic collection and some of the later works of Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528). Furthermore, Jacopo Strada’s (1507-1588) arrangement of his own *Magnum ac Novum Opus* for the Fugger bankers exhibited another way through which antiquarian culture could travel across the Alps. The studies on Roman antiquity conducted by Joannes Rosinus (1550-1626) also clearly revealed the impact of this tradition on learned German milieus.<sup>92</sup>

---

general, see <http://emblematica.grainger.illinois.edu/>. For Ruscelli’s *impresa*, see also Gizzi 2016; Marini, Procaccioli 2012.

**91** The works of Antoine Lafréry (1512-1577) and Giovanni Battista de’ Cavalieri (1525-1601) are worthy of mention in this context.

**92** On the fortune of Cyriacus of Ancona’s in Germany, see Kutsogiannês 2020. On the sources of Schedel’s collection see Kikuchi 2010. On Dürer and his relationship with antiquity, see the collection Ebert-Schifferer, Hartmann Fiore 2007, espe-

In France, the growth of antiquarian scholarship was encouraged by King Francis I and by the circle of humanists who gravitated around him.<sup>93</sup> The already mentioned studies of Guillaume Budé were followed by his disciple Lazare de Baïf, who was an ambassador to Venice, from where he sent several antiquities to his homeland, and arranged for innovative antiquarian investigations to be carried out on clothing, vases, and vessels. Guillaume Du Choul (1496-1560) investigated several aspects of Roman religion by cross-referencing material and literary sources. Marc-Antoine Muret (1526-1585), a disciple of Giulio Cesare Scaligero (1484-1558), carried out the largest part of his activity in Italy, publishing editions of Terence, Horace, and the elegiac poets. Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), son of Scaligero himself, demonstrated his antiquarian scholarship in editing ancient authors and in his grand work on historical chronology. Just as well, Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614) devoted his life to antiquarian philology, publishing and commenting many ancient authors, among the others Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistae*.

Antiquarian erudition was also practiced at the highest level in the Low Countries.<sup>94</sup> Hubert Goltzius, one of the most famous numismatists of the second half of the sixteenth century, developed his scholarship while travelling from the Netherlands to Italy: the purpose of his publications was to reconstruct the history of the Roman Empire by drawing links between ancient coins and inscriptions and their related narrative sources. Similar experience, even

---

cially 140-85 (a contribution by Lucia Faedo on his work on ancient mythology), 80-7 (a contribution of Marzia Faietti on his emulation of Mantegna), and 32-43 (a contribution by Antonio Giuliano on his work as an antiquarian); see also the famous essay Warburg 1999, 553-9 and the exhibition catalogue Buck, Hurttig, Stolzenburg 2013. On Strada's work at the imperial court in Vienna, see Jansen 2019 and the *DFG-Projekt Jacopo Strada's Magnum ac Novum Opus*, a sixteenth-century numismatic corpus at the Gotha Research Center of the University of Erfurt, by Martin Mulsow, Volker Heenes and Dirk Jacob Jansen, <https://www.uni-erfurt.de/forschung/forschungsprojekte/jacopo-stradas-magnum-ac-novum-opus>. Studies on Rosinus's scholarship are still missing (see Rosinus 1583).

**93** On antiquarianism in France, see McGowan 2000 and Cooper 2013. Very little studies have been conducted on Lazare de Baïf; see his intellectual biography Pinvert 1900, on his work as a jurist and as a translator, see Sanchi 2013, as well as Fassina 2014. An interesting case is also about Antoine Morillon; see Crawford 1998. On Du Choul's life, work, and collection, see Guillemain 2002; Cooper 2003; and Guillemain 2008. On Muret, see the recent intellectual biography Bernard-Pradelle 2020. On Scaliger's antiquarian work, see Grafton 1983 and 1991; for his correspondence, see the 8 volumes Botley, van Miert 2012. For Casaubon's scholarship, see the old monograph Pattison 1875 and the publication of his correspondence in England Botley, Vince 2018.

**94** On Goltzius's travels, see Napolitano 2010 and 2011. It is possible to find only occasional references to van Giffens's scholarship, see e.g. Demetriou 2015 (on Homer) or Butterfield 2015, 46-68 (on Lucretius). The scholarship on Lissius is extensive. For his antiquarian approach, see Papy 2001; 2004; 2012; Hendrickson 2017. On the antiquarianism of the Rubens, see van der Meulen 1994.

though mainly oriented towards philology and bibliophilia, was for Huber van Giffen (1534-1604), commentator of the Homeric poems and editor of Lucretius, among his other works. Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), who spent part of his life in Rome, investigated many aspects of classical and biblical antiquity, including banqueting, poliorcetica, the real nature of the Christian cross, and more complex analyses of Roman civilisation. Even though his focus was mainly philological in nature, Lipsius often used material findings to carry out his emendations and corrections of ancient texts; his *Antiquae lectiones* provide a clear example of this methodological approach. The long journey through Italy completed by Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) also contributed significantly to antiquarian scholarship: he was a learned painter, and it has been proved that his drawings of statues and ruins increased the knowledge on the material bequest of antiquity, thanks also to the help of his brother Philip (1574-1611) and his son Albert (1614-1657).

Through these paths, it is also clear how antiquarian surveys ended up including national investigations, the purpose of which was to reconstruct a reliable history for a specific territory, following the model of the studies undertaken on Roman antiquity. In fact, the method transitioned from classical and universal dimension to a local and particular. Therefore, by comparing local literary sources with local ruins, it was possible to give a new shape to the origins:<sup>95</sup> [I] France, described, for example, in the works of Jean Lemaire de Belges (1473-1525), and Pierre Pithou (1539-1596); [II] England, investigated by William Camden's (1551-1623); [III] Germany, studied in Johan Månsson's (1488-1544) and Philipp Clüver's (1580-1622); [IV] Spain, researched by Zurita's and Francisco Padilla's (1527-1607); [V] Low Countries, with the studies by Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) and Johannes Isacius Pontanus (1571-1639); [VI] Scandinavia Pontanus himself and Ole Worm (1588-1634). In the same period, the Polish scholar Jan Łasicki (1534-1602) attempted to complete the first erudite history of Russia, while histories of the Turkish Empire, China, and the New World, contaminating travel literature with antiquarian accounts, also flourished.

---

**95** On the local approach often adopted by antiquarians, see the collection of essays Christian, De Divitiis 2018, which covers a wide range of local antiquarian investigations. The chapter by William Stenhouse (121-41) touches upon the reuse of antiquity in France; the one by Fernando Mariás and Katrina Olds discuss case studies related to Spain; João Figueiredo (190-208) talks about Portugal; Edward Wouk (209-36), Krista de Jonge (237-60), and Konrad Ottenheim (261-85) discuss cases from the Low Countries; Barbara Arciszewska (286-304) analyses a case from Poland; Jeanna Schultz (305-26) treats some aspects of English antiquarianism. On Jean Lemaire de Belges's scholarship, see Eichberger 2018 and Stecher 1891-92. On Camden's antiquarian method, see Vine 2014. On Månsson and Clüver's treatises, see Jannsen 2017. On Ole Worm, see Tarp 2013 and Andersen Funder 2020, 103-19.

The hypothesis that there was a relationship between the triumph of antiquarian culture and the explosion of religious controversies in Northern Europe is very interesting, especially given the impact of the Reformed approach to Sacred Scriptures on spiritual life. For example, the New Testamentary Commentary of Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus took advantage of the experience acquired in their philological and antiquarian surveys. As one would expect, humanists and theologians (Catholic and Protestant alike) used antiquarianism to support their own positions and contest opposing views.<sup>96</sup> The *Magdeburg Centuries*, overseen by Mathias Flacius (1520-1575), represented the high point for Protestant antiquarian writings and breathed life into a constellation of analogous works by authors such as Matthew Parker (1504-1575), Johann Jakob Gryner (1540-1617) and Johann Wilhelm Stucki (1542-1607). On the Catholic side, the most complete and organised response is represented by the *Annales* of Cesare Baronio (1538-1607), the purpose of which was not only to rehabilitate the Roman vision of Christianity from a historiographic perspective but also to utilise a more precise and systematic antiquarian approach. These patterns remained popular for most of the seventeenth century, as demonstrated by the monumental *Roma Sotterranea* written by Antonio Bosio (1575-1629), and *Italia Sacra* written by Ferdinando Ughelli (1595-1670).

Although the antiquarian tradition continued to generate very important successors during the centuries that followed, the turning point for Renaissance antiquarianism can be narrowed down to the early seventeenth century, when its unsuitability for dealing with new scientific enquiries started to become obvious. Hybrid figures who continued to tread the traditional path began to emerge, but they were unable to remain indifferent to the impending new developments: their investigations, initiated in the knowledge of ancient sources, started drifting away authority and gaining unprecedented results thanks to comparison with data acquired through an embryonic empirical investigation and analogy.<sup>97</sup>

This was especially the case with the zoological and botanical studies carried out by Conrad Gesner (1516-1565) and Ulisse Aldrovandi

---

**96** On the relations between antiquarian method and the exegesis of the Sacred Scriptures during the Reformation, see Dost 2001; Backus 2003; Rummel 2008; and van Liere, Ditchfield, Louthan 2012. For an overview on ecclesiastical antiquarianism from the Catholic side, see Bauer 2006; 2020; 2021. On the *Magdeburg Centuries*, see Mentzel-Reuters, Hartmann 2008. On Baronio's historiographic approach, see respectively Zen 1994 and Guazzelli, Michetti, Scorza Barcellona 2012; and on his sources, see Gulia 2009 and Jacks 1985. On the circle of Matthew Parker, see Graham, Watson 1998; on his library and method, see Page 1993. His correspondence is edited in Bruce 1853. On Ughelli's *Italia Sacra*, see Calì, Duranti, Michetti 2013. On Bosio's ecclesiastical archaeology, see Cecalupo 2020 on the first collections of ecclesiastical antiquity; Guazzelli 2019 and Herklotz 2017a, 49-70. See also Ditchfield 2005.

**97** On antiquarianism and science, see Feola 2014.

(1522-1605), who accumulated information on plants and animals not only from ancient authors, but also from personal observation.<sup>98</sup> Girolamo Mercuriale (1530-1606), a physician and antiquarian, not only worked on medical issues, but he dedicated an extensive part of his studies to ancient banquets and sports, conjugating different branches of his scholarly inclinations.<sup>99</sup> Similarly, the physician Georg Agricola pursued studies on the subterranean world, by focusing on metallurgy, on underground animals, and on fossils.<sup>100</sup> The same also happened with the astronomical and scientific investigations of Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637) and Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655).<sup>101</sup>

These were also the years when the collections of antiquities started including taxidermy of animals, fossils, rocks, and other objects that bore special or prodigious qualities. Collections acquired the shape of actual museums or *Wunderkammeren*, like in the case of Aldrovandi himself, or the most famous *Museo Cartaceo* by Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657).<sup>102</sup>

There are, however, two dates in particular which encapsulate this moment of transition: 1620, the year in which Francis Bacon (1561-1626) published his *Novum Organum*, and 1637, the year René Descartes' (1596-1650) *Discours de la méthode* was published. The emerging empiricism of evidence-based enquiry and philosophical scepticism started undermining the reliability of the antiquarian investigation, questioning the nature of the source and hence the value of the method, and this, in turn, opened the way to a new phase in the development of knowledge on the path to modernity.

**98** On the intersections between zoology and the antiquarian method, see Enenkel, Smith 2014. One example of antiquarian approach in botany is given by Pietro Andrea Mattioli's *Discorsi* on Dioscorides books on plants, with an extensive commentary and images; see Mattioli 1544 and Ferri 1997. On Aldrovandi's antiquarian approach to science, see Olmi 1992 and Olmi, Simoni 2018; on his approach to the study of the Bible, see Berns 2015.

**99** On medical antiquarianism, see Siraisi 2003; 2007; 2013. See also Hirai 2011. On Mercuriale, see Agasse 2008; 2016; and Arcangeli, Nutton 2008.

**100** On Agricola's life and works, see Wilsdorf 1956. On his subterranean interests, see Hartmann 1953. On his experience as a humanist, see Prescher 1994, 85-98; Varani 1994; and Hannaway 1992. On the fortune on Agricola's *De re metallica* in China, see Pan 1991.

**101** On Peiresc's intellectual legacy, see Miller 2012; 2015; see also Reinbold 1990. On his library, see Bayle 1990 and Cheny 2015. On his correspondence with Lelio Pasqualini, see Carpita, Vaiani 2012. On his history of Provence, see Miller 2011b. On his antiquarian method, see Miller 1997; 2001; Federici 2010. On his activity as an epigraphist, see Sensi 2005. On Gessendi's empirical approach, see Seidl 2019. On his philosophy, Lolordo 2007. On his approach to the natural world, see Olser 1994; Hirai 2005; Fisher 2005. An intellectual biography is Jones 1981.

**102** See the classic Schlosser 1908. On Cassiano's *Museum*, see also De Lachenal 2018 on seventeenth-century collections of antiquity; Haskell, Montagu, MacGregor 1996-2018 on the antiquities in his museum; Rolfe 2012, 137-56 on medical items present in his museum; Solinas 2001 on his collection in general; Herklotz 1999 on his archaeological method.

### 1.3 Methodology

From an historical point of view, it is clear now that in antiquarian studies, the source began to take on a central role in the entire intellectual system and became the key aspect to consider when searching for knowledge about the past, thereby exerting an influence on the hermeneutical approach. During the Renaissance, many scholars debated the practical applications of the antiquarian methodology. Beyond specific objects of study, antiquarian techniques generally converged on a dual scheme which included a cataloguing phase and an interpretative phase. A large number of records had to be compiled (both directly and indirectly) to create a solid foundation; the records were then divided into different categories where the formal, geographical, political, and typological parameters were considered. After this descriptive stage, a process of amalgamation occurred, which involved the cross-referencing of the data according to its common or distinctive elements, thereby establishing links with its cultural context in the process. The aim was for the interpretation of each finding to be grounded in the comprehension of its morphology, and these records were mainly used to fill gaps in knowledge, providing a plausible reconstruction through analogy.

Personal observation (*autopsia*) became essential to ascertain the reliability of the antiquarian method and allowed other scholars to verify evidence or findings. It was no longer deemed sufficient to rely on texts that simply referred to an issue – it became necessary to elicit primary information and examine the works and pieces that developed around it. It was therefore important to study both primary and secondary sources, such as analogous treatises or commentaries, from a unitary perspective because they could provide further lost information.

Collections permitted antiquarian practice to be carried out widely. Thanks to the collections of ancient findings available, it was possible to carry out multidisciplinary excursions aimed at establishing the links between the different findings and the texts, transforming a general humanist interest in antiquity into a systematic approach to the subject. Although these collections cannot be identified with antiquarianism in and of themselves, they are related to its basic premises. The purpose of antiquarianism instead lays in its capacity to make the data react with the cultural context from which it derived, utilising new instruments to understand the stratification of meanings, where the links between witnesses and time could be found.

The antiquarian approach during the Renaissance enabled the past to acquire a tangible and measurable connotation which was identified through its remains. The ‘materialisation’ of the object of study transformed each finding into a ‘semiotic’ vehicle of unexpected meanings. This progress is particularly meaningful in that it moved away from the literary world: the written form lost its orac-



ular connotation thanks to the objectivation of the support (codex/finding) and medium (the language). This represented a fundamental breakthrough in Renaissance antiquarian erudition: awareness of the equivalence of sources. This equivalence was based on general categories which were subordinated to specific approaches. It was possible to obtain meaningful data from manuscripts, inscriptions, coins, statues, and the like due to the advances made in each specific discipline: philology, epigraphy, numismatics, archaeology, iconography, etc. For each field, the findings were ranked according to their reliability (the most consistent manuscripts, the most relevant inscriptions, the best-preserved coins, etc.).

It was from this awareness that efforts were made, commencing with the collation of manuscripts, then linking different pieces of material evidence to confirm the existence of a historical fact, and finally evaluating data from different and ostensibly incompatible cultural areas. This also resulted in parallels being drawn between the past and present. For example, by using descriptions from ancient sources, it was possible to compare geographical places with their modern circumstances and characteristics. Different linguistic domains (ancient languages vs. current vernaculars) could also be compared to explain the lost meanings of words and expressions. It is therefore clear that the convergence of disciplines in the antiquarian method derived from the interaction of specific and coherent methodologies, which ultimately modified the conformation of the entire system. The advances of one method derived from the advances of others, but only progressively, and it was understood that all were part of the same whole.

The reconstruction of the past (or the idea of the past) depended on the relationship between the plethora of aspects linked to a source and to the phenomena that occurred within the history of tradition. Through conjecture, hypotheses were formulated on the basis of the remains for the purpose of restoring their original status, which required a theoretical cognition of their essence. This was founded on the philological principle of respecting the 'text/object' as handed down, which was the precondition for any amendment or modification. This meant that the criteria of emendation (*emendatio*) had to be applied to the explanation (*explicatio*): clarifying the nature of a source through its tradition, i.e., the recovery of a reliable lesson (*accuratam lectionem*), also became essential for its interpretation (*lectionem utilem*).

The relationship between documentary voids and hypotheses of reconstruction emerged: all the lacunas could potentially be filled because they were part of a cultural grammar, the rules of which were deduced through antiquarian investigation. The illusion of a coherent reconstruction of the heritage of the ancients became the foundation for the construction of a culture of the present in a universal perspective, rooted in the remains of a past perceived as incomplete

but also solid in its material substance. Scholars were encouraged to draw a distinction between their conjectures and hypothetic reconstructions, on the one hand, and the data transmitted, on the other. Only in this way was it possible to preserve the integrity of the tradition without contaminating the evidence and to allow future scholars to solve the problems which they faced.

Ignoring the origins of remains often not only opened the door to a new layer of corruption of tradition but also represented the limits beyond which it was not possible to push forward conjecture in all of its forms: the void of knowledge was considered somehow to be a starting point for the research to be undertaken. This focus on rejecting or accepting conjectures reinforced respect for tradition: the preferred solution was to adopt the 'principle of authority', defending the stability of tradition rather than accepting positions that could have potentially undermined the legacy of knowledge. At the same time, there were also scholars who claimed that real progress could only be achieved in antiquarian studies if new discoveries were made, pointing to the limits of the *auctoritas* and the lack of canonical sources. This also implied the possibility of a credible reconstruction of the matter using external instruments (*argumenta*). To obtain a thorough comprehension of remains without omitting the complex weave of meanings involved, it was necessary to examine their connection to their historical background. Although these endeavours occasionally did not reap any rewards, they remained a mandatory stage of the investigation in that they examined a context from which it was possible to glean parallel or additional information.

Contradictory data emerged from this process, a problem that encouraged the development of alternative solutions to preserve the coherence of the entire system. In this phase, the concept of error (or the nature of errors) became a further instrument to be used in understanding sources more fully. It was hypothesised that the persistence of errors in the tradition was due to those who physically assembled the object analysed. This permitted a distinction to be made between the identity of the author (the creator) and the maker (a scribe, an engraver, a sculptor - but sometimes also the author), admitting the possibility of an unintentional fallacy despite the authority and antiquity being known.

This distinction opened new perspectives: the admission that the error was potentially common to any type of writing, and hence to any type of communication, went straight to the core of the problem, i.e., the hand of the writer, as opposed to the surface on which the wording was written. This represented the first emergence of the awareness that all the data deriving from sources could be influenced by several variables, which had to be understood to fully grasp the subject matter being studied. The source was considered to be influenced by contingencies (e.g., the social or economic status

of the executor), implying that quantitative differences did not necessarily correspond to qualitative dynamics (e.g., if the errors were more frequently found in manuscripts or epigraphs).

This suggested that all types of writing were governed by similar mechanisms, fostering the understanding of the two laws that influenced its morphology: norm and usage. All the potential fluctuations within these factors should be considered, with each specific occurrence assessed in accordance with diatopic (based on geographical place) diachronic (based on time), and diastratic (based on social, cultural, and educational factors) parameters.

#### 1.4 Definition

The intellectual phenomenon of Renaissance antiquarianism developed throughout Europe, manifesting itself in a plurality of works influenced by the origin, the environment and the personal approach of each author, the language adopted, the publishing house involved, and the commissioner. These works were related to a multitude of disciplines, which can be broadly identified by following the encyclopaedic setup of Poliziano's *Panespistemon* (1491). The production of antiquarian works reached its peak during and after the mid-sixteenth century, a period when antiquarianism transitioned from a phase of growth and consolidation to maturity, and the advancements made in previous centuries were systemically classified and widely utilised.

Antiquarian interests can be divided into two key areas, both of which connect all derivative disciplines: the first could be defined as 'logographic', in which the material finding transmitted a written witness, in any form, and in a variety of languages, and the second as 'iconographic', in which the investigation was based exclusively on the morphological aspect, beyond the linguistic factor. It was inevitable that these two contexts would be complementary and that they went hand in hand, mutually benefiting from their respective development. From here, different disciplines emerged, each with its own peculiarities, passing from the literary to the artistic to the scientific and many other areas of enquiry, and each with clearly defined cultural horizons.

The antiquarian writings of the Renaissance were generally categorised according to four models: miscellanies of scattered records, organic works which often contained an encyclopaedic in compass, monographs on specific subjects, and actual narrative histories. In the first case, these works contained explanations of a plurality of misinterpreted or misunderstood passages referring to the antiquarian corpus in the broadest sense, frequently with the title of *Variae* or *Antiquae lectiones*. The works in the second case, on the other hand, were comprised of systematic expositions of antiquarian themes or

topics that also took related contexts into consideration, thereby significantly widening the possible implications of a single study. The third case included surveys on specific topics where the antiquarian approach served as a tool to approach the matter. In the fourth case, the antiquarian practice, as seen in the previous examples, was translated to narrative histories, usually appearing in the form of aetiological digressions relying on derivative and multifarious antiquarian information.

Therefore, Renaissance antiquarianism can be defined as a cultural phenomenon that aims to interpret the past by cross-referencing heterogeneous sources accumulated and collected over time. This entailed the use of new investigative techniques which involved combining literary sources and material findings to provide a reliable foundation for the idea of history. However, Renaissance antiquarianism must not be reduced to mere collecting, nor can it be condensed to an intellectual interest or a general fascination with antiquity. It is reasonable to assume that Renaissance antiquarianism first emerged from the study of the classical world, but it eventually evolved beyond these boundaries to become a method for approaching an object of study rather than simply a discipline in itself. Since the universality of the method became potentially applicable to all fields and times, its essence was manifested in the methodological pathway and perspective to which it was applied. In fact, the broadening of possible historical data sources triggered the development of competencies and interpretative instruments which allowed evidence to be identified from an array of objects of study. From this, it can be seen that Renaissance antiquarianism represented a methodological perspective, the purpose of which was to rethink the way the past was viewed through a critical analysis of sources. This produced a renewed approach toward history, which stimulated the interaction of disciplines and influenced the intellectual life of the time.