

## 1 THE PROBLEM OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION @@

The historian of classical art faces substantial difficulties. The immediate problems of dealing with a body of material that is fragmented in every sense of the word and that lacks a documentary base are compounded by major gaps in the transmission of the cultural context as a whole. Considerable analysis is thus required simply to establish a corpus that is reasonably secure with respect to provenance, chronology, and authorship. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in 1921 used a striking mathematical metaphor to characterize the situation of archaeological research: “It is simply the case that archaeology has a mass of works of art without named creators, and accounts of artists without their works, and it cannot give up seeking connections, even if, taken altogether, asymptotes will remain.”<sup>1</sup> These conditions are so obvious that they have been taken not only to determine the way that ancient art is studied, but even to define entire disciplines.

### DESCRIPTION AND INTERPRETATION

We may introduce the problem of archaeological description by considering a passage in Meyer Schapiro’s influential article of 1953 on “Style,” which

<sup>1</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931), *Geschichte der Philologie* (in A. Gercke and E. Norden, eds., *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* [third ed.; Leipzig and Berlin, 1921, 1927] I, 1–80; repr. Leipzig, 1959) 68: “Die Archäologie hat nun einmal eine Masse Kunstwerke ohne benannte Urheber und Berichte über Künstler ohne ihre Werke, und sie kann nicht darauf verzichten, eine Verbindung zu suchen, wenn auch im ganzen Asymptoten bleiben werden.” See also A. Harris, tr., H. Lloyd-Jones, ed., *U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. History of Classical Scholarship* (Baltimore, 1982) 152. An asymptote is a “line which approaches nearer and nearer to a given curve, but does not meet it within a finite distance”: J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, eds., *The Oxford English Dictionary* (second ed.; Oxford, 1989) I, s.v.

## GREEK SCULPTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF DESCRIPTION

begins by setting out a contrast:

For the archaeologist, style is exemplified in a motive or pattern, or in some directly grasped quality of the work of art, which helps him to localize and date the work and to establish connections between groups of works or between cultures. Style here is a symptomatic trait, like the nonaesthetic features of an artifact. It is studied more often as a diagnostic means than for its own sake as an important constituent of culture. For dealing with style, the archaeologist has relatively few aesthetic and physiognomic terms.

To the historian of art, style is an essential object of investigation. He studies its inner correspondences, its life-history, and the problems of its formation and change. He, too, uses style as a criterion of the date and place of origin of works, and as a means of tracing relationships between schools of art. But the style is, above all, a system of forms with a quality and a meaningful expression through which the personality of the artist and the broad outlook of a group are visible. It is also a vehicle of expression within the group, communicating and fixing certain values of religious, social, and moral life through the emotional suggestiveness of forms. It is, besides, a common ground against which innovations and the individuality of particular works may be measured. By considering the succession of works in time and space and by matching the variations of style with historical events and with the varying features of other fields of culture, the historian of art attempts, with the help of common-sense psychology and social theory, to account for the changes of style or specific traits. The historical study of individual and group styles also discloses typical stages and processes in the development of forms.<sup>2</sup>

By acknowledging that the art historian at times acts like an archaeologist, Schapiro himself signals a significant misapprehension within his formulation. The difficulties presented by the study of ancient art differ in degree but not, ultimately, in nature from those encountered in other fields of art. The qualitative distinction between an “archaeological” process of identification and “art-historical” interpretation disguises the fact that diagnosis does not and cannot exist without (in both senses) an interpretive framework.

The posited contrast also reflects something of the rhetoric of valorization and denigration that accompanied the contentious emergence of these academic disciplines during the nineteenth century and has continued even into

<sup>2</sup> M. Schapiro, “Style,” in A. L. Kroeber, ed., *Anthropology Today. An Encyclopedic Inventory* (Chicago, 1953) 287; repr. in M. Philipson, ed., *Aesthetics Today* (Cleveland and New York, 1961) 81; M. Philipson and P. J. Gudel, eds. (rev. ed.; New York and Scarborough, Ontario, 1980) 137. See also the essays in M. W. Conkey and C. A. Hastorf, eds., *The Uses of Style in Archaeology* (Cambridge, 1990) and K. Zimmermann, ed., *Der Stilbegriff in den Altertumswissenschaften* (Rostock, 1993).

## THE PROBLEM OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

present-day efforts to define and prescribe disciplinary missions. Schapiro's "archaeology" seems a prosaic, constricted, and superficial creature in contrast to his "art history," which aims at nothing less than the illumination of cultural meaning and expression. Conversely, a concern with "art" has in turn been cause for criticism, particularly on the grounds of perceived methodological weakness, even by advocates of an interdisciplinary rather than exclusively text-focussed approach to the study of antiquity.<sup>3</sup>

### ARCHAEOLOGY, PHILOLOGY, AND THE CONTEST FOR INTELLECTUAL RIGOR

The lingering effects on archaeological scholarship of the heritage of dilettantism can be detected in Wilamowitz's remarks on the practices of his teacher, Otto Jahn (1813–1869).<sup>4</sup> In discussing Jahn's work on classical texts, Wilamowitz draws attention to his urgent sense of mission: "He had to elucidate" (erklären mußte er), and it is that process – here linked to the "philological" aspect of Philologie (classical studies) – that Jahn carried over from texts and applied to objects: "Elucidation is also what he is exercising on the monuments, especially sarcophagi and vase-paintings, but also on unprepossessing fragments of every kind, and he is doing it with Zoëga's method. It is not aesthetics, but a philology of monuments (sondern monumentale

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. S. Heckscher, "Erwin Panofsky: A Curriculum Vitae," in E. Panofsky, ed. I. Lavin, *Three Essays on Style* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1995) 184: "One of his dearest friends in Princeton, Erik Sjöqvist, told me: 'When Pan discovered that I considered the humanistic and historical interpretation of our material as the only really important thing, he at once asked me, "If so, why did you become an archaeologist?"' (letter of September 16, 1968)." For the mission and methods of "archaeology," see A. Schnapp, "Between Antiquarians and Archaeologists – Continuities and Ruptures," *Antiquity* 76 (2002) 134–140. See also the contributions in "Viewpoint. Is There a Place for Aesthetics in Archaeology?" *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 4.2 (1994) 249–269.

<sup>4</sup> For Otto Jahn: J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* III. *The Eighteenth Century in Germany, and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America* (Cambridge, 1908, 1958; repr. New York, 1964) 220–221 and passim; W. Schiering, "Zur Geschichte der Archäologie," in U. Hausmann, ed., *Allgemeine Grundlagen der Archäologie. Begriff und Methode, Geschichte, Problem der Form, Schriftzeugnisse* (*Handbuch der Archäologie*; Munich, 1969) 73–74; R. Lullies, "Otto Jahn," in R. Lullies and W. Schiering, eds., *Archäologenbildnisse. Porträts und Kurzbiographien von klassischen Archäologen deutscher Sprache* (Mainz am Rhein, 1988) 35–36; C. W. Müller, "Otto Jahn," in W. W. Briggs and W. M. Calder III, eds., *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia* (New York and London, 1990) 227–238; idem, *Otto Jahn. Mit einem Verzeichnis seiner Schriften* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1991); W. M. Calder III, H. Cancik, and B. Kytzler, eds., *Otto Jahn (1813–1868 [sic]). Ein Geisteswissenschaftler zwischen Klassizismus und Historismus* (Stuttgart, 1991); H. Sichtermann, *Kulturgeschichte der klassischen Archäologie* (Munich, 1996) 220–224 and passim.

GREEK SCULPTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF DESCRIPTION

Philologie). While the former may be more distinguished, for it, too, the understanding of what the artist or craftsman wanted to make or represent is indispensable.”<sup>5</sup>

In using the term “monumentale Philologie,” Wilamowitz alludes to a methodological debate that originated in the late eighteenth century and crystallized in the mid-nineteenth. The phrase is associated with Friedrich Wilhelm Eduard Gerhard (1795–1867), a philologist by training, whose interest in art began with a trip to Italy in 1819–1820 and whose contributions to archaeology led to his appointment in 1844 as Ordinarius für Archäologie in Berlin.<sup>6</sup> Albert Henrichs has found the term used as early as 1833 in Gerhard’s writing, but it did not seem to gain prominence until 1850, when it appeared in the sixteen “Archäologische Thesen” he delivered at a conference of philologists in Berlin. “By *monumentale Philologie*, Gerhard meant ‘research on monuments’ or rather the recording of the ‘totality of monumental material,’ and specifically ‘according to philological fundamentals,’ whereby he assigned to ‘art theory, art criticism, and the explanation of art’

<sup>5</sup> Wilamowitz, *Geschichte* 67–68: “Erklären ist auch, was er an den Monumenten übt, namentlich Sarkophagen und Vasenbildern, auch an unscheinbaren Stücken aller Art, und er tut es mit der Methode Zoegas. Es ist nicht Kunstwissenschaft, sondern monumentale Philologie. Mag jene vornehmer sein, unentbehrlich auch für jene ist das Verständnis von dem, was der Künstler oder Handwerker hat machen und darstellen wollen.” A. Harris (Wilamowitz, *History* 151) renders the contrast thus: “The result was applied classical scholarship rather than expert art criticism.” The phrase “expert art criticism” somewhat obscures the importance of the term “Kunstwissenschaft,” the science of art, which was opposed in a contemporary debate to the historically oriented “Kunstgeschichte.” These conceptions were crucial elements of the “Methodenstreit” of the 1920s and 1930s; for this controversy, see M. Halbertsma, *Wilhelm Pinder und die deutsche Kunstgeschichte* (Groningen, 1985; tr. M. Püschel, Worms, 1992) 83–127. Something of the dimension of “aesthetics” is echoed in Schapiro’s remark quoted earlier on the archaeologist’s focus on “the nonaesthetic features of an artifact” and the relative lack of “aesthetic terms” for dealing with style. A significant discussion of Kunstwissenschaft, Kunstgeschichte, aesthetics, and history appeared not long before the publication in 1921 of Wilamowitz’s *Geschichte*: Hans Tietze, *Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte. Ein Versuch* (Leipzig, 1913; repr. New York, 1973) 1–46; the work is dedicated to Alois Riegl and Franz Wickhoff. For some of these methodological debates, see also the chapter on “Contemporary Issues” in M. A. Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* (Ithaca and London, 1984) 97–113, and C. S. Wood, ed., *The Vienna School Reader. Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s* (New York, 2000) 9–81.

<sup>6</sup> For Eduard Gerhard: O. Jahn, *Eduard Gerhard. Ein Lebensabriß* (Berlin, 1868); Wilamowitz, *Geschichte* 55–56, *History* 123–124; Sandys, *History* III, 217–219; R. M. Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery* (third ed.; London and New York, 1997) 281–285; F. Matz in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 6 (Berlin, 1964) 276–277 s.v.; Schiering, “Geschichte” 45–48, 94–96, and passim; A. Borbein, “Klassische Archäologie,” in T. Buddensieg, K. Düwell, and K.-J. Sembach, eds., *Wissenschaften in Berlin* (Berlin, 1987) II. *Disziplinen* 104–105; H. B. Jessen, “Eduard Gerhard,” in Lullies and Schiering, *Archäologenbildnisse* 20–22; Sichtermann, *Kulturgeschichte* 198–199; H. Wrede, ed., *Dem Archäologen Eduard Gerhard 1795–1867 zu seinem 200. Geburtstag* (Winckelmann-Institut der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 2; Berlin, 1997).

THE PROBLEM OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

a role that was equivalent to ‘grammar, together with literary criticism and hermeneutics, of philology in the narrower sense.’<sup>7</sup> That Gerhard shared the views of those who regretted the shift in classical studies toward an exclusive emphasis on texts and away from the equal consideration of monuments, as had been more often practiced in the time of Winckelmann, is clear in his “Thesen.”

1. We designate as *Archäologie* that branch of classical philology that is founded on monumental works and remains of ancient technology, in contrast to literary sources and subjects; works of architecture and the fine arts, but also the science of places and inscriptions belong to it.

2. The *principal subjects* of archaeological study are the science of monuments, art history, and art antiquities; art theory, art criticism, and the explanation of art are also organically associated with them in a similar way as grammar, together with literary criticism and hermeneutics, stand by the side of philology in the narrower sense.

3. The *task* of archaeology is to deliver to the totality of all philological research and to the total view of ancient life not only a selection of artistic monuments, but the *entirety* of the monumental material, considered in itself and in its consequence for the antiquities of literature, religion, and private life.

4. Research on the monuments of classical antiquity must proceed from the literary knowledge of that same classical antiquity, on which the so-called Philologie in its narrower sense is founded; the *archaeologist* fashions its monumental part on a philological foundation, to assist which, *antiquarians* of the most diverse kind discover material for him, which *artists* must pass judgement on and examine for him.

10. In order to promote archaeology in that philological sense one must not simply adapt its methods to the needs of antiquarians or artists – although to extend them to these is worth recommending in itself – but base it in strong association with philological instruction as a whole.

<sup>7</sup> A. Henrichs, “Otto Jahn als Interpret antiker Bildwerke: Zur Ikonographie des Dionysos und seines Kreises,” in Calder, Cancik, and Kytzler, *Otto Jahn* 83 n. 18, paraphrasing Gerhard’s “Archäologische Thesen”: “Gerhard verstand unter monumentaler Philologie die ‘Denkmälerforschung’ bzw. die Erfassung der ‘Gesamtheit des monumentalen Stoffes’, und zwar ‘auf philologischer Grundlage’, wobei er der ‘Kunstlehre, Kunstkritik und Kunsterklärung’ eine Rolle zuwies, welche der ‘Grammatik samt litterarischer Kritik und Hermeneutik der Philologie im engeren Sinne’ entsprach.” The report on the eleventh Versammlung der Philologen, Schulmänner und Orientalisten Deutschlands, which opened in Berlin on September 30, 1850, appears in *Archäologischer Anzeiger. Zur Archäologischen Zeitung, Jahrgang VIII*, nos. 21–22, September and October 1850, 201–203, and Gerhard’s “Archäologische Thesen” are printed there as Beilage A, 203–205; S. Ahrens, “Eduard Gerhard. Verzeichnis seiner Schriften,” in Wrede, *Dem Archäologen Eduard Gerhard* 21 no. 446.

GREEK SCULPTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF DESCRIPTION

16. Previously archaeology, or *monumental philology*, was promoted by Germany almost only in numismatics and Greek epigraphy; its importance is more and more recognized, without, however, its being brought into the correct connection with philology as a whole; hence no appropriate means for this purpose should be neglected, and shortly, too, regular attention to archaeological study from the side of the Association of Philologists is to be desired.<sup>8</sup>

Significant in Gerhard's proposals is not only the idea that monuments contribute to the general understanding of antiquity, but also his articulation of the archaeological subjects. This systematic division explicitly grants them a hierarchical structure comparable to that of philology and, implicitly, an equivalent intellectual rigor.

The methodological disagreements of the nineteenth century have regularly been seen in terms of a competition between the models offered by the comprehensive "Altertumswissenschaft" (scientific study of antiquity) of Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824) as systematized by August Boeckh (1785–1867) and the exclusive focus on language and literature advocated

<sup>8</sup> Gerhard, "Archäologische Thesen" 203 (emphasis in the original): "1. Als *Archäologie* bezeichnen wir denjenigen Zweig der klassischen Philologie welcher, im Gegensatz litterarischer Quellen und Gegenstände, auf den monumentalen Werken und Spuren antiker Technik beruht; die Werke der Baukunst und der bildenden Künste, aber auch Orts- und Inscriptkunde sind dazu gehörig. 2. *Hauptfächer* des archäologischen Studiums sind Denkmälerkunde, Kunstgeschichte und Kunstalterthümer; Kunstlehre, Kunstkritik und Kunsterklärung sind in ähnlicher Weise als Organon ihnen beigegeben, wie die Grammatik samt litterarischer Kritik und Hermeneutik der Philologie im engeren Sinne zur Seite stehn. 3. *Aufgabe* der Archäologie ist es, nicht nur eine Auswahl von Kunstdenkmälern, sondern die *Gesamtheit* des monumentalen Stoffes, an und für sich und in seinem Ergebniss für litterarische, Religions- und Privatalterthümer, der Gesamtheit aller philologischen Forschung und der Gesamtanschauung des antiken Lebens zu überliefern. 4. Die Denkmälerforschung des klassischen Alterthums muss von dessen litterarischer Kenntniss ausgehen, auf welcher die im engeren Sinn so genannte Philologie beruht; ihren monumentalen Theil bearbeitet auf philologischer Grundlage der *Archäolog*, zu welchem Behuf *Alterthumsfreunde* verschiedenster Art den Stoff ihm ermitteln, *Künstler* denselben ihm begutachten und prüfen müssen." 204: "10. Um die Archäologie in jenem philologischem Sinn zu fördern, ist deren *Methode* nicht sowohl den Bedürfnissen des Alterthumsfreundes oder des Künstlers anzupassen – obwohl auch auf diese sie auszudehnen an und für sich empfehlenswerth ist –, sondern in strengem Zusammenhang mit dem gesammten philologischen Unterricht zu begründen." 205: "16. Die Archäologie oder *monumentale Philologie* war von Deutschland aus lange Zeit fast nur in Münzkunde und griechischer Epigraphik gefördert worden; ihre Wichtigkeit wird immer mehr bekannt, ohne jedoch in den rechten Zusammenhang mit der gesammten Philologie getreten zu sein; es ist daher kein passendes Mittel zu diesem Behuf zu versäumen, und demnächst auch eine regelmässige Beachtung des archäologischen Studiums von Seiten der Philologenvereine zu wünschen." For Gerhard and the institutional and intellectual context of the "Thesen," see A. Schnapp, "Archéologie et tradition académique en Europe aux XVIII<sup>e</sup> et XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Annales Économies Sociétés Civilisations* 37. 5–6 (1982) 768–771.

THE PROBLEM OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

by Gottfried Hermann (1772–1848).<sup>9</sup> Rudolf Pfeiffer expressed skepticism about the common view that classical scholarship was split by a profound divide between these rival schools, believing it preferable to approach the field in terms of more inclusive trends in intellectual history.<sup>10</sup> In practice, the methodological frontier was often crossed, and the work of individuals can be variously construed.<sup>11</sup> There is no doubt, however, that many at the time accepted the existence of such a split, and this perception furnishes the context for the principles of Gerhard and Jahn.

In recalling Jahn's lectures at Bonn, Wilamowitz, a proponent of inclusive Altertumswissenschaft, wrote appreciatively of his treatment of the history of philology: "That is what academic instruction is for, not to coach, or infuse dead knowledge. This is what was given by this history of a science: for it pointed the way to a philology, in which the contrasts between Hermann and Boeckh were smoothed away, and archaeology in its full extent included."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> C. Bursian, *Geschichte der classischen Philologie in Deutschland von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich and Leipzig, 1883) II, 665–705 ("Die Fortbildung der classischen Altertumswissenschaft durch G. Hermann und A. Boeckh"); Sandys, *History* III, 88–101 ("Hermann and Boeckh"); L. Gossman, *Orpheus Philologus. Bachofen versus Mommsen on the Study of Antiquity* (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 73.5; Philadelphia, 1983) 51, 68–70, and passim; J. Irmscher, *Die griechisch-römische Altertumswissenschaft am Übergang von Klassizismus zum Historismus. Zur 200. Wiederkehr der Geburtstage von I. Bekker und A. Boeckh im Jahre 1985* (*Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Gesellschaftswissenschaften* 1986, Nr. 4/G; Berlin, 1986); C. Ungefehr-Kortus, *Der Neue Pauly* 13 (Stuttgart and Weimar, 1999) 523–527 s.v. "Böckh-Hermann-Auseinandersetzung." For a convenient brief treatment of Wolf, especially for his conception of *Altertumswissenschaft*, see H. Funke, "F. A. Wolf," in Briggs and Calder, *Classical Scholarship* 523–528; Wilamowitz, *Geschichte* 48–49, *History* 108–109; S. L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus. Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton, 1996) 16–24. For Boeckh: G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (second ed.; London, 1913) 30–35; Wilamowitz, *Geschichte* 54–55, *History* 120–123; B. Schneider, *August Boeckh: Altertumsforscher, Universitätslehrer und Wissenschaftsorganisator im Berlin des 19. Jahrhunderts. Ausstellung zum 200. Geburtstag, 22. November 1985–18. Januar 1986* (Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ausstellungskataloge 26; Berlin, 1985); A. Horstmann, *Antike Theoria und moderne Wissenschaft. August Boeckhs Konzeption der Philologie* (*Philosophie und Geschichte der Wissenschaften. Studien und Quellen* 17; Frankfurt am Main, 1992), esp. 11–28; for Boeckh and Franz Bopp as members of the faculty of the newly founded University of Berlin and for Wilhelm von Humboldt's support of historical philology, see E. S. Shaffer, "Romantic Philosophy and the Organization of the Disciplines: The Founding of the Humboldt University of Berlin," in A. Cunningham and N. Jardine, eds., *Romanticism and the Sciences* (Cambridge, 1990) 43.

<sup>10</sup> R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford, 1976) 182. He suggests the origin of "this simple scheme" in Bursian's *Geschichte*.

<sup>11</sup> For instance, Borbein, "Klassische Archäologie" 104–105, cites Gerhard's career as an example of the "rapprochement between archaeology and philology" accomplished under the aegis of Boeckh's *Altertumswissenschaft*.

<sup>12</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, tr. G. C. Richards, *My Recollections, 1848–1914* (London, 1930) 99; *Erinnerungen, 1848–1914* (Leipzig, 1928; second ed., 1929) 87: "Dazu ist der akademische Unterricht da, weder abzurichten noch totes Wissen einzutrichtern. Und gerade dies erreichte diese Geschichte einer Wissenschaft, denn sie wies den Weg zu einer Philologie, in

## GREEK SCULPTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF DESCRIPTION

“Monumentale Philologie” thus came to have meaning in a situation of methodological self-consciousness so complex that the exact sense of the term remains subject to varied interpretations.<sup>13</sup>

In November 1848, Jahn delivered a lecture, “On the Essence and Most Important Tasks of Archaeological Studies,” in which he maintained that “a science that sets itself to the goal of investigating ancient life in all its phenomena cannot refrain from treating ancient art.”<sup>14</sup> He contrasted Winckelmann’s inclusion of art in the totality of ancient life with its subsequent reduction in classical studies to the status of an accessory.<sup>15</sup> The question is precisely how Jahn envisioned the treatment of art within a frame of “monumentale Philologie.” Henrichs has summarized two major interpretations of the concept: one, combining monuments and written sources in order to shed light on each other; the other, an approach to art as a language with the goal of apprehending the rules of its grammar of forms.<sup>16</sup> The first, as Henrichs notes, can in no way be seen as an innovation by Jahn, for it had long been practiced; as Wilamowitz remarked, it is the method of Zoëga.<sup>17</sup> While observing that Jahn would have seen the two conceptions not as exclusive, but

der die Gegensätze zwischen Hermann und Boeckh ausgeglichen waren, die Archäologie in ihrem ganzen Umfange einbezogen.” For other aspects of the relationship between Jahn and Wilamowitz, see W. M. Calder III, “What Did Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff Learn from Otto Jahn?” in Calder, Cancik, and Kytzler, *Otto Jahn 195–203*. See O. Jahn, *Gottfried Hermann. Eine Gedächtnissrede* (Leipzig, 1849) 12–16 for remarks on Hermann’s methods and interests; 15: “Sein künstlerisches Talent und Interesse war auf die Sprache, namentlich auf die Poesie gerichtet, für andere Künste, die bildende und die Musik, war er nicht ohne Empfänglichkeit, allein eine dauernde, innere Theilnahme gewannen sie ihm nicht ab.” (His artistic gift and interest were directed towards language, above all to poetry; he was not unresponsive to other arts – the fine arts and music – but they did not win from him a lasting, inner interest.)

<sup>13</sup> Henrichs, “Otto Jahn” 82–87.

<sup>14</sup> *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Zweiter Band. Aus dem Jahre 1848* (Leipzig, 1849) 209: “14. November. Oeffentliche Sitzung. Herr Jahn leitete die zur Feier von Leibnizens Todestage bestimmte Sitzung mit einigen allgemeinen Betrachtungen ein und sprach dann über das Wesen und die wichtigsten Aufgaben der archäologischen Studien.” Jahn (209): “. . . eine Wissenschaft, welche es sich zum Ziel setzt, das Leben des Alterthums in allen seinen Erscheinungen zu erforschen, auf die Beschäftigung mit der alten Kunst nicht verzichten kann.” Schiering, “Geschichte” 74, citing Jahn’s nephew Adolf Michaelis (*Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 13, 1881, 679), notes, “Das Wesen der Kunst war für Jahn – ähnlich wie für Welcker – Prinzip der Archäologie.” (For Jahn, as for Welcker, the essence of art was the principle of archaeology.) For the opinion of Michaelis (1835–1910) on the split between a global science of antiquity and a more limited approach, see P. Rouet, tr. L. Nash, *Approaches to the Study of Attic Vases. Beazley and Pottier (Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology; Oxford and New York, 2001)* 4.

<sup>15</sup> Jahn, “Über das Wesen” 209–210.

<sup>16</sup> Henrichs, “Otto Jahn” 83–84.

<sup>17</sup> Henrichs, “Otto Jahn” 84; see supra 3–4.



THE PROBLEM OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

as complementary, Henrichs argues persuasively that Jahn's approach rested on the analogy of art with language. It is a conception of art that makes possible the notion of a language of images (*Bildersprache*), however difficult it would prove to put into practice.<sup>18</sup>

Yet another aspect of Jahn's "monumentale Philologie" was equally decisive for the study of ancient art: the adoption of method as a goal in itself. As Suzanne Marchand has noted, one of the issues Jahn addressed in his lecture of 1848 was the need for a methodology for art equivalent in rigor to philological techniques, and he praised Zoëga and Gerhard for their contributions to this goal: "Here, too, Zoëga gave the example of completeness and precision, and above all Gerhard not only constantly emphasized the necessity for this research, but also promoted it through extensive publications designed for this purpose."<sup>19</sup> What gave point to Jahn's insistence on rigorous method was the problematic origin of the study of ancient art in dilettantism. This factor finds explicit expression in Jahn's letter to Privy Councillor Johannes Schulze in 1854. The context is Jahn's move from his professorship at Leipzig to Bonn: "It was a special secret joy to me that I was called not as an archaeologist, but as a philologist and an archaeologist, for

<sup>18</sup> Henrichs, "Otto Jahn" 84–87. See Jahn, "Über das Wesen" 223–224 for "die Sprache der Kunstwerke." Marchand, *Down from Olympus* 41, rightly comments on Gerhard's "philology of monuments," "Otto Jahn used the same analogy to indicate archaeology's backwardness: it was essential, he argued, that future generations learn to interpret the 'language of artworks' with the rigor and attention to detail philologists had long applied to their texts." Cf. Müller, "Otto Jahn" 229: "[Jahn] opposed Gerhard's conception of archaeology as 'monumental philology' and gave it an independent role as a science of art – a role that it could only fulfill, however, in close partnership with the other *Altertumswissenschaften*, especially philology." He cites two letters by Jahn of 1854 and 1859 in which he stresses his own identity as both archaeologist and philologist (E. Petersen, ed., *Otto Jahn in seinen Briefen mit einem Bilde seines Lebens von Adolf Michaelis* [Leipzig and Berlin, 1913] 93 no. 26 and 175 no. 72) and one of 1858 giving advice to his nephew Michaelis (164 no. 64): "Was das speciell Wissenschaftliche anlangt, so laß ja die Philologie Kern und Mittelpunkt Deines ganzen Treibens bleiben. Daß Du in Archäologie und Epigraphik recht ordentlich und im Detail hineinkommst ist ganz vortrefflich und die einzige Gelegenheit dazu mußt Du als solche benutzen, aber Gesichtspunkte und Methode müssen philologische sein und bleiben und darum mußt Du Dich in der philologischen Technik halten." (As far as an academic specialty is concerned, let philology be the core and the center of everything you do. That you are starting into archaeology and epigraphy regularly and in detail is really excellent, and you have to take the unique opportunity for it as such, but your point of view and method must be and remain philological, and that is why you have to keep up your philological technique.)

<sup>19</sup> See supra n. 18 for Marchand's observation. Jahn, "Über das Wesen" 223: "Auch hier hat Zoëga das Beispiel der Vollständigkeit und Genauigkeit gegeben, und namentlich Gerhard hat nicht nur stets die Nothwendigkeit dieser Untersuchungen hervorgehoben, sondern dieselben durch umfassende in diesem Sinne angelegte Publicationen wesentlich gefördert."

GREEK SCULPTURE AND THE PROBLEM OF DESCRIPTION

I am convinced and have always taught with great fervor, that there is no ‘solo archaeology,’ and whoever concerns himself exclusively with ancient art will go downhill into dilettantism.”<sup>20</sup>

The study of ancient art has always been haunted by methodological insecurity, and the effects of the consequent quest for rigor and intellectual respectability have not been uniformly positive, sometimes resulting in the adoption of inappropriate interpretive paradigms. Methodological unease and self-consciousness are also factors in another issue signalled in Wilamowitz’s remarks on Jahn: the contrast between a focus on the correct understanding of individual works in context and an approach favoring syntheses – the catalogue of objects, for example, in contrast to the comprehensive history of art.<sup>21</sup> Wilamowitz’s reference to Zoëga recalls that the concern with methodological rigor in relation to the forms of scholarship had already been expressed in the eighteenth century.

Georg Zoëga (1755–1809) is perhaps most renowned as a pioneer in Egyptology, but his methodological contributions to classical archaeology have also

<sup>20</sup> Petersen, *Otto Jahn in seinen Briefen* 93 no. 26: “Eine besondere stille Freude war es mir, daß ich nicht als Archäolog, sondern als Philolog und Archäolog berufen bin, weil ich überzeugt bin und immer mit großem Eifer gelehrt habe, daß es keine Soloarchäologie giebt, und wer sich ausschließlich mit der alten Kunst beschäftigt, zum Dilettantismus herunterkommen wird.” Cf. Gerhard, “Archäologische Thesen” 203 no. 5: “Diese *Abhängigkeit* des Archäologen von *Althumsfreunden* [*sic*] und *Künstlern*, welche oft zu missbräuchlicher Ausdehnung jener Benennung auf antiquarische Dilettanten aller Art Anlass gegeben hat” (This *dependence* of the archaeologist on *lovers of antiquity* and *artists*, which has often given rise to an incorrect extension of the term to antiquarian dilettantes of every kind); 204 no. 12: “Auf den Universitäten wird das archäologische Studium erst dann gedeihen, wenn dessen Lehrfächer sowohl als dessen praktische Uebungen innerhalb des üblichen Trienniums in festeren Zusammenhang mit der philologischen Bildung treten, als es nach bisherigen Studienplänen möglich war. Junge Männer, welche ohne gründliche philologische Bildung oder besondere artistische Fähigkeit der Archäologie sich zuwenden, soll man lieber abschrecken als darin bestärken.” (In the universities, archaeological study will not thrive until its teaching as well as its practice within the usual three-year course are more firmly connected with philological training than was possible with hitherto existing plans of study. Young men who turn to archaeology without basic philological training or special artistic aptitude should be discouraged rather than supported in it.)

<sup>21</sup> For remarks on the rise in the nineteenth century of forms such as histories, monographs on artists, and manuals, see L. Venturi, tr. C. Marriott, *History of Art Criticism* (New York, 1936, 1964) 223–226 (1936 edition); his point of view is indicated by comments such as (223): “Classical archaeology sought to become something more extensive than a history of art. . . . Archaeologists therefore invented the so-called science of antiquity, in order to justify their interest in all that which is not properly art.” Cf. the anxiety about method shown by Wölfflin in his early work: H. F. Mallgrave and E. Ikonomou, trs., *Empathy, Form, and Space. Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873–1893* (Santa Monica, 1994) 40–41, 50. For illuminating remarks on the intellectual and institutional history of the museum catalogue, see Rouet, *Approches* passim.