l'historien tente de les reconstruire et la perception qu’ont pu en avoir les contemporains, la relation pression fiscale-efficacité protectrice étant effectivement en cause. 'Royaumes barbares' ou 'Etats postromains'? Le livre de G. Maier échappe à cette dichotomie par la mise en évidence de structures autrement plus complexes; il marque une étape importante dans l’interprétation de leur fonctionnement institutionnel et constitue un indispensable ouvrage de référence.
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C. G. Heyne was born in 1729 in Chemnitz; he became Professor of Poetry and Eloquence in Göttingen in 1763, where he remained until his death in 1812. Among his students one can count such illustrious names as F. A. Wolf, G. F. Creuzer, the Schlegel brothers, J. H. Voss, J. F. Reitemeier, and G. Zoega. His work ranged extensively: edition of ancient texts (Tibullus, Epictetus, Vergil, Pindar, Apollodorus), works on Greek and Roman history (Sparta, Aristophanes and Athens, Phocion, the Ptolemaic period, Magna Graecia, Etruria, late antiquity), mythology and religion, archaeology, universal history. Despite all this, Heyne has remained relatively unknown among modern scholars and Heidenreich’s magisterial study will serve to put him in a position that he deserves. Why is Heyne unknown to all but specialists in historiography? To some extent because he never wrote a book-length work and he never had a great or bizarre theory. Many modern historiographical works rest to a great extent on great books and great or bizarre theories; Heidenreich shows convincingly why scholars like Heyne are equally important.

But there is another more important factor at play. As Heidenreich observes (21–22), the importance of Heyne depends on the model one uses to construct a historiographical narrative: some narratives move from one great peak to another great peak of scholarship; others construct a continuous progressive development of a discipline, while many posit a Foucauldian story of radical discontinuities. In the first approach, Heyne is lost between the higher and more explored peaks that precede and follow; in the second one, he is usually seen as a follower or an ancestor of another scholar or scholarly approach; in the last, he is perceived as being one of the last adherents of a tradition that came to an end with the work of Niebuhr. Heidenreich attempts to look at Heyne in his own terms.

After an introduction (9–25), the first chapter looks at Heyne’s biography (27–106); the second looks at his editions of texts (107–48); the third focuses on Heyne’s contributions to the German translation of the English ‘Universal History’ (149–85). In chapter four, Heidenreich examines Heyne’s ‘Universitätsprogramme’, written over the course of more than forty years in Göttingen (187–262); these were speeches in Latin, written by Heyne in his capacity as Professor of Eloquence, and presented orally to students and staff on a number of formal occasions. They usually dealt with a comparison between an ancient and a modern phenomenon. Chapter five deals with the thousands of reviews that Heyne wrote for ‘Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen’ over the course of fifty years.
Modern scholarship has often neglected this very important form of early modern scholarship, and Heidenreich does it justice with a very detailed discussion. Finally, chapter 6 examines the papers that Heyne presented to Göttingen’s ‘Sozietät der Wissenschaften’, and which contains most of his antiquarian works (421–580). The book closes with a short conclusion (581–3), a detailed list of Heyne’s oeuvre (585–609) and a bibliography and index.

Why is Heyne important? Arnaldo Momigliano argued fifty years ago that the study of history in the early modern period was divided between two distinct genres and approaches. There was narrative history, written in an elevated style, mainly focusing on political and military events and aiming to provide readers with moral exempla and political knowledge. On the other hand there were the ‘Antiquitates’; antiquarian works which dealt with the aspects of political structure and social, economic and cultural history usually left outside the accounts of narrative history. While narrative histories followed progression through time, antiquarian works were arranged according to subject matter, bringing together materials from all different periods. And while the antiquarians were noted for their meticulous and often pedantic research methods, the primary merits of narrative historians were not research into the sources, but an elevated style and a good knowledge of statesmanship. The interesting thing about ancient history is that until the eighteenth century early modern scholars wrote only antiquarian works; if one wanted to read a narrative account of ancient history, one could only resort to the ancient historians themselves, who were considered the best witnesses to the events they were describing and unsurpassable in style, eloquence and wisdom. It was only in the eighteenth century that modern narratives of ancient history started to emerge. According to Momigliano, the breakthrough that led to the modern study of antiquity came when narrative history adopted the research methods and (to some extent) the subject matter of the antiquarians; for Momigliano, this was the greatest achievement of Gibbon’s ‘Decline and Fall’.

To some extent Heyne verifies Momigliano’s views on the antiquarians; he never wrote a work of narrative history and he rarely wrote reviews of the novel narrative histories of the eighteenth century (292–3). Even more, he was rather negative to this new genre. His review of the work of Haken, who had tried to provide a new narrative of the expedition of the Ten Thousand by combining the various ancient sources and seeing it in a different light, is illustrative; Heyne thought that the knowledgeable reader could judge for himself and there was no point in providing an account of the same events from a different perspective; as Heidenreich comments, ‘the conception of a continuously improved understanding of ancient history through the succeeding interpretations of different scholars was foreign to him’ (358).

On the other hand, the case of Heyne shows that Momigliano’s account is very partial (297). Momigliano believed that antiquarians collected all relevant evidence about a certain phenomenon without drawing distinctions between different periods, without linking the various social, economic, cultural and political antiquities into a connected whole, and without moving from the collection of evidence to the answering of historical questions. Thus, antiquarian works remained unchanging during the early modern period and could not pro-
vide the motor of change in the study of history. Heidenreich shows convincingly that this is a mistaken impression. In review after review Heyne argued that the Greek and Roman societies had changed considerably over the centuries, emphasised the need to distinguish between different periods and the dangers of using evidence from one period to talk about another (298–9). Even more, Heyne was able to transform the disconnected subjects of antiquarian studies into a holistic account of Greek and Roman societies. His ‘Vorlesungen’ on Roman antiquities is a revealing example; the very title ‘Antiquitas Romana’, instead of the traditional ‘Antiquitates Romanae’, speaks volumes. Instead of talking about the distinct subjects of *antiquitates sacrae* and *antiquitates militares*, Heyne brought them together by examining the religious character and the military practices of the foundation and expansion of the Roman state (299). For Heyne it was the ‘Verfassung’ of a state and the ‘Geist’ of a nation that provided the link between the different aspects of a society; in this way he had discovered the key concepts of nineteenth-century scholarship (392–3).

Heidenreich stresses well that in Heyne’s view it was only the early periods of Greek and Roman history which deserved the serious attention of the historian, because it was only here that one could make new discoveries (377). She documents extensively Heyne’s interest in the Dark Ages, which involved not only early Greek and Roman history and mythology (175–80, 431–96), but also the early history of humanity (377–94), Etruscan (497–510) and even Indian history (395–413). This is particularly important, since many of the techniques and approaches that later became the staple of historical research were initially conceived and constructed in the study of these early periods.

Even more, Momigliano severely underestimated the importance of another genre for the development of historiography: the innumerable works that attempted to examine a modern phenomenon in the light of an ancient one, or attempted to draw conclusions and guidance for the present from the history of antiquity. These works are usually examined in studies of the reception of antiquity, but are largely absent in histories of classical scholarship, because modern scholars treat them as unscientific. Although many of them were rather frivolous, and often used antiquity only as a thin veneer for their modern preoccupations, many of them were important pieces of scholarship. Heyne’s University ‘Programme’ belong to this category of works. Heidenreich shows in detail the importance and variability of these works. Heyne was aware of the great differences between antiquity and modernity and in many cases was adamant that ancient solutions could not be applied to modern problems. But he argued that an ancient example could highlight what was problematic in modern society; in one of his programmes in the 1790’s e.g. he argued that although the Romans were extremely cruel towards their enemies, allies and subjects, they were at least prudent enough to make treaties that would serve to give a definite end to a war or dispute, in contrast to the treaties of the 90’s that were no sooner drafted, than immediately contested (247–8). On the other hand, he knew that modern experiences could throw new light to ancient history, as when he argued that the French Revolution made it easier to understand ancient republics (302–3).

Heyne wrote a number of Programmes on the legislators of Magna Graecia (210–9). In the first Programmes he tried to make a distinction between ancient
and modern lawgivers, by arguing that Zaleucus and Charondas did not primarily address the constitution of their states, but rather aimed to produce good citizens with a series of moral laws; these were happy examples of wise lawgivers legislating under the benevolent influence of philosophical thought. But over the course of years, he came to realise the problematic nature of the ancient sources that related these laws; he thus moved to an examination of the sources and the history of the various cities of Southern Italy. In another case, Heyne examined the popular debate on the populousness of ancient and modern nations (202–9). He chose a middle path by arguing that in certain places the population of an ancient city far exceeded what could be supported by the natural fertility of the area. To explain this, Heyne argued that the ancients were much more frugal than the moderns. To prove his case, he wrote a fascinating piece on the social history of Athens, in which he showed how limited were the luxuries and amenities of ancient Athenians.

Heidenreich has provided a very detailed study of Heyne, which should serve as a model to other future works. In particular I would like to commend her attention to the wider non-classical environment within which Heyne worked. Göttingen was a great centre of historical research during Heyne’s time and Heidenreich shows the various links between Heyne’s work and scholars like Schlözer, Gatterer or Michaelis. I have only a few critical points to make. The first one is that her decision to arrange the book according to the different forms of Heyne’s works, despite its important advantages mentioned above, makes it difficult to see the development of Heyne’s thought over time. There is also no concentrated analysis of Heyne’s position within the intellectual climate of his time – there are very interesting but scattered points about his views on warfare and empire (248–52), liberty (197–202) or slavery (232–3), but no in-depth discussion. Finally, Heidenreich avoids answering her own question, i.e. how and where are we going to position Heyne within the development of classical scholarship and the historical discipline. But these are all side issues – scholars who are interested to pursue these questions will find this work a great asset in giving their own answers.
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The present volume is the third monographic publication¹ on the results of the excavations of Maurice Dunand in the sanctuary of the healing god Eshmun near